

## Minutes

Meeting of the Steering Group (SG) of The Campbell Collaboration  
at Losby gods outside Oslo, Norway  
March 7-10<sup>th</sup> 2008

Attending: Arild Bjørndal & Bob Boruch (Co-chairs), Mark Lipsey (incoming Co-chair), Merete Konnerup, Julia Littell, Chad Nye, Terri Piggott, Amanda Sowden, Carole Torgerson, Jeff Valentine, David Wilson, all regular members of the SG. In addition: Dorothy de Moya. Staff from C2 & The Norwegian knowledge centre: Eamonn Noonan (incoming director), Camilla Chausse (incoming information officer), Catherine McIlwain (Monday), Eli Sundby, Bjorn-Tommy Tollanes. Absent: David Weisburd, Nick Royle & Peter Tugwell (Cochrane liaisons)

Minutes March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2008

Minutes from the Copenhagen SG meeting in November, 2007 (and earlier meetings) are accessible on the [C2 web-site](#). This steering group meeting was mostly intended for strategic thinking and for exchange of ideas on how to improve C2 and C2 processes.

### Production

*Reports from and priorities in the Coordinating groups*

*Social Welfare Group.* See [report](#). The SW group wants to develop “interest groups” to cover diverse substantive areas within SW. The next SW newsletter will identify potential topics for interest groups, solicit input, and solicit volunteer leaders. SW co-chairs will identify interest group leaders in advance of the Vancouver colloquium and try to get them to the colloquium. Interest groups will convene during the SW group meeting. Interest groups shall identify burning questions for C2 reviews and initiate reviews (propose review titles and teams). SW group will monitor progress of interest groups and send updates in newsletter. Other important topics:

- Pursuing succession planning with overlap between incoming and outgoing co-chairs and editors. SG agreed that flexible models of succession (with more or less “training”) are needed, depending on skills and experience of the incoming person.
- SW group proposed and SG agreed that each C2 Coordinating Group will circulate new (proposed) titles to coordinators of all other C2 Coordinating Groups & CDPLG *before* the title is approved (probably best to do this at first submission). Purpose is to check for potential duplication/overlap.
- SW group proposed and SG agreed that Coordinating groups shall not be concerned about where a title fits best (which group should be “home” for particular title) – so as to avoid “turf” battles. Selection of editorial group should be initiated by authors, approved by selected group editor (i.e., group should agree that title fits for them or else refer authors to another group), and other groups should be informed. Once registered, authors should not be encouraged to switch groups.

*The Crime & Justice group.* See [report](#). Besides regular production, the C&J group are working on questions about:

- How to get reviews finished that are somehow stuck in the process
- How soon reviews should be updated
- The editorial process for updates
- Identifying new peer-reviewers.

The SG discussed the need to bring in more C&J people to the colloquium. This continues to be a challenge as the Stockholm meeting is a major event for researchers engaged in the C&J-field, and it takes place the month after the Campbell. A suggestion to invite people who recently have completed a C2 review to present at colloquium and give some support for travel will be explored as part of an overall plan for the colloquiums. In general, much more reviews (from all groups) should be presented at colloquiums. A C&J governance plan is to be agreed in June.

*The Education Group.* See [report](#). The group is developing a structure of interest groups to engage more people in review production. It is also looking for possibilities for updating other published reviews as C2 reviews. With the help of Mark Lipsey, the list of doctoral students from Institute for Educational Sciences in the US will be explored as a basis for starting more reviews. Carole Torgerson reported on a concerted action with the Centre for Reviews and Dissemination in York to document all trials (randomized trials and quasi experiments) that have been undertaken in education. When this is completed we will explore how to make this resource available to reviewers undertaking work in the field of education with the help of the Education Co-ordinating Group. Possibilities for integration with Mark Lipsey's library will be explored. Carole will approach Dennis Cheek to see if funding could be available to assist with the development of this trials register. The disability field is of special importance to the Campbell Collaboration as evidence on interventions to improve the lives of disabled persons cut across all our substantive areas, thus making it a possible new coordinating group. The SG expressed a strong endorsement of the suggestion developed by director John D. Westbrook at the National Center for the Dissemination of Disability Research to build a group within the Education Coordinating Group as a start (Chad Nye and Carole Torgerson to take forward).

#### *User's Group (C2UG)*

In accordance with the steering group's general plan to establish explicit and official membership and governance structures throughout the organization, the C2UG submitted the [Campbell Collaboration Users Group \(C2UG\) Governance and Membership Policy Paper](#), dated 29<sup>th</sup> of February 2008 for the steering group's information. The steering group welcomed the initiative. The paper has been subsequently distributed to the names in the C2UG directory (i.e. people who have attended the UG meetings at either the 2006 or 2007 (or both) C2 colloquia).

At the November 2007 steering group meeting in Copenhagen C2UG was charged with helping to create user abstracts. Consequently, C2UG submitted the following paper for steering group approval [Policy Guiding the Production of Campbell Collaboration User Abstracts](#), dated 29<sup>th</sup> of February 2008. The steering group approved the paper and charged the C2UG with developing a practical detailed guide on the basis of this policy.

At the November 2007 steering group meeting the C2UG was charged with developing a policy statement for the steering group to consider the need for user input in the systematic review production process. The C2UG submitted the [User Involvement in the Systematic review Process Campbell Collaboration Policy Brief](#), dated 29<sup>th</sup> of February 2008 to the steering group. The paper was approved and each substantive coordinating group will consider and develop guidelines for involvement of users, likely to be in the form of advisory groups.

Standardization committee to discuss whether to add standard line on plans for advisory board (including users) on Title registration form or protocol.

*Methods*

The Process and Implementation group is in the process of being revived. This effort is being led by Margaret Cargo (University of South Australia) who has a small number of additional helpers. One project they are considering is additions to the CONSORT statement regarding additional details about implementation that should be reported.

The Economic Methods Policy Brief was discussed at the SG meeting in Copenhagen. At that time, we agreed to ask the Economic Methods group to respond to a few comments. This was done, and now the SG needs to vote on whether to approve it or not. It was agreed that the SG would have an additional period of ten days to examine the Brief.

The Methods Group approved a governance document. It outlines the roles and responsibilities of the co-chairs and editor, sets term limits for service (three year terms, renewable once), and establishes a mechanism for voting in elections held within the Methods Group. The Methods Group is now working on incorporating an Advisory Board into its governance plan.

The Training Group is in the process of completing a set of standard training materials that can be used in conjunction with C2 trainings. Ultimately there will be eight sets of slides. Two are essentially complete, and another two are well-underway. In addition, there will be several training sessions held in conjunction with the C2 colloquium in Vancouver, and plans are being laid for a training session in Europe.

*Improvements of editorial processes and the Campbell Library*

The SG decided to initiate a project to bring the Campbell Library closer to an online, open access journal. Since the peer review and support process in C2 is more comprehensive than similar processes in most journals, it is a priority to have that reflected more strongly, i.e. in how reviews are cited, agreements with journals that will co-publish reviews in ways of citations etc. The ad hoc website/standardisation committee appointed in Copenhagen will continue to work with staff to oversee the development of the web-site, information systems, and web-based tools. It consists of several editors (Terri, David, Julia, and Chad), along with Jane Dennis, Catherine McIlwain and Mark Lipsey.

The Campbell Collaboration will initiate another project to seek funding for coupling of hot topics/burning questions with funding and with units that will contract for review production. The secretariat will start the funding process and the SG will continue to work on the actual process.

Other themes and ideas discussed were:

- Coordinators should check with authors at least once every 3 months
- Editors should give priority to protocols over reviews
- Improve the material given to authors after registering a title, in order to support the protocol process better and speed up the process in between title and protocol (goal: one week)
- IT-team and website/standardisation committee should create semi-automatic, interactive title registration and protocol forms – as part of a possible C2 toolbox
- SWG will circulate a draft letter to potential authors on “what they can expect and what we expect”
- A need for a more proactive approach to recruiting authors and offer training

- Better counting of “hits” and “downloads”, eventually leading to a process of registering an impact factor
- Best SR award at the colloquium
- Need to spread the editorial work-load by recruiting and training new editors

### *Information retrieval*

During the meeting ideas and possible initiatives to improve information retrieval were discussed. The important question is: How to facilitate search and literature retrieval for C2 authors? We will explore ways of preorganizing the literature and offering “starter packages” for authors (Mark L to take forward). Karianne Hammerstrom will create a list of potential sites and sources to search (bibliographic databases and websites), with emphasis on where to find unpublished/grey literature (important to check with CRD information specialists).

There was general agreement that C2 could best offer added value by initiating projects on gray literature and effect studies in non-english languages (i.e. the Nordic Registry of effect Studies). In addition to the resources mentioned above we could create a database of unpublished primary studies (start with unpublished studies identified in C2 reviews).

The information retrieval group in Methods will be nudged to update the policy brief and to become more active (Jeff V to take forward).

## **C2 website and publications**

### *C2 website*

The web-site is being moved out of AIR. The design is being brushed up and content reorganized. Staff from the Norwegian Knowledge centre (Bjorn Tommy Tollanes) now works with Catherine McIlwain to have the changes implemented. There will be a proposal put forward for the full system in May.

## **Networks**

### *Centers/Partnering organizations*

The need for a MoU with NC2 was raised (Arild Bjorndal/Merete Konnerup will produce a draft before the next SG meeting).

A subcommittee will be named and given responsibility for preparing a memo on partnering organizations (Eamonn Noonan to take forward). See also notes from last meeting. C2 has a Nordic Campbell Center (NC2) in Copenhagen, and partnership agreements with:

- The Canadian Network for Knowledge Utilization, Centre for the Study of Learning and Performance, Concordia University, Canada
- The Cochrane Collaboration
- The Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Coordinating (EPPI) Centre of the Institute of Education at the University of London, UK
- The North American Resource Center for Child Welfare, USA
- The University of Shizuoka, Japan.
- The Research Mobilization Initiative, University of York, Canada
- The Faculty of Social Work, University of Toronto, Canada

Neither CRD in UK, SCIE in UK, IMS in Sweden nor JBI in Australia have been formalized as partnering organizations. The committee will check on signed, formal agreements with the other listed organizations, and help plan the discussion at the colloquium in May. An important question for the committee is whether the arrangement is of use to both parties or if we should explore other ways of working together.

#### *Future events*

The 2008 C2 colloquium, hosted by the Canadian Council on Learning (CCL) under the leadership of Charles Ungerleider, and to be held in Vancouver, was discussed. Terri Pigott, co-chair of the scientific committee, reported on the development of the program which is being finalized. The SG will snowball even more invitations for attending.

Future colloquia were discussed. NC2 cannot host the event in 2009. Oslo will be explored as an alternative – and Stockholm (Arild Bjørndal to take forward). For 2010 we will explore the possibility of moving the C2 colloquium to coincide with the Cochrane colloquium (in Colorado in October 2010). Other options for 2010 include Chicago and Washington DC. Options for 2011 include Amsterdam/Leiden and Mannheim/Giessen. We will also map meetings of other organizations that (partly) share C2s aims, and explore options for joint meetings. We will continue to work with AIR on organizing events when appropriate.

Concerning the Mosteller award, in the future, methods group should to present short list of candidates to the SG for consideration. This year Bob Boruch will organize a committee to support him. Concerning the Jerry Lee lecture, in the future this will be considered one of plenaries. The scientific program committee will decide this in consultation with Jerry Lee and the SG.

The Steering Group will next meet in Vancouver on Saturday May 10<sup>th</sup> and Sunday 11<sup>th</sup>. The group will also meet after the Colloquium has ended on the afternoon of Wednesday May 14<sup>th</sup>. Tentative plans for a SG meeting in Freiburg, to coincide with the Cochrane Colloquium (7-10 October 2008), will be pursued by the C2 Secretariat (Eamonn to take forward). Decisions on the meeting after that are pending until plans for the 2009 colloquium becomes clearer.

The SG will conduct a two hour annual general meeting at the Vancouver (2008) colloquium, in order to keep everybody informed about developments. There will be other meetings organized by members of the SG as well. These will include a meeting on C2 partner organizations, led by Aron S, Merete K and Arild B.

The Lancet has proposed a one-day seminar together with C2 on the need for better evidence underpinning policy- and practice-decisions in crime & justice, education and social welfare, given the enormous public health impact (as well as other effects) of such decisions. Decisions on this are now pending until plans for the 2009 colloquium becomes clearer.

