

Minutes of the Seventeenth Meeting of the
Campbell Crime & Justice Group Steering Committee
Stockholm, Sweden, June 15, 2008

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 Cambridge, UK
Jacque Mallender, Matrix Knowledge Group, UK
Peter Neyroud, National Policing Improvement Agency, UK
Jonathan Shepherd, Cardiff University, UK
Lawrence Sherman, University of Cambridge, UK/University of Pennsylvania, USA
Hiroshi Tsutomi, University of Shizuoka, Japan
Peter van der Laan, NSCR, The Netherlands
David Weisburd, Hebrew University, Israel (co-chair)
Brandon Welsh, University of Massachusetts-Lowell, USA
David Wilson, George Mason University, USA (editor-in-chief)

Invited Guests

Arild Bjørndal, Campbell Collaboration
Charlotte Gill, University of Pennsylvania (managing editor/coordinator)
Adam Graycar, Rutgers University
Eamonn Noonan, Campbell Collaboration
Maiken Pontoppidan, Nordic Campbell Centre

1. Welcome and Introductions

David Weisburd welcomed everyone to the seventeenth meeting of the Campbell Crime and Justice Group (CCJG) Steering Committee. Committee members Catherine Blaya (European Observatory of Violence in Schools, France), David Farrington (University of Cambridge, UK), and Martin Killias (University of Zurich, Switzerland) sent their regrets at being unable to attend the meeting.

The Committee congratulated member Jonathan Shepherd on winning the 2008 Stockholm Criminology Prize, to be presented at the Stockholm Criminology Symposium on Tuesday, 17 June. David Weisburd introduced the two invited guests from the central Campbell Collaboration (C2), Arild Bjørndal and Eamonn Noonan, and thanked them for their work with C2.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Participants received a copy of the minutes of the sixteenth meeting of the CCJG Steering Committee, held on November 13, 2007 in Atlanta, GA. David Weisburd proposed two corrections:

1. Page 1: Under section 1, 'Welcome and Introductions,' it is stated that "Each co-chair serves a six-year term, which will be staggered so that one new co-chair is

- elected every three years.” This should in fact state that each co-chair serves a three-year term, renewable for a further three years, up to a maximum of six years. Therefore, Peter Grabosky will not automatically serve six years.
2. Page 6: Under section 7, ‘Campbell Collaboration (C2) Developments,’ it is stated that the support for C2 from the Norwegian government amounts to \$690,000 each year for the next three years, including \$500,000 for reviews. This is actually the total amount of money over three years, not the yearly amount.

The Committee agreed to adopt the minutes, subject to the above corrections.

3. Progress Report on Current CCJG Titles

David Wilson reported on the status of CCJG titles through June 9, 2008 (participants received a handout entitled ‘Campbell Collaboration Crime & Justice Group Progress Report’). The key points about the progress of CCJG titles include:

- 11 reviews have been published.
- 5 reviews are being revised with peer reviews completed.
- 2 reviews are seeking peer reviewers.
- 3 reviews are being revised before seeking peer reviewers.
- 2 reviews are in progress but no protocol has been submitted.
- 9 protocols have been approved but the review has not yet been submitted.
- 5 protocols are being revised with peer reviews completed.
- 1 protocols are seeking peer reviewers.
- 5 protocols are being revised before seeking peer reviewers.
- 4 titles have been approved but the protocol has not yet been submitted..

In summary, 11 reviews have been published, 21 reviews are in progress, 15 protocols are in progress, and 5 titles are in progress.

David Wilson reported that he has written twelve action letters since the last meeting, and that there has been increased activity in the progress of titles, but mostly at the protocol stage rather than with those closer to completion. The editor’s role has become more time-consuming, with more reviews coming through. Furthermore, more recently submitted titles are moving most quickly (for example, Alex Piquero and colleagues’ review on early prevention programs). That title was submitted a year ago, and the draft final review is now being peer reviewed.

Jerry Lee asked whether a year was too long, and could a review be done in four months with funding built in. David Weisburd replied that the three reviews funded by the US National Institute of Justice (NIJ), including Piquero’s, were moving more quickly than others. This was due to a policy of choosing authors for funding that were likely to move quickly, and prioritizing those reviews in the editorial process. Reviews often get held up at the peer review stage, but there are several final reviews that have been through peer review and are being revised, that could be expedited.

