Editor’s Note

On the eve of the one-year anniversary of the Pulse Orlando mass shooting, Angela Dwyer and Vanessa R. Panfil reflect on queer criminologies and their relationship to criminological scholarship and public engagement. This powerful essay is the third in The Criminologist’s 2017 series on publicly engaged criminology and criminal justice, and is a must read deserving careful reflection and wide dissemination.

— Jody Miller, ASC Vice President

“We Need to Lead the Charge”—“Talking Only to Each Other is Not Enough”: The Pulse Orlando Mass Shooting and the Futures of Queer Criminologies*

by

Angela Dwyer, University of Tasmania
Vanessa R. Panfil, Old Dominion University

Many people woke up on June 12, 2016, in the middle of LGBTQ pride month, to conflicting reports: an attack on a nightclub, a terrorist attack, an attack on LGBTQ people, an attack on Latinx LGBTQ people? At Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida, a club self-described as a “Latin Hotspot,” a single shooter killed 49 people and injured dozens more. In America, it became the deadliest mass shooting, attack on LGBTQ people specifically, and act of terrorism since 9/11. The massacre had far-reaching impacts on numerous communities. The shooter, who was born in America and previously had been investigated for potential terrorist ties, pledged allegiance to ISIS in a call to 911 before the shooting. Thus, the attack was highly politicized, with some political figures framing it within the context of gun control, while others framed it primarily about radical Islamic terrorism (Alvarez and Pérez-Peña 2016). There were speculations about internalized homophobia, and ambiguity as to whether the shooter had been a patron of Pulse. Much of the media coverage, domestic and international, focused on this more as an act of terrorism than as a hate crime perpetrated against LGBTQ people.
As we near the one-year anniversary of this violent act, we reflect on the potentialities of public criminology as it pertains to the responses of scholars working within and around the nexus between queer and criminology. Responses not just to incidents like this, but to violence against LGBTQ people more generally. We do not purport to know the precise motives of the shooter, and despite an understanding that this was domestic terrorism, we seek to contribute to a much broader conversation about interpersonal and institutional violence against queer people. In many ways, this article is not just about the Pulse nightclub shooting, but about how it exemplifies the experiences of LGBTQ people in the current climate, and the ideas and concerns queer criminologists have about moving forward in this moment.

However, who are we to speak for queer criminology or advance a normative agenda, drawn solely from our own views? Consistent with the ethos of public criminology, and trying to effect what Christopher Uggen and colleagues call for in their recent Criminologist lead article to draw from a larger “chorus of voices” (2017: 6), we asked what other folks thought. Not just professors, but students and practitioners, with varying levels of experience within and exposure to queer criminological academic work. Although in no way a “scientific” sampling method, we received comments from people of diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds, several countries of origin spread across the globe, who fall on a continuum of gender identities including cisgender (female or male consistent with their birth sex), transgender, and non-binary, who may or may not identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or otherwise non-heterosexual. We recognize and acknowledge them as co-producers of this piece and of our recommendations, though take full responsibility for the words we present here, and any omissions are of course our own. We were struck by the passion, depth, and insight of our colleagues and friends, and although we can hardly do justice to all of their prescient comments, we will sure try.

**The Pulse Shooting in Context: Discriminatory Policy and Widespread Violence Against LGBTQ People**

Several themes were evident among many of these sentiments and are at the forefront of our minds as well. The first was that this instance, although unique, extreme, and tragic, occurs within a larger pattern of violence against queer people. We should not focus our efforts on one orchestrated and rare act of violence to the exclusion of other forms of violence, both overt and covert, that happen daily and to broad swaths of LGBTQ people. Political and economic elites enact institutional violence that excludes and oppresses by creating and perpetuating forces such as racism, sexism, and heteronormativity (e.g., Liazos 1972). To illustrate this, we need only point to several well-known pieces of legislation—which are often motivated by fear or dangerous and discriminatory assumptions about LGBTQ people being threatening in various ways—that seek to control queer people’s movements, access to public accommodations, and participation within social institutions. For example, North Carolina’s House Bill 2, referred to colloquially as the “bathroom bill,” required that at a government-run facility, people had to use bathrooms and locker rooms that corresponded to the sex listed on their birth certificate. This law’s recent repeal included a provision that prevents municipalities in North Carolina from passing or amending non-discrimination ordinances through December 2020 (Hanna, Park, and McLaughlin 2017).

Laws such as these, and even their compromise “repeals,” not only prevent legal protections, but as noted by our contributors, arguably incite interpersonal violence from the fears they stoke. Narratives of alleged deception and assumed depravity often underlie fatal violence committed against transgender people (Wodda and Panfil 2015), with transgender women of color facing exponentially higher rates of fatal violence than other women (HRC and TPOCC 2015). Several of our colleagues discussed how after Pulse, queer people of color for a moment became “good victims,” but only vis-à-vis suspected Islamic terrorism (a point we return to shortly). They noted the disturbing hypocrisy of displays of support from otherwise oppressive, conservative political forces; tweets of “thoughts and prayers” for the victims and their families when the state and many citizens make no real effort to protect queer people from violence. Indeed, it more often seems the actions of some political parties and citizens seek to hurt LGBTQ people repeatedly by failing to protect them when they are being victimized and by introducing restrictive measures.

Incidents like the Pulse shooting caused many queer people to feel unsafe in the days that followed, especially in frequenting Pride-month celebrations filled with other queer people. Speaking personally, we (the authors) each felt paralyzing fear, sadness, and rage for days following the shooting, as did many of our colleagues. We each had the moment of “This was me.” But the everyday experience of feeling unsafe—or at least hyperaware—is very real for many LGBTQ people, even for those living in large and diverse cities, in the U.S. and globally. Feelings of unsafety can arise from experiencing victimization personally, or vicariously. For many, while this was an example of extreme hate violence against LGBTQ people, particularly Latinx communities, it is but a single example of violence that they experience along a continuum of various forms of violence, with many trans and gender diverse people experiencing terrifying threats to their safety on a daily basis. The Pulse shooting attracted a lot of positive media coverage, with news outlets around the world expressing their outrage and sympathies for the victims. Yet when a Latina or Black trans woman dies as a result of an individual hate incident, their loss barely rates a mention in these same news outlets. This also raises issues around the global south and the global north (Connell 2007). Specifically, while Pulse evidenced an international outpouring of grief in the media and amongst LGBTQ communities attending vigils, LGBTQ folks in other parts of the world continue to be killed with no mention. Again, their losses are overlooked as important news in these same outlets.

Alongside any positive media coverage, there exists a horrifying narrative among some groups insisting that this massacre was
Comments from our colleagues about activism in many forms were common, as were examples of ways they got involved following Mobilizing Queer Emotions, Experiences, and Collaborations in Pursuit of Public Criminology categories in the upcoming 2020 United States Census, despite originally being on the proposed instruments (Visser 2017).

gender diversity, for example, can be routinely excluded for being too complicated or too much work. Or worse yet, as unimportant: demographic questions around class and ethnicity may make it into mainstream criminological research projects, sexuality and the experiences of gay and/or trans people are excluded simply because their numbers fail to meet a prescribed sample size. While that has at times overlooked all LGBTQ people. In the past, mainstream criminologies have contributed to the marginalization of forms and try to put it to work for us – work from the inside out in ways that situate us and our work within a broader discourse processes that maintain the marginalization of LGBTQ people of color. As criminologists, we should recognize our privilege of various indeed, it is imperative that we continue to seek out ways to be more inclusive lest queer criminologies become part of the broader processes that maintain the marginalization of LGBTQ people of color. As criminologists, we should recognize our privilege of various and to ensure authentic engagements is to cultivate racial diversity among queer criminologists as well, and to build bridges and coalitions. Many recent conversations within queer criminologist circles at professional meetings and in social media outlets have been about the relative whiteness of queer criminology and of research on LGBTQ people more generally, and how to best address that. Even the use of the word “queer” does not resonate with some people due to its changing meanings across generations and cultures. Speaking of white LGBTQ people's experiences in comparison to those of LGBTQ people of color, one of our colleagues reflected, “Your comfort is linked to our pain and suffering.”

If the sentiments we collected are any indication, the community of scholars engaged with queer criminologies is fundamentally and strongly opposed to single incidents of violence being used to bolster exclusionary sentiment, such as Islamophobia, xenophobia, and violence against immigrant communities. Many of our colleagues have expressed genuine disturbance, and for some, downright anger, that violence committed against queer people of color is being used to demonize and criminalize other non-white people.

In addition to this, criminologists have recently highlighted how criminological thinking is shaped heavily by the global north, and when criminological thinking happens, it typically works through global north scholars travelling to and extracting data from the global south, and travelling back to the global north to interpret the data using global north conceptualizations of crime and punishment (Carrington, Hogg, and Sozzo 2016). Queer criminologies are equally guilty of these forms of analyses (Ball and Dwyer forthcoming) and the Pulse incident highlights the importance of ensuring the intersectional focus in queer criminological work to help avoid colonization and nationalism in particular by using “queer, feminist, anti-racist, and anti-colonial scholarship.”

