Editor’s Note: In this issue, we are launching a new column, Member Perspectives, which conveys readers’ thoughts on selected themes of relevance to the ASC membership. In the last issue, I posed the question of how the ASC annual meeting might be enriched. I received some interesting responses, which are summarized on p. 7. For the May/June issue, we are eager to hear your perspective on the current state of the field and the most significant challenges that lie ahead. We also welcome your reactions to any of the content you read here, which we are committed to publishing in a new Letters to the Editor section. Now, let’s see what’s going on in ASC, starting with an essay by Professors James Lynch and Janet Lauritsen on recent efforts directed at revamping crime statistics in America.

Eric Baumer, ASC Vice President

Modernizing the Nation’s Crime Statistics
by
James P. Lynch¹
Janet L. Lauritsen²

The Importance of Crime Statistics for Building Knowledge and Informing Policy

Over the last 20 years there have been great increases in the application of information to better understand specific problems across many domains of social interest. The movement toward evidence-based policy is one manifestation of the recognition that information can help to reduce both crime and coercion in the criminal justice system. Crime statistics have a place in evidence-based policy both as a gauge of the importance and nature of a specific crime problem and as a measure of the impact of specific policies on crime. Yet there are many basic facts about the levels and changes in crime that remain unknown and not well understood. In this essay we describe some important recent efforts to modernize the nation’s system of crime statistics.
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Background

Over the last forty years there have been some significant advances in crime statistics, perhaps the most notable being the introduction of the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). The NCVS gives the public direct participation in the definition of the crime problem and incident level data with which to understand crime and its impact on victims. While the survey has been a useful addition to crime statistics, there are limits to what a sample-based self-report survey can do. Relatively rare crimes like gun violence or crime among the elderly are difficult to assess in household surveys of any reasonable size. To monitor and understand crimes such as these, we need crime statistics from police administrative records that are flexible and can be disaggregated by such features as is possible with the NCVS.

As criminologists know, our major indicator of crimes known to police is the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR), collected by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). The UCR was created in 1929 and it provides a limited amount of information on crimes in a highly aggregated and inflexible form. The most frequently used component of the UCR is the Return A (or offenses known to the police) which reports jurisdiction level counts of seven index crimes—homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft. This is a very narrow slice of crime, and the range of crime included in the UCR has not changed substantially in more than 80 years even though the nature of crime affecting the public has changed in many important ways. For example, crime against women has become a salient issue, but the UCR cannot tell us how many nonlethal violent crimes involved female victims, nor does it indicate how many assaults involved spouses or intimate partners. Cybercrime and identity theft may be included in these counts as thefts, but they cannot be identified. The summary system of the UCR does not include many of the crimes of greatest concern today, including those that are not the responsibility of local law enforcement, nor can it provide the detail and the social context of crime that the public requires. It is an old and flawed statistical system that should be replaced.

This is not news to or an attack on the FBI. They recognized this thirty years ago when they proposed a plan to replace the summary UCR with a new National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS). This system would have provided the detail and social context that the UCR summary system did not have and constituents demanded. The FBI began implementing this system in the early 1990s, but for a variety of reasons this implementation remains incomplete with only approximately 6,000 of almost 18,000 police departments sending their NIBRS data to the FBI. The rate at which agencies are joining NIBRS is moving at a snail’s pace with 5,300 participating in 2003 and only 6,600 involved a decade later. As a result, no national estimates based on NIBRS data can be produced and these data have had very little influence in defining the crime problem and crime control policy.

Efforts to Improve the Nation’s Crime Statistics System

The news on crime statistics is not all bad, however, in that several important efforts are underway to rethink our system of crime statistics. One such effort is the Crime Indicators Working Group (CIWG), a group of police executives that offers guidance to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) in developing crime indicators. A second effort is the National Research Council’s (NRC) Committee on National Statistics (CNSTAT) Panel on Modernizing the Nation’s Crime Statistics which has been tasked with assessing the current system of crime statistics and recommending improvements for the future. A third effort is the National Crime Statistics Exchange (NCS-X) which is assessing the feasibility of implementing NIBRS in a national sample of police agencies. Below we describe these efforts as well as their implications for building a modern system of crime statistics. Our emphasis will be on the CNSTAT Panel because we are involved with the panel and Howard Snyder from BJS described the NCS-X project in detail in a recent edition of The Criminologist (Nov/Dec 2013).

Crime Indicators Working Group (CIWG)

The CIWG was convened by BJS to receive guidance from the law enforcement community on the kinds of crime statistics that they would find useful. Membership in the group was restricted to police chiefs because they are both major consumers and providers of statistics on crime. Members were identified by the major police executive membership groups with additional members chosen for their knowledge and leadership in the field. This group is notable in that it is the first time in more than 80 years that local police executives have been asked to provide guidance on crime indicators. While the FBI routinely consults with local law enforcement through the FBI Advisory Policy Board (APB) process, that process necessarily emphasizes procedural and operational adjustments to existing technical systems over a more holistic assessment and revision of crime data systems and measures. To date, the CIWG has met three times and a fourth meeting has been scheduled. In each of the prior meetings the chiefs identified both the functions that they wanted crime statistics to serve as well as the specific statistical indicators they would like to see produced. Between meetings, BJS staff produced the indicators requested so that the chiefs could react.

A number of important principles emerged from the CIWG discussions. The first stipulated that national crime statistics are not used for tactical purposes in specific jurisdictions but for assessing the relative performance of police agencies. A second principle was that the UCR alone was not satisfactory for this purpose in that it omitted a number of crimes that are both important to the community and consume a lot of police resources. The chiefs also noted that the UCR lacked the detail that allowed them to
contextualize the crime problem. For example, increases in homicides are understood in one way if they result from domestic violence rather than robberies, and a statistical system that cannot make these distinctions is not useful. Contextualizing crime statistics also refers to the type of jurisdiction to which an agency is compared, but, while this warrants thought, it is not an attribute of crime statistics per se. A fourth principle was that crime statistics should be part of a more extensive set of indicators measuring public safety and not simply crime counts. Crime is the product of many social processes that are not under the control of the police and these processes should be accounted for in crime statistics. This could result in standardizing crime rates according to the robustness of other local social systems like education, or the health care system, or it could mean creating a community wellness scale that can be evaluated in concert with the crime indicators. Finally, the chiefs included citizen surveys as a source of crime statistics that they find useful. This includes not only victimization surveys, but also citizen reports on contact with the police, perceptions of police legitimacy, and other matters that are not reports of crime incidents, but are nonetheless relevant to crime.

On the basis of these principles BJS estimated various indicators of crime. Many of the crime incidence indicators identified by the chiefs can be estimated with NIBRS data and the NCVS, while others may be able to be estimated with modifications to the NCVS. BJS is planning at least one more meeting of the CIWG and considering the possibility that the group become permanent. The next meeting will finalize the content of the report on crime advocated by the group in its last meeting and explore some of the self-report measures not addressed as fully in prior discussions. This exercise can help inform both the work of NCS-X and the CNSTAT Panel in that all of these efforts must be driven by the set of estimators they are designed to support. Because the law enforcement community is an important constituency for crime statistics in that they both consume and supply these statistics, their preferences for specific estimators should be shown some deference. 

NRC/CNSTAT Panel on Modernizing the Nation's Crime Statistics

In 2013, the BJS and the FBI, with the urging of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), commissioned a panel of the National Research Council to consider the issue of modernizing crime statistics (see http://sites.nationalacademies.org/DBASSE/CNSTAT/ CurrentProjects/DBASSE_085946). Some of the same misgivings that prompted the creation of the CIWG drove the demand for the NRC panel. Crime statistics and specifically crime statistics based on police administrative records had not undergone a serious re-evaluation and redesign for more than 80 years and there was concern that the current system could not respond to the demand that evidence-based policy evaluations would place on it. It was time for a reassessment.

The panel was charged with making recommendations for the development of a modern set of crime measures in the United States and the best means for obtaining them. Substantive and methodological issues surrounding crime statistics are being considered, as are implementation issues.

Substantive Issues for the Panel

The panel’s consideration of substantive issues include the development of a framework for identifying the types of crimes to be considered in a modern crime classification, and their review focuses on a classification scheme that would afford a full and accurate measurement of criminal events and their attributes. To undertake this task, the panel is considering: types of crime (and their definitions); the current scope of crime types covered by existing FBI and BJS data collections; gaps in our knowledge, including new and emerging forms of crime; the development of an international crime classification framework to increase international comparability; and the optimal scope of crime statistics to serve the needs of the full array of data users and stakeholders such as federal agencies, Congress, law enforcement agencies and other actors in the justice system (such as the courts and corrections officials), researchers, and the general public.

The methodological issues that the panel is reviewing include: the optimal methods to collect the data to produce the crime classification framework developed in the review; an assessment of the appropriateness of existing instruments and methods currently used by the FBI and BJS to collect crime information; and the effectiveness and accuracy of their data processing techniques (including routines for imputation and estimation and the handling of missing data). The panel will also consider the possible role of integrating data from other governmental sources, and from non-FBI/BJS and nongovernmental sources (such as from credit card companies) into crime measurement, as well the capabilities for flexibly identifying and measuring new and emerging crime types going forward. Many conceptual issues are being considered and not all are easily resolved, such as measuring crimes for which jurisdictional location and counting rules are not obvious (e.g., crimes committed by businesses, crimes of fraud against the government, as well as many others).

Implementation issues are the third aspect of the panel’s work: outlining an ideal set of modern crime measures, assessing the sources through which the measures may be drawn, and suggesting by whom the measures should be collected and compiled (whether BJS, FBI, or other actors). To the extent that police report data continue to be a core source of crime statistics, this work involves maximizing the use of locally collected and existing data, leveraging information technology assets, and recognizing
the voluntary nature of crime reporting in current systems (and so minimizing impact on local agency operations while still meeting information needs). The review will also consider contextual information about crime produced by other statistical entities from different perspectives (such as contextual information on homicides, sexual assault, and stalking that may be derived from public health data collections) and the role of survey research in generating the recommended measures, among other issues. In addition, the review may consider cost-effectiveness and budgetary issues, such as priority uses for additional funding that may be obtained through budget initiatives or reallocation of resources among units of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Panel Process

The panel is addressing these topics in two stages. In phase one the panel has focused on the taxonomy and measurement of crime. Developing a taxonomy or crime classification system is a necessary preamble to discussing methodological and implementation issues because it identifies the essential information that must be collected and distinctions that must be made with the data collected. To that end, the Panel has reviewed the crime classifications used in the United States as well as those used in other nations and the draft International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes recently developed by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). A wide range of constituent groups have been asked to describe their need for and use of crime incidence information including federal agencies involved in formulating crime control policy, congressional staffers, interest groups concerned with crime and victimization, academic researchers, state legislators and executive branch officials, local police and decision makers at the municipal level. The panel has worked to reconcile the alternative international and UNODC classifications with the demands of constituent groups, and crime types have been added, removed and altered as required. The final results of the first phase will be published in 2015.

This crime taxonomy will guide the deliberations in the second phase of the panel’s inquiry where methods and institutional arrangements will be defined for collecting and presenting the data necessary to estimate the level and change in the level of crimes in the classification. In some cases existing arrangements for collecting data will need to be supplemented or replaced while in others the panel will decide that certain crime class may need to be excluded from the taxonomy (at least for the near future) because collecting the data required would not be feasible or economically viable. Once the panel has defined the social organization of the statistical system that will provide the data necessary to estimate the new crime taxonomy, it will suggest a strategy for implementing this system. Major changes in the way that we collect and disseminate crime statistics will require time to be put in place, so any implementation plan will need to take a short and long term perspective. Some changes can occur immediately while additional steps are taken to put more extensive changes in place.

