

ACJS *Today*

Official Newsletter of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences

Criminal Justice Students: An Untried New Approach for Responsible Gun Safety

Martin Alan Greenberg*

It has been said that “modern gun politics can be traced to a brief flurry of federal restrictions set early in Bill Clinton’s presidency. In 1993, Congress passed the Brady Bill, requiring licensed gun dealers to perform background checks to keep guns away from would-be buyers with felony records or histories of dangerous mental illness” (Grunwald, 2011, p. 38). As far as private citizens bearing arms, the laws have varied from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Today, in order to become a gun owner, one usually has to at least pass a background check.

Since the beginning of the 21st century, the dominant approach of American presidents has been to repeat “NRA talking points about enforcing gun laws already on the books” (Grunwald, 2011, p. 39).

Table of Contents

Criminal Justice Students: An Untried New Approach for Responsible Gun Safety.....	1
Food for Thought: Ideas for Those Teaching Criminology.....	7
ACJS National Criminal Justice Month Awards Announcement and 2017 Winners.....	12
Book Review: Policing Sexual Offences and Sex Offenders.....	14
2018 ACJS Conference Highlights	18
Announcements	23

By most accounts, enforcement of existing laws has been meager. If it were otherwise, some 30,000 people in the United States would not be dying due

to gunfire each year (p. 36). The very fact of gun ownership implies potential gun use. Thus, the use of guns should call for various controls in order to promote responsible gun ownership. This article seeks to address the need for additional resources to curb gun violence through the establishment of internships for qualified junior and senior college students interested in careers in criminal justice. The interns would be assigned to specialized units in various agencies of government involved in ensuring that accurate information is transmitted in a timely fashion to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS).

The Problem

Despite the tragic toll of gun violence throughout American history, it has only been in recent decades that gun control issues have begun to receive widespread media attention. The starting point was the massacre at Columbine High School in April 1999. The shooting tragedy involved the deaths of one teacher and 14 students (including the two shooters). In addition, 21 students were wounded. The two teenage killers were armed with an assortment of automatic firearms, which they used indiscriminately. “Coverage of the massacre was beamed live to television stations across the nation....As it turned out, Columbine was different in some ways—but sadly routine in others. The aftermath of Columbine looked a lot like the aftermath of many other high-profile shootings in American history: collective outrage, followed by a momentary flurry of unorganized calls and letters and donations from thousands of individuals, and then a quick return to the status quo” (Goss, 2008, pp. 1–2).

Although it has been more than 10 years since the

Virginia Tech campus shooting in 2007, the federal database (NICS) still lacks the names of tens of thousands of mentally ill people who should be barred from buying guns. The Virginia Tech shooter’s name should have been in the national database, preventing him from legally buying guns, but it wasn’t (Brady, 2012). Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts, California, and a few other scattered states have improved their reporting practices,¹ but concern about the importance of database reporting again gained national attention when the U.S. Air Force acknowledged that it had failed to report to NICS dozens of service members who had been charged with or convicted of serious assault. This partly led to Devin Kelley’s massacre of more than two dozen parishioners inside a Texas church on November 5, 2017 because his conviction was not entered into NICS. Kelley should have been barred from purchasing firearms and body armor because of his domestic violence conviction in 2014 while serving at Holloman Air Force Base in New Mexico.

Deadly gun violence continues to take place in public and private spaces. Shoppers in malls, workers in offices, families in their homes, and even school children in their classrooms have suffered victimization. Gun control measures have been stalled at the federal level. While gun control advocates try to build political support to compete with the National Rifle Association, a massive step backward took place when thousands of people wanted by law enforcement officials were removed in 2017 from the background check database that prohibits fugitives from justice from buying guns.

The FBI purged the names from the database after the Justice Department changed its legal interpretation of “fugitive from justice” to say it

pertains only to wanted people who have crossed state lines.

What that means is that those fugitives who were previously prohibited under federal law from purchasing firearms can now buy them, unless barred for other reasons. (Horwitz, 2017)

Previously, the FBI had a broad definition that included in the national database anyone with an outstanding arrest warrant, but after Trump was inaugurated president, the Justice Department decided to narrow the definition to only those persons who have fled across state lines to avoid prosecution for a crime or to avoid giving testimony in a criminal proceeding (Horwitz, 2017). However, because Massachusetts state law prevents fugitives from buying guns, those individuals have now been added back to the federal database under the “state prohibitory” category (Horwitz, 2017).

The New Approach

A great benefit of the proposed plan is that it is not dependent upon the efforts of gun control activists or the need for new national legislation. Thus, the power of the so-called gun lobby in hobbling the efforts of gun control campaigns should not be a barrier. Moreover, it is in keeping with the drive for improving police professionalism. In 1908 the first police academy was opened in Berkley, California, when August Vollmer realized that many officers lacked the skills necessary to solve crimes. For the greater part of the 20th century, the emphasis on police training was not on academic work, but rather on physical training and practical street experience. Today, however, a college education is one of the most valuable assets a police officer can have, especially if there is an interest in promotion and advancement (Armstrong & Polk, 2002). Warren (1999) indicates that it is important for law

enforcement agencies to partner with organizations such as colleges and professional organizations in order to ensure a quality training program.

Criminal justice educational programs turn out many thousands of students each year, making criminal justice “one of a campus’ relevant, contemporary, and highly marketable degree options” (Flanagan, 2000, p. 5). These academic programs consider the manner in which crimes and criminals are detected, detained, tried, and punished. Students learn about the different components and inner workings of the various parts of the justice system. The federal gun background check database is just one of its many components.

Many students in these programs choose to participate in a variety of criminal justice-related internship programs. Law enforcement agencies anxious to meet higher standards of professionalism should welcome an influx of qualified interns in order to deter gun violence. Preservice and volunteer personnel are already providing much-needed administrative work in a variety of local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies. According to one police volunteer study, adults involved in such activities engaged in the following pursuits: administrative duties (71%); community outreach/crime prevention (65%); citizen patrols (63%); emergency preparedness/response (48%); chaplain services (45%); and volunteer program administration (42%; VIPS Program Analysis, 2013). Moreover, the use of volunteers in investigations increased from 16% in 2009 to 27% in 2013. Other advanced and skill-based volunteer duties included translation/interpretation; research; technology; code or parking enforcement; crime analysis; fleet maintenance; and subpoena or warrant services (VIPS Program Analysis, 2013).

