

June 2012

Volume 7, Issue 1

## IN THIS ISSUE

- 1 Editorial
- 2 Announcement  
DEC Constitutional Amendment
- 3 Announcement  
AEC/DEC Roles
- 4 Meet the Board
- 5 AEC/DEC at ASC 2012
- 10 2012 Award Winners
- 12 Feature Article  
Science in Policing
- 15 Membership Information
- 16 Journal of Experimental Criminology
- 17 Upcoming Events

THANK YOU to DEC's Organizational Members

### Gold

CEBCP, George Mason University

Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge

### Silver

ACE! George Mason University

Rutgers University School of Criminal Justice

Welcome to the latest edition of the AEC/DEC newsletter! I apologize that the publication of this newsletter is a little later than usual. It has been a busy and transitional year for the DEC, with the election of a new Executive Board and committee members. Read all about our new team members on Page 4.

Under our new leadership, DEC has continued to strengthen its membership base – as of the end of June we now have 167 active members in 2012, which equals our active membership count for 2011 and exceeds the total for 2010. **We encourage you all to help us reach 200 members by this November's ASC conference!** Please pass this newsletter along to interested colleagues, leave a print-out in the break room, or better yet bring your friends and colleagues to our exciting program of events and networking opportunities at ASC in Chicago. This newsletter showcases all the great presentations, events, and lectures we have in store for you – see our program of events on Page 5, and meet the 2012 award winners on Page 10. Membership of DEC brings many excellent benefits – for just \$35 (\$10 for students) you get access to the *Journal of Experimental Criminology* and mentoring, guidance and support in your research endeavors from a network of experienced experimenters. Prospective members can find out more on Page 15. We look forward to seeing you in Chicago!

Another new development is the introduction of three levels of organizational membership of the DEC. These organizational memberships help to sponsor the important work of the Division. Find out more about the benefits of organizational membership on Page 15. We are grateful to our Gold Members – the Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy at George Mason University and the Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge – and our Silver Members, the Center for Advancing Correctional Excellence! at George Mason University and Rutgers University School of Criminal Justice.

Also since the transition we now have an online presence! You can now find a wealth of information about AEC and DEC at our new website: <http://gemini.gmu.edu/cebcp/DEC.html>. We would love to hear from you if you have any comments or suggestions about the website.

The DEC's mission continues to focus on promoting and improving the use and development of experimental evidence and methods to advance criminological theory and evidence-based crime policy. On Page 12, DEC Chair David Weisburd describes the challenges of institutionalizing and implementing rigorous research evidence in police agencies, and explains how researchers can help change mindsets, practices, and policies.

**Charlotte Gill**  
Outreach Committee Chair

## Reminder: DEC Constitutional Amendment



If you are a DEC member in good standing, **we need your help!** Because the first DEC Executive Board all agreed to serve their full two-year term, the original text of the DEC Constitution that provides for staggered elections is obsolete. In order to hold elections in 2013 for a new board, the following two amendments must be implemented **before ASC 2012 in Chicago:**

1. Amendment to Section VI(A):

“The Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary/Treasurer and Executive Counselors will serve a two-year term. Elections of all Officers shall occur every two years.”

2. Amendment to Section VI(F):

“Vacancies which occur during the term of office for the Vice Chair, Secretary or Executive Counselor of the Division, shall be filled until the next election by appointment of the Chair, with the approval of the Executive Board. Vacancies may be filled at any time and shall be filled for the remainder of the term of office.

See the Constitution at: <http://gemini.gmu.edu/cebcp/DEC/DECConstitution.pdf>

According to the Constitution, we need two-thirds of the current membership’s vote – 107 people – to approve these changes. **Please cast your vote now!** Vote at: <http://tinyurl.com/7kfhlvf>

Thank you again for your assistance.

## Clarifying the Roles of the AEC and DEC

The **Division of Experimental Criminology (DEC)** is one of six divisions in the American Society of Criminology. The DEC seeks to promote and improve the use and development of experimental evidence and methods in the advancement of criminological theory and evidence-based crime policy. The DEC Awards Program recognizes outstanding achievements in experimental criminology.

