

Minutes of the Nineteenth Meeting of the
Campbell Collaboration Crime and Justice Group Steering Committee
Stockholm, Sweden – June 24th, 2009

In attendance:

Steering Committee

Jan Andersson, National Council on Crime Prevention, Sweden*

Peter Grabosky, Australian National University, Australia (co-chair)

Jerry Lee, Jerry Lee Foundation, USA

Friedrich Lösel, University of Erlangen-Nuremberg/Cambridge University, Germany/UK

Jacque Mallender, Matrix Knowledge Group, UK

Lawrence Sherman, University of Pennsylvania/Cambridge University, USA/UK*

Hiroshi Tsutomi, Shizuoka University, Japan

David Weisburd, Hebrew University/George Mason University, Israel/USA (co-chair)

David Wilson, George Mason University, USA (editor-in-chief)

Invited guests

Charlotte Gill, University of Pennsylvania, USA (managing editor/coordinator)

Ross Homel, Griffith University, Australia*

Tony Munton, Matrix Knowledge Group, UK

* Present for part of the meeting.

1. Welcome and Introductions

David Weisburd welcomed everyone to the nineteenth meeting of the Campbell Crime and Justice Group (CCJG) Steering Committee. Committee members David Farrington (Cambridge University, UK), Vicente Garrido (Valencia University, Spain), Martin Killias (University of Zurich, Switzerland), Peter van der Laan (NSCR, Netherlands), Peter Neyroud (National Policing Improvement Agency, UK), Phyllis Schultze (Rutgers University, USA), Jonathan Shepherd (Cardiff University, UK), and Brandon Welsh (Northeastern University, USA) sent their regrets at being unable to attend the meeting. Invited guests Ross Homel and Tony Munton introduced themselves to the Steering Committee.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Participants received a copy of the minutes of the eighteenth meeting of the CCJG Steering Committee, held on November 11, 2008 in St Louis, MO, USA. The Committee unanimously agreed to approve the minutes.

3. Progress Report on Current CCJG Titles

Participants received a handout entitled ‘Campbell Collaboration Crime & Justice Group Progress Report.’ The key points on the progress of CCJG titles include:

- 19 reviews have been published.
- 2 reviews are being revised with peer reviews completed.
- 2 reviews are under peer review.
- 2 reviews are being revised before seeking peer reviewers.

- 11 protocols have been approved but the review has not yet been submitted.
- 1 protocol is awaiting approval.
- 2 protocols are being revised with peer reviews completed.
- 2 protocols are under peer review.
- 2 protocols are being revised before peer review.
- 7 titles have been approved but the protocol has not yet been submitted.

In summary, 19 reviews have been published, 17 reviews are in progress, and 14 protocols are in progress.

In addition, 15 individual projects have undergone some kind of editorial action since the last CCJG meeting. David Wilson has written a total of eleven editorial action letters since that date: one for a protocol pre-peer review, three for protocols post-peer review, five for reviews pre-peer review (two of these were for the same review), and two for reviews post-peer review. Since the last meeting, three titles, two new protocols, and three new reviews have been submitted for the first time, and three titles, one protocol, and two reviews have been approved by the CCJG Steering Committee.

David Weisburd announced that the CCJG should work to produce ten new published reviews in the next year. This effort should be aided by several new funding opportunities (see 'Funding' below).

4. Funding

(a) U.S. National Institute of Justice (NIJ)

CCJG received a continuation for the 2008 financial year of the \$85,000 grant received in 2007, albeit at a lower budget. The 2008 NIJ funding provided \$45,000 for two reviews, to be completed in 2009: *The Effectiveness of Programs to Prevent School Bullying*, by David Farrington and colleagues, and *Parental Imprisonment: a Systematic Review of its Effects on Children's Antisocial Behavior, Crime, and Mental Health Problems* by Joseph Murray (University of Cambridge) and colleagues.

