

EDITORIAL

October 2005
Volume 1, Issue 2

IN THIS ISSUE

- 1** Editorial
- 2** Feature Article:
"Randomised Trials in Restorative Justice in the United Kingdom" by Heather Strang and Lawrence W. Sherman
- 4** About the Academy
- 5** Membership Application; AEC Annual Meeting
- 6** The Stockholm Prize in Criminology; Awards to Members
- 7** New Research Projects
- 9** Upcoming Conferences; Past Conferences
- 10** New Publications
- 11** Journal of Experimental Criminology

Welcome to Volume 1, Issue 2 of the Newsletter of the Academy of Experimental Criminology!

There has been a lot of action in our Academy since I issued our first newsletter in April. The AEC was well represented at the 14th World Congress in Philadelphia in August (story and photos on page 9); the Stockholm Prize in Criminology has shaped much discussion within criminology circles in recent months (see page 6), the Journal of Experimental Criminology is receiving many really great manuscripts (see page 11); and many of our members are about to leave for Toronto for the Annual American Society of Criminology conference. I draw your attention to our AEC session to be held on Friday of the conference at 12.30pm (see details on page 5). Our new fellows and Honorary Fellows (see the list on page 4) will be inducted into the Academy and David Farrington will deliver his Joan McCord address. Have a great time at the conference and particularly at the AEC event on Friday. I wish I could be there; but alas, my two small boys keep me homebound a lot of the time!!! Please take plenty of photos for inclusion in our next newsletter.

Our feature article (see pages 2,3) in this issue of the AEC newsletter is by Heather Strang and Larry Sherman who kindly share some of their caseload nightmares with us all. We can all relate to the problems they experienced and the creative solutions that either landed in their lap or they sought out to resolve their caseload problems. Thanks to Heather and Larry for writing this piece. I will harass someone else in the next few months to start thinking of a Feature Article for our next newsletter issue!!!

The success of the Journal of Experimental Criminology is really a highlight for our Academy. We are now nearing the end of Year One, and I think everyone will join with me in congratulating David Weisburd for his outstanding efforts in creating a really great journal. It is hard to judge the impact of a new journal on the International arena, but the scope and quality of the articles seem to be capturing the attention of very wide range of scholars. The JEC will certainly be a "go to" journal in the future! So...if you haven't already signed up for membership in our Academy, do so now (see page 5) and you will start receiving the JEC!

One more accomplishment that I want to highlight is David Farrington's Beccaria Medal of the New German Society of Criminology (see page 6). Congratulations to you from all of us. It is amazing to see so many of our AEC members receiving international recognition for years of hard slogging at the coalface of running RCTs. It just takes a while for the hard work to be recognized!

In closing, I want to take this opportunity to thank Jeanette Brandis of the Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice and Governance here at Griffith University who helped me to put together this newsletter. Enjoy the newsletter. Please **email a copy of the newsletter** to your friends, colleagues and any listserves that you might be on. Encourage people to join the Academy! And most importantly, make sure you attend the AEC session on Friday at 12.30pm at the American Society of Criminology conference in Toronto this month.

Lorraine Mazerolle
Vice President & Newsletter Editor,
Academy of Experimental
Criminology

Randomised Trials in Restorative Justice in the United Kingdom

Heather Strang and Lawrence W. Sherman

In late 2000, the British Home Office issued an invitation to tender for a program development and evaluation project in restorative justice (RJ). As one of many crime prevention initiatives in the first Blair Government, there was nothing remarkable about the subject matter or the funding of an evaluation. Not even the total budget of 3 million pounds was remarkable. What was remarkable was that for the first time in a generation, a Home Office tender not only allowed for a randomised controlled trial design but gave it preference.

While ultimately three development grants and one evaluation grant were made under the tender, the largest portion of the work went to a consortium of the Australian National University and the University of Pennsylvania (now operating as the “Jerry Lee Program of Randomized Controlled Trials in Restorative Justice”). That grant was not for “evaluation,” but rather for “development.” After five years of Australian experience in evaluating the RJ program in the RISE project, our research team anticipated that objective evaluation would not be useful after the fact unless the program itself was mounted as an RCT. Our bid, therefore, was on the basis of a research and operational partnership with a variety of criminal justice agencies taking on the challenge of actually *developing* the RJ programs to be tested, and operating them as RCTs. We bid on behalf of three United Kingdom police constabularies, a probation authority, a mediation service and a prison, each of which would provide staff for the project over the following four years and work hand in glove with us.

