

Minutes of the Twentieth Meeting of the
Campbell Collaboration Crime and Justice Group Steering Committee
Philadelphia, PA, USA – November 3, 2009

In attendance:

Steering Committee

David Farrington, Cambridge University, UK*
Catherine Gallagher, George Mason University, USA
Peter Grabosky, Australian National University, Australia (co-chair)
Martin Killias, University of Zurich, Switzerland*
Jerry Lee, Jerry Lee Foundation, USA
Jianhong Liu, University of Macao/Southwest University of Political Science & Law,
China
Friedrich Lösel, University of Erlangen-Nuremberg/Cambridge University, Germany/UK
Phyllis Schultze, Rutgers University, USA
Jonathan Shepherd, Cardiff University, UK
Lawrence Sherman, Cambridge University, UK*
Peter van der Laan, NSCR, Netherlands
David Weisburd, Hebrew University/George Mason University, Israel/UK (co-chair)
Brandon Welsh, Northeastern University, USA
David Wilson, George Mason University, USA (editor-in-chief)

Invited Guests

Thomas Feucht, National Institute of Justice, USA*
Charlotte Gill, University of Pennsylvania, USA (CCJG managing editor/coordinator)
Tony Munton, Matrix Knowledge Group, UK
Welmoed Spahr, Springer Publishing, USA*

* Present for part of the meeting.

1. Welcome and Introductions

David Weisburd, as meeting chair, welcomed everyone to the twentieth meeting of the Campbell Crime and Justice Group (CCJG) Steering Committee. Committee members Jan Andersson (National Council on Crime Prevention, Sweden), Vicente Garrido (Valencia University, Spain), Jacque Mallender (Matrix Knowledge Group, UK), Peter Neyroud (National Policing Improvement Agency, UK), and Hiroshi Tsutomi (Shizuoka University, Japan) sent their regrets at being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee welcomed new members Jianhong Liu (China) and Catherine Gallagher (USA) to the group.

David Weisburd informed the Committee of the recent death of founding member Ulla Bondeson. The group paused for a minute's silence in recognition of Ulla and her many contributions to the work of the CCJG. David Farrington will be writing an obituary for an upcoming issue of *The Criminologist*.

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting, Stockholm, June 24, 2009

The minutes of the previous meeting (Stockholm, Sweden, 24 June 2009) were approved, subject to Charlotte Gill clarifying with Jan Andersson the nature of the relationship of the Swedish Government with the Council of Europe in a section on the upcoming United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders.

3. Update from Peter Neyroud

Peter Neyroud was unable to join the meeting by telephone as planned due to technical difficulties in the meeting room. David Weisburd reported on the issues Peter planned to discuss: the NPIA funding for CCJG reviews, and an update on POLKA (Police Online Knowledge Application).

The NPIA funding for CCJG reviews on policing topics has proved to be very useful. Four full reviews and two systematic searches have been funded. A conference will be held outside London in March 2010 to showcase the reviews:

Reviews:

- **Legitimacy in policing**
Lorraine Mazerolle (University of Queensland, Australia), Sarah Bennett, Matthew Manning, Patricia Ferguson, and Elise Sargeant
- **GIS effects on crime reduction efficacy**
Larry Hoover (Sam Houston State University), Yan Zhang, and Solomon Zhao
- **Interview and interrogation methods: effects on confession rate, quality of information elicited, and accuracy of credibility assessment**
Christian Meissner (University of Texas, El Paso) and Allison Redlich
- **Spatial displacement and diffusion of benefits among geographically focused policing initiatives**
Kate Bowers (UCL Jill Dando Institute of Crime Science), Shane Johnson and Rob Guerette

Searches:

- **Stress management training and development programs for police officers and recruits**
George T. Patterson (CUNY Hunter College) and Irene Chung
- **'Policing schools': A systematic search for evaluative studies of non-curricular law enforcement strategies to prevent school crime and disorder**
Anthony Petrosino (WestEd) and Sarah Guckenberg

NPIA has also generously funded two existing reviews to speed up their completion:

- **Police strategies for reducing illegal possession and carrying of firearms**
Christopher Koper (PERF), and Evan Mayo-Wilson
- **The effects of Pulling Levers policing on crime**
Anthony Braga (Harvard University), and David Weisburd

Regular NPIA funding is unlikely to continue due to current budgetary constraints, but Peter Neyroud would like to continue to support CCJG with some money

he has available for special projects. Discussions are currently under way to work out how CCJG could receive money without being put in a grantor position. This was the case for the existing funds and there was some concern about how this fit with CCJG's traditional approach of being community of scholars that is supportive of people who want to complete reviews. With the NPIA grant, CCJG had to request that potential grantees did a lot of work on protocols with no guarantee of being accepted.

