DATE: September 20, 2011

I. RESEARCH PROPOSAL SUMMARY

Principal Researcher: David Mezeika, Criminal Justice Coordinating Council

Title: Assessment of Recidivism in the District of Columbia

Institution: Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC), Washington, DC

Description: The objective of this study is to 1) assess the ways in which DC criminal justice agencies define and measure recidivism, and use this information to inform decision-making; and 2) conduct a District-wide recidivism analysis from a cohort of previously incarcerated individuals. Researchers will provide recommendations based on the frequency, prevalence and degree to which a number of covariates affect recidivism.

This study pertains to CSOSA only.

Subjects, Type of Data and Analysis: The researchers will use a cohort of approximately 3,900 persons sentenced and released from the DOC in FY 2007. The researchers currently have a number of demographic variables, unique identifiers and first release date in FY 2007. This request is to obtain from CSOSA additional data for post-release criminal justice system involvement.

Specifically, the request includes data for the following:

1. Whether the offender was under supervision after the release date provided by CSOSA;
2. How long the offender was under supervision;
3. The nature of supervision; and
4. Why this supervision was terminated.
II. RECOMMENDATION

The RRC recommendation for this study:

☑ Support  ☐ Support with Conditions  ☐ Do Not Support

The RRC considers the proposed study to be non-agency research as defined in Research and Evaluation Policy Statement 1201. The RRC recommends to support with conditions this request as described in the researcher’s proposal.

The RRC recommends support for this study with the condition that CSOSA/ORE will prepare de-identified data for CJCC. In this case, CJCC will provide ORE with an analysis file, ORE will de-identify all records and provide these to OGC for final review and approval.

- The requested data readily can be extracted with minimal CSOSA resources.
- ORE can provide the following in response to this request:
  - Construct a binary variable that indicates whether a supervision period began after the provided release date;
  - Number of days from supervision period begin date to supervision period end date;
  - Supervision level (i.e., minimum, Medium, Maximum, Intensive) on the last date of supervision; and;
  - Supervision status (e.g., Satisfactorily, Unsatisfactorily, Confined, Revoked, etc.) at time of case closure.

III. SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- The proposed research shows no evidence of non-compliance with Agency policies pertaining to research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I ACCEPT the RRC Recommendation</th>
<th>I DO NOT ACCEPT the RRC Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Signature] Adrienne R. Poteat, Acting Director, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
To The Research Review Committee

The following information is provided to assist the committee in assessing the compliance with CSOSA and PSA data sharing guidelines as laid out in Policy Statement 1201.

CJCC is conducting a recidivism study funded by the Bureau of Justice Statistics in partnership with a number of agencies including the Department of Corrections, The Metropolitan Police Department, the Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency. The objective of this study is twofold: (1) to assess the ways in which DC Criminal Justice agencies define recidivism, measure recidivism, and use that information to inform agency decision making and (2) to conduct a District-wide recidivism analysis from a cohort of previously incarcerated individuals. With this information, CJCC will analyze provide recommendations based upon the frequency, prevalence, and the degree to which a number of covariates affect recidivism.

Our current study has a cohort of approximately 3,900 individuals sentenced and released from the Department of Corrections in FY2007. For these individuals we have a number of demographic variables, unique identifiers (PDID and DCDC), and their first released date in FY2007. However, we require CSOSA to fill in some gaps in these individuals post-release life, which may be related to recidivism. While we have accurate information on when they were released we do not know:

- Whether they were under CSOSA supervision after the release date provided by CJCC
- How long they were under supervision (a start and end date)
- The nature of this supervision (eg, intensity)
- Why this supervision was terminated (eg, parole completion versus violation)

We understand that not all individuals in our cohort will have CSOSA data since many of them were released on misdemeanor offenses without any post release supervision, but if we could append the above data (or some of it) to those who were supervised by CSOSA it would greatly assist the study.

Participation in this study among the offender population will in no way affect their supervision status. All information regarding their personal information will remain confidential.
(1) A summary statement containing the following information items in the order in which they are listed below:

(a) Name(s) and current affiliation(s) of the researcher(s); David Mazeika, Criminal Justice Coordinating Council

(b) Title of the study; Assessment of Recidivism in the District of Columbia FY2007

(c) Purpose of the project; See opening letter

(d) Location of the project; Washington, DC

(e) Duration of the study; Study is a retrospective examination of pre-existing data. The collection and analyze of these data should take approximately three months.

