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Congratulations to the 2016-2017 CLS awards recipients!

**Gilbert Geis Award – Dallas Augustine**
Excellence in research
Dallas Augustine has demonstrated a consistent ability to work hard, think critically, and build on her prior graduate and work experience to design and complete an ambitious research project. She interviewed dozens of formerly incarcerated people upon their release from jail or prison in Orange County. Her in-depth, qualitative analysis of the cognitive process of “recovering” from criminal behavior and imprisonment has revealed that the formerly incarcerated struggle as much with keeping work as with finding work, shifting the focus of debates about re-entry success in important ways.

**Arnold Binder Award – Sofia Laguna**
Outstanding service contributions
Sofia Laguna has demonstrated exemplary service to the department, UCI campus and community. At the department level she has played a key role in development of the new doctoral-level race and justice emphasis. Additionally, she was key student member of our graduate admissions process this past year. Many prospective students commented on how helpful and informative she was. Sofia has mentored students both within and outside of the department, thus earning her recognition for her mentoring two years in a row. For the community at large, Sofia has provided service by volunteering at the OC needle exchange in Santa Ana.

**Smith Pontell Award – Rylan Simpson**
Outstanding accomplishments in graduate study
Rylan Simpson has excelled at all aspects of his graduate studies; he is a well-rounded scholar. His empirical research on policing has been published in excellent journals, he regularly gives well received guest lectures in courses in addition to his outstanding work as a TA, and he links to the community through all the work he has done presenting to various police agencies, thus garnering him attention and requests for presentations as far away as Brisbane, Australia.

**Kitty Calavita Award – Chris Contreras**
Best second-year project
Chris Contreras submitted his second year paper “A Block-Level Analysis of Medical Marijuana Dispensaries and Crime in the City of Los Angeles”. This paper was published in Justice Quarterly, 2016. This outstanding research looks at the effect of marijuana dispensaries on crime rates within socially organized blocks. Chris’s timely contribution provides some much needed analysis for states as they look to revenue sources through legalization of marijuana.
Examining the Relationship between the Structural Characteristics of Place and Crime

Young-An Kim


The existing research has successfully revealed the patterns of concentration and variability of crime as well as structural characteristics at the street segment level. Yet an intellectual gap still exists in that the effects of structural characteristics of street segments on crime have rarely been tested. The present study fills this gap by employing a unique method to apportion block level Census 2010 data to the street segment level, and tests the effects of structural characteristics on crime at the street segment- and block levels. This study poses the following research questions: (1) What are the effects of structural characteristics on crime when analyzed at the street segment level? (2) Are these effects distinct from or similar with those analyzed at the block-level? and (3) Which and what types of structural characteristics predict crime better at which level?

Objectives

The current study proposes unique methods for apportioning existing census data in blocks to street segments and examines the effects of structural characteristics of street segments on crime. Also, this study tests if the effects of structural characteristics of street segments are similar with or distinct from those of blocks.

Methodology

This study compiled a unique dataset in which block-level structural characteristics are apportioned to street segments utilizing the 2010 U.S. Census data of the cities of Anaheim, Santa Ana, and Huntington Beach in Orange County, California. Negative binomial regression models predicting crime that include measures of social disorganization and criminal opportunities in street segments and blocks were estimated.

Results

The results show that whereas some of the coefficients tested at the street segment level are similar to those aggregated to blocks, a few were quite different (most notably, racial/ethnic heterogeneity). Additional analyses confirm that the imputation methods are generally valid compared to data actually collected at the street segment level.

Conclusions

The results from the street segment models suggest that the structural characteristics from social disorganization and criminal opportunities theories at street segments may operate as crucial settings for crime. Also, the results indicate that structural characteristics have generally similar effects on crime in street segments and blocks, yet have some distinct effects at the street segment level that may not be observable when looking at the block level. Such differences underscore the necessity of serious consideration of the issues of level of aggregation and unit of analysis when examining the structural characteristics-crime nexus.

Additional information

• Young-An Kim, PhD Candidate, received the 2016 Student Paper Award from the Korean Society of Criminology in America (KOSCA) for his work on the imputation of census block data to street segment described in this paper.

