

THE EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGIST

THE EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGIST



2014 Organizational members

Gold:

- Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge
- Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy, George Mason University

Silver:

- Institute for Social Science Research, University of Queensland
- Department of Criminal Justice, Temple University

Contents

- 2 DEC Membership Information
- 3 Awards and Accolades
- 3 LUM TITLE
- 4 A Trip Down Memory Lane for an Experimental Criminologist
- 5 Our Role As Experimental Criminologists
- 6 Surprised, honored, and grateful for good mentors and colleagues in experimental criminology
- 6 Mapping good places for bad behavior
- 7 Death and Experimental Criminology
- 7 Boundary Adherence during Place-Based Policing Evaluations
- 8 DEC Sessions of Interest, ASC Annual Meeting

Welcome to the first issue of *The Experimental Criminologist* for 2014!

In this issue we recognize the contributions made by this year's winners of awards from the DEC and AEC, as well as look towards an exciting annual meeting in San Francisco.

We are excited to present original articles from the recipients of DEC awards and the newly elected AEC fellows. Anthony Braga, winner of AEC's Joan McCord award, and Cynthia Lum, newly elected AEC fellow, reflect upon the strong mentors and collaborations that have contributed to their successes. David Weisburd takes us on a trip down memory lane as the recipient of the Jerry Lee Lifetime Achievement Award. James Alexander, our second incoming AEC fellow, discusses the role that we, as experimental criminologists, should take on in developing juvenile justice interventions. Finally, Lawrence Sherman and Heather Harris, winners of the Award for Outstanding Experimental Field Trial, Joel Caplan, winner of the Outstanding Young Experimental Criminologist Award, and Evan Sorg, Student Paper Award recipient, discuss their outstanding research.

The DEC website has also grown up over the last year or so. Located at <http://exprim.org/>, the site has a wealth of information, including a fledgling "Teaching Corner." In this section you can browse syllabi and lesson plans for lessons and courses on experiments, evaluation research or any other topic of interest. We would welcome your contributions to the Corner, as well as information on recent publications and recent, notable achievements by members for the website. You will also find links to the articles from this issue of the newsletter, our constitution and other essential information.

The weeks before the American Society of Criminology annual meeting are always great time to renew your ASC membership for 2015—or to join for the first time. We hope you'll renew your DEC membership at the same time, or join us as a new member! You can find everything you need to know about membership within these pages or on our website.

On behalf of the DEC and AEC boards, we are looking forward to seeing you all in San Francisco. Please join us for the DEC Awards Ceremony and Luncheon at 12:30 in the Club Room on Wednesday, November 19th. The Joan McCord Award Lecture and AEC Awards Ceremony will begin, in the same room, at 2:00. Both events promise to be exciting and informative; we hope you can attend.


Jordan Hyatt
Editor



Division of Experimental Criminology
American Society of Criminology
1314 Kinnear Road, Suite 212
Columbus, OH 43212

To:

office
postage
here

DEC

Division of Experimental
Criminology

American Society of
Criminology

Chair
LORRAINE MAZEROLLE

Vice-Chair
CYNTHIA LUM

Secretary Treasurer
CHARLOTTE GILL

Executive Counselors
CHRISTOPHER KOPER
AKIVA LIBERMAN
SUSAN TURNER

Send membership forms to:

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF
CRIMINOLOGY
c/o Division of
Experimental Criminology
1314 Kinnear Road, Suite 212
Columbus, OH 43212

expkrim@gmail.com



DIVISION OF EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY

2015 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— <i>REDUCED!</i>	\$20*
STUDENT INDIVIDUAL membership— <i>REDUCED!</i>	\$5
GOLD ORGANIZATIONAL membership	\$1,000
SILVER ORGANIZATIONAL membership	\$500
BRONZE ORGANIZATIONAL membership	\$250

Individual memberships provide a yearly electronic subscription to the *Journal of Experimental Criminology* and the DEC newsletters. You may opt in to receive a paper copy of the Journal. Individual memberships for the DEC are on the same form (page 2) 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, Charlotte Gill, directly at expkrim@gmail.com. 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://expkrim.org>

AEC Awards:

Joan McCord Award

Anthony Braga

Rutgers University

Outstanding Young Experimental
Criminologist Award

Joel Caplan

Rutgers University

New Fellows

James Alexander

FFT

Cynthia Lum

George Mason University

DEC Awards:

Jerry Lee Lifetime Achievement Award

David Weisburd

Hebrew University/George Mason University

Award for Outstanding Experimental Field Trial

Milwaukee Domestic violence experiment follow-up

Lawrence Sherman

Universities of Cambridge and Maryland

Heather Harris

UC Berkeley

Student Paper Award

Boundary Adherence during Place-Based

Policing Evaluations: A Research Note

Evan Sorg

Temple University

Accolades for DEC and AEC Members

Joan Petersilia received the Stockholm Prize in Criminology on June 10 at Stockholm's beautiful City Hall. Joan was recognized along with **Dan Nagin** this year.

This year, **David Farrington** was awarded the ASC's Vollmer Award, and **David Weisburd** was awarded the Sutherland Award. Both will be presented with their awards at the ASC conference in San Francisco.

FOLLOW DEC ON THE WEB AND SOCIAL MEDIA

Visit DEC at <http://expkrim.org>, "Like" our page at <https://www.facebook.com/expkrim> and follow us @DivExpCrim. Please send us news items, photos, event information, and ideas for new content. We also welcome your contributions to this newsletter—please email them to Charlotte Gill at expkrim@gmail.com before the 15th of each month.

Research is a Social Interaction

Cynthia Lum, George Mason University



In 2005, Sue-Ming Yang and I wrote a piece for the Journal of Experimental Criminology in which we discussed why crime and justice researchers choose to conduct experimental evaluations. One of our findings was that informal training and mentorship, as well as collegiality, teamwork, and experience working with others mattered as much as formal education

in terms of methodological decision making. This certainly has been my experience over the years. When I started graduate school, I had very little knowledge of experimental research or criminal justice evaluation, nor was my career choice the academe. Had it not been for Larry Sherman and David Weisburd, as well as an early exposure to working on the Maryland Report, the Jerry Lee Crime Prevention Symposia, and Campbell reviews, no amount of formal training would have likely placed me on my current path. Their mentorship sparked my interest in how research is used and translated into practice and policy. These experiences also helped me develop an optimistic outlook on the potential for criminal justice institutions to deliver both effective and fair interventions to victims, offenders, and communities when bolstered by strong science.