(f) Research methods to be employed; Cox proportional hazards model

(g) Sample type and size required and time frame for sample collection; Data has already been collected from a cohort of approximately 3900 individuals sentenced and released from the Department of Corrections in fiscal year 2007. No power analysis has been conducted on this sample to determine if it has adequate statistical power.

(h) Agency staff and/or resources needed to support the study and description of the support needs: CICC will provide the compiled data to CSOSA once the data set has been received from all other agencies. CSOSA will be expected to return de-identified matched data. CSOSA ORE will need to match offender records on the available linking variables (e.g., docket number, PDID, etc.).

(i) Indication of risk or discomfort to subjects as a result of participation; None.

(j) Anticipated results; There are no formal hypotheses, but the results should inform us on the prevalence and frequency of recidivism in the District across a host of covariates.

(k) List of deliverables: A final report summarizing the study’s findings will be presented to all stakeholders participating.

(2) A detailed statement, which includes the following information items in the order in which they are listed below:
(a) **Review of the related literature;**

(b) **Detailed description of the research method;** As used in numerous studies of recidivism, the current work will employ survival analysis (also referred to as event history analysis, hazard modeling, failure-time analysis, or reliability analysis, depending on the researchers educational background). Survival analysis has a number of advantages over another commonly used technique, logistic regression, in that it does not ignore important variation in the timing of recidivism and can incorporate time-varying covariates.

(c) **Significance of anticipated results and their contribution to the advancement of knowledge;** Results may support and inform decision-making and cooperation among criminal justice agencies in DC.

(d) **Benefits of research and/or participation to CSOSA/PSA;** See above.

(e) **Specific resources required from the Agency;** As indicated in the cover letter, post-release data is requested to complete an excel file. We anticipate that it will take approximately 16-20 hours for designated staff to code, execute, review, and respond to follow-up questions.

(f) **Description of all possible risks, discomforts, and benefits to individual subjects or a class of subjects, and a discussion of the likelihood that the risks and discomforts will actually occur;** There are no risks or benefits to the subjects since the study will examine data retrospectively. All data will be removed of personal identification and stored on a secure computer.

(g) **Description of steps taken to minimize any potential risks or discomforts;** The data will be structured and presented in a way that will make it impossible to identify specific individuals in the cohort.

(h) **Description of physical and/or administrative procedures to be followed to:** 1) ensure the security of any individually identifiable data that are being collected for the project; and 2) destroy research records or remove individual identifiers from those records when the research has been completed; See above.

(i) **Description of any anticipated effects of the research project on Agency programs and operations;** The study is not designed to examine specific programs, but will provide a snapshot of recidivism rates using a variety of measures.
(j) Relevant research materials such as vitae, endorsements, descriptions of similar work undertaken, sample informed consent statements, questionnaires, and interview schedules;

See attached project schedule, survey instrument collected from the following partner agencies DYRS, CSOSA, MPD, PSA, DOC and vitae.

(k) Statement indicating that copies of all deliverables will be provided to CSOSA/PSA; and

The final report will be provided to all partner agencies.

(l) Statement that copies of any datasets will be provided to CSOSA/PSA at the conclusion of the project. The dataset will be shared with CSOSA in order to validate data during the project and the final dataset will be shared.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mannone Butler
Executive Director
Criminal Justice Coordinating Council

Enclosures (3)
**Working plan of action**

1. Determine the relevant agencies to which the questionnaire about their current practice in measuring recidivism will be sent. These agencies should currently measure recidivism and use the statistics internally or externally (June 30)
   a) Tentative list of relevant agencies: Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency, Court Social Services, Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services, DC Department of Corrections, Pretrial Services Agency, and the Metropolitan Police Department

2. Email the questionnaire to the agencies above (July 1)

3. Possible meeting with statisticians from the relevant agencies: Discuss their recidivism measures based on their responses to the questionnaire and the verification of JUSTIS data (Week of July 4)

4. Data verification: Verify the JUSTIS data we are going to analyze with the agencies that contribute data to the JUSTIS database (Week of July 4, may be Week of July 11 depending on the availability of agency statisticians)

5. First briefing report (about a week from the meeting (3) )

6. Based on the population of those who were released between Oct 2006 and Sep 2007 (approximately 4,000), determine the sample data set we are going to analyze (Weeks of July 11-July 18)
   a) Sample criteria:
      - (Sentenced by D.C. Superior Court and) released from DOC facilities between Oct 2006 and Sep 2007
      - A number of covariates will be included in this data set
      - CJCC is in negotiations with DYRS to obtain a juvenile sample as well

