

ASC EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING MINUTES

April 26 - 27, 2013

Atlanta Marriott Marquis Hotel

Board Members in attendance: Bob Agnew, Joanne Belknap, Becky Block, Lisa Broidy, Shawn Bushway, Karen Heimer, Colin Loftin, Karen Parker, Travis Pratt, Nancy Rodriguez, Robert Sampson, Susan Sharp, Charles Wellford, Pam Wilcox, and Chris Eskridge (Recorder). Visitors – Tim Brezina, Todd Clear (via Skype), Brian Payne, Volkan Topalli, Charles Wellford.

The meeting was called to order by ASC President Bob Agnew at 3:00 pm, April 26, 2013.

1 – Bob Agnew, Susan Sharp, and Tim Brezina outlined upcoming Atlanta meetings plans and progress.

2 – Charles Wellford and Todd Clear (on Skype) led a discussion regarding ASC's policy activities. Brian Payne shared the view of the ACJS leadership on this same issue. The Board approved the motion that ASC re-engage in lobbying efforts with ACJS. Specifically:

- a) A National Policy Joint Oversight Committee (NPJOC) will be established, consisting of 8 to 10 individuals, half representing ASC and half representing ACJS. At least one of the ASC representatives is to be a member of the ASC Policy Committee.
- b) The NPJOC will be responsible for lobbying and educational efforts that focus on strengthening free and independent scientific inquiry, and the support for crime and justice research.
- c) The NPJOC will operate under the direction of the ASC and ACJS Executive Boards, with major activities and goals being approved by the ASC and ACJS Boards.
- d) Up to \$20,000 a year is authorized to be spent (along with up to \$20,000 a year coming from ACJS) to hire a COSSA representative who will focus on crime and justice issues. The NPJOC will work in conjunction with COSSA in the hiring process.
- e) The NPJOC will provide strategic oversight of the COSSA crime and justice staff member. This staff member will be managed on an operational level by the COSSA Director, but will be under the general directive of the NPJOC.
- f) The NPJOC will study the possibility of developing White Papers, and will make recommendations to the ASC and ACJS Boards as to their feasibility. If deemed feasible, the NPJOC will outline proposed mechanisms for their preparation and dissemination.
- g) The NPJOC will help establish a Council for the Support of Research and Statistics on Crime and Criminal Justice
- h) The NPJOC will help formulate and identify key issues for the Council for the Support of Research and Statistics on Crime and Criminal Justice.
- i) The NPJOC was allocated an operating budget of \$5,000 a year coming from ASC funds, and if approved, an additional \$5,000 a year coming from ACJS.
- j) There will be an evaluation of this effort four years after the formation of the NPJOC.

Ad Hoc Policy Review Committee report, April 2012 (attached)

Policy Committee Implementation Recommendations, January 2013 (attached)

COSSA report, April 2013 (attached)

3 - Charles Wellford, ASC COSSA Representative, discussed threats to NSF funding. The Board agreed to send a letter to COSSA in support of their opposition to the threatened cuts, and to send an email to ASC members urging them to oppose the threatened cuts. Charles Wellford and Marjorie Zatz will also write an article on the NSF threats for The Criminologist.

4 - The Executive Director and Treasurer reported that the Society and the divisions are all in a solid financial position. An external auditor reviewed our financial records for 2012, and gave us a clean bill of health. The Board approved the following policy statement to be included in the ASC Policy Manual, as recommended by the auditor:

“The Executive Director, in conjunction with the Treasurer, may invest Society funds. The Executive Director and Treasurer are to consult with Teron Carter of Fifth Third Bank before investing Society funds. Society funds are to be conservatively invested in standard market stock and bond mutual funds. Any significant shift in investment strategy requires the approval of the Finance Committee. The status of all investments shall be reported in each budget statement and in all Society financial reports prepared for the Board. The Executive Director and/or the Treasurer are to provide said financial reports at least twice a year - in advance of the Annual Meeting and in advance of the Mid-Year Board Meeting.”

5 – The award committee reports were reviewed, and the Board voted to approve the selection of the following award recipients:

- a) Bloch Award – Margaret Zahn
- b) Cavan Award – Christopher Wildeman
- c) Fellows – Richard Felson, Janet Lauritsen, Cassia Spohn, Chris Uggen
- d) Outstanding Article - Ronald L. Simons, Man Kit Lei, Steven R. H. Beach, Gene H. Brody, Robert A. Philibert, and Frederick X. Gibbons for the 2011 article “Social Environment, Genes, and Aggression: Evidence Supporting the Differential Susceptibility Perspective.” American Sociological Review 76: 883-912.
- e) Sellin-Glueck Award – Clifford Shearing
- f) Sutherland Award – Cathy Widom
- g) Vollmer Award – Mark Lipsey

6 – The Board approved the appointment of Wayne Osgood as the Editor of Criminology. His term in office will expire in November of 2017.

7 – The Board discussed the general misperception that Criminology & Public Policy articles can be peer reviewed - that not all of them are invited papers. To counter this misperception, the Board suggested that the CPP editors periodically send out general “Calls for Submissions.”

8 - The Board thanked Becky Block for her work on The Criminologist, and Becky particularly noted the fine work being done by Anne Arendt in the Columbus office. The Board discussed the inclusion of “book reviews” versus “book essays” in The Criminologist, and recommended that the Editor continue the “Thoughts about Books” section, but consider the possibility of book reviews for the future. Becky will develop a guide for the next Editor and Associate Editor. (Publications Committee report.[attached])

9 – The Board approved the proposed list of committee members for 2013-2014, subject to minor adjustments based on potential committee member’s willingness to serve.

10 - The Board approved a budget of up to \$1,000 a year for Liaison expenses, except for the United Nations Liaison who has a budget of \$2,000.