National Crime Statistics Exchange (NCS-X)

NCS-X is an effort undertaken with the support of the FBI to implement an incident-based system of crime reporting similar to, if not the same as NIBRS. This collection is designed to make national estimates of crime using a sample of roughly 400 police agencies as well as the some 6,600 agencies currently reporting NIBRS data to the FBI. The intent is to provide national estimates of crime that are much better able to summarize the range of crimes and their social context demanded by the CIWG and by constituents interviewed by the NRC/CNSTAT Panel than is possible with the summary UCR. Once national estimates in this detail are available, they will become a prominent feature of evidence-based crime control policy and growing the population-based NIBRS will proceed more rapidly.

The first phase of the NCS-X work is focused on testing the assumptions underlying this strategy. One issue that must be considered includes the assumption that most of the data required by NIBRS can be extracted from existing police management information systems. A second requirement of this work is whether a sample of 400 police agencies can be recruited to report the necessary incident-level data in order to generate a nationally representative sample for purposes of reporting crime statistics. The third issue concerns the costs of making modifications to police departments’ management information systems, and the necessary training of staff from these agencies to provide the needed data.

BJS staff, in cooperation with the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) and the Research Triangle Institute (RTI), are collecting data on the 400 sample agencies to assess the reasonableness of these assumptions. The information collected in this first phase will be used to develop a grant and technical assistance program designed
to encourage the participation of sample agencies in NCS-X. The second phase of NCS-X will be the implementation of this grant program and thereby the recruitment of sample agencies into NCS-X.

Conclusions

These three efforts are different in many ways, but they were all born of deep dissatisfaction with the current state of crime statistics and especially crime incidence statistics. The CIWG has cast a relatively broad net in defining crime statistics, including information relevant to crime but not strictly crime incidence statistics. In contrast, the NRC/CNSTAT panel has focused initially on delineating what is meant by “crime” and on measuring its level of incidence. NCS-X (and NIBRS before it) has focused less on the content of a crime classification or taxonomy than on the importance of collecting incident-level data on crime. These efforts complement each other in important ways. Defining a crime classification system is essential to guiding data collection designs, and people will not support data collections that do not produce meaningful statistics. Some of the problems encountered in implementing NIBRS occurred because the incident-based system was used largely to reproduce the same Index Crime Classification as the UCR summary system. The CIWG and NRC/CNSTAT panel have done much of the hard work required in creating a crime classification system with the detail and scope that consumers demand of modern crime statistics. The NCS-X group should embrace these classifications and demonstrate the ability of incident-level data to estimate crime rates for these crime classes, which will help interest sample agencies in participating in NCS-X.

Of the three efforts, CIWG and the CNSTAT panel are the most similar in intent and purpose. Both are designed to define statistical indicators of crime. As mentioned above, the CIWG has employed a much broader definition of crime statistics, but it has elicited feedback from a much narrower constituent group—local police executives. The CNSTAT panel has obtained feedback on crime incidence statistics only but from a much wider range of constituent groups. The two groups should embrace their different approaches to a similar problem, share their results and use them to achieve their related but different goals.

Finally NCS-X’s extensive investigation of various strategies for implementing an incident-level collection of crime incident statistics should help the CNSTAT panel, especially in the second phase of their work. The panel will need to make judgments about the wisdom of various methods of collecting crime incidence data. Police administrative records will figure prominently in any collection system recommended by the panel. They should be able to draw on the information collected by the NCS-X staff on the records management system capabilities of police agencies and the ability to extract that data for statistical purpose.

In all of the years that we have been involved in crime statistics, we have never seen as much dissatisfaction with the state of these statistics and as much energy for making them better. We are fortunate too, to have these three complementary efforts going on at the same time (as well as a number of activities within the FBI that we are not as familiar with). They raise the possibility that the dissatisfaction with and energy to improve crime statistics will have sufficient focus to make real progress. If the work of CIWG, the NRC/CNSTAT panel and NCS-X can produce a crime taxonomy that better describes crime in the 21st century and a design for collecting the required information, we hope that the members of ASC are willing to actively support this plan, so that we will finally have the system of crime statistics that the nation and the discipline deserve.
In the January/February issue I encouraged readers to share ideas on ways that the ASC conference could be enriched. The volume of responses was not substantial, but there were some interesting suggestions. Two themes struck me as particularly intriguing.

First, a handful of members lamented that because of the overlapping nature of sessions on the program, it was difficult to attend many presentations of interest; in light of that, a few suggested that technology might help to alleviate the matter. Though their specific recommendations differed, in essence they suggested that the content of the conference could be made more accessible if sessions were recorded and shared on the ASC website. Doing something like that several years ago may have been cost prohibitive, but given the digitization revolution in which we are currently living, it is not difficult to imagine a future in which audio or video conference proceedings are posted after the meeting so that members can check out sessions they missed or even re-live some they were able to attend. Presenters who would prefer not to be included could perhaps opt out when submitting their abstract for the meeting. These and other details could be ironed out by the ASC Executive Board if there is sufficient interest in the general idea among the membership. If so, get in touch with the board to let them know (http://www.asc41.com/officers.htm)

Second, several members who wrote in on the theme of enhancing the annual meeting also strongly encouraged the ASC leadership to consider holding the meeting in a more diverse set of cities. Some simply expressed dissatisfaction with the monotony of the current four city rotation (San Francisco, Washington, DC, Chicago, Atlanta), wondering why other large cities in relatively close proximity to them weren't also included (e.g., Seattle, Baltimore, Memphis, Charlotte). Others rationalized their positions on the basis of personal preferences, such as the desire for warmer weather during the conference (e.g., Miami, Tampa, San Diego, Phoenix, Honolulu) or access to what they described as interesting social and cultural attractions (e.g., Austin, Boston). Finally, a few suggested that holding the meeting in the nation's largest cities might help to increase the visibility of the ASC, so they recommended that in addition to Chicago, places such as New York City, Los Angeles, Houston, and Philadelphia (i.e., the other four cities that make up the top 5) be considered. One thing I have learned as a member of the ASC Executive Board is that the issue of site selection for our annual conference is more complex than it may seem on the surface, but the good news is that the Board is currently giving serious consideration to the matter. Indeed, this is one of the primary issues being evaluated by the ASC Long-range Planning Committee, which was established by the Board a few years ago. If you would like to weigh in, please feel free to contact the committee (http://www.asc41.com/committees/comembers.html).

For the May/June issue, I would welcome the opportunity to share any other ideas you have about enhancing the ASC annual meeting, but I am also eager to hear your thoughts on a few much more philosophical questions, reflecting on where we stand and where we are headed: (1) How would you characterize the current state of the field of criminology and criminal justice (i.e., what are some of the most positive and negative trends and developments)?; and (2) What do you regard as the most significant challenges for maintaining or enhancing the status of the field over the next decade or so? I look forward to hearing what you have to say about these issues over the next month (ebaumer@fsu.edu). Check back in to Member Perspectives in the May/June issue to see what your colleagues have to say.

Eric Baumer, ASC Vice President
This month we give the ASC editors a break and have the pleasure of sharing with you a compelling guest commentary from Professor D. Kim Rossmo. He has some candid advice for editors on how they might most effectively and efficiently approach the publication of journal articles.

Short and Sweet: A Call for Concise Journal Articles

The Criminologist

by

D. Kim Rossmo
School of Criminal Justice
Texas State University

Journal publishing is an important part of academic life; articles allow us to communicate in writing our ideas and discoveries, to generate debate and learn from feedback. Scholarly publishing began in the 1600s, and then grew dramatically with progress in the sciences during the 1800s. Many early journals were initially bulletins or proceedings published by learned societies so members could follow their colleagues' work. Criminology began in 1963 as Criminologica: Newsletter of the American Society of Criminology, evolving into a scholarly journal in 1966.

There are several reasons for publishing. A publication record helps doctoral students get hired, junior faculty members achieve tenure, and associate professors become full. Publishing allows us to achieve professional recognition and advance our discipline through the sharing of opinions, research, and knowledge. Occasionally, academic publishing influences government policy and criminal justice practice.

Underlying the importance of publishing is the assumption that others read what we write. However, competition for readership is high. A generation ago, the literature was smaller; there were fewer criminologists writing shorter articles for a handful of journals. Today's situation is much different, with hundreds of different journals publishing articles related to our discipline (Sorensen, Snell, & Rodriguez, 2006). Articles in Criminology used to be much shorter than they are now. Over the past 50 years they have tripled in page length, growing from an average of under 10 pages in the 1960s to over 30 pages in the 2010s (see Figure 1).† Over the same period, perhaps not coincidentally, the number of authors per article more than doubled.

Figure 1. Length of Articles Published in Criminology.

† Source: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1745-9125/issues. Page numbers for 2014 articles were increased by 15% to compensate for formatting changes introduced in Volume 52 (narrower margins, no spaces between references).
Most readers have limited time, so it is not surprising that some articles receive little attention. Just as adding questions to a survey can reduce its response rate, longer articles come with a communication cost. While the history of criminology is rooted in the essay disciplines, our research has become increasingly experimental and quantitative over the years. Perhaps it is time to explore alternative article formats for scholarly publishing.

The length and style of journal articles varies considerably across disciplines. Traditionally, outlets for criminology and sociology have provided more space for developing ideas than those for physics, biology, and chemistry. Over the past decade, I have had the opportunity to work with zoologists, biologists, and epidemiologists interested in applications of my research to their disciplines. These collaborations have resulted in papers published in natural science journals (e.g., Journal of the Royal Society Interface, International Journal of Health Geographics, Journal of Zoology). One of the differences in writing for such journals is their shorter word limits, typically about half of what we see in criminology. Articles have to be carefully structured and written in a succinct manner; every word counts and there is little room for verbosity. While such brevity was challenging for someone educated as a social scientist, ultimately it helped improve my writing. It is surprising how much can be said in a few pages if one is forced to do so. (Most of these journals allow extra materials, such as raw data and color graphs, to be posted online.)

I occasionally review papers for some of these same journals and find I now much prefer reading manuscripts with a tight format. If communication is the point of publishing, then message length should facilitate that end. Redundancy, pleonasm, and windiness hinder communication. Overly long articles can affect the dissemination of knowledge, either because most people are deterred from reading them or because their central message gets lost in verbiage. Sometimes less is more.

Writing concise but complete papers is not easy. However, short journal articles have a number of potential benefits:

- They focus both authors and readers on the substance of the work. Authors are forced to be clear and concise, resulting in better writing, more pleasant reading, and improved learning.
- Reviews take less time so referees should be easier to find. Moreover, methodological problems are harder to hide in a short manuscript. In turn, a short format requirement concentrates reviewers’ suggestions and critiques.
- More articles per journal issue can be accommodated.
- More of those articles would actually be read.
- The time from a manuscript’s acceptance to its appearance in print should be shorter.
- New information would be more accessible to criminal justice practitioners, government policy makers, and others outside of academia, enhancing the real-world influence of our writing.
- A journal’s impact factor is based on the citations of its articles. Given that an article has to be first read and understood before it will be cited, enhancing readability could result in higher impact factors.

Articles in Criminology currently run from 9,000 to 10,000 words (and would be longer without editorial intervention). A few journals in our field publish slightly shorter articles, while some accept up to 15,000 words. Several have no specified limit. By contrast, American Psychologist only allows 7,000 words, and Professional Geographer, only 5,000 words. The top scientific journals permit even less space; submissions to Science cannot exceed 4,500 words, and those to Nature, only 3,000 words. Medical and public health journals often limit research articles to 3,500 words. These journals also publish even shorter items (1,000 or 2,000 words), such as comments, replies, letters, and reports.

While journals in our discipline do not formally require a minimum length for papers, it is evident short manuscripts are not submitted, not favorably reviewed, and/or not accepted for publication; over the past five years, there were no articles under 20 pages in Criminology. Lead editor Wayne Osgood recently told me that although very few short manuscripts are submitted to the journal, they are definitely welcome and, in some cases, even preferable. Many of us hold an implicit assumption, perhaps a vestige from our time as students, that more is better when it comes to writing. We should challenge this, as authors by writing more concise papers, and as reviewers by judging papers on their content and not their length.