7. Examine recidivism rates (6, 12, 18, and 24 months following the release to community) (Weeks of July 25-August 1)

8. Second briefing report (August 10)

9. Determine relevant factors that significantly affect recidivism rates (Weeks of August 8-August 15)

10. Come up with general guidelines on what information should be accompanied by the recidivism statistics (Week of August 22)

11. Identify the reentry programs and initiatives that are currently implemented in the District and recommend the recidivism measures by which those reentry programs are evaluated (Weeks of August 29-September 5)

12. Third briefing report (September 10)

13. Preliminary draft report (September 16)

14. Presentation of findings and final draft report (September 30)
Survey: Definitions and Measurements of Recidivism

Recidivism is one of the fundamental measurements of effectiveness and accountability for criminal justice agencies, facilities, and programs. CJCC received a grant from the Bureau of Justice Statistics to look at how recidivism is measured by criminal justice agencies in the District of Columbia.

The questions that follow will ask you about your agency’s current practice in defining and measuring recidivism. Your responses will provide the basis for developing recommendations for District-wide measures of recidivism.

1. About your agency and your role in the agency:
   - Agency name: ________________________________
   - Your name: ________________________________
   - Contact information: ________________________
   - Job title: ________________________________
   - What are your primary responsibilities?
     ________________________________

2. Recidivism is normally defined as the act of reoffending after having been punished (convicted, incarcerated, etc.). Within the context of this survey, recidivism also includes other undesirable events (e.g., rearrest, fail to appear) for pretrial/un-sentenced populations. Using this broad definition of recidivism, does your agency track recidivism?

   [ ] Yes, we track recidivism
   [ ] No, we don’t track recidivism

If your answer is “yes” to Question 2, please proceed to Question 3 and continue.
If your answer is “no” to Question 2, please describe the reason(s) why your agency currently does not track recidivism and answer Question 2.1.

Reason(s): ______________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________

2.1 Do you use measures of recidivism that are not calculated by your own agency (such as those calculated by other DC agencies, or obtained through collaborations with organizations and think tanks, e.g., Urban Institute, Vera Institute, etc.)?

☐ Yes
☐ No

If your answer is “yes” to Question 2.1, please specify the agencies or organizations from which you obtain recidivism measures. Please also describe the recidivism measures.

Agencies or organizations: ________________________________________
Recidivism measures: ____________________________________________

If your answer is “no” to Question 2.1, please answer Question 2.2.

2.2 Is your agency interested in tracking and measuring recidivism in the future?

☐ Yes
☐ No

If your answer is “yes” to Question 2.2, please describe the reason(s) why your agency is interested in tracking and measuring recidivism and describe the nature and type of recidivism your agency is interested in tracking and measuring.
Reason(s):

The nature and type:

If your answer is "no" to Question 2.2, please describe the reason(s) why your agency is currently not interested in tracking and measuring recidivism.

Reason(s):

3. What population does your agency track recidivism for?
   *Please check all that apply*

   - [ ] Pretrial
   - [ ] Probation
   - [ ] Parole
   - [ ] Supervised release
   - [ ] Other (Please specify) ________________________________

4. Does your agency track recidivism separately for special need populations?
   *Please check all that apply*
☐ Yes (Please check all the conditions that characterize the populations):
  ☐ Sex offenses
  ☐ Domestic violence
  ☐ Substance abuse
  ☐ Mental health
  ☐ Gangs
  ☐ Other (Please specify) ____________________________

☐ No

5. If your agency tracks recidivism, does it measure the extent of recidivism in some way (e.g., 12-month recidivism rate)?

  ☐ Yes
  ☐ No

If your answer is “yes”, please proceed to Question 6 and continue.

If your answer is “no”, please explain the reason(s) why your agency tracks recidivism, but does not quantify its extent.