Committee members agreed that it was important to maintain both the group's reputation with scholars and its commitment to high standards when making funding decisions, while avoiding potential conflicts of interest. A discussion followed about how future offers of funding should be managed. Funding agencies may not be willing to give money to reviews already in progress, because there appears to be no open competition, and the ability to bring new people into the group is limited. However, this is how CCJG has previously received funding for individual reviews, and it avoids requiring people to undertake 'wasted' work. Tony Munton noted that in addition to open competition, the UK government sometimes adopts a framework model for funding, by which certain people are identified as suitable for doing the work and can receive funds without having to go through procurement. It was agreed that the best possible solutions would be to either have a shorter application process, or identify people. David Weisburd and David Wilson also acknowledged that the full CCJG steering committee should have a broader role in the decision-making process in future. David Weisburd suggested having an open discussion with Peter Neyroud by email to raise and discuss some of these issues.

Peter Neyroud will give a full report on the POLKA application at the next meeting.

4. Update from Jan Andersson

Due to the technical difficulties in the meeting room, Jan Andersson was unable to call in as planned. Jan sent a memo, which David Weisburd supplemented from his recent meeting with Jan in Israel. Jan wished to update the CCJG on two issues: the 2010 Stockholm Criminology Symposium (June 14-16), and the United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders, Salvador, Brazil, 12-19 April, 2010.

In a change to recent years, the Stockholm Criminology Symposium will be held at a central location in the city, and there will be one main theme (Policing) instead of three. A secondary theme will be contemporary criminology, covering sentencing, corrections, etc. The number of parallel sessions will be reduced and sessions will not be scheduled at the same time as the plenaries. Jan is hoping to increase links with international organization, and is working with Peter Neyroud to bring in various policing and governmental organizations from around the world to participate in and sponsor sessions. High-visibility sessions will be funded by the symposium.

Jan is hoping for several sessions on CCJG reviews and broader issues such as systematic review methodology and experimental research. Brandon Welsh will take the lead on organizing these, and will contact Jan with copies to the co-chairs. David Wilson and Charlotte Gill will help to identify potential reviews.

Committee members suggested the following ideas for presentations and panels:

- Adaptations of last year's policing sessions, which were not well-attended due to clashes (Jonathan Shepherd)

- International context of ‘what works’ – how programs transfer between countries (Friedrich Lösel)
- Designing a ‘buddy system’ of criminologists and policy-makers (Jerry Lee)
- How can practitioners take away meaning from reviews of complex interventions (Catherine Gallagher).

It has not yet been decided how Sweden will be participating in the UN Congress, but Jan will be discussing this further in a meeting on November 5. He still hopes that CCJG will be involved if possible, and reiterated an offer to pay for the travel of two CCJG members. The group envisaged giving a broader presentation about issues in systematic reviews, counter-intuitive findings, etc., rather than the results of systematic reviews. Provisionally, David Wilson and Brandon Welsh will attend, as two committee members who have been involved in a lot of reviews.

5. 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:

- 22 reviews have been published.
- 1 review is being revised with peer reviews completed.
- 3 reviews are under peer review.
- 3 reviews are being revised before seeking peer reviewers.
- 9 protocols have been approved but the review has not yet been submitted.
- 2 protocols are being revised with peer reviews completed.
- 3 protocols are under peer review.
- 3 protocols are being revised before peer review.
- 9 titles have been approved but the protocol has not yet been submitted.

In summary, 22 reviews have been published, 16 reviews are in progress, and 17 protocols are in progress.