Continued on Page 5

ACJS 2019 Annual Conference

“Justice, Human Rights, and Activism”

**March 26th – 30th, 2019
Baltimore Marriot Waterfront Hotel
Baltimore, Maryland**

Host Hotel:

Baltimore Marriot Waterfront Hotel
700 Aliceanna Street
Baltimore, MD 21202
Phone: (410) 385-3000



Baltimore Skyline as seen from the Inner Harbor. Photo courtesy of harbus.org

For more information please visit: <http://www.acjs.org/page/2019AnnualMeetin>

In order to help ensure that current gun purchase laws are complied with, students could work with agencies in specialized units to ensure that the federal gun background check database is up to date. “Since the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) was created in 1998, the background check system has prevented 1.5 million people from buying guns, including 180,000 denials to people who were fugitives from justice, according to government statistics” (Horwitz, 2017). The proposed program would not detract from any of the requirements of an undergraduate degree program or limit student activities, but would be an enhancement to any program by giving it a distinctive career focus. The proposed program would be offered as an optional internship choice (track) within an existing bachelor’s degree program. Additional benefits would include improving academic competence and performance (especially communication/technology skills) and increasing the leadership abilities of participants.

Implementation

The implementation of any new program requires leadership. Concerned faculty and administrators of colleges with criminal justice degree programs are needed to advance the project. In addition, the support of organizations such as the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS) and the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) is valuable. In our democracy, the citizenry should have the most influence on the nation’s laws and criminal procedures. In the United States, there may be more guns in circulation than there are inhabitants. Thus, an effort should be made to gain the support of the National Rifle Association (NRA) for this project. For Alexander Hamilton and the nation’s other founding fathers, responsible gun

ownership was contingent upon maintaining good standing in a local militia unit. In today’s world, responsible gun ownership appears to be based on the rhetoric and political influence of the NRA and taking courses from its qualified instructors. The combined efforts of these three organizations would greatly help to ensure the timely reporting of critical information to the NICS without the need for further legislation.

Conclusion

The proposed internship program involving administrative duties for advanced criminal justice students in order to ensure a current NICS database is designed to reduce and deter crime. When there exist only limited resources to supplement ongoing efforts or to initiate new programs, the use of qualified volunteers should be considered. Faculty in criminal justice should approach the concerned agencies to establish these placements. Of course, this possibility requires initiative and imagination. Drucker (1990) has warned that such characteristics may tend to become suppressed in some organizations. “Non-profits are prone to become inward-looking. People are so convinced that they are doing the right thing, and are so committed to their cause, that they see the institution as an end in itself. But that’s a bureaucracy. Soon people in the organization no longer ask: Does it service our mission? They ask: Does it fit our rules? And that not only inhibits performance, it destroys vision and dedication” (Drucker, 1990, p. 113). Such an obstacle should not deter faculty and other concerned leaders from this new approach for gun safety; the stakes are too high. In a speech at the White House on January 5, 2016, President Obama noted, “Every single year, more than 30,000 Americans have their lives cut short by guns. We are the only advanced country on Earth that sees

this kind of mass violence erupt with this kind of frequency” (quoted in Lopez, 2016).

Notes

1. State laws treat guns in a wide variety of ways. Slate has a good rundown of the differences based on research from the Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence (see Kirk & Quandt, 2015).

References

- Armstrong, D. & Polk, O. E. (2002, Sept./Oct.). College for cops: The fast track for success. *Journal of the Institute of Justice and International Studies*, 17(5), 24–26.
- Brady, J. (2012, August 16). *States aren't submitting records to gun database*. Retrieved December 31, 2017 from <https://www.npr.org/2012/08/16/158932528/states-arent-submitting-records-to-gun-database>
- Drucker, P. F. (1990). *Managing the nonprofit organization: Principles and practices*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Flanagan, T. (2000). Liberal education and the criminal justice major. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 11(1), 1–13.
- Goss, K. A. (2008). *Disarmed: The missing movement for gun control in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Grunwald, M. (2011). The Tucson tragedy: Fire away. *Time*, pp. 36–39.
- Horwitz, S. (2017, November 22). Tens of thousands with outstanding warrants purged from background check database for gun purchases. *Washington Post*. Retrieved December 31, 2017 from https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/tens-of-thousands-with-outstanding-warrants-purged-from-background-check-database-for-gun-purchases/2017/11/22/b890643c-ced1-11e7-9d3a-bcbe2af58c3a_story.html
- Kirk, C. & Quandt, K. R. (2015, October 7). Gun control laws by state. *Slate*. Retrieved December 31, from http://www.slate.com/blogs/the_slatest/2015/10/07/gun_control_laws_by_state_oregon_new_york_texas_california.html
- Lopez , G. (2016, January 7). *President Obama's boldest action on guns yet, explained*. Retrieved December 31, 2017 from <https://www.vox.com/2016/1/4/10708324/obama-gun-control-executive-order>
- VIPS Program Analysis. (2013). *2013 Volunteers in police service program analysis of registered volunteer law enforcement programs*. Retrieved January 18, 2014 from http://www.policevolunteers.org/files/2013_Analysis_Results_Report.pdf
- Warren, G. A. (1999). *Police academy training for 21st century law enforcement*. Dover, DE: Delaware Law Enforcement Institute.

***Martin A. Greenberg** is currently the director for research and education at the New York State Association of Auxiliary Police and a past president of the Auxiliary Police Benevolent Association of the City of New York. In addition to serving as a criminal justice program administrator and professor for nearly four decades, he has authored four books on the citizen's role in public safety and has worked as a senior court officer, probations officer, volunteer police officer, and high school campus security aide. He has been a lifetime member of the ACJS since the early days of its founding.

Food for Thought: Ideas for Those Teaching Criminology

Maria Tcherni-Buzzeo,* University of New Haven

Sometimes, it is worthwhile for an instructor in a criminology course to play devil's advocate. Often, students will accept at face value each theory of crime they are reading about (especially if their readings include some excerpts from the original theorists' writing). On the surface, each theory makes sense and invokes a reaction of "yes, of course!" from many of the students (both undergraduate and graduate). Thus, in this column, we would like to explore some ideas to consider and questions to ask. The first installment deals with critical thinking questions about social disorganization theory (SDT). **We will be very curious to hear from you and see if you have any other theories or topics you would like to question and probe in your classes. You are welcome to contribute a column to this series!**

Social Disorganization Theory: Critical Questions

The key premise of the original formulation of SDT by Shaw and McKay (1942), as often laid out in criminology textbooks, is to identify what it is about high-crime neighborhoods that distinguishes them from other, less problematic ones. Shaw and McKay have identified three key features of such neighborhoods: residential mobility, ethnic/racial heterogeneity, and poverty. These features supposedly make it less likely for the residents of such neighborhoods to "band together" against crime. So here are some thought-provoking questions to ask your students (and discuss in class as an interactive exercise):

1. What kinds of crime do people need to "band together" against? Does this idea imply that crime is a dark force coming from the outside? Is this image correct? Who commits crimes within the neighborhood: outsiders or residents?