David Weisburd reported that the continuation will no longer be available, and future funding requests to NIJ would have to be made in response to a specific RFP. However, NIJ has shown a positive attitude toward systematic review research in a recent solicitation. George Mason University, through the Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy, has entered a proposal for \$500,000 to fund six systematic reviews that will also be submitted as CCJG reviews. The proposal also provides funding to maintain the CCJG Coordinator role through a post-doctoral fellowship.

(b) U.K. National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA)

In addition to funding previously offered to expedite the completion of two CCJG reviews (Koper & Mayo-Wilson: firearm control, and Braga & Weisburd: Pulling Levers policing), NPIA has provided CCJG with an extremely generous funding package of \$420,000 for 2009-10. This money will be used for the production of systematic reviews and searches (scoping of available literature) on policing-related topics of interest to NPIA. While actual funding will depend on which projects are selected, NPIA expects to fund four full systematic reviews at \$50,000 each, and two systematic searches at \$25,000 each. The RFP closed several days before the meeting, and ten proposals were

received, which will now be evaluated by the CCJG co-chairs, editor, and a representative from CCJG.

The funding from NPIA also allows for the employment of a grant coordinator. This coordinator, David McClure, is a graduate student at George Mason University. He will also help the current CCJG Coordinator, Charlotte Gill, who is volunteering time next year while finishing her doctoral dissertation. David Weisburd noted that the Steering Committee must start thinking about funding sources for the coordinator role for the following year.

The Steering Committee expressed its gratitude to Peter Neyroud for his generosity in providing this funding package.

(c) Jerry Lee Foundation

Jerry Lee has provided important, consistent funding for CCJG and its activities. He funds the annual Jerry Lee Symposium, which has grown into an extremely successful event. He has also supported the CCJG Coordinator, and graciously agreed last summer to extend this support for an additional year beyond his original three-year commitment. The Steering Committee expressed its gratitude to Jerry for his generosity and dedication to the Group.

(d) Nordic Campbell Centre (NC2)

No new developments were reported regarding NC2 funding. NC2 has provided funding for many CCJG systematic reviews, and pays on completion of the final review, providing some incentive to finish. NC2 only funds projects when a draft final review is submitted for the first time.

(e) C2 Norway

CCJG has received two rounds of funding from the Campbell Collaboration's (C2) central administration in Norway for the completion of systematic reviews. Four reviews are funded in 2009, in addition to five that received funding in 2008. C2 makes \$40,000 available to each review group every year for this purpose, as well as providing \$25,000 for the Editor position. The following reviews have received funding for 2009:

- *A Systematic Review of Programs Designed to Improve Self-Control up to Age 10 among Children and Adolescents: Self-Control and Delinquency/Crime as Outcomes* by Alex Piquero (University of Maryland), Wesley Jennings, and David Farrington.
- *The Effects of Face-to-Face Restorative Justice for Personal Victim Crimes* by Heather Strang (Australian National University), Lawrence Sherman, and Evan Mayo-Wilson.
- *Motivational Interviewing for Substance Abuse* by Geir Smedslund (Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services) and colleagues.
- *A Systematic Review of Strategies and Interventions to Counter Cross-Border Trafficking in Human Beings for the Purpose of Sexual Exploitation* by Peter van der Laan (NSCR) and colleagues.

The status of future funding from C2 Norway is currently unknown: see section on 'C2 Developments,' below.

(f) Discussions with other funding agencies

No details of additional funding possibilities were reported.

5. Deregistration of Inactive Titles

Title deregistration is important because registration of a title with CCJG represents ‘ownership’ of that topic, thus preventing others from submitting similar reviews. Authors should, therefore, show evidence of progress. Two reviews have been deregistered since the last meeting: *Arrest for Domestic Violence* (Maxwell/Garner), and *Interventions for Victims* (Marandos/Perry). The authors of the former review did not respond to a deregistration letter, and the authors of the latter review initially agreed to continue but then informed the Editor that they were no longer able to work on the review.