However, it will likely require the explicit support of journal editors and editorial boards for short articles to be accepted as part of the publishing repertoire in criminology. The leading journals in our field might consider experimenting with short articles limited to, for instance, 4,000 words, for a trial period of two years. Once the trial is complete, the experiment could be evaluated...
by surveying readers, authors, reviewers, and editors. If the evaluation is positive, the shorter article format should become a permanent option.

Some papers require more space because of their complexity, coverage, or significance, and authors ought to have both long and short manuscript options. However, I believe it is important to not distinguish short articles by name (e.g., reports, notes) as this might create a bias. There is nothing inherently superior in more words – only in better communication.

Authors may also consider following the abstract design used by the Journal of Quantitative Criminology, Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, and Journal of Experimental Criminology, when appropriate. This format divides an abstract into four parts – objectives, methods, results, and conclusions – allowing readers to quickly review the essential components of an article and helping them determine which ones they might want to read in full.

If publication is about communication, then we need to ensure we do so in the best manner possible. Few scholars today have the luxury of surplus reading time. Some papers simply do not require their length or use the space they have well; do we really need to repeatedly see the same literature reviews? Ultimately, effective writing is about respecting both the message and the reader, striking a balance between comprehensiveness and economy, and focusing on the important while omitting the unnecessary. Instituting an optional short article format in criminology journals, similar to those followed in natural science publications, would help improve our communication and learning.
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Robin S. Engel (University at Albany, SUNY) Policing; Criminal Justice Theory; Criminal Justice Administration
Ben Feldmeyer (Pennsylvania State University) Race/Ethnicity, Immigration, and Crime; Demography of Crime; Methods
Bonnie S. Fisher (Northwestern University) Victimology/Sexual Victimization; Public Opinion; Methodology/Measurement
James Frank (Michigan State University) Policing; Legal Issues in Criminal Justice; Program Evaluation
Edward J. Latessa (The Ohio State University) Rehabilitation; Offender/Program Assessment; Community Corrections
Sarah M. Manchak (University of California, Irvine) Correctional interventions, Risk Assessment and Reduction,
   Offenders with Mental Illness
Joseph L. Nedelec (Florida State University) Biosocial Criminology; Evolutionary Psychology; Life-Course Criminology
Paula Smith (University of New Brunswick) Correctional Interventions; Offender/Program Assessment; Meta-Analysis
Christopher J. Sullivan (Rutgers University) Developmental Criminology, Juvenile Prevention Policy, Research Methods
Lawrence F. Travis, III (University at Albany, SUNY) Policing; Criminal Justice Policy; Sentencing
Patricia Van Voorhis (University at Albany, SUNY; Emeritus) Correctional Rehabilitation and Classification;
   Psychological Theories of Crime; Women and Crime
Pamela Wilcox (Duke University) Criminal Opportunity Theory; Schools, Communities, and Crime, Victimization/
   Fear of Crime
John D. Wooldredge (University of Illinois) Institutional Corrections; Sentencing; Research Methods
John P. Wright (University of Cincinnati) Life-Course Theories of Crime; Biosocial Criminology; Longitudinal Methods
Roger Wright (Chase College of Law) Criminal Law and Procedure; Policing; Teaching Effectiveness
2015 Election Slate for 2016 - 2017 ASC Officers

The following slate of officers, as proposed by the Nominations Committee, was approved by the ASC Executive Board for the 2015 election:

President-Elect
Doris MacKenzie, Penn State University
Jim Lynch, University of Maryland

Vice President-Elect
Janet Lauritsen, University of Missouri - St. Louis
Jody Miller, Rutgers University

Executive Counselor
Charis Kubrin, University of California, Irvine
Andres Rengifo, Rutgers University
Delores Jones-Brown, John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Ineke Marshall, Northeastern University
Ryan King, Ohio State University
Brian Johnson, University of Maryland

Additional candidates for each office may be added to the ballot via petition. To be added to the ballot, a candidate needs 50 signed nominations from current, non-student ASC members. If a candidate receives the requisite number of verified, signed nominations, their name will be placed on the ballot.

Fax or mail a hard copy of the signed nominations by Friday, March 21, 2015 (postmark date) to the address noted below. Email nominations will NOT be accepted.

American Society of Criminology
1314 Kinnear Road, Suite 212
Columbus, Ohio 43212-1156
614-292-9207 (Ph)
614-292-6767 (Fax)

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS FOR 2016 ELECTION SLATE OF 2017 - 2018 OFFICERS

The ASC Nominations Committee is seeking nominations for the positions of President, Vice-President and Executive Counselor. Nominees must be current members of the ASC, and members in good standing for the year prior to the nomination. Send the names of nominees, position for which they are being nominated, and, if possible, a current C.V. to the Chair of the Nominations Committee at the address below (preferably via email). Nominations must be received by August 1, 2015 to be considered by the Committee.

Steve Messner
University at Albany, SUNY
Department of Sociology
1400 Washington Ave
Albany, NY 12222-0100
518-442-4674 (Ph)
smessner@albany.edu
DIVISION OF EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY
AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY

Membership Drive 2015, Awards, Committees and ASC-Washington D.C.

DIVISION MEMBERSHIP DRIVE 2015

The Division of Experimental Criminology (DEC) seeks to promote and improve the use of experimental evidence and methods in the advancement of criminological theory and evidence-based crime policy. We welcome members with a broad range of interests in evaluation research methods, including randomized controlled trials, quasi-experiments, and systematic reviews, in all areas of crime and justice: corrections, courts, policing, prevention and more! Membership includes a subscription to the Journal of Experimental Criminology. Learn more at http://expcrim.org.

The Division is also home to the Academy of Experimental Criminology, which honors outstanding scholars who have advanced experimental research.

Now is an excellent time to renew or begin your 2015 membership to the ASC and the Division of Experimental Criminology! Download the ASC membership form at http://www.asc41.com/appform1.html or scan the code on the left.

We also offer organizational memberships for departments, centers, and institutions interested in supporting DEC. Contact us at expcrim@gmail.com for more information.

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS:
DEC AND AEC AWARDS DUE APRIL 1

The DEC and the Academy of Experimental Criminology (AEC) are now accepting nominations for AEC Fellows and Honorary Fellows, the Joan McCord Award (AEC), the Outstanding Young Experimental Scholar Award (AEC), the Jerry Lee Lifetime Achievement Award (DEC), the Award for Outstanding Experimental Field Trial (DEC), and the Student Paper Award (DEC). Please send nomination letters and CVs to the DEC Secretary-Treasurer at expcrim@gmail.com.

ASC-WASHINGTON D.C. 2015

We encourage DEC members to submit presentations and panels to the Advances in Experimental Methods sub-area for ASC (deadline: March 13). Contact us at expcrim@gmail.com if you are interested in volunteering at the DEC table!

Lorraine Mazerolle (Chair), Cynthia Lum (Vice Chair), Charlotte Gill (Secretary-Treasurer)
Executive Counselors: Christopher Koper, Akiva Liberman, and Susan Turner
http://expcrim.org
The Division of Policing

Membership: We invite ASC members to join the Division of Policing in 2015 for just $15. Our Division is creating a new dialogue among policing scholars, practitioners, policy makers, community leaders and students of policing and we want you to be a part of it. Visit ascpolicing.org for more information.

Committees: The Division of Policing now has five committees. We invite members to become involved in our committees, which cover a number of exciting topics, including building connections to international policing organizations, reaching out to practitioners and policymakers, and providing recommendations on federal data collection efforts. Visit ascpolicing.org/committees/ for details.

Awards: Visit ascpolicing.org/awards for more information on submitting nominations for the Division’s first awards to be given at ASC 2015!

http://ascpolicing.org

Standing Committees:
- Awards
- International
- Journals
- National Data Collection
- Policy and Practice Outreach

Executive Board:
- Chair: Dennis Rosenbaum
- Vice Chair: Anthony Braga
- Secretary-Treasurer: Cody Telep
- Executive Counselors: Matthew Hickman, Cynthia Lum, William Terrill
Oral History Criminology Project

The Oral History Criminology Project is an on-going effort to collect accounts of the development of the field as told through the scholars who have played an integral role in its expansion. We invite you view our catalog of sixty interviews ranging from Adler to Zahn. To this existing body of work we have recently added the following eight videos:

- Robert Agnew by Timothy Brezina
- Meda Chesney-Lind by Merry Morash
- Marcus Felson by Brendan Dooley
- Jack P. Gibbs by Brendan Dooley
- Peggy C. Giordano by Jennifer Copp
- Karen Heimer by Stacy DeCoster
- Nicole Hahn Rafter by Chester L. Britt
- Mark Warr by Brendan Dooley

To access the collection simply click “Resources” on the ASC main page (asc41.com) and then “Oral History Project”.

RECENT PhD GRADUATES

Henderson, Jaime S., “Estimating the impacts of SORNA in Pennsylvania: The potential consequences of including juveniles.” Chaired by Kate Auerhahn, January 2015, Temple University
CALL FOR NOMINATIONS - 2015 ASC AWARDS

The American Society of Criminology

Announces its call for nominations

for the following 2015 Awards

Mentor Award
Teaching Award
Gene Carte Student Paper Competition

**These Awards will be presented during the Annual Meeting of the Society. The Society reserves the right to not grant any of these awards during any given year. Award decisions will be based on the strength of the nominees' qualifications and not on the number of nomination endorsements received for any particular candidate (or manuscripts in the context of the Hindelang and Outstanding Paper awards). Current members of the ASC Board are ineligible to receive any ASC award.**
CALL FOR NOMINATIONS - 2015 ASC AWARDS

NOMINATIONS FOR 2015 ASC AWARDS
(Nomination submission dates and rules are the same for awards on this page)

The ASC Awards Committee invites nominations for the following awards. In submitting your nominations, provide the following supporting materials: a letter evaluating a nominee's contribution and its relevance to an award, and the nominee's curriculum vitae (short version preferred) by the due date listed to the appropriate committee chair. All materials should be submitted in electronic format. The awards are:

TEACHING AWARD

The Teaching Award is a lifetime-achievement award designed to recognize excellence in undergraduate and/or graduate teaching over the span of an academic career. This award is meant to identify and reward teaching excellence that has been demonstrated by individuals either (a) at one educational institution where the nominee is recognized and celebrated as a master teacher of criminology and criminal justice; or, (b) at a regional or national level as a result of that individual's sustained efforts to advance criminological/criminal justice education.

Any faculty member who holds a full-or part-time position teaching criminology or criminal justice is eligible for the award, inclusive of graduate and undergraduate universities as well as two- and four-year colleges. In addition, faculty members who have retired are eligible within the first two years of retirement.

Faculty may be nominated by colleagues, peers, or students; or they may self-nominate, by writing a letter of nomination to the Chair of the Teaching Award Committee. Letters of nomination should include a statement in support of nomination of not more than three pages. The nominee and/or the nominator may write the statement.

Nominees will be contacted by the Chair of the Teaching Award Committee and asked to submit a teaching portfolio of supporting materials.

The teaching portfolios should include:
1. Table of contents,
2. Curriculum Vita, and
3. Detailed evidence of teaching accomplishments, which may include:
   • student evaluations, which may be qualitative or quantitative, from recent years or over the course of the nominee's career
   • peer reviews of teaching
   • nominee statements of teaching philosophy and practices
   • evidence of mentoring
   • evidence of research on teaching (papers presented on teaching, teaching journals edited, etc.)
   • selected syllabi
   • letters of nomination/reference, and
   • other evidence of teaching achievements.

The materials in the portfolio should include brief, descriptive narratives designed to provide the Teaching Award Committee with the proper context to evaluate the materials. Student evaluations, for example, should be introduced by a very brief description of the methods used to collect the evaluation data and, if appropriate, the scales used and available norms to assist with interpretation. Other materials in the portfolio should include similar brief descriptions to assist the Committee with evaluating the significance of the materials.