## **Governance**

### *Strategic plan*

The draft strategic plan was not discussed in detail. It is now out for consultation. It will be discussed at the annual general meeting (AGM) at the colloquium in Vancouver and possibly approved at the SG meeting there (Arild Bjørndal and Eamonn Noonan to take forward). The plan articulates main goals and activities of C2.

*Governance plan*

A draft governance plan has been prepared and was discussed. The plan aims to ensure that C2 achieves its mission and operates according to agreed-upon principles. Bob Boruch will sort out pending questions about the legal entity in April. The SG reiterated that it wants the board to consist of the voting members of the SG (as is the case in the Cochrane Collaboration). We will put the plan out for consultation (including discussing it at the AGM in Vancouver). It will most likely be approved immediately after the Vancouver meeting.

*Policy papers: availability and updating*

Catherine McIlwain is establishing a register of all C2 policy papers. The co-chairs will examine them regarding need for updating, and appoint people to take the lead on updating.

*Secretariat*

The roles and responsibilities of the Secretariat were discussed. Arild Bjorndal will be the principal point of contact for the new director and communication officer.

The Campbell Collaboration (C2) Social Welfare Coordinating Group (SWCG)  
Report to the C2 Steering Group  
February 2008

*Status of Reviews, Protocols, and Titles* (see attached report for details)

To date, the SWCG has entertained 72 distinct titles for C2 reviews in the fields of social welfare. 23 reviews are complete, and 15 are underway. 12 protocols are in progress, as are 4 new titles. 18 titles are inactive. We have received multiple documents for most of these titles.

*Other News*

The C2 SWCG has 230 Affiliates and 94 Voting Members. We are very pleased to have a new Affiliate from India, renewed interest in the SWCG from Australia and New Zealand, and inquiries about the SWCG from Tanzania and elsewhere. It would be useful to have a tally of SWCG Affiliates and Members by country – and think about where we are under-represented.

We send period electronic bulletins to all SWCG Affiliates and Members (with copies to C2 SG members). These bulletins are modeled on the CCInfo electronic bulletin developed and distributed by Cheryl Arratoon at the Canadian Cochrane Center. In recent weeks, members and affiliates have asked to have their news posted to our list. We will consider formalizing the bulletin by soliciting postings and setting a schedule for the bulletin (and acknowledging our debt to CCInfo). It will be important to consider how our postings fit with any C2 central newsletters or bulletins.

On 18 January 2008, SWCG Members elected a new Co-Chair, Professor Aron Shlonsky of the University of Toronto. In advance of the election, Professor Shlonsky was nominated by 4 different Affiliates/Members--and no other names were put forward. Support for Aron's nomination was unanimous. We are very pleased to welcome Aron as Co-Chair. Aron is a preeminent child welfare scholar and first author of a C2 protocol on the predictive validity of instruments for assessing risk of the recurrence of child maltreatment.

The C2 Social Welfare group welcomes a new Coordinator, Trine Bak Nyby, whose position is hosted by the Nordic Campbell Center (NC2), Danish National Institute of Social Research (SFI) as of 11 February 2008. Trine has already taken responsibility for our membership and mailing lists; revised our title registration form; and compiled a status report on all titles, protocols, and reviews in the SWCG (including those in the CDPLPG).

Dr. William Turner is our new Editor-in-training. William is the first/second author of two completed C2/Cochrane reviews, and Lecturer at the University of Bristol (UK). As Editor-in-training, he will work alongside the SWCG Editor, drafting internal critiques and action letters, going over these with the Editor, and taking more responsibility for feedback to authors over time. A similar process of shadowing/mentoring is used to train Cochrane Coordinating Editors.

New members of the SWCG Editorial Board are Paul Montgomery (UK), Bruce Thyer (USA), and Joanne Yaffee (USA). The SWCG Editorial Board will meet at the C2 Colloquium in May.

*Recent Publications*

- Corcoran, J., & Littell, J. H. (in press). Meta-analysis. In B. Thyer (Ed). *The Handbook of Social Work Research Methods, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Corcoran, J., & Littell, J. H. (in press). Meta-analysis. In A. R. Roberts (Ed), *Social Workers' Desk Reference, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Littell, J. H. (2007). News from the Campbell Collaboration. *Society for Social Work and Research (SSWR) News*, 14 (1), 9-10.
- Littell, J. H. (2008). How do we know what works? The quality of published reviews of evidence-based practices. In D. Lindsey & A. Shlonsky (Eds.), *Child Welfare Research: Advances for Practice and Policy* (pp. 66-93). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Littell, J. H. (2009). Meta-analysis. In T. Mizrahi & L. Davis (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Social Work, 20<sup>th</sup> edition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Littell, J. H. (in press). Evidence-based or biased? The quality of published reviews of evidence-based practices. *Children & Youth Services Review*.
- Littell, J. H. (in press). Evidence-based practice: Evidence or orthodoxy? In B. L. Duncan, S. D. Miller, & B. Wampold (Eds.), *The Heart and Soul of Change: What Works In Therapy, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Littell, J. H., & Corcoran, J. (in press). Systematic reviews. In B. Thyer (Ed), *The Handbook of Social Work Research Methods, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Littell, J. H., & Corcoran, J. (in press). Systematic reviews. In A. R. Roberts (Ed.), *Social Workers' Desk Reference, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Littell, J. H., Corcoran, J., & Pillai, V. (2008). *Systematic reviews and meta-analysis*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wells, K., & Littell, J. H. (in press). Study quality assessment in systematic reviews of intervention effects. *Research on Social Work Practice*.

#### Recent Presentations

- Littell, J. H. "Evidence-based or biased? The quality of published reviews of evidence based practices." Peer reviewed presentation, Society for Social Work and Research conference, Washington, DC, 18 January 2008.
- Littell, J. H. "Credible evidence in social care." Keynote address, Joanna Briggs Institute International Convention, Adelaide, South Australia, 26 November 2007.

**The Campbell Collaboration (C2) Social Welfare Coordinating Group (SWCG)  
Report on the Status of Titles, Protocols, and Reviews  
25 February 2008**

*Summary*

**Completed Reviews: 23**

Published in C2-RIPE: 17

Should be in C2-RIPE: 2

Embargoed until Cochrane publishes in April 2008: 4

**Reviews in Progress: 15**

Reviews submitted: 6

Under revision with external critiques complete: 4

Under review/revision before seeking external readers: 2

Protocols approved, reviews not yet submitted: 9

**Protocols in Progress: 13**

Protocols submitted: 7

Under revision with external critiques complete: 2

Under review/revision before seeking external readers: 5

Titles approved, protocols not yet submitted: 6

**Titles in Progress: 3**

Titles submitted: 3

Under revision with internal critique completed: 3

**Inactive Titles: 18**

Withdrawn by authors: 6

Stalled (no active authors): 6

Rejected by editors: 6

**Total SWCG Titles: 72**

Titles, protocols and reviews completed, in progress or inactive

## 23 Completed reviews

*Published in C2-RIPE*

- 1. Work programmes for welfare recipients (SW2004/6)**  
Geir Smedslund, Kare Birger Hagen, Asbjorn Steiro, Torill Johme, Therese Kristine Dalsbo, Mons Georg Rud  
Contact: [Geir.Smedslund@kunnskapssenteret.no](mailto:Geir.Smedslund@kunnskapssenteret.no)  
Notes: NC2  
Status: Approved 1st August 2006.
- 2. Interventions Intended to Reduce Pregnancy-Related Outcomes Among Adolescents (SW2003/2)**  
Lauren Scher, University of Pennsylvania, Matthew Stagner, and Rebecca Maynard  
Contact: [rmaynard@gse.upenn.edu](mailto:rmaynard@gse.upenn.edu) or [laurenscher@yahoo.com](mailto:laurenscher@yahoo.com)  
Status: Approved 24 October 2006.
- 3. Independent living programmes for improving outcomes for young people leaving the care system**  
Charles Donkoh, Kristen Underhill, Paul Montgomery  
Contact: [charles.donkoh@green.oxon.org](mailto:charles.donkoh@green.oxon.org)  
Notes: Co-reg. CDPLG & NC2  
Status: Review published Campbell and Cochrane June 2006. This is an empty review. Updated searches sent to authors in October 2007 as searches were old (June 2005). Hope for update in 2008.
- 4. Multisystemic therapy for social, emotional, and behavioral problems in children and adolescents aged 10-17**  
Julia H. Littell, Melanie Popa, Burnee' Forsythe  
Contact: [jlittell@brynmawr.edu](mailto:jlittell@brynmawr.edu)  
Notes: Co-registered (CDPLG) & NC2  
Status: Approved 23 Aug 2005. Update started summer 2007.
- 5. Cognitive-behavioural interventions for children who have been sexually abused**  
Geraldine Macdonald G, Ramchandani P, and Higgins J.  
Contact: [Geraldine.Macdonald@csci.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Geraldine.Macdonald@csci.gsi.gov.uk)  
Notes: Co-reg. CDPLG & NC2.  
Status: Approved 11 Aug 2006. Publication in Cochrane 18 October 2006, published on C2-RIPE November 2006.
- 6. Cognitive behavioural therapy for men who physically abuse their female partner**  
Geir Smedslund, Therese Dalsbø, Asbjørn Steiro, Aina Winsvold and Jocelyn Aas  
Contact: [Geir.Smedslund@kunnskapssenteret.no](mailto:Geir.Smedslund@kunnskapssenteret.no)  
Notes: Co-reg. CDPLG and NC2.  
Status: Approved 1 May 2007. Published Cochrane and C2-RIPE 18 July 2007.
- 7. Behavioural and cognitive behavioural training interventions for assisting foster carers in the management of difficult behaviour**

William Turner, Geraldine Macdonald and Jane Dennis

Contact: [w.turner@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:w.turner@bristol.ac.uk)

Notes: Co-reg. CDPLG & NC2.

Status: Approved 1 May 2007. Published Cochrane and C2-RIPE 18 July 2007.

**8. School-based education programmes for the prevention of child sexual abuse**

Karen Zwi, Sue Woolfenden, Danielle Wheeler, Tracey O'Brien, Paul Tait, Katarina Williams

Contact: [zwick@sesahs.nsw.gov.au](mailto:zwick@sesahs.nsw.gov.au)

Notes: Co-reg. CDPLG & NC2.

Status: Approved 23 May and published Cochrane and C2-RIPE 18 July 2007.

**9. Exercise to improve self-esteem in children and young people**

Eilin Ekeland, Frode Heian, Kåre Birger Hagen, Jo Abbott, and Lena Nordheim

Contact: [eilin.ekeland@fysio.no](mailto:eilin.ekeland@fysio.no)

Notes: Co-registered CDPLG.

Status: Review approved April 2003. Updated searches being run March 2008. Authors will action previous comments whilst updating.

**10. Individual and group based parenting for improving psychosocial outcomes for teenage parents and their children**

Esther Coren and Jane Barlow

Contact: [esther.coren@scie.org.uk](mailto:esther.coren@scie.org.uk)

Notes: Co-registered CDPLG

Status: Review approved and published 2001. Update in process (overdue). Externally funded Group (University of Nottingham [Duggan, Ferriter et al.] is to assist with updating this and other out of date DPLPG reviews starting spring 2008. Searches rerun Feb 2008

**11. Interventions for learning disabled sex offenders**

Lorraine Ashman, Lorna Duggan

Contact: [Lorraine.Ashman@nht.northants.nhs.uk](mailto:Lorraine.Ashman@nht.northants.nhs.uk)

Notes: Co-registered CDPLG.

Status: Review approved 2002. Update completed summer 2007; must go to Campbell methods (JD to action).

**12. Family and parenting interventions in children and adolescents with conduct disorder and delinquency aged 10-17**

Katrina Williams and Sue Woolfenden

Contact: [williamskat@sesahs.nsw.gov.au](mailto:williamskat@sesahs.nsw.gov.au)

Notes: Co-registered CDPLG.

Status: Review published 1999. Agreed upon full update. Externally funded Group (University of Nottingham [Duggan, Ferriter et al.] is to assist with updating this and other out of date DPLPG reviews starting autumn 2008.

**13. Group based parent-training programmes for improving emotional and behavioural adjustment in 0-3 year old children**

Jane Barlow and Jacqueline Parsons

Contact: [Jane.Barlow@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:Jane.Barlow@warwick.ac.uk)

Notes: Co-registered CDPLG.