On the basis of the numbers of apparently eligible cases in publicly available records, as well as the operational experience of our partners, we proposed a series of experiments which would test the effects of RJ for a wide range of offences and offenders in various settings and at various points in the justice system. Our intention initially was to concentrate on adult offenders who had committed middle range offences dealt with in the Magistrates’ (lower) courts in two contrasting sites – London with its multi-ethnic mix and Northumbria with its homogeneous white population. We were also able to set up experiments to examine the effects of RJ in post-conviction settings with violent offenders sentenced both to probation orders and to terms of imprisonment in the Thames Valley area. In all of these experiments the treatment group

participated in RJ *in addition to* conventional justice and all participating offenders needed to have accepted responsibility for the crime. (This was in sharp contrast to RISE, in which RJ was tested as a diversion from prosecution).

The challenges of caseload haunt experimental criminology, as everyone well knows if they have ever attempted to set up a trial. During an intensive ‘Phase 1’ period we sought out the best possible published data on the likely number of eligible cases, concentrating on locations in each site with the highest crime rates. We put a vast effort into identifying the systems and individuals that could ‘deliver’ the cases to the experiment. Our small team made contact with literally hundreds of people at every point in the justice system across our three sites. We learned a great deal about the realities of criminal justice processing in this period. We also learned how misleading published data can be when it is not designed to answer the question that needed answering: how many cases were there that related to offenders in the age range we specified who had committed the kinds of offences we specified, being processed in the sites we specified at the point in the justice system we specified?

Caseload problems of one kind or another surfaced in each of our experiments. London Magistrates’ Courts proved so problematic for intercepting cases after conviction but before sentencing that we decided to abandon them in favour Crown Courts. It was our good fortune to be invited by some intrepid London Crown Court judges to come and experiment in their courts, where most of the offenders pleading guilty were in custody and more accessible than the less serious offenders in Magistrates’ Courts who were at liberty on bail while awaiting sentencing.

We were delighted by the challenge of Crown Court cases. They provided an unexpected opportunity to test RJ with offenders pleading guilty to very serious burglary and robbery offences. The fact that most of these RJ conferences had to be held inside the prisons where the offenders were remanded introduced yet another layer of complexity. A whole new set of relations with the London prisons had to be negotiated before this was possible. With the help of our judges, many of whom regarded us with a wry scepticism but who were intrigued by the charm and persistence of our

staff, two exciting experiments in London Crown Courts were carried out over the next two years.

In Northumbria we faced similar challenges in Magistrates' Courts, but did not have enough Crown Court cases to change the location of the adult RCT. Instead, we tried heroic measures to persuade the Magistrates not to sentence "there and then" (as soon as an offender pled guilty). In order to test the RJ meeting of offender and victim, we needed the court to adjourn the case for sentencing 28 days later. In principle, the court officials agreed to this. In practice, most of the eligible cases were lost to "there and then" sentences. Even the extraordinary meeting we held with some 300 Magistrates led by the Lord Chancellor of England and Wales failed to turn the caseflow around. In the 1200-year history of that ancient office, it was likely the first time any Lord Chancellor (who appoints all Judges) had asked Magistrates to cooperate with an RCT. The result was absolutely no increase in caseflow.

Fortunately, our two Northumbrian experiments with juveniles facing a police Final Warning – the 'last chance' before prosecution in Children's Court – proved a model of amicable partnership. A well-run youth justice system whose leaders were keen to participate in the research fed cases to the experiments like apples falling off a tree. Because none of these offenders faced custodial sentences, we were able to begin assessing the impact of RJ on re-offending immediately. These results, to be published shortly, are unexpected, complex, and extremely important in filling in the jigsaw of what we know about the differential effects of RJ under different conditions.

Our two remaining experiments, carried out in the Thames Valley area of the UK at the post-conviction stage – probation and in prison – have proven immensely worthwhile. We were surprised at the high rate of offender take-up in the prison experiment. About two-thirds of those we approached accepted the invitation to meet their victim, even though there was no tangible benefit in terms of favourable parole or release outcomes. All these cases related to serious

violent crime involving personal encounters at the time of the offence. The in-prison RJ conferences were highly emotionally charged events, often with complicated dynamics between the participants. But the consensus of attendees was that they yielded commensurate rewards by the end of the conferences, in the great majority of cases.