Brandon Welsh reported that he is a co-author on two of the five reviews in this category. He and his colleagues are working through the reviewers’ comments, some of which were more difficult to rectify than others. He stated that the delays to his reviews were a result of earlier, inefficient editorial practices that have since been revised, so he did not envision such issues continuing into the future. The new editorial system, under

which the CCJG editor writes an action letter highlighting only the most important elements of the peer reviews, had greatly smoothed the process. David Wilson noted that all the stalled and problematic reviews predate the new editorial system. He also stated that not all of the five reviews in this section were stalled: Patrick Tolan's review on mentoring completed the peer review process just two weeks before this meeting.

David Weisburd asked how authors who were close to completion could be persuaded to finish. David Wilson and Charlotte Gill reported that the peer and methods review processes often created the longest delays: even with incentive payments for timely completion, it has been difficult to engage busy people. Furthermore, due to a lack of older records, it has not always been possible to use the same reviewer for the protocol and final review. Even where the protocol reviewer could be identified, they may be too busy to look at the final review. A new reviewer can bring up new issues. Brandon Welsh stated that authoring a Campbell review has become more prestigious in the last few years, and more progress might be made now that many authors are inclined to prioritize reviews in addition to journal articles and books.

Jerry Lee asked that a working group be formed to examine whether reviews could be completed in six months, to report back at the next Committee meeting. Jacque Mallender stated that six months may not be enough time to do justice to the literature and rigorous process of the systematic review. That time frame would be challenging for a commercial organization with fully dedicated teams and a payment incentive, and Campbell reviews are generally produced by academics working voluntarily, in small groups, and alongside other projects. Peter Grabosky agreed, highlighting the CCJG counter-terrorism review, in which a small team had to examine twenty-thousand documents in order to obtain seven studies for inclusion in the meta-analysis. Jerry Lee asked if the working group could instead report on the ideal timeframe for a review. He expressed the importance of making reviews commercially viable: government agencies are unable to wait a year to eighteen months for summaries of evidence. Peter Neyroud confirmed that government agencies are usually looking for answers within one business cycle, so that results can be implemented in the next cycle. However, Friedrich Lösel proposed that there should not be a fixed timeframe for all reviews, due to the voluntary nature of the work and the specific needs of various research areas.

David Wilson suggested that Jacque Mallender's model of using full-time, professional staff was the ideal way to speed up the process. With the right funding for infrastructure, a centre could be created to provide full-time technical assistance. Jacque Mallender agreed that this could work well and offered to share some elements of the Matrix business model, including the concept of producing rapid evidence assessments. Arild Bjørndal also indicated that the long-term vision of C2 was to be able to provide a body of evidence, through its web library, from which rapid evidence assessments could be conducted. C2 would move towards a model of building lists of important questions to show to governments in order to obtain their interest and funding, from which local research centers could be created. Friedrich Lösel agreed that a good pool of studies is needed before reviews can be done quickly. He highlighted an example from his own work, in which he was able to save sex offender treatment in Bavaria from discontinuation simply by pulling out journal articles published from his in-progress sex offender review.

The Committee agreed to create a working group to report back at the next meeting, comprising David Wilson (chair), Jerry Lee, Jacque Mallender, and Peter Neyroud from the CCJG, and Arild Bjørndal and Mark Lipsey from C2.

The discussion turned to expediting the peer review process, particularly the methods reviews. Under the current system, the methods group editor solicits a peer review from a methods expert, writes an action letter, and then the CCJG editor writes another action letter based on the methods and other peer reviews. This duplication of work was causing the methods editor to become overwhelmed. David Wilson noted that the act of soliciting a methodological peer review indicated the methods group editor's 'seal of approval,' and agreed to talk to the current methods editor, Terri Piggott, about how the process could be streamlined. Arild Bjørndal added that there was no reason the current system could not be changed, especially as C2 grows and it becomes unrealistic to have just one methods editor.