Building the Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy with David Weisburd solidified these interests. The CEBCP helped to connect me to colleagues with whom to learn and collaborate, and also pushed me to write about evaluation research in the context of the broader research-to-practice movement. The CEBCP's mission, its faculty and graduate students challenge me to think about how knowledge can be generated, exchanged, translated, and disseminated to improve not only criminal justice but also our discipline. For example, work with Christopher Koper and Cody Telep ultimately led to the Evidence-Based Policing Matrix and the Matrix Demonstration Projects. Chris's expertise and meticulous evaluation skills sharpened my approach, and we went on to combine our efforts on evaluating license plate recognition technology and further expand our study of technology with James Willis, Linda Merola and Julie Hibdon. Work done with Charlotte Gill, Devon Johnson, Rik Legault and Linda Merola helped us push the envelope on thinking about how national security interventions might be evaluated in terms of both effectiveness and fairness.

Further, international collaborations with those at the Institute of Criminology at Cambridge, the Campbell Collaboration, and the Scottish Institute of Policing Research have greatly influenced my thinking and scholarship. And then there are those who have kept me accountable to my practitioner side, carefully reminding me of the consequences of evaluation and the importance of keeping findings relevant for the police. Folks like John Kapinos, Renee Mitchell, Jeff Egge, Jamie Roush, Jim Bueermann, Jim Burch, Laurie Robinson, Carl Maupin, Hassan Aden, and so many others have continued my education with their sage advice and input.

Although as academics we might think otherwise—given the individual nature of the promotion and tenure process—research and scholarship is ultimately a social interaction, one that requires high-quality mentors, smart and kind colleagues, generous sharing of ideas and opportunities, and critique and challenge by trusted contrarians. My work in evaluation, translational criminology, and evidence-based crime policy is simply a reflection of being part of such an environment. Sure there are a couple of bad apples out there. But I have become keenly aware of my extraordinary luck in finding many more of the good—mentors, colleagues and friends that have taught me so many important lessons, reaffirming what Sue-Ming and I found in our research years ago.

A Trip Down Memory Lane for an Experimental Criminologist

David Weisburd, George Mason University & Hebrew University



When I began my work in experimental criminology, it wasn't really a major concern among criminologists. Indeed, in my graduate training at Yale experimental work in criminology was hardly mentioned. My main work then was based on observational data as was that of most criminologists at the time. Indeed, it is interesting to me that I have been termed a "randomista" in recent years¹, when I continue to do a good deal of work relying on statistical modeling to control for confounding causes. In fact, my approach to experiments and other methods goes back to one of my mentors at Yale, Albert J. Reiss Jr. Al thought it was ridiculous for people to think of themselves as experimental or non-experimental, quantitative or qualitative, as if that defined an intellectual position. Methods are simply that. They are tools to use in understanding social phenomena.

I was very interested in statistics early on in my career, and that was the impetus for becoming involved in experimental studies. Larry Sherman and I worked together in the late 1980s on the hot spots policing approach and wanted to challenge the prevailing position of scholars at the time that the police could not prevent crime. It was clear that we needed to use a method for our study that would provide a convincing causal inference. Simply stated, whether you were interested in statistical modeling or not, experiments can provide that convincing causal statement and we decided that the evaluation of hot spots policing had to be experimental. This meant for me that I had to brush up a good deal on experimental methods.

One advantage of being interested in the statistics is that it forces you to integrate statistics and methods in your approach to experiments. This turned out to be important in the Minneapolis Hot Spots Patrol study. A statistician recommended that we use a matched pairs—or fully blocked randomized design. Given very good theory about causality in hot spots policing, and very good data to match sites, that approach would have yielded the most powerful approach to the data. However, theory in this area was not very strong and the data were limited. This led me to develop a partially blocked randomized design approach, which has been used in a number of studies and has been a recent focus of my research as well². If we had used the fully blocked randomized experiment approach we would have lost many degrees of freedom in our analysis without a corresponding benefit in terms of equivalence in the data. This reinforces to me the reason why experimental researchers should really understand the details of the statistical approach they are using.

“One advantage of being interested in the statistics is that it forces you to integrate statistics and methods in your approach to experiments.”

At the time of the Minneapolis study, Larry and I also conducted a review of randomized experiments. I wrote a paper from that review³ that led to what Larry was to call “Weisburd’s paradox.”⁴ The paradox was that increasing the sample size of studies did not necessarily lead to the benefit expected. The rule is that larger samples provide more power, at least in theory. But in practice larger studies did not have higher power than smaller ones in that review. The review also brought to bear just how few randomized experiments had been done. I began at that time to see the importance not only of doing experiments but also of making the case for experiments in crime and justice.

The most important result of that concern was the development of the Journal of Experimental Criminology. When I began to develop the idea of the journal more than ten years ago, many people argued that it could not be a success. Some raised the issue of whether there were enough experimental articles in criminology to justify a new journal in this area. Others noted that the growth of new journals, combined with the large number of existing journals, made it too crowded a field for a reasonable likelihood of success. With support from the Campbell Crime and Justice Group and Springer Verlaag, we went ahead. Now after a decade, the journal was ranked 10 of 52 in the ISI, ahead of such long standing journals as the British Journal of Criminology, Criminal Justice and Behavior, and the Journal of Quantitative Criminology. Now with the journal and the establishment of the Division of Experimental Criminology, experimental criminology is becoming a key area in criminology.