In addition, 18 individual projects have undergone some kind of editorial action since the last CCJG meeting. David Wilson has written a total of ten editorial action letters since that date: two for new titles, three for protocols pre-peer review, two for protocols post-peer review (including a second action letter for a protocol that also received a post-peer review action letter before the last meeting), two for reviews pre-peer review, and one for a review post-peer review. Since the last meeting, eight titles, three new protocols, and three new reviews have been submitted for the first time, and six titles, two protocols, and three reviews have been approved by the CCJG Steering Committee. A fourth review is ready to be sent to the committee for approval after the meeting. Many of the new titles and protocols submitted were a result of the recent NPIA funding.

David Wilson reported that a discussion on how to speed up and improve the editorial process took place at the recent Campbell Collaboration Steering Group meeting. The key issue for CCJG is the peer review process. The in-house editorial process has been greatly improved, and David tries to get action letters out within a week, but it can still take three to four months to obtain all the external reviews. Speed is particularly important when obligations to funding agencies (especially the government)

exist. A discussion ensued at the C2 meeting about which aspects of peer review are vital to maintain integrity, and what can be changed. One possible solution is to move to a conference call format for peer reviews, instead of asking for a written document.

The CCJG committee generally agreed with this idea, although several limitations were pointed out, including the possibility of creating a ‘groupthink’ effect whereby peer reviewers might tend to agree with each other (especially if a status imbalance existed). A solution to that issue would be to ask reviewers to send their initial thoughts in advance, either through short written comments or a short rating proforma. David Wilson felt that a discussion on the phone would lead to better editorial feedback, particularly because CCJG’s peer review process is designed to revise and improve reviews, rather than a ‘yes/no’ vote like journal peer reviews. Because C2 reviews have a set structure, it would be easy for the editor to guide the discussion.

Peter Grabosky expressed concern about busy people buying in to a conference call format (where they would have to be pinned down at a specific time). Jerry Lee felt that this format would be more likely to succeed, especially if people could be given the option of calling in individually if it became too difficult to schedule everyone on the same call. Individual conference calls might also help to assuage concern about bias and contamination of peer reviews.

The committee decided that it would be useful to experiment with the different options and ideas, including group calls, individual calls, and standard forms. The standard form could be optional. The experimentation process would start with the collective approach, and authors will be given options to arrange calls two, three, or four weeks in the future. Charlotte Gill as managing editor would take notes during the call in order to provide feedback to the authors. David McClure’s time could also be used for this process, especially for the NPIA reviews, as he is coordinating reviews submitted under that grant. Charlotte Gill will prepare data on comparative review rejection rates and average time to review for the next meeting.

6. De-registration of Inactive Titles

No reviews are listed for deregistration at this time. It was noted that the CCJG bylaws state that reviews remaining inactive for a year will be deregistered. However, this is not in the document that goes to new reviewers. Charlotte Gill will add this to the guidance for new reviewers.

7. Consideration of New Titles

Participants received a title registration form for a proposed systematic review titled: *Dutch recidivism studies on the effectiveness of penal interventions*, by Bouke Wartna and Daphne Alberta of the Dutch Ministry of Justice. The Committee reserved discussion of this title until this meeting because the scope of the proposed review was too broad in terms of interventions, but raised the interesting question of whether a country-specific review fit within C2’s framework. Although, as Lawrence Sherman stated, being able to summarize studies that are not accessible to the English-speaking world into English is a substantial contribution, in practice CCJG reviews look at specific interventions and most are only limited to North America because the interventions only exist there (e.g., boot camps). However, CCJG does not want to alienate new reviewers.

Martin Killias suggested an ‘open borders’ model in which any good research may be taken into account, with geographical restrictions imposed only because the programs only exist in a limited number of countries. Friedrich Lösel added that English-language reviews also suffer from bias because reviewers do not have the resources to search in other languages; however, national-based reviews may detract from C2’s international mission if individual countries only want to fund reviews of their own studies. Catherine Gallagher argued against limiting reviews by geography at the outset, but suggested that editors can work with authors to develop their international search if they have the resources available to do one. David Farrington added that CCJG should not reject such proposals outright because most policymakers and practitioners are interested in whether research findings apply in their own countries.

The Committee agreed that the proposal should be considered and that David Wilson should work with the review team in narrowing the proposal and trying to broaden its international scope, or focusing on an intervention that only exists in the Netherlands. It was agreed that Peter van der Laan should contact the review team in the first instance, since he knows the authors and has not yet spoken to them about the proposal. Peter will then speak to David Wilson about how to proceed.