Status: Second publication, last update 2003. Overdue for updating. Externally funded Group (University of Nottingham [Duggan, Ferriter et al.] is to assist with updating this and other out of date DPLPG reviews starting spring 2008. Searches rerun November 2007

**14. Parent-training programmes for improving maternal psychosocial health**

Jane Barlow, Sarah Stewart-Brown and Esther Coren

Contact: [Jane.Barlow@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:Jane.Barlow@warwick.ac.uk)

Notes: Co-registered CDPLG.

Status: Review updated 2003. Overdue for updating. Externally funded Group (University of Nottingham [Duggan, Ferriter et al.] is to assist with updating this and other out of date DPLPG reviews starting spring 2008. Searches rerun Jan 2008

**15. Speech and language therapy interventions for children with primary speech and language delay or disorder**

James Law, Zoe Garrett, Chad Nye

Contact: [jlaw@qmuc.ac.uk](mailto:jlaw@qmuc.ac.uk)

Notes: Co-registered CDPLG.

Status: Review published 2003. Update received August 2007. Internal editing done. Jeff supplied comments Oct 07. Authors responded Nov 2007; Geraldine responded February 2008; authors required to submit further revisions. Jane trying to get Chad (not consulted on update) to assist.

**16. School feeding for improving the physical and psychosocial health of disadvantaged elementary school children**

Elizabeth Kristjansson, [kristjan@uottawa.ca](mailto:kristjan@uottawa.ca), University of Ottawa, Canada, Vivian Robinson, Mark Petticrew, Barbara MacDonald, Julia Krasevec, Laura Janzen, Tricia Greenhalgh, George Wells, Jessie MacGowan, Anna Farmer, Bevery Shea, Alan Mayhew, and Peter Tugwell

Contact: [kristjan@uottawa.ca](mailto:kristjan@uottawa.ca)

Notes: Co-reg. CDPLG.

Status: Approved Nov 2006

**17. Cognitive-Behavioral treatment for antisocial behavior in youth in residential treatment**

Bengt-Ake Armelius, Tore Henning Andreassen

Contact: [bengt-ake.armelius@psy.umu.se](mailto:bengt-ake.armelius@psy.umu.se)

Notes: Co-reg. CDPLG & NC2.

Status: Approved 28 September 2007. Searches are quite old; first author has suggested rerunning: DPLPG to action by May in concert with NC2.

*Approved, not in C2-RIPE*

**18. Treatment Foster Care for improving outcomes in children and young people**

Geraldine Macdonald and William Turner

Contact: [Geraldine.macdonald@qub.ac.uk](mailto:Geraldine.macdonald@qub.ac.uk)

Notes: CDPLG & NC2.

Status: Approved 30 Nov 2007

**19. Personal assistance for older adults (65+) without dementia, but with impairments**

Evan Mayo-Wilson, Paul Montgomery and Jane Dennis

Contact: [evan.mayo-wilson@socres.ox.ac.uk](mailto:evan.mayo-wilson@socres.ox.ac.uk)

Notes: Co-reg. CDPLG.

Status: Title approved August 2005. Protocol approved 17 October 2007. Review approved November 2007, publishing embargo lifted January. Should be in C2-RIPE. NB change to title from previous.

*Approved, embargoed until April 2008*

**20. Financial benefits for child health and well-being in low income or socially disadvantaged families in developed world countries**

Patricia Lucas, Sandra Dowling, Carol Joughin, Gabriella Laing, Karen McIntosh, Julia Newbury, Mark Petticrew, Alan Shiell, Helen Roberts

Contact: [patricia.lucas@bris.ac.uk](mailto:patricia.lucas@bris.ac.uk)

Notes: NC2 Co-reg CDPLG.

Status: Approved 21 Feb 2008. Can be mounted on C2 webpage when 'live' on Cochrane Library, 16 April 2008.

**21. Cognitive-behavioural interventions for preventing youth gang involvement for children and young people (7-16)**

Herrick Fisher and Paul Montgomery and Frances Gardner

Contact: [cricket.fisher@hertford.ox.ac.uk](mailto:cricket.fisher@hertford.ox.ac.uk)

Notes: NC2 funded.

Status: Protocol approved 15 Nov 2007. Review submitted 21 Dec 2007 Approved 21 Feb 2008. Can be mounted on C2 webpage when 'live' on Cochrane Library, 16 April 2008.

**22. Opportunities provision for preventing youth gang involvement for children and young people (7-16)**

**Herrick Fisher and Paul Montgomery and Frances Gardner**

Contact: [cricket.fisher@hertford.ox.ac.uk](mailto:cricket.fisher@hertford.ox.ac.uk)

Notes: NC2 funded.

Status: Protocol approved 15 Nov 2007. Review submitted 21 Dec 2007. Approved 21 Feb 2008. Can be mounted on C2 webpage when 'live' on Cochrane Library, 16 April 2008.

**23. Personal assistance for adults (19-64) with both physical and intellectual impairments**

Evan Mayo-Wilson, Paul Montgomery and Jane Dennis

Contact: [evan.mayo-wilson@socres.ox.ac.uk](mailto:evan.mayo-wilson@socres.ox.ac.uk)

Notes: Co-reg. CDPLG.

Status: Title approved August 2005. Protocol approved 17 October 2007. Review approved 20 February 2008. Can be mounted on C2 webpage when 'live' on Cochrane Library, 16 April 2008.

## 15 Reviews in Progress

*Being revised with external critiques complete*

1. **Families and Schools Together (FAST) for improving social, psychological, and educational outcomes in children of age 4-13 and their families**  
Chad Nye, Haluk Soydan, Celia Almeida, Salvadore Chacon-Moscoso, Julio Sanches-Meca, and Jane Dennis  
Contact: [cnye@mail.ucf.edu](mailto:cnye@mail.ucf.edu)  
Notes: Co-reg. CDPLG & NC2.  
Status: 4th submission 6 Nov 07. Sent to authors 4 Jan 08. Resubmission to DPLPG/C2 Methods expected early March 2008
2. **Threat of Compulsory Participation in Active Labour Market Programmes for the Unemployed (SW2004/7)**  
Nils Henning Bjørn, Peter Jensen, Lars Pico Geerden  
Contact: Peter Jensen [pje@asb.dk](mailto:pje@asb.dk)  
Notes: NC2.  
Status: With Authors since March 06. Authors don't agree on whether to do meta-analysis. **[make peter 1<sup>st</sup> author, update search (Karianne), add methods (Terri?)]**
3. **Case Management for Substance Use Disorders (SW2005/5)**  
Morten Hesse, Wouter Vanderplasschen, Eric Broekaert, Mats Fridell and Richard Rapp  
Contact: [mortenhesse@crf.dk](mailto:mortenhesse@crf.dk)  
Notes: Co-reg. Cochrane Drugs and Alcohol Group & NC2.  
Status: Protocol approved 3 May 2007. 1st version of review submitted 30 May 2007 (Review published in Cochrane Issue 4 2007). Action letter will be sent to authors February 2008 **[Julia send]**

*Being revised with one external critique complete*

4. **Home visits for prevention of impairment and death in elderly people (SW2006/3)**  
Jennifer Burton, Paul Montgomery, Evan Mayo-Wilson, Kristin Underhill and Camilla Thorgaard  
Contact: [jennifer.burton@socres.ox.ac.uk](mailto:jennifer.burton@socres.ox.ac.uk)  
Notes: De-registered from Cochrane. NC2.  
Status: First version of review sent 22 Dec 2006. Editor sent response to authors 30 April 2007. New draft (2. submission) sent to editor 17 July 2007. **Peer review sent to authors early Nov 2007. Trine to check w authors**

*Being revised/reviewed before seeking external readers*

5. **Health and social impacts on residents following housing improvement (SW2004/4)**  
Hilary Thomson, Mark Petticrew and Eva Selstrøm  
Contact: [h.thomson@msoc.mrc.gla.ac.uk](mailto:h.thomson@msoc.mrc.gla.ac.uk)  
Notes: NC2  
Status: Title and protocol approved December 2004. 1. Version of review submitted 30 November 2007. **Julia to write action letter**
6. **Kinship Care for the Safety, Permanency, and Well-Being of Children Removed from the Home for Maltreatment**

Mark Winokur, Deobrah Valentine and Amy Holtan

Contact: [benwin@lamar.colostate.edu](mailto:benwin@lamar.colostate.edu)

Notes: CDPLG & NC2.

Status: Title approved April 2006. Protocol approved 21 Feb 2007. Review draft received 29 Feb 2008.

*Protocol approved, review not yet submitted*

**7. Home based support for socially disadvantaged mothers**

Geraldine Macdonald, Cathy Bennett, Jane Dennis, possibly others

Contact: [esther.coren@scie.org.uk](mailto:esther.coren@scie.org.uk)

Notes: Co-reg. CDPLG.

Status: Withdrawn February 2008. Expect revised protocol May 2008. **Can we fund a meeting/help from them? Aron put Harriet Macmillian @ macmaster in touch. Julia put Will S in touch.**

**8. Interventions for the prevention of relationship and dating violence in adolescents and young people**

Joanne Nurse, Shakiba Habibula, Dinesh Sethi

Contact: [Jo.Nurse@Ishtm.ac.uk](mailto:Jo.Nurse@Ishtm.ac.uk)

Notes: Co-reg. CDPLG.

Status: Jane is rewriting second draft on behalf of authors with assistance of CDPLPG editor Steve Milan. This will take a long time yet, the authors need a lot of help. Should be taken on by University of Nottingham Group mentioned above: report to follow.

**9. Mass media interventions for influencing the use of health services (SW2006/2)**

Miranda Cumpston, Jill Hayden, J Grilli, and C Ramsay

Contact: [miranda.cumpston@med.monash.edu.au](mailto:miranda.cumpston@med.monash.edu.au)

Notes: Co-reg. Cochrane Effective Practice & Organisation of Care Group (Review published in Cochrane, update in progress)

Status: Protocol approved 4 Feb 2007. **Trine check w author.**

**10. Functional Family Therapy**

Julia Littell, Arild Bjørndal, Aina Winsvold and Karianne Hammerstrøm

Contact: [jlittell@brynmawr.edu](mailto:jlittell@brynmawr.edu)

Notes: Co-registered CDPLG.

Status: Title approved January 2006. Protocol approved 21 Feb 2007.

**11. Personal assistance for children and adolescents (0-18) with physical impairments**

Evan Mayo-Wilson, Paul Montgomery, and Jane Dennis

Contact: [Evan.mayo-wilson@socres.ox.ac.uk](mailto:Evan.mayo-wilson@socres.ox.ac.uk)

Notes: Co-reg. CDPLG.

Status: Protocol approved August 2006.

**12. Personal assistance for children and adolescents (0-18) with intellectual impairments**

Evan Mayo-Wilson, Paul Montgomery and Jane Dennis

Contact: [evan.mayo-wilson@socres.ox.ac.uk](mailto:evan.mayo-wilson@socres.ox.ac.uk)

Notes: Co-reg. CDPLG.

Status: Title approved August 2005. Protocol approved 17 October 2007.

**13. Personal assistance for children and adolescents (0-18) with both physical and intellectual impairments**

Evan Mayo-Wilson, Paul Montgomery and Jane Dennis

Contact: [evan.mayo-wilson@socres.ox.ac.uk](mailto:evan.mayo-wilson@socres.ox.ac.uk)

Notes: Co-reg. CDPLG.

Status: Title approved August 2005. Protocol approved 17 October 2007.

**14. Personal assistance for adults (19-64) with physical impairments**

Evan Mayo-Wilson, Paul Montgomery and Jane Dennis

Contact: [evan.mayo-wilson@socres.ox.ac.uk](mailto:evan.mayo-wilson@socres.ox.ac.uk)

Notes: Co-reg. CDPLG.

Status: Title approved August 2005. Protocol approved 17 October 2007.

**15. Risk of child maltreatment: A systematic review of the predictive validity of instruments (SW2006/1)**

Aron Shlonsky, Mike Saini and Ulla Jergeby

Contact: [aron.shlonsky@utoronto.ca](mailto:aron.shlonsky@utoronto.ca)

Notes: NC2. IMS Sweden

Status: Title approved 30 March 2006. Protocol approved 6 Nov. 2007. **Now screening 4k titles**

## 13 Protocols in Progress

*Being revised with external critiques complete*

**1. Cognitive-Behavioural Therapy with Parents Who Have Physically Abused Their Children**

Mogens Nygaard Christoffersen, Diane DePanifilis, Jacqueline Corcoran, Clara Daining, and Pricilla Ryder

Contact: [Mc@sfi.dk](mailto:Mc@sfi.dk)

Notes: Co-reg. CDPLG & NC2

Status: resubmission 19 Feb 2008 – expected protocol approved March 2008

*Being revised with external critiques complete, methods critique will be sought after revision*

**2. Mentoring to prevent tobacco use by children and adolescents (SW2006/5)**

Roger Thomas, Eileen Schmidt, Diane Lorenzetti, Karen Smith, Wendy Spragins

Contact: [rthomas@ucalgary.ca](mailto:rthomas@ucalgary.ca)

Notes: Authors need editor/scientific writer. Methods critique will be sought after author revisions.

