

April 2010
Volume 5, Issue 1

EDITORIAL

IN THIS ISSUE

- 1 **Editorial**
- 2 **Announcement:**
ASC Establishes the
Division of Experimental
Criminology
- 4 **Comment:**
Experimental Criminology
Newsletter: Passing the
Editorship
by Lorraine Mazerolle
- 6 **Feature Article:**
Experimentalism is
Contagious
by Lawrence Sherman
- 7 **Feature Article:**
Place Based Policing
by David Weisburd
- 9 **The View From D.C.**
The Federal Role in
Promoting Evidence
Based-Practice
By Laurie Robinson
- 10 **AEC / DEC Voices**
Edmund McGarrell
Cynthia MacDougall
- 13 **From Our Young
Scholars**
Sarah Bennett
John MacDonald
- 14 **The Journal of
Experimental
Criminology**
- 15 **News Around the
AEC / DEC**
- 16 **DEC Mentoring
Project**
- 17 **Upcoming
Conferences**

Borrowing a line from our former editor, Dr. Lorraine Mazerolle, "Much has occurred over the last year as our Academy grows in both stature and influence." This year is no different. Some may have noticed that our logo has expanded. This isn't just Volume 4, Issue 1 of the Academy of Experimental Criminology's newsletter. It is also the first newsletter of the Academy of Experimental Criminology & Division of Experimental Criminology.

As of November 2009 the Division of Experimental Criminology (DEC) is now one of only six divisions within the American Society of Criminology. This change reflects the growing influence that experimentation is having in our discipline. Readers interested in learning more about DEC, and possibly even joining (which comes with a subscription to the *Journal of Experimental Criminology* among other freebies), can find more information on page 2.

Membership also comes with entrance into the Tuesday-Before-ASC Meetings that Dr. Lawrence Sherman notes in his article *Experimentalism is Contagious*. For those interested in learning how to start their own experiments, or needing support for continuing one, it is nice to know that membership in DEC also provides mentorship from senior "experimentalists." In fact, there is a huge amount of expertise contained within AEC and DEC on all aspects of experimental criminology. (See more about the DEC Mentoring Project on page 16.) The Academy members want others to tap into this knowledge base so as to grow experimental research.

Those interested in policing can read about *Place Based Policing*. Dr. David Weisburd won the prestigious Stockholm Prize in Criminology this year based upon this cutting edge research. We are all proud of Dr. Weisburd's achievements and wish him heartfelt congratulations.

Also of note, Laurie Robinson, former acting head of the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) and newly appointed Assistant to Attorney General Eric Holder, was made an honorary fellow in AEC. In this issue she speaks about her work to bridge the divide between research and practice using evidence-based policies and programs at OJP. Her commitment to rigorous science can be seen in her priority to expand the use of randomized controlled trials to strengthen the knowledge base. This issue also contains papers from this year's new fellows. Drs. Edmund McGarrell and Cynthia MacDougall, and newly awarded young scholars, Drs. Sarah Bennett and John MacDonald. Congratulations to them all.

Now that we are a division within AEC, please make sure to look for us at this November's American Society of Criminology meeting. In our next newsletter in October 2010, we will make sure to include some of the many events hosted by the Academy and Division.

Finally, as new editors to this newsletter, we feel privileged to be part of this wonderful network of scholars who are passionate about their research. And we would like to welcome new scholars who are looking for colleagues who will challenge and inspire them.

Lynette Feder & Anthony Braga
Newsletter Editors

ANNOUNCEMENT

The American Society of Criminology Announces a New Division:

The Division of Experimental Criminology

The Executive Board of the American Society of Criminology has established a new Division of Experimental Criminology. The purpose of the Division is “the promotion and improvement of experimental evidence and methods in the advancement of criminological theory and evidence-based crime policy.”

Underpinning the establishment of the new Division of Experimental Criminology is the growing use of randomized experiments by ASC members. This is indicated by growing evidence, for example:

- The founding of the Academy of Experimental Criminology in 1998, whose 50 Fellows meet annually at ASC with open ASC panel sessions (see <http://www.crim.upenn.edu/aec/>)
- The founding of the Campbell Crime and Justice Group in 2000, which has now completed 22 full systematic reviews of experimental and quasi-experimental evidence (see http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/reviews_crime_justice/index.php)
- The founding of the Journal of Experimental Criminology in 2005, and its high citation counts.
- The growing attendance at all Academy of Experimental Criminology events held at ASC in recent years, including the annual Joan McCord Prize Lecture.
- The growing interest among graduate students in experimental methods.
- The increasing interest among ASC members in offering rigorous evidence on policy effectiveness as manifest in articles in Criminology & Public Policy.
- The establishment of two registries for randomized trials at www.crim.cam.ac.uk/experiments

The field of experimental criminology is unified by the practical and theoretical problems in designing, delivering, analyzing, interpreting and synthesizing randomized controlled field experiments. This unity is clear in the standard objectives of such designs as required by the multi-disciplinary CONSORT statement (see <http://www.consort-statement.org/>). It is also clear that there are great complexities and challenges in delivering high-quality experiments under the standards of field research set by the CONSORT statement organization. These problems provided fertile ground for the coming together of an intellectual community that will now be recognized and supported in the form of an ASC Division.

At its organizational meeting in 2009, organizing Division Chair Doris MacKenzie of Pennsylvania State University nominated the following officers, who were duly elected by vote of those present:

CHAIR: Lawrence Sherman, Cambridge University and University of Pennsylvania

VICE CHAIR: Lorraine Mazerolle, University of Queensland

SECRETARY-TREASURER: Todd Armstrong, Sam Houston State University

EXECUTIVE COUNSELORS:

Lynette Feder, Portland State University

Peter Greenwood, Association for the Advancement of Evidence-Based Practice

David Weisburd, Hebrew University and George Mason University

The Division also created the following committees, and appointed the chairs indicated in parentheses with their email addresses below. Any member of the new Division who is interested in joining any of these committees is invited to contact the committee chair.

Divisional Committees

Awards (David Weisburd dweisbur@gmu.edu)

Mentorship (Peter Greenwood peter.greenwood@sbcglobal.net)

Outreach (Lynette Feder lfeder@pdx.edu)

Training (Lorraine Mazerolle l.mazerolle@uq.edu.au)

Website (Lawrence Sherman Lawrence.Sherman@crim.cam.ac.uk)

Future meetings of the DEC at annual ASC conferences will include training sessions in experimental methods, mentoring and “grand rounds” discussions of managing experiments, social events and the presentation of awards for excellence in experimental criminology.

Dues for the 2010 membership year are \$35 and \$10 for students. Membership dues include a free print and electronic subscription to the JOURNAL OF EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY (see <http://www.springer.com/social+sciences/criminology/journal/11292>). Student membership dues include free on-line access to the same journal.

To join the Division of Experimental Criminology, send a credit card order or check with a notation for “DEC Membership” (\$35) or “DEC Student Membership” (\$10) in the on-line ASC membership renewal or joining page at <http://www.asc41.com/appform1.html>.