The **Academy of Experimental Criminology (AEC)** was founded in 1998 to recognize criminologists who have successfully led randomized, controlled field experiments in criminology. The AEC recognizes outstanding achievements in experimental criminology through the election of Fellows and Honorary Fellows, and its Awards Program.

We wanted to bring your attention to a memorandum of understanding developed between the Academy of Experimental Criminology and the Division of Experimental Criminology of the ASC. We wanted to have a clear definition of collaboration with the Academy, and the memorandum of understanding describes that process. Please write to the DEC office at [expcrim@gmail.com](mailto:expcrim@gmail.com) if you have any questions or comments about the memorandum.

*This letter of understanding clarifies the relationship between the Academy of Experimental Criminology (AEC) and the Division of Experimental Criminology (DEC) of the American Society of Criminology. The AEC is an independent, self-governing and unincorporated organization. In recognition of the special relationship between the AEC Fellows and the DEC, and to facilitate the joint efforts of the two organizations to advance experimental criminology, the AEC and DEC agree to the following:*

- 1. The AEC Awards, including the AEC Fellows status, and Honorary Fellow status, the Young Scholar Award and the Joan McCord Award will be chosen by the Awards Committee of the DEC.*
- 2. The DEC agrees that the President of the AEC will serve as a voting member of the DEC Awards Committee from the date of this agreement.*
- 3. The AEC Young Scholar Award will become the Outstanding Young Experimental Criminologist Award.*
- 4. The DEC will take on the obligation of producing plaques for all of the AEC Awards.*

## Meet the Board

In November 2011 Division of Experimental Criminology members elected a new Executive Board at the DEC business meeting, held at the American Society of Criminology conference in Washington, D.C. The Executive Board, convened by the Division Chair, forms policies for the Division, provides advice, decides the budget and approves chairs for the DEC committees, which include Awards, Outreach, and Mentoring.



**Chair** | [David Weisburd](#) *George Mason University/Hebrew University Jerusalem*

David Weisburd is Distinguished Professor of Criminology, Law and Society at George Mason University and Walter E. Meyer Professor of Law and Criminal Justice at the Hebrew University Law School in Jerusalem. He is the 2010 recipient of the Stockholm Prize in Criminology and has conducted extensive experimental and evaluation work on policing interventions. He is a fellow of the ASC and Academy of Experimental Criminology, and editor of the *Journal of Experimental Criminology*.



**Vice Chair** | [Lynette Feder](#) *Portland State University*

Lynette Feder is Professor in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Portland State University and a fellow of the Academy of Experimental Criminology. She has conducted evaluations of a wide range of criminal justice interventions with police, courts, corrections and social service agencies. Her focus is on conducting experiments that assess effectiveness and theoretical mechanisms and aid in the development of policy, particularly in the area of intimate partner violence and batterer intervention.



**Secretary-Treasurer** | [Cynthia Lum](#) *George Mason University*

Cynthia Lum is Associate Professor of Criminology, Law and Society at George Mason University and Deputy Director of the Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy. She has conducted evaluations of the effectiveness of policing and security interventions and technology. Her main focus is on translating evidence into practice, including the development of the Evidence-Based Policing Matrix, which helps police practitioners to institutionalize and use evaluation evidence.



**Executive Counselor** | [Anthony Braga](#) *Rutgers University/Harvard University*

Anthony Braga is Professor of Criminal Justice at Rutgers University and Senior Research Fellow in the Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management at Harvard University. He is President and a fellow of the Academy of Experimental Criminology. He has conducted extensive research on controlling gang and gun violence, and crime at hot spots, including the implementation of Operation Ceasefire. He has also advised Commissioner Davis of Boston Police Department and a number of government agencies.



**Executive Counselor** | [Geoffrey Barnes](#) *University of Pennsylvania*

Geoffrey Barnes is Research Assistant Professor of Criminology at the University of Pennsylvania and a fellow of the Academy of Experimental Criminology. He has extensive experience of working on randomized controlled trials on responses to criminal behavior, including cognitive-behavioral therapy for high-risk probationers and restorative justice programs in Australia and the United Kingdom. His interests also include forecasting serious offending through the analysis of complex data systems.