Status: Comments sent to authors on based on two external critiques.

*Being revised/reviewed before seeking external critiques*

- 3. The effects of early childhood educational programmes (ECE) on the socio-emotional development and school achievement of children disadvantaged by poverty (SW2004/11)**  
 Greg Brooks, Bente Jensen and Mogens Nygaard Christoffersen  
 Contact: [G.Brooks@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:G.Brooks@sheffield.ac.uk) and [gregbrooksuk@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:gregbrooksuk@yahoo.co.uk)  
 Notes: NC2. CDPLG edits this review, but it is not co-registered with Cochrane.  
 Status: New lead reviewer – Greg Brooks. Geraldine and Carole have discussed a solution. Need to resolve overlap with the C1 Zoritch review. Require further clarification of Carol's role as honorary associate editor. **Julia ask Jane what we can do to help on this and other CDPLPG titles (money?)**
- 4. A systematic review of interventions to reduce distress in adult victims of sexual violence and rape (SW2006/8).**  
 Cheryl Regehr, Ramona Alaggia and Michael Saini  
 Contact: [cheryl.regehr@utoronto.ca](mailto:cheryl.regehr@utoronto.ca)  
 Notes: NC2 is negotiating contract  
 Status: Title approved 6 Feb 2007. Protocol submitted 7 Sep 2007. Action letter sent Feb 2008.
- 5. Effects of school-based cognitive-behavioral anger interventions on child and adolescent aggressive behavior (SW2007/1)**  
 Julia Lavenberg, Sandra J. Wilson, Herbert M. Turner, Anthony Petrosino and Martin Olsson  
 Contact: [j.lavenberg@gmail.com](mailto:j.lavenberg@gmail.com)  
 Notes: NC2. This review is cross-registered in all three substantive groups.  
 Status: Title approved 27 July 2007. Protocol Submitted 6 Dec 2007. Action letter will be sent to authors in February 2008.
- 6. Home based, parent mediated, early educational intervention for children with, or biologically at risk of developmental disability**  
 Jill M Ellis & Miriam Wüst.  
 Contact: [j.ellis@ich.ucl.ac.uk](mailto:j.ellis@ich.ucl.ac.uk)  
 Notes: Co-reg CDPLG, NC2  
 Status: Title and protocol approved in C1 in 2001. Draft review 'lost' in 2001. Recovered in 2006. Searches re-rerun 2006. JE and MW working together to get through old and new searches. 'In/out' form completed; DE form updated; protocol updated but submission to Methods delayed by JE's illness and family complications. Anticipate submission C2 Methods by mid Nov. Anticipate review submission mid May 2008. **[Trine ask Jane where this is?]**
- 7. Parent training for ADHD**  
 Morris Zwi, Ann York, Camilla Thorgaard & Jane Dennis.  
 Contact: [Morris.Zwi@dh.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Morris.Zwi@dh.gsi.gov.uk)  
 Notes: Co-reg CDPLG, NC2.  
 Status: Title and protocol approved by C1. Awaiting C2 title and protocol approval, Jeff sent comments on the protocol. Searches new as of Nov 2006. 21 papers selected. Needs a new lead reviewer. **[now what's needed? Trine to find out and tell Aron who might be able to identify new reviewer]**

*Title approved, protocol not yet submitted:*

**8. Family group conferences for children at risk of abuse and neglect (SW2005/1)**

David Hayes and Elisabeth Backe-Hansen

Contact: [d.hayes@qub.ac.uk](mailto:d.hayes@qub.ac.uk)

Notes: Co-reg CDPLG & NC2

Status: First version of title approved January 2005. Approval of new title registration October/ November 2006 (new authors). Tony withdrew 29 May 2007, no time to continue. David Hayes is the new lead reviewer. Consider recruiting an additional researcher Steven Rose (other suggestions: Peter Marsh, Aron Shlonsky, Mike Saini). **Priority. Aron to contact Jane.**

**9. Mentoring to prevent use of illegal drugs and alcohol by children and adolescents (SW2006/6)**

Roger Thomas, Eileen Schmidt, Diane Lorenzetti, Karen Smith, Wendy Spragins

Contact: [rthomas@ucalgary.ca](mailto:rthomas@ucalgary.ca)

Notes:

Status: Title approved 25 September 2006.

**10. HIV/AIDS Education for Knowledge and Attitude Change, Sexual Behavior Change, and Reducing HIV/AIDS Incidence in Youth in Sub-Saharan Africa (SW2007/2)**

Rebecca Maynard, Clarisse Haxton, David Seidenfeld

Contact: [rmaynard@gse.upenn.edu](mailto:rmaynard@gse.upenn.edu)

Notes:

Status: Title accepted 23 October 2007.

**11. Interventions for the secondary prevention and treatment of emotional abuse of children by primary carers**

Anita Schrader McMillan, Sarah Stewart-Brown, Yvonne Carter, Jane Barlow, Moli Paul, Peter Sidebotham, Geraldine MacDonald

Contact: [S.A.Schrader-McMillan@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:S.A.Schrader-McMillan@warwick.ac.uk)

Notes: CDPLG

Status: Title approved 1 Feb 2007. Fourth draft of protocol in hands of authors (GM).

**12. Preschool feeding programmes for improving the health of disadvantaged infants and young children**

Elizabeth Krisjjansson, Mark Pettigrew, Julia Krasevec, George Wells, Vivian Robinson,

Trisha Greenhalgh, Peter Tugwell, Laura Janzen, Beverly Shea, Alan Mayhew

Contact: Elizabeth A. Kristjansson <[kristjan@uottawa.ca](mailto:kristjan@uottawa.ca)>

Notes: CDPLPG

Status: Title is co-registered and approved November 2007

**13. Effectiveness of Interviewing Skills Training (SW2006/7)**

Marion Bogo, Glenn Regehr, Cheryl Regehr and Michael Saini

Contact: [Marion.bogo@utoronto.ca](mailto:Marion.bogo@utoronto.ca)

Notes:

Status: Authors sent new title reg. form (3rd submission) 17 July 2007. Approved.

### 3 Titles in Progress

*Under revision after internal review*

- 1. Engagement of Women and Communities of Color in HIV Vaccine Trials: A Systematic Review**  
Peter A. Newman, Michael Saini and Charlene Cook  
Contact: [p.newman@utoronto.ca](mailto:p.newman@utoronto.ca)  
Notes:  
Status: Authors sent title registration 19 October 2007, sent to editor 30 October 2007 (?), received by editor 26 November 2008, editor sent comments to author 7 January 2008. Almost ready for approval.
  
- 2. Adopted children's physical, cognitive, and socio-emotional development**  
Femmie Juffer and Marinus H. Van Ijzendoorn  
[juffer@fsw.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:juffer@fsw.leidenuniv.nl)  
Notes: CDPLG  
Status: To be finally approved
  
- 3. Internet based self-help therapy programmes for mental disorders.**  
Morten Fenger  
Contact: [mmfenger@gmail.com](mailto:mmfenger@gmail.com)  
Notes: NC2. Scope is too large.  
Status: Title submitted 27 November 2007, comments sent 7 January 2008. Referred to CDPLPG.

### 18 Inactive Titles

*Withdrawn by authors*

- 1. Solution-focused therapy (2004/1)**  
Jacqueline Corcoran et al.  
Status: Title accepted, protocol not submitted, title withdrawn by lead author.
  
- 2. Impact of new roads on health outcomes (2004/5)**  
Matt Egan et al.  
Status: Title accepted, protocol not submitted, title withdrawn by lead author.
  
- 3. Health impacts of workplace reorganization (2004/8)**  
Matt Egan et al.  
Status: Title accepted, protocol not submitted, title withdrawn by lead author.
  
- 4. Health and social impacts of public investment and privatization in business**

Matt Egan et al.

Status: Title accepted, protocol not submitted, title withdrawn by lead author.

**5. Media-delivered cognitive behavioural therapy and behavioural therapy (self-help) alone for anxiety disorders in adults (SW2004/-10)**

Evan Mayo-Wilson, Paul Montgomery

Contact: [Evan.Mayo-Wilson@socres.ox.ac.uk](mailto:Evan.Mayo-Wilson@socres.ox.ac.uk)

Notes: Co-reg. Cochrane Depression, Anxiety & Neuroses Group (CDAN)

Status: Protocol published in Cochrane Issue 1, 2006. Protocol approved 13 Sept 2006.

Withdrawn by authors.

**6. Media-based behavioural treatments for behavioural disorders in children**

Paul Montgomery, Gretchen Bjornstad

Contact: [paul.montgomery@psychiatry.oxford.ac.uk](mailto:paul.montgomery@psychiatry.oxford.ac.uk)

Notes: Co-registered CDPLG

Status: An update published in Cochrane Library (Issue 1, 2006). Jane sent request to authors about Campbell reg. 19 Jan 2007. No time for update or Campbellizing.

*Stalled, no active authors*

**7. Impact of Mandatory Work Policies on Family Structure (SW2004/3)**

Matthew Stagner, Jennifer Ehrle, and Jane Reardon-Anderson, Katherine Kortenkamp

Contact: [paffairs@ui.urban.org](mailto:paffairs@ui.urban.org)

Status: Title accepted, protocol accepted, first version of review submitted. Comments sent January 2006. Under revision by authors, search update is needed. 28 Feb 2007: Authors will not proceed with the review. Title removed from web 6 March 2007.

**8. Employment effects of job training for adults with musculoskeletal disorders” (SW2005/3)**

Geir Smedslund, Carina Gustafsson, (Staffan Marklund)

[staffan.marklund@arbetslivsinstitutet.se](mailto:staffan.marklund@arbetslivsinstitutet.se)

Notes: NC2. Earlier title ‘Vocational rehabilitation for individuals with ill health’

Status: Title approved October 2005. Protocol: With authors, external critiques complete

New team set in 2007, but lead reviewer still missing.

**9. Monitoring and Sanctions in Social Insurance (SW2005/4)**

Per Johansson, Johan Vikström and Per Skedinger

Contact: [per.johansson@ifau.uu.se](mailto:per.johansson@ifau.uu.se)

Notes:

Status: Title approved January 2006. The work has been stopped for at least one year due to sickness. NC2 may become involved in this one. Per does not have time to work on it now.

NC2 offered help from an extra reviewer

**10. Homelessness and housing interventions**

No lead reviewer yet. Interested and committed to the project: Jim Baumohl, Lars

Benjaminsen, Michael Saini (Debra Rog? David Hulchanski?)

Notes: NC2 and Univ of Toronto

Status: First meeting with Jim and Lars in Stockholm July 2007. 2nd meeting 5 Oct. 07 with Aron and interested parties (telephone conference). Aim: Gather an international team of experts, apply for funding from the larger players, define the area, produce title reg. completed by April 2008. Aron and Krystyna suggest a title.

**11. In-home services to prevent out-of-home placement and recurrence of child maltreatment in cases of child abuse and neglect**

Geraldine Macdonald, Julia Littell, Jacqueline Corcoran

Notes: authors are swamped

Status: nothing yet

**12. Assertive Community Treatment for persons with schizophrenia.**

Notes: Cochrane review needs updating and reanalysis with cumulative meta-analysis.

Interested authors include: Tomi Gomory (USA), Robert King (Australia). Aron will pursue with Cochrane schizophrenia group (has contacted RGCoordinator).

Rejected by editors

**13. Welfare rights advice in health settings**

Martin White et al.

Status: Title approved, protocol approved, review published elsewhere, review submitted and rejected, authors will not revise.

**14. Measuring professional competence relevant to social work: A systematic review of the reliability and validity of assessment tools**

Marion Bogo et al.

Status: Title rejected 2 November 2006. In response to substantive feedback, authors identified a related topic and developed another title ("Effectiveness of Interviewing skills training," SW2006/7).

**15. What does a person need to disclose about a current psychiatric condition or history in the context of employment? (SW2007/3)**

Elaine Brohan et al.

Contact: [elaine.brohan@iop.kcl.ac.uk](mailto:elaine.brohan@iop.kcl.ac.uk)

Status: Title rejected 7 January 2008

**16. The impact of revealing a current psychiatric diagnosis or history on finding or keeping a job (SW2007/4)**

Elaine Brohan et al.