Jonathan Shepherd then stated that the group needed to create a market for systematic reviews, and suggested having a press briefing every time a new review was published. David Weisburd asked if C2 planned to implement the infrastructure to allow this to happen. Eamonn Noonan replied that it was important to highlight the work already done, although the priority for C2 was to build a corpus of work that could be quickly updated. He expressed a preference for direct contact with policy-makers and summaries of findings, rather than press releases. However, Jerry Lee pointed out that a press release, if well-written, is an inexpensive and effective way to promulgate information. He suggested using Ted Gest, a former crime journalist who runs a crime and justice news e-mail digest. Friedrich Lösel agreed that press releases would help to highlight interesting findings in areas that were not currently considered pressing policy questions (in which case, direct contact with policy-makers might be more effective).

Brandon Welsh assured that his street lighting review would be completed soon, and possibly also his review on CCTV. The three NIJ-funded reviews have to be completed by the end of the summer, and Trevor Bennett's neighborhood watch review and Tolan's review on mentoring are also very close. Peter Grabosky agreed to peer review and approve the Feder and Wilson domestic violence review (which requires an external editor since David Wilson is the co-author – using the old external editor system has caused delays). It was also agreed, with the approval of Arild Bjørndal, that Friedrich Lösel could submit his sex offenders review even though the protocol was missing. Friedrich also agreed to provide a budget for funding of his child skills review to Charlotte Gill, along with a copy of the protocol. Given this information, David Weisburd requested that eight new reviews be published by the next meeting. The Committee agreed.

4. Deregistration of Inactive Titles

David Weisburd suggested that the potential deregistration of titles that have been stalled for a long period of time should be discussed at every meeting. He began by requesting the deregistration of his own title, co-authored with Mimi Azjenstadt, on Israeli criminal justice practices, which has been stalled for nearly two years. Other titles considered for deregistration were:

- Kenneth Adams: juvenile curfews

- Graham Farrell and Ken Pease: repeat victimization (David Wilson also agreed to contact them).
- Rania Marandos: interventions for victims (David Wilson will speak to co-author Amanda Perry about its continuation, but she is focusing on another review and may not have time).
- Chris Maxwell: effects of arrest on domestic violence
- Marc Renzema: electronic monitoring (David Weisburd will write to Marc asking for a funding proposal, as money may be a factor of the delay).

Jacque Mallender noted that criteria should be put in place for deregistration, so that it was not an arbitrary decision. The Committee agreed that the Managing Editor should check on the progress of reviews every six months. After two checks with no evident progress, the co-chairs would send the author a letter of intention to deregister unless the author provided evidence that progress would be made in the next six months. David Weisburd said that this timeframe would be most effective for older stalled reviews, and could be revised for newer ones, the progress of which has generally been faster. He asked that this proposal be added to the CCJG governance document.

The Committee also agreed that it would be a good idea to include a ‘Hot Topics’ page on the new website, that would flag topics that had been deregistered, but were still considered important issues and could be picked up by new authors.

5. Consideration of New Titles

Committee members received a copy of a title proposal by Alex Piquero and Wesley Jennings, on programs to increase self-control. However, David Weisburd stated that it was fairer to send new titles by email to the whole Committee, rather than approving them quickly at meetings, so the Committee held off on approving that title.

David Weisburd noted that calls for new titles worked best when Committee members sought out people to work on certain topics. A recent call for papers in the ASC newsletter did not appear to increase submissions, although it was agreed that in future, authors proposing titles should be asked how they heard about the Group.

Peter van der Laan distributed copies of a new title proposal on human trafficking to Committee members. He also requested that a review be conducted on probation supervision. Charlotte Gill stated that she was planning to work on this topic as part of her dissertation, and planned to submit it as a Campbell review. The Committee and guests then discussed other ‘hot topics,’ and suggested potential authors (in parentheses):

- Crime development in the vicinity of drug treatment locations (Rutgers University is currently looking at this).
- Faith-based programs (Byron Johnson).
- Sports programs for delinquent juveniles (possibly Wayne Osgood).
- Alcohol-related violence (Don Weatherburn, or Alex Wagenaar at the University of Florida, who is looking at alcohol pricing and consumption – Peter Grabosky has already contacted him about preparing a Campbell review. Jacque Mallender also offered to ask Home Office staff who had worked on a review of alcohol pricing).

