From the President

John Vivian
Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections

In graduate school we learned about the importance of contributing to our profession, and an important way to demonstrate that contribution is participation in professional organizations like the WSC. Over 120 colleagues from three countries and 23 states and Canadian provinces participated in our 2007 conference in Arizona. Almost one-third of the participants were students. Please set aside February 14 through 16, 2008 for participation in the next WSC conference. We will be meeting at the Holiday Inn, Sacramento Capitol Plaza. The hotel is within walking distance of several attractions and the Holiday Inn has complimentary high speed internet. We are evaluating cites in San Diego (2009) and Hawaii (2010) for future WSC conferences.

Many of the 2007 conference presentations addressed important policy issues, and I believe that significant changes can occur when research guides policy. I have been an embedded researcher within three Arizona criminal and juvenile justice agencies for over 25 years, and during that time learned to modify my style to provide policy relevant research. I have seen colleagues struggle unsuccessfully with the constraints posed by the conduct of operational research. It is challenging to make research results relevant, but it is rewarding to see policy makers apply research findings to important criminal justice problems. Any researcher wishing to perform policy relevant work should keep five principles in mind. First, data quality may be more important than the methodological sophistication. At times, operational research findings are reviewed by staff who are intimately familiar with agency raw data, and they are keenly aware of its strengths and weaknesses. The best methodology in the discipline will yield useless results if the raw data are perceived as invalid or unreliable. Second, we live in an instantaneous world, and an immediate answer to a research question is often expected. Under those circumstances it is preferable to give a good answer to a research question rather than waiting for an ideal answer that may take weeks or months to research. Third, researchers should remember that they are a part of a team, and the other team members are unlikely to be trained researchers. It is essential that they have confidence in your work. A simple method that non-researchers can understand will have a greater impact upon policy, than a sophisticated methodology that is too technical to be understood. Next, research audiences need to be told what our research results mean. Succinct statements of what was found and what the findings mean are priceless. Finally, in graduate school we learned about stick-to-itiveness, or the ability to persevere. The same principle of stick-to-itiveness applies to conducting policy relevant work. Researchers able to endure the vicissitudes of operational research over time can have a great impact upon policy.

I hope that you find the five principles of policy relevant research useful, and that they contribute to achieving the WSC goal of: "...foster(ing) criminological scholarship, research, education, and training within academic institutions and within the components of the criminal and juvenile justice systems, including public and private agencies concerned with crime, justice, and corrections."

From the Editor

Yvette Farmer

In an earlier issue of this newsletter, Miki Vohryzek-Bolden talked about honoring colleagues in life and after death. In life, Inger Sagatan-Edwards, past president of the WSC, received the Lohman award for outstanding contributions to the WSC. She passed away recently, and now we honor her after death. With
help from Barbara Bloom, we hope that you will appreciate Inger’s
spirit and the contributions that she made to the WSC and the
profession.

In an effort to see that the newsletter remains informative and
continues to challenge its readers to critically evaluate important
issues in criminology and criminal justice, you will see an article on
protecting animal companions when they are part of the domestic
violence experience and the idea of creating a therapeutic
community for sex offenders. In Miki’s Reflections, you will see her
thoughts on evidence-based research practices which supplement
our President’s thoughts on the five principles of policy relevant
research. If these pieces inspire you to share your thoughts in an
upcoming issue of the newsletter, please let me know.

This is our newsletter and I would like to encourage all of the
readers to take an active role in sharing important ideas and
information with the membership. The deadline for receipt of
materials will be March 1st for the Spring issue and August 1st for
the Fall issue. Ideas should be sent to Dr. Yvette Farmer, California
State University, Sacramento, 6000 J Street, Sacramento, California
95815-6015. The telephone number is (916) 278-5062 or 278-6487
(message).

I look forward to hearing your ideas, answering your questions, or
addressing your concerns about the newsletter.

WSC Acknowledges
the Life and Contributions of
Inger Sagatun-Edwards

By Barbara Bloom

On April 2, 2007, the Western Society of Criminology (WSC) lost a
past president, long-time member, colleague and friend. Inger
Sagatun-Edwards died in her Los Altos Hills home several months
after being diagnosed with an aggressive form of pancreatic cancer.
She was 62 years old.