8. Updates to Published Reviews

The issue of when to require that published CCJG reviews are updated was discussed at the last meeting in Stockholm. Participants received a report showing the time in years since publication and the time in years since the estimated date of the search for each completed review. In many cases there was a long delay between conducting the work and the completion of the editorial process (although this is getting shorter as older reviews are completed and newer reviews move along more quickly). The Committee agreed that a policy is required on the requirements for updating reviews and warnings about outdated reviews.

David Wilson noted that C2 has a little-known policy that new authors can update reviews if the original review team does not, but no mechanisms have been developed for this and there are no good norms to build on. CCJG’s title registration gives authors ownership of the title, so that model is not a good fit. C2 is looking for a better policy on ‘timing out.’

The Committee agreed that a fixed rule would be problematic in this field, as some areas move more quickly than others. Young researchers may also change the focus of their work and not keep up to date with the topic of their reviews. Catherine Gallagher noted that it would be relatively easy to run a search for studies that have been completed since the original search date and note how many new studies are available, which could be incorporated into a ‘warning label’ on the original review. However, as Peter Grabosky noted, policymakers may be concerned about the implications of using ‘old’ reviews for practice. Phyllis Schultze also noted that reviews on ‘hot topics’ or in emerging areas (e.g., drug courts, cyber abuse) needed more frequent full updates. She suggested that a committee should be formed to determine which reviews fell into these categories and should be prioritized for updating.

The Committee agreed that CCJG should be more explicit about the updating process, and a policy should be included in the guidelines that are sent out to new

reviewers. In addition to Phyllis's suggestion, the following possible solutions were put forth:

- Create a mechanism online through which anyone can post references to new studies on a topic for authors to use as a reference in the update process;
- Write to authors encouraging them to include a paragraph about updates;
- Four years after the search date and three years after publication, review authors should be asked to carry out an update;
- After six years without an update, the review should be opened up to other authors and the original should carry a 'health warning.'

The Committee will send a letter to the authors of each review that currently falls in the 'three years after publication and four years after search' category to ask what their plans are for updating the review. The nature of the response to this exercise will inform further decision-making about an updating policy.

9. Campbell Review Issues

The issue of consistency in the presentation of forest graphs was raised. Some reviews show results favoring the intervention on the right-hand side of the graph, whereas others show them on the left. David Wilson explained that the problem with standardizing graphs is that the appropriate presentation may depend on the type of intervention or outcome. It also depends on the software used. C2 has discussed this issue and is still working on a policy. In the meantime, clear labeling and explanation for decisions about graphical presentation will be required.

David Wilson reported that a standardized model for titles is now being used, along the lines of '[Intervention] for [population] for [outcome].' C2 does not want to change the titles of reviews that have already been published, but David is working to change the titles of all reviews that are still working through the various stages of the editorial process. He encouraged the Committee to suggest edits to more complex titles when protocols and reviews are sent for approval, if they have not been changed already. The intervention should always be the first part of the title.

Another issue on the agenda for discussion is the quality of evidence. Peter Grabosky noted the tension between the needs of funders and consumers, and CCJG's principles on evidential rigor. This leads to the question, "How low should we go" in terms of methodological quality? If there is a strong indication that evidence is going to be systematically biased, is it acceptable to exclude all quasi-experimental evidence in which there is likely to be a selection effect, even if it constitutes the main body of research about an intervention? Or, as David Farrington and his colleagues did in their systematic review of parental imprisonment effects on children (a risk factor that, for obvious reasons, cannot be tested in a randomized experiment), is careful analysis and coding of studies' confounder control strategies the best compromise?

David Wilson noted that the existing C2 policy states a preference for randomized trials, but reviews can include quasi-experiments. At a minimum, results for different study types must be shown separately before any steps are taken to combine them. However, this policy will be revised in the next year by a working group that includes David, Mark Lipsey, and Terri Pigott. They would be grateful for CCJG's advice on changes to the policy. Martin Killias noted that separate analyses were acceptable, but if