At the last CCJG Steering Committee meeting, it was agreed that any review not making progress before the current meeting should be considered for deregistration. Three titles were listed for discussion:

Repeat Victimization Programs: Farrell/Pease. David Farrington had previously informed the Committee that personal circumstances had prevented the authors from moving ahead with this title. However, no contact has been made with the authors in several years. The Committee agreed that a sensitively-worded deregistration letter should be sent to the authors, with the requirement that progress be made before the next meeting in November.

Juvenile Curfews: Adams. This review received a deregistration letter after the last meeting. The author responded and indicated an interest in continuing, but did not respond to further requests for a timeline. The Committee agreed to deregister this title.

Electronic Monitoring: Renzema. This review also received a deregistration letter, requesting the author to complete the review two weeks before the present meeting. Nothing has been received, so this review will also be deregistered.

The Committee agreed that, given their importance, the deregistered review topics should be made available to other interested authors. Available topics will be advertised on the CCJG mailing list and website, and possibly through other outlets such as the American Society of Criminology, CRIMNET (Australia), and the European Criminology mailing list.

6. Updates to Existing Published Reviews

Peter Grabosky noted that CCJG systematic reviews are supposed to be updated on a regular basis to reflect the most current body of evidence on a topic, and suggested that the Steering Committee should more closely monitor out-of-date reviews.

David Wilson informed the Committee that C2’s original vision, based on Cochrane Collaboration guidelines, was for reviews to be updated every two years. The main C2 Steering Group felt this was unrealistic, as progress in the social sciences tends to be slower than in health sciences. The general feeling was that updates should occur three years after first publication, but there is no firm policy.

The discussion of the Committee focused on deciding how frequently reviews should be updated, and how this should be enforced. Committee members felt that it was difficult to set a specific guideline, because the need for an update could vary by the specific review topic. Peter Grabosky suggested asking authors to update after three

years, unless they can show compelling justification to the contrary. Tony Munton added that a systematic search could be done after three years to see if new evidence is available, and that the result of the search could determine the need for a full update. However, some uncertainty ensued as to whether the clock should run from the date of publication of the original review, or the date on which the original search was conducted (which, for many published CCJG reviews, is considerably earlier). As a compromise, Lawrence Sherman suggested requiring updates five years from the original search date. Authors could search for new studies, and the Editorial Board could consider whether an update should be requested based on the results. As an incentive to authors to work on updates, reviews with searches more than five years old could carry a ‘disclaimer’ indicating the age of the search.

David Wilson noted that CCJG has not necessarily made it clear to authors that updates are required and others can take over if ownership lapses. Thus, it will be important to first remind authors about the update requirement, and ask them what their plans are. David Weisburd agreed, and suggested proceeding as follows:

1. Estimate the official search date for all nineteen published reviews (the date at which they stopped including studies will help with the estimate).
2. Write to each review author, indicating that reviews must be updated every five years in the interest of scientific integrity. Inform authors that at minimum, a systematic search should be conducted, and ask them to let the CCJG know their plans. Ask them to send reasons why the review does not need to be updated, if applicable. Inform them that reviews that are not updated will carry a disclaimer.
3. Wait to see how authors respond before deciding how to deal with updates.

The Committee agreed with this procedure. Jacque Mallender suggested also asking authors what they thought would be a reasonable timeframe to offer reviews to other teams for updates in the event of a lack of response from the original reviewers.

The Committee also agreed that a five-year-old C2 review is still a comparatively good asset for people who want to know ‘what works,’ and they did not support the possibility of archiving old reviews or removing them from the C2 library.

The Committee also agreed that once a norm was established, it should be added to CCJG’s Guidelines for New Reviewers.

7. CCJG Website and Mailing List

David Wilson announced that C2 had relaunched the online Library within the past week. The library has a new, improved search function and visual identity, and looks more professional. Each review is now classified as a freestanding publication with a standard citation format and DOI (Digital Object Identifier) number, and the library is classified as a monograph collection entitled *Campbell Systematic Reviews*. New reviews will also be published according to a standardized layout, and the format will be applied to older reviews later. All completed reviews have already been updated with a standardized title page design.