- Police legitimacy/politeness/minority-related issues (David Weisburd/Dick Hobbs from the new Crime Unit at the London School of Economics Department of Sociology). Policing in emerging democracies (possibly David Bailey).
- Peer support programs for ex-offenders – not just employment-specific, as in the published review by Visser and colleagues (Joan Petersilia and Susan Turner).
- Multi-systemic therapy (Julia Littell – already done for the Social Welfare group/Cochrane – just need to ask about co-registration).
- Reducing knife crime/carrying (Lawrence Sherman to do or recommend author).
- Police use of ‘less-than-lethal’ weapons e.g. Tasers (find out who did recent study on Taser use/David Klinger, University of Missouri/Michael White, John Jay).
- Effectiveness of the use of forensic science and technology in policing: DNA, ANPR, facial recognition (collaborate with John Morgan, NIJ for advice and possible funding).
- Effectiveness of removal of crime assets/proceeds of crime (Jacque Mallender to find out who reviewed this for Matrix).
- Neighborhood policing/community policing/reassurance agenda (NPIA).
- Parole decisions/effectiveness of high-risk release strategies (Joan Petersilia and Susan Turner/Faye Taxman – Charlotte Gill to look for literature on decision-making as well as risk assessment).
- The effectiveness of sentencing commissions.
- Institutional programs for juveniles in criminal justice vs. social welfare settings (Friedrich Lösel interested in this; to look at Vicente Garrido’s review).

At David Weisburd’s suggestion, the Committee agreed that six weeks before the next meeting, Committee members should be working on mapping out the field so that new areas for research could be proposed.

6. Campbell Collaboration (C2) Developments

David Weisburd thanked the C2 guests for their work since coming on board. He stated that the CCJG’s relationship with C2 had changed for the better thanks to Arild Bjørndal’s efforts to move C2 forward, particularly through gaining infrastructural support. With Eamonn Noonan joining the organization, the CCJG is now supported by a professional and experienced staff.

Committee members received copies of the new C2 governance plan and draft strategic plan, which were described by Arild Bjørndal. David Weisburd informed the Committee of some changes to the governance plan that he had supported during negotiations. First, a proposal to change the review approval structure so that editors could approve reviews without the support of the steering committees was removed, as it was not in the interests of the CCJG, which has a highly active Steering Committee. Second, David Weisburd advocated against calling the web library the ‘Campbell Online Journal,’ as this name could hamper authors’ ability to publish reviews elsewhere.

Arild Bjørndal indicated that he thought C2 should build on the strengths of CCJG, and incorporate some of the Group’s organizational features into the larger picture. CCJG is an essential part of C2, and he is pleased to see the Group’s dedication to working on important ‘burning questions.’

7. Governance of the Crime and Justice Group

Committee members received copies of the draft CCJG governance plan, which David Wilson had prepared with reference to the C2 governance plan. David Wilson gave committee members an overview of the contents of the plan.

David Weisburd suggested adding the clarification to Section II that, when new co-chairs are elected, CCJG's procedure has been to elect a nominating committee, made up of Steering Committee members, which considers nominations and brings them to the full Committee for a vote.

The Committee then discussed the issue of membership of the CCJG. Arild Bjørndal explained that in other groups, people registered as members were those who were able to work on the production of systematic reviews, and people registered as affiliates were not working on them at the moment. Members are allowed to elect co-chairs. David Weisburd explained that CCJG has been run differently: in other groups, the editor runs the 'intellectual property' of the group, whereas in CCJG the Committee and co-chairs both have an input. Therefore, he proposed a non-voting membership but a transparent electoral process. Members and affiliates could have an input in who could become a Committee member or co-chair, but the Committee would have the final say. This would be similar to the American Society of Criminology model, in which members do not have voting rights.

Lawrence Sherman proposed that life membership be conferred on anyone who had contributed to the systematic review process in some way (author, co-author, peer reviewer), at some time. The Committee voted to adopt this definition. Non-members who simply wish to join the mailing list and watch the activities of the Group would be affiliates of the Group (although the committee disliked this term, it was adopted to distinguish between members and maintain consistency with the other groups – the title would not be conferred on these people). Members and affiliates would not be permitted to claim any right to speak on behalf of the Group.