Letters of nomination (including statements in support of nomination) should be submitted in electronic format and must be received by April 1. The nominee's portfolio and all other supporting materials should also be submitted in electronic format and must be received by June 1.

Committee Chair: VICTOR RIOS
University of California, Santa Barbara vrios@soc.ucsb.edu

(805) 893-6036 (P)
CALL FOR NOMINATIONS - 2015 ASC AWARDS

GENE CARTE STUDENT PAPER COMPETITION

The Gene Carte Student Paper Award is given to recognize outstanding scholarly work of students.

Eligibility: Any student currently enrolled on a full-time basis in an academic program at either the undergraduate or graduate level is invited to participate in the American Society of Criminology Gene Carte Student Paper Competition. Prior Carte Award first place prize winners are ineligible. Students may submit only one paper a year for consideration in this competition. Dual submissions for the Carte Award and any other ASC award in the same year (including division awards) are disallowed. Previous prize-winning papers (any prize from any organization and or institution) are ineligible.

Application Specifications: Papers may be conceptual and/or empirical but must be directly related to criminology. Papers may be no longer than 7,500 words. The Criminology format for the organization of text, citations and references should be used. Authors’ names and departments should appear only on the title page. The next page of the manuscript should include the title and a 100-word abstract. The authors also need to submit a copy of the manuscript, as well as a letter verifying their enrollment status as full-time students, co-signed by the dean, department chair or program director, all in electronic format.

Judging Procedures: The Student Awards Committee will rate entries according to criteria such as the quality of the conceptualization, significance of the topic, clarity and aptness of methods, quality of the writing, command of relevant work in the field, and contribution to criminology.

Awards: The 1st, 2nd, and 3rd place papers will be awarded prizes of $500, $300, and $200, respectively and will be eligible for presentation at the upcoming Annual Meeting. The 1st prize winner will also receive a travel award of up to $500 to help defray costs for attending the Annual Meeting. The Committee may decide that no entry is of sufficient quality to declare a winner. Fewer than three awards may be given.

Submission Deadline: All items should be submitted in electronic format by April 15.

Committee Chair: JODI LANE (352) 294-7179 (P)
University of Florida jlane@ulf.edu

MENTOR AWARD

The Mentor Award (established in 2014) is designed to recognize excellence in mentorship in the discipline of Criminology and Criminal Justice over the span of an academic career.

Any nonstudent member of the ASC is an eligible candidate for the ASC Mentor Award, including persons who hold a full or part time position in criminology, practitioners and researchers in nonacademic settings. The award is not limited to those members listed in the ASC Mentoring Program.

Nonstudent members may be nominated by colleagues, peers, or students but self-nominations are not allowed. A detailed letter of nomination should contain concrete examples and evidence of how the nominee has sustained a record of enriching the professional lives of others, and be submitted to the Chair of the ASC Mentor Award Committee. The letter should specify the ways the nominee has gone beyond his/her role as a professor, researcher or collaborator to ensure successful enculturation into the discipline of Criminology and Criminal Justice, providing intellectual professional development outside of the classroom and otherwise exemplary support for Criminology/Criminal Justice undergraduates, graduates and post-graduates.

The mentorship portfolio should include:
1. Table of contents,
2. Curriculum Vita, and
3. Detailed evidence of mentorship accomplishments, which may include: academic publications, professional development, teaching, career guidance, research and professional networks, and other evidence of mentoring achievements.

Letters of nomination (including statements in support of the nomination) should be submitted in electronic form and must be received by April 1. The nominee's portfolio and all other supporting materials should also be submitted in electronic form and must be received by June 30.

Committee Chair: RUTH PETERSON (614) 292-6681 (P)
Ohio State University Peterson.5@sociology.osu.edu
The Division of International Criminology (DIC) Opens Nominations for 2015 Awards For Distinguished Scholar, Book, and Student Papers

The DIC is pleased to offer a variety of ways to encourage scholarship on international and comparative crime and justice. These methods include competitive monetary awards for outstanding graduate student papers, and recognition of outstanding books and distinguished individuals who have contributed to the body of knowledge in the field.

Sesha Kethineni, Chair
ASC Division of International Criminology
www.interntionalcriminology.com

Freda Adler Distinguished Scholar Award

The Division of International Criminology (DIC) of the American Society of Criminology is currently soliciting nominations for the Freda Adler Distinguished Scholar Award. This prize is awarded annually to an international scholar, who has made a significant contribution to international criminology, including international criminal justice, comparative, cross-border and transnational crime or justice research. Nomination requires a letter of nomination and a complete CV to be sent electronically to the Adler Award Committee chair, Dr. Patricia Brantingham. She can be contacted at: pbrantin@sfu.ca. The nomination letter must explain why the candidate is qualified to be considered for the award. Letter-writing campaigns by multiple nominators are discouraged. Self-nominations are also discouraged. Current DIC Executive Board members are excluded from being considered for the Award. The deadline for nominations is July 31, 2015. The award will be presented at the annual meeting in November, 2015 in Washington, D.C.

2015 Distinguished Book Award

The Division of International Criminology (DIC) is seeking nominations for the 2015 Outstanding Book Award. The award is given to the author of a book published on any topic relating to the broad areas of international or comparative crime or justice with a formal publishing date in calendar years 2013, 2014, or 2015. Nominations are reviewed by a committee of the DIC. We encourage nominations from publishers, colleagues and authors. Nominations from any country are welcome, but the book must be published in English. Multiple-authored books are also eligible, but edited books are not. Nominated books for the 2015 award must be received by the Book Award committee chair, Dr. Sanja Kutnjak Ivkovich no later than May 1, 2015. She can be contacted at: kutnjak@msu.edu. Copies must be made available to the members of the Book Award committee. The award will be presented at the annual meeting in November, 2015 in Washington, D.C.

2015 Outstanding Student Paper Awards

The Division of International Criminology conducts a student paper competition each year. This year we are accepting submissions from students enrolled in Master’s and doctoral programs, studying subjects related to international crime and justice. The paper topics must be related to international or comparative criminology or criminal justice.

Submissions must be authored by the submitting student (only) and should not be submitted if student will have graduated by the November ASC annual conference. Co-authorships with professors are not accepted. Papers must be previously unpublished and cannot be submitted to any other competition or made public in any other way until the committee reaches its decision. Manuscripts should include a 100-word abstract, be double-spaced (12-point Times New Roman or Courier font), written in English, and should be no more than 7500 words in length. Submissions should conform to APA format for the organization of text, citations and references. Eligible students worldwide are strongly encouraged to submit papers in English only.

Manuscripts must be submitted as an e-mail attachment in Word or as a .pdf or .rtf file only. Submissions should be accompanied by a cover sheet which includes the author’s name, department, university and location, contact information (including e-mail address) and whether the author is a Master’s or doctoral student, and the precise name of the degree program in which the student is enrolled. Winning submissions in each category will receive a monetary award and be recognized at the meeting of the American Society of Criminology in November. Nominations should be sent to the DIC Student Paper Award committee chair, Dr. Camille Gibson no later than June 1, 2015. She can be contacted at: cbgibson@pvamu.edu. The awards will be presented at the annual meeting in November, 2015 in Washington, D.C.
CALL FOR PAPERS

Annual Meeting 2015
Washington DC
November 18 – 21 2015
Washington Hilton

The Politics of Crime & Justice

Program Co-Chairs:

Jean McGloin, University of Maryland
and
Chris Sullivan, University of Cincinnati

asc2015dc@gmail.com

ASC President:

CANDACE KRUTTSCHNITT
University of Toronto

SUBMISSION DEADLINES

Thematic panels, individual paper abstracts, and author meets critics panels due:

Friday, March 13th, 2015

Posters and roundtable abstracts due:

Friday, May 15th, 2015
2015 ASC CALL FOR PAPERS

SUBMISSION DETAILS

All abstracts must be submitted on-line through the ASC website at www.asc41.com/annualmeeting.htm. On the site you will be asked to indicate the type of submission you wish to make. The submission choices available for the 2015 meetings include: (1) Complete Thematic Panel, (2) Individual Paper Presentation, (3) Author Meets Critics Session, (4) Poster Presentation, or (5) Roundtable Submission.

Please note that late submissions will NOT be accepted. Also, submissions that do not follow the guidelines will be rejected. We encourage you to submit in sufficient advance of the deadline so that you can contact the ASC staff (for responses during normal business hours) if you are having problems submitting.

Complete Thematic Panel: For a thematic panel, you must submit titles, abstracts (no more than 200 words) and author information for all papers together. Each panel should contain between three and four papers and possibly one discussant. We encourage panel submissions organized by individuals, ASC Divisions, and other working groups.

- PANEL SUBMISSION DEADLINE:
  Friday, March 13th, 2015

Individual Paper Presentations: Submissions for a regular session presentation must include a title and abstract of no more than 200 words, along with author information. Please note that these presentations are intended for individuals to discuss work that has been completed or where substantial progress has been made. Presentations about work that has yet to begin or is only in the formative stage are not appropriate here and may be more suitable for roundtable discussion (see below).

- INDIVIDUAL PAPER SUBMISSION DEADLINE:
  Friday, March 13th, 2015

Author Meets Critics: These sessions, organized by an author or critic, consist of one author and three to four critics discussing and critiquing a recently published book relevant to the ASC (note: the book must appear in print before the submission deadline (March 13, 2015) so that reviewers can complete a proper evaluation and to ensure that ASC members have an opportunity to become familiar with the work). Submit the author’s name and title of the book and the names of the three to four persons who have agreed to comment on the book.

- AUTHOR MEETS CRITICS SUBMISSION DEADLINE:
  Friday, March 13th, 2015

Poster Presentations: Submissions for poster presentations require only a title and abstract of no more than 200 words, along with author information. Posters should display theoretical work or methods, data, policy analyses, or findings in a visually appealing poster format that will encourage questions and discussion about the material.

- POSTER SUBMISSION DEADLINE:
  Friday, May 15th, 2015

Roundtable Sessions: These sessions consist of three to six presenters discussing related topics. For roundtable submissions, you may submit either a single paper to be placed in a roundtable session or a complete roundtable session. Submissions for a roundtable must include a title and abstract of no more than 200 words, along with participant information. A full session requires a session title and brief description of the session. Roundtable sessions are generally less formal than thematic paper panels. Thus, ASC provides no audio/visual equipment for these sessions.

- ROUNDTABLE SUBMISSION DEADLINE:
  Friday, May 15th, 2015
2015 ASC CALL FOR PAPERS

APPEARANCES ON PROGRAM
Individuals may submit ONLY ONE FIRST AUTHOR PRESENTATION. Ordinarily individuals may make one other appearance as either a chair or discussant on a panel. Appearances on the Program as a co-author, a poster presenter, or a roundtable participant are unlimited.

Only original papers that have not been published or presented elsewhere may be submitted to the Program Committee for presentation consideration.

The meetings are Wednesday, November 18th, through Saturday, November 21st. Sessions may be scheduled at any time during the meetings. ASC cannot honor personal preferences for day and time of presentations. All program participants are expected to register for the meeting. We encourage everyone to pre-register before September 28th to avoid paying a higher registration fee and the possibility of long lines at the onsite registration desk at the meeting. You can go to the ASC website at www.asc41.com under Annual Meeting Info to register online or access a printer friendly form to fax or return by mail. Pre-registration materials should be sent to you by August 31st, 2015.

SUBMISSION DEADLINES

- Friday, March 13th, 2015 is the absolute deadline for thematic panels, regular panel presentations, and author meets critics sessions.
- Friday, May 15th, 2015 is the absolute deadline for the submission of posters and roundtable sessions.

ABSTRACTS
All submissions, including roundtables, must include an abstract of no more than 200 words. They should describe the general theme of the presentation and, where relevant, the methods and results.

EQUIPMENT
Only LCD projectors will be available for all panel and paper presentations to enable computer-based presentations. However, presenters will need to bring their own personal computers or arrange for someone on the panel to bring a personal computer. Overhead projectors will no longer be provided.