For more information about the Division or suggestions for its mandate, please contact:

Professor Lawrence W. Sherman, Chair
 Division of Experimental Criminology
 American Society of Criminology
 Director, Jerry Lee Centre for Experimental Criminology
 Institute of Criminology
 University of Cambridge
 Sidgwick Avenue
 Cambridge CB3 9DA
 United Kingdom
 US Phone (+1) 267-269-1757
 Email: Lawrence.Sherman@crim.cam.ac.uk
 Website: www.crim.cam.ac.uk/experiments

Experimental Criminology Newsletter: Passing the Editorship

by Lorraine Mazerolle

In 2005, as the incoming Vice President of the Academy of Experimental Criminology, I edited the first edition of the Academy of Experimental Criminology (AEC) newsletter (Volume 1, Number 1 appeared in April 2005). From the outset, I saw the AEC newsletters as being a vehicle to provide information to the AEC membership (including paying members, Fellows and Honorary Fellows) about activities in the broad space of experimental criminology, to serve as a forum for exchanging professional insights, and to foster discussion about experimental issues, developments and ideas.

During my tenure as the AEC newsletter editor, I produced seven newsletters introducing new AEC Fellows and Honorary Fellows, congratulated the four AEC Fellow recipients of the acclaimed Stockholm Prize in Criminology (Losel, Olds, Shepherd and Weisburd), advertised forthcoming and relevant conference gatherings, and featured articles about, among other things, small sample size issues in systematic reviews (Vol 2, issue 1), Lawrence Sherman's visionary ideas for REXNet (Randomized Experiments Network) in Vol 3, Issue 2, and the challenges of experimental criminologists working from within government (Joan Petersilia) in Vol 4, Issue 1.

To date, the AEC newsletter has also served as an important forum for recruiting new members to the AEC and communicating, with a wide audience, the exponential growth in scale and importance of experimental criminology within academe, criminal justice practice and in the policy arena (more about this last issue below). As the newsletter editor, I have wanted to reach out to the global experimental criminological family and foster growth in our networks.

Now, as I pass the baton as Newsletter Editor to Professors Lynette Feder and Anthony Braga, I reflect on some of the highlights that I have observed, and reported on, as the AEC Newsletter Editor over the past five years. In no particular order, I see these highlights as the following:

1. The Journal of Experimental Criminology: In Spring 2005, AEC Fellow and 2010 recipient of the Stockholm Prize in Criminology, Professor David Weisburd, produced the inaugural volume of the Journal of Experimental Criminology, beautifully published and well supported by Springer, particularly Welmoed Spahr. David is a brave man to venture into the world of establishing a new journal and taking on the Editorship of the journal amongst his myriad of other responsibilities! I think we are universal in saying what an unbelievably fantastic job David has done in guiding the journal over the last five years,

producing, to date, 20 volumes of exceptionally high-quality articles, all in our space of experimental criminology. In the age of citing "impact factors" and h-indexes, we are well on the way to the JEC as being in the top tier of criminological journals in the world. A big "Thanks" to David for steering the JEC during these formative years.

2. The Stockholm Prize in Criminology: In another huge "first," the generous contributions by AEC Honorary Fellow Jerry Lee, Stockholm University and the Soderberg Foundation of Sweden, coupled with the visionary activities of Professors Lawrence Sherman and David Farrington, brought the announcement of the establishment of the million kroner Stockholm Prize in Criminology during the closing ceremony of the 14th World Congress in Criminology in Philadelphia in July 2005. Since this time, there have been 5 years of the prize being awarded, bringing 9 prize winners, of which four are Fellows of the AEC (44.4%). That's a huge accomplishment on a personal level to AEC prize winners Losel, Olds, Shepherd and Weisburd. It also speaks volumes for the importance of the field of experimental criminology and the way our research is used by practitioners in their efforts to reduce crime and advance human rights.

3. The Joan McCord Award: It was with great sadness that the AEC experienced the loss of Professor Joan McCord in early 2004. She was the 3rd President of the AEC (2003-2004) and a lifetime inspiration to us all. Joan's Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study is one of the classic experimental studies of all time and the award comes with a \$750 stipend, generously provided by Springer (publishers of the *Journal of Experimental Criminology*).

4. The Experimental Young Scholar Award: One of the biggest challenges in our field of experimental criminology is training the next generation of scholars who can learn the ins and outs of running complex field trials yet still find their way in the "publish or perish" world that is academic life. With a generous donation by Stockholm Prize winner, Friedrich Losel (out of his prize winnings), we were able to create the US \$1,000 Experimental Young Scholar Award in 2006. Since establishment of the prize, five outstanding young experimental criminologists (Gayle and Todd Armstrong, Elizabeth Groff, Sarah Bennett and John MacDonald) have won the prize, making it clear that the future of experimental criminology is in safe hands.

5. REXNet: REXNet is one of my personal favorite highlights and something I would truly like to see come to fruition. In 2007, Lawrence Sherman and his colleagues at Cambridge came up with the idea of developing a Randomized Experiments Network for Prospective Meta-Analysis. The key to REXNet is building capacity and

skills to conduct randomized experiments as well as creating the infrastructure to support the implementation of meta-experiments. My team and I at the University of Queensland are keen to work with Professor Sherman and others around the world to bring REXNet to fruition. Future dialogue about the way forward will be uppermost on my mind as President of the AEC.

6. The Division of Experimental Criminology: So, now we come to the establishment of the Division of Experimental Criminology (DEC). The American Society of Criminology comprises just six Divisions (including DEC). Under the leadership of Professor Doris MacKenzie during her tenure as AEC President, Doris brought to fruition the establishment of the DEC in 2009. Thirty AEC members signed a petition that was forwarded to the ASC Board in early 2009. The DEC had its inaugural meeting at ASC in 2009 and from that meeting the executive of the Division was formed.

The stage is now set for further expansion of the field of experimental criminology. The AEC will continue to exist as a Fellows and Honorary Fellows organization that is set up to recognize criminologists who have successfully led randomized controlled field trials (Fellows) or persons who work has made substantial contributions to the advancement of experimental criminology. We now have 52 Fellows and 10 Honorary Fellows.

As with other similar organizations, we will continue to expand our Fellows base and it will be the AEC that continues to honor scholars in the form of the Joan McCord and Young Scholar's Awards. The DEC will function as the subscription base for the Journal of Experimental Criminology and, at least in the short term, serve as the working arm for the global growth of experimental criminology. The DEC Executive is planning a range of activities over the next year, many of which you will read about in this inaugural DEC/AEC newsletter. For me, I am very happy to hand over the reins of the newsletter editorship to my colleagues Lynette and Anthony as they bring new ideas and fresh insights to our population of interested readers.

Lorraine Mazerolle is a Research Professor in the Institute for Social Science Research at the University of Queensland. She is currently the President of the Academy of Experimental Criminology and Vice Chair of the American Society of Criminology's Division of Experimental Criminology.

Experimentalism is Contagious

by Lawrence W. Sherman

The new Division of Experimental Criminology (DEC) of the American Society of Criminology (ASC) provides new evidence on an old hypothesis: *experimentalism is contagious*. In its first six months, the DEC has attracted 125 members. This means that roughly one in every 30 members of ASC has joined the DEC, making it the largest membership organization in the history of experimental criminology. Many members are scholars who have never conducted randomized field trials themselves, but are clearly interested in the subject. The task of DEC is to make the most of that interest, translating it into a life-long commitment to excellence in reading, teaching, criticizing and supporting experimental methods in criminology.