On the subject of intersectional identities and overlapping systems of oppression and privilege, one way to reduce colonialism and to ensure authentic engagements is to cultivate racial diversity among queer criminologists as well, and to build bridges and coalitions. Many recent conversations within queer criminologist circles at professional meetings and in social media outlets have been about the relative whiteness of queer criminology and of research on LGBTQ people more generally, and how to best address that. Even the use of the word “queer” does not resonate with some people due to its changing meanings across generations and cultures. Speaking of white LGBTQ people's experiences in comparison to those of LGBTQ people of color, one of our colleagues reflected, “Your comfort is linked to our pain and suffering.”

Indeed, it is imperative that we continue to seek out ways to be more inclusive lest queer criminologies become part of the broader processes that maintain the marginalization of LGBTQ people of color. As criminologists, we should recognize our privilege of various forms and try to put it to work for us – work from the inside out in ways that situate us and our work within a broader discourse that has at times overlooked all LGBTQ people. In the past, mainstream criminologies have contributed to the marginalization of the experiences of LGBTQ people in criminal processing systems, something which Derek Dalton (2015) suggests makes for an ambivalent relationship with mainstream criminologies in the first instance. We see this sideling highlighted in studies where the experiences of gay and/or trans people are excluded simply because their numbers fail to meet a prescribed sample size. While demographic questions around class and ethnicity may make it into mainstream criminological research projects, sexuality and gender diversity, for example, can be routinely excluded for being too complicated or too much work. Or worse yet, as unimportant: there is no greater example of this as a political issue than the (continued) omission of sexual orientation and gender identity categories in the upcoming 2020 United States Census, despite originally being on the proposed instruments (Visser 2017).

Mobilizing Queer Emotions, Experiences, and Collaborations in Pursuit of Public Criminology

A third theme that builds on the first two is to mobilize emotion and life experience to inform our work. In the Pulse victims and survivors, queer criminologists saw ourselves reflected: names, complexions, sexual and gender identities, ways we form community. Comments from our colleagues about activism in many forms were common, as were examples of ways they got involved following...
the incident or in longer stretches of equality-minded LGBTQ activism. Calls were made for us to get involved wherever possible, and to include ourselves and our experiences in our work. This can certainly be challenging. As Forrest Stuart notes in his recent (2017) *Criminologist* lead article, many academics are fearful to do this because of the risk of being accused of doing “me-search” or introducing bias into our scholarly works. But of course LGBTQ or allied scholars have pertinent experience in exploring concepts of import to queer communities, and of course we can utilize it to better inform our scholarship and our recommendations. Of course.

As mentioned, building bridges and coalitions is also key. We need to rethink what it means to do criminological work in a way that integrates public criminology principles. Working with practitioners and with the community at large are essential steps in making queer criminological thinking and research visible in the focus on public criminologies. Much of what we know about queer people’s experiences with crime, victimization, and the criminal and juvenile justice systems is actually from human rights organizations and found in the grey literature: accounts from and findings of their research conducted on the ground and published on their own, outside of academic or commercial publishers (e.g., Amnesty International 2006). These sources are immensely helpful in understanding the challenges facing queer communities and should give us inspiration about how to make queer criminologies more public and collaborative. This might also entail employing new (or newer) ways of communicating and connecting: social media, op-eds, and community outreach.

Engaging in public ways with different forms of more mindful alternative media outlets is a good start, like Adam Messinger (2017) has done with research around transgender victims of domestic violence who are undocumented. But we also should engage with mainstream populist media as well — those media outlets who have also silenced and even ridiculed the lives of LGBTQ people in the past. (It is similarly true for us to share our work with mainstream academic outlets, instead of fatalistically believing that our discipline has not moved closer toward an interest in social justice — see Panfil and Miller 2014.) We must talk back to the criminal processing systems that we do research about; doing research on how LGBTQ young people experience policing is worthless unless the police organizations themselves are aware of what the young people said (Dwyer 2011). We need to go back to organizations and institutions of social control, present our research to them, tell them the narratives of the people we speak to, and see the ‘aha’ moments when they realize the gravity of the situation and what they can do to ameliorate it. We can attest to the strength and utility of this strategy. Queer criminological research has virtually no power or influence unless we talk back to these services about the research we do. Talking back could also include testifying at state legislatures and making ourselves visible in other forms of public civic life. As one commentator astutely suggested, “Talking only to each other is not enough.”

**Queering Academic Landscapes**

We close this article with a few reflections on our final theme, of academic possibilities. We start with the most obvious, which is curricular. Courses within and outside of criminology can be enhanced by providing even just a basic overview about what queer lives (good and bad) look like, queer figures and their accomplishments, and histories of violence against LGBTQ people. But, in light of the fact that criminology and criminal justice majors are among some of the most homophobic college students, and they will go on to serve LGBTQ populations in their work, integrating information about LGBTQ communities into criminology and criminal justice curricula seems particularly prudent (Fradella, Owen, and Burke 2006). Both authors and several of our commentators have responded to the dearth of queer-related information in each of their university’s course offerings by designing new courses and teaching them. Although not all universities allow such flexibility in course development, there is almost always room to at least integrate some primary source materials, documentaries, and/or news coverage of current events into existing courses. Based on our own experience and what we’ve heard from others, students learn a lot in these specific or enhanced courses since much of the information is brand new to them, and they are appreciative to have particular exposure, knowledge, or cultural competency that other future practitioners and scholars may not have. Even LGBTQ students have articulated the utility of these courses for their ability to be conversant in existing scholarly research on LGBTQ communities, and they appreciated that their experiences, and those of their peers and broader communities, were represented in their coursework. The key issue is engaging senior university administrators to convince them that these forms of information should not just be elective knowledge, but knowledge integrated across core curricula. The same is true for straight colleagues who benefit from heterosexual privilege, and thus may not be aware of the pressing issues facing LGBTQ communities, particularly LGBTQ communities of color.

More in line with a public criminology sensibility, we can support LGBTQ students on campus by lending our time, expertise, and enthusiasm to the development, growth, and nurturance of student organizations that serve them. This may be especially important at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs), which are significantly less likely to have LGBTQ student organizations and resource centers (Lenning forthcoming). We understand that service assignments on committees related to improving diversity and inclusion or campus pride may not “count” much towards tenure, or may be time- and energy-consuming. They are essentially labors of love and are not feasible for some. However, if we have good intentions and a stated interest and are not willing to roll up our sleeves and do the work, who will?

Small steps can be taken to improve climate without an official committee assignment. We can educate our own colleagues and make sure our university figures respond (at all!) and in an affirming way to incidents like the Pulse shooting and to other pivotal
moments in queer history. We can empower colleagues to educate themselves, as sometimes it can be an expectation that LGBTQ faculty members are the ones to do this work – and some of us get to the point of burnout from the exhausting process of educating so many from the minds of so few. We can agitate for safe spaces on university and college campuses for LGBTQ students in times of crisis and mourning. Following the shooting, there were exchanges on the QUEERCCJ listserv about whether our respective universities’ administrations sent out any sort of communication to students and faculty/staff about the incident, and if so, whether it was acknowledged as an act of violence targeted at LGBTQ people. The willingness of faculty members to step up, help draft responses, consult on initiatives, give talks around campus, and related activities undoubtedly improved outcomes for students at those institutions.

Finally, caution might be warranted before we embrace full engagement in public criminology. As queer criminologists, we need to be cognizant of how our research might be used against us in an attempt to demonstrate that LGBTQ lives are somehow inherently pathological. We should be wary to avoid always being the tokenistic queer folks, moving towards political fatigue. We must be mindful of how traditional criminologies have at times excluded us as unmentionable minorities, and perhaps aberrant individuals. We need to move forward consciously about how, by co-opting ourselves into the race to make criminologies more public, we are not inadvertently reinforcing power relations that will continue to keep LGBTQ issues in this minority space. We nonetheless see many possibilities to build community and coalitions among fellow scholars, whether mainstream or critical, queer and non-queer alike, with the shared goal of making queer criminologies and criminology more inclusive and intersectional. In closing, the Pulse shooting reminds us why the endeavors we have discussed here are of such vital importance, and we wish to honor the victims and survivors of Pulse by renewing our efforts and leading the charge.
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INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF COMPARATIVE AND APPLIED CRIMINAL JUSTICE: REFLECTING ON 40 YEARS OF PUBLISHING

by

Mahesh K. Nalla (Editor-in-Chief) April 2017

For more than 40 years, the *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice* (*IJCACJ* or *International Journal hence forth*) has been a leading source for bringing together research contributions to the world community of criminologists on important matters relating to crime and justice. The journal was started by Professor Dae Chang at Wichita State University where he retired in 1999 as Professor Emeritus after a long and distinguishing career.

Professor Chang, who received his Ph.D. in Criminal Justice from Michigan State University (MSU), was a strong advocate of the study of comparative crime and justice issues, founded the journal in 1977 and edited it until 1999. During his tenure, Professor Chang tirelessly promoted the cause of comparative criminal justice through his journal as well as published numerous books, book chapters, and refereed journal articles during his academic career. In 2000, I was appointed as Editor-in-Chief when the journal was housed at MSU School of Criminal Justice.