Contact: [elaine.brohan@iop.kcl.ac.uk](mailto:elaine.brohan@iop.kcl.ac.uk)

Status: Title rejected 7 January 2008

**17. System-level characteristics and outcomes of the public Vocational Rehabilitation program (SW2008/1)**

Heike Boeltzig et al.

Contact: [Heike.Boeltzig@umb.edu](mailto:Heike.Boeltzig@umb.edu)

Status: Authors encouraged to contact Cochrane Qualitative Methods group. Agreed not to pursue this review with us. Too USA-focused and qualitative.

**18. Fatty acids for attention-deficit/hyperactivity symptomatology in children aged 6-12 (SW2008/2)**

Stephen James, Paul Montgomery

Contact: [Stephen.james@green.ox.ac.uk](mailto:Stephen.james@green.ox.ac.uk)

Status: Received 25 February 2008, simultaneous duplicate submission to CDPLPG and SWCG, overlaps with another CC title.

## Memorandum

---

To: Campbell Collaboration Steering Group  
From: David B. Wilson, Crime and Justice Coordinating Group Editor  
Date: February 29, 2008  
RE: Crime and Justice Update

---

The Crime and Justice coordinating group continues to make steady progress toward completed reviews. At present, we have 10 approved and published reviews, 1 review waiting for final approval from the co-chairs and CJ steering committee (anticipated date of approval March 11, 2008). We also have 2 new protocols that are waiting final approval from the co-chairs and steering group. These should also be approved within two weeks unless a member of the steering committee raises a concern that must be addressed by the authors.

Since the previous steering group meeting (November 2007, Copenhagen), much of the editorial activity within the CJ group has been at the level of protocols. Eight different registered titles had editorial action at the protocol level. At present, we have four protocols that have been fully peer-reviewed and only require authors to make final editorial changes. We also have four reviews that have been fully peer-reviewed and are being edited by the authors.

Several of our active reviews have some level of funding. Five are receiving assistance from C2 Norway, three are receiving funding from the US National Institute of Justice and are required to have draft final reports submitted by summer 2008, and three have funding from the Nordic Campbell Center. It is anticipated that this funding will greatly facilitate the progress of these reviews toward completion.

In January, the COPS office published a summary of Mazerolle and colleagues review of police-led drug enforcement strategies. This publication reaches police practitioners and decision makers, and is published both in hard copy and electronic formats. Several other CJ titles are being considered for similar publications.

Two in-progress reviews will be highlighted at the upcoming *Jerry Lee Symposium* that will be held in Washington, DC, on May 4 and 5, 2008. The two reviews are Davis and Weisburd's, "The effects of second responder programs on repeat incidents of family abuse," and Alex R. Piquero, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, and Richard Tremblay's, "Effectiveness of family programs implemented up to age 5 in reducing later antisocial behavior/delinquency." CJ C2 reviews will also be featured at the *World Congress of Criminology* conference held in Stockholm in June.

A detailed report of the status of all CJ titles is attached.




---

## The Crime and Justice Coordinating Group Report on the Status of Titles, Protocols and Reviews February 2008

---

### REVIEW SUMMARY

---

#### Published Systematic Reviews

There are currently **10** published systematic reviews.

#### Reviews in Progress

Awaiting approval:	1
Being revised with external critiques complete:	4
Seeking external readers:	1
Being revised before seeking external readers:	3
In progress but no protocol submitted:	2
Protocol approved, review not yet submitted:	7
<i>Total</i>	<b>18</b>

#### Protocols in Progress

Awaiting approval:	2
Being revised with external critiques complete:	4
Seeking external readers:	2
Being revised before seeking external readers:	6
Awaiting initial review:	0
<i>Total</i>	<b>14</b>

#### Titles in Progress

Title approved, protocol not yet submitted:	5
Awaiting approval:	1
Interest registered; awaiting submission:	0
<i>Total</i>	<b>6</b>

#### Total CCJG Documents

There are currently **48** documents published or in progress.

1 title is currently inactive.

Key: **COPS publication**

**NIJ 2007 funding – expedite**

**C2 2008 funding - expedite**

---

## 10 PUBLISHED REVIEWS

---

- 1. “Scared Straight” and other juvenile awareness programs for preventing delinquency**  
Anthony Petrosino, Harvard University; Carolyn Turpin-Petrosino and Jon Buehler  
Contact: [anthony\\_petrosino@hotmail.com](mailto:anthony_petrosino@hotmail.com)  
Title Status: Approved and registered.  
Protocol Status: Approved 08-Jan-03 and registered.  
Review Status: Approved 27-Jun-05 and registered.
- 2. The effects of correctional boot camps on offending**  
David B. Wilson, George Mason University; Doris Layton MacKenzie, University of Maryland; and Fawn Ngo Mitchell  
Contact: [dwilsonb@gmu.edu](mailto:dwilsonb@gmu.edu)  
Title Status: Approved and registered.  
Protocol Status: Approved 08-Jan-03 and registered.  
Review Status: Approved 27-Jun-05 and registered.
- 3. The effectiveness of counter-terrorism strategies**  
Cynthia Lum, George Mason University; Leslie Kennedy and Alison Sherley  
Contact: [clum@gmu.edu](mailto:clum@gmu.edu)  
Funding: \$3,000 (NIJ 2004)  
Title Status: Approved and registered.  
Protocol Status: Approved 03-Jan-04 and registered.  
Review Status: Approved 17-Jan-06 and registered.
- 4. The effects of non-custodial employment programs on the recidivism rates of ex offenders**  
Christy Visher and Laura Winterfield, the Urban Institute  
Contact: [cvisher@ui.urban.org](mailto:cvisher@ui.urban.org)  
Funding: \$12,000 (Smith-Richardson Foundation)  
Title Status: Approved and registered.  
Protocol Status: Approved 03-Nov-00 and registered.  
Review Status: Approved Jan-06 and registered.
- 5. Prison-based drug treatment programs**  
O.J. Mitchell, University of Cincinnati; David B. Wilson and Doris Layton MacKenzie  
Contact: [ojmarrh.mitchell@uc.edu](mailto:ojmarrh.mitchell@uc.edu)  
Title Status: Approved. Registered in C2 RIPE  
Protocol Status: Approved 15-Jan-05 and registered.  
Review Status: Approved 18-Sep-06 and registered.
- 6. Effects of custodial vs. non-custodial sentences on re-offending**  
Martin Killias and Patrice Villettaz, University of Lausanne  
Contact: [martin.killias@unil.ch](mailto:martin.killias@unil.ch)  
Funding: \$80,000 (Swiss National Science Foundation)  
Title Status: Approved and registered.  
Protocol Status: Approved 12-Feb-03 and registered.  
Review Status: Approved 31-Oct-06 and registered.

**7. Hot spots policing**

Anthony Braga, Harvard University

Contact: [anthony\\_braga@harvard.edu](mailto:anthony_braga@harvard.edu)

Funding: \$12,000 (Smith-Richardson Foundation). \$3,000 (C2 incentive).

Title Status: Approved and registered.

Protocol Status: Approved and registered.

Review Status: Approved 09-May-07 and registered.

**8. Police-led drug enforcement strategies**

Lorraine Mazerolle, David W. Soole, and Sacha Rombouts, Griffith University

Contact: [l.mazerolle@griffith.edu.au](mailto:l.mazerolle@griffith.edu.au)

Funding: \$3,000 (C2 incentive).

Title Status: Approved and registered.

Protocol Status: Approved 01-Feb-2005 and registered.

Review Status: Approved 09-May-07 and registered.

Comments: **Published by COPS 14-Jun-07.**

**9. Cognitive-behavioral programs for juvenile and adult offenders: a meta-analysis of controlled intervention studies**

Mark Lipsey, Vanderbilt University; Nana Landenberger, and Sandra J. Wilson

Contact: [mark.lipsey@vanderbilt.edu](mailto:mark.lipsey@vanderbilt.edu)

Title Status: Approved and registered.

Protocol Status: Approved 21-Oct-06 and registered.

Review Status: Resubmitted 02-Aug-07.

Approved 09-Aug-07 and registered.

**10. Programs for serious (violent and chronic) juvenile offenders in secure corrections**

Vicente Garrido and Luz Anyela Morales, University of Valencia

Contact: [vicente.garrido@uv.es](mailto:vicente.garrido@uv.es)

Funding: \$3,000. \$1,500 (C2 incentive).

Title Status: Approved and registered.

Protocol Status: Approved 03-Nov-00 and registered.

Review Status: Submitted 25-Mar-07.

Action letter sent 26-Jun-07.

Resubmitted 7-Aug-07.

Approved 21-Sep-07 and registered.

---

**REVIEWS IN PROGRESS**


---

*1 Review Awaiting Approval***1. Cost-benefit analysis and cost-effectiveness of sentencing: a systematic review of the literature**

Cynthia McDougall, University of York; Marc Cohen, Raymond Swaray and Amanda Perry

Contact: [c.mcdougall@psych.york.ac.uk](mailto:c.mcdougall@psych.york.ac.uk)  
 Funding: \$3,000 (NIJ 2004).  
 Title Status: Approved and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Approved and registered.  
 Review Status: Peer reviews received.  
 Methods review received 6-Jun-06.  
 Resubmitted 25-Feb-08.  
 Sent to SC 26-Feb-08.

#### *4 Reviews Being Revised with External Critiques Complete*

##### **1. Effects of closed circuit television surveillance on crime**

Brandon C. Welsh, University of Massachusetts, Lowell; and David P. Farrington,  
 University of Cambridge

Contact: [bcwelsh66@msn.com](mailto:bcwelsh66@msn.com)  
[dpf1@hermes.cam.ac.uk](mailto:dpf1@hermes.cam.ac.uk)  
 Funding: \$3,000 (NIJ 2004)  
 Title Status: Approved and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Approved and registered.  
 Review Status: Being revised with external critiques complete  
 Comments: Followed up by Peter Grabosky 30-Jan-08.

##### **2. Assessing the effectiveness of interventions designed to support victims of crime: A systematic review of psychological outcomes**

Rania Marandos and Amanda Perry, University of York

Contact: [raniamarandos25@hotmail.com](mailto:raniamarandos25@hotmail.com)  
 Funding: \$3,000  
 Title Status: Approved and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Approved 03-Jan-02 and registered.  
 Review Status: Peer review 1 solicited 22-Jun-06, received 23-Jun-06.  
 Peer review 2 solicited 29-Sep-06, received 15-Oct-06.  
 Methods review 21-Jun-06.  
 Info review 6-Oct-06.  
 Action letter sent 20-Oct-06.  
 Being revised with external critiques complete

##### **3. Effects of improved street lighting on crime**

Brandon C. Welsh, University of Massachusetts, Lowell; and David P. Farrington,  
 University of Cambridge

Contact: [bcwelsh66@msn.com](mailto:bcwelsh66@msn.com)  
[dpf1@hermes.cam.ac.uk](mailto:dpf1@hermes.cam.ac.uk)  
 Funding: \$3,000 (NIJ 2004). \$1,500 (C2 incentive).  
 Title Status: Approved and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Approved and registered.  
 Review Status: Review submitted 4-May-07.  
 Peer review 1 solicited 10-May-07, received 18-May-07.  
 Peer review 2 solicited 27-May-07, received.

Methods review 7-Jun-07.  
 Action letter sent 20-Jun-07.  
 Being revised with external critiques complete  
 Comments: Followed up by Peter Grabosky 30-Jan-08.

#### **4. The effectiveness of neighbourhood watch**

Trevor Bennett and Katy Holloway, University of Glamorgan; and David Farrington, University of Cambridge

Contact: [thbennet@glam.ac.uk](mailto:thbennet@glam.ac.uk)  
 Funding: \$3,000 (NIJ 2004). \$1,500 (C2 incentive).  
 Title Status: Approved and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Approved and registered.  
 Review Status: Submitted 4-May-07.  
 Peer review 1 solicited 26-May-07, received 29-May-07.  
 Peer review 2 solicited 6-May-07, received 30-May-07.  
 Methods review 8-Oct-07.  
 Action letter sent 17-Oct-07.  
 Being revised with external critiques complete  
 Comments: Followed up by Peter Grabosky 30-Jan-08.