It is still too soon to reach final conclusions about the effects of RJ on crime in these RCTs (see <http://www.sas.upenn.edu/jerrylee/research/rj.htm>.)

The evidence of benefits of RJ to victims, however, is clear and consistent (see our 2005 JEC article and more publications under review). Most important for the enterprise of experimental criminology, we have demonstrated several conclusions about RCTs in the UK. One is that it was possible to complete 8 separate RCTs with over 850 cases randomly assigned after over 1700 victims and offenders gave consent to random assignment. Across all of these eight experiments, deliberately structured to test RJ in the maximum combination of circumstances and for a broad range of offences and offenders, we showed that it is viable to 'insert' RJ into the criminal justice system. Despite its great complexity, overburdened by the sheer volume of cases and competing priorities, we were able to find enough support from key players to make the RCTs happen. We do not think that we are unique in that respect. This should be possible for any experimental criminologist to accomplish in the UK, provided enough attention is given to explaining the program to the players--and provided it does not compete with pre-existing state-imposed targets.

[Note: Please direct any questions to heather.strang@anu.edu.au . As always, we gratefully acknowledge the support of the Jerry Lee Foundation, without whose support this research program would not have been possible. Our UK field staff members were all critical to the success of these trials, especially Nova Inkpen, Sarah Bennett, Dorothy Newbury-Birch, Caroline M. Angel, Meredith Rossner and Geoffrey Barnes].

ABOUT THE ACADEMY

The Academy of Experimental Criminology was founded in 1999 in order to advance the development of experimental criminology. It seeks to increase awareness of randomized experiments in crime and justice, and to aid in the improvement of experimental methods in criminology.

The Academy also supports the Journal of Experimental Criminology, which publishes major advances in criminology and its methods through field experimentation, as well as quasi-experiments and other forms of research involving systematic manipulation of social or other variables. A newsletter concerned with the Academy and experimental criminology more generally is published twice a year.

The Academy recognizes criminologists who have successfully led randomized field experiments in criminology through their election as Fellows. Since 2003, the Academy has also recognized persons whose work has made substantial contributions to the advancement of experimental criminology, without actually conducting randomized field experiments. These people are elected as Honorary Fellows.

Fellows and Honorary Fellows are elected annually by vote of Fellows in good standing, and are installed at the annual meeting held in conjunction with the meeting of the American Society of Criminology. The Academy is governed by an executive board consisting of all living persons who have been elected as Presidents.

For more information visit the AEC website at <http://www.crim.upenn.edu/aec>

or contact Amber Leon, amberl@sas.upenn.edu
Academy of Experimental Criminology
c/o University of Pennsylvania
The Jerry Lee Center of Criminology
3814 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA

PRESIDENTS

Lawrence Sherman, Founding President, 1999-2001
David P. Farrington, 2001-2003
Joan McCord, 2003-2004
David L. Weisburd, 2004-2007

VICE-PRESIDENT

Lorraine Mazerolle, 2004-2007

FELLOWS

Steve Aos, Washington State Institute for Public Policy
Richard Berk, University of California
Robert F. Boruch, University of Pennsylvania
Richard F. Catalano, University of Washington
Patricia Chamberlain, Oregon Social Learning Center
Kenneth A. Dodge, Duke University
Delbert Elliott, University of Colorado
David P. Farrington, Cambridge University
Mark Greenberg, Pennsylvania State University
Denise C. Gottfredson, University of Maryland
Peter W. Greenwood, RAND
Adele V. Harrell, The Urban Institute
J. David Hawkins, University of Washington
Scott Henggeler, Medical University of South Carolina
Shep Kellam, American Institute for Research
Martin Killias, University of Lausanne
Friedrich Lösel, University of Erlangen - Nuremberg
Doris Mackenzie, University of Maryland
Lorraine Mazerolle, Griffith University
David Olds, University of Colorado
Debra Pepler, York University
Joan Petersilia, University of California, Irvine
John B. Reid, Oregon Social Learning Center
Alison Ritter, Turning Point
Matthew Sanders, University of Queensland
Lawrence J. Schweinhart, High/Scope Education Research Foundation
Jonathan P. Shepherd, University of Wales
Lawrence W. Sherman, University of Pennsylvania
Heather Strang, Australian National University
Patrick H. Tolan, University of Illinois at Chicago
Richard E. Tremblay, University of Montreal
Susan Turner, RAND
Frank Vitaro, University of Montreal
David L. Weisburd, Hebrew University & University of Maryland

HONORARY FELLOWS

Jon Baron, Coalition of Evidence Based Policy
Sir Iain Chalmers, Oxford, England
Jerry Lee, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Anthony Petrosino, IFC, Center for Evaluation
Nick Ross, University College London

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

NAME:.....