Receiving the Jerry Lee Award for Life Time Achievements in Experimental Criminology, I am most proud of what I, and others, have done to make experimental criminology an important area of criminology. The landscape has changed much in the last thirty years. But I wouldn't want to end this short essay without mentioning my students who have been critical in this advancement. Lorraine Mazerolle (now division Chair, and last year's Joan McCord recipient), Anthony Braga (this year's Joan McCord recipient) and Antony Petrosino were an early generation of my students that have made key contributions to this area. There is also a younger generation of students including Barak Ariel, Elizabeth Groff, Josh Hinkle, Cynthia Lum, Nancy Morris, Justin Ready, SueMing Yang, Cody Telep, and Laura Wycoff, and who have also begun to make key contributions.

1. Sampson, Robert J. (2010). Gold Standard Myths: Observations on the Experimental Turn in Quantitative Criminology, *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 25: 489-500.
2. Weisburd, David and Charlotte Gill. (2014). Block Randomized Trials at Places: Rethinking the Limitations of Small N Experiments. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 30:97-112.
3. Weisburd, David. (1993). Design Sensitivity in Criminal Justice Experiments. In Michael Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and Justice*, 17 (pp. 337-380). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
4. Sherman, Lawrence. (2007) The power few: experimental criminology and the reduction of harm. *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 3:299-321.

Our Role As Experimental Criminologists

James F Alexander, University of Utah and Functional Family Therapy



Can Experimental Criminology help us determine how we can facilitate the greatest benefits with the lowest costs to Juveniles? That is but one of myriad questions and issues we might address, but for me and FFT (Functional Family Therapy) cost/benefit considerations have been a driving force in over four decades of our work. And for me, the answer is “yes.”

Why Experimental Criminology? Through the lens of rigor we can better understand “what works,” providing a counterpoint to some of the promotional and even distortive claims we sometimes hear in the field. Since the late 1960's, when I (JFA) worked as a B.A. level Social Worker in the Watts and San Pedro areas of L.A. County, I've both appreciated and been appalled by the various strategies used, both in the US and Internationally, to deal with juveniles who were highly at-risk or who already were offending. What has emerged during these four decades of research and experience as an interventionist are several major principles.

Principle 1. Outcomes are primary! Some professionals and agencies working with high-risk adolescents (“difficult-to-treat,” juvenile offenders) have seemed to accept the “nothing works” philosophy. The result has been a shift away from “what are our outcomes” to more agency-focused questions such as “are we following our guidelines,” “is turnover among staff a problem,” “shouldn't we get raises based on longevity/ seniority rather than client outcomes?”

Despite such forces, I, FFT and some other models (e.g., MST, BSFT, MDFT, MTF) and many voices in the CDC, NIJ, CSPV, and elsewhere have continued to insist that improving outcomes as our raison d'être. Team uniforms and good PR certainly help, but in the end The World Series, Bowl Games, and I would argue the health of Juvenile Justice as a field depends mostly on outcomes.

Principle 2. Working with the living unit (usually family in the case of juveniles) produces better outcomes than asking troubled youth to undertake the change journey on their own. If during or after intervention juveniles are to continue to live in their “family” unit, it makes no sense (in terms of outcomes as well as costs) to work only with the youth. Unfortunately when I first entered the field what seemed to prevail was indeed a focus on working primarily with the youth individually in an office. Some youth even were sent away to other locations for long periods of time. When interventionists did meet with parent(s), they often told parent(s) what they should do to support positive youth functioning, but juvenile justice systems rarely had resources to actually work with the parents to facilitate what they had been told they must do. Parents in turn often were unmotivated or unable to comply with suggestions or directives they had been given. As a result by the 1990's juvenile offending rates were high and increasing, detention (jail, prison, and residential facilities) costs were skyrocketing, and institutions such the CDC were identifying juvenile crime as an “epidemic.”

Luckily, during the past decades we have achieved considerably better outcomes by:

Principle 3. Understanding change as a relational process. As interventionists (P.O.'s, Counselors, Social Workers, Case Managers, Therapists) all of us recognize that outcomes are better when we have

a positive relationship with the juvenile and family. We also recognize that positive change requires time, but almost paradoxically change must begin quickly or youth & families drop out, lose hope, and revert to previous maladaptive patterns. Funding also suffers.

As a result we noted that what was needed was an intervention, in our case FFT (Functional Family Therapy), that was designed to first (and quickly!) create positive relational motivation with all the major family members, then use that enhanced motivation to initiate quickly positive and specific behavior changes. Those changes also needed to target the specific risk factors operating in the family. Finally, changes had to “fit” the family. In our field “one size does not fit all.”

Thus a necessary first step in the 1970's was to determine what behavior patterns actually characterized adaptive (i.e., “normal”, not “ideal”) families from maladaptive families. We researched and learned from real families who were functioning well and crime free even if they were struggling, single parent-headed, and poor. They became our role models, not the sanitized and idealized (and usually white) families often found in textbooks and on TV!

4. Monitoring with feedback is critical, both for juveniles and their families but also for us, the interventionists. Youth on probation are monitored, often at a quite “micro” level:

“Did he show up on time?”
“Did she get tested and follow up with her ...?”
“Did the Mom arrange for ___ to get to school?”

In turn, outcomes as well as morale improved when we also monitored ourselves, the interventionists, tracking processes such as:

- What did the Interventionist do/not do to establish a collaborative working relationship?
- Did he (Interventionist) present expectations and tasks with a structure and language system that matched the family?
- Did she (P.O) deal with the family in respectful ways or with an air of condemnation?

Stated bluntly, it seemed that what interventionists (P.O.'s, etc) did was important, but how they did it was equally important.

In conclusion: We must put our money where our mouth is. While we must be able to “talk the talk,” we also must “walk the walk” in ways associated with positive outcomes. We know that many theories, opinions, personal preferences, and agency practices exist in our field. As Experimental Criminologists it is our job to provide rigorous data and carefully articulated intervention programs in order to deal effectively and efficiently with the very challenging situations we face.

Success doesn't derive only from knowing what to do (i.e., “common factors” or “core elements”); success also requires we understand the timing and delivery of technical elements. We must understand the diverse ways to with, i.e., “match,” youth and their families depending on such dynamics as their age(s), our age, their race/ethnicity, our race/ethnicity, everyone's gender. Experience does not alone insure positive outcomes. So instead we must insist on accountability for ourselves as well as for our clients; accountability to empirically established policies and procedures.