• He is a member of the Irvine Laboratory for the Study of Space and Crime co-directed by Drs. John Hipp and Charis Kubrin. He also maintains a blog where he shares videos related to his work on neighborhoods and data analysis.
Complicating Race: Afrocentric Facial Feature Bias and Prison Sentencing in Oregon

Amanda M. Petersen


My research analyzed sentencing outcomes for Black males and females sentenced to prison in Oregon. Specifically, I asked if Black stereotypicality in facial features, or what the literate has called Afrocentricity, resulted in longer prison sentences for Black individuals. My research question was based on 1) general empirical knowledge on implicit bias, suggesting that biases are pervasive and difficult to control, 2) past research on Black stereotypicality bias, in which stereotypically Black males were found to receive harsher court outcomes, and 3) the focal concerns perspective, in which individuals perceived by judges as more dangerous and criminal (i.e. Black males) are theorized to receive harsher court sentences.

Data and Methodology

A random sample of 110 Black males, and the full population of 91 Black females, was provided by the Oregon Department of Corrections. The Department also provided demographic information, earliest possible release data, and a variety of factors related to legal history. I then acquired photographs of each individual in the sample from the Oregon Offender Search database. Photos were experimentally rated for perceived Black stereotypicality in facial features to create a “facial feature rating” ranging from 1 (not very stereotypic) to 9 (very stereotypic).

Three models were estimated for both females and males to predict the effect of Afrocentricity: 1) a univariate regression to estimate the effect of Afrocentricity, 2) a multivariate regression to estimate the effect of Afrocentricity, as well as other “extralegal” factors, and 3) a multivariate regression to estimate the effect of all variables, including factors related to offense seriousness and offense history. An additional set of models was estimated to understand the interaction of gender and Afrocentricity.

Results

Results were less straightforward than past research; in past studies, the influence of perceived Afrocentricity for condemned males was statistically significant, even after controlling for legal and extralegal factors. For Black males in my study, however, Afrocentricity was a positive predictor in the univariate and extralegal models, but the effect was diminished when factors related to offense seriousness and offense history were included. Additionally, I found that Black females perceived as more stereotypically Black were not predicted to receive longer sentence lengths, either before or after accounting for extralegal and legally relevant factors. In a series of models interacting gender and Afrocentricity, sentence length did not vary for females and males regardless of the variables included. To summarize, I found that Afrocentric facial feature bias was playing some role in the sentencing of Black males (likely before interaction with a judge), but did not appear to be affecting outcomes for Black females.

Discussion

The influence of variables related to offense seriousness and offense history raise questions about cumulative legal outcomes for Black males and others who are potentially disadvantaged by an infinite list of cognitive biases. Specifically, additional explanation is needed to understand where in the legal process Black males become disadvantaged by their Black stereotypicality. Put otherwise, additional research may clarify the lack of race-neutrality in “legally relevant” factors. However, I ultimately question the utility of acquiring additional evidence on the specific locations of anti-Black bias that influences the males in my study. Indeed, if the existing knowledge on implicit bias is accurate—that all individuals express at least some variety of implicit bias, and that these biases are difficult to control and impossible to completely eradicate—we are ultimately faced with the question of reforming a legal system that can never be bias-free.
School resource officers (SROs) serve two purposes: to maintain order and safety for the students and teachers in a way that a typical school security guard could not, and to positively interact with students on a daily basis, normalizing officers in the eyes of students and potentially improving police and community relations more broadly. The use of sworn officers within schools has recently been subject to increased scrutiny as a cause of what has become known as the “School-to-Prison Pipeline.” Since SROs are sworn law enforcement officials with arrest powers, critics contend that SROs may be more likely to respond to student misbehavior by making an arrest, which security guards or principals are not able to do.