**Executive Counselor** | [Elizabeth Groff](#) *Temple University*

Elizabeth Groff is Associate Professor of Criminal Justice at Temple University and a fellow of the Academy of Experimental Criminology. Her research focuses on crime and place, including simulation modeling, and law enforcement technology. With colleagues at Temple, she recently conducted an experimental evaluation of the Philadelphia foot patrol program and is currently working with Philadelphia Police Department to evaluate different policing strategies.



## AEC/DEC @ ASC – Chicago 2012

Join us at the American Society of Criminology conference in Chicago this November for an exciting program of experimental criminology workshops, special events, and panels.

***All current and prospective members are welcome!***

---

### **SPECIAL EVENTS**

---

#### **Tuesday, November 13**

Division of Experimental Criminology Workshop

1:00 – 5:00pm (Room TBC)

#### **Practical Solutions for Administering Multi-Site Randomized Trials**

John Roman & Shelli Rossman (Urban Institute)

In this workshop, we will provide practical guidance for a range of issues that arise during the operations of a randomized trial across multiple sites. This includes lessons from past multi-site projects, the logistics of assignment, the logistics of managing multiple demonstration sites, managing qualitative and quantitative research tasks, tracking subjects and minimizing attrition, statistical analysis and ethics.

\$25 per attendee

***...and much more! →→→***

## Wednesday, November 14

### **The Joan McCord Award Lecture and the Academy of Experimental Criminology Awards Ceremony**

2:00 – 3:20pm

The Academy of Experimental Criminology will honor the 2012 Joan McCord Award Recipient, Professor Mark Lipsey. The Joan McCord Award recognizes an individual who reflects Joan's spirit and legacy as a "skeptical thinker," interested in the way history enlightens current issues in criminal justice. Her work was characterized by her multi-disciplinary approach to research, her advocacy of experimental designs, and her commitment to longitudinal follow-up. After this special event, new Fellows will be inducted into the Academy and the Young Experimental Scholar Award will be presented.

### **The Division of Experimental Criminology Meet and Greet and Awards Ceremony**

3:30 – 4:50pm

Welcome DEC members and prospective members! Come meet other criminologists conducting experiments and join us for refreshments and good fellowship. We will also celebrate the winners of the Division's awards – the Jerry Lee Lifetime Achievement Award, Award for Outstanding Experimental Field Trial, and the Student Paper Award. Join us for refreshments, and stay for the announcement of the winner of the 2013 Stockholm Prize in Criminology!

### **Celebrating the Recipient of the 2013 Stockholm Prize in Criminology**

3:30 – 4:50pm

Please join us in celebrating the recipient of the 2013 Stockholm Prize in Criminology. The Stockholm Prize is the highest international prize in the field of criminology, and has been established under the aegis of the Swedish Ministry of Justice. The prize is awarded for outstanding achievements in criminological research or for the application of research results by practitioners for the reduction of crime and advancement of human rights. We invite all members of the ASC to join us for this important event.

***All Wednesday events will take place in the same location (Room TBC)***

***\*\*\* Read more about our Award Winners on page 10! \*\*\****

## EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY PANELS AT ASC

### EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY I

#### Effects of Restorative Justice Conferencing Ten Years On

(Chair: Heather Strang, *Cambridge University*)

A 15-year program of rigorous research on the effects of restorative justice conferences (RJC) has yielded consistent findings on benefits for most victims and offenders willing to participate in these meetings. These benefits have usually been measured in terms of immediate victim impact and on reoffending behaviour over two years post-intervention. Participants in the Reintegrative Shaming Experiments (RISE) that were conducted between 1995 and 2000 have now been interviewed again ten years after their cases were randomly assigned either to court in the usual way or diverted to RJC. Effects on both victims and offenders have proven to be long-lasting and this panel will discuss important differences that have emerged in the long-term consequences of court and RJC.

#### Victims of property and violent crime: Effects of restorative justice ten years on

Heather Strang, *Cambridge University*

#### Restorative justice and procedural justice: Attitudes of drinking drivers ten years on

Geoffrey Barnes, *University of Pennsylvania*

#### Fatal consequences: Risk of death among violent offenders randomly assigned to restorative justice or to court

Lawrence Sherman, *Cambridge University & University of Maryland*

### EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY II

#### Alternative Methods to Overcome Challenges in Randomized Controlled Experiments

(Chair: KiDeuk Kim, *Urban Institute*)

These papers discuss alternative methods to overcome challenges in implementing randomized controlled experiments. Two papers discuss the use of regression discontinuity techniques, while the third examines respondent-driven sampling approaches.