To delve deeper into the topic, I would recommend checking out empirical research on the victim-offender overlap (Broidy et al., 2006; Jennings et al., 2010), journey to crime literature (Pizarro et al., 2007; Andresen et al., 2014), and some recent research on crime pattern theory (Menting et al., 2016).

2. If we look at existing high-crime neighborhoods, do the three key features of SDT still hold? Is there much residential mobility and ethnic/racial heterogeneity in most poor urban ghettos or rural areas of high poverty?

Wilson's iconic book The Truly Disadvantaged (1987) or his article (Wilson, 1991) summarizing the main issues detailed in the book could be very good resources for further discussion of the issues of inner-city residents. Studies on how minorities have become highly segregated and concentrated in high-crime neighborhoods (Krivo et al., 2009), with mass incarceration contributing to the process (Western & Wildemann, 2009), while violence and structural racism reinforce such segregation patterns (Xie & McDowall, 2010; Hipp, 2011) could be very helpful in discussing the plight of inner-city residents and their sociopolitical issues. Some peculiarities of rural crime and its correlates

are explored in studies focusing on juvenile violence and homicide (Osgood & Chambers, 2000; Lee & Thomas, 2010) and rural crime victimization patterns (Kaylen & Pridemore, 2013).

3. Alternatively, can we find some places where all three features are present—high mobility, heterogeneity, and poverty – but crime is low?

As an illustration for this discussion, I use my experience of having lived at an MIT family dorm, where all three SDT characteristics are prominent: it is a high-rise with mostly poor graduate students and their families, who come from all over the world (various cultures, ethnicities, traditions, and languages), and it has a high residential mobility (families constantly move in and out). At the same time, very little “banding together” is going on, and there is essentially zero crime. What is different about places like these college/university dorms that makes them basically crime free? McCall and her colleagues (2013) suggest that it is institutional engagement of youth that moderates the relationship between age and crime: very little crime is happening in college towns compared to their share of young (i.e., most crime-prone) populations because these youths are engaged in meaningful pro-social activities, which serve as mechanisms of social control. (This explanation, as you can see, moves us from SDT to Hirschi’s theory of social bonds.)

Alternatively, you can steer this conversation toward a very interesting discussion of how poverty and education are intertwined in the modern United States (Chaudry et al., 2016) and how any discussion of poverty as a crime correlate in this country necessarily implies the combination of poverty and low or deficient education (Tcherni, 2011). At the same time, research conducted in

other developed countries shows the impact of education in preventing and reducing crime (Usher, 1997; Buonanno & Leonida, 2009; Groot et al., 2010), while studies of prison-based educational programs in the U.S. show some modest impact in reducing recidivism of ex-offenders (Wilson et al., 2000; Lockwood et al., 2012; Kim & Clark, 2013; Davis et al., 2014; Pompoco et al., 2017).

4. High-crime neighborhoods of 75 years ago (during Shaw and McKay’s time) were filled with immigrants. How does that square with the fact that most modern-day immigrants in the United States are the least likely category of people to commit crime? Did the nature of immigration change? Did the type of people who become immigrants change?

There are consistent findings in recent research literature about the role of immigration and immigrants in crime: longitudinal studies show that increases in the proportion of immigrants in the community lower the crime rates, especially violent crime (Martinez et al., 2010; MacDonald et al., 2013; Ousey & Kubrin, 2009, 2014, 2018).

These are just some of the questions that I have found useful when discussing SDT with my students, to help them develop critical thinking skills and engage them in interesting and meaningful conversations in class. Some students are shy to voice their opinions and ideas when a question is posed to the whole class, so I divide the class into groups of three or four students and have them discuss some of these issues within the group, with a subsequent whole-class discussion moving from one group to the next, to hear their opinions and ideas.

For more advanced, graduate classes, I also recommend a discussion of reformulations of SDT

through the works of Kornhauser (1978), Bursik (1988), Sampson and Groves (1989), Bursik and Grasmick (1992), and Sampson et al. (1997), as well as an excellent review of these developments and directions for further research by Kubrin and Weitzer (2003).

References

- Andresen, M. A., Frank, R., & Felson, M. (2014). Age and the distance to crime. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 14(3), 314–333.
- Broidy, L. M., Daday, J. K., Crandall, C. S., Sklar, D. P., & Jost, P. F. (2006). Exploring demographic, structural, and behavioral overlap among homicide offenders and victims. *Homicide Studies*, 10(3), 155–180.
- Buonanno, P., & Leonida, L. (2009). Non-market effects of education on crime: Evidence from Italian regions. *Economics of Education Review*, 28(1), 11–17.
- Bursik, R. J. (1988). Social disorganization and theories of crime and delinquency: Problems and prospects. *Criminology*, 26(4), 519–552.
- Bursik, R. J., & Grasmick, H. G. (1992). Longitudinal neighborhood profiles in delinquency: The decomposition of change. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 8(3), 247–263.
- Chaudry, A., Wimer, C., Macartney, S., Frohlich, L., Campbell, C., Swenson, K., ... Huan, S. (2016). *Poverty in the United States: 50-year trends and safety net impacts*. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services.
- Davis, L. M., Steele, J. L., Bozick, R., Williams, M. V., Turner, S., Miles, J. N., ... Steinberg, P. S. (2014). *How effective is correctional education, and where do we go from here? The results of a comprehensive evaluation*. Washington, DC: RAND.
- Groot, W., & van den Brink, H. M. (2010). The effects of education on crime. *Applied Economics*, 42(3), 279–289.
- Hipp, J. R. (2011). Violent crime, mobility decisions, and neighborhood racial/ethnic transition. *Social Problems*, 58(3), 410–432.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jennings, W. G., Piquero, A. R., & Reingle, J. M. (2012). On the overlap between victimization and offending: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17(1), 16–26.
- Kaylen, M. T., & Pridemore, W. A. (2013). Social disorganization and crime in rural communities: The first direct test of the systemic model. *British Journal of Criminology*, 53(5), 905–923.
- Kim, R. H., & Clark, D. (2013). The effect of prison-based college education programs on recidivism: Propensity score matching approach. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 41(3), 196–204.
- Kornhauser, R. R. (1978). *Social sources of delinquency: An appraisal of analytic models*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Krivo, L. J., Peterson, R. D., & Kuhl, D. C. (2009). Segregation, racial structure, and neighborhood violent crime. *American Journal of Sociology*, 114(6), 1765–1802.
- Kubrin, C. E., & Weitzer, R. (2003). New directions in social disorganization theory. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 40(4), 374–402.