### **1 Review Seeking External Readers**

#### **1. Court-ordered interventions for domestic batterers**

Lynette Feder, Portland State University; David B. Wilson and Kimberly Keplinger

Contact: [lfeder@pdx.edu](mailto:lfeder@pdx.edu)  
 Funding: \$12,000 (Smith-Richardson Foundation)  
 Title Status: Approved and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Resubmitted 22-Sep-06 (with peer reviews).  
 Approved 15-Aug-07 and registered.  
 Review Status: Submitted 28-Aug-07.  
 Peer review 1 solicited 2-Oct-07. Awaiting receipt.  
 Peer review 2 solicited 30-Jan-08. Awaiting receipt.  
 Methods review solicited 29-Aug-07, received 17-Jan-08.  
 Seeking external readers  
 Comments: Larry Sherman is the PA

### **3 Reviews Being Revised Before Seeking External Readers**

#### **1. Screening and assessment tools used to assess juvenile/young offenders for risk of suicide/self-harm on admission to a prison/secure institution**

Amanda Perry, University of York; and Rania Marandos

Contact: [aep4@york.ac.uk](mailto:aep4@york.ac.uk)  
 Funding: \$3,000 (NIJ 2004).  
 Title Status: Approved and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Approved and registered.  
 Review Status: Being revised before seeking external readers  
 Comments: Dave W is working with authors re methodological issues (Sep 06)

**2. Effects of face-to-face restorative justice for personal victim crimes**

Heather Strang, Australian National University; Larry Sherman, University of Pennsylvania; and Evan Mayo-Wilson

Contact: [heather.strang@anu.edu.au](mailto:heather.strang@anu.edu.au)  
 Title Status: Approved and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Approved 26-Nov-04 and registered.  
 Review Status: Being revised before seeking external readers  
 Comments: Awaiting publication of new trials before updates. One more substantive review needed.

**3. Institutional violence: a systematic review of the impact of situational factors on violence**

Lisa Gadon, David J. Cooke and Lorraine Johnstone, Glasgow Caledonian University

Contact: [l.gadon@gcal.ac.uk](mailto:l.gadon@gcal.ac.uk)  
 Funding: \$3,000 (NIJ 2004).  
 Title Status: Approved and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Approved 26-Jan-05 and registered.  
 Review Status: Being revised before seeking external readers  
 Comments: David Farrington to follow up on progress (Jan 08).

*2 Reviews In Progress, No Protocol Submitted***1. Treatment for sex offenders**

Friedrich Lösel, University of Erlangen-Nuremberg; and Martin Schmucker

Contact: [fal23@cam.ac.uk](mailto:fal23@cam.ac.uk)  
 Funding: \$3,000 from ???  
 Title Status: Approved and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Being revised  
 Review Status: In progress, no protocol submitted  
 Comments: Dave wrote to Friedrich Sep 07 – copies of protocol and peer reviews needed. Jerry Lee follow-up Feb-08.

**2. Juvenile curfews**

Kenneth Adams, University of Central Florida

Contact: [kenadams@mail.ucf.edu](mailto:kenadams@mail.ucf.edu)  
 Title Status: Approved and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Being revised  
 Review Status: In progress, no protocol submitted

*7 Protocols Approved, Review Not Submitted***1. Electronic monitoring's impact on reoffending**

Marc Renzema, Kutztown University; and Evan Mayo-Wilson, Oxford University,

Contact: [renzema@kutztown.edu](mailto:renzema@kutztown.edu)  
 Funding: \$3,000  
 Title Status: Approved and registered.

Protocol Status: Approved and registered.  
 Review Status: Not submitted  
 Comments: Email from author 8-Nov-07. He plans to work on this during January 08.

## 2. Police strategies for reducing illegal possession and carrying of firearms

Chris Koper, University of Pennsylvania; and Evan Mayo-Wilson  
 Contact: ckoper@policeforum.org  
 Funding: \$3,000.  
 Title Status: Approved and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Approved and registered.  
 Review Status: Not submitted  
 Comments: Needs new co-author. May work on it after March 08.

## 3. Child skills training

Friedrich Lösel, University of Erlangen-Nuremberg; and Andreas Beelman  
 Contact: [fal23@cam.ac.uk](mailto:fal23@cam.ac.uk)  
 Funding: \$3,000.  
 Title Status: Approved and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Approved. **Not registered.**  
 Review Status: Not submitted  
 Comments: Dave wrote to Friedrich Sep 07 – copies of protocol and peer reviews needed. Jerry Lee follow-up Feb-08.

## 4. The effects of problem-oriented policing on crime and disorder

David Weisburd, Hebrew University; John Eck, University of Cincinnati, Josh Hinkle, and Cody Telep  
 Contact: [msefrat@mscc.huji.ac.il](mailto:msefrat@mscc.huji.ac.il)  
 Funding : \$19,500 (NIJ 2007).  
 Title Status: Approved and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Submitted 8-Sep-06.  
 Resubmitted 26-Sep-06.  
 Peer review 1 solicited 1-Oct-06, received 24-Nov-06.  
 Peer review 2 solicited 5-Oct-06, received 24-Oct-06.  
 Methods review received 20-Nov-06.  
 Info review received 6-Oct-06.  
 Action letter sent 7-Dec-06.  
 Resubmitted 19-Mar-07.  
 Approved 15-Apr-07 and registered.  
 Review Status: Not submitted

## 5. Drug Courts

David B. Wilson, George Mason University; O.J. Mitchell, University of Cincinnati; and Doris Layton MacKenzie, University of Maryland  
 Contact: [dwilsonb@gmu.edu](mailto:dwilsonb@gmu.edu)  
 Title Status: Approved and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Resubmitted 12-Mar-07.  
 Approved 20-Jul-07 and registered.

Review Status: Not submitted  
 Comments: Steven Belenko (Temple) is the PA.

#### 6. Mentoring programs to affect juvenile delinquency and associated problems

Patrick Tolan, University of Illinois at Chicago; David Henry, Michael Schoeny, and Arin Bass

Contact: [ptolan@psych.uic.edu](mailto:ptolan@psych.uic.edu)  
 Title Status: Approved and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Approved 6-May-06. Awaiting registration.  
 Review Status: Not submitted  
 Comments: First draft of review to be submitted late Feb 08.

#### 7. Prevalence and type of cyber abuse targeting children and adolescents: a systematic review to evaluate current approaches

Faye Mishna, Robert MacFadden and Michael Saini, University of Toronto

Contact: [f.mishna@utoronto.ca](mailto:f.mishna@utoronto.ca)  
 Funding: NC2. \$5,000 (C2 Norway).  
 Title Status: Approved 18-Jun-06 and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Submitted 15-Dec-06.  
 Action letter sent 8-Jan-07.  
 Resubmitted 21-Mar-07.  
 Peer review 1 solicited 23-Mar-07, received 23-Mar-07.  
 Peer review 2 solicited 30-Mar-07, received 30-May-07.  
 Methods review received 22-May-07.  
 Info review received 30-Jun-07.  
 Action letter sent 27-Jun-07.  
 Resubmitted 30-Aug-07.  
 Approved 14-Sep-07 and registered.  
 Review Status: Not submitted

---

## PROTOCOLS IN PROGRESS

---

### *2 Protocols Awaiting Approval*

#### 1. Effectiveness of programs to prevent school bullying

David Farrington, University of Cambridge; Anna Baldry, Second University of Naples; Britta Kvytsgaard, Danish Ministry of Justice; and Maria M. Ttofi, University of Cambridge

Contact: [dpf1@cam.ac.uk](mailto:dpf1@cam.ac.uk)  
 Funding: NC2.  
 Title Status: Submitted 19-Mar-07.  
 Approved 08-Apr-07 and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Submitted 31-May-07.  
 Action letter sent 15-Jun-07.  
 Resubmitted 20-Aug-07.  
 Peer review 1 solicited 23-Aug-07, received 10-Sep-07.

Peer review 2 waived due to lack of responses.  
 Methods review solicited 22-Aug-07, received 4-Dec-07.  
 Info review received 7-Apr-07.  
 Action letter sent 10-Dec-07.  
 Resubmitted 19-Feb-08.  
 Sent to SC 20-Feb-08.  
 Awaiting approval  
 Review Status: Not submitted

## 2. The effects of second responder programs on repeat incidents of family abuse

Robert C. Davis, RAND Corporation, and David Weisburd  
 Contact: [robertd@rand.org](mailto:robertd@rand.org)  
 Funding: \$19,500 (NIJ 2007)  
 Title Status: Submitted 5-Sep-07.  
 Approved 21-Sep-07 and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Submitted 18-Oct-07.  
 Resubmitted 26-Nov-07.  
 Peer review 1 solicited 27-Nov-07, received 3-Dec-07.  
 Peer review 2 solicited 26-Nov-07, received 11-Jan-08.  
 Methods review solicited 26-Nov-07, received 13-Dec-07.  
 Info review solicited 26-Nov-07, received 5-Dec-07.  
 Action letter sent 23-Jan-08.  
 Resubmitted 25-Feb-08.  
 Sent to SC 26-Feb-08.  
 Awaiting approval.  
 Review Status: Not submitted

### *4 Protocols Being Revised with External Critiques Complete*

#### 1. What works in rehabilitating offenders: a systematic review of Israeli criminal justice practices

Mimi Ajzenstadt and David Weisburd, Hebrew University  
 Contact: [mimi@mscc.huji.ac.il](mailto:mimi@mscc.huji.ac.il)  
 Title Status: Approved and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Peer review 1 solicited 25-Sep-06, received 18-Nov-06  
 Peer review 2 solicited 30-Oct-06, received 27-Nov-06  
 Methods review received 27-Sep-06  
 Info review received 6-Oct-06.  
 Action letter sent 8-Dec-06.  
 Being revised with external critiques complete  
 Review Status: Not submitted

#### 2. Outpatient treatment for drug-involved offenders

Dr Faye Taxman, Virginia Commonwealth University  
 Contact: [ftaxman@gmu.edu](mailto:ftaxman@gmu.edu)  
 Funding: \$3,500 (C2 Norway).  
 Title Status: Approved and registered.

Protocol Status: Submitted 20-Jan-07.  
 Action letter sent 25-Jan-07.  
 Resubmitted 2-Feb-07.  
 Peer review 1 solicited 7-Feb-07, received 9-Mar-07.  
 Peer review 2 waived due to lack of responses.  
 Methods review received 16-Mar-07.  
 Info review received 7-Apr-07.  
 Action letter sent 4-Jan-08.  
 Being revised with external critiques complete

Review Status: Not submitted

### 3. The effectiveness of Criminal Justice Liaison and Diversion Services (CJLDS) for mentally disordered offenders

David Scott, Royal Victoria Hospital; and Sinead McGilloway, National University of Ireland at Maynooth

Contact: [david.scott@qub.ac.uk](mailto:david.scott@qub.ac.uk)  
 Funding: \$14,600 (C2 Norway)  
 Title Status: Approved 01-Jun-06 and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Submitted 18-Apr-07.  
 Action letter sent 26-Apr-07.  
 Resubmitted 12-Sep-07.  
 Peer review 1 solicited 19-Oct-07, received 4-Oct-07.  
 Peer review 2 solicited 24-Sep-07, received 29-Dec-07.  
 Methods review solicited 9-Oct-07, received 12-Dec-07.  
 Action letter sent 4-Jan-07.  
 Being revised with external critiques complete

Review Status: Not submitted

### 4. Effects of drug substitution programs on reoffending

Martin Killias and Marcelo F. Aebi, University of Lausanne

Contact: [martin.killias@unil.ch](mailto:martin.killias@unil.ch)  
 Funding: Swiss Federal Office of Public Health, \$10,000 (C2 Norway)  
 Title Status: Submitted 12-Jul-07.  
 Approved 20-Sep-06 and registered.  
 Protocol Status: Submitted 2-Nov-07.  
 Action letter sent 7-Nov-07.  
 Resubmitted 15-Nov-07.  
 Peer review 1 solicited 26-Nov-07, received 20-Dec-07.  
 Peer review 2 solicited 23-Jan-08, received 5-Feb-07.  
 Methods review solicited 20-Nov-07, received 26-Dec-07.  
 Info review solicited 20-Nov-07, received 5-Dec-07.  
 Action letter sent 16-Feb-08.  
 Being revised with external critiques complete.

Review Status: Not submitted

*2 Protocols Seeking External Readers*

**1. Effectiveness of family programs implemented up to age 5 in reducing later antisocial behavior/delinquency**

Alex R. Piquero, John Jay College of Criminal Justice; Brandon C. Welsh, University of Massachusetts-Lowell; David P. Farrington, Cambridge University; and Richard Tremblay, University of Montreal

Contact: [apiquero@jjay.cuny.edu](mailto:apiquero@jjay.cuny.edu)

Funding: \$19,500 (NIJ 2007)

Title Status: Submitted 02-May-07.