In accomplishing its task, DEC needs a good theory—as well as good evidence. The election campaign of President Obama, which drew on Malcolm Gladwell's book *THE TIPPING POINT*, provides a good basis for all theories of change. The idea of “viral marketing” by one-to-one contact between an enthusiastic “early adopter” of the change and a somewhat more cautious later adopter describes a process observed in many situations. It is often compared to infectious diseases—not for the harm it causes (although some changes clearly do) but for the geometric form of the growth rate. But in that form there lies a caution: that rapid growth soon peaks when it reaches all possible targets, or when the strength of the message itself dissipates.

Building DEC for the long run requires not just early rapid growth, but long-term steady growth of a sustained effort to build experimentalism into criminology. We certainly have no intentions of shutting out other methods and perspectives (despite frequent accusations to that effect). All we ask for is a seat at the table in the full mosaic of scientific criminology. Our theory of change, then, needs to consider how we can remain welcome at that table, as well as getting there in the first place.

Mainstream criminology will welcome experimentalism to the extent that it finds experimentalism theoretically useful, methodologically reliable, and financially feasible. The connection of experiments to theory may be the hardest challenge we face, even if we are successful in demonstrating the true effects of policies. Thus one priority for DEC is to promote theoretical richness in experimental design, much as *Journal of Experimental Criminology* (JEC) Editor David Weisburd requires in JEC articles.

The methodological reliability of experiments is also a formidable challenge. The new National Academy of Sciences report on clinical trials in cancer treatment reports that some 40% of clinical trials are never completed, due to low enrolment of patients and other

logistical problems.¹ It is just these kinds of challenges for experimental criminology that the DEC will address in its annual Tuesday-Before-ASC-Meetings workshops, starting this November 16 at 2 pm at the ASC hotel in San Francisco.

The financial feasibility of experiments is perhaps our brightest hope, one that we can spread far and wide in mainstream criminology. The Obama Administration is by far the most supportive of policy experiments in US history. Other countries are also “summoning the Randomistas,” as Australian economist Andrew Leigh urged his nation to do in a recent paper. In the UK, senior police executives are designing their own RCTs, providing operational as well as research costs in consultation with the Jerry Lee Centre for Experimental Criminology at Cambridge.² This June, President Sebastián Piñera of Chile will launch a new national program to make crime policy more evidence-based, with a keynote address by the founding President of the Academy of Experimental Criminology (Lawrence Sherman).

More and more governments get it. And they invest in it. They know that academics disagree a lot, but they can tell that a good RCT settles a lot of debates (at least about facts). They also know the most precise estimates of cost-effectiveness come from RCTs, providing a more legitimate means of choosing which programs to support (or kill) in a transparent political culture. All they need is for each RCT to be as clean as possible, with high rates of treatment as intended, adequate statistical power, and reliable measures of both treatment and outcomes. Yet not even cancer research is doing that much at the moment.

This suggests that the major purpose of DEC must be to foster excellence in the *art* of experimental design, leadership and management. Some of that art can be converted to science by checklists and manuals. But in the short run we need to use much more thick description in our discussions of how experiments can happen, whose motives matter, how interests and organizations may converge in an “experimental moment” that a criminologist can seize for the sake of good science. Those themes and related topics should dominate our training sessions, allowing us to train each other as well as novices.

DEC will give awards, host websites, have social events and even dances. But perhaps the backbone of DEC should be the Tuesday-Before-ASC afternoon meetings, in which we get together and share our lessons learned, among a growing number of active experimenters. There may be no better way to keep experimentalism contagious.

Lawrence W. Sherman is the Wolfson Professor of Criminology and Director of the Jerry Lee Centre of Experimental Criminology at Cambridge University.

1. http://books.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=12879
2. www.crim.cam.ac.uk/experiments

Place Based Policing: Research Recognized in the Stockholm Prize in Criminology 2010

by David L. Weisburd

Police practices are focused primarily on people. The practices often begin with people who call the police and are focused on identifying offenders who commit crimes. They end with the arrest of those offenders and their processing through the criminal justice system. Catching criminals on a case-by-case basis and processing them through the criminal justice system remains the predominant police crime prevention strategy. The research that led to my receipt of the Stockholm Prize however, suggests that police should put places, rather than people, at the center of their practices. My point is not simply that places should be considered in policing, but that they should be a key component of the databases that police use, of the geographic organization of police activities, and of the strategic approaches that police use to combat crime and disorder.

The evidence base for this research includes observational studies, but randomized controlled trials form a key element of the development of knowledge in this area. The key experiment in encouraging place based policing was the Minneapolis Hot Spots Experiment in the early 1990s (Sherman and Weisburd, 1995). This was followed by a series of other experimental studies including the Jersey City Drug Hot Spots Experiment (Weisburd and Green, 1995) and the Jersey City Violent Crime Hot Spots Experiment (Braga, Weisburd et al., 1999).

What Is a "Place"?

Place-based policing is not simply the application of police strategies to a unit of geography. Traditional policing in this sense is place-based, since police routinely define their units of operation in terms of large areas such as precincts and beats. Place, in place-based policing, refers to a different level of geographic aggregation. Places in this context are small micro units of analysis such as buildings or addresses; block faces or street segments; or clusters of addresses. Such places where crime is concentrated are commonly called "hot spots."

Policing Places: What Is It?

Place-based policing emphasizes the specific places where crimes are concentrated. It begins with an assumption that something about a place leads to crimes occurring there. In this sense, place-based policing is theoretically based on routine activities theory (Cohen and Felson, 1979), which identifies crime as a matter of the convergence of suitable targets (e.g., victims), an absence of capable guardians (e.g., police), and the presence of motivated or potential offenders. Of course, all these elements must occur within the context of a place or situation. Accordingly, place-based policing recognizes that something about specific places leads to the convergence of these elements.

The strategies of place-based policing can be as simple as bringing extra patrols to high crime places, as Lawrence Sherman and I did in the Minneapolis Hot Spots Policing Experiment (1995). But place-based policing can also take a much more complex approach to the amelioration of crime problems at places. In the Jersey City Drug Market Analysis Project (Weisburd and Green, 1995), for example, we used a three-step program (comprising identifying and analyzing problems, developing tailored responses, and maintaining crime control gains) to reduce problems at drug hot spots. In the Jersey City Violent Crime Hot Spots experiment, step by step problem solving was employed to ameliorate hot spots characterized by serious violent crimes (Braga et al., 1999).

The Advantages of Policing Places

Since Lawrence Sherman and colleagues suggested the importance of the concentration of crime at small units of geography (Sherman et al., 1989), a number of scholars have turned their attention to what they termed the "criminology of place." In the Seattle Crime Trends at Places Study (Weisburd et al., 2004), my colleagues and I showed that crime is highly concentrated in a small number of places in a city across long periods of time. Over a 14-year period, about 4 percent of the street segments each year were found to contain half of the crimes recorded. This concentration seems to be even greater for specific types of crime. For example, we found that 86 street segments out of 29,849 accounted for one-third of the total number of juvenile crime incidents in Seattle (Weisburd, Morris, and Groff, 2009).