- Lee, M. R., & Thomas, S. A. (2010). Civic community, population change, and violent crime in rural communities. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 47(1), 118–147.
- Lockwood, S., Nally, J. M., Ho, T., & Knutson, K. (2012). The effect of correctional education on postrelease employment and recidivism: A 5-year follow-up study in the state of Indiana. *Crime & Delinquency*, 58(3), 380–396.
- MacDonald, J. M., Hipp, J. R., & Gill, C. (2013). The effects of immigrant concentration on changes in neighborhood crime rates. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 29(2), 191–215.
- Martinez, R., Stowell, J. I., & Lee, M. T. (2010). Immigration and crime in an era of transformation: A longitudinal analysis of homicides in San Diego neighborhoods, 1980–2000. *Criminology*, 48(3), 797–829.
- Menting, B., Lammers, M., Ruiter, S., & Bernasco, W. (2016). Family matters: Effects of family members' residential areas on crime location choice. *Criminology*, 54(3), 413–433.
- McCall, P. L., Land, K. C., Dollar, C. B., & Parker, K. F. (2013). The age structure–crime rate relationship: Solving a long-standing puzzle. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 29(2), 167–190.
- Osgood, D. W., & Chambers, J. M. (2000). Social disorganization outside the metropolis: An analysis of rural youth violence. *Criminology*, 38(1), 81–116.
- Ousey, G. C., & Kubrin, C. E. (2009). Exploring the connection between immigration and violent crime rates in US cities, 1980–2000. *Social Problems*, 56(3), 447–473.
- Ousey, G. C., & Kubrin, C. E. (2014). Immigration and the changing nature of homicide in US cities, 1980–2010. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 30(3), 453–483.
- Ousey, G. C., & Kubrin, C. E. (2018). Immigration and crime: Assessing a contentious issue. *Annual Review of Criminology*, 1(1), 63–84.
- Pizarro, J. M., Corsaro, N., & Yu, S. S. V. (2007). Journey to crime and victimization: An application of routine activities theory and environmental criminology to homicide. *Victims and Offenders*, 2(4), 375–394.
- Pompoco, A., Wooldredge, J., Lugo, M., Sullivan, C., & Latessa, E. J. (2017). Reducing inmate misconduct and prison returns with facility education programs. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 16(2), 515–547.
- Sampson, R. J., & Groves, W. B. (1989). Community structure and crime: Testing social-disorganization theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(4), 774–802.
- Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 277(5328), 918–924.
- Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1942). *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Tcherni, M. (2011). Structural determinants of homicide: The big three. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 27(4), 475.
- Usher, D. (1997). Education as a deterrent to crime. *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 30(2), 367–384.

Western, B., & Wildeman, C. (2009). The black family and mass incarceration. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 621(1), 221–242.

Wilson, D. B., Gallagher, C. A., & MacKenzie, D. L. (2000). A meta-analysis of corrections-based education, vocation, and work programs for adult offenders. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 37(4), 347–368.

Wilson, W. J. (1991). Another look at the truly disadvantaged. *Political Science Quarterly*, 106(4), 639–656.

Xie, M., & McDowall, D. (2010). The reproduction of racial inequality: How crime affects housing turnover. *Criminology*, 48(3), 865–896.



Maria Tcherni-Buzzeo is an associate professor of criminal justice at the Henry C. Lee College of Criminal Justice and Forensic Sciences, University of New Haven. She completed her PhD at SUNY-Albany in 2011. Maria teaches research methods and criminological theory courses at the undergraduate, master's, and doctoral levels. Her research interests focus on testing structural and biosocial explanations for crime trends and patterns, and understanding the relationship between poverty and violence, with a focus on crime prevention. Her research has been published in the *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *Justice Quarterly*, and *Deviant Behavior*.

ACJS National Criminal Justice Month Awards Announcement and 2017 Winners

The ACJS National Criminal Justice Month Committee encourages all members to participate in learning projects that encourage and promote the study of and involvement in criminal justice during the month of March, as it is National Criminal Justice Month. Projects and events should be organized to begin during this kickoff month and continue throughout the year, to enable maximum exposure and to optimize viability. The committee strongly encourages events and projects be centered on the 2019 Annual Meeting theme of “Justice, Human Rights, and Activism.” Members will be eligible to submit their entries to be considered for the awards that will be presented at the 2019 Annual Meeting in Baltimore. The 2017 award recipients are as follows:

Community Engagement: Saint Louis University

In addition to other events throughout National Criminal Justice Month 2017, the Saint Louis University (SLU) Criminology and Criminal Justice Program held two events aimed at bringing together faculty, staff, student, and community members to highlight criminal justice. We hosted a popular “Write a Rep” event during which all members of SLU and the surrounding community were invited and encouraged to write a letter of substance to a political or public representative of their choosing. All were encouraged to become more intimately educated about their selected issue. We provided

laptops and Internet access to assist participants to research their topic and to identify specific representatives (local, state, or federal) to whom they wanted to write, as well as postcards and postage! More than 70 faculty, staff, students, and community members wrote postcards over the three-day event. We also hosted a “Speak Your Mind” event to provide students with a variety of opportunities to reflect on and articulate the major criminology, criminal justice, and other social justice issues of concern to them. We then created a banner, which still hangs in the main corridor of our building. The banner reads “Criminology & Criminal Justice and Social Work Students Stand Up For...” and students identified the “what/who” it is that they “stand up for” by writing it on our banner.

Education: Metropolitan State University of Denver

The MSU Denver CJC Study Abroad Program traveled to the Netherlands for a nine-day faculty-led adventure in education. Our mostly nontraditional, commuter student population requires above and beyond experiences to increase their educational engagement, and taking them to the International City of Peace and Justice fit the bill beautifully! This class made an educational impact by showing our students some hands-on differences between the U.S. criminal justice system

and other criminal justice systems, but even more so by showing them international criminal justice with visits to the International Criminal Court and various tribunals. Our students also mingled with Hague University students and became social media stars within our own university's social media circle. For these students, it truly was a once-in-a-lifetime educational opportunity.

Program of the Year: Penn State Harrisburg

During March 2017, Penn State Harrisburg hosted several events to recognize National Criminal Justice Month. The Penn State Harrisburg chapter of Alpha Phi Sigma organized a teddy bear drive for the local policing agency: Operation Tactical Teddy Bear. The honor society collected more than 100 stuffed animals from January through March to donate to the Middletown Borough Police Department to distribute to children officers meet

while on call, in an effort to enhance police-community relations. The Criminal Justice Club hosted the MEGGITT Firearms Training Systems (FATS), which is a shooting simulation system allowing participants to explore what kind of force (if any) they would use in a variety of police calls for service. The Criminal Justice Club also hosted a college-wide bus trip to the International Spy Museum in Washington, DC, engaging participants in an historical look at U.S. espionage and an interactive spy experience, and the club invited Detective Sergeant Lisa Layden of Southwestern Regional Police Department to Penn State Harrisburg to talk to students about issues in policing. A final event, a panel discussion on police body-worn cameras ("Are Police-Worn Body Cameras the Answer?") was scheduled for March 2017 but was postponed to April due to inclement weather.