11 – The Board approved the following amendment to Article 6 of the By-Laws – “The membership will be given 45 days to submit their ballots.” The Board will re-vote on this amendment at the next Board Meeting. Ballots will now be sent out using the ASC President’s electronic return mail address.

12 - Volkan Topalli reported on local arrangements for the Atlanta meeting.

13 - The Board discussed the possibility of the ASC making use of new electronic media, such as Facebook and Twitter.

14 - The Board discussed and approved in principal the creation of an Ad Hoc Long Range Planning Committee for the ASC. Among the key charges of this committee would be assessing the tasks of the current Executive Director and developing a transition plan for continuing to accomplish those tasks in the future. Bob Agnew will follow up via email.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 pm on Saturday, April 27, 2013.

Chris Eskridge, Recorder

IMPROVING CRIME AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESEARCH AND STATISTICS PROGRAMS: A ROLE FOR THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY

INTRODUCTION AND ASSUMPTIONS

In January of 2012 the boards of the American Society of Criminology (ASC) and the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS) appointed an Ad Hoc committee to:

“... review our Raben Group-based policy activities and initiatives to date. The Ad Hoc Committee will draw upon external reviewers and will specifically examine costs, benefits, and impacts of these undertakings. The Committee is also to explore additional activities that may be undertaken in the policy arena. The motion passed.”

Following a thorough review of the Raben Group’s activities and initiatives, the goals the sponsoring organizations had set for this initiative, and the role of the ASC National Policy Committee, the Ad Hoc committee recommended that the contract with the Raben Group not be renewed¹. The boards of ASC and ACJS did not renew the contract with the Raben Group.

The Ad Hoc committee went further than just evaluating the performance of the Raben Group. It also found that:

1. Everyone we interviewed expressed support for the ASC/ACJS seeking to educate the executive and legislative branches about the value of supporting crime and justice research and statistics. All noted the importance of science in crime policy, the need for scientists leading NIJ and BJS, and the need for these agencies to follow best practices.
2. To be effective in doing this ACJS and ASC should work together. However, to be more effective these organizations should consider working with a broader range of organizations (e.g., all of the major law enforcement organizations who support the goals identified in #1 above), and by doing so, increasing the impact of the effort

Therefore, the Ad Hoc committee, after finding that continuing with the Raben Group at current levels of funding was not advisable, stated:

1. There are other mechanisms available to ASC and ACJS to achieve the goals of this effort. These include adding more resources (\$10,000-20,000 per month) to a competitively awarded contract with a professional organization; contracting with COSSA to provide services to the organizations that are

¹ The report is available from Chris Eskridge or the ad hoc committee chair, Charles Wellford.

above and beyond those that result from their membership in COSSA; contracting with someone in the DC area with ties to and an understanding of educational efforts of the type described above; and, enhancing the role of the Executive Director of ACJS and or ASC to include these functions as a key part of his/her duties. If ACJS and ASC decide to end the relationship with the Raben Group that decision should be accompanied by a decision to activate one of these other options.

2. Any future efforts should be guided by continuity of leadership by key members in each organization, explicit statements of what is expected by the sponsoring organizations; more attention to levels of effort received; attention to how well the effort is achieving its goals (e.g., awareness and use of scientific research by legislators dealing with crime and justice issues; consulting key Congressional staff to assess their evaluation of the efforts; surveys of briefing attendees); and outreach to a much broader set of organizations.

Recently, the chairperson of the ASC National Policy Committee (NPC) asked two of the members of the Ad Hoc committee (Stephen Mastrofski and Charles Wellford) to further consider these findings and recommendations and propose a specific plan of action for the NPC to consider.

We approached this task with the following assumptions:

1. Funding for any effort cannot exceed \$20-40,000 per year. This comes from informal discussions with ASC leadership and from the fact that this was the amount devoted to the effort with the Raben Group.
2. Any commitment will be for at least five years. The effectiveness of lobbying² with branches of the federal government (which we assume is the primary focus) depends on building relationships and credibility. These cannot be achieved if people and approaches change too frequently.
3. The NPC and the ASC Board will provide specific direction to any effort, closely monitor activities, set clear goals and benchmarks, and involve the membership as much as possible. This did not uniformly occur with the Raben effort.

² Organizations like ASC can lobby under certain conditions. It will be important for the leadership of ASC to become more aware of what can and cannot be done as a 501(c)(3) organization.

4. Any effort must include a “research function”. That is there must be a capability to responsibly respond to requests for information that are relevant to the lobbying efforts. For example, federal research and statistics spending by state or congressional district; recommendations for improving NIJ and BJS; rationale for support of a crime commission; etc.. It is not reasonable to expect that these and other issues can be addressed without involving the NPC and the ASC membership.

5. There is a short term solution and a long term solution that the NPC should consider. The long term solution is the creation of a presence for the ASC and the executive director in the Washington, D.C area. There is a reason almost every other social science discipline and field has their headquarters in the DC area. We know that this has been discussed in ASC many times over the past 20 years or more. We also assume that this will not happen as long as the current executive director is in office – which we hope is a long time. However, at some point this will change, and at that time ASC should again consider the costs and benefits of moving to the DC area and having an executive director who can manage relations with the federal government. We urge this to be part of the succession planning for ASC.

OPTIONS

We see two options that are available for consideration. Either of these can be effective, especially if they include two other conditions that are described below.

1. DC representative for ASC. In this option ASC would appoint someone to a part-time position as the ASC representative for governmental relations. Ideally, this person would be someone with intimate knowledge of the people and processes in the Congress and executive branch who deal with crime and criminal justice research and statistics. This person would be a senior, perhaps retired, criminologist with credibility in these parts of government and with the ASC. This person would represent ASC interests and seek enactment of the agenda set by the NPC and the ASC. To be clear, neither of the authors of this report have any interest whatsoever in such a position. However, other organizations (e.g., the American Economic Association (AEA) and the Population Society of America) use this approach and have found it effective. Key to the success of this approach would be the selection of the right person and his/her commitment to

doing this for at least five years. In order to have this person working on average two days a week it would require a salary in the range of expenditures noted above and he/she would need administrative and travel support.