Lawrence Sherman reported that his Masters students at Cambridge have been working on systematic reviews, and he would like to post them on the Cambridge Institute of Criminology website and link to them from the CCJG website as a resource

(with a note clearly indicating that they are not Campbell-approved reviews). The Committee agreed that Charlotte Gill would work with Lawrence Sherman to set this up.

Jacque Mallender noted that several CCJG Steering Committee members had joined the Linked In networking site following a discussion at the last meeting. She asked Charlotte Gill to set up a CCJG group, that could be joined not only by Committee members, but also by any interested parties. The group could be used to provide updates and members could be added to the main CCJG mailing list.

Charlotte Gill reported that the mailing list has been successful since its relaunch, with over 350 subscribers. At present, mailings are only sent out when there is news to report, but the Committee agreed that it would be good to have a monthly newsletter in an appealing format, with information about the progress of reviews and other news or requests. Charlotte Gill will work to put this together for future mailings.

8. Evolution of CCJG Steering Committee

Following discussions at the last meeting, the CCJG Steering Committee put out a second call for nominations for Committee membership earlier this year, with clarified instructions requiring nominees to include a statement of their qualifications and expertise in evidence-based practice, a commitment to the development of evidence and systematic synthesis, and letters of support from colleagues. Two nominations were received: Jianhong Liu from China, and Catherine Gallagher from the USA. Invited guests were excused from this part of the meeting, while the Committee voted on membership.

The Committee noted that Jianhong Liu has extensive qualifications and experience in evidence-based policy, and is uniquely placed to foster randomized controlled trials in the Chinese criminal justice system. His original training as a physicist indicates his appreciation for analytical rigor. He has also been at the forefront of attempts to set up an Asian Society of Criminology. Peter Grabosky noted that he had spoken to Professor Liu, and that he was committed to attending at least one meeting per year. The Committee also noted the importance of having a representative in Asia, since Chuen-Jim Sheu stepped down two years ago.

The Committee noted that Catherine Gallagher has an impressive background in systematic reviews and meta-analysis, and has devoted her career to the interface between the justice and health systems. In this regard, she already has experience in working with the Cochrane Collaboration, and has encouraged links between Cochrane and CCJG. She has already been involved in important work on behalf of CCJG, such as chairing the topic mapping committee and participating in the dissemination committee.

The Committee unanimously voted to approve the membership of both Jianhong Liu and Catherine Gallagher.

9. UN Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders, Salvador, Brazil, 12-19 April, 2010

Jan Andersson reported on the progress of plans to represent CCJG at the above upcoming conference, which should attract up to three thousand people from around the world. Jan reported that he has approached the Swedish government regarding a delegation from Sweden, and asked about the government's interest in working with the Swedish National Council on Crime Prevention to arrange workshops or ancillary

meetings on topics relating to CCJG issues. The response was positive but no formal decision has been taken by the government. Jan will continue discussions with the ministry, presenting to them an outline of a lunch-to-lunch session at the conference. Jan will update the chairs of the CCJG. Jan noted that there may be travel and accommodation funding available for two CCJG members.

Peter Grabosky suggested that CCJG should organize presentations on the work of the Group and some substantive topics. Although the theme of the conference is Drugs and Crime, there are usually presentations on a range of substantive areas.

David Weisburd requested that this item be put on the agenda for the monthly conference call between the co-chairs, editor, and managing editor, for discussion about who should attend and present. Peter Grabosky said he may attend. David Wilson may also attend, and could present a methods workshop. David Farrington and Brandon Welsh were also suggested as potential representatives. Although there is only funding for two, CCJG could send three representatives if Peter Grabosky attended, as he will already be traveling at this time and may be able to get to Brazil more easily.

The Committee agreed that the CCJG Brochure should be reprinted for distribution at the conference. They also discussed the possibility of putting CCJG presentations on a thumb drive to distribute to participants, to increase visibility and marketability. Charlotte Gill will investigate the costs of these approaches.