The Stability of Place-Based Targets

There is perhaps a no better-established fact in criminology than the variability and instability of offending across the life course. It is well-established that a primary factor in this variability is the fact that most offenders age out of crime often at a relatively young age. But there is also evidence of strong instability in criminal behavior for most offenders, even when short periods are observed. This may be contrasted with developmental patterns of crime at place, which suggest much stability in crime incidents over time.

In our Seattle study (Weisburd et al., 2004), we found not only that about the same number of street segments were responsible for 50 percent of the crime each year, but that the street segments that tended to evidence very low or very high activity at the beginning of the study period in 1989 were similarly ranked at the end of the period in 2002. While there are developmental trends in the data, what is most striking is the relative stability of crime, at place, over time. This also means that if the police are able to do something about crime hot spots they are likely preventing long-term chronic crime problems.

The Effectiveness of Place-Based Policing

Lawrence Sherman, Lorraine Mazerolle, Anthony Braga, John Eck and I were among the first researchers to show that hot spots policing could be effective in doing

something about crime. At a time of skepticism regarding the effectiveness of police practices, we found that concentrating patrols on crime hot spots could benefit crime prevention (see Braga and Weisburd, In Press). One long-standing objection to focusing crime prevention geographically is that it will simply shift or displace crime to other places not receiving the same level of police attention, that crime will simply “move around the corner.”

Given the common assumption of spatial displacement, my colleagues and I at the Police Foundation conducted a study in 2006 to directly test whether hot spots policing strategies did simply “move crime around the corner.” The study was singularly focused on examining to what extent immediate spatial displacement occurred as a result of hot spots policing strategies. The findings in this study reinforced a growing challenge to the displacement hypothesis. No evidence of immediate spatial displacement was found; however, strong evidence of spatial diffusion of crime control benefits was found. Places near targeted areas that did not receive special police intervention, actually improved.

That study provided us with the advantage of qualitative data collection to understand why place-based policing does not simply push crime around the corner. We found that offenders did not perceive all places as having the same opportunities for crime. For example, easy access for clients was a critical criterion for drug dealers, as was relatively few residents who might call the police about prostitutes. The need for special characteristics of places to carry out criminal activity meant that crime could not simply displace to every place in a city. Indeed, the number of places evidencing such characteristics might be relatively small. In turn, spatial movement of offenders from crime sites often involved substantial effort and risk by offenders. As one drug dealer told us, “...you really can't deal in areas you aren't living in, it ain't your turf. That's how people get themselves killed.” Moreover, offenders, like nonoffenders, come to feel comfortable with their home turf and the people they encounter.

Increasing Prevention while Decreasing Incarceration

Over the past two decades, we have begun to imprison Americans at higher and higher rates. Spending on prisons has increased at more than double the rate of spending on education and health care. About 2.3 million Americans are in prisons or jails, institutions that are often dehumanizing and degrading.

Policing places puts emphasis on reducing opportunities for crime at places, not on waiting for crimes to occur and then arresting offenders. Successful crime prevention programs at places need not lead to high numbers of arrests, especially if methods are developed that discourage offenders. In this sense, place-based policing offers an approach to crime prevention that can increase public safety while decreasing the human and financial costs of imprisonment for Americans. If place-based policing were to become the central focus of police crime

prevention, rather than the arrest and apprehension of offenders, we would likely see at the same time a reduction of prison populations and an increase in the crime prevention effectiveness of the police.

What Must Be Done?

For place-based policing to succeed, police must change their unit of analysis for understanding and doing something about crime. My research suggests that it is time for police to shift from person- based policing to place-based policing. While such a shift is largely an evolution in trends that have begun over the past few decades, it will nonetheless demand radical changes in data collection in policing, the organization of police activities, and particularly the overall worldview of the police. It remains true today that police officers see the key work of policing as catching criminals. It is time to change that worldview, so that police understand that the key to crime prevention is in ameliorating crime at place.

Dr. David L. Weisburd holds a joint appointment as a Distinguished Professor in the Administration of Justice Department at George Mason University and also as the Walter E. Meyer Professor of Law and Criminal Justice at the Hebrew University Law School in Jerusalem.

References

- Braga, A., D. Weisburd, E. Waring and L. G. Mazerolle. (1999). Problem-oriented policing in violent crime places: A randomized controlled experiment. *Criminology*, 37, 541-580.
- Braga, A. and D. Weisburd. (Forthcoming) *Policing Problem Places: Crime Hot Spots and Effective Prevention*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, L. E., and M. Felson. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review* 44, 588-605.
- Sherman, L., P. Gartin, and M. Buerger. (1989). Hot Spots of Predatory Crime: Routine Activities and the Criminology of Place. *Criminology*, 27, 27-56.
- Sherman, L., and D. Weisburd (1995). General deterrent effects of police patrol in crime “hot spots”: A randomized study. *Justice Quarterly* 12, 625-648.
- Weisburd, D., and L. Green (1995). Policing drug hot spots: The Jersey City DMA experiment. *Justice Quarterly* 12, 711-735.
- Weisburd, D., S. Bushway, C. Lum, et al. (2004). Crime trajectories at places: A longitudinal study of street segments in the City of Seattle. *Criminology* 42, 283-322.
- Weisburd, D., L. Wyckoff, J. Ready, et al. (2006). Does crime just move around the corner?: A controlled study of spatial displacement and diffusion of crime control benefits. *Criminology* 44, 549-591.

THE VIEW FROM D.C.

The Federal Role in Promoting Evidence-Based Practice

by Laurie Robinson

In December 2008, Eric Holder – who had just been tapped to be the next Attorney General – began asking if I would consider coming back to the U.S. Department of Justice. In truth, I was quite happy where I was, directing the Master of Science Program at the University of Pennsylvania's Department of Criminology and working with my good friend Larry Sherman and others. I had left the Justice Department in 2000 after spending seven years under President Clinton and Attorney General Reno as Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs (OJP). The thought of being part of an historic Administration and of working with Eric Holder, for whom I have the deepest admiration and respect, was exciting, but until the inauguration I frankly was not tempted to commit to anything beyond a brief role to assist in transition.

Then, with one phrase uttered by the new President in his inaugural address, my mind did start in motion. When I heard President Obama say that he would “restore science to its rightful place,” I started thinking that I might never have a better opportunity to realize my goal of helping to bridge the divide between research and practice. I accepted the Attorney General's offer to become the acting head of OJP, and later was honored to be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate as Assistant Attorney General. I looked to take advantage of the opportunity almost immediately, launching – with the Attorney General's strong support – an effort called the Evidence Integration Initiative.

E2I, as we call it, has three aims: (1) to improve the quantity and quality of evidence that we generate through OJP's research, evaluation, and statistical functions; (2) to better integrate evidence in program and policy decisions; and (3) to improve the translation of evidence into practice. E2I is an OJP-wide effort, ably spearheaded by Dr. Phelan Wyrick of my staff, and its goal is to help criminal and juvenile justice policymakers and practitioners better understand what has been shown to work, based on accepted scientific principles. Specifically, we are working to establish common expectations and definitions for credible evidence across OJP programs. We also are forming Evidence Integration Teams to synthesize evidence on specific justice topics and develop principles for practice that can be communicated to the field. And we are focusing on how to get information out to practitioners and policymakers in a format that is accessible and useful.