Award winners with ACJS President Nicole Leeper Piquero and Committee Chair Jessica Craig

Book Review: *Policing Sexual Offences and Sex Offenders*, by Terry Thomas

Leeds, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Reviewed by Kristi L. Greenberg,* University of New Haven

In *Policing Sexual Offences and Sex Offenders*, Terry Thomas seeks to explain the ever-changing role of police officers in the U.K., including their added responsibilities brought about by sex offenders. The book is divided into two sections. The first covers the typical and historical role of police officers, and the second assesses two new roles that have emerged in recent years since the enactment of the Sex Offender Register and related policies. The book is an excellent collection of information regarding the obstacles, challenges, and policies police officers must work through daily to ensure public safety when addressing sexual offenses and offenders.

Prior to the core of the text, an extensive list of abbreviations is provided. From an international perspective, the list is a quick guide for understanding the concepts and policies subsequently presented. Each chapter begins with an abstract that grounds the reader in the topics to be covered and generates a clear picture of changing themes without confusion. This, in conjunction with the layout of Part I, which focuses on how police address sexual offenses, and Part II, which addresses how police monitor and regulate sexual offenders, provides an ease of use suitable not only for the field practitioner but the layperson as well.

In the introduction, Thomas (2016) states, “this book is about the work of the police with people who are suspected of committing or having committed sexual offenses” (p. 2). Part I is a comprehensive compilation of historical information regarding police handling of sexual offenses. As seen in other jurisdictions globally, there has been a “culture of disbelief by police with sexual assault reports” (p. 8). The inclination for an officer to not believe a victim has, as Thomas notes early in the text, often stemmed from the occupational culture of police agencies. Practices such as “no-criming” or “not recording an incident as a crime” (p. 20) are discussed as an important piece of policing history in which victims were either not believed, not supported, or completely discouraged from reporting. This is an important starting place, as it lays the groundwork for the discussion presented on Britain’s enactment of policies, laws, and the creation of new agencies to address sex offenses.

Central to Part I, Thomas (2016) examines the creation of the Sexual Offences Act of 2003, the creation of Sexual Assault Referral Centers, Child Exploitation and Online Protection Command, and the Serious Crime Analysis Section, to name only a few. He further examines the police procedures that

have long been in practice for investigating crimes, including those that most would consider standard police work: interviewing subjects, polygraphs (post-2014 when they were approved for use in the U.K.), DNA, fingerprints, and other forms of evidence collection. Thomas examines the creation, over time, of specially trained officers (or STOs), specialist rape teams, and their ability to work within the relatively newly created Sexual Assault Referral Centers to better address the needs of victims. These centers are staffed by individuals from multiple agencies and are intended to “improve the reception and treatment of complainants, and at the same time, to increase the levels of reporting, and improve the gathering of evidence” (p. 19). Overall, this multidisciplinary approach, coupled with greater police training, has had an enormous impact on the experiences of victims, as well as enhancing officers’ abilities to collect evidence and pursue an arrest. Additionally, an important note about these centers is what they do for victims, in addition to aiding the police to arrest and pursue criminal charges against attackers. Outside of the direct scope of this text, but still insinuated by Thomas, is the ability of victims to regain a sense of control over their lives, which benefits their overall mental health (Westmarland & Alderson, 2013).

In conjunction with greater training, the notion of increased mutual aid between local and national agencies, especially Scotland Yard, was emphasized. This is due to the historical practice of the “British ... [priding] themselves on their local

policing arrangement accountable to local communities” (Thomas, 2016, p. 43). This point becomes particularly salient once the reader begins Part II. Sexual offenses and offenders have become more transitory and able to offend across various jurisdictions, which Thomas explains in greater detail in the latter half of the text.

Part II focuses on policing sex offenders more so than the sex offenses themselves. Emphasis is placed on police agencies’ abilities to communicate with each other nationally and internationally and with their communities. Much like in Part I, Thomas (2016) provides an excellent overview of many nuances of the system without becoming overburdened with small details. Discussion of the international component to policing sex offenders is particularly interesting. Through the use of INTERPOL, EUROPOL, and Transnational Policing Networks, it becomes apparent to the reader how British police are able to access and share relevant data. There are clauses within the Sex Offenders Act of 1997 and the Sexual Offenses Act of 2003 for prosecuting “sexual offenses [committed] against children in other countries” (p. 64) and for what is now known as the Traveling Sex Offender, which can “ban certain known sex offenders from going abroad at all” (p. 66). There is also a discussion on the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA), which began as an informal practice among police and probation agencies and ultimately became official policy as a part of the Criminal Justice and Courts Services Act of 2000 (Hudson, Taylor, & Henley, 2015). This

joint effort by police, probation, and prison agencies (prison being added later) means these agencies are now “required to work together in risk assessing and managing registered sex offenders in the community” (Thomas, 2016, p. 76).

The paramount theme of Part II, aside from detailed discussion of legal abilities, departmental policies, and court decisions related to sexual offenders, is the overwhelming amount of responsibility that is placed on police officers in the U.K. Many of the policies that are enacted rely upon police officers to petition a magistrate for approval, such as through Foreign Travel Orders or Sexual Offenses Prevention Orders. Additionally, police are responsible for the dissemination of what Thomas (2016) refers to as “soft” information on sex offenders, which is “more speculative, like police intelligence they have gathered or has been passed to them” (p. 89). This information is provided to other agencies, potential employers, and, in some instances, the public. There is a great burden associated with these responsibilities, as individuals have challenged the release of this information in the courts. Ultimately, the police still want to ensure public safety, and that becomes a delicate balance—one that is appropriately discussed by Thomas.

The one criticism that can be offered is Thomas’s (2016) discussion of the recently acquired police responsibility of conducting risk assessments. Highlighting it as a cornerstone of new police responsibilities and stating that “risk assessment was central to this police work to try and ‘predict’ the likely future of offending of the RSO

(Registered Sex Offender)” (p. 76), the author glosses over the topic and fails to adequately describe these tools and their related procedures. What is discussed is that this task became a police officer duty under the Criminal Justice and Court Services Act of 2000, which “establish[ed] arrangements for the purpose of assessing and managing the risks posed in that area by relevant sexual or violent offenders” (p. 76), with a very brief mention of home visits and related policies and practices. The names of risk assessment tools are offered, but nothing further. The reader is left wondering whether there is not sufficient information available on the topic, or whether it was intentionally avoided. In an age when risk assessments are being used more frequently, it seems like a large oversight.

The concluding chapter’s tone contrasts with the chapters that preceded it, perhaps being more indicative of the author’s personal point of view rather than the objectivity of the information presented earlier. Thomas (2016) ends the discussion by stating, “we need, perhaps, to close the gap between policies on paper and policies in action” (p. 107), which is a point that can be heeded internationally in the context of sex offender policy. There is an inevitable international nature to some sexual offenses, especially with the advent of the Internet. However, policing within each community still needs to be given the resources and training required to effectively attain the goal of public safety, however a jurisdiction chooses to define it.