#### Can matching and similar adjustments achieve the experimental benchmark?

KiDeuk Kim, *Urban Institute*

#### Regression discontinuity as a tool for criminal justice practitioners

Sarah Jalbert & William Rhodes, *Abt Associates*

#### Respondent-driven sampling in criminal justice randomized controlled trials

Alese Wooditch, Amy Murphy, & Faye Taxman, *George Mason University*

### **EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY III**

#### **Evaluating Police Legitimacy and Procedural Justice**

(Chair: Lorraine Mazerolle, *University of Queensland*)

These three papers explore evaluations of police legitimacy and procedural justice, combining a systematic review on police-led interventions designed to improve police legitimacy, a randomized field trial of procedural justice, and lessons learned from an experiment regarding minority youth perceptions of procedural justice.

#### **Legitimacy in policing: A systematic review and meta-analysis**

Lorraine Mazerolle, Sarah Bennett, & Jacqueline Davis, *University of Queensland*

#### **Shaping citizen perceptions of police legitimacy: A randomized field trial of procedural justice**

Emma Antrobus, Lorraine Mazerolle, & Sarah Bennett, *University of Queensland*

#### **Improving perceptions of police in youth and ethnic minorities: Findings from a randomized field trial of procedural justice-based policing**

Kristina Murphy, Lorraine Mazerolle, Sarah Bennett, & Emma Antrobus, *University of Queensland*

### **EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY IV**

#### **Using Experimentation to More Deeply Explore Criminal Justice Issues within Interventions**

(Chair: Sue-Ming Yang, *National Chung Cheng University*)

This panel brings together four papers which use experimentation to delve into specific intervention concerns in criminal justice evaluation research.

#### **Examining disorder perception: A look at what's inside of the black box**

Sue-Ming Yang, *National Chung Cheng University*

#### **Implementing randomized field trials in an administrative context: Tales from the field**

Eileen Ahlin, *Westat*

#### **Housing an IPV preventive intervention within a nurse-home visitation program: Overcoming obstacles in conducting field experiments**

Lynette Feder, *Portland State University* & Jacqueline Campbell, *University of Maryland*

#### **Evaluating the effectiveness of gender responsive delinquency intervention programming**

Jacob Day, Lisa Tichavsky, & Margaret A. Zahn, *North Carolina State University*

**EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY V****The Sociology of Knowledge Generation – the People and Agencies Behind Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Research in Policing**

(Chair: Cynthia Lum, *George Mason University*)

An important part of generating evaluation research in policing is translating and disseminating it for practice. This not only involves receptivity to research in police agencies, but relationships between researchers and practitioners. This panel discusses the sociology of this knowledge generation, looking behind the studies included in the Lum-Koper-Telep Evidence-Based Policing Matrix to see the relationships underpinning experimental policing research on crime control outcomes.

**Who generates police evaluation research? A description of agencies**

Breanne Cave, Julie Grieco, Lauren Revier & Cody Telep, *George Mason University*

**Repeat players and rigorous police evaluation research**

Julie Grieco, *George Mason University*

**The receptivity of police to research**

Cody Telep, Cynthia Lum & Christopher Koper, *George Mason University*

**EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY VI****An Experimental Evaluation of Supervision Strategies for High Risk Probationers in Philadelphia**

(Chair: Geoffrey Barnes, *University of Pennsylvania*)

These papers will report on an experimental evaluation of supervision strategies for high risk probationers in Philadelphia.

**The effect of cognitive behavioral therapy on the recidivism of high risk offenders**

Ellen Kurtz, *Philadelphia Adult Probation and Parole Department* & Geoffrey Barnes, *University of Pennsylvania*

**Estimating the actual treatment effects of cognitive behavioral therapy**

Jordan Hyatt & Geoffrey Barnes, *University of Pennsylvania*

**Implementing an experimental evaluation in the community corrections environment**

Amanda Tudor, *Philadelphia Adult Probation and Parole Department* & Jordan Hyatt, *University of Pennsylvania*

... **Dates, times and locations to be confirmed** ...