there are no randomized trials on a topic it is harder to set a benchmark to judge other studies. David Wilson would prefer that reviewers handled the issue sensitively, by setting a cut point in advance, but did not want to completely exclude other types of studies if readers would expect to see them included. Another problem with restricting inclusion criteria only to RCTs is generalizability, as such trials often require strict eligibility criteria for random assignment that may not be workable in practice. Jerry Lee suggested that a way around this would be to follow the approach taken by David Weisburd and his colleagues in the CCJG review on problem-oriented policing. The review focused on a meta-analysis of experimental and high-quality quasi-experimental studies, and showed the pre-post studies in a separate table. This satisfies readers who know the body of research on that topic, while at the same time demonstrates the difference between the more and less rigorous research. Martin Killias agreed that such studies can add value, and that a note could be included in reviews explaining why the meta-analysis was only conducted on the smaller subset of more rigorous designs. Jianhong Liu added that specific criteria could be developed for evaluating the quality of nonrandomized studies.

10. Funding

(a) CCJG infrastructure/Norway funding

David Weisburd noted that CCJG needs to start planning for new funding sources for its infrastructure in the next two years. The group needs to find ways to help members attend meetings and pay for editorial support. At present, money for encouraging the timely completion of reviews and peer reviews has come from C2, as has money for editorial work. C2 funding is relatively stable because the money received from the Norwegian government is now a permanent part of the government's budget. Some of the editorial money received will be used to support the managing editor. This funding previously came from the Jerry Lee Foundation, but that funding is no longer available. The managing editor has traditionally been a graduate student, and has therefore been an expensive position to fund because of the need to cover tuition, etc. The current managing editor will be moving to George Mason University next year as a postdoctoral fellow, and will be able to continue her work as part of that role, but again CCJG is in the position of having an institutional member cover its infrastructure costs for the foreseeable future. For the next meeting, an attempt will be made to assess infrastructure costs, how they are currently paid for, and how stable those sources are.

(b) National Institute of Justice

The current climate at NIJ/Office of Justice Programs seems to be favorable to evidence-based policy. A 'what works clearinghouse' and large-scale systematic review program have been suggested. However, CCJG no longer has funding from NIJ. The previous grant has just ended and a recent proposal submitted by George Mason University to carry out Campbell reviews was not received well by the peer reviewers.

Thomas Feucht confirmed NIJ's commitment to science, research, evidence, and evidence-based policy. He explained that NIJ had not had a lot of money available in 2009 and the award processes were under pressure due to compressed timelines determined by Recovery Act funding. In 2010 further opportunities may be available,

although in all cases it is harder to obtain funding to cover infrastructure costs rather than finished research products.

(c) Discussions with other funding agencies

Catherine Gallagher agreed to talk to David Wilson and David Weisburd about ideas for various places to seek support for different elements of the CCJG process: individual reviews, infrastructure costs, or capacity building.

Jonathan Shepherd suggested maintaining links with NPIA, which seem to be strong at present, to see what other resources may be available there.

Peter Grabosky and Jonathan Shepherd agreed that it would be prudent to work more closely with the Scandinavian countries. C2 has a strong relationship with the Norwegian government and the Swedish justice minister is committed to working more closely with CCJG.

11. Introduction of New Committee Member Jianhong Liu

CCJG's newest member, Jianhong Liu, from the University of Macao and Southwest University of Political Science and Law, China, introduced himself to the Committee. He has been working on a translation of the C2 website into Chinese. In general, Jianhong's work focuses on trying to advance evidence-based policy in China and Asia more broadly. The main difference between Asia and the United States and Europe is that there are very few randomized trials or systematic reviews. He has a future-based vision of CCJG – if the C2 method can be pushed into Asia with the help of other CCJG members, change could be effected in terms of the production of high-quality primary research too.

12. Topic Mapping

Tony Munton gave a presentation on the work that has been done by the topic mapping subcommittee since the Stockholm meeting. The purpose of the topic mapping exercise is to encourage the development of systematic reviews in priority areas. The work that has been done by the committee so far constitutes the groundwork for preparing to create a list of priority areas for review. The committee's approach was to identify the whole range of interventions covered by CCJG's scope. First, a taxonomy was created to show what areas CCJG reviews fall into, in order to identify the gaps. Since most reviews largely fall into one or two topic areas, a strategy must then be developed to move into the areas that are currently missed. The committee has also worked to develop a structure for titles, that coincides with C2 policies on title standardization discussed earlier in the meeting.