In sum, Thomas (2016) provides an overview of a vast number of topics and policies within a relatively short text. In doing so, the majority of topics are covered sufficiently to give the reader a general understanding, with the one exception noted regarding risk assessments. Thomas also portrays the difficulties police officers face in the U.K., as many tasks still fall upon their shoulders to initiate, investigate, and monitor, whereas in some instances, similar policies in America would be handled by prosecutors or shared with other agencies. The text is an overall positive addition to other works in its field.

References

- Hudson, K., Taylor, C., & Henley, A. (2015). Trends in the management of registered sexual offenders across England and Wales: A geographical approach to the study of sexual offending. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 21*(1), 56–70.
- Thomas, T. (2016). *Policing sexual offences and sex offenders*. Leeds, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Westmarland, N., & Alderson, S. (2013). The health, mental health, and well-being benefits of rape crisis counseling. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 28*(17), 3265–3282.

***Kristi Greenberg** is currently an offender rehabilitation coordinator with the New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision. She earned a master's degree in public administration from Marist College and a master's degree in criminal justice from John Jay College of Criminal Justice, where she also earned a bachelor's degree in forensic psychology. She is currently pursuing a PhD in criminal justice at the University of New Haven.



The 2018 ACJS Conference in New Orleans

**2018 ACJS Awards presented by ACJS President Nicole Leeper Piquero
and ACJS Awards Committee Chair Wesley G. Jennings**



Bruce Smith Sr. Award
J. Mitchell Miller



Founders Award
George Higgins



Academy Fellow Award
Mary K. Stohr



Outstanding Book Award
Dean Dabney, Richard Tewksbury
*Speaking Truth to Power: Confidential
Informants and Police Investigations*



**The William L. Simon/Routledge
Outstanding Paper Award**

Brittany Hayes, Eryn O'Neal

*The Effects of Individual- and National-Level
Factors on Attitudes toward Child
Maltreatment*



Donald MacNamara Award

Nathan Link, Francis Cullen, Robert
Agnew, Bruce G. Link

*Can General Strain Theory Help Us
Understand Violent Behaviors Among People
With Mental Illnesses?*



**The Michael C.
Braswell/Routledge Outstanding
Dissertation Award**

Adam Matz

*Enhancing Community Supervision:
A Unified Voice for Community
Corrections Concerning Police-
Probation/Parole Partnerships*



Academy New Scholar Award
Joshua Cochran



ACJS Outstanding Mentors

Carol Archbold, Melissa
Barlow, Maria Garase, Dee
Wood Harper, Catherine
Kaukinen, Linda Keena, Bitna
Kim, Joseph Linskey, Tonisha
Pinckney, Joy Pollock, Ryan
Randa, Jill Rosenbaum, Lisa
Sample, Jeff Walker, Doris
Yates

Other Conference Recognition



Lorenzo Boyd
Outgoing Past President



Mary Stohr
Outgoing Executive Director



George Higgins
Outgoing Editor of *JCJE*



Nicole Piquero to Faith Lutze
Presidential Gavel Pass



Robert Worley
Outgoing Editor of *ACJS Today*



Camille Gibson
Outgoing Region 4 Trustee



Bitna Kim
Outgoing Trustee at Large



Andrea Schoepfer & Nadine Connell
2018 Program Co-Chairs



CRIME & JUSTICE RESEARCH ALLIANCE

Board Members

Nancy La Vigne, PhD (Chair)
Director, Justice Policy Center
The Urban Institute

Paul Elam Jr., PhD
President
Public Policy Associates, Inc.

Natasha Frost, PhD
Associate Dean of Graduate
Studies and Associate Professor,
School of Criminology & Criminal
Justice
Northeastern University

Marlyn J. Jones, PhD
Professor, Division of Criminal
Justice
California State University,
Sacramento

David L. Myers, PhD
Professor and Director,
Criminal Justice PhD Program
University of New Haven

Richard Rosenfeld, PhD
Professor of Criminology and
Criminal Justice
University of Missouri - St. Louis

Christy Visser, PhD
Professor of Sociology and
Criminal Justice
University of Delaware

Peter Wood, PhD
Professor of Sociology and
Criminology
Eastern Michigan University

John Worrall, PhD
Professor of Criminology
University of Texas at Dallas

As you continue to stay informed about the latest news and events relating to crime and criminal justice topics, we encourage you to review the monthly newsletter from the Crime & Justice Research Alliance (CJRA).

As you may know, CJRA is a centralized resource of authoritative experts and scholarly studies created to provide policy makers, practitioners, and the public with direct access to relevant research on crime and criminal justice issues. Formed in 2015, CJRA is a collaborative partnership between the nation's two leading criminal justice scholar associations, ACJS and the American Society of Criminology (ASC).

CJRA lobbies for federal funding for crime and justice research, while facilitating access to evidence-based research by its experts through its website (<http://crimeandjusticeresearchalliance.org/>), proactive media outreach, and advocacy on the hill. The website provides a list of experts who are willing to talk to policy makers and the media as well as abstracts of policy-relevant research.

As part of its outreach efforts, the Alliance publishes a monthly newsletter (<http://crimeandjusticeresearchalliance.org/news/>), which includes the following categories:

Introduction

The introductory article of the newsletter highlights recent or upcoming events, trending issues, and messages from the chair of CJRA. This section provides an overview of the recent focus and efforts of the Alliance and briefly summarizes timely information.

Washington Update

For the latest news and information about what is happening on the hill, check out the Washington Update. The CJRA government relations consultant provides an overview of the current funding for crime and criminal justice research as well as explanations of the events taking place in our nation's capital.

Expert Q&A

Each month, the CJRA communications consultant works with a CJRA expert to share his or her research findings with national media outlets. The expert Q&A provides a link to the article that was promoted as well as a one-on-one interview with the lead author about the impact of the findings.

In the News

The news section of the newsletter highlights a few of the news articles secured by the CJRA communications consultant on behalf of CJRA experts from that month.

www.crimeandjusticeresearchalliance.org



ACJS Seeking Committee Volunteers for 2019-2020

Prabha Unnithan, ACJS 1st Vice President, is actively seeking Committee volunteers to serve during his presidency, March 2019 – March 2020. If you are interested in learning more about how to be actively involved in service to ACJS, contact Prabha at Prabha.Unnithan@colostate.edu to volunteer. Every attempt will be made to place ACJS members who volunteer on a standing or *ad hoc* Committee.

Committee membership is limited to ACJS members. The composition of all committees will be as diverse as possible with regard to gender, race, region, and length of Academy membership.