POSITION or TITLE:.....

DEPARTMENT:.....

INSTITUTION/AGENCY:.....

ADDRESS:.....

.....

.....

.....

WORK PHONE:.....

E-MAIL:.....

METHOD OF PAYMENT (please tick)

Check (made payable to the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania)

Credit Card

CREDIT CARD PAYMENT

VISA MASTERCARD

Card No.:.....

Name on card:.....

Exp. date:.....

Amount: \$US60/50 Euros.....

Return application form with credit card information or check to:

Academy of Experimental Criminology
 Attn: Amber Leon
 c/o University of Pennsylvania
 The Jerry Lee Center of Criminology
 3814 Walnut Street
 Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA

detach and send 

AEC ANNUAL MEETING

NOVEMBER 16 - 19, 2005

The Academy of Experimental Criminology annual meeting is held in conjunction with the American Society of Criminology meetings. This year, the ASC meetings are in Toronto, Canada, from Wednesday 15th to Saturday 19th November.

Schedule Information:

Scheduled Time: Fri, Nov 18 - 12:30pm - 1:50pm **Building/Room:** Royal York Hotel /
Title Displayed in Event Calendar: Academy of Experimental Criminology
Session Participants:

Chair: David L. Weisburd (Hebrew University/University of Maryland at College Park)

Presentation of Joan McCord Award

*David P. Farrington (University of Cambridge)

Joan McCord Award Lecture: Key Longitudinal-Experimental Studies in Criminology

*David P. Farrington (University of Cambridge)

Presentation of Honorary Fellows for 2005

*Anthony Petrosino (Campbell Crime & Justice Group), Nick Ross (Health Watch)

Presentation of Academy Fellows for 2005

*Steve Aos (Washington State Inst. for Public Policy), Richard Berk (UCLA), Delbert S. Elliott (University of Colorado at Boulder), Mark Greenberg (The Pennsylvania State University), Debra Pepler (York University)

New members welcome!

The AEC is currently accepting new members. Members receive as part of their membership a subscription to the Journal of Experimental Criminology. Members are also invited to participate in the annual meeting of the Academy and receive copies of the newsletters, reports, etc. produced by the Academy. Members have the right to vote for officers of the Academy (but not for Academy fellows who are elected by Academy Fellows only). Memberships dues are US\$60 (50 Euros).

STOCKHOLM PRIZE IN CRIMINOLOGY

The Swedish Minister of Justice, Thomas Bodström, announced during the closing session of the 14th World Congress of Criminology held at the University of Pennsylvania in August, the creation of an international prize for crime research, a yearly award designed in part to promote more effective and humane public policies for dealing with criminals.

The Stockholm Prize in Criminology, worth 1 million Swedish kronor (about \$133,000) will be awarded annually beginning in June. The prize is supported by a number of organizations, including the Jerry Lee Center for Criminology, Stockholm University, and the Soderberg Foundations of Sweden.

The main goals of the prize are to foster knowledge on the causes of crime; improve crime prevention strategies and policies for helping victims; and find ways to reduce miscarriages of justice. Minister Bodström said justice would be better served if officials worldwide worked more closely with data provided by criminologists instead of creating policies based on emotional reactions to crime.

The first award will be bestowed by a jury chaired by Lawrence Sherman, Director of Penn's Jerry Lee Center for Criminology and Stockholm University criminologist, Jerzy Sarneck and composed of nine crime experts from across the globe.

In conjunction with the awarding of the prize, which will take place at Stockholm City Hall, a crime symposium on the winner's research will be held at Stockholm University.