Surprised, honored, and grateful for good mentors and colleagues in experimental criminology

Anthony Braga, Rutgers University and Harvard Kennedy School



It is a great honor to be selected as the 2014 recipient of the Academy of Experimental Criminology's Joan McCord Award. Indeed, Professor McCord was a lifetime inspiration to us all and her Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study is one of the classic experimental studies of all time. In this brief essay, I will summarize some of my work in the area of evidence-based crime policy that is being recognized by this prestigious award. However, before I discuss my work, I would like to acknowledge that my crime policy work has been influenced greatly by caring mentors such as David Weisburd, excellent colleagues such as Lorraine Mazerolle and David Kennedy, and enthusiastic graduate students such as David Hureau. I am indebted to their (and others) ongoing support of my career.

Much of my academic work has been focused on evaluating the impacts of police prevention strategies on recurring crime problems. I have strived to form effective and long-lasting research partnerships with criminal justice, social service, and community-based agencies. Indeed, strong working relationships with practitioners are necessary to implement and successfully complete rigorous evaluation research in field settings.

I have completed a series of influential studies examining whether police can be more effective in controlling crime by focusing their limited resources on the small number of specific places that generate the bulk of crime in cities. With colleagues, I led two randomized controlled trials that tested the impact of problem-oriented policing on crime hot spots and subsequently completed a Campbell Collaboration systematic review of the effects of hot spots policing in crime. The randomized controlled trials have become two of the most frequently cited policing experiments in criminology and the Campbell review greatly informed the conclusions of the National Academies of Sciences panel reviewing police practices and policies.

Another body of work has examined ways to reduce ongoing conflicts among gangs and other types of criminally-active groups that generate large shares of serious violence in cities. With colleagues, I was involved in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the seminal Operation Ceasefire focused deterrence gang violence reduction strategy in Boston. I subsequently completed a Campbell Collaboration systematic review of focused deterrence strategies that revealed these programs were indeed associated with large reductions in targeted violence crime problems. The findings of these studies have framed key components of several U.S. Department of Justice-sponsored nationwide violence reduction initiatives such as Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) and Strategic Alternative to Community Safety Initiative (SACSI).

Many thanks to the Academy of Experimental Criminology for recognizing this body of work

Mapping good places for bad behavior

Joel Caplan, Rutgers University



Geographic information system (GIS) technologies and the concepts of spaces and places are key elements of my current research projects. I learned early in my career that GIS is as much about "thinking spatially" as it is about "technical procedures," and that thinking from the micro-level, or "worm's eye" point of view, was particularly useful for dealing with complex spatial relationships. Risk terrain modeling (RTM) is one prominent example of my successes in this regard.

Upon my arrival at Rutgers University in 2008, I was eager to study crime from a spatial perspective, and to do so in methodologically sound ways that were grounded in established criminological theories. In relatively short order, I teamed with Leslie Kennedy to focus on the spatial nature of criminogenic risk. We developed RTM as a way to simultaneously analyze disparate sources of data and integrate multiple insights gained from many decades of published empirical research.

RTM utilizes GIS to identify and describe vulnerable places for crime by diagnosing the common environmental correlates of criminal behavior patterns. The spatial influences of these factors are operationalized to the landscape and then modeled to show how they co-locate to create unique behavior settings for crime. With a diagnosis of the attractors of criminal behavior, we can make very accurate forecasts of crime incidence without a sole reliance on its past occurrence. Risk terrain maps "paint a picture" to show where conditions are suitable for crime events to occur in the future.

Examining places rather than people for crime analysis does not remove the importance of the human factor. It simply shifts the focus away from personal characteristics to personal preferences. How individual persons select and use the environments that they occupy, and the impact that this has on crime outcomes, becomes the direct focus of the spatial risk perspective with RTM. RTM suggests a way of looking at behavioral outcomes as a function of a dynamic interaction among people that occurs at places. The attributes that RTM seeks to identify of places are not constant nor necessarily are the interactions set in place over time. However, the ways in which these factors combine can be studied to reveal consistent patterns of interaction. RTM, thereby, offers a statistically valid way to articulate and communicate criminogenic and vulnerable areas at the micro-level.

With the growing utilization of intelligence-led operations in the public safety and security sectors, risk assessments for crime and other hazards are especially important for tactical actions, resource allocations, and short- and long-term planning. Since 2009 I have been applying RTM to advance research in these areas. Products from this research have been published in leading refereed journals and presented at professional conferences and events of The White House, the National Institute of Justice, and the Department of Homeland Security, to name a few. I enthusiastically look forward to continuing innovative research that is uniquely relevant to the contemporary study and practice of experimental criminology.

Death and Experimental Criminology

Lawrence Shermanⁱ, Cambridge University and University of Maryland, and Heather Harrisⁱⁱ, University of Maryland



"Space: the final frontier" was the tag line for Star Trek. Perhaps the tag line for experimental criminology should be "Death: the Ultimate Outcome." Tightly controlled randomized experiments, followed up for a long enough time, can reveal surprising and compelling inferences about causes of death. That is what we discovered in our 23-year follow-up of the 1987-88 Milwaukee Domestic Violence Experiment (MilDVE), which randomly assigned 1200 cases of alleged misdemeanor domestic assault to arrest versus warnings with 98% treatment as assigned. In two separate articles in the *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, we examined the treatment effects on mortality for both suspects and victims. What we found was not predicted by any prevailing theory of arrest effects.

For victimsⁱⁱⁱ, we found that arrest had no value in preventing later homicide. Out of 1133 unique victims, only three were subsequently murdered, with zero difference in rates by treatment group. But there was a clear and stunning difference in death rates from all causes: victims whose partners had been arrested were 64% more likely to have died than those whose partners had been warned. These deaths were almost entirely among the 70% of victims who were African-American, in which group arrest of the suspect doubled the victims' death rates overall. For employed victims, the death rate was even higher.

For suspects^{iv}, the overall death rate was no higher for those randomly assigned to arrest, but the homicide death rate was almost three times higher ($p = .096$). The kind of subsequent homicide—not by partners but usually by friends or acquaintances—was suggested by police case summaries, typically describing arguments that provoked the murder.