GUIDELINES FOR ONLINE SUBMISSIONS

Before creating your account and submitting an abstract for a single paper or submitting a thematic panel, please make sure that you have the following information on all authors and co-authors (discussants and chairs, if a panel): name, phone number, email address, and affiliation. This information is necessary to complete the submission.

When submitting an abstract or complete panel at the ASC submission website, you should select a single sub-area (1 through 44) in 1 of 11 broader areas listed below. Please select the area and sub-area most appropriate for your presentation and only submit your abstract once. If there is no relevant sub-area listed, then select only the broader area. If you are submitting an abstract for a roundtable, poster session or author meets critics panel, you only need to select the broader area (i.e., Areas XI, XII, XIII); no sub-area is offered. Your choice of area and sub-area (when appropriate) will be important in determining the panel for your presentation and will assist the program chairs in avoiding time conflicts for panels on similar topics.

- Tips for choosing appropriate areas and sub-areas:
  - Review the entire list before making a selection.
  - Choose the most appropriate area first and then identify the sub-area that is most relevant to your paper.

The area and sub-area you choose should be based on the aspect of your paper that you would describe as the primary focus of the paper. For example, if your paper deals with the sentencing of white collar offenders, you would likely choose Area IV, sub-area 13.

PLEASE NOTE: CLICK ACCEPT AND CONTINUE UNTIL THE SUBMISSION IS FINALIZED. After you have finished entering all required information, you will receive a confirmation email immediately indicating that your submission has been recorded. If you do not receive this confirmation, please contact ASC immediately to resolve the issue.

For participant instructions, see also http://asc41.com/Annual_Meeting/instruct.html
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### Area I  Presidential Plenaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[President &amp; Program Committee]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[one submission from each division chair]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area II  Division "Highlighted" Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Christopher Browning  <a href="mailto:browning.90@osu.edu">browning.90@osu.edu</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JC Barnes  <a href="mailto:barnejr@ucmail.uc.edu">barnejr@ucmail.uc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stacey Bosick  <a href="mailto:stacey.bosick@ucdenver.edu">stacey.bosick@ucdenver.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olena Antonaccio  <a href="mailto:oantonaccio@miami.edu">oantonaccio@miami.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamara Madensen  <a href="mailto:Tamara.Madensen@unlv.edu">Tamara.Madensen@unlv.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shaun Thomas  <a href="mailto:sathomas@ualr.edu">sathomas@ualr.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ben Feldmeyer  <a href="mailto:ben.feldmeyer@uc.edu">ben.feldmeyer@uc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LaDonna Long  <a href="mailto:llong@roysevelt.edu">llong@roysevelt.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area III  Causes of Crime and Criminal Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chris Schreck  <a href="mailto:cjsgcj@rit.edu">cjsgcj@rit.edu</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Biological, Bio-social, and Psychological Perspectives  Karen Parker  <a href="mailto:kparker@udel.edu">kparker@udel.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Developmental and Life Course Perspectives  Bill Sousa  <a href="mailto:William.sousa@unlv.edu">William.sousa@unlv.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Social Process Theories  Martin Bouchard  <a href="mailto:mbouchard@sfu.ca">mbouchard@sfu.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Routine Activities and Situational Perspectives  Alesha Durfee  <a href="mailto:Alesha.Durfee@asu.edu">Alesha.Durfee@asu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neighborhood &amp; Place  Chris Schreck  <a href="mailto:cjsgcj@rit.edu">cjsgcj@rit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Structural Theories (Culture, Disorganization, Anomie)  Chrysanthi Leon  <a href="mailto:santhi@udel.edu">santhi@udel.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Critical, Conflict &amp; Feminist Perspectives  Danielle McGurin  <a href="mailto:dmcurri@pdx.edu">dmcurri@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area IV  Types of Offending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chris Schreck  <a href="mailto:cjsgcj@rit.edu">cjsgcj@rit.edu</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Violent Crime  Aili Malm  <a href="mailto:Aili.Malm@csulb.edu">Aili.Malm@csulb.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Property and Public Order Crime  Pete Simi  <a href="mailto:psimi@unomaha.edu">psimi@unomaha.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Drugs  Andrew Lemieux  <a href="mailto:A.Lemieux@nscr.nl">A.Lemieux@nscr.nl</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Domestic Violence  Jennifer Carlson  <a href="mailto:Jennifer.carlson@utoronto.ca">Jennifer.carlson@utoronto.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sex Crimes  Sarah Manchak  <a href="mailto:sarah.manchak@uc.edu">sarah.manchak@uc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>White Collar, Cyber, Occupational &amp; Organization Crime  Toya Like-Haislip  <a href="mailto:liket@umkc.edu">liket@umkc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Organized Crime  Jacob Stowell  <a href="mailto:J.Stowell@new.edu">J.Stowell@new.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Terrorism &amp; Hate Crimes  Lynn Addington  <a href="mailto:adding@american.edu">adding@american.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Green Criminology  Kathryn Schwartz  <a href="mailto:Jennifer.Schwartz@wsu.edu">Jennifer.Schwartz@wsu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area V  Correlates of Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kathryn Schwartz  <a href="mailto:Jennifer.Schwartz@wsu.edu">Jennifer.Schwartz@wsu.edu</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gangs &amp; Peers  Allison Payne  <a href="mailto:Allison.payne@villanova.edu">Allison.payne@villanova.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Substance Abuse  Kate Fox  <a href="mailto:Katefox@asu.edu">Katefox@asu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Weapons  Kate Fox  <a href="mailto:Katefox@asu.edu">Katefox@asu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mental Health  Allison Payne  <a href="mailto:Allison.payne@villanova.edu">Allison.payne@villanova.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Gender, Race &amp; Social Class  Jennifer Carlson  <a href="mailto:Jennifer.carlson@utoronto.ca">Jennifer.carlson@utoronto.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Immigration/Migration  Toya Like-Haislip  <a href="mailto:liket@umkc.edu">liket@umkc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area VI  Victimology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Allison Payne  <a href="mailto:Allison.payne@villanova.edu">Allison.payne@villanova.edu</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Patterns and Trends in Victimization  Jennifer Schwartz  <a href="mailto:Jennifer.Schwartz@wsu.edu">Jennifer.Schwartz@wsu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Fear of Crime Victimization  Allison Payne  <a href="mailto:Allison.payne@villanova.edu">Allison.payne@villanova.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Policy &amp; Prevention of Victimization  Jennifer Schwartz  <a href="mailto:Jennifer.Schwartz@wsu.edu">Jennifer.Schwartz@wsu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2015 ASC CALL FOR PAPERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area VII</th>
<th>The Criminal Justice System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Policing &amp; Law Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Prosecution, Courts &amp; Sentencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Capital Punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Jails &amp; Prisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Community Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Prisoner Reentry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>The Juvenile Justice System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Criminal Justice Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area VIII</th>
<th>Perceptions of Crime &amp; Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Media &amp; Social Construction of Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Attitudes about the Criminal Justice System &amp; Punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Convict Criminology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area IX</th>
<th>Comparative &amp; Historical Perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Cross-National Comparison of Crime &amp; Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Historical Comparisons of Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Transnational Crime &amp; Justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area X</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Advances in Quantitative Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Advances in Qualitative Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Advances in Evaluation Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Advances in Experimental Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Advances in Teaching Methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area XI</th>
<th>Roundtable Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area XII</th>
<th>Poster Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area XIII</th>
<th>Author Meets Critics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shawn Bushway sbushway@albany.edu
David Klinger Klingerd@umsl.edu
Angela Reitler areitler@gmu.edu
Marla Sandys msandys@indiana.edu
Josh Page page@umn.edu
Ben Steiner bmsteiner@unomaha.edu
Phil Goodman p_goodman@utoronto.ca
Aaron Kupchik akupchik@udel.edu
Greg Pogarsky gpogarsky@albany.edu
Rod Brunson rodbrunns@newark.rutgers.edu
Michelle Brown brown7210@gmail.com
Justin Pickett jpickett@albany.edu
Michael Lenza lenzam@uwosh.edu
Susanne Karstedt s.karstedt@leeds.ac.uk
Amy Nivette amy.nivette@nuffield.ox.ac.uk
Randolph Roth Roth.5@osu.edu
Jay Albanese jsalbane@vcu.edu
Gary Sweeten Gary.Sweeten@osu.edu
Sonja Siennick ssiennick@fsu.edu
Sandra Bucerius bucerius@ualberta.edu
Thomas Loughran tloughran@umd.edu
Sarah Bennett sarah.bennett@uq.edu.au
Jody Clay-Warner jclayw@uga.edu
Megan Augustyn Megan.Augustyn@utsa.edu
Susan Case asc@asc41.com
Finn Esbensen esbensen@msx.umsl.edu
Located in the heart of Philadelphia, one of the most vibrant yet affordable big cities in the country

**Excellent graduate opportunities**

MA and PhD in criminal justice
Up to five years PhD funding for qualified applicants
Highly competitive stipends with 12-month health insurance

**Research that makes a difference**

**Main areas of specialization:** corrections; policing & crime prevention; public health & CJ policy; communities & the geography of crime; juvenile justice.

Ranked by *The Chronicle of Higher Education* among the top ten most productive doctoral faculty in criminology and criminal justice.

Decades of proven relationships with city, state and federal agencies, including police departments, correctional agencies, and probation and parole.

Department currently has over $11 million in grants and awards.

**A diverse and eclectic faculty**

Kathleen Auerhahn (UC Riverside) punishment, court processing, simulation modeling
Steven Belenko (Columbia) drugs & crime, treatment, health services & implementation
Jamile Fader (Pennsylvania) urban inequality & crime, juvenile justice, desistance and reentry
Elizabeth Groff (Maryland) spatial criminology, agent-based modeling, policing
Phil Harris (SUNY Albany) juvenile justice policy, juvenile corrections, program evaluation
Matt Hiller (Texas Christian) drug abuse treatment, mental health, implementation science
Jerry Ratcliffe (Nottingham) policing, criminal intelligence, crime science, spatial criminology
Aunshul Rege (Rutgers) cybercrime, terrorism, organized crime, corporate crime
Caterina Roman (American) violence, social network analysis, built environment, gangs, reentry
Cathy Rosen (Temple) criminal law & procedure, legal history, women & the law
Ralph Taylor (Johns Hopkins) community criminology; police/community interface; evaluation
LaTosha Taylor (Illinois) prisoner reintegration, social justice, family & incarceration
Nicole Van Cleve (Northwestern) courts, the racialization of criminal justice, ethnography
E. Rely Vikicà (Temple) courts, corrections, comparative criminal justice
Wayne Welsh (UC Irvine) violence, corrections, substance abuse, organizational theory
Jennifer Wood (Toronto) policing & security, regulation, public health law

[www.temple.edu/cj](http://www.temple.edu/cj)
POLICY CORNER

WHAT IS HAPPENING IN WASHINGTON, AND HOW DOES THAT AFFECT YOU?

by

Laura Dugan, ASC National Policy Committee Chair

The Latest in Washington

• At the time of this writing, ASC member, Nancy Rodriguez is heading to Washington to become the next Director of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), as appointed by President Barack Obama. Congratulations Nancy! By the time you read this, she would have already been sworn in (February 9). This is very good news for us, as President Obama is maintaining the trend of heading the Institute with renowned scholars who will preserve and extend the role of science when seeking evidence-based solutions to crime to optimize criminal justice practices. For more on Dr. Rodriquez, read Arizona State University’s announcement of her appointment. https://asunews.asu.edu/20141030-nancy-rodriguez-appointed-nij-director

• As of January 6th, the 114th Congress is in action with both houses now being led by Republicans. This means that the Chairpersons of relevant committees and subcommittees with oversight for funding and policy issues that impact social and behavioral science are also Republican. Let’s encourage them to prioritize the role of science and evidence based solutions to crime! Please see this list provided by COSSA http://www.cossa.org/resources/congressional-resources/ to learn who heads the committees that most influences your work and the funding for your work. The committees will become especially active after President Obama releases his budget on February 2nd.