On the Net: <http://www.criminologyprize.com>

MEMBERS' AWARD

**Be sure to congratulate our members
for their recent awards!**

- ◆ The Beccaria Medal of the New German Society of Criminology has been awarded to Professor David Farrington of Cambridge University, for his lifetime contributions to the field, and for his faithful support of the advancement of criminology by his colleagues in Germany and around the world. The award was made at a Banquet held in the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, near the conclusion of a three-day biennial conference that included plenary and panel sessions on evidence-based policy, the use of the Maryland scale in rating research designs, and a plenary paper by professor Farrington on his recent Journal of Experimental Criminology article (with Brandon Welsh) on randomized experiments in crime and justice.
- ◆ David Weisburd has been made a Fellow of the American Society of Criminology for his contributions to Experimental Criminology. The honorary title "Fellow" recognises persons who have made a scholarly contribution to the intellectual life of the discipline, whether in the form of a singular, major piece of scholarship or cumulative scholarly contributions. Longevity alone is not sufficient. In addition, a Fellow must have made a significant contribution to the field through the career development of other criminologists and/or through organisational activities within the ASC".

RESEARCH PROJECTS

◆ **Campbell Collaboration Crime and Justice Group Protocols**

Two new protocols have recently been approved. Protocols are one way that the C2 tries to encourage explicitness and transparency in the review process. Readers are encouraged to contact the authors with feedback, citations to possibly eligible studies, or other correspondence.

➤ **The effectiveness of incarceration-based drug treatment on criminal behaviour**

For more information, contact Doris Layton MacKenzie, David Wilson or Ojmarrh Mitchell

The objective of this review is to systematically synthesize the available evidence regarding the effectiveness of incarceration-based drug treatment interventions in reducing drug use and recidivism. More specifically, this systematic review will focus on addressing the following research questions: Are incarceration-based drug treatment programs effective in reducing recidivism and drug use? Approximately how effective are these programs (i.e. what's the magnitude of the effect)? Are there particular types of drug treatment programs that are especially effective or ineffective? What program characteristics differentiate effective programs from ineffective programs? These questions will be addressed using meta-analytic synthesis techniques.

<http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/cj/reviews/2005-01-drugtreatment.pdf>

➤ **A systematic review of drug law enforcement strategies**

For more information, contact Lorraine Mazerolle

The review describes the search procedures and documents the results of our review in five main categories: international/ national interventions (such as interdiction and drug seizure); reactive/directed interventions (including crackdowns, raids, buy-busts, saturation patrol, etc); proactive/partnership interventions (including third-party policing, problem-oriented policing, community policing, drug nuisance abatement, etc); individualised interventions (such as arrest referral and diversion); or interventions that used a combination of reactive/directed and proactive/partnership strategies. Our research finds that proactive interventions involving partnerships between the police and third parties and/or community entities appear to be more effective at reducing both drug and non-drug problems in drug problem places than reactive/directed approaches. But the general quality of research in drug law enforcement is poor, the range of interventions that have been evaluated is limited and more high quality research is needed across a greater variety of drug interventions.

<http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/cj/reviews/>

A new Randomized Control Trial funded by the National Institute of Justice **By Nancy LaVigne**

Car crimes are some of the most costly crimes confronting America, yet we know little about how to prevent them. The proposed research will employ the Situational Crime Prevention (SCP) framework to develop an initiative to reduce car crime and to conduct a randomized controlled trial to assess the effectiveness of that measure. The study will focus on crimes occurring in Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (Metro) commuter parking lots, and will be conducted in full partnership with and support from the Metro Transit Police (MTP).

The research will be guided by: (1) an analysis of crimes occurring in Metro's 50 long-term parking lots; and (2) a series of site observations to assess the design and environment of each lot. Results of this preliminary analysis will be used to identify an array of promising crime prevention tactics. The Urban Institute (UI) and MTP staff will jointly decide upon a single tactic that will be implemented in 25 of Metro's 50 long-term lots, with the treatment lots identified through a blocked randomized selection process. Outcomes will be measured through a difference-in-differences (DID) analysis, as well as through a more rigorous panel structure time series analysis. In addition, UI researchers will examine potential geographic, temporal, and tactical displacement resulting from the intervention, and will also conduct a cost-benefit analysis of the intervention. Findings will be disseminated through the publication of articles in both practitioner and academic journals, as well as through conference presentations.

RESEARCH PROJECTS CONTINUED

**A new grant from US Department of Education Institute for Educational Sciences
\$1.5 million for a three-year period**

Effects of Enhanced After School Programs on Educational Outcomes: A Randomized Trial

The University of Maryland Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice (UM) and the Baltimore County (BC) Local Management Board (LMB) propose a rigorous test of the effects of enhanced after school programs (ASPs) on academic outcomes and related student behaviors. Considerable government funds are being invested in after-school programming in the U.S. Congress appropriated \$993.5 million to support 6,800 21st Century Community Learning Centers in 2003. In Maryland, the General Assembly recently provided \$10 million for ASPs.