One of our objectives is to support expansion of the use of randomized field experiments, a core element in strengthening our base of scientific knowledge and a vital step toward realizing the full potential of research in fighting crime. At the same time, we are thinking broadly about what constitutes evidence, recognizing the utility of

statistical, qualitative, and other research approaches that fall below the gold standard's threshold of rigor. The fact is that the pool of data derived from randomized experiments is still relatively small, and until it is widened we must be in a position to support practitioners who need information to meet immediate needs. Otherwise, we risk losing them as allies and as fellow advocates for smarter, data-driven approaches.

With the needs of the practitioner field in mind, we are working toward developing an evidence-based Web site – a Crime Solutions Resource Center, as we are calling it – and we hope to create a diagnostic center, or “help desk,” that will provide direct support to jurisdictions as they apply these approaches. The President's budget request for next year supports both these initiatives. It includes \$1 million for the online clearinghouse and \$6 million for the diagnostic center. It also includes a three-percent set-aside of OJP grant and reimbursement programs to be used for research, evaluation, and statistical purposes, in addition to funds for our National Institute of Justice and Bureau of Justice Statistics. This level of commitment to social science research in our field on the part of a President is, I believe, unprecedented.

People throughout the Obama Administration and the Department of Justice are talking seriously and deeply about the importance of science, and they are taking a genuine interest in what research is showing. The President himself, speaking to the National Academy of Sciences a year ago, declared that “[s]cience is more essential for our prosperity, our security, our health, our environment, and our quality of life than it has ever been before.” Likewise, the Attorney General has said that “[g]etting smart on crime means. . . embracing science and data, and relying on them to shape policy.” Our leaders in government appreciate the value of research and are committed to using federal resources to bolster our knowledge of what works in preventing and reducing crime.

This is an exciting time to be involved in criminal and juvenile justice research, and I am thrilled to be part of this watershed moment in the history of our field. I am convinced that, working with the American Society of Criminology and its Division of Experimental Criminology – along with the many dedicated criminal and juvenile justice researchers I have met over the years – we will finally see the day when the research and practitioner communities are, in fact, working together as partners.

Laurie Robinson is the Assistant Attorney General of the Office of Justice Programs in the United States Department of Justice and an honorary fellow of the Academy of Experimental Criminology.

Moving toward Evidence-Based Practice

by Edmund F. McGarrell

For years, calls from media reporters, elected officials and police chiefs made me cringe as I sensed they wanted clear-cut answers about policy, program or practice, for which we did not have the evidence-base upon which to offer much insight. Fortunately, the work of the scholars involved in the Academy of Experimental Criminology (AEC) has moved the field of criminal justice and criminology significantly in terms of building a foundation of evidence upon which to assess and craft policy and practice.

Indeed, the commitment of the AEC to randomized, controlled field experiments has served to a significant extent as the intellectual foundation for the movement toward evidence-based practice that is now reflected in the leadership of the U.S. Department of Justice, the Campbell Collaboration, the Center for Evidence Based Practice, the *Journal of Experimental Criminology* and related developments. This trajectory was also evident in Todd Clear's recent Presidential address to the American Society of Criminology (Clear, 2010).

One crime problem that has reflected the growth of research-based knowledge is gun violence. In the early 1990s, at the peak of the nation's homicide epidemic, I was working with the Spokane, Washington Police Department on a variety of community- and problem-oriented policing initiatives. A common question during those years was whether there were any research-based promising practices to reduce gun crime? Several years later the city of Indianapolis was experiencing a re-birth of its downtown and the re-development of neighborhoods amidst an economic boom that was producing near zero unemployment, yet it was also setting records for levels of homicide. The same question arose, what does research suggest we can do to reduce the level of lethal violence?

Although it was impossible at the time to identify evidence-based practice, in contrast to the situation in Spokane, there were now some intriguing and promising research findings emerging that suggested that we as researchers might have something to offer criminal justice practitioners struggling to prevent and reduce gun crime. AEC fellows Larry Sherman and David Weisburd's research in Minneapolis pointed to the potential of focusing on hot-spots of crime (Sherman and Weisburd, 1995). Sherman's study of policing gun crime hot spots in Kansas City suggested that directed police patrol focusing on illegally possessed guns had significant potential to reduce gun crime (Sherman and Rogan, 1995). AEC fellow Anthony Braga, David Kennedy and colleagues demonstrated that linking research-based problem analysis with a focused

deterrence strategy that has come to be known as "pulling-levers" had significant potential for reducing youth gun violence (Braga et al., 2001). When presented with these early findings, Indianapolis police, prosecutorial and city officials agreed to implement strategies consistent with the research but also asked that there be a research component to assess whether or not they were having their intended effect. The result was the Indianapolis quasi-experiment on directed police patrol that largely replicated Sherman's Kansas City findings (McGarrell et al., 2001) and were subsequently supported by Cohen and Ludwig's (2003) study in Pittsburgh. The Indianapolis pulling-levers initiative indicated a 34 percent reduction in homicide that stood in contrast to homicide trends in similar Midwestern cities (McGarrell et al., 2006). Importantly, the results were most significant for reducing gang homicide (Corsaro and McGarrell, 2009) and for reducing the risk of homicide for those at highest risk - young, black males in high crime neighborhoods (Corsaro and McGarrell, forthcoming).

A similar process unfolded as Indianapolis officials sought to more effectively address crime associated with very young children in the juvenile court that both experience and research suggested were at high risk of becoming chronic offenders. Once again AEC fellows Larry Sherman and Heather Strang were developing an experiment on the use of family group conferences built on the reintegrative shaming theory advanced by their colleague John Braithwaite. Although the research base at the time was quite limited, the combination of frustration with practices in an overcrowded urban juvenile court, the logic of Braithwaite's model, and the trust that had emerged through the research collaboration on the above-mentioned violence reduction efforts, resulted in the Indianapolis Restorative Justice Experiment. Consistent with other restorative justice research, the most unambiguous finding was the increased satisfaction of victims with the family group conference process (McGarrell, 2001). Additionally, the youths participating in the family group conferences had significantly lower rates of failure compared to youths in the control group (McGarrell and Hipple, 2007).

Both the gun crime and restorative justice research examples also point to the need for continued movement from early implementation and assessment, to promising practice, to evidence-based practice, and the need for continued testing of the components of what may be called promising or evidence-based practice. The Boston gun project provided a foundation for the Department of Justice's Strategic Approaches to Community Safety Initiative (SACSI), of which the Indianapolis project was one of ten. These developments eventually influenced DOJ's Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) national initiative intended to reduce gun crime. Our research suggests that where PSN was effectively implemented, it resulted in reduced violent crime and homicide (McGarrell et al., forthcoming; 2009). Yet, the research does not allow us to carefully assess which components of PSN were most influential in violence reductions. Was it the increase in federal

prosecution of gun crime? The direct communication of a deterrence message? The integration of research partners that may have assisted in targeting limited resources on hot spots and chronic offenders? Are the local, state, federal and community partnerships critical facilitating components? Similarly, the Indianapolis restorative justice experiment suggests an impact for very young, first time offending youths. Sherman and Strang's findings, however, suggest caution and the need to distinguish between juvenile and adult offenders, property and violent offenders, and to examine for variation across cultural groups. In both cases it becomes clear that while there is abundant evidence of the potential impact of these strategies, much remains to be uncovered through rigorous designs if we are to continually move toward evidence-based practice.