10. Consideration of New Titles

The Steering Committee welcomed guest Ross Homel, and invited him to talk about a meta-analysis he has been working on, which he presented in a CCJG panel at the Stockholm Criminology Symposium the day before this meeting.

Ross expressed his support of the Campbell Collaboration's work. He described the meta-analysis he has been working on with a colleague, Matthew Manning, on whose doctoral research the project is based. The meta-analysis, which examines the economic/cost elements of early childhood interventions (especially benefits to participants) has proceeded in a slightly different framework from the traditional C2 review, particularly in its examination of multiple dimensions of treatment.

David Wilson explained that the current framework of the review is problematic from C2's point of view because it examines multiple interventions, rather than a specific program, technology, or policy that could be implemented to deal with a certain problem. In general, C2 reviews need to take a narrow focus because of the title ownership issue: the present multi-dimensional review would likely encompass five or six possible individual reviews. However, the Committee is interested in Ross's review because it focuses on a specific risk population, unlike other reviews in the same area, and compares categories of programs. The Committee stressed the value of the work, regardless of its suitability as a CCJG review, and noted the importance of having such a highly qualified team working in this area. They suggested that if Ross and his colleagues wished to submit the review to CCJG, they could focus on one element of the review and submit that part. Jacque Mallender also offered to put Ross in touch with the Cochrane-Campbell Economic Methods Group, given the nature of the investigation.

Ross also informed the Group that in Australia there was a potential issue with publishing a C2 review: the C2 library is not viewed as a 'proper' publication. The Australian Research Council will be evaluating what counts as a journal and what does

not. The decision could affect funding and researchers' willingness to produce reports for CCJG. Peter Grabosky offered to write to Arild Bjørndal and Mark Lipsey (C2 co-chairs) in advance of the assessment exercise to find out if C2 can arrange to have the C2 Library accredited as a journal. However, the Committee foresaw the potential problem that the journal could initially receive a low ranking.

On a separate point relating to new titles, Peter Grabosky noted that Adam Graycar is interested in submitting a title on corruption control, but is currently in the process of changing jobs so is not yet ready.

David Wilson also reported that a review on sex offender treatment had recently been suggested. This topic is already being reviewed by Friedrich Lösel and colleagues. However, the second reviewer proposed examining treatment for female sex offenders, which is not covered in Friedrich's review. The Committee agreed that the number of studies in this area would likely be low, but encouraged David Wilson to obtain a formal title proposal from the second reviewer for its consideration.

11. Report on Progress of Topic Mapping Committee

At the last CCJG Steering Committee meeting, a subcommittee was set up to work on mapping the scope of the field and topic areas, in order to generate new titles for review. The subcommittee comprised Catherine Gallagher (chair), Martin Killias, Friedrich Lösel, Jacque Mallender, and Tony Munton. The subcommittee met in Orta San Giulio, Italy, from May 15-17, 2009. Catherine Gallagher was unable to attend the present meeting, but supplied a paper entitled *The Orta Report* (which was described as a work-in-progress/recommendations rather than a final report), and Tony Munton described the subcommittee's activities to the Group.

The purpose of the mapping meeting was twofold: to map the subject area, in order to better inform CCJG activities by providing a clear view of how commissioned reviews map onto the relevant policy landscape; and to develop criteria for prioritizing topic areas for review. The subcommittee found the first of these aims to be the most complex, and Tony Munton limited his discussion in the present meeting to issues surrounding that part of the process.

The subcommittee started by performing a card-sorting exercise, in which participants wrote down elements of the criminal justice arena and put the ideas together (Catherine Gallagher described this as a 'qualitative factor analysis.' From this exercise, they created a four-dimensional taxonomy for interventions: target, purpose, outcome, and setting. Titles of CCJG reviews should be located across these four cells: who the intervention is for, why, what happens, and where (e.g., '*The Effects of Neighborhood Watch Programs on Suburban Residential Community Residents' Worry About Crime*'). This classification should help to characterize both the reviews themselves, and the demand for reviews.