Inger’s academic career spanned nearly four decades. She came to
California from Norway as an exchange student, returned home, then
eventually came back on a full scholarship to Stanford University
where she received her doctorate in sociology in 1971. She taught
at UC Riverside before coming to San Jose State University (SJSU)
in 1975 where she served as Chair of the Department of Justice
Studies for twelve years before becoming Dean of the College of
Applied Sciences and Arts in 2005.

I first met Inger as a member of the WSC board in the 1990s. I had
been aware of her research and policy-related work in the areas of
family and domestic violence, child abuse, and juvenile justice, but I
got to know her even better through the WSC. She served as WSC
President (1996-97) and was awarded the Joseph Lohman Award for
Outstanding Contributions to the WSC in 1997.

The WSC held its first ever conference in Honolulu in February of
1997 when Inger was President and I recall how much she enjoyed
the President’s reception which was on the terrace overlooking the
marina at the Hawaii Prince Hotel. The conference was a bitter sweet
event for her because, six months prior in August of 1996, her
teenage son, Don, was killed in an auto accident.

I also had the very good fortune to teach in the Administration of
Justice Department at SJSU from 1998 to 2000 when Inger was
department chair. It was because of her encouragement that I
applied for and obtained my first tenure track assistant professor
position at SJSU. When I ultimately left SJSU to take a full-time
position at Sonoma State University, which was closer to home,
Inger fondly and humorously never let me forget it.

Mona Lynch, who succeeded Inger as Chair of the Department of
Justice Studies at SJSU was quoted in the university newspaper as
follows: “She was warm, she was funny. She was driven and strong.
She kept us all in line, but with a smile on her face, and we really all
just cared deeply for her—in the department and in the college.”

My husband, Peter Cohn, and I were among over 1,000 people who
attended a memorial service for Inger on April 9th at Stanford
Memorial Church. Inger’s husband, Judge Len Edwards, recently
retired from Santa Clara County Juvenile Court, her son Erik, family
members, friends and colleagues celebrated her life and spoke
eloquenty about the contributions that she made to their lives.
There was great joy and gratitude present as the speakers intimately
described how Inger profoundly enriched their lives through such
wise counsel, generous insights, thoughtful conversations and
generous hospitality.

In her message on the College of Applied Sciences and Arts website,
Inger set forth the college’s vision “to serve societal needs through
innovative applications of knowledge and to empower graduates to
be exemplary members of a diverse global community.” Let this,
among her other significant contributions to family, academia, and
community, be a lasting legacy and a testament to her vision,
strength and commitment to all humankind.

Inger Sagatun-Edwards
December 24, 1944 - April 2, 2007
COME JOIN US!

WESTERN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY
35TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE
HOLIDAY INN
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
FEBRUARY 14 - 16, 2008

We encourage you to mark your calendar for the 35th Annual Conference of the WSC. The theme of the conference is Social Justice: Informing Evidence-based Policy and Planning. The Program Chairs are: Dr. Christine Famega, Department of Criminal Justice, CSU San Bernardino, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA 92407 and Dr. Adrienne Freng, Department of Criminal Justice, University of Wyoming, 1000 E. University, Dept. 3197, Laramie, WY 82071. The Call for Papers appears in this issue, but you may also want to contact Dr. Famega, Dr. Freng, or check out our website - www.sonoma.edu/cja/wsc/main/html for additional information about the conference. We look forward to seeing you in California’s Capital City!

MIKI’S REFLECTIONS
Miki Vohryzek-Bolden

Many criminal justice journals are replete with articles addressing ‘what works,’ evidence-based practices in community corrections and in institutional settings, and other articles that focus on the importance of implementation of these evidence-based practices. There are also a number of articles that have used meta-analysis of existing research studies to assess the impact of certain programs on recidivism. One only has to look at recent articles in the Criminology and Public Policy, Journal of Experimental Criminology, Law and Human Behavior, and publications from the National Institute of Corrections and the National Institute of Justice to fully grasp the importance that public policy decision-makers are placing on ‘evidence-based’ criminal justice programs.