2. COSSA Plus. With this option the ASC would, in addition to paying its normal COSSA dues, contract with COSSA for a dedicated staff person at 50% of effort. This person would be dedicated to working for ASC but would have the administrative and management support of COSSA and could draw on the credibility and access that COSSA has established. This could also be done within the cost range noted above. This person would be a junior staff member of COSSA but would know with whom to work and how to do it from the very first day of engagement. This model would be close to the Raben Group but would provide substantially more time dedicated to ASC than Raben was able to provide.

We recommend that the NPC recommend option 2 to the ASC Board. We have informally discussed this with Howard Silver and he is open to this option. We feel that this option can be ramped up quickly and will take advantage of an organization and staff with a proven record in this sort of enterprise.

If the NPC selects one of these options or some other we believe there are two other conditions that should be considered. First, the NPC should become more active than it was with Raben in setting goals, monitoring performance, and providing assistance. For example at the AEA their board meets weekly (by phone with their representative) and members make frequent trips to the Hill and to key administrative offices. AEA makes sure that members of their committee have extensive experience in the Washington arena. This will also require that membership on the NPC is renewable and that the NPC has support for their involvement (travel and per diem at a minimum. Second, ASC should take the leadership in developing a Council for the Support of Crime and Criminal Justice Research. Many other organizations have such a council³. ASC is a small, academic based, and relatively unknown organization in the broader policy world. When we did our review of the Raben Group we found no principals in Congress who knew the organization by name. Our experience strongly suggests that police chiefs, sheriffs, and others who work in the criminal justice system have more access to and credibility with Congress and the Executive than academics. A council would bring all of the various criminal justice advocacy groups together to support NIJ, BJS and other research and statistical agencies in the crime and justice space. Just as now, the sole focus would be on funding, appropriate leadership and transparency and peer review in the awards process. ASC would provide the leadership and staff (i.e., in the person of the ASC government relations staff person). The scope and rules of the Council would have to be carefully worked out but it they

³ For a partial listing see <http://www.cossa.org/about/cossaledcoalitions>

were then representatives representing the academic and criminal justice community could speak with one voice on the importance of quality research and statistics.

We do *not* recommend that the ASC use this vehicle to state and advocate for policy positions on substantive issues in the fields of crime and justice. However, we do see an appropriate role for the ASC in providing timely research support that would inform policy discussions. This might best be provided in the form of short “white papers” that the ASC would commission at the request of national policy makers.

With a strong NPC, a coalition of organizations committed to enhancing research and statistics and competent staff support, the ASC could begin to achieve its long standing goal of working to improve the infrastructure for crime and criminal justice research and statistics.

April 2, 2013

From: Stephen Mastrofski & Charles Wellford
To: Chris Eskridge, Executive Director, American Society of Criminology
Re: Report of COSSA representatives on activities

This report summarizes the activities of COSSA and its two ASC representatives, Mastrofski and Wellford over the last several months. Because the ASC Executive Director receives copies of COSSA's Board meetings, we will not recapitulate those items, but rather highlight a few aspects of our impressions and activities relevant to COSSA and the functions COSSA performs for the ASC.

From our perspective, the most important reasons for ASC's involvement with COSSA is to advance the amount of funding for crime and justice research, to lobby for the selection of high quality social scientists to lead federal agencies that handle federal funding for this research (e.g., NIJ and BJS), and to enhance the relevance and utility of the discipline for public policy decisions. The periodic reports of COSSA's Executive Director show the various ways in which he and COSSA have worked to advance the case for increased funding for crime and justice research. In the last year the efforts have been largely lobbying to minimize cuts to funding. The effects of major federal funding cutbacks due to sequestration will be manifested, not in the current year's budget, but the following one. The attached transcript of COSSA's recent testimony before a Congressional subcommittee regarding federal funding support for NSF, NIJ, and BJS provides some indication of the need for a focused and determined effort to highlight the protection of crime and justice research funding, particularly challenging when other disciplines, such as political science, are under severe attack.

At the request of the ASC President Robert Agnew, Wellford and Mastrofski have been working with Todd Clear (of ASC's Policy Committee) to organize a lobbying campaign with the U.S. Congress to protect and strengthen funding for crime and justice research. The plan set forth is for the presidents of the ASC and ACJS to lead a small group of interested parties that will meet with two key members of Congress or their staff: Representative Frank Wolf (VA) and Senator Barbara Mikulski (MD). Other persons agreeing to attend include a representative of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, a representative of a local police agency from the member's district, and a representative of a major university in each district (U. of Maryland and Geo. Mason U.). COSSA will schedule and coordinate the meeting and preparation for the meeting, which is expected to include brief but forceful statements of the value of empirical research to shed light on the major issues of crime and justice facing policy makers today. COSSA estimates that the likely timing for this meeting will not be before late April, which effectively means no sooner than early May, because of the scheduling of the ASC board meeting.

At the solicitation of ASC leadership, Wellford and Mastrofski have also prepared and delivered to the Policy Committee a long-term plan for increasing the ASC's relevance to the public policy process concerning crime and justice.¹ This plan discusses options and offers recommendations for developing a sustained and sustainable lobbying presence in the Washington area while working collaboratively with other organizations with compatible perspectives. Among the options considered is one that has an expanded role for COSSA (based on increased ASC funding support).

¹ See "IMPROVING CRIME AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESEARCH AND STATISTICS PROGRAMS: A ROLE FOR THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY" and "IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE CONCERNING REESTABLISHING AN ASC/ACJS ROLE IN FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR CRIME AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESEARCH AND STATISTICS."