Features of the Steering Committee were then discussed. David Wilson suggested that the Steering Committee should comprise a fixed number of members to maintain transparency, but David Weisburd proposed that the size should instead be kept within certain parameters, in case an important potential member was identified but there was no reason to remove other members to make room for them. The group agreed that the Committee should remain at approximately eighteen members, its present size, but could expand to a maximum of twenty-four members. Steering Committee members would be expected to attend Committee meetings at least once a year. Failure to attend for three consecutive meetings will prompt a discussion as to whether the Committee member should remain on the Committee (rather than immediate termination of Committee membership). Potential removal of Committee members will become an agenda item at future meetings. It was agreed that there would be no limit to the amount of time a Committee member could serve in this capacity, since the field is small and people who are strongly committed to its development should not be forced to step down.

The Committee agreed that a call for nominations would be sent to members and posted on the website, and any nominations could be considered by the Committee. People can self-nominate and nominate others. David Weisburd noted that this process might help to identify people who had not previously come to the Committee's attention, especially people from lower- and middle-income countries.

There was clarification of the correct title of the Managing Editor/Coordinator. In other groups, the role is titled ‘Coordinator.’ However, in the CCJG it has historically been ‘Managing Editor,’ which is more meaningful in the US context. The Committee agreed that the Managing Editor/Coordinator could use both titles.

Due to the voluntary nature of the Group and members’ subsequent difficulties with traveling to meetings regularly, the Committee agreed to reduce the voting quorum from two-thirds to one-half of members, with no proxy voting allowed. Some Committee members expressed a preference for leaving the quorum for electronic votes at two-thirds, but it was agreed that there should be no difference between in-person and electronic votes, so the quorum for electronic votes was also reduced to one-half.

The Committee also agreed that one of the two representatives of the CCJG to the C2 Steering Group should always be a CCJG co-chair.

David Weisburd thanked David Wilson for his work on the CCJG governance plan, and the Committee members unanimously voted to give the plan provisional approval, subject to the edits discussed.

8. Funding

(a) US National Institute of Justice (NIJ)

David Weisburd reported that the \$85,000 awarded by NIJ in 2007 had enabled the three funded reviews to move fast, and they were all due to be completed this summer. The themes and authors of the three funded reviews are:

- Second responder programs for repeat domestic violence, by Robert Davis and colleagues;
- Early family and parent training programs to prevent delinquency, by Alex Piquero and colleagues; and
- Problem-oriented policing, by David Weisburd and colleagues.

David Weisburd announced that David Hagy, NIJ Director, had just given an initial agreement to support six reviews next year, and David Weisburd had sent in a proposal memo to initiate this process.

(b) UK National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA)

Peter Neyroud reported that funding for two reviews (Pulling Levers policing by Anthony Braga and colleagues, and gun control by Christopher Koper and colleagues) had been approved, but there was a delay while invoicing arrangements were worked out.

(c) Jerry Lee Foundation

Jerry Lee continues to provide funding for the Jerry Lee Crime Prevention Symposium, and for the CCJG Managing Editor/Coordinator. The Committee thanked Jerry Lee for his generosity.

(d) Nordic Campbell Centre (NC2)

Maiken Pontoppidan, the CCJG representative from NC2, explained that her organization provides small amounts of funding for reviews (in the region of \$5,000), and arranges for a Nordic reviewer to join the review team for in-kind help. NC2 is currently

funding four CCJG reviews. Charlotte Gill agreed to coordinate with Maiken Pontoppidan to obtain small amounts of funding for additional reviews.

(e) C2 Norway Funding

Arild Bjørndal explained that C2 Norway offers seed money for reviews nearing completion. The amount per group has not yet been fixed, but in 2008 it was \$40,000. C2 Norway is happy to let the respective groups decide how best to spend the money. C2 Norway can also obtain larger funding packages for pertinent themes: they are currently providing around \$70,000 for Anthony Petrosino and colleagues' review of juvenile court processing.

Eamonn Noonan added that C2 Norway has committed to funding five CCJG reviews this year from the \$40,000 budget. The criteria for the funding are as follows:

- The review must be near to completion, or in a position to be completed quickly;
- The theme must have relevance to Norwegian interests; and
- The reviewers must be willing to present the findings in Norway.

The C2 Norway funding has been exhausted for 2008, but they can begin funding again in January 2009. Eamonn Noonan asked the CCJG to provide new requests in advance of that date so that funding could begin as soon as possible.