Reason(s): ____________________________

______________________________

6. How does your agency measure recidivism?
   • Recidivism event (the event that determines that a person has recidivated):
* Please check all that apply

☐ Arrest
☐ Conviction/adjudication
☐ Incarceration/confinement
☐ Violation of supervision conditions
☐ Other (Please specify the event) ____________________

- How long are the tracking or follow-up periods for recidivism? In other words, how long does your agency follow individuals after they are initially punished to examine if they have reoffended or violated supervision conditions in some way?
* Please check all that apply

☐ 6 months
☐ 12 months
☐ 18 months
☐ 24 months
☐ 36 months
☐ Other (Please specify) ____________________

- Does your agency calculate the extent of recidivism by any of the following methods?
* Check all that apply

☐ The percentage who recidivated during the period of follow-up (this is often referred to as “recidivism rate”)

☐ Total number of recidivism events during the period of follow-up

Average frequency rate (dividing the total number of recidivism events for each person by the total time in community, and taking the average)
☐ Other (Please specify) ____________________________

- Does your agency measure recidivism by the type of reoffending or the type of supervision violations? (e.g., violent offense vs. non-violent, a new crime vs. technical violation, rearrest vs. failure to appear)
  ☐ Yes
  ☐ No

7. Does your agency measure recidivism by the characteristics of the individuals who are supervised by your agency?
   *Please check all that apply

  ☐ Age (in years)
  ☐ Sex (Male, Female)
  ☐ Ethnicity
  ☐ Race
    Type of offense that resulted in the individual being supervised by your agency (e.g., conviction offense) or the severity of the offense (felony vs. misdemeanor)
  ☐ Employment status
  ☐ Educational attainment
  ☐ Marital status
  ☐ Residential stability
  ☐ Special supervision conditions (domestic violence, sex offender, gang affiliation, etc.)
  ☐ Participation in treatments (e.g., substance abuse, mental health), educational/vocational training
  ☐ Offense history (e.g., age at first arrest, number of prior arrests/convictions/incarcerations)
  ☐ Risk level based on risk assessments
  ☐ Other (Please specify) ____________________________
8. How does your agency use the recidivism information recidivism you collect/calculate? *Please check all that apply
   □ External reporting
   □ Internal program evaluation or assessment
   □ Agency planning
   □ Other (Please specify) _______________

9. Are there aspects of the manner in which your agency defines and measures recidivism that are not adequately captured by the above questions? If so, please describe them here.

10. Please describe the rationale for the manner in which your agency defines and measures recidivism. For example, if your agency only tracks and measures reincarceration as a recidivism event, why not track and measure reconviction as a recidivism event?


THIS IS THE END OF THE SURVEY.

Thank you for taking the time to answer our questions.

Your input is very important to this project.
David Mazeika
University of Maryland
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
2220 LeFrak Hall
College Park, Maryland 20740
Phone: 202-642-0429
Email: dmazeika@umd.edu

EDUCATION

Doctor of Philosophy
Expected 2012
Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Maryland, College Park

Master of Arts
December 2008
Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Maryland, College Park

Dr. David Weisburd, Chair

Bachelor of Arts
May 2004
Major: Law and Justice
Minor: Political Science
With Honors
Rowan University, Glassboro NJ

RESEARCH INTERESTS

Crime and place, the spatial analysis of crime, statistics, evidence-based policies, crime trends, the diffusion of innovations, and policing.

PEER REVIEWED PUBLICATIONS


WORKING PAPERS
Mazelka, David, Amy Sariti, and Brad Bartholomew. The role of opportunity in mapping and forecasting crime on a college campus.

Sariti, Amy, Bartholomew, Brad, and David Mazelka. Assessing the various methodological approaches to measuring the stability of hot spots.

Posick, Chad, Michael Rocque, Kevin Whiteacre, and David Mazelka. The Rationality of Metal Theft: An Opportunity Approach.

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS


PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Coordinator for 2011 Jerry Lee Crime Prevention Symposium

Statistical Advisor for Gemstone Honors Program, Fall 2010 / Spring 2011.


Mazelka, David, and Brad Bartholomew. Campus Safety Awareness for Education. Presented at The University of Maryland, College Park, Fall 2009.

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Graduate Research Assistant
August 2010 – June 2011
Graduate assistant to Dr. Lawrence Sherman
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Maryland, College Park

Graduate Research Assistant
January 2010 – May
Graduate assistant to Dr. Jean McGloin
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Maryland, College Park

Graduate Research Assistant
August 2009 – December 2009
Graduate assistant to Dr. Hanno Petras
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Maryland, College Park

Graduate Research Assistant
June 2008 - June 2009
CSAFE grant
Assistant to Dr. Sally Simpson and Dr. Jean McGloin
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Maryland, College Park

GERMANE JOB EXPERIENCE

Criminal Justice Coordinating Council
June 2011 - Present
Research Analyst
Washington, DC