A final point worthy of note is that COSSA's annual policy colloquium, held in DC in November, will continue. Last year Laurie Robinson was the featured speaker on crime and justice topics, and the year before, Albert Blumstein served that role. The colloquium provides an opportunity for DC-area policy makers to hear about important social science research issues and for representatives of various social science associations to collaborate with each other, as well as to meet policy makers. At this year's first meeting, the general sense of COSSA attendees was that the 2013 colloquium might include a presentation on the timely issue of gun research. Obviously, the ASC has a great deal to contribute here.

Testimony of Howard Silver, Executive Director, Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), to the House Commerce, Justice, Science Subcommittee, House Appropriations Committee. Honorable Frank Wolf, Chairman. March 21, 2013.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

My name is Howard Silver and I am the Executive Director of the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA). The Consortium represents 115 professional associations, scientific societies, universities and research institutes concerned with the promotion of and funding for research in the social, behavioral and economic sciences. COSSA functions as a bridge between the research world and the Washington community. A list of COSSA's membership is attached.

COSSA appreciates the opportunity to comment on budgets for the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). Given the sequester, the continuing budget disputes, and the lack of the President's proposed FY 2014 budget, COSSA does not recommend any specific numbers for these agencies' appropriations for FY 2014. COSSA strongly requests that the Committee recommend a generous increase for NSF over its final FY 2013 budget to restore funds lost by the sequester. In particular, we endorse enhanced funding for its Research and Related Activities and Education and Human Resources accounts.

The NIJ and BJS have been underfunded for so long that as two National Academies' reports have noted they also need enhanced resources to fulfill their missions. We strongly appreciate the Subcommittee's support for the set-aside of Office of Justice Programs' funds for these two agencies. All three of these agencies significantly impact federal support that social and behavioral scientists receive to investigate issues important to the nation's future. NSF's Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences (SBE) directorate provides 62 percent of federal funding for basic research in these sciences at U.S. colleges and universities. In some disciplines, such as political science, it is close to 95 percent.

COSSA is well aware that each year the Subcommittee confronts difficult choices among competing agencies under its jurisdiction. Especially in this era of budget reductions, we hope that you can provide sufficient funding for these agencies so that we do not curtail this nation's capacity for scientific research, education, and evidence-based policy making. COSSA appreciates your generosity to these agencies in the past and hopes that this can continue.

NSF

It is discouraging that the last time I was here, in 2011, the Administration was proposing a FY 2012 NSF budget of \$7.8 billion. Barring unforeseen developments, the FY 2013 budget will be around \$6.9 billion. COSSA strongly hopes that in considering the FY 2014 budget, the Subcommittee will lead the Congress in restoring the lost funds for NSF, which is still the world's premier basic science agency supporting ALL the sciences.

COSSA regrets the departure of Dr. Suresh as director after his all-too-brief tenure. We applaud the elevation of Dr. Cora Marrett to Acting Director. As someone who has served in that capacity before as well as Deputy Director and leader of two of NSF's directorates, she is well-qualified and experienced to lead the Foundation. COSSA hopes that the Administration would give her strong consideration for the Director's position.

COSSA was also deeply disappointed by the House's action in 2012 to prohibit funding for NSF's political science program. The Political Science Program supports scientific research that creates knowledge critical for making our own democracy stronger, for understanding the actions of nations around the world, and for achieving efficiencies and fairness in our public policies. Like all scientific endeavors, its researchers follow the scientific method of developing hypotheses, testing them through data collection and analysis, and producing publishable results while archiving the data for replication. Political science does not take sides or make decisions about values. It provides data for understanding political processes and identifies generalizable relationships. This research is used, mostly without acknowledgement, by decision makers in this legislative branch, the executive branch, and in capitals around the world. The research saves lives, analyzes political upheaval, increases competitiveness, and explains democratic governance.

Research in the social, behavioral and economic sciences (SBE) and its directorate at NSF have and will continue to contribute mightily to this nation and the world. At a hearing on Cybersecurity in the House Science, Space, and Technology on February 26, three witnesses, all with experience in the private sector, made clear the importance of research on human behavior to deal with this important national security issue. A former Vice President at McAfee told the panel: [Cybersecurity] is "no longer an engineering discipline. It requires deep involvement from economists, sociologists, anthropologists and other scientists to create holistic research agendas..." In addition, an acknowledged key paper in this area, "Risk in Networked Information Systems," was written by University of Michigan political scientist Robert Axelrod. NSF needs to play a key role in supporting this interdisciplinary research.

NSF and its funders have always fostered the notion of "transformative research." Here are two from the SBE disciplines that have hugely changed our thinking about an important topic. The late Elinor Ostrom of Indiana University and Daniel Kahneman of Princeton University both won the Nobel Prize in economics, even though Ostrom was trained as political scientist and Kahneman as a psychologist. Both made tremendous contributions to the understanding of decision making; one by collectivities and the other by individuals. Ostrom, according to the Nobel Committee, in her analysis of economic governance: "Challenged the conventional wisdom by demonstrating how local property can be successfully managed by local commons without any regulation by central authorities or privatization." Kahneman, again from the Nobel citation: "Integrated economic analysis with fundamental insights from cognitive psychology, in particular regarding behavior under uncertainty, thereby laying the foundation for a new field of research."

NSF has also recognized the importance of research on disasters. Two areas of studies are risk communication and resilience. H. Dan O'Hair, of the University of Kentucky and his team used demographic, socioeconomic, physiological, and psychological data to improve the accuracy and efficacy of advisories and warnings for weather systems leading to improved communication of

hurricane information that promotes more effective protective decision-making, thus saving lives and property. They now have an I-CORPS grant to examine the potential of extending the scientific knowledge gained from the NSF-supported studies to improving private communication platforms. The NSF-supported work of Roxane Cohen Silver of the University of California, Irvine, has contributed to our understanding of how people cope with disasters, from the September 11th tragedy to earthquakes and firestorms. Both O’Hair and Cohen will be participants in an April 25th congressional briefing, co-sponsored by the House R&D Caucus and the Coalition for National Science Funding.