Methodology

In this paper, I exploit variation in the timing and size of federal grants distributed by the Department of Justice’s Community Oriented Policing Services’ (COPS) “Cops in Schools” (CIS) program, which allowed law enforcement agencies to staff SRO positions, to identify the impact of these SROs on the school environment. I first demonstrate that CIS grants were awarded to police agencies and local governments that initially had higher crime rates in and out of school, as reported in the National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS), suggesting that existing studies that do not take endogenous determination of SROs and crime into account will produce biased estimates of the impact of those officers in schools. I then show that, conditional on agency fixed effects and demographic control variables, agencies that did, and did not, receive CIS grants had statistically identical trends in both in and out of school crime as well as arrest rates for crimes occurring in school. I find that CIS grants had an immediate, although heterogeneous, impact on overall law enforcement employment, as reported in the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR). Using a sample of law enforcement agencies in the Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS), I then show that CIS grants were specifically used to staff SRO positions, and that one additional CIS officer granted essentially doubled the number of SROs an agency employed within one month of grant receipt. Finally, I show that schools located in counties where local law enforcement agencies received CIS grants were more likely to report having armed security staff, as reported in the National Center for Education Statistics Survey on School Crime and Safety (SSOCS) in 2003, 2005, and 2007.

Results

I next use the receipt of CIS grants to estimate the causal relationship between these grants and the School-to-Prison Pipeline. I begin by exploring the impact of CIS grants on school safety in the SSOCS. Based on these surveys of school administrators, I conclude that CIS grants were associated with reductions in school crime rates. At the same time, however, I find small, but imprecisely estimated, increases in the likelihood that school administrators report contacting police about the incidents that do still occur.

I more rigorously estimate the impact of SROs on crimes known to police and arrests using the (NIBRS) between 1997 and 2007. I find that, conditional on a rich set of school characteristics, police jurisdictions that received CIS grants did learn about more violent crime taking place in schools, along with more weapons and drug violations. However, the agencies also learned about more minor violations that occurred outside of school, particularly drug offenses. Taken at face value, this suggests that hiring SROs may have increased the propensity of citizens to contact the police in general.

Arrest records in the UCR suggest that law enforcement agencies who were awarded CIS grants were more likely to make arrests for crimes committed in school, and this is driven by the arrest of juveniles who are less than 15 years old. I do not find evidence that, on average, hiring SROs results in more arrests for crimes committed off school grounds, with the exception of arrests for drug charges.

Taken as a whole, these results suggest that there are potentially important negative consequences to posting law enforcement officials in schools, but also some potential benefits. A grant program aimed at improving school safety for at-risk children appears to have also resulted in the accumulation of arrest records for young students. At the same time, there is evidence that people were more likely to contact police about drug crimes occurring outside of schools suggesting that posting law enforcement officers in schools may help to improve police-community relations more broadly. Finally, perhaps more importantly, and in contrast with existing research that failed to properly account for the endogenous allocation of officers, I find evidence that hiring SROs increases school safety.
This paper analyzes the prosecution of drug cases, as situated within the immigration enforcement regime in a federal criminal court on the Southwest border. Specifically, I examine the adjudication processing responses at the intersection of immigration and drug offenses in Southern Division of a district I refer to as Southwestern district. I demonstrate how characteristics of “drug cases” are constructed at this intersection in such a manner that makes them stand apart from the prototypical federal drug case. In this border jurisdiction, the prevailing adjudicatory logic is concerned with defendants’ status as unauthorized outsiders to such an extent that drug defendants are barely distinguishable from immigration defendants. I theoretically situate the study in the “crimmigration” literature, which addresses the process by which criminal law has “swallowed” immigration law making the lines between the two indistinct. I argue that the confluence of criminal and immigration law has created a hybrid juridical subject, and postulate that immigration policy has become so criminalized that its logic now prevails in traditional criminal justice proceedings along the border.

Methodology

The findings are drawn from a comparative qualitative field research study situated in four distinct federal district court jurisdictions in the United States. I used direct observations and in-depth interviews, supplemented by analyses of social artifacts and secondary data sources, to look in-depth at variations in local legal contexts and their impact on how criminal cases, especially drug cases, are selected and adjudicated in this system. I use multiple data sources, including field notes of my direct observations; transcripts from in-depth interviews with defense attorneys, former and current federal prosecutors, and district court judges; case file materials including sentencing memos, plea agreements, transcripts, and other relevant documents from sentenced cases in the districts.