Both of these findings were "serendipitous," and hence outside the hypothetico-deductive framework of medical or public health research. But they both illustrate the enormous potential for following up any experiment in which individuals are randomized into different treatments. Science has many examples in which causation is demonstrated before explanation fits the facts. The contribution of experiments in challenging prevailing theories may thus be even stronger when the outcome measure is the incontrovertible evidence of a difference in death rates.

Boundary Adherence during Place-Based Policing Evaluations

Evan Sorg, Temple University



"Boundary adherence during place-based policing evaluations: a research note," used geographic data gathered during the Philadelphia Foot Patrol Experiment to examine the extent to which police officers patrolled outside of their assigned foot beats during the experiment. This research highlights the importance of monitoring police activities during hot spots policing experiments. Although the possibility of spatial crime displacement—the prospect that crime or criminals will just "move around the corner"—is a common criticism of place-based policing interventions, evidence suggests that this is not an inevitable outcome. Rather, a diffusion of crime control benefits—crime reductions extending beyond targeted sites—is more commonly documented. However, some have suggested that a diffusion of crime control benefits may reflect a misspecification of target area boundaries. In other words, researchers may have mislabeled a direct benefit of receiving a dosage of policing as a diffusion of benefits because all of the area that police worked in was not captured. This research note explored this assertion head on and found that there may be some merit to this concern. During the Philadelphia Foot Patrol Experiment, officers reported patrolling, on average, 0.13 square miles outside of their assigned target areas. The areas that were actually patrolled overlapped all of the catchment locations used to measure displacement and 30 percent of the control locations. Officers noted several reasons for leaving their beats, including boredom, the desire to address displaced crime and the need to generate activity, such as arrests and pedestrian stops, which became difficult to do within their beats over time because they acted as a crime deterrent. The article concludes that greater care must be given to considering officer boundary compliance during experimental evaluations, and that the extent of boundary noncompliance must be documented and reported in the future. The article also has important implications for the design of hot spots experiments and how police effectiveness is gauged. This note was published in volume 51, issue three of the *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*.

i. Distinguished University Professor, University of Maryland; Director, Cambridge University Institute of Criminology; Chief Executive of the Cambridge Centre for Evidence-Based Policing (www.cambridge-cbp.net).

ii. Ph.D. Candidate, Criminology & Criminal Justice, University of Maryland; Junior Fellow, Cambridge Centre for Evidence-Based Policing.

iii. Sherman, L. W., & Harris, H. M. (2014). Increased death rates of domestic violence victims from arresting vs. warning suspects in the Milwaukee Domestic Violence Experiment (MilDVE). *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1-20. (free access online at <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11292-014-9203-x/fulltext.html>)

iv. Sherman, L. W., & Harris, H. M. (2013). Increased homicide victimization of suspects arrested for domestic assault: A 23-year follow-up of the Milwaukee Domestic Violence Experiment (MilDVE). *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 9(4), 491-514.