Another area of innovation in the SBE sciences remains the contributions of interdisciplinary research, including geography, responsible for the creation of Geographic Information Systems (GIS). NSF’s support of the National Center for Geographic Information Systems and Analysis in the mid-1980s spearheaded the development of what is now a multi-billion GIS industry. These systems are now applied by states, counties, and localities, supplying the backbone of crime mapping activities that have played such an important role in the crime reduction America has experienced in the past two decades. GIS is also used by the private sector to improve delivery systems and store location planning.

As you know, the SBE directorate has funded significant amounts of research on youth violence that was summarized in a report recently produced for this Subcommittee. We are also grateful that SBE is supporting and enhancing access to the three Gold Standard Surveys – the Panel Study on Income Dynamics, the General Social Survey and the American National Election Studies. Each of these has painted a unique longitudinal portrait of Americans’ economic, social, and political attitudes and behavior, so important for policy making at all levels of government.

COSSA also welcomes the inter-agency neuroscience initiative and thanks the Subcommittee for its support. Under the direction of OSTP’s Philip Rubin, former Director of the SBE’s Division of Behavioral and Cognitive Sciences (BCS), the initiative is moving ahead examining many challenges, including those presented by the proposed Decade of the Brain. The BCS division has strongly supported research in cognitive science and the neuroscience of cognition and behavior, such as language learning and usage, thought, decision making, and social processes. It is now soliciting proposals, especially interdisciplinary ones, to extend the research to include adaptation to changing environments as well as neural mechanisms underlying dynamic decisions and communication.

The Education and Human Resources Directorate has transformed itself with a renewed emphasis on research and evaluation of STEM programs. COSSA strongly supports this and we are delighted that NSF has improved its inclusion of the SBE sciences as part of the “S” in STEM. Not only is it usually SBE scientists who conduct the research and evaluation studies, but it is important that these sciences are seen as an integral part of K-12 education in this country. They have a lot to offer elementary and secondary students.

COSSA applauds NSF’s continued interest in broadening participation of underrepresented groups in the sciences. Working with NSF and NIH, the COSSA-led Collaborative on Enhancing Diversity in the Sciences has held two workshops on the issue. The latest was held in

May 2012 and the report will be available shortly. We also thank NSF for providing two speakers for the event, Dr. Marrett, and Kellina Craig-Henderson of the SBE directorate.

Again, we hope the Subcommittee can restore NSF's lost funding during the FY 2014 appropriations process to keep America's scientific prowess in ALL disciplines intact.

NIJ and BJS

The distinguished criminologist, the late James Q. Wilson, who helped disseminate the “broken windows” theory that led many big-city mayors to confront crime and delinquency resulting in significant decreases in criminal activities in the past 15 years, argued that the federal government can be and should be the research and development arm of the criminal justice system supporting research and data collection, analysis, and dissemination. The NIJ and BJS have been the key agencies for this purpose. Their recently departed leaders John Laub and James Lynch brought professionalism and the knowledge gained from their careers as scientists to their positions. We hope similarly qualified people will soon be appointed to replace them. The NIJ has played a key role in designing and testing crime prevention and control strategies by focusing on three major areas – the nature of crime, the causes of crime, and the response to crime. It has funded studies and evaluations that are rigorous, scientifically sound, and valuable to criminal justice practitioners – police, prosecutors, judges, correctional officials, and policymakers.

NIJ has recently emphasized the notion of “Translational Criminology” – the translation of scientific discoveries into policy and practice to help prevent, manage, and control crime. It includes: addressing the gaps between scientific discovery and program delivery; finding evidence that something works and figuring out how to implement the evidence in real world practice settings; and knowing what conditions facilitate or inhibit field use of research evidence.

NIJ has also tried to develop an innovative, integrated, cutting-edge research agenda by bringing together the three seemingly disparate sciences the agency supports — the social, forensic and physical sciences.

Also in the past few years, with constrained resources, NIJ has focused on two very important developments: the significant increases in the rate of incarceration; and the soaring crime rate during the 1980s, which was followed by equally large declines during the 1990s and continuing into the new century. The Institute has co-funded with the MacArthur Foundation the creation of a panel at the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to study the causes of consequences of high rates of incarceration and a series of roundtables to synthesize the research on crime trends.

Other areas of NIJ funding in the past two years include new studies of: California prison realignment; race, crime, and victimization; victim-offender overlap; desistance from crime; police legitimacy; and criminal sanctions. NIJ has continued its work in research programs such as violence against women, teen dating violence, and sexual assault. The goal in all of these efforts is to develop a cumulative body of research knowledge.

NIJ is also deeply committed to funding the most rigorous scientific designs including evaluations using randomized controlled trials (RCT) wherever possible. Right now, NIJ has 17 RCTs in the field. To further strengthen the science, NIJ has initiated Standing Peer Review

Panels consistent with practices at other science agencies throughout the federal government. NIJ will also take over Crime Solutions.Gov, a program initiated by former Assistant Attorney General Laurie Robinson when she led the Office of Justice Programs.

One major success story is NIJ's support of the Kennedy School of Government's Executive Session on Policing and Public Safety. Here leading police executives and researchers come together on a regular basis to tackle the major issues facing the field, by focusing on practitioners and finding out the knowledge they need to do their jobs. Currently, there are several papers under production, jointly written by police chiefs and researchers. The sessions also focus attention on how best to "influence the field" through concerted efforts to transform practice and policy. Given the success of this initiative, NIJ will convene a new Harvard Executive Session beginning in 2013 on the future of community corrections policy. The goal is to assemble a panel of expert researchers, practitioners, and others to explore key ideas to help shape the future of policy, practice, and research on issues of offenders supervised in the community.