The main point of discussion about the proposed framework was the extent to which it allowed for potentially confounding interventions (e.g., backfire effects or unintended consequences) to be identified. For example, the CCJG review on boot camps shows a distinction between punitive and CBT-based programs. The framework would need to be able to pick up on this 'intervention within an intervention' idea. Catherine Gallagher explained that the framework does allow for the specification of primary and secondary interventions. David Weisburd concluded that the current work is important for showing how the list of missing areas would be created, and asked if such a list could be prepared in time for the next meeting.

13. C2 Developments/Website

David Wilson reported on recent developments in the central Campbell Collaboration. The Methods Group has been working on adapting the Cochrane handbook for C2. So far, the methods should be adaptable, but C2 cannot be as strict about evidential quality – Cochrane reviews have explicit criteria for the treatment of non-RCTs that would not be workable in the social sciences.

The new Campbell Library is online, and published reviews are now part of an official monograph series with a DOI number and consistent format, titled ‘Campbell Systematic Reviews.’ In his term as co-chair, Mark Lipsey has prioritized the professionalization of the website. The next priority is to clean up policy statements. Currently they are hard to find online and are largely out-of-date. The website also now includes an in-house tracking system for review management. The system has the benefit of being C2-owned, so it can be easily changed, and it is written in a commonly-understood programming language to make any transitions to new management easier.

The original 501(c)(3) designation of C2 has been changed so that control of the entity lies within the group rather than with an external board of directors that is separated from the C2 steering group. C2 is not currently engaged in any revenue-generating activities, as attempts in the past have been problematic. Attempts to generate revenue through publications were not successful because publishing contracts would have limited C2’s ability to maintain open access to reviews, which remains a priority. Jerry Lee suggested investigating the ‘Annals’ model used by the American Academy of Political and Social Science as an alternative publication outlet.

14. Evolution of the CCJG Steering Committee

Peter Grabosky is stepping down as co-chair in November 2010, and David Weisburd’s second term is due to end at the same time. Nominations for a new co-chair should be considered. David Weisburd is also nearing the end of his term on the C2 Steering Group. One representative to that group from CCJG must be a co-chair, so the new co-chair must be willing to go to C2 meetings, which are paid for. At least one meeting takes place in Norway; the next one is the week before the Stockholm Criminology Symposium in 2010.

The Committee agreed that David Weisburd should continue as co-chair for two more years at the end of his term to avoid the problem of having two new co-chairs starting at the same time. It was agreed that if the current governance document does not allow for such a transitional period, a change should be proposed. David Wilson will check the governance document for the appropriate procedures. It was agreed that David Farrington would chair a nominations committee for the new co-chair; Peter Grabosky and David Weisburd would serve on that committee. Charlotte Gill will contact David Farrington with the rules for nominations and to set up a telephone conference for the nominations committee. Briefly, a call for nominations goes out to the steering committee, and any nominations are considered by the nominations committee (the nominations committee is also allowed to suggest names). The nominations committee then recommends candidates for a vote. David Farrington will notify nominees first to ensure that they are willing to serve.

Vicente Garrido may step down from the steering committee, leaving a position open for a representative from a Spanish-speaking country. Two names were put forward: Santiago Redondo and Carlos Carcach. Peter Grabosky and David Weisburd will contact these two potential candidates informally before they are asked to provide materials for a vote.

15. Publications

(a) Journal of Experimental Criminology

Welmoed Spahr reported that the Journal is doing well and they expect download figures to double between 2008 and 2009. The most downloaded articles this year were Friedrich Lösel's systematic review of sex offender treatment, and David Farrington and Brandon Welsh's article about what we have learned in the last two decades from randomized trials in criminology. By next year, a decision on acceptance into the ISI ranking system will have been made. Previously, the journal was rejected because the authorship was not international enough, but this has improved more recently and the citation count is higher. The journal is ranked highly in other ranking systems, such as SJR.

(b) Springer book series

Welmoed Spahr reported that the series editors, Lawrence Sherman and Heather Strang, have broadened the scope of the series from evidence-based crime prevention to evidence-based crime policy. One title has been signed up to be published next year and another three are close to signing. Springer expects to have one or two books in print in the next year. Lawrence Sherman explained that the series is about original research that builds on rigorous statements about prior research, such as alcohol-based injury prevention programs and nurse home visitation programs. He thanked Peter Grabosky for his early support of the project, noting that the book that has been signed up is one that Peter helped to bring on board.