Statistical Analysis Advisor
May - June 2011
Indian Police Service
Jaipur, India

Metropolitan Police Department
February 2011 – May 2011
Intern
Research and Analysis Division

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Instructor
January 2011 – May 2011
CCJS 200: Statistics for Criminologists
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Maryland, College Park

Instructor
September 2010 – December 2010
CCJS498M: Crime Mapping
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Maryland, College Park (at Shady Grove)

Instructor
July 2010 – August 2010
CCJS 200: Statistics for Criminologists
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Maryland, College Park

Graduate Teaching Assistant
Fall 2009
CCJS710: Advanced Research Methods in Criminology
CCJS350: Juvenile Delinquency
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Maryland, College Park

Graduate Teaching Assistant
August 2010 – December 2010
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Maryland, College Park

Graduate Teaching Assistant
January 2008 - May 2008
Assistant to Dr. Elaine Doherty
CCJS 200: Statistics for Criminologists
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Maryland, College Park

Graduate Teaching Assistant
September 2007 – December 2007
Assistant to Dr. Brian Johnson
CCJS 200: Statistics for Criminologists
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Maryland, College Park

Graduate Teaching Assistant
September 2006 – May 2007
Assistant to Dr. David Foster
CCJS 105: Criminology
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Maryland, College Park

Graduate Teaching Assistant
September 2005 – May 2006
Assistant to Dr. Arnet Gaston
CCJS 100: Introduction to Criminal Justice
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Maryland, College Park

TEACHING INTERESTS

Undergraduate Level:
- Criminological Theory
- Criminal Justice
- Policing
- Crime and Place
- Statistics
- Crime Measurement and Crime Trends

Graduate Level:
- Crime and Place
- Spatial Analysis
- Statistics
- Policing
- Seminal in Criminological Theory
- Seminar in Criminal Justice

AWARDS

Distinguished Teaching Assistant 2007-2008: Award Granted by the Center for Teaching Excellence at the University of Maryland, College Park

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

American Society of Criminology Member since 2006

REFERENCES

Available upon request
Kiminori Nakamura

Contact Information
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Maryland
2220 LeFrak Hall
College Park, MD 20742 USA

Phone: (301) 405-5477
E-mail: knakamura@crim.umd.edu

Academic Positions
Assistant Professor, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, University of Maryland, 2010-

Education
Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania USA
Ph.D., Public Policy and Management, July 2010
H. John Heinz III College
Thesis: "Redemption in the Face of Stale Criminal Records Used in Background Checks"
Committee: Professors Alfred Blumstein, Daniel Nagin, and Melvin Stephens

University of California, Irvine, California USA
M.A., Demographic and Social Analysis, June 2005
B.A., Criminology, Law and Society, June 2004
Magna cum Laude

Sophia University Tokyo, Japan
Department of Psychology, April 1999 - June 2001

Research Interests
Recidivism and Reentry, Criminal Career, Life Course / Developmental Criminology, Social Network Analysis, Quantitative Methods

Publications
Peer-Reviewed Articles

Other Publications

Submitted Manuscripts
"Race: Prevalence and Longer-Term Recidivism Risk" (with Alfred Blumstein)
"Violence in the Balance: A Structural Analysis of How Rivals, Allies, and Third-Parties Shape Inter-Gang Violence" (with George Tita and David Krackhardt)
Working Papers

"Risk Assessment: Proof of Safety versus Proof of Hazard"

"Robustness of Redemption Process Across Time and Space" (with Alfred Blumstein)

"Effect of Criminal History on Redemption" (with Alfred Blumstein)

"Risk Tolerance Measures for Redemption Using Receiver Operating Characteristics Curve" (With Wilpen Gorr and Alfred Blumstein)

Book Chapter in Preparation


Conference Presentations

"Redemption: The Effect of Prior Criminal History and Racial Differences in Risk Profiles"
American Society of Criminology, San Francisco, November 2010.

"Redemption for Sex Offenders"
American Society of Criminology, San Francisco, November 2010.

"Is Redemption Possible with Widespread Use of Criminal Background Checks?"
Middle Atlantic States Correctional Association, Atlantic City, June 2010.

"Is Redemption Possible with Widespread Use of Criminal Background Checks?"
Defendant Offender Workforce Development Conference, Dallas, April 2010.

"Process of Redemption Should be Built into the Use of Criminal-History Records for Background Checking"
American Society of Criminology, Philadelphia, November 2009.

"Robustness Testing of Redemption Estimates"
American Society of Criminology, Philadelphia, November 2009.