• The National Academies’ National Research Council Committee on Law and Justice is seeking a new board director. The Committee’s mission is to “improve research methods and information to inform and support the development of the national and state-level criminal justice policy, and to extend and help advance criminological and criminal justice research.” The director’s position is very important as she or he works with the Committee Chair, senior staff, and Committee members to identify current and emerging issues in criminal justice and, among other things, to organize workshops and panels of experts to investigate these issues. We are all familiar with some of the key research and findings that have come out of the committee (http://sites.nationalacademies.org/dbasse/claj/index.htm). If interested in the position, follow this link http://ch.tbe.taleo.net/CH04/ats/careers/requisition.jsp?org=NAS&cws=1&rid=7982.

The general theme of these news items is “let’s keep the science in Washington”! More importantly, let’s do what we can to assure that funding for criminological and criminal justice research remains valued.

ASC Policy Panel Reminder

Hopefully you have submitted your policy panel proposal to me by the March 1 deadline. Given that the 2015 Annual Meeting is in the policy home of the nation, we have a big opportunity to plan a wide range of policy panels, bringing in experts who are based in Washington, DC.
ASC Media Specialist

We are in the process of hiring a media specialist to help publicize the research conducted by ASC members. The job description is below. If you know of anyone who might be interested, have them email Laura Dugan at ldugan@umd.edu with the subject line ASC MEDIA SPECIALIST.

Position: Social Media & Media Relations Specialist

Position Purpose: The social media and media relations specialist will execute a social media strategy that will help promote the research of ASC members through social media outlets, blogs, and media lists. This person would interact directly with the membership of ASC to help translate research findings to be accessible to a broader audience.

Duties include:

1. Develop social media strategy, goals, and metrics of success.
2. Establish the ASC voice and online personality across various social media platforms.
3. Create weekly content for ASC's Facebook, Linkedin, Instagram, Twitter, YouTube, and blog sites to support ASC members' research.
4. Focus on building an engaged community of followers to help disseminate research results.
5. Help facilitate the membership's use of social media to disseminate their own research findings.
6. Research, author, and edit content.
7. Interview researchers for story ideas.
8. Monitor media activities and identify emerging and notable criminal justice and criminological events to which our researchers can respond.
9. Write and distribute research briefs related to current newsworthy criminological events.

Preferred Qualifications:

• At least five years of professional experience, preferably in communications, media or a related environment.
• A four-year degree in marketing/communication, journalism, or related field.
• An understanding and ability to write about criminal justice and criminological research.
• A demonstrated proficiency with results-oriented social media campaigns.
• Strong verbal and excellent written communications skills.
• Strong attention to detail relating to material accuracy, consistency, grammar, and spelling.
• Ability to work with researchers to translate their findings to media appropriate messages.

Terms of Employment

The successful candidate will serve as a part-time freelance consultant and be compensated via annual contract (subject to renewal) for an anticipated level of effort of .50 FTE. Compensation commensurate with experience.
What Makes A Successful Collaboration?

by

Janne E. Gaub (janne.gaub@asu.edu) and Lisa M. Dario (ldario@asu.edu)

Introduction:

In the March/April 2013 issue of *The Criminologist*, we made the case for collaboration in graduate school as a key to success. In this follow-up, we discuss a few key concerns that graduate students should consider to increase the likelihood of engaging in successful collaborations. These issues, which include authorship, fulfilling collaborative commitments, and setting the parameters of a collaboration, are sometimes sensitive and awkward, especially in the context of a professor/graduate student relationship. Effectively managing these hurdles hinges on open communication throughout the entire collaborative process.

Authorship:

Perhaps the most important issue in academic collaborations is to establish authorship order. Be clear from the beginning regarding what is expected of each person. Secure agreement on authorship order up front from all collaborators. The field of criminology does not have established rules of authorship (though sociology and other related fields have varying degrees of guidelines), so people may have different expectations regarding authorship. Consideration should be paid to a variety of issues when determining authorship. Work load is a key factor in establishing not only authorship order but whether someone should be included as an author at all. This is especially salient for students; for many graduate students, work as a research assistant may rise to the level that warrants inclusion on a paper. Additionally, clearly outlining expectations of the work at the start of the project (i.e., who is responsible for writing specific sections of the manuscript, setting deadlines and group meetings, or preparing the final document for journal submission) will likely reduce later frustrations by keeping all collaborators “on the same page.” While this is a sensitive topic, it must be broached. It is also necessary to continually discuss authorship. That is, if work load changes, authorship may change, too.

Another factor in determining authorship that can be rather divisive is data ownership. Some data collectors believe that any publication using their data should include them as an author, while others will permit those interested in using their data to have access and would only want authorship if they contributed substantively to the paper itself. It is important to address expectations related to this up-front if you want to use data that is not publicly available. Additionally, authorship is not just about workload or data ownership. Coming up with a novel idea is a very important part of the research process and should be given due credit, as the value of intellectual property needs to be recognized. That being said, merely having an interesting idea does not merit first authorship. Like all issues pertaining to author position, and collaboration more generally, having meaningful, honest conversations with your coauthors can alleviate any ambiguity about where people stand in authorship order.

Fulfilling Collaborative Obligations:

When considering a new collaboration, it is wise to identify others who have worked with the person in the past. Firsthand knowledge from others who have worked with this individual may shape your decision to collaborate (or not). Additionally, it is important to work with others (professors or peers) known for following through on their commitments. If at all possible, stick to collaborations with those you know will fulfill their obligations – and then follow through on your own work as well. This relates to the continued authorship discussion. If, for example, you find yourself with too many current commitments it is imperative to let your coauthors know. If your time cannot be devoted to the collaboration, perhaps a coauthor can take on your duties (and authorship position). By being open about your time and obligations, you are not holding up the project and are consequently being a “good” collaborator.

When Collaborations End:

It can be difficult to know when and how to end a collaboration. It is useful to know, from the beginning, whether collaboration will be a one-time affair, relatively short-term, or a long-term working relationship (Lewis, Ross, & Holden, 2012). In determining the expected time-frame for the collaboration, consider:

- Is this a one-paper partnership or part of a series of manuscripts?
- Does the collaboration require the use of one person’s data, and if so, does this person expect to be on all publications that use the data going forward?
• Are all collaborators in agreement over authorship order and duties? If the collaboration will result in a series of publications, will authorship change?

The answers to these questions may be fluid, so be open to change. What began as a one-time collaboration, especially if the collaboration was due to a course paper or independent study, may become a longer-term partnership if additional questions were raised that warrant follow-up studies. You also may find you simply enjoy working with a particular person or group and wish to continue the collaboration. The reverse can also happen and an expected long-term collaboration may be ended for any number of reasons (e.g., a change in personal or professional commitments, or a shift in research interests). When this happens, it is necessary to be clear about your intentions while not “burning bridges.”

Conclusion:

Research productivity is closely related to collaboration (de Solla Price & Beaver, 1966; Lee & Bozeman, 2005), but collaborations take effort and are certainly not easy. Navigating authorship, work load, and the parameters of a collaboration at the start of the working relationship will better ensure that everyone does their fair share and leaves the collaboration with a positive experience. Ruggill and McAllister (2006) conclude their piece on the “wicked problem of collaboration” with this insight:

Collaborators negotiate different schedules, work demands, and ways of seeing, as well as resource pinches that hinder the process… And yet, it is precisely because collaboration can be so wicked that it is so valuable. In constantly requiring collaborators to assess and reassess their rationales, artistic visions, and project objectives, collaboration makes for reflexive, complex, and innovative projects, which (at least to us) are the most satisfying and useful of all.

While at times challenging, collaboration has the potential to transform ordinary, individual efforts into something extraordinary (Farrell, 2001).

References:


Recently, the response to rape and sexual assault on college campuses has been a topic of great discussion; however, the role of one important population who is integral in this response has been virtually omitted from these discussions—faculty. As educators, faculty members provide formal and informal support to students in the classroom, during office hours, and in mentoring and supervisory roles. Such support may result in extraordinarily personal disclosures by students, with research demonstrating that faculty from an array of academic disciplines report receiving disclosures of sexual assault, stalking, and intimate partner violence from students (Richards, Hayes, & Branch, 2013). As faculty and students are typically both adults, such disclosures may largely occur under the presumption of confidentiality. However, a 2011 “Dear Colleague” letter by the Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights reiterating schools’ Title IX obligations, and recent federal investigations into possible Title IX violations at over 70 postsecondary institutions, has led to new campus policies that restrict the number of university employees that can receive confidential disclosures from students. To satisfy requirements under Title IX, institutions such as Columbia University, Barnard, and Occidental College now include faculty as “responsible employees,” among those employees obligated to report knowledge of criminal incidents to the institution without the guarantee of complete confidentiality. A bill (SB 712) advancing in the Virginia senate escalates the stakes of faculty reporting even further, penalizing any faculty member who fails to report information regarding an alleged sexual assault to police within 24 hours with a misdemeanor charge. Although the responsiveness of such policies should be praised, the gap between the policy problem and solution cannot be overlooked. Prominent cases featured in media coverage and federal investigations have centered on the ineptitude or unwillingness of universities and colleges to provide prompt and equitable responses to cases of sexual assault reported by students—not underreporting by victims wary of disciplinary or criminal proceedings. Policies requiring mandatory reporting of all disclosures that potentially compel victims, with or without their consent, into proceedings that often involve “…mystifying disciplinary proceedings, secretive school administrations, and off-the-record negotiations” (Lombardi, 2009, para. 6) place faculty in a difficult position. However, until additional policy reform takes place, faculty may approach the balance between victim support and compliance with institutional rules in several ways.

Faculty should determine their institution’s reporting policies, and whether they may be required to disclose identifiable information regarding a sexual assault. For faculty designated as responsible employees, students potentially disclosing assaults must be immediately informed of faculty responsibilities to report campus crimes. Regardless of whether students elect to continue to disclose their victimization, faculty should provide information regarding counseling services and advocacy centers on campus, and inform students that federal law permits professional and pastoral counselors and non-professional counselors and advocates to provide confidential support services. In addition, faculty should have a clear understanding of community services such as rape crisis centers, Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner programs, and domestic violence shelters to inform students of alternative confidential support options. Such awareness may be uniquely important for criminal justice or criminology faculty, as courses on crime and violence—particularly those on rape, sexual assault, and/or domestic violence—may serve as the impetus for disclosures. Students in Branch, Hayes-Smith, and Richards’ (2011) study reported seeking out faculty as victim support providers given their known expertise as criminologists. Thus, faculty may consider providing information in their syllabi regarding their role as responsible employees alongside alternative confidential service providers.

The responses survivors receive from disclosure sources play a critical role in their recoveries. Prior literature indicates that victims of sexual violence who receive negative reactions to a disclosure such as disbelief, questions insinuating blame, minimization, and other victim blaming messages often fail to access services post-victimization and rarely attempt to disclose the violence again (Ahrens, 2006). Although the inappropriate nature of such responses may seem self-evident, faculty members report a lack of confidence regarding how to respond to student disclosures (Hayes-Smith et al., 2010). However, research demonstrates that social reactions supportive of victim recovery are rather straightforward. For example, Sarah Ullman’s (2000) validated measure of reactions to disclosures of sexual assault characterizes positive reactions as those providing emotional support, expressing care and concern, identifying that the victimization was not the victim’s fault, and providing information or tangible assistance, such as helping the student to get medical care.