Approved 17-May-07 and registered.

Protocol Status: Submitted 21-Nov-07.

Action letter sent 4-Dec-07.

Resubmitted 9-Dec-07.

Peer review 1 solicited 6-Jan-08, received 12-Jan-08.

Peer review 2 solicited 31-Jan-08, received 17-Feb-08.

Methods review solicited 13-Dec-08.

Info review received 21-Feb-08.

Seeking external readers

Review Status: Not submitted

**2. Parental imprisonment: a systematic review of its effects on children's antisocial behavior, crime, and mental health problems**

Joseph Murray and David Farrington, University of Cambridge

Contact: [jm335@cam.ac.uk](mailto:jm335@cam.ac.uk)

Funding: NC2.

Title Status: Submitted 09-Jan-07.

Approved 25-Jan-07 and registered.

Protocol Status: Submitted 30-Jan-08.

Action letter sent 6-Feb-08.

Resubmitted 21-Feb-08.

Peer review 1 solicited 27-Feb-08.

Peer review 2 solicited 28-Feb-08.

Methods review solicited 27-Feb-08.

Info review solicited 28-Feb-08.

Seeking external readers.

Review Status: Not submitted

*6 Protocols Being Revised Before Seeking External Readers***1. Repeat victimization programs**

Graham Farrell, Loughborough University; and Ken Pease

Contact: [g.farrell@lboro.ac.uk](mailto:g.farrell@lboro.ac.uk)

Title Status: Approved and registered.

Protocol Status: Being revised before seeking external readers

Review Status: Not submitted

Comments: No contact with this author.

**2. Community-based programs for juveniles**

Tammy White and Neil Weiner, University of Pennsylvania

Contact: [neilw@sp2.upenn.edu](mailto:neilw@sp2.upenn.edu) or [nweiner@vera.org](mailto:nweiner@vera.org)

Funding: **TBA (C2 Norway).**

Title Status: Approved and registered.

Protocol Status: Being revised before seeking external readers

Review Status: Not submitted

**3. Interventions to prevent violent behaviour specifically targeted at people with a diagnosed mental illness presenting to forensic services**

Maria Leitner, University of Liverpool; James McGuire, Richard Wittington, Wally Barr

Contact: [marialeitner@btinternet.com](mailto:marialeitner@btinternet.com)

Title Status: Approved and registered.

Protocol Status: Being revised before seeking external readers

Review Status: Not submitted

Comments: Needs to be formatted as a Campbell review but author does not have time to work on it.

**4. Risk assessment strategies for the forensic mental health population**

Maria Leitner, University of Liverpool; James McGuire, Richard Wittington, Wally Barr

Contact: [marialeitner@btinternet.com](mailto:marialeitner@btinternet.com)

Title Status: Approved. Registered in C2 RIPE

Protocol Status: Being revised before seeking external readers

Review Status: Not submitted

Comments: See above

**5. Effects of Pulling Levers Policing on crime**

Anthony Braga, Harvard University; and David Weisburd, University of Maryland and Hebrew University, Jerusalem

Contact: [anthony\\_braga@harvard.edu](mailto:anthony_braga@harvard.edu)

Title Status: Submitted 12-Dec-06.

Approved 25-Jan-07 and registered.

Protocol Status: Submitted 7-Feb-07.

Action letter sent 16-Feb-07.

Being revised before seeking external reviewers.

Review Status: Not submitted

**6. The impact of juvenile court processing and further system penetration on subsequent delinquency**

Anthony Petrosino, Learning Innovations at WestEd, and Carolyn Turpin-Petrosino, Bridgewater State College

Contact: [apetros@wested.org](mailto:apetros@wested.org); [cpetrosino@bridgew.edu](mailto:cpetrosino@bridgew.edu)

Title Status: Submitted 16-Oct-07.

Approved 29-Oct-07. Registered.

Protocol Status: Submitted 8-Feb-08.

Action letter sent 16-Feb-08.

Being revised before seeking external readers

Review Status: Not submitted

---

**TITLES IN PROGRESS**


---

*5 Titles Approved, Protocols Not Yet Received*
**1. Corporate crime deterrence**

Sally Simpson, University of Maryland; William Laufer, University of Pennsylvania; and N. Craig Smith

Contact: [ssimpson@crim.umd.edu](mailto:ssimpson@crim.umd.edu)

Title Status: Approved and registered.

Protocol Status: Not submitted

Review Status: Not submitted

**2. The effects of arrest on domestic violence**

Chris Maxwell, Michigan State University; and Joel Garner

Contact: [cmaxwell@msu.edu](mailto:cmaxwell@msu.edu)

Title Status: Approved May-05 and registered.

Protocol Status: Not submitted

Review Status: Not submitted

**3. Effects of school-based cognitive-behavioral anger interventions on child and adolescent aggressive behavior**

Julia Lavenberg, University of Pennsylvania; and Sandra Jo Wilson, Vanderbilt University

Contact: [j.lavenberg@gmail.com](mailto:j.lavenberg@gmail.com)

Title Status: Submitted 11-Jun-07.

Approved 03-Aug-07 and registered.

Protocol Status: Not submitted

Review Status: Not submitted

Comments: Cross-listed with Education and Social Welfare groups

**4. Motivational interviewing for substance abuse**

Kjetil Karlsen, Sørbyen Legesenter, Norway; Geir Smedslund, Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services; Asbjørn Steiro; and Karianne Thune Hammerstrøm

Contact: [kka@sbls.no](mailto:kka@sbls.no)

Title Status: Submitted 13-Jun-07.

Approved 10-Aug-07 and registered.

Protocol Status: Not submitted

Review Status: Not submitted

Comments: Title changed from 'The effects of motivational interviewing (MI) on reoffending in prison populations' due to lack of studies in that area.

**5. Re-entry programs for formerly incarcerated women**

Gretchen Heidemann, and Haluk Soydan, University of Southern California

Contact: [gheideman@usc.edu](mailto:gheideman@usc.edu)

Title Status: Submitted 06-Nov-07.

Approved 10-Dec-07. Awaiting registration.

Protocol Status: Not submitted  
Review Status: Not submitted

*1 Title Awaiting Approval*

**1. The impact of determinate sentencing strategies over incarceration and sentence length: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the literature**

Paula M. Kautt, Cambridge University

Contact: [pmk33@cam.ac.uk](mailto:pmk33@cam.ac.uk)

Title Status: Submitted 09-May-07. Awaiting approval.

Protocol Status: Not submitted

Review Status: Not submitted

Comments: This has not yet been approved due to concerns about the nature of the existing evidence. Dave sent letter detailing SC concerns to Kautt 4-Sep-07.

---

**INACTIVE TITLES**

---

**1. A systematic review of the empirical evidence of geographical displacement and diffusion of benefits**

Kate Bowers and Lucia Summers, UCL Jill Dando Institute of Crime Science, UK

Contact: [l.summers@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:l.summers@ucl.ac.uk)

Title Status: Submitted 28-Sep-07.

Approved 22-Oct-07.

Protocol Status: Not submitted

Review Status: Not submitted

Comments: Authors stopped working on the project because Ron Clarke is working on the same topic for COPS.

---

**Semi-Annual Report  
for the  
Campbell Collaboration  
Education Coordinating Group  
March 7-10, 2010**

TO: Steering Committee

FROM: Carole Torgerson & Chad Nye, Co-Chairs

DATE: Feb 29, 2008

SUBJECT: Education Coordinating Group Activities

This report will provide a brief update and summary of the activities of the Education Coordinating Group (ECG) since the last meeting in Copenhagen, November, 2007.

ECG Organizational Changes

The ECG core group held monthly phone conference meetings in the last quarter (Oct - Dec) dealing with review procedures, reviewer supports, membership, organizational structure, Kauffman funding, training issues. These regular meetings have continued into Jan and Feb, 2008.

Review Production

<b>ECG activity since November 2007</b>				
INQUIRIES	3 + ? NCDDR titles			
	<b>SUBMITTED</b>	<b>ACCEPTED</b>	<b>REQUESTED CHANGES --PENDING</b>	<b>REJECTED</b>
TITLES	3	1	2	0
PROTOCOLS	2	0	2	0
REVIEWS	1	0	0	0
IN-PROGRESS (no new submission within this timeframe)			6	

In total, the ECG has 12 reviews in progress and 5 completed reviews.

The Editors and Managing Editor held 14 editorial conference calls during the quarter Oct - Dec and a further 3 into January and February, 2008 to discuss submitted titles, protocols, reviews and editorial procedures.

## **ECG Facilitating Groups**

**New Coordinating Group proposal:** A proposal was received from the National Center for Dissemination of Disability Research (see attached) to consider the development of a Disability Coordinating Group. The circulation of the proposal to the SG suggested a preliminary start up of the group be as a sub-group in the Education Coordinating Group. The general response of the SG was less than enthusiastically supportive of the proposal.

**ECG Subgroup Proposal:** A proposal was submitted to the SG Co-Chairs that suggested the establishment of several sub-groups under the umbrella of the ECG to reflect specific areas of research interests in the field of Education (see attached). The goal would be to establish an identifiable content focus on a variety of research interests in an attempt to broaden the 'perceived' scope of the ECG review topics and to increase the number of people engaged in the C2 process.

### Membership

In keeping with the decision of the Steering Group at the last meeting, the ECG developed, circulated, and approved a proposal for setting up a membership structure. The final document outlining the membership structure was a modification of one developed by Julia Littell and the Social Welfare Group. We believed it would minimize confusion and would be in the best interest of the overall C2 organization if the wording of the notices were similar. Thus, we contacted Julia Littell and requested her permission to modify the SW group proposal. She generously consented.

We sent the email on 1 February, first targeting those who attended the ECG meeting in London in May 2007. We then added persons who've had previous contact with the ECG or were known personally by the Coordinators to have an interest in participating in the ECG. Discussions are currently underway as to the best way of meeting our goal of increasing active participation in the group.

The document was sent to 55 persons, with 4 emails returned due to invalid email addresses. As of this writing, the majority of respondents are electing "affiliate" status. Of those who responded and currently have an ECG review in progress, all elected "member" status

### Funding Support

The Kauffman Foundation agreed to provide \$100,000 to the ECG for the production of reviews in the area of science, math, or engineering. Kauffman has agreed to fund one of the proposals received. Negotiations are ongoing to refine the proposal in accordance with suggestions from the Kauffman representative and to organize transfer of the funding.

### Training Program

A two-stage ECG training program was developed with the University of Mannheim, Germany. The first stage was held Feb 12-15, 2008. Thirty participants registered and took part in the workshop, which covered history and rationale for systematic reviews, protocol development, inclusion and exclusion criteria, coding and quality assessment, and a brief introduction to meta-analysis. The second part of the workshop will take place June 24-27, 2008 in the University of Mannheim, Germany.

## **Challenges**

1. ECG needs to increase participation in the Group activities:
  - a. Through review production.
  - b. Establishment ECG Steering Group may help to extend the network of individuals knowledgeable and interested in the systematic review process.
  - c. Need to engage in more training programs for review activities.
2. ECG needs to develop the methodology and procedures for conducting systematic reviews in Assessment. The Educational community is quickly coming to the question of the adequacy of the assessment framework used to identify, diagnose, and ultimately intervene with effective curricular instruction, group or individual therapy, treatment or intervention.
3. ECG needs actively to include the consumer point of view in the review process. There are functionally no practitioners representing the schools (e.g., superintendents, principals, teachers) or representatives of the policy or funder perspectives in the ECG. Our review must begin to engage an external consumer reviewer for all titles, protocols, and reviews. We need to develop a readable, accurate, and brief summary of research that can at least be the interest tipping point for the consumer and non-reviewer

Submitted by:

Carole Torgerson  
Chad Nye  
Co-Chairs  
C2 Education Coordinating Group

Note: We gratefully acknowledge the help of Julia Lavenberg (Managing Editor) during the compiling of this report.

**Date:** 29<sup>th</sup> of February 2008

**Author(s):** Campbell Collaboration Users Group co-chairs and secretariat

**Target group:** The membership of the Campbell Collaboration Users Group

**Status:** Draft presented to the C2 steering group in March 2008 meeting in Oslo. This paper will guide the establishment of a C2UG membership base. When this membership base has been established this policy paper will be put to a vote. Future changes to this paper will also be put to a vote among C2UG membership.