DEC Sessions of Interest, ASC Annual Meeting

Title	Time	Day	Room	Event Type
Necessity is the Mother of Invention: Applying Innovative Thinking to Research Conducted in Real-World Settings	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Wednesday	Sierra A, 5th Floor	Panel session
Issues in the Use of Experimental Research Methods	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Wednesday	Salon 12, B2 Level	Panel session
Evaluating the Effectiveness of Police Body Worn Cameras	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Wednesday	Sierra J, 5th Floor	Individual paper
Implementation of an Enhanced Probation Program: Evaluating the Process and Outcomes	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Wednesday	Salon 4, B2 Level	Individual paper
New York State's Adolescent Diversion Program is Effective for High-Risk Young Adults	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Wednesday	Nob Hill B, Lower B2 Level	Individual paper
Systematic Review of Empathy and Offending: A 10-Year Update	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Wednesday	Salon 11, B2 Level	Individual paper
Exploring the Intersections of Innovation, Implementation, Research and Practice: The Office of Justice Programs' Role in Translating Criminological Research	9:30 AM-10:50 AM	Wednesday	Salon 15, B2 Level	Panel session
Policing Hot Spots	9:30 AM-10:50 AM	Wednesday	Salon 11, B2 Level	Panel session
Evaluation of Judicially Led Responses to Eliminate School Pathways to the Juvenile Justice System	11:00 AM-12:20 PM	Wednesday	Salon 2, B2 Level	Individual paper
An Experimental Study of the Influence of Impression Management on Self-reported Precautionary Behaviors between Genders	11:00 AM-12:20 PM	Wednesday	Foothill J, 2nd Floor	Individual paper
Collaborative Approaches to Problem-Solving and Crime Prevention	11:00 AM-12:20 PM	Wednesday	Salon 5, B2 Level	Panel session
The Effectiveness of College-based Dating Violence Bystander Intervention	12:30 PM-1:50 PM	Wednesday	Salon 5, B2 Level	Individual paper
An Education Disrupted: Juvenile Delinquency and Schooling	12:30 PM-1:50 PM	Wednesday	Salon 2, B2 Level	Panel session
Division of Experimental Criminology Lunch and Awards Ceremony	12:30 PM-1:50 PM	Wednesday	Club Room, 2nd Floor	Special event
The Joan McCord Award Lecture and the Academy of Experimental Criminology Awards Ceremony	2:00 PM-3:20 PM	Wednesday	Club Room, 2nd Floor	Special event
Blueprints for Gang Prevention: A Randomized Controlled Trial	2:00 PM-3:20 PM	Wednesday	Salon B, B2 Level	Individual paper
Improving Outcomes in Correctional Populations	2:00 PM-3:20 PM	Wednesday	Foothill D, 2nd Floor	Panel session
The Hot Bus Stops Patrol Experiment: London 2014	2:00 PM-3:20 PM	Wednesday	Salon 12, B2 Level	Individual paper
The Role of Needle Exchange Programs in Crime Reduction	2:00 PM-3:20 PM	Wednesday	Sierra F, 5th Floor	Individual paper
Doing Systematic Reviews in Crime Prevention	2:00 PM-3:20 PM	Wednesday	Salon 5, B2 Level	Panel session
Beyond Violence: Results from a Multi-Stage Research Process	3:30 PM-4:50 PM	Wednesday	Salon 14, B2 Level	Individual paper
Re-examining the Soft Drink-Behavior Problem Relationship	3:30 PM-4:50 PM	Wednesday	Sierra I, 5th Floor	Individual paper
Is Something Better Than Nothing? The Effect of Forcing Inmates Onto Short Terms of Parole Supervision	3:30 PM-4:50 PM	Wednesday	Salon 1, B2 Level	Individual paper
Engaging the Family in Treatment	3:30 PM-4:50 PM	Wednesday	Pacific B, 4th Floor	Panel session
Malnutrition Effects on Crime and Delinquency: A Meta-Analysis of the Quasi-Experimental and Randomized Controlled Trials Progressing from Correlation Through Causation	3:30 PM-4:50 PM	Wednesday	Sierra I, 5th Floor	Individual paper
Eyewitness Identification Procedures: Theory, Reform, Effects, and Findings from a Randomized Field Experiment	5:00 PM-6:20 PM	Wednesday	Salon 2, B2 Level	Panel session
An Experimental Test of Four Methods of Showing Photo Spreads to Witnesses During Robbery Investigations	5:00 PM-6:20 PM	Wednesday	Salon 2, B2 Level	Individual paper
The Effects of Post-Release Supervision on Recidivism: A Matched Survival Analysis Approach	5:00 PM-6:20 PM	Wednesday	Foothill D, 2nd Floor	Individual paper
The Role of Practitioner-Driven Science	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Thursday	Sierra J, 5th Floor	Panel session
Evaluating Educational Outcomes after Serving with Electric Monitoring	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Thursday	Nob Hill A, Lower B2 Level	Individual paper
A Reevaluation of the Hydraulic Relation Hypothesis	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Thursday	Sierra F, 5th Floor	Individual paper
The Effects of Online Reader Comments on Crime News	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Thursday	Foothill H, 2nd Floor	Individual paper
Does Medication-Assisted Treatment for Opiate Addiction Work to Reduce Recidivism: A Meta-Analysis	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Thursday	Sierra J, 5th Floor	Individual paper
Adopting and Sustaining Evidence Based Practices in Corrections	9:30 AM-10:50 AM	Thursday	Salon 6, B2 Level	Panel session
Getting Beyond the "Evidence:" What Research Evidence Clearinghouses Provide-And What They Don't	9:30 AM-10:50 AM	Thursday	Pacific J, 4th Floor	Panel session
NIDA's Criminal Justice Drug Abuse Treatment Studies (CJDATS): Findings and Lessons Learned from Implementation Research	9:30 AM-10:50 AM	Thursday	Sierra F, 5th Floor	Panel session
Testing Victim Satisfaction in Out-of-court Disposals Compared to Court Prosecution: A Randomized Controlled Trial	9:30 AM-10:50 AM	Thursday	Pacific B, 4th Floor	Individual paper
Those who Discourage Crime? Two Experiments on the Influence of Guardians	9:30 AM-10:50 AM	Thursday	Salon 4, B2 Level	Individual paper
Social Learning and Theft: An Experimental Test of the Causal Mechanisms	9:30 AM-10:50 AM	Thursday	Salon 1, B2 Level	Individual paper
The Effects of Mandatory Crisis Intervention Training on Police Use of Force	9:30 AM-10:50 AM	Thursday	Salon 5, B2 Level	Individual paper
Evidence-Based Crime Policy I	9:30 AM-10:50 AM	Thursday	Sierra H, 5th Floor	Panel session
Increased Mortality of Domestic Violence Victims after Partner Arrests	11:00 AM-12:20 PM	Thursday	Salon 12, B2 Level	Individual paper
Implicit Social Cognitive Processes Underlying Criminal and Victim Identities: Data from Laboratory Experiments and Field Studies	11:00 AM-12:20 PM	Thursday	Foothill D, 2nd Floor	Panel session
Cops and Cameras: Organizational Characteristics and Controversial Policy Implementation	11:00 AM-12:20 PM	Thursday	Salon 5, B2 Level	Individual paper
Evidence-Based Crime Policy II	11:00 AM-12:20 PM	Thursday	Sierra H, 5th Floor	Panel session
Policing Schools: Strategies to Reduce Crime and Increase Perceptions of Safety in Primary and Secondary Schools	11:00 AM-12:20 PM	Thursday	Pacific B, 4th Floor	Individual paper
Policy Panel: The Impacts of California's Historical Prison Downsizing	12:30 PM-1:50 PM	Thursday	Salon 13, B2 Level	Panel session
The Girls Circle: An Evaluation of Gender-Specific Programming	12:30 PM-1:50 PM	Thursday	Salon 1, B2 Level	Individual paper