"Redemption in an Era of Widespread Background Checking"

"Criminal Background Checks and Hiring Ex-Offenders"

"Developments in Redemption"
American Society of Criminology, St. Louis, November 2008.

"Redemption in the Presence of Widespread Criminal Background Checks"
American Society of Criminology, Atlanta, November 2007.
"Gang Territory and Community Social Networks"
American Society of Criminology, Toronto, Canada, November 2006.

"Street Gangs: Structure and Violence"
Sunbelt Conference, Vancouver, Canada, April 2006.

Invited Talks

"Business Intelligence and Predictive Analytics in Criminal Justice" (invited panelist)
Optimal Solutions Group, LLC’s Real-Time Seminar, College Park, MD, February 2011.

"Redemption in the Face of Stale Criminal Records Used for Background Checks"
Symposium: Undoing the Effects of Mass Incarceration, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, January 2011.

"Are Criminal Background Checks Misleading Employers?"
Forum by The Job Opportunities Task Force and ReEntry of Ex-Offenders Clinic at the University of Maryland School of Law, Baltimore, MD, November 2010.

"Redemption in the Face of Stale Criminal Records Used for Background Checks"
(with Alfred Blumstein)
Ohio Ex-Offender Reentry Coalition meeting, Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, Columbus, OH, September 2010.

"Redemption in the Face of Stale Criminal Records Used for Background Checks"
(with Alfred Blumstein)
New York Division of Criminal Justice Services, Albany, NY, July 2010.

"Redemption in an Era of Widespread Background Checking" (with Alfred Blumstein)

"Redemption in the Presence of Background Checking - Some Preliminary Results"
(with Alfred Blumstein)

Grants

"Potential for Redemption in Criminal Background Checks"
(Co-PI with Alfred Blumstein). National Institute of Justice, June 2007–June 2010
(with no cost extension). $60,000.

Current

"Extension of Current Estimates of Redemption Times: Robustness Testing, Out-of-State Arrests, and Racial Differences"

Pending

"Determining the Timing of Parole Discharge Based on the Concept of Redemption"

Awards and Fellowships

Elected to Sigma Xi, 2010
Carnegie Mellon University

H. John Heinz III College Doctoral Fellowship, 2006–present
Nominated for the Heinz College Outstanding Teaching Assistant Award, 2008

University of California, Irvine
In-state Financial Award and Teaching Assistantship for the MA program in Demographic and Social Analysis, 2004

Elected to Phi Beta Kappa, 2004
Membership in Golden Key International Honour Society, 2004

Teaching Experience

University of Maryland

Instructor
Introduction to Criminology Fall 2010
Undergraduate course

Carnegie Mellon University

Teaching Assistant
Intermediate Empirical Methods for Public Policy and Management Fall 2008, 2009
Graduate course

Applied Econometrics I Fall 2009
Graduate course

Applied Econometrics II Spring 2010
Graduate course

Management Science I: Optimization and Multicriteria Methods Spring 2009
Graduate course

Decision Making Under Uncertainty Spring 2009
Graduate course

University of California, Irvine
Learning and Academic Resource Center (LARC)

Tutor
Probability and Statistics in the Social Sciences Fall 2003 - Spring 2004
Tutored UCI undergraduate students in introductory statistics
Obtained advanced tutoring certification from the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA)

Other Academic Experiences

University of California, Irvine, California USA
Presenter 2005
Presented a research project "Presence of Gang Territory and Its Impact on Community Social Networks" for a master's degree in Demographic and Social Analysis

*Undergraduate Researcher 2004*

UCI Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (UROP) Fellow

Presented a research project titled "Victims, Offenders, and Places: Spatial Patterns in LA Gang Homicide" at the UROP symposium.

**Workshop Participation**


Space, Networks and Social Influence Workshop, sponsored by the National Consortium on Violence Research (NCOVR), University of California, Irvine, February 2006.

**Appearances in Popular Media**


**Activities and Services**

**Professional Service**

Manuscript Reviewer:

*Journal of Quantitative Criminology*

*Social Forces*

**Departmental Service**

University of Maryland:

Statistics Committee, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 2010

**Professional Affiliations**

American Society of Criminology

American Sociological Association

International Network for Social Network Analysis

**Additional Information**

Computer Skills:

Statistical: R, SAS, Stata, SPSS

Social Network: UCINET, SIENA, ORA, AutoMap

Other: \LaTeX