See <http://asc41.com/annualmeeting.htm> for program updates

## Spotlight on our 2012 Award Winners

The AEC/DEC Awards Committee announced the 2012 Award Winners to our members on June 2<sup>nd</sup>. **Congratulations to all of the winners!** Please join us as we celebrate our award winners during our special program of events at ASC in November.

### ***DIVISION OF EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY AWARDS***

#### **Jerry Lee Lifetime Achievement Award**

*Friedrich Lösel Cambridge University/University of Erlangen-Nuremberg*

Friedrich Lösel is Director of the Institute of Criminology at the University of Cambridge and Professor of Psychology at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany. He has carried out research on a range of topics including juvenile delinquency, corrections, personality disorder, and school bullying. His current work includes the Erlangen-Nuremberg Development and Prevention Study, a combined longitudinal and experimental study of 600 children and their families from preschool age that has been running for 10 years. Professor Lösel has published over 300 journal articles and book chapters and 18 books, has held numerous service and advisory positions, and various honors including the Stockholm Prize in Criminology, the European Association of Psychology and Law's Award for Lifetime Achievement, and the Sellin-Glueck Award of the American Society of Criminology.



#### **Award for Outstanding Experimental Field Trial**

*Karen Amendola and colleagues Police Foundation*

Most law enforcement agencies have traditionally deployed officers based on a 40-hour work week of five consecutive 8-hour shifts followed by 2 days off. Recently, an increasing number of agencies have compressed the work week into 4 10-hour or 3 12-hour shifts. This randomized controlled trial, funded by the National Institute of Justice, compared outcomes including fatigue, quality of life, job performance, and impact on overtime for officers assigned to 8-, 10-, and 12-hour shifts. The study found officers assigned to 10-hour shifts got more sleep than those on 8-hour shifts, while those on 12-hour shifts were more sleepy and less alert at work. Officers on 10-hour shifts also reported higher quality of work life and reduced overtime, indicating cost savings for police agencies.

Read more at: <http://www.nij.gov/topics/law-enforcement/officer-safety/stress-fatigue/shift-work.htm>



#### **Student Paper Award**

*Cody Telep George Mason University | How much time should the police spend at crime hot spots? Answers from a police agency directed randomized field trial in Sacramento, California [with Renee Mitchell and David Weisburd]*

This paper reports on the findings of an experiment that tested Koper's (1995) recommendation that police officers randomly rotate between hot spots, spending about 15 minutes in each. The experiment revealed significant declines in incidents and calls for service in the treatment areas compared to controls and also presents a model for low-cost, agency-led field trials. Cody Telep is a doctoral candidate and graduate research assistant in the Center for Evidence-Based Policy, George Mason University.

## ACADEMY OF EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY AWARDS

### Joan McCord Award | Mark Lipsey *Vanderbilt University*



Mark Lipsey is Research Professor in the Department of Human and Organizational Development and Director of the Peabody Research Institute at Vanderbilt University. He is an expert in public policy, program evaluation, field research methodology, and research synthesis. The focus of his recent research is risk and intervention for juvenile delinquency and substance use. He is the recipient of numerous honors, including Vanderbilt University's Earl Sutherland Award for achievement in research, the Campbell Collaboration's Mosteller Award for Distinctive Contributions to Systematic Reviews, and the American Evaluation Association's Paul Lazarsfeld Award.

### Fellow | Jens Ludwig *University of Chicago*

Jens Ludwig is McCormick Foundation Professor of Social Service Administration, Law, and Public Policy and director of the University of Chicago Crime Lab. He is a senior fellow in economic studies at the Brookings Institution and research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER). His research focuses on social policy in the areas of urban poverty, education, crime, and housing policy and includes the HUD-funded *Moving to Opportunity* and numerous studies of gun violence, including an evaluation of the Brady Act and a study of Chicago's underground gun markets. In 2006 he received APPAM's David N. Kershaw Prize for Distinguished Contributions to Public Policy.