The purpose of this journal is to encourage the exchange of theoretical views and scientific findings to develop, promote, and advance key research areas in criminal justice for use in classroom and in practice. The *International Journal* focuses on two distinct but related concepts. First, papers are *comparative*: i.e., comparative analysis of cross-cultural theories of crime, legal systems, policing, courts, juvenile justice, women offenders, and minority offenders. Education, training, and planning also will be included. Second, papers highlight policy recommendations for applying research findings to the operations of criminal justice in a given country or region.

*IJCACJ* has developed a unique and growing constituency. Comparative and applied criminal justice is a broad but distinctive, interdisciplinary research area that was not adequately served by any journal prior to the launch of the *IJCACJ*. Established to advance international and cross-national empirical research on crime and criminal justice, *IJCACJ* has developed a reputation for hosting and nurturing social science and humanities research that addresses the diverse ways in which academics and practitioners apply the findings to practice, policy, and in the classroom.

The journal distinguishes itself in this field of study by its exclusive focus on applied research and by serving as an outlet for articles on theory testing models developed in western democracies and criminal justice legal analyses. *IJCACJ* provides a forum where different theoretical methodologies and approaches can be advanced, drawing on economics, sociology, anthropology, history, literary theory, geography, cultural studies, social studies of business organization and management, and political philosophy, as opposed to concentrating on one perspective. This is reflected in the published output and the composition of the editorial board, which has strength across these areas.

As a consequence of *IJCACJ*’s efforts to include discussions from a broad theoretical, methodological, and disciplinary range, it both appeals to and attracts academics across a variety of subject areas. The journal’s international approach is illustrated by articles published from five continents. Research from over 80 countries has appeared in past issues. These include: Africa and the Middle East (Bahrain, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Israel, Cote d’Ivoire [Ivory Coast], Liberia, Malawi, Nigeria, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, Zimbabwe); the Americas (Bahamas, Bermuda, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Jamaica, Mexico, Peru, U.S. [Including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico], Venezuela); Asia (Bangladesh, China, Hong Kong, India, Japan, Nepal, North Korea, Pakistan, the Philippines, South Korea, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Thailand, Vietnam); Europe (Armenia, Austria, Cyprus, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, England, France, Germany [Including former East Germany], Greenland, Italy, Malta, Northern Ireland, Republic of Ireland, Poland, Portugal, Russia (including Former USSR), Scotland, Slovenia [Including former Yugoslavia], Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine; and Oceania (Australia, New Zealand, and Papua New Guinea).

It was not just the coverage of criminology from around the globe that made it a much sought after international journal. Over the years, the journal has also covered both traditional criminal justice issues and many emerging issues that often remain on the fringe. Some of the special issues over time either covered a specific country or ran thematic issues. Special issues on a wide range of developing topics have been covered, including issues concerning nomadic and aboriginal populations, money laundering,
intimate partner/domestic violence, product counterfeiting, human trafficking, wildlife crime management, conversation criminology, terrorism, and methodological issues in comparative criminology.

In 2005, the journal became affiliated with the American Society of Criminology (ASC)'s Division of International Criminology (DIC). During this time, the International Journal has grown in recognition and circulation, thanks largely to high-quality submissions from scholars in the field and the affiliation. While this was an important development for the journal, the primary goal of the journal was not altered. The new affiliation, however, brought some changes the governance structures of the journal. Half the members of the advisory and editorial boards are nominated by the DIC. The editorial board members are from all over the world, including the UK, Australia, USA, Canada, Trinidad & Tobago, Germany, Italy, UK, Japan, Hong Kong, Singapore, and South Korea.

In an effort to further develop the International Journal and to make it even more accessible to readers, contributors, and libraries, many of the technical chores related to publishing were transferred to a professional and reputable company. In 2011, all of the publishing aspects of the journal were acquired by Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. The journal moved from 2 issues to 4 per year, and publishing is now done on both hardcopy and online. All of the articles from prior years are digitized and made accessible online to readers. With the implementation of online protocols, the number of submissions has increased, the review time reduced, and the overall turnaround process from submission to final printing of accepted manuscripts improved.

The journal now is accessible to readers worldwide via sales packages with institutions and as part of Routledge's Social Sciences and Humanities Library (SSH Library). Further, Routledge is committed to wide distribution of its journals to non-profit institutions in developing countries. The number of full-text downloads has increased impressively since 2014. Articles are downloaded from all regions of the world with nearly two-thirds North America, and Northern and Central Europe.

IJCACJ's wide appeal can also be seen by the journals that cite its articles. In 2016 alone, the journal's content was cited by Aggression & Violent Behavior, British Journal of Criminology, Homicide Studies, Journal of Criminal Justice, Journal of Intercultural Studies, Policing, Sociological Perspectives, Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, among others.

The journal's growth is on a very positive trajectory. Submissions have been increasing in recent years, and the journal continues to see strong submissions from around the world. Its presence in key abstracting and indexing databases is also increasing. It has long been indexed in the primary criminal justice databases, including NCJRS, Criminal Justice Abstracts, and, since establishing partnership with Routledge, the journal is also being indexed by Scopus and the Emerging Social Sciences Indexes.
ASC Hosts Panel at American Association for the Advancement of Science Conference

The American Society of Criminology hosted a panel at the American Association for the Advancement of Science annual meetings in Boston in February 2017. This high profile venue is the premier general science conference in the nation. There are a limited number of panels and only a handful of social science panels, so ASC’s representation on the program is significant. The title of the panel was *Crime, Justice, and Death*. William Alex Pridemore (University at Albany – SUNY, School of Criminal Justice), who is ASC’s Liaison to AAAS, organized and moderated. Linda Teplin (Northwestern University, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences), Heather Harris (University of California – Berkeley, Sociology Post-Doc), and Pridemore were presenters. Brandon Welsh (Northeastern University, School of Criminology and Criminal Justice) was discussant. After accepting the panel for the program, the AAAS Scientific Program Committee selected the panel to be coupled with three others as part of an all-day seminar/theme, entitled “Criminal Justice: Science and the Law.”

The theme of this year’s AAAS meeting was “serving society through science policy.” Thus, the ASC panel addressed a topic with implications for harm reduction via science policy. Teplin presented research using data from the *Northwestern Juvenile Project*. She and her colleagues examined rates of and risk factors for premature mortality in 1829 delinquent youth. Sixteen years after detention, 111 had died, most from homicide by firearm. Mortality rates varied by age, gender, and ethnicity, but were 2-10 times higher than general population rates. Significant risk factors in adolescence for later mortality included drug dealing, alcohol use disorder, and gang membership. Harris presented research on the racial divide in health risk factors among young men during transition to adulthood. Her results showed premature mortality among blacks at this stage is due largely to violence, while among whites it is due largely to drug use. Youth with these risk factors typically interact with the criminal justice system, which may help or harm their transitions, and thus Harris focused on relationships between criminal justice policies, these negative outcomes, and characteristics – like education, work, and home environment – of the transition to adulthood. Pridemore presented research that used population-based case-control data to study the effect of recent criminal victimization on early death. Men who had been victims of violence in the past year were 2.6 times more likely than those who had not to die prematurely. Cause of death data for decedents showed those victimized in the past year were 3.2 times more likely than those who had not to die of homicide. He discussed the results in the context of the competing explanations – state dependence or risk heterogeneity – of repeat victimization.

Pridemore is currently preparing ASC’s proposal for the 2018 AAAS meeting. The theme is “Advancing Science: Discovery to Application” and the meeting will be held in Austin, Texas.

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS FOR 2018 ELECTION SLATE OF 2019 - 2020 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, 2017 to be considered by the Committee.

Charles Wellford
Criminology & Criminal Justice
University of Maryland
2220 LeFrak Hall
College Park, MD 20742
301-405-4701 (Ph)
301-314-0179 (Fax)
wellford@umd.edu
DIVISION OF EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY
AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY

Membership Drive 2017, Org. Memberships & ASC in Philadelphia

DIVISION MEMBERSHIP DRIVE 2017

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 2017 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.

ORGANIZATIONAL SPONSORSHIPS AVAILABLE!

Did you know the DEC also offer organizational memberships? Show how committed your department, center, or institution’s commitment to experimental criminology is by becoming a member today. We strive to recognize all of our sponsors in unique and exciting ways. Contact us at expcrim@gmail.com for details.

ASC - PHILADELPHIA 2017

DEC and AEC look forward to welcoming you to Philadelphia in November! Join us for an exciting program of events, including the annual Joan McCord lecture and DEC/AEC joint awards ceremony.

Stay tuned for more information! Please contact us at expcrim@gmail.com if you are interested in helping out on the DEC exhibit table!

Sponsorships Available

Joan McCord Award winner David Hawkins with former AEC President Peter Greenwood at ASC in New Orleans.