Every year, ACJS needs volunteers for the Academy's Standing Committees. Committee volunteers usually serve for one year, beginning with the Friday of the Annual Meeting after the Executive Board meets.

Appointments to the following ACJS Standing Committees are for one year, unless otherwise stated:

- **Academic Review** (Members serve three-year terms and membership is restricted to trained certification reviewers)
- **Affirmative Action** (Open membership)
 - **Assessment** (Open to three new members members who serve three-year terms)
 - **Awards** (Open membership)
 - **Business, Finance, and Audit** (Open to one person from the ACJS membership selected by the 2nd Vice President)
- **Committee on National Criminal Justice Month** (Open membership)
 - **Constitution and By-Laws** (Open to three new members selected by the 2nd Vice President and serve three-year terms)
 - **Ethics** (Members are nominated by the Trustees-At-Large and appointed by the ACJS Executive Board and serve three-year terms)
 - **Membership** (Open membership)
 - **Nominations and Elections** (Members are appointed by the Immediate Past President)
- **Program**
 - **Public Policy** (Open membership)
 - **Publications** (Open membership)
 - **Student Affairs** (Open membership)
 - **Crime and Justice Research Alliance (CJRA)** (Open to two members at large appointed by the 1st Vice President)

The success of ACJS depends on having a dedicated cadre of volunteers.

Committee membership is an excellent way to make a difference in the future of ACJS.



CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

The ACJS Nominations and Elections Committee is soliciting nominations for the following Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences offices: Second Vice President, Secretary, Trustee-At-Large, Region One Trustee, and Region Five Trustee. All candidates for office must be regular ACJS members in good standing. The individuals who are elected will take office at the Friday 2019 ACJS Executive Board Meeting.

The person elected to the office of Second Vice President will have a four-year term of office on the ACJS Executive Board and will hold the offices of Second Vice President, First Vice President, President, and Immediate Past President in turn. The persons elected to the office of Secretary and Trustee-at-Large will have a three-year term. The person elected to a Regional Trustee position will have a three-year term. Only current ACJS Regular members holding professional employment affiliation in the Region and having been a member of the respective regional association for at least one full year immediately prior to being nominated or petitioning may run for the respective Trustee position. Region One includes the states Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont; and District Columbia and the Canadian Provinces of New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Ontario, Prince Edward Island, and Quebec. Region Five includes the states of Alaska, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming; and Canadian Provinces of Alberta and British Columbia; and the Pacific Territories and Possessions.

Individuals seeking ACJS office may achieve candidacy by either petition or nomination. Individuals who use the petition process automatically secure candidacy, as long as the petitions are deemed to meet the minimum number of signatures required. Individuals who are nominated for office shall compete for placement on the slate via review by the Nominations and Elections Committee, which will make a recommendation to the ACJS Executive Board regarding the final slate of candidates.

Those nominating individuals for ACJS office are expected to contact the nominee to ensure that the nominee is willing to run for the office in question. An ACJS member seeking an office via petition must obtain seventy-five (75) signatures of Regular ACJS members in good standing. The petition must state the name and complete address of the candidate, e-mail address, home and office phone numbers, and the office the candidate is seeking. To facilitate verification, the petition must also include the clearly printed name, signature, and institutional affiliation or address of each ACJS member signing it and the signature date. More than one petition form may be submitted on behalf of a specific candidate.

Nomination Forms Must Be **Postmarked** By July 1, 2018. The Nomination Form can be found on the ACJS website at: <http://www.acjs.org/page/FormsPolicyManual>

Petition Forms Must Be **Received** No Later Than June 15, 2018. The Petition Form can be found on the ACJS website at: <http://www.acjs.org/page/FormsPolicyManual>

Mail all nominations and petitions to:

Nicole Leeper Piquero, Chair
ACJS Nominations and Elections Committee
Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences
7339 Hanover Parkway, Suite A
Greenbelt, MD 20770.

Address any questions to the Committee by contacting Dr. Piquero at npiquero@utdallas.edu.

As per ACJS Policy 303.01, the following rank-ordered criteria will be used by the Nominations and Elections Committee in making recommendations to the ACJS Executive Board regarding the final slate of candidates.

1. *Dependability, demonstrated experience, record of accomplishments.*
2. *Demonstrable service to the Academy.*
3. *Demonstrable record of scholarship or contributions to the field of criminal justice.*

ACJS Policy 104.01 states its goal of inclusivity. ACJS seeks to provide opportunities for all its members to participate in the business of the Academy, including policy and decision-making.

NOTE: *The final slate of candidates approved by the ACJS Executive Board will be asked to complete a Candidate's Information Form. This document will include length of ACJS membership, previous service for ACJS, previous service to other criminal justice organizations, major publications, and a candidate's statement.*



Call for Nominations

Academy Awards

To be presented at the
2019 ACJS Awards Ceremony

Baltimore Marriott Waterfront Hotel
Baltimore, MD

2019 ACJS Awards – Nominations Deadline – August 15, 2018

Bruce Smith Sr. Award
Academy Fellow Award
Academy Founder's Award
Outstanding Book Award
The William L. Simon/Routledge Outstanding Paper Award
The Michael C. Braswell/Routledge Outstanding Dissertation Award
ACJS Minority Mentorship Grant Award
Academy New Scholar Award
Outstanding Mentor Awards
Donal MacNamara Award
Leadership and Innovation Award

**SAGE Junior Faculty Professional Development Teaching Awards and
Ken Peak Innovations in Teaching Award–
Nominations Deadline – October 15, 2018**

***Award descriptions, nominations criteria, and submission information are
available in the “Awards” Section of the ACJS website at www.acjs.org.***

George Higgins
ACJS Awards Committee Chair
University of Louisville
george.higgins@louisville.edu

Call for Papers From the *Journal of Gang Research*:

The *Journal of Gang Research* is an interdisciplinary journal, now in its 25th year as a professional quarterly publication, and it is the official publication of the National Gang Crime Research Center (NGCRC). It is a peer-reviewed quarterly professional journal and the editors are well-known gang researchers or gang experts. It is abstracted in a number of different social sciences, including but not limited to: Sociological Abstracts (American Sociological Association), Psychological Abstracts (American Psychological Association), Criminal Justice Abstracts, National Criminal Justice Reference Service, Social Service Abstracts, and others.

For over twenty years, the *Journal of Gang Research* has published original quantitative and qualitative criminological research dealing with gangs and gang problems. These publications have included a wide range of topical areas including theory, qualitative and quantitative research, and useful policy analysis related to gangs and gang problems. A list of the articles previously published in the *Journal of Gang Research* (along with other information) is published at the NGCRC website: www.ngcrc.com/ngcrc.page2.htm

INFORMATION FOR AUTHORS

We are inviting submissions of original research on gangs, gang members, gang problems, gang crime patterns, gang prevention, and gang social policy issues.