The discussion in the present meeting focused on suggestions for improving this taxonomy. Lawrence Sherman felt it was missing a reference to the comparison group, and suggested something closer to the PICO (Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome) framework used in health research. Tony Munton noted that Catherine Gallagher had drawn a parallel with the PICO model, but had tried to extend the taxonomy to classify topics into multiple areas. Lawrence Sherman suggested a three-dimensional framework for greater simplicity, covering Population, Intervention, and

Outcome, with comparison/setting encompassed by those key dimensions. He argued for using the word ‘Intervention’ over ‘Purpose.’ Jacque Mallender requested that this issue be taken back to the full committee to get Catherine Gallagher’s input. The Committee recommended that the subcommittee debate and rework the terminology as necessary, and present their results at the next meeting.

Jacque Mallender noted that a key part of the exercise was to take stock of what has already been done and how that maps onto what the subcommittee felt ought to be done. However, the subcommittee found it difficult to fit existing titles into the taxonomy because they were often vague and lacked information. David Wilson explained that C2’s original intention was to have standardized titles along similar lines (Intervention, Population, Outcome, Setting/Modifier), but have not enforced this; however, the issue had recently resurfaced at the main C2 Steering Group meetings. The Committee agreed that Jacque Mallender and Catherine Gallagher should consult with Charlotte Gill to obtain the additional information needed to classify existing titles.

Charlotte Gill will also write to David Farrington to find out if he has a copy of the original topic mapping document produced by Joan McCord for CCJG, and will ask the full Steering Committee to comment on *The Orta Report* to enable the subcommittee to produce a revised document.

12. Report on Progress of Dissemination Committee

At the last CCJG Steering Committee meeting, a subcommittee was set up to consider strategies for disseminating review findings to policy and practice audiences. The subcommittee comprised Jacque Mallender (chair), Catherine Gallagher, Peter Greenwood, Peter Neyroud, and Lawrence Sherman. The subcommittee conducted several telephone conferences prior to the present meeting. Jacque Mallender gave a PowerPoint presentation to the Committee on the work of the subcommittee to date. Charlotte Gill will circulate Jacque’s slides to the full Steering Committee.

The subcommittee began by considering ‘who are the stakeholders?’ Stakeholders were classified in terms of their role in the evidence-to-practice cycle, their geographical coverage, their economic sector, and their business model, in commercial terms (these categories are not mutually exclusive). This produced the following typology:

- Those who influence or set policy
- Those who provide evidence for policy
- Those who fund policies and programs
- Those who deliver policy
- Those affected by harm

These stakeholders operate locally up to internationally, in a range of areas related to criminal justice, and in a range of sectors (public, voluntary, commercial). Depending on their classification, they have different interests in reviews. Crucially, those who provide evidence for policy actually need to use C2 reviews as the ‘gold standard’ source of evidence. They are both highly interested *and* highly powerful, and need to be the main focus of dissemination efforts. The choice of media for communicating evidence also depends on the power and interest of the different stakeholders; for example, those who are the main focus of efforts need clear, easy-to-read user summaries. Other groups

just need to know CCJG exists; for example, via the website or our presence at conferences.

The National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) is piloting the subcommittee's dissemination process, by identifying key audience members and relevant reviews, and disseminating user abstracts of the reviews through its network of contacts and new web-based knowledge management system for UK policing (called POLKA). The next steps are to review and evaluate the effectiveness of the pilot (Jacque called for the Committee's suggestions on how to do this), and to identify and target four or five more well-connected 'high power, high interest' agencies like NPIA, in order to start moving the evidence into practice. A targeted campaign at select agencies is needed, rather than a general discussion.

Jerry Lee suggested using visuals rather than words to get messages across effectively, since people act primarily on emotions. It is also possible to use facial coding to assess effectiveness: taking cues from people's facial expressions while they look at information. He said that Peter Neyroud has seen a demonstration of software that can do this. Jacque also noted that Peter Neyroud has communications experts, rather than substantive experts, working on this strategy, and would be able to present more details at the next meeting. She expected that the team he has built will be aware of some of these strategies.