Context & Findings

Southwestern District is among the highest-volume federal districts, with a criminal caseload comprised substantially of immigration and drug cases. In 2014, when I completed my field research in this site, Southwestern district had nearly 6600 non-petty criminal convictions, 87% of which were immigration and drug cases. In 2014, when I completed my field research in this site, Southwestern district had nearly 6600 non-petty criminal convictions, 87% of which were immigration and drug convictions. There has been astounding growth in the volume of both offense categories in this district, especially since 2008. Among those arrested for either drug-related or immigration-related offenses in the Southern Division of Southwestern District, there are two potential routes to adjudication, either via a rapid-resolution, mass-processed mode or through an individualized mode. One of the mass-processing route is “flip-flop” court, which includes illegal entry/re-entry cases, drug cases, mainly composed of “backpacker” cases, and a smattering of illegal identity cases. The defendant is offered a misdemeanor conviction and a particular sentence outcome, totaling less than 360 days of incarceration, in exchange for an immediate guilty plea prior to receiving discovery, a waiver of all rights, and a waiver of the full-blown sentencing procedure. Not all immigration and drug defendants are offered a mass-processing option. Those who are not are funneled directly into an individualized adjudication route. The primary determinant of who gets sorted where is the defendant's criminal history, including his or her prior convictions in U.S. courts.

In the paper, I detail the micromechanics of both the “flip-flop” court and the drug cases routed to the individualized felony prosecution process. The proceedings in both settings highlight how the immigration enforcement imperative undergirds adjudication practices in this federal court, so much so that it challenges the notion that the criminalization of immigration is a one-way process. I conclude that there has been more of an “immigrantization” of criminal law that has intensified with the increased use of enforcement tactics at the border. The sentences meted out in both drug cases and illegal reentry cases were justified as a deterrent to returning (rather than to transporting drugs). Even in flip-flop court, where there was little individualized colloquy and where the sentences do not serve as future deterrents, the practices marked the processed defendants as essentially of a single category of excludable subjects. Each was one of a flood of only nominally criminal border-crossers who had to be dealt as efficiently and expeditiously as possible so that they could do their assigned time in prison then be removed from the country. Caught up in a larger crack-down on immigrants, the flip-flop back-packers merely carried illicit drugs but were otherwise indistinguishable from the other men and women picked up in the same desert.
University of California, Irvine

Not an “Iron Pipeline”, but Many Capillaries: Regulating Passive Transactions in LA’s Illegal Gun Market

Kelsie Y. Chesnut, Melissa Barragan, Jason Gravel, Natalie A. Pifer, Keramet Reiter, Nicole Sherman, & George E. Tita


California has strict firearm-related laws and is exceptional in its regulation of firearms retailers. Though evidence suggests that these laws can reduce illegal access to guns, typically through the restriction of firearm possession by people considered most at risk of having and, ultimately using, guns in the commission of dangerous crimes, high levels of gun violence persist in Los Angeles (LA), California. Utilizing data from interviews conducted with incarcerated gun offenders, the current analysis describes the sources of guns accessed by active offenders in LA, and reports offenders’ varied motivations for obtaining guns. Specifically, we find that in LA’s illegal gun market, social relationships facilitate access to guns across a diffuse network of “capillaries”, providing some individuals, influenced by fear and/or possible economic gain, with frequent opportunities to illegally procure firearms through passive transactions.

Methodology
The current study proposes unique methods for apportioning existing census data in blocks to street segments and examines the effects of structural characteristics of street segments on crime. Also, this study tests if the effects of structural characteristics of street segments are similar with or distinct from those of blocks.

Results & Discussion
Not an Iron Pipeline, but Many Capillaries

Unlike other US regions, where most recovered firearms come from an “iron pipeline”, through which crime guns from states with less restrictive firearms-sales laws flow into states with more restrictive firearms-sales laws, the local gun market in LA is not reliant on interstate channels. Instead, LA’s illegal gun market is composed of countless capillaries; both transient and close social connections facilitate gun acquisition in an already highly saturated market, where only a small portion of crime guns come from out of state. Moreover, respondents rarely identified one specific individual (or group) they would turn to for a gun; rather, they described access to a number of sources through the activation of appropriate social channels. For instance, when asked how he purchased his gun, the following respondent replied:

They pass, pass, pass down, you know? They just pass down. Say for instance we had, uh, been playing basketball, or you know, everybody's tired, and you sitting back like, damn, man, like, I need that, you know, I need that heat. And they're like, oh, I know this dude that probably got one, he got a couple of them, he might want to sell one.