### Fellow | Philip Cook *Duke University*



Philip Cook is ITT/Sanford Professor of Public Policy and Professor of Economics and Sociology at Duke University. He is co-director of the NBER Work Group on the economics of crime, and a member of the National Academy of Sciences, with which he has served in several roles. His research has focused on truancy prevention, preventing alcohol-related problems through restricting alcohol availability, and with Jens Ludwig has authored books on the costs, consequences, and control of firearm availability.

### Fellow | Bruce Taylor *NORC, University of Chicago*

Bruce Taylor is Principal Research Scientist with the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago, where he conducts research on substance abuse, mental health, and criminal justice. He has extensive experience in applied research, field experiments, and program evaluation. His work includes a study of the effectiveness of a dating violence prevention program in schools, police officer safety, license plate recognition for reducing auto theft, and the integration of crime analysis into police patrol work. He was formerly Research Director at the Police Executive Research Forum.



### Honorary Fellow | James 'Chips' Stewart *CNA Corporation*



James 'Chips' Stewart is Senior Fellow for Law Enforcement at the CNA Corporation. He served as the Director of the National Institute of Justice from 1982 to 1990 and is a retired Chief of Detectives of Oakland (CA) Police Department. He is a national expert on police operations and has extensive experience in leading research studies and technical assistance programs.

### Young Experimental Scholar Award | Charlotte Gill *George Mason University*

Charlotte Gill is Senior Research Associate in the Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy at George Mason University and received her Ph.D. from the University of Pennsylvania in 2010. She has been involved in conducting several randomized controlled trials, including a study of low-intensity probation supervision in Philadelphia and experiments in restorative justice with the Metropolitan and Thames Valley police services in the UK. She is also managing editor of the Campbell Crime and Justice Group.



## Feature Article

# Science in Policing

*This article is based on remarks given by David Weisburd at the National Institute of Justice conference on June 18, 2012 and **Police science: Towards a new paradigm** (David Weisburd and Peter Neyroud, National Institute of Justice/Harvard University Executive Session on Policing and Public Safety, 2011).*

Read the full article at <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/228922.pdf>

In our paper, Peter Neyroud and I wanted to lay out in clearer terms what was necessary for police agencies to play a key part in the evidence based policy movement. Whatever one's view of the idea of evidence based policy, there is a clear movement in government to the idea that practices and policies must be based on rigorous scientific evidence. This is a key reality for police, as budgets are cut and federal and local funders require "evidence" that the programs and practices of the police are cost efficient and effective. Indeed, in the present world of government funding, agencies that cannot make a clear case for the utility of their practices find themselves arguing with futility for support in a competitive public marketplace. The police, in our view, must find their way to integrate into this larger movement in government.

We think that movement is overall a good one, though a blind adherence to narrow ideas of evidence and science, like blind adherence to any set of ideas, is not likely to fit well to the complex realities of our world. We titled our article *Police Science* because we wanted to emphasize two key ideas:

1. Science was something that the police should integrate more into their world. It is key to the evidence based policy movement. And we think there is no reason why police should not take a leadership role in advancing scientific methods. Indeed, innovative police managers have become leaders in evidence based science already in criminal justice.
2. We also wanted to emphasize that the police should take "ownership" of science. Science should not be something imposed on the police, it should be something that they embrace and take control of.

### The Problem

While police have become a locus for innovation in criminal justice, police agencies generally still pay little attention to evidence in the development of practices and policies. I have just sat on a review committee for innovative police programs for a US government agency. What struck me most was that in developing innovative practices most agencies seem to ignore the evidence base that exists. This is true in the training and promotion practices of police as well. For example, in promotion procedures in most police agencies, police need to know the law, but they do not need to know what science has taught us about police practices and policies.

There is a growing knowledge base on what works in policing and under what conditions. And there is a growing evidence of the importance of the scientific method as reflected in, for example,

problem oriented policing. But police generally don't see science in policing as their problem. They often fail to conduct the descriptive and analytic work necessary to understand and develop solutions to problems, and they often do not see the importance of using more sophisticated social science methods for evaluation of such programs. Certainly many police agencies fail to recognize the importance of experimentation in drawing conclusions about the effectiveness of programs.