David Weisburd noted that the COPS office in the US has similar responsibilities to NPIA, and has just been re-funded, so would be an appropriate agency to target. The National Institute of Justice has also put out a solicitation for translating research into policy. Jacque indicated that the Matrix US office could look into this.

Jerry Lee also suggested Peter Neyroud should look at information mapping techniques (e.g., infomap.com), which help to summarize and simplify complex information for the production of user-friendly research summaries.

David Weisburd thanked Jacque and the dissemination subcommittee for their work, and encouraged them to continue their work in consultation with the CCJG co-chairs.

13. CCJG Governance

David Wilson reported that there have been no changes to the CCJG Governance Plan approved by the Committee at the last meeting.

14. C2 Developments

David Weisburd reported that there had been some concern about money in the central Campbell Collaboration, with fears of possible budget cuts. While funding for the CCJG Editor and travel to meetings appears to be unaffected, any cuts may limit C2's ability to fund systematic reviews. This year, C2 will be applying to the Norwegian government for a renewal of its initial three-year funding package. In the event that the funding is not renewed, C2 has begun exploring alternative avenues for long-term stable infrastructure support. A committee has been formed, including Jerry Lee and Bob Boruch, to consider core funding opportunities.

Lawrence Sherman raised the issue of the C2 special edition of *The Lancet* that accompanied the recent Colloquium. The journal put out a call for papers related to C2, but did not publish most of the submissions. David Weisburd reported that he had

brought this up at the recent C2 Steering Group meeting, but although the problem was acknowledged, no solution was forthcoming.

15. Publications

(a) Progress report on Springer book series

The series has been approved, but the four formal book proposals have not yet been put forward to the publisher. David Weisburd agreed to discuss this with Welmoed Spahr at an upcoming meeting to find out what needs to be done next.

(b) Progress report on *Journal of Experimental Criminology*

David Weisburd reported that the Journal was making good progress. It has started to receive some rankings (SJR, journalrankings.com) and has been placed ahead of the *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* on citations in some rankings. It has not received an Impact Factor yet because of the length of time taken for that review process: journals need to be well-established, published on time, and well-cited, so JEC is on track. A special issue on unpublished experiments in domestic violence prevention is forthcoming in 2010.

(c) COPS (Office of Community Oriented Policing Services)

There have been no new COPS publications of CCJG reviews recently, but publications on Problem-Oriented Policing and Boot Camps are coming soon. COPS is likely to have an interest in publishing any reviews related to policing.

(d) Publications of the Swedish National Council on Crime Prevention (BRÅ)

Jan Andersson and David Weisburd reported that BRÅ is due to publish CCJG-related reviews by David Weisburd, David Wilson, David Farrington, Alex Piquero, and Brandon Welsh. Charlotte Gill is to send Jan Andersson the addresses of Steering Committee members so that they can receive hard copies of the publications. Publications are also available online in PDF format, and were on display at the Stockholm Criminology Symposium.

16. Report on Recent Meetings

(a) 9th Jerry Lee Crime Prevention Symposium, Washington, DC, April 27-28, 2009

The 2009 Jerry Lee Symposium was supported by the Jerry Lee Foundation, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Maryland, and George Mason University. David Weisburd reported that the meeting was a great success, and although work was still required to encourage people to attend both days, overall signups were 25 per cent higher than the previous year.

(b) 9th Campbell Collaboration Colloquium, Oslo, Norway, May 18-20, 2009

CCJG was better represented at this year's Colloquium than it has been in the past, and turnout was very large overall. Heather Strang presented her review on Restorative Justice, David Wilson and David Weisburd presented their review on the use of DNA in police investigations, Faye Taxman and Catherine Gallagher held a meeting to introduce their new Justice Health Network, which brings together criminology and

health, and which they intend to register as a Cochrane 'field.' Jonathan Shepherd gave an outstanding Jerry Lee Lecture on crime and health.