(f) Discussions with Other Funding Agencies

European Union

Peter van der Laan highlighted a new opportunity for funding from the European Union, as part of its proposed development of an EU Crime Expert Web platform. The CCJG has previously been unsuccessful in obtaining EU funding, but Eamonn Noonan (who has experience of working for the European Parliament) explained that it is difficult to get funding on a project-by-project basis, and responding to EU calls for tender is a labor-intensive process. It is preferable to bring the Group to the EU's attention through a government agency, rather than through individuals. Jan Andersson explained that he was a member of the EU network for crime prevention, and his organization was lobbying alongside the Swedish Ministry of Justice for evidence-based research, so he may be able to provide a link. The Committee agreed that an ad hoc working committee should be formed, comprising Peter van der Laan (chair), Jan Andersson, Friedrich Lösel, Peter Neyroud, and Eamonn Noonan, to investigate these possibilities. Peter Neyroud also noted that Peter van der Laan's proposed new title on human trafficking met one of the EU's key topic areas, and should be put forward as an example of the CCJG's work.

Foundation and Philanthropy Funders

Jacque Mallender announced that, following discussions at the previous CCJG meeting, she had approached a UK organization, New Philanthropy Capital (NPC), which aims to improve the evidence base for charity funders. Jacque Mallender agreed to introduce David Weisburd to NPC representatives during his upcoming visit to the UK. It was agreed that Arild Bjørndal should also be involved in these discussions.

9. Report on Recent Meetings

(a) 8th Jerry Lee Crime Prevention Symposium, 5-6 May 2008, University of Maryland/Washington, DC

Committee members received copies of the 2008 Jerry Lee Symposium program. David Weisburd announced that the meeting had been a great success. Over ninety people attended the first day (geared towards an academic audience), at which David Wilson gave an excellent talk on how failure to use a systematic search strategy could result in 40-50 per cent of studies being missed. The second day, held in Washington, DC and aimed at practitioners and policymakers, also attracted over ninety attendees. The final roundtable discussion, 'Advancing Evidence-Based Crime Policy: Recommendations for the next Congress and a New Administration,' was extremely successful. In general, the meeting has enabled people in Washington, DC to learn about Campbell, and has raised awareness of methodological issues.

The 2009 Symposium will have three sponsors: the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Maryland, and George Mason University. The Planning Committee will comprise David Weisburd (chair), David Wilson, Jerry Lee, Jon Baron, Laurie Robinson (who co-chairs the meeting with David Weisburd), and a new member to represent the University of Maryland, Doris MacKenzie. The Committee voted to approve this Planning Committee. The date of the 2009 Symposium will be decided later this summer.

(b) 8th Campbell Collaboration Colloquium, 12-14 May 2008, Vancouver, Canada

Jacque Mallender reported that the C2 Colloquium had been very successful. The Economics Methods Group put on several economics-themed panels, including some on crime and justice.

10. Upcoming Meetings

(a) 9th Campbell Collaboration Colloquium, 19-21 May 2009, Oslo, Norway

David Weisburd noted that CCJG participation in the C2 Colloquium has been small compared to the Group's activity. One reason for this is that the Colloquium is often scheduled close to the Jerry Lee Symposium and the CCJG summer meeting. However, in 2010 the Colloquium may be moved to October to coincide with the Cochrane Colloquium. Lawrence Sherman agreed that the Jerry Lee Centre at Cambridge (Lawrence Sherman, David Farrington, and Friedrich Lösel) would arrange Crime & Justice panels for the 2009 Colloquium, even if they could not attend themselves. Arild Bjørndal also announced that C2 was thinking about arranging a one-day workshop just before the Colloquium, which would follow the Jerry Lee Symposium model and target policymakers.

(b) American Society of Criminology, 12-15 November 2008, St Louis, MO

The Committee thanked Brandon Welsh for organizing five CCJG panels at the upcoming ASC conference. The last time CCJG had a big showing at ASC it was because the chair waived the requirement that people could only be a lead author on one

presentation. We did not have that privilege this time, so five panels is a great achievement.

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

Brandon Welsh agreed to organize CCJG panels again for the 2009 ASC meeting.