Susan Turner (Chair), Liz Groff (Vice Chair), Jordan Hyatt (Secretary-Treasurer)
Executive Counselors: Charlotte Gill, Cody Telep, and Elise Sargeant
http://expcrim.org
The ASC Division on Corrections & Sentencing Requests Nominations for Annual Awards

**Lifetime Achievement Award**
This award honors an individual’s distinguished scholarship in the area of corrections and/or sentencing over a lifetime. Recipients must have 20 or more years of experience contributing to scholarly research. Retired scholars will be considered. Nominations should include a nomination letter and the candidate’s curriculum vitae and should be submitted to Sara Wakefield, Nominations Committee Chair, at dcsawards@gmail.com no later than September 1, 2017.

**Distinguished Scholar Award**
This award recognizes a lasting scholarly career, with particular emphasis on a ground-breaking contribution (e.g., book or series of articles) in the past 5 years. The award’s committee will consider both research in the area of corrections and sentencing and service to the Division. Recipients must have 8 or more years of post-doctoral experience. Nominations should include a nomination letter and the candidate’s curriculum vitae and should be submitted to Sara Wakefield, Nominations Committee Chair, at dcsawards@gmail.com no later than September 1, 2017.

**Distinguished New Scholar Award**
This award recognizes outstanding early career achievement in corrections and sentencing research. The award’s committee will consider both research in the area of corrections and sentencing and service to the Division. Recipients must have less than 8 years of post-doctoral experience. Nominations should include a nomination letter and the candidate’s curriculum vitae and should be submitted to Sara Wakefield, Nominations Committee Chair, at dcsawards@gmail.com no later than September 1, 2017.

**Practitioner Research Award**
The Practitioner Research Award recognizes excellent social science research that is conducted in government agencies to help that agency develop better policy or operate more effectively. The emphasis will be placed on a significant piece of research concerning community corrections, institutional corrections, or the judiciary conducted by a researcher or policy analyst employed by a government agency (federal, state, or local). Besides recognition and an opportunity to present about the research at ASC, there will be a reimbursement of up to $500 to attend the annual
meeting. Nominations should include a nomination letter and the candidate’s curriculum vitae and should be submitted to dcsawards@gmail.com by no later than September 1, 2017 (please put “practitioner research award nomination” in the subject line).

Marguerite Q. Warren and Ted B. Palmer Differential Intervention Award
The Differential Intervention Award is given to a researcher, scholar, practitioner, or other individual who has significantly advanced the understanding, teaching, or implementation of classification, differential assignment, or differential approaches designed to promote improved social and personal adjustment and long-term change among juvenile and adult offenders. The award focuses on interventions, and on ways of implementing them that differ from “one-size-fits-all,” “one-size-largely-fits all,” or “almost fits all,” approaches. The recipient’s contribution can apply to community, residential, or institutional within or outside of the United States. Consideration for this award does not necessarily require a full nomination packet (which usually requires quite a bit of work in preparation). Just send the award committee the person’s name, affiliation, and a couple of sentences on what that person has done to deserve consideration for the Warren/ Palmer Differential Intervention Award. Nominations should be sent to dcsawards@gmail.com no later than September 1, 2017.

Student Paper Award
This award is presented in recognition of the most outstanding student research paper. Eligibility is limited to papers that are authored by one or more undergraduate or graduate students and have not been previously published or accepted for publication at the time of submission. Papers written with faculty members are not considered for this award. Submissions will be judged on five evaluative criteria, including: the overall significance of the work; its research contribution to the field; integration of prior literature in the area; appropriateness and sophistication of the research methodology (if applicable); and overall quality of writing and organization of the paper. Papers should not exceed 30 pages of double-spaced text. References, tables, and figures are not included in the page limit. Please email papers to Jeff Mellow, Student Paper Award Committee Chair, at jmellow@jjay.cuny.edu no later than August 15, 2017.

Dissertation Scholarship Award
The Division on Corrections & Sentencing of the American Society of Criminology announces a dissertation scholarship award. The DCS will grant a monetary award of $1,000 to assist a doctoral student with completion of his/her dissertation. Doctoral students who have, or will have, successfully completed their dissertation prospectus defense at the time of the award are eligible to apply. The award is aimed specifically at students who are working on a sentencing or corrections topic for their dissertation and we are looking for a dissertation with the potential to make a unique and important contribution to the field. These monies can be used to assist with data collection or to offset other costs associated with the dissertation research. To be eligible, students must have completed all required course work, passed qualifying comprehensive exams, and have successfully defended the dissertation prospectus by the award date (November, 2017). Please see www.asc41.com/dcs for submission details. Applications are due on September 1, 2017 and should be submitted to dcs.dissertation@gmail.com
DOV Mission
The mission of the Division of Victimology (DOV) is to promote the professional growth and development of its members through scholarship, pedagogy, and practices associated with the field of Victimology. The DOV strives to ensure that its members will 1) contribute to the evolution of the Victimology discipline by supporting and disseminating cutting edge research, 2) develop and share pedagogical resources, 3) support professional enhancement workshops and activities, 4) embrace the development of evidence-informed programs and services, 5) advance victims’ rights, and 6) encourage the advancement of the intersection of scholarship and practices.

Why Join DOV?
The DOV promotes professional growth and development of its members by providing networking opportunities, mentorship, and sharing recent scholarship, news, opportunities, and teaching advice, through the DOV website and quarterly newsletters. We will also develop and highlight Victimology-related panels at ASC, sponsor a social gathering at ASC, and provide award opportunities to our members!

Membership Information
The DOV welcomes new members to join via the ASC membership form for $20 ($5 for students).

DOV Officers
Chair: Billy Henson
bwhenson@ship.edu

Co-Chair: Emily Wright
emwright@unomaha.edu

Treasurer: Kelly Knight
Kelly.knight3@montana.edu

Secretary: Kate Fox
Katefox@asu.edu

Executive Officers:
Wes Skogan
skogan@northwestern.edu

Leah Daigle
 ldaigle@gsu.edu

Jeanna Mastrocinque
j mastroc@ycp.edu

DOV Awards
Bonnie S. Fisher Victimology Career Award
Faculty Teacher of the Year
Faculty Researcher of the Year
Graduate Student Paper of the Year
Undergraduate Student Paper of the Year
Practitioner of the Year

Website: ASCDov.com Facebook: /ascdov/ Twitter: @ascdov
The Division of Terrorism and Bias Crimes is committed to advancing the scientific study on Terrorism and Bias Crimes, testing innovation in the field, and promoting excellence in practice through translational activities. The most effective way to achieve such a mission is through the creation of a global network of scholars, practitioners, policy makers, community leaders, and students. We hope that the Division will be such a network, and we hope your expertise and participation will add to our Division’s mission.

We invite and encourage you to become a member of the American Society of Criminology’s Division of Terrorism and Bias Crimes (DTBC). You can become a member of the Division by completing the form located at https://www.asc41.com/appform1.html and sending to asc@asc41.com.

Please join us for our annual meeting and social at this year’s American Society of Criminology Conference in Philadelphia, PA, November 16th at 2:45pm. We hope to see you in attendance and look forward to your important role in the future growth of research and education on terrorism and bias crimes.

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

The DTBC is now seeking nominations for:

Chair, Vice Chair, and one Executive Counselor who will serve a two-year term starting after the 2017 ASC meeting. We are also accepting nominations for a non-voting student member who will serve on the membership committee for one year.

Please send nomination letters and a short bio of the nominee to Sue-Ming Yang (syang10@gmu.edu) before May 31st, 2017. (*self-nomination is welcome!)

Gary LaFree (Chair), Joshua Freilich (Vice Chair), Sue-Ming Yang (Secretary-Treasurer)

Executive Counselors: Brian Forst, Laura Dugan, and Jeff Gruenewald

Learn more at http://ascterrorism.org/
Susan maintains membership records of the Society. She prepares distribution mailing lists quarterly for the Society’s two journals. She coordinates with the online submission company for the set-up of the home page for the annual meeting for the submission site each year in preparation for scheduling. She prepares the print program, coordinates with the app company for development to create the meeting app, serves as the Assistant Meeting Manager for the Annual Meeting (assisting the Executive Director as needed), and serves as the Advertising and Exhibits Coordinator for the annual meeting. She also serves on the Long Range Planning Committee.

Kelly became a member of the ASC staff in 2013. Her main responsibilities are to manage the website and *The Criminologist*. She also administers the yearly election for officers and performs various tasks related to the annual meeting preparation and execution. Kelly is a graduate of Columbus State Community College, Stetson University, and University of Phoenix. She is a part-time staff and faculty member at Ohio University’s regional campus in Chillicothe, OH. She looks forward to precious free time to spend participating in fitness activities, working in her yard, and most importantly, spending time with her son, daughter, granddaughter, and great-granddaughter.

Nicole has been working for ASC for over 11 years and has served in various roles over the years before settling in her current position. She handles all daily financial transactions for the Society. She graduated from Denison University in 2002 with a B.A. in Communications. Nicole was born and raised in the Bronx, NY before moving to Ohio after college. She is always on the lookout for good pizza and other authentic Italian goodies. Nicole and her husband Ryan live in Westerville, OH and keep busy with their 4-year-old son, Jacob, and a 13-year-old Labrador Retriever, Raven.