Why is this an important trend and why should we take notice? Recidivism rates are high, especially for adult offenders, and the costs of incarceration continue to rise. Some states, including California, have shifted towards a consideration of programs that offer some hope for rehabilitation of inmates. In a January 2006 report from the Washington State Institute for Public Policy, the authors note that “the goal [of evidence-based criminal justice programs] is to improve the criminal justice system by implementing programs and policies that have been shown to work. Just as important, research findings can be used to eliminate programs that have failed to produce desired outcomes.”

Every year, our state legislatures and correctional agencies fund various programs for adult and juvenile offenders without any rigorous evaluation of their respective effectiveness. Why make that financial investment without any evidence regarding their effectiveness? There is always the potential that we may do more harm than good with ineffective programs. Seems to me that this is bad fiscal and public policy. The number of articles that focus on evidence-based practices also suggest that our criminal justice agencies want to see more rigorous evaluations of their programs.

We, as criminal justice researchers, have an opportunity to make a difference in our field by providing our justice agencies with research that focuses on measurable outcomes. In our reports, we also need to indicate that identifying interventions with quality research support often necessitates a realignment of the organizational infrastructure. In other words, the correctional agencies must avoid both the ‘cookie-cutter’ approach to program implementation and the ‘we’ve always done it this way’ attitude of many of its employees. Change requires commitment. Commitment comes in part from buy-in, which is strengthened when employees are informed early and often about the pending changes and well-trained in its programmatic aspects.

I encourage all of you to consider what this trend means for you as criminal justice professionals. On a practical note, we need to remember that most of the people who go to prison get out. So why not give them proven tools to succeed in the community and not return to prison?
# CALL FOR PARTICIPATION

**Western Society of Criminology**

35th Annual Conference

**Theme – Social Justice: Informing Evidence-Based Policy and Planning**

**February 14-16, 2008 • Sacramento, CA**

> Please note that the deadline to send abstracts topic chairs is October 5, 2007 <

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUVENILE JUSTICE ISSUES</th>
<th>POLICING</th>
<th>COURTS &amp; CORRECTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Vivian</td>
<td>Aili Malm</td>
<td>Laurie Kubicek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator of Research and Development</td>
<td>Department of Criminal Justice</td>
<td>California State University, Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections</td>
<td>California State University – Long Beach</td>
<td>Division of Criminal Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624 W. Adams Street</td>
<td>1250 Bellflower Blvd.</td>
<td>6000 J Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, AZ 85007</td>
<td>Long Beach, CA 90840</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95819-6085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 602-542-2274</td>
<td>Phone: 562-477-0879</td>
<td>Phone: 916-278-5066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: 602-542-4026</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:amalm@csulb.edu">amalm@csulb.edu</a></td>
<td>Fax: 916-278-7692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:jvivian@azdjc.gov">jvivian@azdjc.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:lkubicek@csus.edu">lkubicek@csus.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHY OF CRIME</th>
<th>RACE, CLASS, GENDER &amp; CRIME</th>
<th>THEORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Kinney</td>
<td>Brenda Vogel</td>
<td>Yvette Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fraser University</td>
<td>Department of Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Division of Criminal Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Criminology, Institute for Canadian Urban Research Studies (ICURS)</td>
<td>California State University, Long Beach</td>
<td>California State University, Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8888 University Dr.</td>
<td>1250 Bellflower Blvd.</td>
<td>6000 J Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, BC, CANADA V5A IS6</td>
<td>Long Beach, CA 90840-4603</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95819-6085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 604-268-7234</td>
<td>Phone: 562-985-1894</td>
<td>Phone: 916-278-5062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: 604-291-4140</td>
<td>Fax: 562-985-8086</td>
<td>Fax: 916-278-7692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:jkinney@sfu.ca">jkinney@sfu.ca</a></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:bvogel@csulb.edu">bvogel@csulb.edu</a></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:drfarmer@csus.edu">drfarmer@csus.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERRORISM OR INTERNATIONAL CRIME</th>
<th>TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE</th>
<th>PUBLIC POLICY AND PLANNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finn-Aage Esbensen</td>
<td>Connie Ireland</td>
<td>Stacy L. Mallicoat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Department of Criminal Justice</td>
<td>California State University, Fullerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri-St. Louis</td>
<td>California State University, Long Beach</td>
<td>Division of Politics, Administration and Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330 Lucas Hall</td>
<td>1250 Bellflower Blvd.</td>
<td>PO Box 6848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8001 Natural Bridge Road</td>
<td>Long Beach, CA 90840-4603</td>
<td>Fullerton, CA 92834-6848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, MO 63121</td>
<td>Phone: 562-985-8711</td>
<td>Phone: 714-278-2132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 314-516-4619</td>
<td>Fax: 562-985-8086</td>
<td>Fax: 714-278-3524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:esbensen@umsl.edu">esbensen@umsl.edu</a></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:cireland@csulb.edu">cireland@csulb.edu</a></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:smallicoat@fullerton.edu">smallicoat@fullerton.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In deciding the most appropriate place to send your abstract, think about the main focus of your paper and how it might fit with the topic of the panel. For example, if your paper examines both race and juvenile issues, think about whether you would like to be placed on a panel with other papers discussing race issues or other papers dealing with juvenile issues and then send to the most appropriate topic chair. Electronic submissions are preferred to hard copies being mailed or faxed. All presenters are asked to submit an abstract to only one of the panel topics listed above. ALSO, PLEASE KEEP YOUR ABSTRACT TO 150 WORDS OR LESS.