(d) United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders 2010

Peter Grabosky explained that many governments are represented at this conference, held by the UN every five years. He would get back to the Committee with the location and date of the meeting, but wanted to start thinking ahead about how to increase CCJG exposure. Jan Andersson reported that Brå had been approached by the Swedish government to organize one of the major half-day sessions, and they were planning a session on evidence-based crime and justice. Jan Andersson and Peter Grabosky agreed to coordinate the CCJG effort, particularly as participants in the conference need to have standing, such as the backing of a government agency. Eamonn Noonan added that the conference ends with the signing of a UN declaration, so Committee members should start thinking about what to say in a paragraph in the declaration.

(e) European Society of Criminology, 2-5 September 2008, Edinburgh, UK

Martin Killias, David Farrington, and Friedrich Lösel organized two sessions with CCJG presentations at this year's conference. Peter van der Laan provisionally agreed to organize sessions at the 2009 conference. Jerry Lee agreed to pick up the cost of producing brochures for the conference. Charlotte Gill will update the brochures. David Weisburd noted that the Group should plan for a stable infrastructure budget to support administrative costs, such as producing brochures.

(f) Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences

The CCJG is not coordinating anything at this time, since there is considerable overlap in attendance with ASC.

(g) Practitioner Meetings

David Weisburd noted that a plan was needed for raising CCJG's profile at practitioner meetings, since academics tend to get invited in serendipitous ways. Peter Neyroud offered to help out, since he attends many of the meetings. Jerry Lee suggested bringing a practitioner onto the Steering Committee, such as Jon Baron, who is very influential in Washington, DC.

(h) Other Meetings

Peter Grabosky reported that the chair of the Association of French-Speaking Criminologists wants CCJG to use their conference as a platform to raise its profile. Peter Grabosky agreed to pursue this along with CCJG's other French-speaking members.

11. Publications

(a) Progress Report on Springer Book Series

At the last CCJG meeting, Welmoed Spahr from Springer said the publisher would consider a book series if CCJG could provide prospectuses for two books. Peter Grabosky reported that he and Lawrence Sherman were able to provide four prospectuses, and that Springer was very happy with the diversity of the proposals. Peter Grabosky hoped to report on further progress in November. The four proposals were:

- The Montreal early childhood experiments (Richard Tremblay);
- The RISE restorative justice experiments (Lawrence Sherman and colleagues);
- A collection on counter-terrorism (Cynthia Lum and colleagues); and
- A book on mapping perceptions of fear of crime (Doran and Burgess – Australian geographers).

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

Committee members received a list of recently published and forthcoming articles. David Weisburd reported that the journal was doing very well: the Smith-Richardson Foundation lists it first on its file of prestige outlets for the publication of their funded research. Submissions to the journal have also increased. The journal has now been ranked in the second tier of the University of Maryland's classification, placing it in the top 20-25 of a total of 130. A high impact factor is one of the requirements for first-tier rankings; it usually takes five years to obtain one, and the journal is in its fifth year, so that may be available soon.

The journal published CCJG review abstracts this year, but Springer, the publisher, disapproved of the decision. The Committee agreed to drop the abstracts.

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

Committee members received hard copies of the COPS publication of Lorraine Mazerolle and colleagues' report on street-level drug law enforcement. The COPS office publishes shortened versions of CCJG reviews relevant to policing, which are sent out to 30,000 people, mostly practitioners. COPS has agreed only to publish approved CCJG reviews, which means the Group's logo can be printed on the cover. Future issues will also feature the C2 logo. Charlotte Gill agreed to write to Matt Lysakowski from the COPS office to ask about the cover layout. Jerry Lee suggested that the C2 and CCJG logos should be more prominent.

(d) Swedish National Council on Crime Prevention

The Council published reviews of mentoring programs and early family and parent training programs, in addition to reviews of street lighting and CCTV published last year. None of these reviews has yet been approved by the CCJG, but Jan Andersson agreed to put the CCJG and C2 logos on any Brå publications of approved reviews.

Jan Andersson also proposed that Brå could provide around \$10,000 of funding for reviews, preferably to go through Cambridge University.