Joining us in August of 2016, Abby is the newest member of our team. Her duties in the office include processing membership applications and meeting registrations as well as meeting scheduling. Abby grew up in Pataskala, Ohio and is a 2004 graduate of Miami University. She spends her evenings teaching dance classes and all of her free time laughing with her husband Chris and children Otis and Fiona. Look for her at the meeting in Philly… she’ll be the one with blue hair!
If the ASC wants to have a presence in debate over crime and justice issues, supporting the Crime and Justice Research Alliance is the best -- perhaps the only -- way to do it. The CJRA brings our research into the public spotlight. CJRA informs us about the attention to crime and justice issues in Congress. Make no mistake. These are not tasks that we can accomplish without supporting an organization devoted to promoting our research in the media and keeping us informed of crime and justice policy issues at the federal level. The CJRA is our instrument to make our voices heard in national policy debate over the issues we care about. It costs money to support the research promotion and policy information the CJRA provides. We should insure that the CJRA, now our policy voice, has the resources to carry out its important mission. I urge our members to support the CJRA so that our research can have an impact on crime and justice policy.

Richard Rosenfeld
March 30, 2017

In Defense of the CJRA
by
Natasha A. Frost, ASC National Policy Committee Chair

The last policy corner focused on how central the Crime and Justice Research Alliance (CJRA) is to increasing our capacity to get criminological research findings and actual facts (as opposed to alternative facts) into the hands of politicians, the media, and broader publics. Much of that work is accomplished through Caitlin Kizielewicz and Thomas Culligan, whose work through the Crime and Justice Research Alliance simply would not be possible without the financial support of the ASC and ACJS.

Just last week, with the help of CJRA’s media consultant, Caitlin Kizielewicz, John Laub and Rick Rosenfeld were able to get their open letter to President Trump, which was signed by all living ASC presidents, published in The Washington Post.

Many of us were therefore surprised and dismayed to learn that some members of the boards of each organization have begun to question the value of what we get for our investment in CJRA. In this month’s policy corner, we provide our Washington Update, the ASC Presidents’ letter recently published in The Washington Post, and then Todd Clear and Charles Wellford join Rick Rosenfeld in urging us not to abandon crime policy, emphasizing the value of continued investments in the CJRA for criminologists, for our professional associations, and for the field.

Washington Update

The following Washington Update was prepared for the Crime and Justice Research Alliance by Thomas Culligan of the Brimley Group.

On March 16, the White House released the FY 2018 President’s Budget Request, which provided snapshot of the Trump Administration’s priorities and proposed cuts for the upcoming fiscal year. The budget document, which only provided limited information about agency funding levels and key initiatives, proposes $54 billion in cuts to non-defense discretionary spending to offset an increase of the same amount for defense.

Among these proposed cuts include a $1.1 billion decrease, or 3.8 percent, from current levels, for the Justice Department, of which $700 million in reductions would come from the elimination of the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP) and other "unnecessary spending on outdated programs that either have met their goal or have exceeded their usefulness," but does not articulate which programs fall into that category. These proposed cuts could have significant implications for justice research programs. More detailed information is anticipated in mid-May, when the full budget is scheduled to be released.

The White House has also released a list of additional cuts it would like made to many of these same programs in FY 2017, should the Congress pass a full year funding bill or as part of a continuing resolution once the current funding expires on April 28. These proposed cuts include a $310 million reduction through the elimination of the SCAAP program and cuts to the Byrne JAG program.

Additionally, the Department of Justice is moving forward with plans to enforce an appropriations restriction prohibiting funding to so-called “sanctuary jurisdictions,” which are state and local jurisdictions that do not comply with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) detainer requests for individuals charged or convicted of a crime. On March 27, Attorney General Sessions spoke at a White House press conference to announce the department’s intention to deny funds to these jurisdictions, and to take back funds from any jurisdiction that is not in compliance after receipt of grants.
On Capitol Hill, Congress is attempting to move forward with the FY 2018 Appropriations process, despite having limited information from the budget request and many vacancies in key administration posts that constrain opportunities for budget and oversight hearings. It is anticipated that the appropriations hearings and process will continue to move forward in April and May, with the goal of bringing bills to the House and Senate floors in the summer months.

In late March, the Senate Judiciary Committee held hearings with Supreme Court nominee Judge Neil Gorsuch, and Senate deliberations on his confirmation will continue during April. The House Judiciary Committee has advanced several bills including the Adam Walsh Reauthorization Act, the Child Protection Improvements Act and the Targeting Child Predators Act, which are expected to go to the House floor this spring.

Keep Science in the Department of Justice

From the DNA revolution to hot spots policing, scientific discovery and evaluation have become essential tools in the nation’s quest to control crime and advance justice. The research and statistics agencies of the Department of Justice have led the way in promoting evidence-based criminal justice policy and practice.

We are former presidents of the American Society of Criminology, the largest organization of criminologists in the world. We write as criminologists deeply committed to public service and promoting evidence-based crime policies, and not as representatives of any professional association. We call on President Trump and Attorney General Sessions to appoint bona fide research scientists with knowledge of crime and justice to direct the National Institute of Justice and Bureau of Justice Statistics, the research and statistics arms of the DOJ.

To sustain and strengthen the role of science at DOJ, we urge the President and Attorney General to select leaders of the research and statistics missions who are committed to the following operating principles:

1. Maintain rigorous standards for scientific integrity, objectivity, and transparency. Good science is honest, open, repeatable, free of ideological bias, and conducted without political interference.

2. Promote criminal justice policies, programs, and practices that are evidence based. An indispensable lesson learned from evidence-based medicine was that intuition is often wrong. An important resource for evidence-based criminal justice is CrimeSolutions.gov, a clearinghouse in the DOJ’s Office of Justice Programs that informs policymakers and practitioners about what works, what is promising, and what does not work to reduce crime, based on carefully evaluated research.

3. Promote innovative crime policies. Fresh thinking on long standing issues regarding crime and justice should be encouraged. At the same time it is vitally important to incorporate a research component in every new policy or program so that we can learn while we are doing. New ideas without rigorous assessment will not help to solve the crime and justice problems we face.

4. Improve existing crime and justice data tools and develop new ones. Devising and implementing fair and effective crime policies require reliable information systems. Amidst controversy over police use of force and the causes of the recent crime increases, it is an urgent task is to appraise the accuracy and timeliness of existing federal crime data series.

The President has issued an executive order directing the Attorney General to establish a Task Force on Crime Reduction and Public Safety that would, among other responsibilities, “evaluate the availability and adequacy of crime-related data and identify measures that could improve data collection in a manner that will aid in the understanding of crime trends and in the reduction of crime.” We strongly recommend the appointment to the task force of social scientists and practitioners with extensive knowledge of criminal justice data and experience applying it to real-world crime problems.

5. Use existing resources in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort. For example, the 21st Century Task Force on Policing examined in some depth the topic of police officer safety, an issue of deep concern to both the President and Attorney General. A good starting point for assessing the crime rise in Chicago and elsewhere is the recently completed National Academy of Sciences’ Roundtable on Crime Trends. The National Academy of Sciences’ panel on Modernizing Crime Statistics is an essential resource for the Attorney General’s new crime and public safety taskforce. So is the Crime Solutions clearinghouse, which identifies programs that are effective in preventing violence.
We recognize that reducing crime and securing justice are primarily the responsibility of state and local governments in the United States. But the federal government has an important role to play in the promotion of scientific best practices across all levels of government. The nation will be best served by a Department of Justice that prizes scientific integrity, free and open inquiry, and evidence-based policies and practices. Nowhere will these qualities be more important than in the agencies responsible for crime and justice research, evaluation, data, and statistics.
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Don’t Abandon Crime Policy

by

Todd R. Clear and Charles Wellford

March 30, 2017

Has it ever been more important to have an active voice for evidence in the US crime and justice policy scene?

Each of us have been in Criminology for over forty years. We well remember the fact-free days of justice policy. It gave us the war on drugs, mandatory minimum sentences, three-strikes laws (and even two-strikes laws, too), felon disfranchisement, and a host of counterproductive collateral consequences--among other now recognized problems. To be free of facts is to live in the world of feel-good policy where nothing needs to comport with anything we actually know. In recent years we have seen a growing recognition of the role science can play in improving justice and reducing crime.

As former Presidents of ASC, we were instrumental in the Society’s efforts to support higher quality criminological research and seek ways to have that research influence crime and justice policy, including the establishment of vital partnerships with the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. We were therefore alarmed to learn that some members of the ASC leadership are questioning the value of continuing financial support of the Crime and Justice Research Alliance.1

We could not disagree more with this stance, and we are not alone. This month, 25 former presidents of ASC co-signed a detailed statement that calls upon the DOJ to, among other things, prize “…evidence-based policies and practices.”2

The CJRA has been co-founded by the two largest scholarly associations devoted to crime and justice studies as an institutional vehicle to do just that—and has been growing in expertise and impact since it began the work. In fact, the CJRA is the latest iteration in a growing commitment the ASC Board has made to be a voice for evidence in crime policy, going back more than a decade.