Most police agencies do not see science as critical to their everyday operations, at best it is a luxury that can be useful but also can be done without. This can be contrasted with other public services like medicine and education, which have come to view science as a much more central component of their work. An important part of policing is the police craft, the clinical experience that is gained from generation to generation and passed down from officer to officer. This craft is critical to policing, but it is also the case that broader scientific evidence on policing should be an integral part of the police toolbox. Just as I would rather go to a doctor with experience, I want my police to learn the craft of policing from doing. But just as I would want my doctor to have knowledge of scientific evidence about what works in what situations, I would want the same from police agents.

In our paper, we emphasize that the lack of ownership of science by the police has not only hampered the development of evidence based policies and practices, but it has also impacted directly on police science. Medical research in the US has a budget of \$30 billion a year; dental research almost \$400 million; and education research about \$200 million. In contrast, the National Institute of Justice has a budget of about \$50 million, of which only a

part is spent on policing research. We think that the failure of the police to take ownership and advocate scientific research is one of the reasons why justice has fared so poorly.

But it would wrong to place the onus solely on the police. The universities have certainly stayed in their ivory towers far from the realities and problems of policing. Though there is a growing cadre of police scholars concerned with real world problems in policing, such problems have had little salience among the main stream of criminologists and others concerned with policing. Police scholars need to make the scene of policing as much as police need to take ownership of police science.

*“The universities will have to make the scene of policing if police science is to advance...”*

### The Solution

How can the police move science to a central place in the policing industry? What is required for policing to become an evidence-based profession? Our answer to these questions is surprisingly simple, though we suspect it will nevertheless be challenging for both police practitioners and academic policing researchers.

For police science to succeed it must move from the outside to the Center of policing. Basic scientific research describing and analyzing police problems, and police technologies, and evaluating police programs and practices must become a natural and organic part of the police mission. The knowledge base of policing must become a natural part of police education, and police

education must be based more upon what we know about police management and practices and policies, than simple wrote laws and rules about policing. The police will have to take science seriously. They will have to advocate for funding for police science on Capitol Hill, and not just funding for the hiring of police officers and police equipment. We think that police agencies should also devote parts of their budget for police science, not only in the development of analysis and training, but also in assessments of routine programs and practices. This is the police obligation.

But scientists must also play their part. Academic researchers must seek to answers questions that are critical to the police function, and they must address problems that are at the core of policing. The universities will have to make the scene of policing if police science is to advance in the world of policing.

For police science to succeed in government, and to be seen as critical to policing in the long run, it is going to have to be recognized as serious science. Today, scientific work in policing does not have a very elite status in criminology, and it has also been criticized strongly in relationship to technologies such as DNA testing and digital fingerprinting. Ironically, university academics often think that making the scene of policing will water down their scientific integrity. But areas like medicine are the proof that just the opposite is true. By making the scene of policing, academic police research is likely to get more respect and be taken more seriously by the police, by government, and within the universities.

The federal government will also have to invest more in policing. How can we expect science to provide any knowledge on the vast array of problems and possible solutions that police are confronted with, with a budget of

just a few million dollars a year devoted toward program development, tools for description and analysis, and evaluation? We think that an agency devoted toward developing the science of policing is critical, or at least that a clear large scale investment be made through existing federal agencies.

## Conclusion

We argue in our essay for the importance of the adoption of the norms of evidence-based policy in policing and of the police taking ownership of police science. Such ownership would facilitate the wide scale implementation of evidence-based practices and policies in policing, and would change the fundamental relationship between research and practice. It would also fundamentally change the realities of police science in the universities. We believe that such a change would also increase the quality and prestige of police science. It is time to redefine the relationship between policing and science. We think that bringing the universities into police centers, having researchers make the scene of policing, and having the police take ownership of police science will improve policing and ensure its survival in a competitive world of provision of public services. These processes have already begun in policing. The task is to invigorate this movement in the coming decades.