CONFERENCE REGISTRATION!

All conference participants need to make reservations by January 15, 2008. Information about the Holiday Inn Capital Plaza can be found on the hotel website (www.holidayinnsacramento.com) or by calling 1-800-HOLIDAY or directly at 916-446-0100. To receive the conference rate of $124+tax (single) or $134+tax (double), you need to indicate that you are with the Western Society of Criminology Annual Conference.

STUDENTS

The Western Society of Criminology provides several opportunities for students in conjunction with the annual conference, including travel money and a paper competition. Please see the following for requirements and application information.

June Morrison Scholarship Fund: The WSC offers five ($100) student scholarships for participation in our annual conference. WSC student members who have had their papers selected for presentation are eligible to apply, and the funds are awarded on a first-come, first served basis. Applications must be received by January 1, 2008, and information can be obtained by consulting Student Information, which is in the Conference section of the WSC website (http://www.sonoma.edu/cja/wsc/wscp/)

Miki Vohryzek-Bolden (MVB) Student Paper Competition: Students are eligible to complete in a Student Paper Competition sponsored by WSC. One undergraduate and one graduate student paper (either sole authored or co-authored) will be selected. Papers co-authored by faculty will not be considered. Appropriate types of papers include but are not limited to policy analyses, original research, literature reviews, position papers, theoretical papers, and commentaries. Students selected for this award will be recognized at the conference and will receive a cash award and registration reimbursement. Information can be obtained by consulting Student Information, which is in the Conference section of the WSC website (http://www.sonoma.edu/cja/wsc/wscp/).
Where are the Wild Things?:
Animals Caught in the Domestic Violence-Abuse Cross-Fire Find Themselves in Protective Orders

Sue Cote, J.D., Ph.D.
California State University, Sacramento

The cases typically read like this one:

A jury in November [2004] found John W. Witham, 27 [of Randolph, Maine] guilty of deliberately driving his pickup truck over a pet carrier containing his girlfriend’s cat as it was having kittens in the driveway of their Augusta (Maine) home. ‘It’s me or the cat,’ Witham reportedly told Jessica James [his girlfriend](Pet-Abuse.com, 2007)

Sadly, cases like the one above are not new in the world of animal cruelty or domestic violence. They reflect further evidence of the connection or “link” between animal cruelty and interpersonal violence. More importantly, these cases also reflect a need to protect animals caught in this domestic violence (DV) cross-fire.

Currently, most if not all fifty states provide assistance to domestic violence victims by allowing them to get protective orders for them and their children. Unfortunately, most states do not offer assistance to domestic violence victims that would allow them to remove or safely place their companion animals elsewhere. This occurs despite the fact that animal abuse is prevalent in homes where children have been abused and neglected. Many statutes contain language that allow victims, with police assistance, to make a one-time stop at the home to procure essential personal effects for themselves and their children, but no mention of the family pet. This gap in many state laws has left victims between a rock and hard place; many feel they have to make a choice between their own safety and the safety of their pet.