1 For CJRA, see: (http://crimeandjusticeresearchalliance.org). CJRA is the only national effort sponsored by academic organizations (ACJS and ASC) seeking to increase research on crime and justice and educate state, local and national leaders about research and scientific evidence on crime and justice policy.

This is not just about federal crime policy, either. As important as federal leadership can be, much of the work of the CJRA involves disseminating scholarly research via state and local media outlets throughout the country, earning 285 media placements since its inception. It is at the state level, after all, where most of today’s thoughtful (and evidence-led) justice innovation is taking place.

But you can’t disseminate research if you don’t have the funding to conduct it. That’s why another critical role of the CJRA is outreach on Capitol Hill to educate lawmakers on the importance of our research and continued funding in support of it. CJRA’s lobbying for funding increases for BJS and NIJ led to the House providing an $11 million increase for these agencies in its FY 2017 Appropriations bill - the first significant funding increase in years.

With federal funding now on the chopping block, it is more critical than ever to have representation on the Hill. CJRA has laid the groundwork for that work by establishing a dedicated website and distributing a monthly e-newsletter that is disseminated to over 1,200 subscribers including a curated list of congressional staff working on issues of crime and justice.

Despite these accomplishments, there are countless ways that the ASC could be more effective as a voice for evidence and the CJRA could be more impactful in its work. It goes without saying that whatever improvements are needed, they will not be accomplished by abandoning our current efforts. It is crucial to the mission of our scholarly society to improve the evidentiary foundation for practice, and we should ever strive for refining how we take on this part of our mission.

This is not a time to walk away. This is a time to double-down. We implore the ASC not to abandon the academy’s responsibility to inform public policy makers about evidence on crime policy. Doing this work costs not much more per member than a Starbucks and a bagel at this year’s meeting.

In the end, we will consume the policies that our political institutions produce. So—pay now or pay later.

---

**RECENT PHD GRADUATES**


Milburn, Travis W., “Bakken Bombs: A Criminological Inquiry into the Lynchburg Train Derailment.” Chaired by Dr. Mona J.E. Danner, August 2016, Old Dominion University.


Silva, Maya, “Examination of the Personal Narratives of Desisters and Non-Offenders: Do They Really Differ?” Chaired by Dr. Wayne Welsh, July 2016, Temple University.

Smith, Kyshawn, “Making the Case for Place.” Chaired by Dr. Ruth A. Triplett, August 2016, Old Dominion University.

Turner, Justin, “Killing the State: The Cultural Afterlife of Edward Byrne.” Chaired by Dr. Randy Myers, August 2016, Old Dominion University.

Upton, Lindsey L., “Care, Control, or Criminalization? Discourses on Homelessness and its Responses.” Chaired by Dr. Ruth A. Triplett, August 2016, Old Dominion University.

Waggoner, Kimberlee, “What Can State Talk Tell Us About Punitiveness? A Comparison of Responses to Political Mass Shootings in the United States and Norway.” Chaired by Dr. Randy Myers, August 2016, Old Dominion University.
THIS GRADUATE DEGREE equips current and future criminal justice practitioners, leaders, researchers, and educators with the academic and applied expertise to confront the increasing complexities of issues related to crime, security, technology, and social justice.

Choose from two concentrations currently in high demand in the criminal justice profession:

- Justice Advocacy
- Intelligence and Technology

THE MASTER OF SCIENCE IN CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE OFFERS:

- Accelerated one-year or part-time formats
- Online and evening classes
- Internship and networking opportunities
- Competitive tuition
- Scholarships and financial aid
- Optional test scores

PROGRAM LEADERSHIP

Tom Nolan, Ed.D.
Program Director,
Criminology and Criminal Justice,
Merrimack College

A former senior policy analyst in the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties at the Department of Homeland Security in Washington, DC, as well as a 27-year veteran (and former lieutenant) of the Boston Police Department, Tom Nolan is consulted regularly by local, national, and international media outlets for his expertise in policing and civil rights and civil liberties issues, police practices and procedures, the police subculture, and crime trends and criminal behavior. Nolan’s scholarly publications are in the areas of gender roles in policing, the police subculture, and the influence of the popular culture on criminal justice processes. Tom writes regularly for the American Constitution Society in Washington, DC as well as The Daily Beast.
Graduate students are primarily instructed on how to write for the purpose of a course requirement, Master's thesis, or Doctoral degree qualification; however, they are less likely to receive comprehensive instruction on writing for peer-reviewed journal publication. This is a critical paradox because graduate students' job market potential (particularly in academia) is largely determined by their number of first author publications in top research journals. To address this paradox, the Rutgers Implicit Social Cognition (RISC) Lab, which is comprised of two faculty (Principal Investigator (PI) Luis Rivera, an experimental social psychologist, and co-PI Bonita Veysey, a criminologist) and us, their three graduate students, have developed a summer writing group to hone graduate students' skills at writing publishable research manuscripts. Generally speaking, this writing group provides an opportunity for graduate students and faculty to receive feedback on manuscripts in progress, most of which represent a collaboration between two or more writing group members. Given the success of our summer writing group for increasing high quality manuscript submissions, the lab has collectively agreed to continue the writing group throughout the Fall and Spring terms. In this column, we discuss the structure, benefits, and results of the RISC Lab's summer writing group, and provide recommendations for continuing the writing group throughout the fall and spring semesters.

**Basic Structure of the RISC Lab's Summer Writing Group**

Each lab member (graduate students and faculty alike) is tasked with working on one manuscript throughout the semester. The writing group meets for 90 minutes each week to discuss group members’ papers. New versions of each paper are shared with the group on a bi-weekly rotating basis in order to dedicate adequate time to each paper. This serves the dual purpose of ensuring that all papers receive adequate time for discussion and allowing adequate time for lab members to incorporate writing group feedback prior to their next submission. Lab members may submit completed sections of a manuscript (e.g., Methods & Results) or full drafts. We initially asked everyone to submit their papers five days before our meeting; because the norm became two to three days prior, we changed the deadline for paper submissions to three days before our meeting. Once submitted, all writing group members are required to critically review and provide feedback (using “Track Changes” and “New Comment” features in Microsoft Word) on each newly submitted paper prior to the start of that week's meeting.

During our meetings, we first select the order in which we will review the two to three new papers submitted that week. We then begin discussions on the first paper by addressing “big picture” comments, including anything regarding overall structure and flow of the paper or its theoretical basis. Next, we discuss more detailed comments (e.g., wording issues). As the lab provides feedback to the lead author, each author writes down comments on their own (clean) drafts of their papers and asks any clarifying questions to the reviewer. When all comments are complete (or time is up, in the case of the final paper) the author of the paper lists major and minor revisions that will be incorporated into the next draft. This includes editing the paper based on comments received from the writing group, as well as introducing a new section of the manuscript, if applicable. Line edits are generally reserved for the lab members’ “final” manuscript submission to the group. Although, recently we modified our structure and encourage doing line edits for each submission in order to push a paper out faster when it is in its final stages.

The structure of the writing group allows ample time for us to edit and update our manuscripts, being that we have two (summer) to three (fall/spring) weeks between submissions.

**Benefits of the Writing Group**

Mentoring is a critical component of graduate student success that can improve students' productivity and self-efficacy (Paglis, Green, & Bauer, 2006; Weidman & Stein, 2003). Critically, mentoring can involve both instrumental and psychosocial support from academic advisors and other graduate students (Maher, Ford, & Thompson, 2004; Tenenbaum, Crosby, & Gliner, 2001). We argue that our writing group provides an ideal context for mentoring graduate students, not only in terms of writing ability and publication potential, but also in terms of promoting critical thinking about complex research issues. The below list captures the main benefits of our summer writing group:
As noted by Roche (2016) in a previous issue of *The Criminologist*, working on our own time, while still being held accountable has benefits: Being able to set our own schedules (within boundaries) and work during times that we are most productive can be both a blessing and a curse. While our writing group does not require that we all sit down as a group and write at the same time, it does require that we submit our manuscripts by a certain deadline in order to gain feedback, which in turn increases accountability.

Learning to write for journal publication: Prior to submitting drafts of a paper, writing group members are required to inform the lab as to which journal they will be submitting. This is important because different journals have distinct standards and writing styles. This taught us the key lesson that before we write a manuscript, we need to know for which audience we are writing. This is critical for not only paper logistics (e.g., structure, images), but also for paper content (e.g., level of detail). Feedback also allows us to develop a lexicon specific to research manuscripts.

Sharpen writing skills: In the words of our advisor, Dr. Rivera, we have learned how to “massage sentences” so that they are as concise as possible. In many of the papers we write for courses, and for our dissertations, we are instructed to write comprehensively (read: long-winded) about a subject. This adds to the length of our papers. However, when writing for manuscripts we have to limit our words all while ensuring that our argument is strong and sufficiently supported. In addition, the structure of writing group requires that people continuously write in order to ensure that they will be able to submit a paper every other week.