As the previous excerpt highlighted, respondents relied heavily on social relationships to facilitate access to available guns. Of the 77 illegal guns identified by respondents, 66 (85.7%) were obtained from another individual, while only 11 guns were legally purchased or found. The most common way our respondents got a gun (39%) was from a close social connection (friend/third-party connection).

Motivations for Passive Transactions
The hidden and illicit nature of the illegal gun market suggests that gaining access would require a buyer to initiate a transaction. Furthermore, such gun acquisitions might be expected to be for explicitly criminogenic purposes. However, a substantial portion of our respondents (25.5%) purchased their firearms through a transaction initiated by another party—what we term a passive transaction. Further, in these passive transactions, concerns for personal safety, drug or other economic opportunities influenced respondents’ gun purchase decision—making processes. In the following example, a respondent described that despite his initial resistance to purchasing an illegal gun, he eventually changed his mind after being pressed to consider his vulnerability to violence:

Somebody asked me do I want to buy it, I told them no, then they said, “What do you do? Do you gangbang?” I said no, they said, “So you walk around here?” I’m like, “Yeah.” They like, “So you walk around here, you don’t gangbang?” I’m like, “No.” He was like, “So what do you do for a living?” I’m like, “Well, I do rap. I be in the studios and stuff.” And he’s like, “So you’re a rapper and you be having jewelry and everything, you don’t have no gun to protect yourself?” Pretty much persuade me, bought it, but then I end up going to jail for it.

Conclusion
In sum, LA’s illegal gun market, where existing social relationships facilitate access to guns across a diffuse network, some individuals, influenced by factors including both fear and economic opportunity, have frequent opportunities to illegally purchase firearms through passive transactions. Gun violence prevention policy should better recognize and reduce these transactions, by addressing their underlying causes.
Keramet Reiter’s “23/7: Pelican Bay Prison and the Rise of Long-Term Solitary Confinement,” presents a decade long research agenda that exposes the complexities and tragedies of solitary confinement. Reiter’s work takes the reader through the history of solitary confinements and the troubling construction of Pelican Bay, California’s notorious supermax state prison. She is critical of the legislation that was simply passed, essentially unnoticed, and she is critical of the level of discretion afforded to prison officials in the construction and maintenance of the Security Housing Units (SHUs). Further, Reiter poses the question: Do we need and even truly want solitary confinement? Also, after years of judicial decisions surrounding the conditions of solitary confinement, why hasn’t it been ruled unconstitutional?

Throughout the book, Reiter questions whether inmates housed at SHU truly deserve the label they often receive—“the worst of the worst.” She begins by recounting Todd Ashker’s story, an inmate who has been locked in the SHU for decades for his (loose) association with the Aryan Brotherhood. Ashker, who serves as a jailhouse lawyer, has led some of the most publicized prison hunger strikes protesting long-term isolation and prison conditions. Described as the “archetype of the worst of the worst” (p.32) by prison officials, Reiter highlights the dissonance between such a description and the mild mannered and empathetic Todd Ashker she met. Reiter’s own experiences are corroborated by the fact that for many inmates like Ashker, disciplinary records (or relative lack thereof) are at odds with the serious labels they receive. In questioning the incongruity between the official description of SHU inmates and her own observations, the author calls attention to unforgiving, irredeemable, and sometimes outright arbitrary nature of mechanism that lead to solitary confinement. For example, a key issue Reiter tackles the process of gang validation as one mechanism through which prisoners are relegated to solitary confinement. Appearing in a picture with a know gang member or even the possession of a known gang members name on a piece of paper are sometimes sufficient for validating an inmate gang status which could land a prisoner in the SHU.