**David Weisburd**

*Chair*

*Division of Experimental Criminology*



## Membership Information

Thank you for your interest in the Division of Experimental Criminology (DEC) at the American Society of Criminology (ASC). We appreciate your support and participation in advancing experimental research and evidence-based practices in our field. We invite you and your organization to join the DEC through the American Society of Criminology. DEC membership fees and contributions support our many activities throughout the year, including workshops, awards, newsletters, and ASC activities.

The DEC accepts both INDIVIDUAL and ORGANIZATIONAL memberships, with yearly dues as follows:

INDIVIDUAL membership	\$35*
STUDENT INDIVIDUAL membership	\$10
GOLD ORGANIZATIONAL membership	\$1,000
SILVER ORGANIZATIONAL membership	\$500
BRONZE ORGANIZATIONAL membership	\$250

Individual memberships provide a yearly subscription to the *Journal of Experimental Criminology* and the DEC newsletters. Student membership dues include free on-line access to the same journal. Individual memberships for the DEC are on the same form as used for ASC membership (**note**: You must be an ASC member to apply to DEC). The online membership form can be found at <http://www.asc41.com/appform1.html>.

(\*Life memberships are available to life members of ASC).

Organizational memberships provide centers, departments, institutes, non-profits, universities, and other entities with one yearly subscription to the *Journal of Experimental Criminology* and newsletters as well as two registrations for our annual workshop at ASC. Additionally, organizational logos will be displayed on newsletters and websites for silver and gold members. To apply for organizational membership, please contact the DEC Secretary Treasurer, Cynthia Lum, directly at [clum@gmu.edu](mailto:clum@gmu.edu) (703-993-3421). An invoice for the membership dues will be generated specifically to your organization for the level of sponsorship indicated.

*Thank you so much for your continued support of experiments!*

**DEC on the web**

<http://gemini.gmu.edu/cebcp/DEC.html>

## Journal of Experimental Criminology

The **Journal of Experimental Criminology (JEC)** is published four times a year in cooperation with the Academy of Experimental Criminology and Division of Experimental Criminology. A subscription to the JEC is included in the Division's membership dues. The JEC 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. **View the contents of the current issue at:** <http://www.springerlink.com/content/v05vvkj15u3h/>.

### Editor-in-Chief

David Weisburd, Hebrew University, Israel; and George Mason University, USA

### Managing Editor

Gali Aviv, Hebrew University, Israel

### Associate Editors

Mimi Ajzenstadt, Hebrew University, Israel

Lorraine Mazerolle, University of Queensland, Australia

David B. Wilson, George Mason University, USA

### Editorial Board

Richard Berk, University of Pennsylvania, USA

Howard Bloom, MDRC, USA

Robert Boruch, University of Pennsylvania, USA

Anthony Braga, Rutgers University and Harvard University, USA

Chester Britt, Northeastern University, USA

Gerben Bruinsma, NSCR & Leiden University, The Netherlands

Shawn Bushway, SUNY, Albany, USA

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 Zürich, Switzerland

Simcha Landau, Hebrew University, Israel

Mark Lipsey, Vanderbilt University, USA

Friedrich Lösel, 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, University of Texas at Dallas, USA

Hannah Rothstein, Baruch College, USA

Lawrence Sherman, University of Cambridge, UK and University of Maryland, USA

Faye Taxman, George Mason 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:**

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

## Upcoming Events

### **CEBCP Annual Symposium 2012**

August 13-14, 2012

Fairfax, Virginia, USA

Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy (CEBCP), George Mason University

Theme: "Translating Research into Practice"

Website: <http://gemini.gmu.edu/cebcp/CEBCPSymposium.html>

### **12<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the European Society of Criminology**

September 12-15, 2012

Bilbao, Spain

European Society of Criminology (ESC)

Theme: "Criminology in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: A Necessary Balance between Freedom and Security"

Website: <http://eurocrim2012.com>

### **68<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology**

November 14-17, 2012

Chicago, Illinois, USA

Theme: "Thinking About Context: Challenges for Crime and Justice"

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

### **25<sup>th</sup> Annual Australia and New Zealand Society of Criminology Conference**

November 27-29, 2012

Auckland, New Zealand

Australia and New Zealand Society of Criminology (ANZSOC)

Theme: "Public Criminologies: Crime, Power, and Marginalisation"

Website: <http://www.anzsoc2012.org>