DEC Sessions of Interest, ASC Annual Meeting

Title	Time	Day	Room	Event Type
The Interaction of False Facts and Memory Conformity on the Reliability of Eyewitness Accounts	12:30 PM-1:50 PM	Thursday	Sierra E, 5th Floor	Individual paper
Evidence-Based Crime Policy IV	12:30 PM-1:50 PM	Thursday	Sierra H, 5th Floor	Panel session
Incarceration, Reentry and Recidivism	2:00 PM-3:20 PM	Thursday	Sierra J, 5th Floor	Panel session
Rapid HIV Testing for Individuals on Probation/Parole	2:00 PM-3:20 PM	Thursday	Salon 14, B2 Level	Individual paper
School-Based Crime Prevention: Strategies for Youth Development	2:00 PM-3:20 PM	Thursday	Salon 1, B2 Level	Panel session
Evidence-Based Crime Policy III	2:00 PM-3:20 PM	Thursday	Sierra H, 5th Floor	Panel session
Evaluating Advocacy-based Mentoring Models to Prevent and Reduce Delinquency	3:30 PM-4:50 PM	Thursday	Salon 11, B2 Level	Panel session
Connections Between Restorative Justice and Reduced Offender Mortality	3:30 PM-4:50 PM	Thursday	Pacific E, 4th Floor	Individual paper
Monetary Benefits and Costs of an Improved Street Lighting Program, Based on Crime Reduction	3:30 PM-4:50 PM	Thursday	Salon 2, B2 Level	Individual paper
Restorative Justice: An International Journal Annual Lecture	5:00 PM-6:20 PM	Thursday	Salon 8, B2 Level	Panel session
Perceptions of Police Legitimacy in the Context of Truancy: Results from a Randomized Field Trial	5:00 PM-6:20 PM	Thursday	Pacific I, 4th Floor	Individual paper
How Race Colors Our Love for Guns: Race and Support for Gun Laws	5:00 PM-6:20 PM	Thursday	Pacific C, 4th Floor	Individual paper
Randomized Controlled Field Trials in Policing: An Organizational Learning Perspective	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Friday	Sierra E, 5th Floor	Individual paper
Intimate Partner Violence Measurement: New Self-Report Measures That Do Not Produce Gender Symmetry	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Friday	Salon A, B2 Level	Individual paper
The Use of Enhanced Contextual Priming in the NCVS to Facilitate Retrieval of Victimization Events	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Friday	Sierra A, 5th Floor	Individual paper
DNA Evidence: The Lapperson's Application	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Friday	Salon 14, B2 Level	Individual paper
Abandoned Buildings, Land Reutilization and the Impact on Neighborhood Disorder, Police Calls for Service, and Perceptions of Fear	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Friday	Pacific E, 4th Floor	Individual paper
Evaluating Impact, Monitoring Performance, and Analyzing Costs in a New Generation of Juvenile Drug Courts	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Friday	Pacific G, 4th Floor	Panel session
Evaluating COP Effectiveness: Differences in Crime Measures and Methodology	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Friday	Sierra J, 5th Floor	Individual paper
Innovation and Reform in Justice Programs and Policy	9:30 AM-10:50 AM	Friday	Foothill J, 2nd Floor	Panel session
Reducing Gun Violence through Smart Policing	9:30 AM-10:50 AM	Friday	Pacific H, 4th Floor	Panel session
What Can 105,000 Incarcerated Offenders Tell Us about the Effects of Participation in Correctional Programs?	9:30 AM-10:50 AM	Friday	Salon 10, B2 Level	Panel session
Breaking the Near Repeat Pattern for Residential Burglary	9:30 AM-10:50 AM	Friday	Salon 4, B2 Level	Individual paper
Disrupting Illegal Gun Transfers	9:30 AM-10:50 AM	Friday	Foothill D, 2nd Floor	Individual paper
Triangulation of Proof and the Confusing Case of CCTV Effectiveness	9:30 AM-10:50 AM	Friday	Salon 4, B2 Level	Individual paper
Punishment Alternatives: Civil Citations and Juvenile Delinquency in Florida	9:30 AM-10:50 AM	Friday	Pacific F, 4th Floor	Individual paper
Has Science Taken Hold in Criminal Justice?	11:00 AM-12:20 PM	Friday	Foothill G1, 2nd Floor	Panel session
Police and Procedural Justice	11:00 AM-12:20 PM	Friday	Nob Hill B, Lower B2 Level	Panel session
Swift and Certain En-Masse: Evidence from Washington State	11:00 AM-12:20 PM	Friday	Salon 6, B2 Level	Individual paper
Police Use of Cameras	12:30 PM-1:50 PM	Friday	Foothill G2, 2nd Floor	Panel session
Police Complaints: Issues and Challenges	12:30 PM-1:50 PM	Friday	Nob Hill B, Lower B2 Level	Panel session
Hotspots of Police Legitimacy	12:30 PM-1:50 PM	Friday	Salon 4, B2 Level	Individual paper
Imprisonment and Reoffending	12:30 PM-1:50 PM	Friday	Salon B, B2 Level	Panel session
Evaluation of the Allegheny County (PA) Jail Collaborative Reentry Program	12:30 PM-1:50 PM	Friday	Sierra J, 5th Floor	Individual paper
Evidence-Based Violence Prevention and Juvenile Justice Reform	2:00 PM-3:20 PM	Friday	Foothill G2, 2nd Floor	Panel session
Evidence-Based Violence Prevention and Juvenile Justice Reform	2:00 PM-3:20 PM	Friday	Foothill G2, 2nd Floor	Panel session
Increasing the Impact of Research Evidence on Crime Prevention Policy: Lessons from Studies of Policymaking	2:00 PM-3:20 PM	Friday	Salon 5, B2 Level	Individual paper
Update on the HOPE Demonstration Field Experiment	2:00 PM-3:20 PM	Friday	Salon A, B2 Level	Panel session
Relevance of Photo Arrays to Key Criminal Justice Decision Makers: An Experimental Study	2:00 PM-3:20 PM	Friday	Pacific E, 4th Floor	Individual paper
Community Policing II: International Applications	2:00 PM-3:20 PM	Friday	Salon 1, B2 Level	Panel session
Blurred Lines: Age of Adulthood and Implications of Processing Youth in Juvenile vs Adult Court	2:00 PM-3:20 PM	Friday	Pacific F, 4th Floor	Individual paper
Complexities of Implementing, Evaluating, and Advocating for Evidence-Based Risk Assessment in Correctional Settings	3:30 PM-4:50 PM	Friday	Pacific J, 4th Floor	Panel session
Data-Approaches to Crime and Traffic Safety: Lessons Learned from the Smart Policing Initiative in Shawnee, Kansas	3:30 PM-4:50 PM	Friday	Sierra E, 5th Floor	Individual paper
Evidence Standards for Successful Program Evaluations: The Inside Scoop for Program Evaluators from CrimeSolutions.gov and Model Programs Guide	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Saturday	Foothill E, 2nd Floor	Panel session
Police-Academia Co-Production of Evidence for Policy and Practice	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Saturday	Salon 1, B2 Level	Panel session
Efficacy of a Process Improvement Intervention on Inmate Awareness of HIV Services: A Multi-Site Trial	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Saturday	Salon A, B2 Level	Individual paper
Motivation for Change in Correctional Populations	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Saturday	Foothill G2, 2nd Floor	Panel session
The Thin Green Line: Examining Environmental Regulation and Environmental Offending from Multiple Perspectives	8:00 AM-9:20 AM	Saturday	Pacific C, 4th Floor	Individual paper
The Effect of the Alcohol Availability on Crime: A Quasi-experimental Analysis of the Repeal of the Sunday Off-premise Liquor Sales Ban	9:30 AM-10:50 AM	Saturday	Salon B, B2 Level	Individual paper



New Editorial Team

Lorraine Mazerolle, The University of Queensland, St. Lucia, QLD, Australia

Editor-in-Chief

David B. Wilson, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, USA

Editor, Systematic Reviews

www.springer.com/11292

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 committed to the advancement of the science of systematic reviews and experimental methods in criminology and criminal justice. The journal publishes empirical papers, reviews of substantive criminal justice problems, and methodological papers on experimentation and systematic review. Coverage ranges across the broad array of scientific disciplines that are concerned with crime and justice problems.