A strength of the book is that it forces the reader to struggle with their ideology on punishment; what is acceptable, necessary, helpful, harmful, and finely humane. For instance, it is difficult not to be alarmed by the immutable nature of a point system based on questionable violations that lead to placement in solitary confinement, making it next to impossible to be released. What is more alarming is how the narrative surrounding the irredeemable and dangerous nature of SHU inmates provided by officials makes its way to the general public, but also to the courts, thus leaving many unbothered by the presence and maintenance of solitary confinement. Judicial decisions consistently fall short of deeming the punishment itself as unacceptable—despite the wealth of empirical evidence on the deleterious effects solitary confinement has, particularly on mental health, even when used for periods as short as a week.

An important aspect of “23/7” is Reiter’s account of the origins of the supermax prisons and isolation techniques in part through the legacy of revolutionary George Jackson, the violence attributed to him, and his alleged attempt to escape continues to serve as the basis for the need for supermax prisons. Reiter’s discussion of the events surrounding Jackson’s alleged escape attempt may leave readers wondering how much of this legend is racialized. Would the story of the violent outbreak be as famous and seemingly deserving of the construction of Pelican Bay’s SHU-like structures if Jackson were a white male? The continual deference to Jackson and the potential revolt of prisoners is present throughout the book—though Reiter could have expanded on the racialized facets of Jackson and his legacy.

Ultimately, Reiter is constrained in her ability to quantitatively discuss who exactly is enduring the conditions of solitary confinement given the lack of quality data collection by officials. While it is evident that she took her time to flesh out complexities of prison, the absence of data on who exactly officials have subjected to isolation is a shortcoming of the book. Readers might be left wanting a more in-depth discussion of prisoner reentry after isolation, an area Reiter discusses but could have delved into more especially given the fact that courts have been more willing in recent years to impose limits on SHUs rather than ban them altogether. Prisoner re-entry into general population is likely to be an important issue if the trend continues.

Despite these critiques, “23/7” is a herculean effort to construct a vivid depiction of what prisoners throughout the nation face as they are arbitrarily placed in isolation and essentially forgotten about. The book highlights the significant difficulties associated with the type of data collection necessary to properly tell the unsettling story of long-term solitary confinement and paves the way for future research in an area where it is sorely needed. Reiter’s work should be applauded of course for its contribution to academia and its insightful dissection of the challenges of doing research in prison, but also for the candid discussion it provides about the role of academia in the politicized environment surrounding prison reform. Ultimately the greatest service of “23/7” is its demystification of the well-kept, but highly suspect legend of SHUs’ “worst of the worst.” While it is intended for an academic audience, the book is easily accessible to a broader audience, and is deserving of critical attention especially from policy makers and prison officials.
### CLS Presentations at the 2017 Law & Society Meeting