In addition to providing supervision of youths while parents are working, ASPs are often intended to improve academic performance and to alter related student behaviors (e.g., attendance, drug use, conduct). However, rigorous research on the effects of ASPs on these outcomes is sparse. When ASPs serve high-risk youths in need of supervision and incorporate formal social skills training, they can have positive effects on student social adjustment. ASPs can also increase academic performance, but only when students attend the programs frequently, which is rare. Rigorous research on enhanced ASP models that incorporate the activities recommended in prior research is sorely needed.

The UM has been collaborating for more than five years with the youth-serving agencies responsible for funding and operating Maryland ASPs for the purpose of developing ASP models that incorporate effective, research-based practices. We propose to test a combination of replicable enhancements to ASPs that have been fully developed and deployed in Maryland's ASPs. These enhancements will be implemented in a standardized fashion in five Baltimore County ASP programs located in public middle schools.

These enhancements include:

- A standardized social skills training curriculum aimed at reducing substance use;
- A structured tutoring component aimed at increasing academic outcomes; and
- An attendance incentive system that reinforces both school and ASP attendance.

All of the programs will operate for nine hours per week for 36 weeks.

Five hundred middle school-aged youths who have volunteered to participate in the enhanced ASPs will be randomly assigned to receive the enhanced ASP or to serve as "treatment as usual" controls. The potential participants, students in five Baltimore County middle schools, are predominantly minority (70%) and about half receive free or reduced lunch (51%). Detailed data on the quality and quantity of ASP services provided will be collected, and data on academic outcomes and related student behaviors will be collected and analyzed to determine the impact of enhanced ASP on these outcomes.

The outcomes of the study will be disseminated to state and national level practitioner and policy groups as well as to researchers. The study will be policy-relevant because it will provide evidence about how an existing public expenditure can be modified to improve learning outcomes at little or no extra cost by replacing current practices with more effective ones.

NEW FUNDED RESEARCH, JOB VACANCIES, ETC.

This space is your space. Use it to publicize new funded projects, on-going research initiatives, experiences in running RCTs, job vacancies, social information, etc...

Please email your news and contributions to: l.mazerolle@griffith.edu.au or j.brandis@griffith.edu.au



UPCOMING CONFERENCES... PAST CONFERENCES

◆ **Delivering Crime Prevention: Making the Evidence Work**

Sydney, Australia, November 21, 22, 2005
Australian Institute of Criminology &
Attorney-General's Department of New South Wales

The conference will critically examine the role of evidence-based policy (EBP) approaches in the development and delivery of crime prevention policies and programs in Australia today. The different models for EBP programs will be critically assessed in terms of their appropriateness and effectiveness in informing and improving practical crime prevention policy and on-ground working. Barriers to the successful implementation of evidence-based initiatives will be reviewed and possible solutions explored.

Website:

<http://www.aic.gov.au/conferences/2005-cp/>

◆ **Sixth International Campbell Collaboration Colloquium Producing Systematic Reviews of Evidence**

Los Angeles, California, February 22-24, 2006
University of Southern California
School of Social Work

The colloquium will focus on systematic reviews of high-quality evidence on the effects of interventions in crime and justice, education, and social welfare and consider how systematic reviews may be used in policy and program settings. It will bring together policymakers, researchers, and consumers with an interest in better evidence of what works.

The agenda includes presentations of systematic reviews developed by Campbell Collaboration participants and reviews generated by other organizations that are trying to provide better evidence for making decisions. It includes presentations on methodological research and developments that support this mission as well as the development of the Collaboration and partner organizations.

Website:

<http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/>

◆ **The 14th World Criminology Congress** was held at the University of Pennsylvania in August. The Congress was co-hosted by the Jerry Lee Center of Criminology and the University of Pennsylvania. More than 1,000 delegates and over 35 societies from all over the world were represented at the Congress. The Academy of Experimental Criminology was well represented at the Congress, with many members and Fellows giving papers. Larry Sherman and his team put together a fabulous Congress. The Stockholm Prize announcement coming at the end of the Congress was a fitting finale to a great conference.



*Standing :Friedrich Lösel, David Wilson, Laurie Robinson,
Jerry Lee.*

Seated: Lynette Feder and Sabrina Austin.