17. Upcoming Meetings

(a) European Society of Criminology, Ljubljana, Slovenia, 9-12 September, 2009

A CCJG presence has been organized at this conference. Martin Killias is convening a session, Tony Munton from Matrix will be attending, and Peter Grabosky will be providing an overview of CCJG activities. Charlotte Gill will send some brochures for distribution at the session.

(b) American Society of Criminology, Philadelphia, PA, 4-7 November 2009

Brandon Welsh sent the Committee a report on five panels that have been registered at this conference that showcase the work of CCJG. Across the five panels, twelve currently registered CCJG systematic reviews will be presented, along with several more potential reviews and primary experiments on crime prevention. The Committee thanked Brandon for his hard work in organizing the panels.

(c) 10th Jerry Lee Crime Prevention Symposium, Washington, DC, April/May 2010

David Weisburd thanked Jerry Lee for his continued sponsorship of this event. The dates for the 2010 Symposium have not yet been announced. The Committee approved the 2010 Symposium planning committee: David Weisburd, David Wilson, Jerry Lee, Jon Baron, Lawrence Sherman, and Gary LaFree.

(d) 1st Campbell/Cochrane Co-Colloquium, Keystone, CO, USA, 18-22 October, 2010

The next C2 Colloquium has been moved from May to October to coincide with the Cochrane Collaboration Colloquium. One thousand attendees are expected. Although the co-colloquium is experimental, Cochrane is very keen to foster closer involvement with C2. C2 will probably have its own day or evening for award presentations, the Jerry Lee Lecture, and so on. The Committee will encourage members and colleagues to attend.

David Weisburd noted that C2 offers two important prizes: the Mosteller Award for contributions to meta-analysis and systematic reviews, and the Boruch Award for contributions to evidence-based policy. The Boruch Award was not awarded this year because there were no nominations. The Committee agreed to consider potential nominees for this year and to let the CCJG co-chairs know.

(e) Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology, Perth, 22-25 November, 2009

Peter Grabosky is attending and will be highlighting the work of CCJG.

(f) Asian Society of Criminology, Macau, 11-14 December, 2009

The Asian Society of Criminology will be holding its first ever meeting. New CCJG Steering Committee nominee Jianhong Liu was instrumental in setting up this event.

(g) ISC World Congress of Criminology, Kobe, Japan, 21-26 October, 2011

CCJG will arrange a presence at this meeting nearer the time.

(h) Other Upcoming Meetings

Friedrich Lösel announced that he has received part of a grant to examine ‘what works’ among various interventions in Europe, and will be organizing two or three conferences in Cambridge over the next two years, at which policymakers from European countries will be represented. He suggested arranging CCJG panels at the meetings, and keeping participants updated on CCJG progress using the thumb drive and brochure strategies.

Friedrich also noted that Catherine Gallagher’s non-profit organization, the Lloyd Society, has a mapping tool that shows where studies have been conducted around the world, and suggested this might be an interesting technique to adopt for Campbell studies.

18. Other Business

Jerry Lee drew the Committee’s attention to a program being set up by Jon Baron, director of the Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy, that seeks to identify programs that work and move them toward obtaining federal funding. Programs are deemed effective according to the following criteria:

- Evaluated in at least two randomized controlled trials that show results in the same direction;
- Two years’ worth of results indicating that the program is effective; and
- Substantial effect in reducing crime outcomes.

Charlotte Gill will look through completed CCJG reviews to see whether any of the policies or interventions reviewed by our authors would fit these criteria.

19. Date of Next CCJG SC Meeting

The next meeting of the CCJG SC will provisionally take place on Tuesday, November 3, 2009 prior to the American Society of Criminology conference in Philadelphia, PA, USA. A dinner for participants will be held on the evening of Monday, November 2.

While this meeting was being held, David Weisburd was announced as the winner of the 2010 Stockholm Prize in Criminology. Congratulations to David, who joins Friedrich Lösel and Jonathan Shepherd as members of the CCJG Steering Committee who have been awarded the Prize.