Data generated by BJS on victims, offenders, law enforcement, prisons and the courts are the basis of many congressional decisions on funding and legislation. We appreciate the Subcommittee's support for the redesign of the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), which has allowed reinstatement of the sample size and interviewer training, and the development of sub-national estimates. It will also allow BJS to fulfill the goal of finding better ways for measuring rape and sexual assault in this self-report survey.

BJS also hopes to embark on NCS-X: The National Crime Statistics Exchange. The first phase of this program is to facilitate the development of a nationally representative sample of U.S. law enforcement agencies that provide detailed information on crime incidents in their communities. It is anticipated that these data will be extracted from local management information systems and assembled at the national level using existing state and national data collection infrastructures.

The agency has also designed and implemented a software system that taps rap sheets housed in state repositories across the nation and yields a searchable database that summarizes the recorded criminal histories of tens of thousands of individuals. The database will support recidivism studies.

Through the modestly-funded State Justice Statistics program, the Statistical Analysis Centers (SACs) conduct research on issues that are essential to both state and federal agencies, such as assessing prescription drug use, human trafficking, and the effects of sex offender policy reform. SACs also have served as the majority of data collection providers for the BJS Arrest-Related Deaths data series. The NRC report urged that BJS expand and strengthen its relationships with the SACs.

Finally, BJS is attempting to upgrade its collection of criminal court processing information to take advantage of the capabilities of modern court management information systems. It has also undertaken efforts to assess the feasibility of building a system of administrative records on white collar crime and an establishment survey of victim services agencies.

These initiatives by NIJ and BJS to help us better understand crime will have difficulty succeeding without enhanced resources. We again thank you for the set-aside funds, but more is necessary.

As always, thank you for the opportunity to present our views.

IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE CONCERNING REESTABLISHING AN ASC/ACJS ROLE IN FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR CRIME AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESEARCH AND STATISTICS

Implementation of the recommendation from the ASC Policy Committee to reestablish efforts to encourage greater support for crime and criminal justice research and statistics¹ must address the following:

1. Engaging ACJS. Funding the proposal assumed the continuation of support from ASC and ACJS. At the request of President Agnew the leadership of ACJS was asked if they would be interested in considering the proposal approved by the Policy Committee. The leadership expressed great interest in doing this and agreed to take the proposal to their Board meeting in March. The leadership of ASC should maintain contact with ACJS and continue to encourage their adoption of the proposal.

2. The key players. There are three sets of key actors. First are the policy committees of the ASC and ACJS, which would continue to operate as they have but with a more limited scope of operations. Second would be a small group of ASC/ACJS appointed representatives, who would form the Joint Oversight Committee to manage the COSSA effort. The Joint Oversight Committee would set goals for the staff person, monitor performance, be directly involved in working with relevant federal organizations and bodies, provide semi-annual reports for the sponsoring organizations, manage “white papers” (see section 5) and identify key issues for consideration by the third group, the Council for the Support of Research and Statistics on Crime and Criminal Justice. The Council’s charter would be to support research and statistics on crime and criminal justice. The Council would provide a formal link to get the endorsement of all participating organizations for items referred to it by the COSSA group. The Council could also develop proposals that are consistent with its charter for consideration by the COSSA group.

3. Providing leadership for the effort. The COSSA Plus option and the associated Council for the Support of Research and Statistics on Crime and Criminal Justice would be directed by the ASC and ACJS.

This will require a reconsideration of the way each organization manages its role in policy issues. However managed there are three related activities: 1) managing the COSSA effort (the Joint Oversight Committee); 2) participating in the Council for the Support of Research and Statistics on Crime and Criminal Justice; and, 3) considering crime control and criminal justice policies that each organization might support. While related, these are distinct efforts that each organization will have to address.

To manage the COSSA effort we suggest a small Joint Oversight Committee (8-10) with equal representation from each organization. These should be individuals with substantial

¹ By this phase we mean to cover not only funding issues but other infrastructure issues such as the leadership of relevant agencies and commissions, independence and integrity of agency and commission operations, transparency of operations, program structure, content and effectiveness, and level and qualifications of staff. We include juvenile and tribal justice issues in the general phrase criminal justice. The word crime includes juvenile delinquency and all forms of white collar, corporate, and international crime.

experience in dealing with federal legislative and executive branches, respected in their organizations, and with an understanding of the operations of key federal agencies. Ideally, they would also include members from states and districts in key positions on important legislative committees. Finally, they should know how to manage professional staff. At least one member from each organization should be from the policy committee of each organization, and the lead person from each organization should serve on the proposed Council. All members should be able to travel to Washington when needed.

The proposed Council would involve one member each from a large number of organizations (obvious members in addition to ACJS and ASC would be IACP, PERF, PF, ACA, NSA, NDAA, NCDLA, JRSA, NCJA, APPA and any other organization that is not exclusively an advocacy group). The Council would have a rotating leader. Staff support would come from the COSSA plus staff person under the supervision of the Joint Oversight Committee.

ASC and ACJS would continue to have policy committees. These committees would consider all policy issues other than those that addressed support for crime and criminal justice research and statistics.

4. Qualifications and functions of the COSSA staff person. Given the funding level for this position he/she is likely to be at the beginning of his/her career in representing organizations at the federal level or someone who is retired from a career in crime and justice research or statistics but with little experience in representing organizations. We think the selection process should be open to both types of applicants. After time each of these ideal types would develop the experiences and contacts that they do not bring to the position. The staff person would be managed on a day-to-day basis by the Executive Director of COSSA but would have a performance review semi-annually by the oversight committee. This person would track and report on appropriation and legislative activities that relate to the charge of the oversight committee; establish and maintain relationships with key administrative and legislative staff and leaders; draft testimony for approval by the oversight committee for delivery or submission; arrange meetings for committee and council members with leaders and staff; arrange meetings in local districts and states with key members and local members of ASC and ACJS; organize at least two hill days for members (coordinated with speaker series organized by other organizations); provide staff support to meetings of the committee and council; and, prepare a column for the newsletters and/or websites for participating organizations.