Submit Online

For author instructions and to submit a manuscript online, please visit:

<http://www.editorialmanager.com/joex>

For Editorial Inquiries, please contact the journal editorial office at: ugjoex@ug.edu.au

Forthcoming Special Issue

In 2015 JOEX is having its Tenth Birthday! To celebrate, we will be publishing a Special Issue in March 2015, featuring articles by distinguished international criminologists who have made important contributions to experimental criminology. The goal of the Special Issue is to highlight the key contributions of experimental criminology to both theory and/or policy over the last ten year period.

Editorial Board

Associate Editors:

Emma Antrabus, The University of Queensland, St Lucia, Qld, Australia

Sarah Bennett, The University of Queensland, St Lucia, Qld, Australia

Editorial Board:

Mimi Ajzenstadt, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel

Richard Berk, UCLA, USA

Howard Bloom, MDRC, USA

Robert Boruch, University of Pennsylvania, USA

Anthony Braga, Harvard University, USA

Chester Britt, Northeastern University, USA

Gerben Bruinsma, NSCR, Amsterdam, 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

Brian Johnson, University of Maryland, USA

Hans-Jürgen Kerner, University of Tübingen, Germany

Martin Killias, University of Zürich, Switzerland

Simcha Landau, Hebrew University, Israel

Mark Lipsey, Vanderbilt University, USA

Friedrich Loesel, University of Cambridge, UK

Michael D. Maltz, Ohio State University, USA

Angela Higginson, The University of Queensland, St Lucia, Qld, Australia

Cynthia Lum, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, USA

David McDowall, University at Albany, USA

John McDonald, University of Pennsylvania, USA

Kristina Murphy, Griffith University, Australia

Daniel Nagin, Carnegie Mellon University, USA

Anthony Petrosino, Harvard University, USA

Alex Piquero, University of Maryland, USA

Hannah Rothstein, Baruch College, City University of New York, USA

Lawrence Sherman, University of Cambridge, UK; University of Pennsylvania, USA

Faye Taxman, George Mason University, USA

Richard Tremblay, University of Montreal, Canada

David Weisburd, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel and George Mason University, Virginia, USA

David Weisburd, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel and George Mason University, Virginia, USA

David Weisburd, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel and George Mason University, Virginia, USA

David Weisburd, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel and George Mason University, Virginia, USA

David Weisburd, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel and George Mason University, Virginia, USA

David Weisburd, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel and George Mason University, Virginia, USA

David Weisburd, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel and George Mason University, Virginia, USA

David Weisburd, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel and George Mason University, Virginia, USA

David Weisburd, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel and George Mason University, Virginia, USA

David Weisburd, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel and George Mason University, Virginia, USA

David Weisburd, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel and George Mason University, Virginia, USA

David Weisburd, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel and George Mason University, Virginia, USA

David Weisburd, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel and George Mason University, Virginia, USA

David Weisburd, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel and George Mason University, Virginia, USA

David Weisburd, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel and George Mason University, Virginia, USA

David Weisburd, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel and George Mason University, Virginia, USA

Managing Editor:

Adele Somerville, The University of Queensland, St. Lucia, QLD, Australia

DIVISION OF EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY

Welcome to San Francisco!



The Division of Experimental Criminology (DEC) seeks to promote and improve the use of experimental evidence and methods in the advancement of criminological theory and evidence-based crime policy. We welcome members with a broad range of interests in evaluation research methods, including **randomized controlled trials, quasi-experiments, and systematic reviews**, in all areas of crime and justice: **corrections, courts, policing, prevention and more!** Membership includes a subscription to the *Journal of Experimental Criminology*. Learn more at <http://expcrim.org> or scan the QR code at bottom left to join now. The Division is also home to the Academy of Experimental Criminology, which honors outstanding scholars who have advanced experimental research.

DEC & AEC AT ASC-SAN FRANCISCO 2014

We look forward to welcoming you to San Francisco in November! Join us for an exciting program of events on Wednesday, November 19:

12:30 – 1:50. **Division Luncheon and Awards Ceremony.** *Free for current DEC members! \$20 non-members.*

2:00 – 3:20. **The Joan McCord Award Lecture and Academy of Experimental Criminology Awards Ceremony.**

All events take place in the Marriott conference hotel. Room locations to follow on the ASC Annual Meeting Website.

We hope to see many of you there to celebrate our award winners and discover experimental criminology!

CONGRATULATIONS TO OUR 2014 AWARD WINNERS!

Division of Experimental Criminology

Jerry Lee Lifetime Achievement Award

David Weisburd

Award for Outstanding Experimental Field Trial

Lawrence Sherman and Heather Harris, "Milwaukee Domestic Violence Experiment: 23-Year Follow-Up"

Student Paper Award

Evan Sorg et al., "Boundary Adherence during Place-Based Policing Evaluations"

Academy of Experimental Criminology

Joan McCord Award

Anthony Braga

AEC Fellows

James Alexander and Cynthia Lum

Outstanding Young Experimental Criminologist

Joel Caplan

DEC & aec



Lorraine Mazerolle (Chair), Cynthia Lum (Vice Chair), Charlotte Gill (Secretary-Treasurer)
Executive Counselors: Christopher Koper, Akiva Liberman, and Susan Turner

<http://expcrim.org>