**Law & Society Association Annual Meeting, Mexico City, June 20-23rd, 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday, June 20th</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM - 9:45 AM</td>
<td>Hard Bargains: The Coercive Power of Drug Laws in Federal Court</td>
<td>Mona Lynch</td>
<td>Author Meets Reader</td>
<td>Constitucion A (2nd Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM - 9:45 AM</td>
<td>Hard Bargains: The Coercive Power of Drug Laws in Federal Court</td>
<td>Keramet Reiter</td>
<td>Author Meets Reader</td>
<td>Constitucion A (2nd Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM - 9:45 AM</td>
<td>Convergences and Differences among Undocumented Youth: Preliminary Thoughts regarding Policy Design</td>
<td>Susan Coutin, Jennifer Chacon, Stephen Lee</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Terraza (3rd Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM - 9:45 AM</td>
<td>One million and counting? How policy levers will impact the future of sex offender registries in the United States.</td>
<td>Trevor Hoppe, Kyle Maksuda, Bryan Sykes</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Angel A, Reforma Tower (19th Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM - 11:45 AM</td>
<td>The American Legal Profession in the New Millennium: Out of Many, One?</td>
<td>Ann Southworth, Scott Cummings, Carol Seron, Steven Boucher, Anna Raup-Klouevsky, Rebecca Sandefur</td>
<td>Salon Session</td>
<td>Independencia (3rd Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 PM - 2:30 PM</td>
<td>Courting Death: The Supreme Court and Capital Punishment</td>
<td>Mona Lynch</td>
<td>Author Meets Reader</td>
<td>Imperio C (2nd Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 PM - 2:30 PM</td>
<td>Engines of Anxiety: Academic Rankings, Reputation, and Accountability</td>
<td>Carroll Seron</td>
<td>Author Meets Reader</td>
<td>Sala 452, Danubio Tower (4th Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 PM - 2:30 PM</td>
<td>Contrasting the Exceptional: Punishing Murder in Norway and California</td>
<td>Valerie King</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Reforma A, Reforma Tower (19th Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 PM - 4:30 PM</td>
<td>A qualitative examination of (non)compliance in high-violence communities</td>
<td>Kelsie Chesnut, Melissa Barragan</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Sala 452, Danubio Tower (4th Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 PM - 4:30 PM</td>
<td>The “13th” and Interdisciplinary Approaches to the Examination of State Power through Law: A Discussion with and Lessons from the Work of Millennial Scholars at the University of California, Irvine</td>
<td>James Pratt, Jr.</td>
<td>Roundtable</td>
<td>Angel D, Reforma Tower (19th Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 PM - 6:30 PM</td>
<td>Geography of Walls, Borders &amp; Bridges</td>
<td>Susan Coutin</td>
<td>Plenary Session</td>
<td>Clasico (2nd Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday, June 21st</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM - 9:45 AM</td>
<td>Socio-cultural perspectives and possibilities in the study of law</td>
<td>Keramet Reiter, Kristen Maziarak, James Pratt, Jr., Kasey Ragan</td>
<td>Roundtable</td>
<td>Imperio D (2nd Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM - 9:45 AM</td>
<td>Valuation of Gestational Labor in Contracts for Surrogate Motherhood</td>
<td>Hillary Berk</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Colonia (2nd floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, June 22nd</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM - 9:45 AM</td>
<td>Politics, Bureaucracy and Penal Change in Denmark</td>
<td>Lori Sexton, Keramet Reiter, Jennifer Sumner</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Sala 458, Danubio Tower (4th Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM - 11:45 AM</td>
<td>23/7: Pelican Bay Prison and the Rise of Long Term Solitary Confinement</td>
<td>Keramet Reiter</td>
<td>Author Meets Reader</td>
<td>Sala 458, Danubio Tower (4th Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM - 11:45 AM</td>
<td>Constructing the U.S.-Mexico Border: Reifying the State of American Essentialism</td>
<td>Kasey Ragan</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Reforma B, Reforma Tower (19th Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM - 11:45 AM</td>
<td>Youth Diversion Programs and the Ongoing Punishment of Youth and Families</td>
<td>Analicia Mejia Mesinas</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Lerma, Reforma Tower (19th Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 PM - 2:30 PM</td>
<td>Squad Car Psychiatry: Delinquent Mad and Bad in Policing the Mentally III</td>
<td>Natalie A. Pifer</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Imperio B (2nd Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 PM - 2:30 PM</td>
<td>The quiet disappearance of Relisha Rudd</td>
<td>Jasmine Montgomery</td>
<td>Salon Session</td>
<td>Independencia (3rd Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 PM - 4:30 PM</td>
<td>Contested Embrace: Transborder Membership Politics in Twentieth-Century Korea</td>
<td>Susan Coutin</td>
<td>Author Meets Reader</td>
<td>Sala De Consejo, Reforma Tower (19th Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 PM - 4:30 PM</td>
<td>A Critical Analysis of Minority-Group Threat Theory</td>
<td>Matt Barnes</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Caza B (3rd Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday, June 23rd</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM - 11:45 AM</td>
<td>From &quot;My Lord&quot; to &quot;Your Honour&quot;: Transforming British Legal Practice into Caribbean Jurisprudence</td>
<td>Lee Cabatingan</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Imperio B (2nd Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM - 11:45 AM</td>
<td>Parental Immigration Detention and its Consequences for Children’s Educational Experiences</td>
<td>Gabriela Gonzaleza, Caitlin Patler</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Sala De Consejo, Reforma Tower (19th Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 PM - 6:30 PM</td>
<td>Eating Your Own: The Law and Politics of Police Intervention in Police Officer Misconduct</td>
<td>Anjuli Verma, Peter Hanink, Geoff Ward</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Constitucion C (2nd Floor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>