(e) Plain Language Summaries/Structured Abstracts

Peter Grabosky discussed the importance of presenting standardized abstracts in a form accessible to both producers and consumers of research. Maiken Pontoppidan reported that the C2 Users Group summarizes reviews, which are posted on the SFI (Danish National Centre for Social Research) website. They are written in Danish and put into a Danish context, and then the review authors approve an English version. Committee members were shown the summary of Mark Lipsey and colleagues' CCJG review of cognitive-behavioral therapy as an example. The Committee suggested that these could be sent to news agencies, such as Ted Gest's email digest. Jerry Lee suggested adopting a newspaper layout to attract readers.

(f) Other Publications

Hiroshi Tsutomi showed Committee members copies of his new Ryukoku-Campbell series, through which CCJG reviews are translated into Japanese and published in a journal format. The Committee thanked Hiroshi Tsutomi for his work on translating the website and reviews.

Friedrich Lösel reported that the Spanish-language journal *Psicothema*, which has published four CCJG reviews, also published in 2007 a 650-page German review of evidence-based policy, edited by Friedrich Lösel and colleagues. He thanked Lawrence Sherman for his assistance with that publication. The journal is particularly important due to its large South American readership.

12. CCJG Website and Mailing List

David Wilson reported that the website is being upgraded by professional staff in Norway, and should be online by September 1. One of the priorities was to improve the visual identity of reviews and add more graphics. Jerry Lee suggested providing thumbnail pictures of review authors. Peter Grabosky explained that the new website would be usable for group coordinators – one of the designers' criteria is to use only widely-available, portable web tools. Certain people will be authorized to log in and make changes to Group areas. Jacque Mallender reiterated her offer to have Matrix informatics staff help with the website, but agreed that the Norwegian team seemed to be making good progress.

Peter Grabosky reported that he had recently visited the National Taipei University, where they expressed an interest in creating a Chinese version of the CCJG website. Professor Susyan Jou of the National Taipei University agreed to take the lead on this and collaborate with a colleague at the University of Macau to ensure the website would be accessible to mainland China. Work will begin in the New Year. Eamonn Noonan agreed to the project, subject to a memorandum of understanding that the translation will remain faithful to the approved format and content of the original website.

13. Evolution of the CCJG Steering Committee

David Weisburd requested that this discussion be postponed until the beginning of the next meeting, since the governance plan had just been created. The Group will ensure that a clause about nominations is posted on the website by then, and Jon Baron and Susyan Jou could perhaps be nominated as new members.

14. Other Business

Jacque Mallender announced that Matrix was looking for demonstration reviews for economic models, and that she planned to approach Mark Lipsey, Lorraine Mazerolle, Anthony Braga, and David Wilson to propose this for their reviews on cognitive-behavioral therapy, drug law enforcement, Hot Spots policing, and drug courts respectively.

Jerry Lee suggested creating a CCJG group on the professional networking service LinkedIn. This would enable group members to see other group members' external contacts. Charlotte Gill agreed to research this and report back to the Group.

Jerry Lee proposed that C2 make recommendations for randomized controlled trials in areas where there is little or no evidence. The Committee agreed that at the next meeting, there should be a discussion of what the Group could do and how it should be organized. Jerry Lee suggested that C2 or the Academy of Experimental Criminology (AEC) could review protocols for primary experimental research, along the lines of the FDA model for pharmaceutical research. Hiroshi Tsutomi added that the C2-SPECTR register of randomized trials was not re-funded, so it was important to have this discussion either through CCJG or AEC.

Eamonn Noonan announced that a training session on systematic review methods, led by Jeff Valentine, would be held in Leiden, Netherlands from August 18-20. Anyone interested should contact Eamonn Noonan or Peter van der Laan. David Weisburd proposed that CCJG could encourage a training session at ASC, and asked that this be added to the agenda for discussion at the next meeting.

Friedrich Lösel announced that the new Jerry Lee Centre of Experimental Criminology at Cambridge University was to open on June 30, with a conference on evidence-based policing to follow on July 1-2. David Weisburd added that he was involved in establishing a Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy at his new institution, George Mason University, as of July 1.

15. Date of Next CCJG Steering Committee Meeting

The next meeting of the CCJG SC will take place on Tuesday, November 11, 2008 at the American Society of Criminology in St Louis, Missouri. There will be a dinner for participants on the evening of Monday, November 10.