5. How would the proposed “white papers” be managed? The precedent for this recommendation was the activities undertaken by ASC at the beginning of the Janet Reno’s service as Attorney General. She asked for a meeting with ASC leaders to discuss key issues in crime and justice. From that meeting a list of issues was identified and ASC leadership selected individuals to author papers on each topic. There was some review of the papers and then they were submitted to General Reno who is said to have used some of them quite extensively. The papers summarized the research on the selected topics, reached substantive and policy conclusions when warranted, and proposed a research agenda. Think of the effort as an early version of factcheck.org; or think of it as a mini-version of what the Committee of Law and Justice and its related panel do with massive funding.

How this might operate depends on whether there is any funding for it. Without funding the Joint Oversight Committee would identify topics, invite participants, review the papers and submit them on behalf of the organizations. Only a few could be done each year. Perhaps they could be incorporated into a journal but the focus would be service to a key person or organization. If there were funding, the oversight committee would function like the CLAJ and would set up panels with some staff, and a rigorous review process. While NAS charges \$750,000-\$1,200,000 for a review panel and \$500,000 for CLAJ annually, the oversight committee could do these for less than half the cost to funding agencies. We are not able to provide greater detail on this aspect of the recommendation until the issue of funding is decided – including whether ASC and or ACJS would agree to be the sponsoring organizations for such an effort. However, organized reports would not reach conclusions or make substantive recommendations unless the science base was firmly established (the NAS approach to controlling violations of this principle would followed for any work done in conjunction with this portion of the recommendations).

One major challenge is that on some of the most compelling issues of our time, experts will not agree on what the most compelling evidence is or how to interpret it. Within the ASC and ACJS there may be significant variation in the perspective that a participant brings to a given policy issue. Clearly, the selection of persons to draft a white paper should take into account credible differences among our field's experts on issues selected for white papers. Such a group should be charged with seeking consensus based on the best evidence, but where consensus is not possible, the product could make clear where views diverge and why. This should help alleviate concerns that this process will be subject to bias because scientists favoring only a particular perspective are selected to participate in the preparation of a document on a given issue.

6. What is a reasonable timeline for implementation? Assuming approval by ASC and ACJS boards by May of 2014 we would propose the following timeline:

- July of 2014 ASC and ACJS appoint members to the Joint Oversight Committee. Committee holds meeting to set first year agenda and long-term goals that are submitted to organizations for approval.
- September of 2014 staff person appointed at COSSA.
- November of 2014 proposed Council members identified and invited to join Council by ASC and ACJS leadership
- Oversight committee holds monthly teleconference to chart progress and modify plans
- January – July of 2014 staff and committee arrange at least four education days in DC and two in districts and states of key leaders during recess periods.
- November 2014, two or three key issues are identified as a focus for the year in conjunction with the Council. Members are informed and administrative and congressional contacts are facilitated.
- By May of 2014 ASC and ACJS decide how they want to proceed with the development of white papers. To facilitate this decision the oversight committee would prepare an options paper and a recommendation.
- January and July of 2014, the oversight committee prepares staff evaluation and an assessment for the boards of progress.

If the recommendations of the Policy Committee are adopted there will be many other issues that will emerge because any such effort requires agility, reaction to changing environments, and trust.

April 16, 2013

Executive Board
American Society of Criminology
1314 Kinnear Road
Suite 212
Columbus, OH 43212

Dear Executive Board Members

This is the report of the 2012-2013 ASC Publications Committee for the mid-term Executive Board meeting. The Publications Committee met on November 16th in Chicago. Attending were Carolyn Rebecca Block (chair), Wayne Osgood (*Criminology* co-editor), Charles Tittle, Ross Matsueda (past chair), Daniel Nagin (*Criminology & Public Policy* co-editor), William Bales (*Criminology & Public Policy* co-editor), Tom Blomberg (*Criminology* co-editor), Karen Heimer, Travis Pratt, Eric Baumer, and Kevin Beaver. Rosemary Gartner (*Criminology* co-editor) was unable to attend. There were three agenda items: (1) discussion of issues surrounding “overly similar” journal submissions; (2) discussion of a possible book review section in the *Criminologist*, and guidelines for choosing books if there were such a section; and (3) coming issues of the *Criminologist*. Discussion of the first item required almost all of the meeting’s allocated hour and twenty minutes, with a couple of minutes spent on items two and three.

Ross Matsueda led the discussion of “overly similar” journal submissions. At the request of the ASC Board, he had conducted a survey of journal editors on the issue, and he summarized the initial *Criminologist* article by the three co-editors of *Criminology*, the responses of journal editors to the survey, and an additional letter on the issue submitted by Frank Cullen. Ross then invited committee members to comment. After a vigorous discussion, the committee agreed to suggest to the ASC Board the following: (1) In the same issue, the *Criminologist* would publish discussion pieces by the *Criminology* co-editors and by Frank Cullen. ASC members would then be invited to comment on the issue; (2) There would be a session at the 2013 ASC meetings devoted to this topic.

The Committee decided against having a regular book review section in the *Criminologist*, citing the heavy logistic and possible legal problems this would cause. However, the Committee was in favor of Becky Block’s plan to publish occasional book reviews in a section titled, “Thoughts about Books: Occasional essays inspired by provocative reading.” Becky then reviewed other plans for the *Criminologist*, especially the establishment of additional “corners,” including “A View from the Field: What’s Happening Outside of Academia,” and “Collaboration Corner: News and Notes about Research Collaborations.” This was unanimously approved by the Committee.