Practice in providing and receiving feedback: Not only do we receive feedback from our doctoral student peers, we receive direct feedback from our advisors who have experience submitting and reviewing research manuscripts in two related but distinct fields (criminology and psychology). Comments on our own papers aid us in our writing as does listening to comments on others’ papers. In the beginning of our writing group, we doctoral students were not comfortable providing feedback to others and as a result some meetings were carried heavily by our advisors. However, as time has passed and our writing group has become a staple in our academic lives, we have now learned how to provide feedback to our peers and faculty advisors and have overcome our initial shyness. Listening to others’ feedback has allowed us to think more critically about our own and other people’s research. Becoming comfortable with receiving critical feedback is also essential for developing the “thick skin” that is necessary for a career in academia. This practice in providing constructive feedback will aid us as reviewers for journals in the future.

Attention to theory: Many times as doctoral students we get so caught up in methods and results that we forget about the importance of the front-end of our papers, and grounding our research in theory. Also, because our lab is comprised of members of different academic backgrounds, reading other people’s work has increased our exposure to other literatures and theoretical perspectives.

Manuscript completion: The goal of our writing group is to have each member submit one manuscript for publication per semester.

Results of the RISC Lab’s Summer Writing Group
Arguably the greatest benefit of our writing group is manuscript submission. Each semester, we have a goal of publishing one article per writing group member. Since the summer of 2016, our group has submitted a total of four manuscripts for publication. Of these, two received a “Revise and Resubmit” notification and two remain under review. Additionally, the group is finalizing two manuscripts to be submitted within the next two months.

Recommendations for Continuing the Writing Group
The summer represents, for most of us, a (slightly) less stressful and busy time. It was expected that our productivity levels in writing group would therefore be greater during this time. Given the success of our writing group, we decided to continue this practice in the more hectic fall semester, albeit with some modifications. During the busier fall semester, we have adopted a tri-weekly rotating submission schedule. Every third week, lab members take turns leading discussion on a published peer-reviewed research report on a topic related to their research. This is important for writing group sustainability because during the fall and spring semesters, doctoral students and advisors have added responsibilities, including coursework and teaching duties.

Finding the perfect format for our writing group required that we monitor and adjust our progress, however, it has proven to be beneficial for both students and faculty members alike.
DOCTORAL STUDENT FORUM
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OBITUARY

RAY PATERNOSTER

On March 5, 2017, the world lost one of the greatest fathers, husbands, sons, siblings, teachers, and scholars on the planet. Raymond Paternoster, who was born on February 29, 1952, was taken much too early from so many people who loved him. He died in the arms of his wife, Ronet Bachman, and son, John, after a nearly 3-month herculean battle against idiopathic pancreatitis.

Ray earned his BA at the University of Delaware in 1972 and a Ph.D. in criminology at Florida State University in 1978. He was a Distinguished Professor in the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of Maryland, College Park, where he served for nearly 35 years.

Ray wrote several books and over 200 articles and chapters during his career. He was an internationally-renowned scholar in the area of deterrence/rational choice theory and offender decision-making, and at the forefront of more rigorous empirical testing of theory in general. Beyond these academic achievements, he worked tirelessly to ensure that his scholarship was translated to policy.

Importantly, Ray was just as devoted to teaching as he was to scholarship. He mentored dozens of Ph.D. students and junior colleagues, and delighted in teaching undergraduate courses in statistics. He was a one-of-a-kind professor, but never took himself too seriously. When named a Distinguished Professor he added the moniker, “Emperor of Wyoming,” to his signature in playful protest. He will always remain the only Emperor of Wyoming.

Ray lived each second of his life to the fullest. He loved the Yankees, standup paddle boarding, traveling, backpacking, skiing and walking our dog, Mickey, in the woods. He recently learned to love RVing, despite his original perception that it was “camping for wimps.” His newest interest was in cooking, and he insisted that his family call him “Chef” when he was in the kitchen.

Above all, Ray believed the most important job in his life was being a father. He was not only Ronet’s husband and John’s father, he was their best friend. During the last day of Ray’s life, John told him that having the greatest dad in the world for 19 years was better than having a mediocre dad for 50 years.

There will be celebration of Ray’s life in the summer of 2017. In lieu of flowers, donations in Ray’s honor can be made to the Delaware Food Bank, the National Center for Law and Economic Justice, or the American Civil Liberties Foundation

Written by Ronet Bachman
The Ph.D. in Criminology and Criminal Justice at Old Dominion University is centered on policy and inequality, criminological theory, and research methods and statistics. The department features a diverse faculty with expertise in:

- Inequality (race, class and gender)
- Juvenile Justice
- Policing
- Social Justice
- Violence Against Women
- Criminological Theory
- Research Methods and Statistics

**Ph.D. in Criminology and Criminal Justice**

- Competitive assistantships
- Ph.D. students publish with faculty in peer-reviewed journals
- Ph.D. students gain valuable teaching experience
- Past students have received awards from national organizations
- Recent Ph.D. graduates have accepted tenure-track positions at James Madison University, Eastern Kentucky University, Marymount University and Arcadia University (among others)

**For more information, contact:** Dr. Scott R. Maggard, Ph.D. Graduate Program Director, smaggard@odu.edu; (757) 683-5528

The department also offers an M.A. in Applied Sociology, with the option to select a sociology, criminal justice, or women’s studies track. For more information, contact: Dr. Ingrid Whittaker, M.A. Graduate Program Director, iwhitake@odu.edu; (757) 683-3811
Providing audio feedback is a simple, but powerful gesture that humanizes and personalizes feedback for students in the online classroom. The benefits to providing audio feedback to students can include saving time on grading student work, as instructors can record their comments versus writing or typing their comments. Audio feedback can offer additional support for students, as students may begin to feel more confident with their writing when instructors use audio comments versus only written comments (Cavanaugh & Song, 2014).

For instance, through the use of audio feedback a recent study found that: “students were able to detect nuance more effectively, understand content more thoroughly, and engage with the instructor at a more personal level through audio feedback than through written feedback” (Cavanaugh & Song, 2014, p. 123). An increased sense of availability and approachability can result as audio feedback humanizes the instructor, by increasing students’ perceptions that their instructors care about them and their involvement and success within the class (Ice, Curtis, Philips, & Wells, 2007). Audio feedback can assist instructors in building a rapport and strengthening relationships with students, as using audio feedback can increase a sense of community within the online classroom and may lessen the isolation that online students sometimes report in course-related surveys (Ice et al., 2007; Kelly, 2014; Thompson & Lee, 2012).

There are a few things to consider regarding the use of audio tools to provide feedback to students. First, an instructor can be either a beginner or an expert in implementing technology into the online classroom. What matters most however, is that an instructor is comfortable enough with an audio tool to be able to teach students how to use the tool and to communicate the benefits and purpose of using an audio tool. In deciding what works best for you and for your students, remember one size does not fit all. It is best to find a tool that reflects your teaching style and what you believe will benefit your students most based on the context of your classroom.

Second, practice makes (near) perfect. Consider using one audio tool at a time and practice with this tool repeatedly. Avoid overwhelming yourself by incorporating several tools at once, as students will look to the instructor as the ‘technical support’ when it comes to the use and implementation of the selected tool. By focusing on one tool at a time, this can lessen the intimidation that sometimes accompanies implementing a new technology for both students and instructors.

Third, explore and have some fun with the tool of your choice, as there is no right or wrong way to implement technology into your classroom. Familiarize yourself in using the tool, in conjunction with learning the tool’s strengths and weaknesses. Be aware of any existing support services, helpful tips or videos that may be offered through the tool’s website. Once you have fully acclimated yourself to using the new tool, then introduce the tool to students.

Fourth, consider using free and user-friendly tools to provide audio feedback to students. There are many tools available online, which provide audio capabilities and can be embedded using an embed code into an online classroom. A smartphone has audio capabilities within it and there are many free applications that can be used depending on the type of phone an instructor has. Consider using the Voice Memos application or video feature on an iPhone, or the camera feature on an Android device. Once an audio file is created, the file can be emailed, or a voice application can be used such as Voice Recorder Pro, or another similar application that allows users to save an audio file and retrieve the file easily.