*Left to Right: Peter Grabosky, Jerry Lee, David Weisburd,
Anthony Braga, Chris Koper and Mike Schlossman.*

◆ **Third Party Policing**

Lorraine Mazerolle and Janet Ransley
Cambridge University Press

Third party policing represents a major shift in contemporary crime control practices. As the lines blur between criminal and civil law, responsibility for crime control no longer rests with the state agencies but is shared with a wide range of organisations, institutions, or individuals. The first comprehensive book of its kind, *Third Party Policing* examines this growing phenomenon, arguing that it is the legal processes of third party policing that defines it as a unique strategy. Opening up the debate surrounding this controversial topic, the authors examine civil and regulatory controls necessary to forge third party partnerships and they explore the historical, legal, political, and organisational environments that shape its adoption. This innovative book combines original research with a theoretical framework that reaches far beyond criminology into politics and economics. It offers an important addition to the world-wide debate about the nature and future of policing and will prove invaluable to scholars and policy makers.

The Authors

LORRAINE MAZEROLLE is an Associate Professor in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Griffith University. She is the author of *Policing Places with Drug Problems* (1999), and co-editor, with Jan Roehl, *Civil Remedies and Crime Prevention* (1998).

JANET RANSLEY is a senior lecturer in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Griffith University. She has worked extensively in legal practice, and in providing research and policy advice for parliamentary and government agencies in Australia. Dr Ransley is the co-editor with Tim Prenzler, of *Police Reform: Building Integrity* (2003).

JOURNAL OF EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY

The *Journal of Experimental Criminology* is published four times a year in cooperation with the Academy of Experimental Criminology. A subscription to the Journal is included in the Academy's membership dues. The *Journal of Experimental Criminology* focuses on high quality experimental and quasi-experimental research in the development of evidence based crime and justice policy. The journal is also committed to the advancement of the science of systematic reviews and experimental methods in criminology and criminal justice. The journal seeks empirical papers on experimental and quasi-experimental studies, systematic reviews on substantive criminal justice problems, and methodological papers on experimentation and systematic review. The journal encourages submissions from scholars in the broad array of scientific disciplines that are concerned with crime and justice problems.

Editor-in-Chief:

David Weisburd, *Hebrew University, Israel; and University of Maryland, USA*

Managing Editor:

Rochelle Schnurr, *Hebrew University, Israel*

Associate Editors:

Mimi Ajsenstadt, *Hebrew University, Israel*
Lorraine Mazerolle, *Griffith University, Australia*
David B. Wilson, *George Mason University, USA*

Book Review Editor:

Chris Maxwell, *Michigan State University, USA*

Editorial Board Members:

Howard Bloom, *MDRC, USA*;
Robert Boruch, *University of Pennsylvania, USA*;
Gerben Bruinsma, *NSCR & Leiden University, The Netherlands*
John Eck, *University of Cincinnati, USA*;
David Farrington, *University of Cambridge, UK*;
Denise Gottfredson, *University of Maryland, USA*;
Peter Grabosky, *Australian National University, Australia*;
Hans-Jürgen Kerner, *University of Tübingen, Germany*;
Martin Killias, *University of Lausanne, Switzerland*;
Mark Lipsey, *Vanderbilt University, USA*;
Friedrich Loesel, *University of Erlangen-Nuremberg*;
David McDowall, *University at Albany, NY, USA*;
Daniel Nagin, *Carnegie Mellon University, USA*;
Lawrence Sherman, *University of Pennsylvania, USA*;
Richard Tremblay, *University of Montreal, Canada*

For up-to-date information, instructions for authors & your FREE online sample, visit the Journal's homepage at

www.kluweronline.com/issn/1573-3750

Published and forthcoming papers include:

Issue 3, September 2005

Special issue preface

D. Weisburd

Generating and using evidence to guide public policy and practice: Lessons from the Campbell Test-bed Project

Phoebe Cottingham, Rebecca Maynard, Matthew Stagner

Ex-offender employment programs and recidivism: A meta-analysis

Christy A. Visher, Laura Winterfield, Mark B. Coggeshall

Hot spots policing and crime prevention: A systematic review of randomized controlled trials

Anthony A. Braga

Oppositional defiant disorder: A systematic review of evidence of intervention effectiveness

M. C. Bradley, David Mandell

Effects of face-to-face restorative justice on victims of crime in four randomized, controlled trials

Lawrence W. Sherman, Heather Strang, Caroline Angel, Daniel Woods, Geoffrey C. Barnes, Sarah Bennett, Nova Inkpen