As evidence-based practice increasingly becomes part of the lexicon of policymakers, practitioners, and researchers, it becomes increasingly important for governmental and foundation funding agencies to provide the resources to support projects that move the field continually toward evidence-based practice. Given the demands placed on the professional field for working with researchers on rigorous evaluation designs, and randomized controlled experiments in particular, linking programmatic funding support with research funding holds significant promise for both advancing research knowledge and providing the professional community with the knowledge and tools needed to implement evidence-based practice.

Edmund F. McGarrell is the Director of and Professor in the School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University. He is also a newly elected Fellow of the Academy of Experimental Criminology.

References

Braga, A., Kennedy, D., Waring E., & Piehl, A. (2001). "Problem-oriented policing, deterrence, and youth violence: An evaluation of Boston's Operation Ceasefire." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 38, 195-226.

Clear, T. (2010) "Policy and evidence: the challenge to the American Society of Criminology: 2009 presidential address to the American Society of Criminology." *Criminology* 48,1-25.

Cohen J. & Ludwig, J. (2003) "Policing crime guns". In: Ludwig J., Cook P. (eds). *Evaluating gun policy*. Brookings Institution Press, Washington, DC

Corsaro, N. & McGarrell, E. (2009) "Testing a Promising Homicide Reduction Strategy: Re-Assessing the Impact of the Indianapolis 'Pulling Levers' Intervention." *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 5, 63-82.

Corsaro, N. & McGarrell, E. (Forthcoming) "Reducing Homicide Risk in Indianapolis between 1997 and 2000." *Journal of Urban Health*

McGarrell, E., Chermak, S., Weiss, A. & Wilson, J. (2001) "Reducing Firearms Violence through Directed Police Patrol." *Criminology and Public Policy* 1, 119-148.

McGarrell, E. (2001) *Restorative Justice Conferences as an Early Response to Young Offenders*. OJJDP Juvenile Justice Bulletin (NCJ 187769). Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

McGarrell, E., Chermak, S., Wilson, J. & Corsaro, N. (2006) "Reducing Homicide through a 'Lever-Pulling' Strategy." *Justice Quarterly* 23, 214-231.

McGarrell, E. & Hipple, N. (2007) "Family Group Conferencing and Re-offending Among First-Time Juvenile Offenders: The Indianapolis Experiment." *Justice Quarterly* 24, 221-246.

McGarrell, E., Hipple, N., Corsaro, N., Bynum, T., Perez, H., Zimmermann, C. & Garmo, M. (2009). *Project Safe Neighborhoods – A National Program to Reduce Gun Crime: Final Project Report*. Submitted to the National Institute of Justice. <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/226686.pdf>

McGarrell, E., Corsaro, N., Hipple, N. & Bynum, T. (Forthcoming) "Project Safe Neighborhoods and Violent Crime Trends in U.S. Cities: Assessing Violent Crime Impact." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*.

Sherman L. & Rogan, D. (1995) "The effects of gun seizures on gun violence: 'Hot spots' patrol in Kansas City." *Justice Quarterly* 12, 673-693.

Sherman, L. & Weisburd, D. (1995). "General deterrent effects of police patrol in crime 'hot spots': A randomized controlled trial." *Justice Quarterly*, 12, 625-648.

Making a Difference

By Cynthia McDougall

Last year I was extremely honoured to be invited to be a Fellow of the Academy of Experimental Criminology, and to join a body of academics whose research I have admired for many years. Although in the UK criminal justice system randomized controlled trials have experienced some opposition, I have been committed to this methodology for some years, inspired by the strong leadership of David Farrington, now supported in the UK by Larry Sherman and Friedrich Losel. I am pleased to say that, as a consequence of their work, rigorous research methods and outcome focused practice is becoming more and more recognised and introduced into UK government policy.

I read with interest a recent article in the AEC Newsletter by Joan Petersilia about her experience as an 'embedded criminologist' and Anthony Braga's subsequent essay on the importance of 'timing' in introducing experimental criminology into public policy evaluations (Vol. 4, Issue 1, 2009). I agree with both. My experience has been as a 'very embedded criminologist' being employed for some years as Head of Psychology for HM Prison and Probation Services' and more recently as a University academic providing consultancy to a practising probation area, County Durham, in the North East of England. Both sides of the fence provide their own difficulties and advantages. If I

am honest I think I had less influence on government policy while working within the organization as an employed civil servant, despite the high status of the role, than I now have as an academic consultant. The main reason for this is that I am working at a local level with managers and practitioners who have real and immediate problems to solve and are very receptive to solutions that can be provided by evidence-based research.

This feels much more meaningful than developing high level policies which may or may not be wholeheartedly adopted by practitioners. This is in accord with the comments by Petersilia and Braga that research must have policy relevance and must be introduced when the timing is appropriate. In the case of the local probation areas in the UK, they are being set an outcome target of reducing reoffending while at the same time being required to reduce costs. This is a time when effectiveness is all important so that resources can be directed towards the higher levels of risk and need using interventions based on research evidence of what will be most effective. What is equally important is a receptive Chief Executive who wants to know about research evidence and is prepared to rigorously evaluate the interventions being put into practice. Since preliminary evaluation in the County Durham probation area has shown that the evidence-based interventions positively impact on reoffending to a statistically significant degree, there is now increased interest being shown by government at a policy level. Outcome focus on reoffending, evidence-based interventions and rigorous evaluation is making a difference.

It is acknowledged that RCTs can be difficult to apply in the 'real world', and it is essential that organizational constraints are taken into account (cf Petersilia and Braga). I had initiated an independent investigation evaluating an evidence-based structured probation supervision program, 'Citizenship' in County Durham probation area, and the next stage was to introduce the program to two neighbouring probation areas. I encouraged both to evaluate program effectiveness in reducing reoffending using a randomized controlled trial methodology. One area (Area A) agreed with the proposal, whereas the other area (Area B) was concerned that it had heavy demands on its resources and concluded that it would be easier to introduce the program across the whole area simultaneously, so cutting down on training events and management of the implementation. Area B opted for a quasi-experimental model with a retrospective analysis. Area A was not without its problems: for example it was not prepared to wait up to 2 years before implementing the program to half of its offender population; and it could not accept randomization at an offender level, with probation officers or even probation teams managing some cases using Citizenship and others simultaneously managing in the traditional way.

Together with the investigation team (Pearson, Torgerson, Bowles and Kanaan), we set out to address all of the concerns of Area A, and as a consequence the

program was implemented and evaluated using a randomized 'stepped wedge' design, with individual probation offices adopting the new program sequentially at 2 monthly intervals across the area. The outcome was that Area A implemented the program without difficulty and on time, whereas in Area B implementation of the program across the entire area was difficult to manage, with some staff not engaging fully with the program and being unsure about when and how the program should be applied. As a consequence, at the mid-evaluation stage, Area B concluded that Citizenship was not sufficiently integrated within the area, and it had to re-launch the program, repeating the training and implementation steps already taken. It is not always recognised that the method of evaluation may impose a structure on the implementation which might actually be beneficial and improve the effectiveness of the program. The lesson from these evaluations is that RCTs may be difficult to implement, but if the constraints of the organization are taken into account, they can actually assist effective implementation, as was the case of Area A.