Authors should submit four (4) copies of the paper in ASA or APA format to: George W. Knox, Ph.D., Editor-in-Chief, *Journal of Gang Research*, National Gang Crime Research Center, Post Office Box 990, Peotone, IL 604681-0990.

Sample Issue Request Form

Yes, please send me a free sample copy of
the *Journal of Gang Research*.

Name: _____

School/Agency: _____

Address: _____

City, ST, Zip: _____

Mail to: Journal of Gang Research, NGCRC, PO Box 990, Peotone, IL 60468-0990.

Fax to: (708) 258-9546

Main Website: www.ngcrc.com

Justice Quarterly Review

Call for Papers

Jeffery Ulmer, the *JQ Review* Editor, is pleased to invite submissions for the 2018 *JQ Review* issue: *Prosecutorial Discretion: Processes and Outcomes*. We invite manuscripts that examine topics such as:

- Prosecutors' interactions and relations with police
- Prosecutorial charging decisions
- Prosecutors and plea bargaining, including charge bargaining, sentencing bargaining, fact bargaining, and other dimensions
- Prosecutors' discretion around pursuing mandatory minimums
- Prosecutors' relations with the broader court community
- Disparities in prosecutorial decisions and outcomes
- Prosecutorial accountability and decision visibility
- Prosecutors and the death penalty



We will consider theoretical as well as empirical papers, and we welcome quantitative, qualitative, and multimethod research. All submissions will be subject to peer review and are due no later than **March 31th, 2018**. Please submit manuscripts through [JQ's Scholar One submission site](#), following the *Justice Quarterly* [Instructions for authors](#). In your cover letter please note that your submission is specifically for the *Justice Quarterly Review* issue, so that it is assigned to the Review Editor. If you have questions, please submit them to Jeffery Ulmer by email at jtu100@psu.edu. For more information about *Justice Quarterly*, please visit www.tandfonline.com/rjqy.

ACJS Today

Editor: **David Myers, PhD**
Professor and PhD Program Director
University of New Haven
300 Boston Post Rd. West Haven, CT
06516
Phone: 203.479.4883
dmyers@newhaven.edu

Historian: **Mitchel P. Roth, PhD**
Sam Houston State University
College of Criminal Justice
P.O. Box 2296
Huntsville, TX 77341
Phone: 936.294.1649
icc_mpr@shsu.edu

ACJS National Office

Executive Director: John L. Worrall
worrall@utdallas.edu

Association Manager: Cathy L. Barth
manager@acjs.org

Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences
P. O. Box 960
Greenbelt, Maryland 20770

Office Location:
7339 Hanover Parkway, Suite A
Greenbelt, MD 20768-0960
Tel.: (301) 446-6300; (800) 757-ACJS (2257)
Fax: (301) 446-2819
Website: <http://www.acjs.org>

ACJS Today Publication Schedule

January
March
May
September
November

Copyright © 2017 by the Academy of Criminal
Justice Sciences. All rights reserved. Distributed
to all current members of ACJS.

Submission Deadlines

December 15th
February 15th
April 15th
August 15th
October 15th

*The editor will use his discretion to accept, reject or
postpone manuscripts.*

Article Guidelines

Articles may vary in writing style (i.e., tone) and length. Articles should be relevant to the field of criminal justice, criminology, law, sociology, or related curriculum and interesting to our readership. Please include your name, affiliation, and e-mail address, which will be used as your biographical information. **Submission of an article to the editor of *ACJS Today* implies that the article has not been published elsewhere nor is it currently under submission to another publication.**

ACJS 2018 – 2019 Executive Board

President

Faith Lutze
Washington State University
Criminal Justice Program
P.O. Box 644872
Pullman, WA 99164
509-335-2272
lutze@mail.wsu.edu

1st Vice President

Prabha Unnithan
Colorado State University
Department of Sociology
200 West Lake Street
Fort Collins, CO 80523
970-491-6615
prabha.unnithan@colostate.edu

2nd Vice President

Cassia Spohn, Ph.D.
Foundation Professor and Director
School of Criminology and Criminal Justice
Arizona State University
411 N. Central Ave, Suite 600
Phoenix, AZ 85004
602-496-2334
cassia.spohn@asu.edu

Immediate Past President

Nicole Leeper Piquero
University of Texas at Dallas
Program in Criminology
800 West Campbell Road
Richardson, TX 75080
972-883-2485
npiquero@utdallas.edu

Treasurer

Marlyn J. Jones
California State University, Sacramento
6000 J Street
Sacramento, CA 95819-6085
916-278-7048
916-278-7692
marlyn@csus.edu

Secretary

Heather L. Pfeifer
University of Baltimore
1420 North Charles Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
410-837-5292
hpfeifer@ubalt.edu

Trustees-At-Large:

Peter J. Benekos
Mercyhurst University
Erie, PA 16546
814-572-7842
pbenekos@mercyhurst.edu

Ashley Blackburn
Department of Criminal Justice
University of Houston – Downtown
One Main Street, C-340M
Houston, TX 77002
713-222-5326
blackburna@uhd.edu

Regional Trustees:

Region 1—Northeast

Aimee "May" Delaney, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Criminal Justice
Worcester State University
Department of Criminal Justice
486 Chandler Street
Worcester, MA 01602
(508) 929-8421
adelaney@worcester.edu

Region 2—Southern

Leah Daigle
Georgia State University
Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology
140 Decatur Street
1227 Urban Life Building
Atlanta, GA 30303
404-413-1037
ldaigle@gsu.edu

Region 3—Midwest

Victoria Simpson Beck
University of Wisconsin Oshkosh
Department of Criminal Justice
421 Clow Faculty, 800 Algoma Blvd.
Oshkosh, WI 54901-8655
(920) 424-7094 - Office
beckv@uwosh.edu

Region 4—Southwest

Christine Nix
University of Mary Hardin Baylor
Criminal Justice Program
UMHB Box 8014, 900 College Street
Belton, TX 76513
254-295-5513
Christine.nix@umhb.edu

Region 5—Western

Ricky S. Gutierrez, Ph.D.
Division of Criminal Justice
California State University, Sacramento
6000 J. Street
Sacramento, CA 95819-6085
916-278-5094
rickyg@csus.edu

National Office Staff:

Executive Director

John L. Worrall
University of Texas at Dallas
800 West Campbell Road, GR 31
Richardson, TX 75080
972-883-4893
worrall@utdallas.edu

Executive Director Emeritus

Mittie D. Southerland
1525 State Route 2151
Melber, KY 42069
270-674-5697
270-674-6097 (fax)

Association Manager

Cathy L. Barth
P.O. Box 960
Greenbelt, MD 20768-0960
301-446-6300
800-757-2257
301-446-2819 (fax)
manager@acjs.org