Another tool offering audio capabilities is Voki (www.voki.com). “Known as an animated podcasting site, Voki is vastly underrated as a feedback tool. Creating avatars and giving them a voice does take time, but students love the interactivity of Voki” (Barnes, 2014). Once a user name and password are created, users can then customize Voki characters with different backgrounds, clothes, hats, jewelry, hair color, eye color, skin color, and make-up. Voki users have the option to type a message selecting different voices, or users can record their own voice using a microphone, or audio files can be uploaded from the user’s computer or handheld device. Voki audio files can be used to introduce a new unit or topic each week, and the link can be sent to students through email, or embedded into an online classroom using an embed code. Here is an example from the author’s classroom on providing a farewell message to students at the end of a term: http://www.voki.com/site/pickup?scid=8042750&height=267&width=200&chsm=d90857de9ade8be5e406d53f75a3b0ed
Fotobabble (www.fotobabble.com) is a simple and free tool using images and audio, in which users can create an audio message in literally just a few seconds. Upload images, record an audio message, and share with students from a mobile device or from a computer. Fotobabble can be used to create audio messages for introductions, classroom reminders, study tips, or to highlight or recognize achievements throughout a term or semester. Here is an example of the author providing audio feedback to a student using Fotobabble: http://www.fotobabble.com/m/K2pjSWVCSk4wRTA9

Jing (https://www.techsmith.com/jing.html) is a free screencasting tool that allows users to create five minute tutorials, capture videos, animations, or images, and allows these screencasts to be shared publicly or privately within the user’s Screencast.com library. There are several benefits to screencasting including enhanced learning outcomes and “[asynchronous] access to learning materials—both to make up for missed classes as well as to review materials covered in class” (Thompson & Lee, 2012). Jing audio files can be shared as a link during a synchronous class, embedded into classroom announcements, or shared as a link in an online discussion thread. Jing audio files can also be emailed to students, or the link can be housed within a classroom shared folder, class blog or class website for later retrieval or viewing. Jing audio files can be used to complete a demonstration, discuss a student’s essay, review the grading rubrics for a course, review an exam, discuss project requirements, or to assist students in understanding a difficult concept (Ice et al., 2007). Here is an example of the author using Jing: https://www.screencast.com/t/jwEXNccTb0X

Kaizena (https://kaizena.com) is an audio commenting tool, which can be added within Google Drive, within Google Docs. Using Kaizena, instructors can highlight text, create audio comments, written comments, and can share resources that are housed within an online library connected to the user’s Kaizena account. “The resources library allows teachers to provide narrative feedback, followed by a link to [a] teaching model. This is a fantastic time saving feature” (Barnes, 2014). Kaizena can be used to provide audio feedback for a midterm essay or final project, providing in-depth and detailed feedback directly within the student’s assignment, rather than having to type the feedback. Kaizena provides interactive feedback, as both instructors and students can provide feedback for one another directly within the shared Kaizena file. Here is a helpful video to get started with Kaizena: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AJvSyYgetGw&feature=youtu.be

Once you have selected the audio tool that best fits your needs and the needs of your students, you can create personalized audio feedback that goes beyond just typing feedback to students. Audio feedback can provide opportunities for increased connections between instructors and students and assist in building a sense of community within the online classroom.
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WESTERN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY

2018 Annual Conference
Long Beach, California

February 1st – 3rd, 2018

Hilton Long Beach
701 West Ocean Blvd.
Long Beach, CA  90831-3102
(562) 983-3400

❖ Please note that the deadline to submit abstracts is October 6, 2017. The abstract submission site will open for submission in mid-August. Please check the WSC website at westerncriminology.org for updates❖

TENTATIVE PANEL TOPICS

- COURTS AND JUDICIAL PROCESSES
  (INCLUDING SENTENCING)
- CORRECTIONS
- CRIME ANALYSIS
  (INCLUDING GEOGRAPHY & CRIME AND SOCIAL NETWORKS & CRIME)
- CRIMINOLOGICAL THEORY
- CYBERCRIME
- DRUGS/SUBSTANCE ABUSE & CRIME
- FORENSIC SCIENCE
- GENDER, SEXUALITY, & CRIME
- JUVENILE JUSTICE
- LEGAL ISSUES IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE
  (CRIMINAL LAW, CRIMINAL PROCEDURE, & EVIDENCE)
- ORGANIZED CRIME & GANGS
- PEACEMAKING CRIMINOLOGY
- POLICING
- SEX CRIMES
- TEACHING
  (PEDAGOGY & ASSESSMENT IN JUSTICE EDUCATION)
- TERRORISM
- WHITE COLLAR CRIME

All proposals must be electronically submitted through the WSC’s online Abstract Submission System:

In deciding the most appropriate topic area for your abstract, think about the main focus of your paper and how it might fit within a panel organized around a larger topical theme. For example, if your paper examines both race and juvenile issues, think about whether you would like to be placed on a panel with other papers discussing race issues or other papers dealing with juvenile issues and then submit it to the topic area in which you think it fits best.

All presenters are asked to submit an abstract of 1,100 characters or fewer to only one of the panel topics listed above. In addition to the abstract, please include the name, mailing address, email address, and phone number for all authors on the submission for the participant directory. Note that all presenters must pre-register for the conference, which will also open summer 2017.
CRIMINOLOGY AROUND THE WORLD

If you have news, views, reviews, or announcements relating to international or comparative criminology, including new books or conference announcements, please send it here! We appreciate brevity (always under 1,000 words), and welcome your input and feedback. – Vesna Markovic at vmarkovic@newhaven.edu

International Centre for Counter-Terrorism (ICCT), The Hague Policy Brief - “Rehabilitating Juvenile Violent Extremist Offenders in Detention: Advancing a Juvenile Justice Approach”

The ICCT, Global Center on Cooperative Security wrote a policy brief focused on juvenile violent extremist offenders (JVEOs) in detention. Even though terrorism is a major issue impacting the global community, and those charged with violent extremism are in a special offender category, juvenile offenders should be treated according to international juvenile justice standards. The severity of crimes committed by JVEO’s also vary. The juveniles perpetrating these crimes may be viewed as victimizers, but also as victims themselves.

This policy brief focuses on JVEOs who are either in a juvenile correction facility or in prison. It emphasizes effective treatment and rehabilitation. The brief discusses risk management and intervention planning, the role of operational management on rehabilitation, designing and delivering interventions for rehabilitation and reintegration, as well as, transitioning the JVEOs out of juvenile facilities and prisons and into the community. Due to the nature of the crimes committed, authorities may tend to treat JVEOs harshly instead of focusing on reforming them. The brief is intended to provide strategies for managing JVEOs that is specifically tailored to that offender population.

The report is available on the ICCT website:


The Freedom House Organization report on freedom in the world was published in 2017 and focuses on developments around the world in 2016. The report examines the state of freedom in 195 countries worldwide, as well as, 14 territories for the 2016 calendar year. Each country and territory is ranked on a scale of 0 to 4 on twenty-five separate indicators. These indicators are added up to give the country an index score, with the maximum possible score of 100. They also rank the countries based on their freedom status, freedom of the press status, and freedom on the net. These ranking are either free, partly free, or not free.

The report found that in 2016, nearly 70 countries had a decline in areas of civil liberties and political rights, while only 36 countries showed gains in those areas. They also cited that while in the past, these declines were registered in countries that had dictatorships and/or autocracies, in 2016 there were numerous democracies that also experienced these declines. In 2016, Finland had the highest aggregate score, while the territory of Tibet had the lowest score (1 out of a possible 100). Issues in 2016 also discussed in the report include the Syrian conflict and its impact on democracies, as well as terrorism and the disorder fueled by that. The report also listed 10 countries to watch for 2017 because of various internal issues that may represent a turning point in the trajectory of those countries.

The report is available on the Freedom House Organization website at:

New International Books of Interest


---

**CRIMINOLOGY MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES**

British Society of Criminology Annual Conference 2017
July 4-7, 2017
Sheffield Hallam University in the UK   http://www.britsoccrim.org/conference/

Crime and Justice in Asia and the Global South: An International Conference
Co-hosted by the Crime and Justice Research Centre (QUT) and the Asian Criminological Society
July 10-13, 2017

Twelfth International Conference on Interdisciplinary Social Sciences
July 26-28, 2017
Hiroshima, Japan   http://thesocialsciences.com/2017-conference

The 20th International Gang Specialist Training Conference
Hosted by The National Gang Crime Research Center
August 7-9, 2017
Chicago, IL   http://www-ngcrc.com/register.html

Redesigning Justice: Promoting Civil Rights, Trust and Fairness
March 21-22, 2018
MARK YOUR CALENDAR

FUTURE ASC ANNUAL MEETING DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>November 14 -- 17</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>Atlanta Marriott Marquis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>November 20 -- 23</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>San Francisco Marriott Marquis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>November 17 -- 20</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>Palmer House Hilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>November 16 -- 19</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>Atlanta Marriott Marquis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>November 15 -- 18</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>Philadelphia Marriott Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>November 20 -- 23</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>San Francisco Marriott Marquis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>November 18 - 21</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>Palmer House Hilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>November 17 -- 20</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>Dallas Anatole Hilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>November 15 -- 18</td>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>New Orleans Riverside Hilton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2017 ANNUAL MEETING

THEME: Crime, Legitimacy and Reform: Fifty Years after the President’s Commission

Make your reservations early for Philadelphia, PA
November 15 - 18, 2017

Philadelphia Marriott Downtown
1201 Market St., Philadelphia, PA 19107
Phone Reservations: 1-800-228-9290
Online Reservations: https://aws.passkey.com/go/AmerSocCrime

$200 single & double occupancy

YOU MUST MENTION YOU ARE WITH ASC TO OBTAIN THIS RATE