An encouraging postscript to this exercise was that recently a small team of probation practitioners who were introducing a new initiative asked for advice on implementing a randomized 'stepped wedge' design in order to evaluate its effectiveness. It can be considered a success when the value of rigorous evaluation becomes self-evident and is initiated by the practitioners themselves. This really feels like making a difference.

Cynthia McDougall is Professor in the Centre for Criminal Justice Economics and Psychology at the University of York. She is also a newly elected Fellow of the Academy of Experimental Criminology.

Sarah Bennett

2009 Academy of Experimental Criminology Young Scholar Award Winner

Last year I received the Academy of Experimental Criminology young scholar award. This was particularly thrilling because a) after turning 40, this may indeed be the last time I am ever referred to as a 'young' anything and b) because it was only a few years ago that I decided to change careers and enter the exciting and dynamic world of criminology.

In my previous work-life, I owned a couple retail businesses in Oregon. Business can be very interesting. There is an idea; there is a plan; there is hope that the idea and plan are right. What was missing from my business however, was an overarching feeling of purpose – that the work that I was conducting could/would make the world a better place. Cliché I know. When this feeling became persistent, I realized I needed change and decided to go 'back to school' and complete my masters in criminology. I was accepted to the University of Cambridge and by a tremendous stroke of luck was assigned Professor David Farrington as my supervisor. Apart from being simply an amazing social scientist, Professor Farrington is perhaps one of criminology's greatest experimental enthusiasts.

Luck would be on my side yet again when I finished my Master's degree, for it was at this point that Professor Lawrence Sherman and Dr Heather Strang were about to embark on the largest multi-site randomized controlled trial in the history of restorative justice. I became a research manager in London and it was here that my interest in experimental research became solidified and practically applied in the London based field trials involving offenders and victims of serious burglary and robbery matters.

All research is challenging but what I figured out very quickly was that experimental field trials involving criminal justice agencies are simply hard work, and for this kind of hard work, experience is everything. Professor Sherman and Dr Strang were phenomenal experimental mentors – extremely passionate about their work, they believed the devil was in the detail and could not stress enough the importance of treatment integrity.

The restorative justice conferences we observed in London were truly amazing. Both victims and offenders came face to face to talk through the criminal event that had brought them together. Metropolitan Police facilitators led the participants through a discussion of what had happened, how people were affected and what could be done to make amends. Each conference was emotionally powerful and it was very rare for a conference to end without someone in the room shedding a tear. My challenging role was to liaise with Crown Courts, prisons, probation and other agencies to work through the operational complexities of case

recruitment, case management and conferencing post guilty plea and pre-sentence. As the trial neared its end (and with only some gentle persuasion from Farrington, Sherman and Strang), I decided to pursue my PhD which focused on the criminal careers of the offenders who took part in the restorative justice research. In 2007, I finished my dissertation and moved to Queensland, Australia with my husband and first child...with our second child following shortly thereafter. Juggling career and family keeps life very interesting.

I am now a research fellow at the ARC Centre of Excellence in Policing and Security (CEPS) at The University of Queensland where I am yet again working with another dynamic criminologist – Professor Lorraine Mazerolle. We are currently running the first experimental field trial testing legitimacy and policing using a high volume and consistently delivered police-citizen encounter – random breath tests (RBTs). RBT operations are conducted throughout Australia and have two principal goals: To catch offending drink drivers and to present a general deterrent to drink driving as motorists either observe or participate in random breath testing. In Queensland alone, there are over 2 million RBTs conducted annually. The goal of our field trial is to enhance the existing RBT procedure by introducing procedural justice ingredients – citizen participation, dignity and respect, neutrality in decision making and trustworthy motives – to promote legitimacy as drivers participate in specifically assigned random breath testing operations. Survey responses from drivers given the usual RBT procedure are compared with drivers who receive the enhanced RBT procedure.

We are also developing a series of experimental field trials that will test an innovative police-led, multi-agency response to truants, prolific and priority offenders and at risk families. Using elements of procedural justice and restorative justice, a tailored plan will be developed in collaboration with the participant(s) and supported until its completion.

When I embarked on this path, I realized that 'making a difference' is a great concept but not that straightforward. To know whether or not that great idea/plan really helps rather than harms it is necessary to conduct thorough research. Experimental research is often challenging but can provide the best indication of the effectiveness of an idea/plan. I feel very fortunate to have worked with so many colleagues in these past few years who have taught me so much, and share a passion to make the world a better place...one experiment at a time.

Dr. Sarah Bennett is a Research Fellow in the Centre of Excellence in Policing and Security (CEPS) at the Institute for Social Science Research (ISSR), University of Queensland.

John MacDonald

2009 Academy of Experimental Criminology Young Scholar Award Winner

Over the past year I have been actively involved in a number of long-term projects involving quasi-experimental designs for assessing social policy effects on crime. Most recently, I have been actively involved in two grants I was awarded from the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CD) with Nancy Nicosia, Economist, RAND. These two projects rely on natural experiments involving changes in policies induced by legislation that furnish a longitudinal approach to identifying social policy effects on crime and criminal justice processing - assuming that the policy shifts that occurred are independent of pre-existing trends in our outcome measures.

The NIDA sponsored project is entitled, "The Role of Race/Ethnicity in Criminal Justice Adjudications," and involves examining race/ethnic disparities in criminal justice adjudications for drug offenses in California. California law mandates (commonly referred to as Proposition 36) that misdemeanor offenders without significant criminal histories are to be diverted to treatment programs in place of jail/prison sentences. Yet, the race/ethnic compositions of those admitted to treatment programs in California are vastly different from arrest and conviction rates. I anticipate the results from this project will be informative for understanding how criminal justice processing influences racial disparities in drug treatment referrals.

The CDC sponsored project entitled, "School Environment as a Mechanism to Reduce Youth Violence and Victimization," involves using the timing of school-based policy changes as natural experiments to generate exogenous variation in school environments and assess their effects on youth violence at multiple levels including state, districts, and schools. This approach is commonly used to estimate a causal impact on academic achievement, but has not been applied widely to youth violence outcomes.

These two projects build on my research agenda assessing the effects of social policy interventions on violent behaviors and racial disparities in the administration of criminal justice. While neither project involves an actual field experiment, they at least provide a real-world mechanism for assessing causal effects that are induced through policy changes.

John MacDonald is the Jerry Lee Assistant Professor of Criminology at the University of Pennsylvania.