Welmoed explained that the books will also be available as e-books. They will be downloadable and searchable at the chapter level, making each chapter like a journal article. It is also possible to embed other media in the e-books, such as illustrative videos. Most of the books will be sole-authored, but Springer will also consider edited collections. The Springer website currently has a link to the book series homepage for solicitations, which Welmoed will send to Charlotte. They expect that most proposals will come from groups like CCJG and from personal discussions. Books will also appear in print, and in paperback if there is a market for it (this will most likely depend on the title, as some may be more or less appropriate for student and practitioner markets). Purchase of a hard copy is not necessary to obtain the e-book format.

(c) COPS Office publication of CCJG reviews

The COPS office is still publishing CCJG reviews. They recently agreed to drop their peer review process and will just do an editorial review, since the papers have already been reviewed as part of CCJG's editorial process.

(d) Swedish National Council on Crime Prevention (BRÅ)

BRÅ has put out two more publications on programs to increase self-control and interventions for male violent offenders. Most BRÅ publications focus on the findings of CCJG reviews and other systematic reviews. Publications on programs for serious juvenile offenders and repeat victimization programs are also in the pipeline. David Farrington handed out copies of some of the publications.

(e) New book by Brandon Welsh and David Farrington: *Making Public Places Safer: Surveillance and Crime Prevention* (Oxford University Press, 2009)

Brandon Welsh generously provided copies of the book to meeting participants.

16. Report on Recent Meetings

The Committee thanked Martin Killias for arranging a successful CCJG presence at the European Society of Criminology conference in Ljubljana, Slovenia (9-12 September, 2009). Peter Grabosky gave an overview of the work of the group, and Jianhong Liu was also in attendance.

17. Upcoming Meetings

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

The Committee thanked Brandon Welsh for his work on organizing five panels showcasing CCJG reviews at this year's conference. The panels are spread evenly across the three main days of the conference, and feature sixteen presentations, mostly highlighting findings from in-progress and recently completed reviews, and three discussants. The full program is available at http://www.asc41.com/Annual_Meeting/2009/2009PrintProgram.pdf. CCJG panels are listed under the titles *Evidence-Based Crime Prevention I-V*.

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

Peter Grabosky will be attending and giving an overview of the work of the CCJG. Thank you to Peter for representing CCJG at this conference.

(c) 10th Jerry Lee Crime Prevention Symposium, University of Maryland/Washington, DC, 19-20 April 2010

The dates for this meeting have now been set and the preliminary program is taking shape. Participants received a copy of the preliminary program. As in previous years, Day 1 focuses on methodological issues and Day 2 showcases the findings of CCJG reviews. The website and registration information for the conference will be available soon. Thank you to Jerry Lee for his generous support of this event.

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

For the first time, C2 will be holding its annual colloquium as part of the Cochrane colloquium. This represents a move to integrate the two groups more closely. C2 will benefit greatly from this venture in terms of learning about methodology and gaining more publicity. Many features of the C2 colloquium will be incorporated, such as the Jerry Lee Lecture, which is a program highlight. CCJG will try to get involved as much as possible. Catherine Gallagher has attended Cochrane colloquia and noted that

they are different from the C2 format. They are more focused around training and policy discussion rather than the presentation of systematic review results. The committee agreed that it was important to include a CCJG presence at the conference. Catherine Gallagher will take the lead on this.

18. Other Business

David Weisburd called attention to the new Division of Experimental Criminology that has been approved within the American Society of Criminology. The division dues will supplant AEC membership (AEC will remain in existence, mainly conferring honors and awards), and division members will receive the Journal of Experimental Criminology. The inaugural division meeting will be held during the 2009 ASC conference.

Jerry Lee noted that the topic mapping issue discussed earlier in the meeting fits with Jon Baron's program that seeks to identify areas in which randomized trials are needed. He offered to chair a committee including David Wilson, Jon Baron, and perhaps Tony Munton to influence efforts in this area.

19. Date of Next CCJG SC Meeting

The next meeting of the Campbell Crime and Justice Group steering committee will take place in Stockholm on Wednesday, June 16, 2010 at the conclusion of the last session of the Stockholm Criminology Symposium, and will include a 'working dinner.'