At the ASC board meeting on Saturday, Becky summarized what happened at the committee meeting on Friday. The board seemed to like the spirit of what we decided to do, but did not especially like some of the particulars. After some discussion, here is how the “overly similar submission” issue stood at the end of the meeting: We were directed to publish two (not one) articles in the *Criminologist*, both in the same issue. The *Criminologist* editor will then ask the ASC membership to further the discussion by submitting comments to a dedicated page on the ASC web site.

In addition, the ASC board voted to hire a person for assistant editor of the *Criminologist* for a three year term, and to review at the end of the three years whether or not we want to continue. All reference to “book review editor” or to book reviews was removed from the job description. The board gave the *Criminologist* permission to go

ahead and publish any book reviews the editor might think interesting and appropriate, but decided there is no need to officially develop criteria for choosing books to review. The board also discussed future issues of the *Criminologist*. Members were enthusiastic about the addition of new “corners.”

The discussion of the “overly similar” publication submissions appeared in the March/April issue of the *Criminologist*. A short introduction by the editor was followed by an article by the *Criminology* editors and then an article by Frank Cullen. ASC members were invited to continue the discussion of the web, and Anne Arendt set up a discussion page and put a direct link to it on the "Announcements" page on the website. You can see it here: <http://www.asc41.com/announcements.htm> The link is titled "Discussion Site: Piecemeal Publication." Anne also put a reminder in the Around the ASC section in the May/June *Criminologist* issue to remind people of this link.

Two “Thoughts about Books: Occasional Essays Inspired by Provocative Reading” have been published in the *Criminologist* so far. In the January/February issue, Bonnie Berry reviewed *Moral Time* by Donald Black. In the March/ April issue, Hilliary Potter reviewed *Arrested Justice* by Beth Richie.

Of the six annual issues of the *Criminologist*, three have now gone to press. (See *Criminologist* Issues Overview, attached). Editors of *Criminologist* columns, Charisse Coston (Teaching Tips), Bianca Bersani (Doctoral Student Forum), Bonnie Berry (Keys to Success for Early Scholars), and Jay Albanese (Criminology around the World) continue to offer readers wonderfully thought-out and timely articles. I encouraged Jay Albanese, as chair of the DIC, to take more responsibility for Criminology around the World, and he has stepped up to the plate nicely. Only one of the three issues contains a “Keys to Success,” but that one contains two related articles with advice for budding critical criminologists. Members of the ASC Teaching Committee, including Charisse Coston, Chair, Natasha Ganem, Kristi Holsinger, Christopher Lyons, Stephen L. Muzzatti, and Heather L. Scheuerma peer review Teaching Tips articles, and the committee receives a number of submissions for every issue. The Editors’ Corner, written by the editors of the two ASC journals in alternating issues, is always wonderfully written and to-the-point, as we might expect from Eric Baumer, Wayne Osgood, Rosemary Gardner, Dan Nagin and Bill Bales. What the *Criminologist* and the ASC would do without these dedicated, talented corner editors, I don’t know!

The *Criminologist* is open to submissions of “featured articles,” and I was happy to welcome *Stealing Science: Research Misconduct and the Misuse of Scholarly Work*, by Mark Davis and Bonnie Berry. A new corner, “A View from the Field: What’s Happening Outside of Academia,” has appeared twice so far, with *What Works to Curb U.S. Street Gang Violence?* by James C. Howell and Michelle Arciaga, and *Fostering Researcher-Practitioner Collaboration* by Angela Moore. In addition, I have been editing the short and newsy “Collaboration Corner: News and Notes about Research Collaborations.” I hope that both of these new columns will continue into the next year. The March/April lead article was written by David McDowell, who won the ASC Teaching Award in 2011, and I think it would be wonderful if the *Criminologist* continued to showcase the importance of teaching by inviting future Teaching Award winners to contribute a lead article or a featured article.

The opening for an Assistant Editor for the *Criminologist* was advertised widely. We received several inquiries, but only three applications, and one of those applications was withdrawn. The deadline for applications is May 1st.

Volkan Topalli has organized a panel for the November ASC on "Pressure, Structure, and Ethics: Criminology's Contemporary Issues in Publishing." Presenters are Wayne Osgood, “Ethical Issues at the Intersection of Building Careers and Building Our Field;” Cassia Spohn, "Ethical Issues in Publishing: The Challenges Journal Editors

Face as They Attempt to 'Police' the Publishing Process;" and Beth Huebner, "Academic Publishing and the Young Scholar: Reflections from PhD Program Directors." The chair will be Volkan Topalli and the discussant will be Robert Bursik.

On March 20th, Wayne Osgood, Rosemary Gartner and Eric Baumer submitted their application for a second term as editors of Criminology. The Publications Committee (minus the three editors, of course) agreed unanimously to accept their application, with the following comments:

- I recommend without reservation that they continue as editors for another 3 year term.
- I totally support their application for another term.
- I totally support a second term for Wayne, Rosemary, and Eric.
- I recommend acceptance of Wayne, Rosemary and Eric's proposal for a second term as Editors of Criminology.
- I support their nomination for another term. I completely support the renewal. They have done excellent work, in my view.
- I will go along with the group. Although I am concerned about a turn away from theory driven research, I will overlook it because unless editors have totally screwed up, they should be given a second term.

In addition, two people who are not members of the Publications Committee voiced their opinions:

- I, too, ENTHUSIASTICALLY recommend extending their term as editors -- they've done a great job. (Ross Matsueda)
- I have debated as to whether or not to chime in as I am, of course, not on this committee. In the end, I have decided that I want to share a simple point of information with you - Wayne and his Editorial Board have been wonderful to work with from my managerial/operational perspective. They respond quickly and efficiently to the inevitable queries and issues that arise, and they work exceptionally well with the Columbus office. (Chris Eskridge)

Finally, I would like to thank Anne Arendt and Chris Eskridge for all of the help and encouragement they have given to me and the Publications Committee.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Rebecca Block
crblock@rcn.com