Journal of Experimental Criminology

The **Journal of Experimental Criminology** is published four times a year in cooperation with the Academy of Experimental Criminology and Division of Experimental Criminology. A subscription to the Journal is included in the Division'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 George Mason University, 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*

Editorial Board Members:

Anthony Braga, *Harvard University, USA*
Howard Bloom, *MDRC, USA*
Robert Boruch, *University of Pennsylvania, USA*
Chester Britt, *Northeastern University, USA*
Shawn Bushway, *SUNY, Albany, 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*
Simcha Landau, *Hebrew University, Israel*
Mark Lipsey, *Vanderbilt University, USA*
Friedrich Loesel, *University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany*
Michael Maltz, *Ohio State University, USA*
David McDowall, *University at Albany, NY, USA*
Daniel Nagin, *Carnegie Mellon University, USA*
Anthony Petrosino, *Learning Innovations at West Ed, USA*
Alex Piquero, *Florida State University, USA*
Hannah Rothstein, *Baruch College, USA*
Lawrence Sherman, *University of Pennsylvania, USA*
Faye Taxman, *Virginia Commonwealth University, 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

<http://www.springer.com/social+sciences/criminology/journal/11292>

NEWS AROUND THE AEC / DEC

AEC / DEC ANNUAL MEETING

November 16-20, 2010

The Academy of Experimental Criminology and Division of Experimental Criminology annual meeting is held in conjunction with the American Society of Criminology meetings. This year, the ASC meetings are in San Francisco, California, from Wednesday 17th to Saturday 20th November. AEC / DEC events begin on Tuesday, November 16th.

AEC / DEC sessions are opened to all ASC participants. Indeed we view the session as an opportunity to showcase the AEC / DEC and encourage new people to join our Division. So ... please invite your friends and colleagues to come along to the events at the ASC this year.

The tentative schedule is as follows:

- ✦ **Tuesday, November 16**, 2PM – 5PM, DEC Workshop, followed by a reception from 5 PM – 6 PM.
- ✦ **Wednesday, November 17**, 1:30 PM AEC Meeting and McCord Lecture. 3:00 PM – 4:20 PM, DEC Meeting.
- ✦ **Thursday, November 18**, DEC Reception starts at 7:00 PM, the Hot Spots band will be playing from 8:00 PM - 11:00 PM, reception to start at 7:00 with the others.
- ✦ **Friday, November 19**, DEC Breakfast – AM TBD

Please stay tuned for final details on time and specific locations. We look forward to seeing you in San Francisco!

NEWS BRIEF

*Submitted by Read Hayes, Ph.D.,
Research Scientist, University of Florida.*

The 50 member Loss Prevention Research Council (including P&G, Bacardi, Home Depot, Macy's, CVS, Walmart, Kay Jewelers, Kroger, T.J. Maxx, Big Lots, Lowes, OfficeMax, Best Buy, and others) and the University of Florida Crime Prevention Research Team has just completed its fifth in-store randomized controlled field trial evaluating CCTV domes and public view monitors, protective merchandise display fixtures, employee procedures, and poly-carbonate protective boxes. Five more RCTs are in the detailed planning phase now.

The RCTs are part of a more comprehensive situational crime prevention R&D program including systematic onsite offender interviews, predictive modeling, shopper intercepts, video footage analyses, incident report compilation/analysis, and 16 Gainesville-area live "lab" retail stores for blue sky testing and adjustment.

DEC MENTORING PROJECT

The membership of DEC includes a number of experienced evaluators who have conducted randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and overcome problems in a variety of settings resulting in rigorous testing of promising programs or policies that have advanced the field. The collective wisdom of these individuals is an invaluable asset to researchers interested in launching their own rigorous evaluations.

In order to take advantage of the resources available within DEC, Peter Greenwood, Denise Gottfredson, Dennis Rosenbaum, Eileen Ahlin, and colleagues are working with DEC to establish a Mentoring Program to serve the needs of less experienced evaluators and help them achieve the degree of rigor in their research designs we all desire. The Mentoring Program will serve both as a means of recruiting young scholars to our Division within ASC (non-member, no mentor) and increasing the quality of evaluations.

The Mentoring Program will include:

- A roster of individual members along with their particular skills and experience in particular settings who are willing to serve as mentors.
- A standardized protocol for DEC members to request mentoring, which would include all of the factors required to match them with appropriate mentors.
- A process for reviewing requests, recruiting appropriate mentors, and tracking the outcome of the effort.
- A way of announcing or advertising the availability of this service.
- A way of recognizing and rewarding mentors.

Some of the specific issues that mentors might help evaluators deal with include:

- Feasibility assessments;
- Justifying an RCT;
- Design and treatment decisions;
- Implementation integrity;
- Implementation and process measurement;
- Impact measurement;
- Statistical techniques most appropriate to test hypotheses regarding program effects;
- Conclusions, interpretations, limitations; and
- General education.

Stay tuned for more information about how to become a mentor or mentee, and how to take advantage of additional resources (e.g., literature) available through the Mentoring Program!

UPCOMING CONFERENCES

◆ The 10th Annual Jerry Lee Crime Prevention

Symposium

Maryland, USA, April 19-20, 2010
George Mason University,
University of Maryland &
University of Pennsylvania

The symposium will feature the work of the Campbell Collaboration Crime and Justice Group. Presentations will focus on methodological issues of random assignment and meta-analysis. Research results on two key topics – problem oriented policing strategies for reducing crime and the effects of outpatient treatment for drug involved offenders – will be presented and followed by reactions from panels of leading practitioners and policymakers.

Website:

<http://gunston.gmu.edu/cebcp/JerryLee.html>

◆ Stockholm Criminology Symposium

Stockholm, Sweden, June 14-16, 2010
Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention &
Stockholm University

The purpose of the symposium is for international criminologists and practitioners to learn about the latest research findings of importance for crime policy and discuss strategies, methods, and measures to reduce crime and improve levels of safety in society. Includes the Stockholm Prize in Criminology, on June 16, at the Stockholm city Hall.

Website:

http://www.criminologyprize.com/extra/pod/?module_ins tance=2

◆ US National Institute of Justice Annual Conference

Arlington, VA, USA, June 14-16, 2010
US National Institute of Justice (NIJ)

The conference showcases developments in technology that increases public safety will be featured. The conference puts a heavy emphasis on the benefits to researchers and practitioners who work together to make effective evidence-based policies and practice what works, what doesn't work, and what the research shows as promising.

Website:

http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/events/nij_conference/welcome.htm

◆ 20th Annual ANZSOC Conference

Alice Springs, Australia, September 27-30, 2010
Australian & New Zealand Society of Criminology

The ANZSOC conference is the premier crime and criminal justice research forum in Australia. Themes include: evidence-based policy making, persistence and desistance, peace-building and security, regulation in theory and practice, interdisciplinarity and theory.

Website:

<http://www.anzsoc.org>

◆ 10th Annual Conference of the European Society of Criminology – Crime, Crime Prevention, and Communities in Europe

Liege, Belgium, September 8-11, 2010
European Society of Criminology (ESC)

The annual conferences of the Society provide an opportunity for the members to present papers on the results of their own research projects as well as learn about the research being done elsewhere in Europe. The conferences are also an occasion where the members can meet each other and discuss on mutual research interests; the meetings have already proved to be an important platform for new pan-European research initiatives.

Website:

<http://www.esc-eurocrim.org/conferences.shtml>

◆ 62nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology – Crime and Social Institutions

San Francisco, CA, USA, November 17-20, 2010
American Society of Criminology (ASC)

The American Society of Criminology is an international organization concerned with criminology, embracing scholarly, scientific, and professional knowledge concerning the etiology, prevention, control, and treatment of crime and delinquency. The themes discussed in the meeting are varied and include the measurement and detection of crime, legislation, the practice of criminal law, as well as a review of the law enforcement, judicial, and correctional systems

Website:

<http://www.asc41.com/annualmeeting.htm>