Fortunately, state legislatures have acknowledged the link between domestic violence and animal cruelty by introducing bills that will allow judges to include pets in protective orders. The following states have enacted the bills into law: Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Maine, Nevada, New York, Tennessee, and Vermont. Presently, seven states have bills pending, including California (SB 353). Under SB 353, the victim would be granted exclusive care, custody, or control of any animal owned by him or her and/or by a minor child living at the residence. Additionally, the bill authorizes the courts to prohibit the abuser from coming into contact with the victim, the child, and the animal companion.

The passage of these laws and the number of bills pending that will provide protection to animals caught in the DV cross-fire reflect an ideological change in the ways in which animals are perceived, treated, and valued in our society today. Though the legal, moral, and ethical debates roar on over the status of animals, these small steps offer progress in the realm of animal-human relations.

An Alternative to Release: A Therapeutic Community for Sex Offenders

Kym Crowder, Graduate Student
California State University, Sacramento

Herman Paschke, a sex offender who was convicted of committing multiple rapes was released from prison in Washington on July 18, 2007. Key factors involved in the release decision were: he graduated from Washington’s sex offender treatment program, he is elderly, and he has an undisclosed medical condition. Given these three factors, officials within the Criminal Justice System (CJS) believe that he is less than 50% likely to re-offend.

The release of Herman exposes the division between the CJS and the public regarding options for sex offenders after their prison terms are completed. Communities in which sex offenders are to be housed never fail to create uproars upon notification of offenders moving into their neighborhoods. Statewide, decisions to release or hold sex offenders are based on such factors as costs related to holding/treating offenders and the constitutionality of civil commitment.

In 2006 at Atascadero State Hospital in California, the average cost of residential treatment for an adult sex offender was $411 per day. This amounts to over $150,000 per year to civilly commit one offender. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the average yearly operating cost per inmate in 2001 was $22,650 or $62 per day. A comparison of these dollar amounts indicates that the cost of treating a sex offender is $349 per day greater than housing a non-sex offending prisoner. Additional costs are also incurred by legal challenges to current laws focusing on controlling sex offenders or the infringement on their constitutional rights. Thus far, courts have upheld the states’ management of offenders through the use of civil commitment and/or mandatory registration and tracking of released offenders.

The extent of discontent with the release of sex offenders in communities is illustrated by attendance at neighborhood meetings in which local authorities announce that a new resident is a sex offender. The old adage, “Not in my backyard!” applies. Members of communities work closely with local officers to prevent sex offenders from re-offending by keeping tabs on them and looking out for suspicious behaviors. However, whereas prison housing prevents the possibility of sex offenders recommitting an offense, the housing of them in a community puts the public in a defensive position.

One possible solution is to create a self-sustaining therapeutic community in which offenders, who are released from the confinement of prison, are moved into a community with other offenders that have specifically-defined boundaries. The area could be enclosed with limited entrances and exits and 24-hour guards to secure them. Each offender would have individualized treatment programs including psychotherapy, group therapy, cognitive-behavioral therapy, and, if necessary, pharmacological therapy. Offenders could pursue the same crafts, trades, and professions as
are seen in the community at large (e.g., farmers, bankers, storekeepers, churchmen, medical providers, sanitation workers, etc.). A sense of self-worth, contribution to community, and some level of control over one's own life could develop. Offenders would live together, work together, and be treated together.

Numerous advantages to this proposal are: prevention of access to new victims; community members would be free from the worry of having offenders in the community; incurred costs would be less expensive than traditional civil commitment. Admittedly, the issues surrounding civil commitment would not be resolved, but, human rights activists may raise fewer objections.

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

**An invitation to share your thoughts...**

As a community of scholars in academia and various professional agencies, we have many thoughts and experiences that we could share with each other. Do you feel strongly about a certain topic? Would you be willing to write about it? Do you believe that others would enjoy reading it? If you answered 'yes' to these questions, please consider sending me an article that I can publish in the newsletter. Your thoughts may benefit all of us and should be sent to Yvette Farmer at drfarmer@csus.edu.

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*