The challenges of responding to campus sexual assault, sexual harassment, and intimate partner violence are significant, and the recent prioritization of these issues by post-secondary institutions should be commended. However, colleges and universities should continue to adapt to concerns by victims, advocates, and faculty alike. As the U.S. Department of Education’s Office for

1 Title IX Coordinators request consent from the student to investigate the incident; however, the institution may disregard the student’s consent if an investigation is required to fulfill the requirements of Title IX.
Civil Rights (2014) itself observes, “A school should be aware that disregarding requests for confidentiality can have a chilling effect and discourage other students from reporting sexual violence” (p. 19). Until additional reforms emerge, faculty thrust into roles as responsible employees that prevent confidential support of students disclosing victimization should prioritize informing survivors of their options and empowering them to make decisions for themselves.
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National Reentry Resource Center Advances the Reentry Field

by

Angela Tolosa, National Reentry Resource Center

Since its inception in 2009, the National Reentry Resource Center (NRRC) has served as the primary source in the United States of information and guidance in reentry, advancing the use of evidence-based practices and policies and creating a network of practitioners, researchers, and policymakers invested in reducing recidivism. Through this work, the NRRC has led systems change across the country to better serve individuals returning from prisons, jails, and juvenile facilities.

Background

The National Reentry Resource Center provides education, training, and technical assistance to states, tribes, territories, local governments, service providers, non-profit organizations, and corrections institutions working on prisoner reentry. It is administered by the U.S. Department of Justice’s Bureau of Justice Assistance and was established by the Second Chance Act (Public Law 110-199). Signed into law on April 9, 2008, the Second Chance Act (P.L. 110-199) was designed to improve outcomes for people returning to communities after incarceration. This first-of-its-kind legislation authorizes federal grants to government agencies and nonprofit organizations to provide support strategies and services designed to reduce recidivism by improving outcomes for people returning from prisons, jails, and juvenile facilities. The Second Chance Act authorizes federal grants and nonprofit organizations to provide reentry services—including employment assistance, substance abuse treatment, housing, family programming, mentoring, victims support, and other services—and to support corrections and supervision practices that aim to reduce recidivism.

The NRRC is a project of the Council of State Governments Justice Center and operates in partnership with the Urban Institute, the Association of State Correctional Administrators, the American Probation and Parole Association, the National Association of Counties, and the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform at Georgetown University’s McCourt School of Public Policy. The work of the NRRC is further rooted in partnerships with more than 150 leading nonprofit organizations, academic institutions, and services providers in the reentry field.

Our Work

Advance the Knowledge Base of the Reentry Field

The NRRC works with top researchers and practitioners to develop consensus-based resources and tools that assist jurisdictions in implementing evidence-based, data-driven strategies to reduce recidivism.

Deliver Training and Technical Assistance

The NRRC imparts individualized and strategic guidance to recipients of Second Chance Act funding in order to maximize their efforts to help individuals returning from incarceration succeed in their communities and to reduce recidivism in their states and communities.

Promote What Works in Reentry

In partnership with the Urban Institute, the NRRC has developed the What Works in Reentry Clearinghouse, an online resource of important research on the effectiveness of a wide variety of reentry interventions. The clearinghouse is available at whatworks.csgjusticecenter.org.

In addition, the NRRC’s online library contains more than 1,000 publications, reports, and other materials to help the field identify proven and practicing practices.

Facilitate Peer Networks and Information Exchange

The NRRC runs monthly webinars and webcasts on key reentry topics, and convenes national training events to facilitate peer-to-peer networking. The NRRC also distributes a monthly electronic newsletter of news and research in reentry, funding

---

1 Reentry refers to the process of people returning to communities after incarceration.
opportunities, and trainings in the field. Recent newsletters are available at http://csgjusticecenter.org/subscribe/

Provide Information for Returning Individuals and Families
The NRRC maintains online state and local reentry directories to help individuals returning home after incarceration and their families identify service providers in their communities.

The NRRC’s mission is to advance the reentry field through knowledge transfer and dissemination and to promote evidence-based best practices. Specifically, the NRRC provides a one-stop, interactive source of current, evidence-based, and user friendly reentry information; individualized, targeted technical assistance for Second Chance Act grantees; and training, distance learning, and knowledge development to support grantees and advance the reentry field. For more information on the work of the NRRC and the field of reentry, visit www.csgjusticecenter.org/nrrc

This is the first of two articles on the work of the National Reentry Resource Center. For more information, please contact Beth Skinner, Program Director, at bskinner@csg.org or Angela Tolosa, Deputy Program Director, at atolosa@csg.org. For more information about the NRRC, please email nrrc@csgjusticecenter.org. You can find information about job opportunities at Council of State Governments Justice Center at www.csgjusticecenter.org/careers.

ADVANCE YOUR CAREER
WITH A MASTER OF SCIENCE IN CRIMINOLOGY AND PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE

THREE DIVERSE CONCENTRATIONS
Administration of Justice + Treatment and Rehabilitation + Emergency Management

Equip yourself with the specialized training needed for successful leadership in government and community organizations, receive education in the Jesuit tradition from faculty nationally recognized as leaders in the field, and engage in research across a range of topics:

- Criminal justice decision-making
- Disparities in criminology and criminal justice
- Countering biological weapons terrorism
- Communities and crime
- Legal constraints on law enforcement
- Correctional treatment of offenders
- Bio-social factors in crime

Full- or part-time options are available with courses offered in the evening and several offered online.

APPLY NOW
To learn more about the program, contact director of admission Kristi Richter or visit us online.

314-977-2752 | krichter@slu.edu | socialwork.slu.edu
Assessing Collaborative Networks to Address Victims’ Legal Needs

by

Michael Field and Sara Debus-Sherrill, ICF International

Victims of crime experience a diverse range of legal needs from asserting their rights in criminal proceedings to additional civil legal issues related to the victimization. For example, victims may need legal assistance to enforce their right to be present at a trial, seek a protection order, retain and protect their job while attending court hearings, receive immigration assistance (e.g., for foreign national human trafficking victims), or obtain a divorce in cases of intimate partner violence. Although these needs result from the victimization, they may be overlooked if they are not directly linked to the criminal justice process. Additionally, victims often have to navigate multiple organizations in order to address the host of complex legal needs following a crime. In response to this issue and in accordance with its Vision 21: Transforming Victim Services report, the Office for Victims of Crime (OVC) created a new demonstration grant program, the OVC Wraparound Victim Legal Assistance Network (WVLAN) Demonstration Project, to address victims’ legal needs using a holistic, wraparound approach.

ICF International (ICF), under a grant awarded by the National Institute of Justice, is evaluating these wraparound legal network models in six demonstration sites in Alaska, California, Colorado, Illinois, Minnesota, and Texas. Each site has between 8 and 21 project partners that form a network to try to better serve victims’ legal needs. These partners are drawn from local victim service providers, legal assistance organizations, criminal justice system actors (e.g., prosecutor’s office, police), advocacy groups, and researchers, among others. The partners at each site have been working together to conduct needs assessments to better understand crime victims’ legal needs in their communities and to design a new service delivery model, which they will be implementing in 2015.

ICF is performing a process and outcome evaluation of the OVC demonstration. One primary component of this evaluation is an assessment of collaboration between the partners at each site. For this project, ICF is taking a multi-pronged approach to measure collaboration between network partners. ICF conducts annual site visits to perform interviews with the project partners and gather in-depth, qualitative information about the nature of preexisting relationships, how the network works together, challenges to and facilitators of collaboration, and lessons learned from the project. ICF also administers a Network Partner Survey on a yearly basis to collect quantifiable measures of collaboration. The survey is divided into two parts; the first focuses on the functioning and dynamics of the project network as a whole while the second measures levels of service integration between each partner pair.

The first section asks about the partners’ activities and experience participating in the steering committee and network partnership. These questions form six scales that measure: Early Drivers (i.e., readiness for change, relationship histories, commitment, and resources), Membership (i.e., composition, level of involvement, and stability of partnership membership), Structure (i.e., defined roles, structural complexity), Interpersonal/Cultural (i.e., cohesion, shared vision, and conflict), Workgroup Processes (i.e., communication, decision-making, leadership, and organization/efficiency), and Formality (i.e., formality of the project’s structure, activities, and processes). While these scales help describe the nature of the partnerships, scale scores are not inherently valued as more or less beneficial; instead, the study will empirically answer the question of which partnership characteristics lead to better success.

The second section asks respondents to rate the level of service integration with each project partner on fourteen items, such as the extent to which they share facility space, have formal written agreements, use common intake forms, or participate in joint case conferences. ICF uses these respondent ratings to perform social network analysis, creating visual diagrams that show the number and strength of connections between partners within each site. The connecting lines between partners illustrate the extent of service integration, with thicker lines indicating higher levels. These diagrams can be very effective at illustrating patterns in relationships that might not be easily detected otherwise. For instance, data from the first year of the survey show that existing relationships are strongest between organizations that provide similar services (e.g., focus on domestic violence) or are in close geographic proximity to one another. ICF will continue to administer the survey annually to measure changes in collaboration over time and include these measures in the overarching outcome analysis to determine whether network functioning and service integration influence the networks’ ability to serve crime victims’ legal needs.

For more information, contact Sara Debus-Sherrill, Co-Principal Investigator, at Sara.Debus-Sherrill@icfi.com.
University of South Florida

Graduate Programs in Criminology and Criminal Justice

Master of Arts in Criminology
Master of Arts in Criminal Justice Administration
Ph.D. in Criminology

Cited in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* among the top 10 criminal and criminology Ph.D. programs in the nation in terms of faculty productivity

Main Areas of Specialization:
Theories of Criminal Behavior and Social Control, Issues pertaining to Inequality and Justice, Corrections, Violence


Tenure-Track Faculty

Lyndsay Boggess (University of California, Irvine) Community context of crime, Race/ethnicity and crime
Max Bromley (Nova University) Campus policing, Campus community crime
John Cochran (University of Florida) Death penalty, Micro social theories of criminal behavior, Macro social theories of crime and crime control
Joshua Cochran (Florida State University) Theories of crime causation; Punishment; Prison experiences; Perceptions of justice; International comparative analyses of criminology and criminal justice
Richard Dembo (New York University) Alcohol and drug use, Juvenile justice
Bryanna Fox (University of Cambridge) Offender profiling, Investigative psychology, Policing, Crime analysis, Psychopathy, Criminal careers and Experimental Criminology
Lorie Fridell (University of California, Irvine) Police use of force, Violence against police, Racially biased policing
Kathleen M. Heide (State University of New York at Albany) Juvenile homicide, Adolescent parricide offenders, Violent offending
Wesley Jennings (University of Florida) Trajectories, Hispanics, Sex offending
Shayne Jones (University of Kentucky) Personality and antisocial behavior, Jury and judicial decision-making
Michael J. Leiber, Chair (State University of New York at Albany) Race, Juvenile justice, Delinquency
Michael J. Lynch (State University of New York at Albany) Radical criminology, Environmental and Corporate crime, Green criminology, Racial bias in criminal justice processes
Ojmarrh Mitchell (University of Maryland) Race and crime, Drug policy, Meta-analysis
Ráchael Powers (State University of New York at Albany) Victimization, Quantitative methodology
M. Dwayne Smith (Duke University) Homicide, Capital Punishment, Structural correlates of violent crime

For information on the Criminology Department visit: [http://criminology.cbcs.usf.edu/](http://criminology.cbcs.usf.edu/)
If you have news, views, reviews, or announcements relating to international or comparative criminology, please send it here! We appreciate brevity (always under 1,000 words), and welcome your input and feedback. – Jay Albanese  jsalbane@vcu.edu

**CRIMINOLOGY AROUND THE WORLD**

**Law, Crime and Punishment in Austria**  
Experiences from a 10-day study abroad program  
by 
Daniela Peterka-Benton, The State University of New York at Fredonia

Everyone knows the benefits for students traveling the world as part of one of the many study abroad programs that every college or university offers. All too often though, themed programs are not as common, particularly in the field of Criminal Justice. As an international faculty member myself, I was in a unique position to design a program focusing on Criminal Justice themes as they pertain to my home country, Austria.

In the summer of 2013 a small group of students with various backgrounds left the US to explore this little nation in the heart of Europe. Our base of operation was Vienna, which allowed the group to participate in many local tours and events. Austria can look back to a long and rich history, sometimes more glorious, sometimes less so, but definitely leaving us with a multitude of options for exploration. Vienna still is influential today in that several international organizations, such as United Nations Offices or the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe among several others, are headquartered there.

The students initially were confronted with law and punishment during the Middle Ages, which was new for many of them. Not only did they learn about early Jewish persecution, witchcraft and the main execution locations in the city of Vienna, but also about the development of a modern legal system and the many changes that went along with it. We also set out to visit some of the international organizations in Vienna, and I was surprised how welcoming all of them were, oftentimes organizing separate programs just for our group. We were able to go on a regular tour of the United Nations, and afterwards were able to meet an employee from the UN Office on Drugs and Crime to speak to the group about their work on the human trafficking issue.

The most impressive visit was sitting in on a Security Council meeting of the OSCE. I expected to be tucked away in the back, but instead we were placed right next to the chair’s table and were officially introduced to the council. At this point I think my students didn’t even dare to breathe! We also visited the US Embassy in Vienna, for a meeting with agents from the Department of Homeland Security, the FBI and Diplomatic Security, giving our students information on what types of responsibilities they have overseas and loads of advice about their career possibilities. I was also able to arrange a meeting with the Head of Central Service for Combating Traffic in Human Beings and Illegal Immigration of the Austrian Federal Ministry of Interior, Criminal Intelligence Service. Our meeting with him began in his office over coffee and cake, a kind of hospitality my students did not expect. Overall they repeatedly noticed the warm and welcoming nature of all the individuals we met during our tours, especially because the Viennese are often considered to be grumpy, but I must say, that we did not encounter that type at all.

The most powerful and impressive tour though took us about 2.5 hours outside of Vienna to the Concentration Camp Mauthausen which was operational from 1938-1945. Now a memorial, the barracks, gas chamber and the local quarry are still open to the public to visit and reflect upon. This place certainly represents the darkest point in Austria’s history, but it was equally important to show how a nation can deal with such an atrocity.

Aside from many topical tours, excursions and presentations I also made it a point to expose the students to some of the cultural highlights of Austria and Vienna including trips to the world famous sausage stands, coffee houses and beer gardens. After a long day of learning one does need a break.

I had a wonderful time with my students and even though a study abroad program requires a lot of work, energy and time, I think it was a great experience for everyone involved, offering students a perspective on crime, justice, history, policy, and practice they will not soon forget.
Visit to the U.S. Embassy in Vienna
From left; front: Megan Bischof, Sara Ribaudo, Miranda Strek-Greco; back: Daniela Peterka-Benton, Daniel Skinner, Brian Buchalski

Visit to the United Nations Office in Vienna
From left: Daniel Skinner, Bond Benton, Daniela Peterka-Benton, Megan Bischof, Brian Buchalski, Miranda Strek-Greco, Sara Ribaudo

Living History Day at the Vienna Military History Museum; presentation of medieval torture instruments: Megan Bischof

R&R at an Austrian sausage stand
From left: Miranda Strek-Greco, Sara Ribaudo, Daniel Skinner, Megan Bischof, Brian Buchalski
On a Lighter Note: Criminology, Music, and Austria
by
Barbara Ann Stolz

While crime and politics have been the primary focus of my career, my passion has always been music, especially classical music. Of late, one of my emerging areas of research interest is the messages that opera communicates about the nature of crime and punishment. In August 2014, I flew to Austria primarily to pursue my musical interests in Vienna and Salzburg. Criminal justice became part of the journey as well.

Even before I left the USA, my criminal justice background presented a problem going through the TSA screening. Living and working in Washington, D.C., security checks are part of one’s daily life. Accordingly, I have learned to “dress for the occasion.” After placing my shoes, 3-1-1 baggie, sweater, and money belt into the plastic tray and onto the conveyor belt, I stepped into the “booth” for my personal body scan. The booth was similar to the equipment used at the main Justice Department building, although in this instance you turned sideways, as indicated by the footprints on the floor, rather than forward. The problem arose when the TSA agent said: “Assume the position.” For the life of me, I could not figure out where to place my hands so that I could lean over to follow her instructions. Perplexed by my confusion, the agent (about 5 feet tall and slightly rotund) stepped into the booth with me. Suddenly, I realized what the shadow image on the wall of the booth was depicting as “the position” and adjusted my posture accordingly. The agent stepped out of the booth and completed the scanning process. As I stepped out of the booth, I said, “40 years of law enforcement.”

The agent burst out laughing; said she was glad I’d made the statement; and proceeded to tell the other agents what I had said, much to their amusement.

During my stay in Austria, the experience most directly related to my criminal justice work was a visit to the United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime (UNODC) in Vienna. A short subway ride from my hotel, I was amazed to step from the station into the UN complex. I proceeded through three levels of security. Going through the metal detector, I set off the alarm, despite having “dressed for the occasion.” Chatting with the U.N. security guard, I expressed surprise at having set off the alarm because living in Washington, D.C. I regularly went through metal detectors and had learned to dress accordingly. He said that he heard that U.S. government employees could shop at a special store that sold clothes and shoes that would not set off metal detectors. Despite having worked for the federal government for 28 years, I am unfamiliar with such a store. Proceeding to the internal courtyard, I was overwhelmed by the UN complex, much larger than in New York City it seemed. (See photo.)

At UNODC, I met with UN colleagues Kristiina Kangaspunta and Fabrizio Sarrica. We had crossed paths in the past, most recently Fabrizio, and I attended the National Institute of Justice conference of human trafficking experts. Our meeting provided the opportunity to share observations and concerns about the evolution of human trafficking as a criminal justice issue and the emerging research needs from an international perspective.
My musical journey also touched on my criminal justice work. In Salzburg, I attended a performance of Franz Schubert’s opera, Fierrabras. Set in the age of Charlemagne, the Frankish King returns to his castle after defeating the Moors. The opera provides an example of incarceration and a threatened death penalty as punishment as a result of the ultimate power conflict—war. Fortunately, wisdom and love prevail and the opera ends happily. Additionally, at a number of historical sites and museums dedicated to Mozart, the visitor is reassured that the prevailing evidence does not support the rumors that he was murdered by his contemporary, the composer Salieri, or by the Masons.

While waiting to enter the concert hall in Salzburg one evening, I had the opportunity to witness law enforcement and emergency vehicles in action. Fire engines, emergency vehicles, and police cars with sirens blazing drove up to the entrance of the large concert hall. All I could think was, “Oh my God, a bomb threat.” Personnel mingled, but no instructions were forthcoming. Suddenly a large black SUV with tinted windows drove into the vehicle entrance to the hall. But the emergency vehicles disbursed as quickly as they had arrived. I cannot swear to the identity of the passenger in the vehicle, but a passerby commented—“Oh, it’s Daniel Barenboim.” He was to conduct that evening.

Several nights later, emerging from Vienna’s English movie theater, I was greeted by metal barricades, set up along Ringstrasse near the Opera House. Trams were not running and pedestrians were held back behind the barricades. My limited German made it difficult for me to comprehend precisely what was happening. Finally, I overheard that the reason for the barricades was Tom Cruise and the filming of the new Mission Impossible movie. I found it interesting that the personnel directing the operation could be identified by their luminescent green vests, but did not appear to be police officers. I traveled far from Washington, D.C., only to be confronted by similar challenges.

My plans for this trip were to follow a musical journey. I was fortunate to attend four concerts, an opera, four high masses with music by a variety of composers, and the “Sound of Music” performed at the Salzburg puppet theater. Nevertheless, criminal justice seemed to follow me. I highly recommend a trip to Austria for music, art, food, warm people, and a bit of criminal justice.

---

**DID YOU KNOW?**

**‘It’s a crime’: Migrant Smuggling**

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) estimates that in the first nine months of 2014, at least 4,077 migrants died while being smuggled abroad. This is 70 per cent higher than the recorded deaths for the whole of 2013. Profit-seeking criminals exploit the lack of legal opportunities available to migrants and take advantage of their situation by offering services at great cost, including transport and document fraud.

Migration is a positive force for development. Yet, when migration is organized illegally by criminal groups for profit, its effect may be outweighed by the negative impact of transnational organized crime and corruption. Migrant smuggling is one of the many transnational crimes to be discussed at the 13th United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice in Doha, Qatar in April 2015. As the international community continues to discuss the post-2015 development agenda, the Crime Congress will focus on the links between security, justice and the rule of law, and the attainment of a better, more equitable world. For more information, see http://www.unis.unvienna.org/unis/en/events/2015/crime_congress.html
NEW INTERNATIONAL BOOKS OF INTEREST


INTERNATIONAL CRIMINOLOGY MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doha, Qatar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 July, 2015</td>
<td>15th International Symposium of the World Society of Victimology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perth, Western Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-26 June, 2015</td>
<td>Asian Criminological Society Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.acs001.com/">www.acs001.com/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10 July, 2015</td>
<td>Crime, Justice and Social Democracy International Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brisbane, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://crimejusticeconference.com/">http://crimejusticeconference.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-26 June, 2015</td>
<td>International Conference on Sociology and Criminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 September, 2015</td>
<td>15th Annual Conference of the European Society of Criminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porto, Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.eurocrim2015.com">http://www.eurocrim2015.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-3 June-July, 2015</td>
<td>British Society of Criminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>www5.plymouth.ac.uk/schools/plymouth-law-school/criminology-voyages-of-critical-discovery/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Register now for the Stockholm Criminology Symposium

You are now welcome to register for the 2015 Stockholm Criminology Symposium. The next Stockholm Criminology Symposium will take place in Stockholm June 8-10, 2015. Last day to register for the 2015 symposium is May 4. Each year the Symposium attracts well over 500 participants from more than 30 countries. It is organized by the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention on behalf of the Swedish Ministry of Justice.

The symposium is organized in conjunction with the award ceremony of the Stockholm Prize in Criminology. This year, the prize is awarded to Professor Ronald V. Clarke of Rutgers University and to Patricia Mayhew, former civil servant at UK’s Home Office.

The work of Ronald V. Clarke and Patricia Mayhew has helped reshape crime prevention strategies worldwide to focus on changing the characteristics of the situations in which crimes repeatedly occur. Thus, Opportunities for crime and situational crime prevention will be the main theme of the Symposium this year. By tradition the Stockholm Criminology Symposium also presents a large number of panels under the general theme contemporary criminology, which provide an overview of the current state of knowledge.

Ronald V. Clarke and Patricia Mayhew will receive the Prize at the City Hall in central Stockholm on the evening of June 9, 2015.

Further information can be found at www.criminologysymposium.com or by calling +468 527 58 475.
NATIONAL CONFERENCES & WORKSHOPS

THE RESEARCH COORDINATION NETWORK (RCN) ON UNDERSTANDING GUILTY PLEAS
June 2-3, 2015
Albany, NY

FRAGILE FAMILIES SUMMER DATA WORKSHOP 2015
June 17-19, 2015
New York City, NY

THE NATIONAL HISPANIC SCIENCE NETWORK ON DRUG ABUSE (NHSN) 15TH ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
June 24-26, 2015
San Antonio, TX

CRIME & JUSTICE SUMMER RESEARCH INSTITUTE: BROADENING PERSPECTIVES & PARTICIPATION
July 6-24, 2015
Columbus, OH

THE SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS (SSSP)
August 21-23, 2015
Chicago, IL

4TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON FORENSIC RESEARCH & TECHNOLOGY” (FORENSIC RESEARCH-2015)
September 28-30, 2015
Atlanta, GA

ICCA CONFERENCE
November 8-11, 2015
Boston, MA
2015 ANNUAL MEETING

THEME: The Politics of Crime & Justice

Make your reservations early for Washington, DC
November 18-21, 2015

Washington Hilton
1919 Connecticut Ave.
Washington, DC 20009 USA

$225 single & $250 double occupancy

YOU MUST MENTION YOU ARE WITH ASC TO OBTAIN THIS RATE