This paper is part of the portfolio of papers governing C2UG activities. They are currently: **C2UG Policy Brief** (17 January 2005), **Options for a C2 Impact Strategy through user interaction** (4 November 2007), **C2 Users Group Working Paper 2007-1** (4 November 2007), [Policy guiding the production of Campbell Collaboration User Abstracts](#) (29 February 2008), and [User involvement in the systematic review process](#) (29 February 2008).

## **Campbell Collaboration Users Group (C2UG) Governance and Membership Policy Paper**

### **1. C2UG activities**

The success of The Campbell Collaboration (C2) ultimately depends on the impact of C2 reviews on policy and practice. Successful translation from research knowledge to impact requires many different types of highly specialised communication- and people-skills to come together. In the case of C2, the process is further challenged by C2's broad scope within public policy (education, crime & justice, and social welfare) and by its international focus. This means that potential end-users of C2 reviews are a huge and very heterogeneous constituency.

The aim for all C2 reviews is to involve potential users in the review production process (cf. *User involvement in the systematic review process*). Although user involvement is crucial to the review process, it is unlikely to secure actual changes in practice or policy across different countries. It is necessary for C2 to engage with organisations that have specific expertise in knowledge translation.<sup>1</sup> These could be knowledge & dissemination organisations, organisation working with professional development, educational organisations, consultancies, not-for-profit organisations, etc. Therefore, the C2 Users Group (C2UG) will act as the central entry point for these organisations and other parties with an interest in utilizing review knowledge. These organisations have the necessary clout, scope, and expertise to contextualise the results of Campbell reviews and bring the knowledge to bear on actual policy and practise in their specific fields and countries.

C2UG aims to be a “hub & spokes”-network, where the C2UG co-chairs and the secretariat act as the hub; supporting and coordinating activities of the spokes: the C2UG members. The members develop C2 user abstracts, bring C2 review knowledge to bear on policy and practice, and engage in other C2 dissemination related activities.

---

<sup>1</sup> These organisations translate research evidence into improved outcomes of professional practice. While translation may appear similar to dissemination or diffusion, it can be differentiated by its emphasis on the quality of research prior to dissemination and implementation of research evidence within a system. Unlike simple dissemination activities, translation requires coordination and process improvement amongst a complex system to influence behavior change and people outcomes, cf. Canadian Institutes of Health Research.

Decisions on major policy issues are made at the yearly meeting of the C2UG at the Campbell Colloquium. The two C2UG-co-chairs supported by the secretariat manage the day-to-day activities. There are two levels of attachment to the C2UG: affiliate and member. Differences will be outlined below.

## **2. C2 strategy and C2UG**

### **The C2 vision...**

*... is to bring about positive social change, and to improve the quality of public and private services across the world, ...*

by the following **C2 mission...**

*... preparing, maintaining and disseminating systematic reviews of existing social science evidence.*

Presently, the Campbell Collaboration's Strategy is not finalised. Therefore, the section below – where activities specifically relating to the C2UG are outlined – is copy-pasted from a paper-in-progress and liable to change:

*“Promoting access, by wide dissemination of the outputs of the Collaboration, engaging potential users of evidence, taking advantage of strategic alliances, and by promoting appropriate prices, content and media to meet the needs of users worldwide”*

## **3. C2UG Meeting**

C2UG governing body is the yearly meeting of the C2UG at the Campbell Colloquium. At the meeting new policies and substantial changes to existing policies are discussed and can be put to a vote. An agenda will be circulated two weeks before the meeting, and members and affiliates can submit agenda items three weeks before the meeting.

Elections for co-chairs are to be held at the annual Campbell Colloquium. Nominations for the upcoming co-chair election should also be reported to the C2UG-secretariat three weeks before the C2UG-meeting at the Colloquium.

## **4. How to become a C2UG-affiliate**

Anyone interested in C2-dissemination activities – individuals or organisations – can become a C2UG affiliate through completion of a form available on the C2 website ([www.campbellcollaboration.org/xxx](http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/xxx)) or at the C2UG meeting at the annual Campbell Colloquium. The form will ask for permission to share contact information with other C2UG affiliates and members as a part of the C2-secretariat's network creating activities.

Affiliates have the right to:

- Participate in the yearly C2UG meeting at the Campbell Colloquium
- Nominate candidates for co-chair elections. Candidates need to be C2UG-members
- Submit agenda items, policy changes etc. for consideration at the yearly C2UG meeting at the Campbell Colloquium

Affiliates are strongly encouraged to take the following initiatives:

- Take the lead – in the C2UG network – on user and dissemination related activities at the yearly Campbell Colloquium and between – e.g. engage in reviews-in-progress through the C2 Coordinating Groups.
- Disseminate C2 User Abstracts in their own local professional network – possibly in different contextualized formats
- Act as ambassadors for the Campbell Collaboration and its reviews in their local professional network
- Become C2UG members if possible

### **5. How to become a C2UG member**

Organisations engaged in the translation of research knowledge into practice (or policy) are eligible to become C2UG members. The requirements for membership are:

- A C2UG liaison person has been appointed and the C2UG-secretariat is notified. The organisation is responsible for replacing the liaison person in case of job change and for notifying the C2UG-secretariat.
- This person (or someone working for this person) has participated in the C2UG training workshop on writing C2 User Abstracts at the annual Campbell Colloquium.<sup>2</sup>

The liaison person (hence the organisation) is then a member of the C2UG with voting rights.

Membership is maintained as long as the liaison person (or someone working for this person) produces a minimum of one C2 User Abstract per year on a newly approved C2 review following the standard set out by C2UG (cf. *Policy guiding the production of Campbell Collaboration User Abstracts*). The C2UG-secretariat will strive to match reviews and organisations thematically.

Being a member of C2UG gives the following rights:

- To participate in the yearly C2UG meeting at the Campbell Colloquium
- To nominate candidates for the co-chair elections. Candidates need to be C2UG-members
- To submit agenda items, policy changes etc. for consideration at the yearly C2UG meeting at the Campbell Colloquium
- To run in the co-chair election
- To vote; one vote per organisation.

Members of the C2UG are even more strongly encouraged to take the initiatives mentioned above under affiliates.

### **6. How to become a C2UG co-chair and the user representative in the C2 steering group**

C2UG-members will elect two co-chairs from among the C2UG-membership.

Presently, there is neither central Campbell nor external funding available for C2UG activities. If any type of C2UG activity is to be possible, there is a need for – in the short run – the two co-chairs to be involved at two different levels. Co-chair 1 must be able to host (i.e. fund) a C2UG-secretariat. This interim requirement will be abandoned when funding has been secured.

---

<sup>2</sup> If a wish for training and hence membership occurs between Campbell Colloquia, then the secretariat will be as helpful as possible in meeting these needs.

C2UG-members are eligible to run for a position as C2UG co-chair with the exception that to run for co-chair 1 the liaison person must hold a managerial position in his/hers organisation.

Co-chairs are elected for a three-year period at the C2UG-meeting at the Campbell Colloquium among the C2UG-membership. Following the general membership policy in the Campbell Collaboration (cf. *Proposal for Membership in the Campbell Collaboration*, 18 October 2007) an elected co-chair can maintain his or her position for a maximum of two periods, i.e. six years.

The election of co-chairs is staggered in order to secure continuity in C2UG activities. At the Colloquium in May 2008 an election for co-chair 2 (presently Amanda Sowden of CRD, York University) will be held. In 2009 co-chair 1 (presently Merete Konnerup, Nordic Campbell Center) will be up for election. In 2010 there will be no elections in C2UG. In 2011 co-chair 2 is up for election; in 2012 co-chair 1 and so forth.

Both co-chairs represent C2UG in the C2 Steering group.

### **7. Duties of the two co-chairs and the C2UG-Secretariat**

The C2UG co-chairs supported by the C2UG-secretariat have the following duties:

- Supply the platform for people and organisations who are interested in taking the lead on or participate in user and dissemination oriented activities within C2
- Organise and run the yearly C2UG-meeting at the Campbell Colloquium (notification of meeting, call for agenda items, distribute agenda, prepare and circulate papers, running of meeting, minute taking and circulation etc)
- Represent user, knowledge broker, and dissemination perspectives in the C2 Steering Group
- Develop and maintain guidelines – aimed at users, reviewers and C2 Coordinating Groups – for how user involvement can become central to the review production process (*User involvement in the systematic review process*)
- Develop and maintain C2UG policies and standards incl. a standard for C2 user abstracts (*Policy guiding the production of Campbell Collaboration User Abstracts, Guidelines for writing a Campbell Collaboration User Abstract, and C2 Users Group Working Paper 2007-1*)
- Facilitate the production of C2 User Abstracts including arranging training workshop at the Colloquium
- Produce a minimum of four C2 User Abstracts per year<sup>3</sup>
- Manage contact information on affiliates and members vis-a-vis the centralised C2 contact database
- Send out C2UG-newsletters to affiliates and members
- Develop and facilitate other C2UG activities

In order to sustain this level of activity, co-chair 1 (i.e. his or her organisation) should – as a minimum – be able to commit at least ¼ man-year from an employee with a university degree and professional experience in dissemination and one month of full-time work a year for the co-chair. Co-chair 2 has to commit individual resources to the work in C2UG at the same magnitude as co-chair 1.

---

<sup>3</sup> From start to finish, a C2 User Abstract – following the C2UG standard set out in *Guidelines for writing a Campbell Collaboration User Abstract* – requires approx. ½ month measured in gross-time (i.e. incl. lunch, vacation, absence due to illness etc).



**Date:** 29<sup>th</sup> of February 2008

**Author:** Campbell Collaboration Users Group co-chairs and secretariat  
Merete Konnerup, Amanda Sowden and Mads Hoeg Andersen

**Status:** Approved by the Campbell Collaboration Steering Group in March 2008. Future changes to this paper will first be approved by the Campbell Collaboration Users Group and then submitted to the steering group for approval.

## **Policy guiding the production of Campbell Collaboration User Abstracts**

*This policy paper lists the formal requirements that a Campbell Collaboration User Abstract must fulfil in order to be recognized as such. It is the responsibility of C2UG to develop a more detailed guideline for writing a C2 User Abstract based on the frame set up in this paper.*

*There are two appendixes to this paper: Appendix 1 is an example of a non-contextualized Campbell User Abstract. Appendix 2 is an example of a contextualized Campbell User Abstract. Both abstracts have been written by Nordic Campbell Centre.*

### **Introduction**

A Campbell Collaboration User Abstract is an official Campbell product in itself. It is based on a Campbell Review, approved by the lead reviewer, and aimed at presenting the key findings of the review in a language adopted for non-researchers in order to facilitate evidence-based decisions in everyday judicial, social, welfare or educational practice.

### **Procedure**

There are basically only two substantive and indispensable requirements when producing a Campbell Collaboration User Abstract:

- 1) All content in the User Abstract must have direct support in the review in question
- 2) The User Abstract must be approved by the lead reviewer

But embedding in local context is also essential for reaching users. Local context makes research results relevant for everyday use. However, local problems, circumstances and issues usually vary from country to country. Therefore, the first steps in the “from review to impact”-translation is divided into: 1) production of the Campbell Collaboration User Abstract in English, and 2) contextualisation and dissemination. Step 1) is a core Campbell activity performed only by members of the Campbell Collaboration Users Group. Step 2) is an optional (but strongly encouraged) reach-out activity employed by members and affiliates of the Campbell Collaboration Users Group or other interested entities

To ease this second step, these organisations are encouraged to translate the abstract into their own language, add comments from a local practitioner and add local facts on the problem and intervention in question. This local information can for instance be added in separate boxes as done by the Nordic Campbell Centre (see *appendix 2* pp. 3-4).

### **Acknowledgements and references**

#### Non-contextualized abstracts

This is the standard Campbell Collaboration User Abstract. Consequently, this is strictly regulated.

Campbell Reviews are in essence standing on the shoulders of a long line of primary studies. These studies are acknowledged through standardized references. Similarly, Campbell Collaboration User Abstracts should have a clearly stated reference to the relevant review.

Furthermore, they should feature the Campbell Collaboration logo following the regular guidelines for other Campbell Collaboration products. Finally, the independent piece of dissemination work of the Campbell Collaboration Users Group member writing the abstract should be acknowledged. An example of how this is done can be seen in *appendix 1*.

For co-registered reviews reference should also be made to Cochrane. Throughout the User Abstract the review should be referred to as a “Campbell/Cochrane Review” and the line “The review is also published in Cochrane Library” should follow the C2-RIPE reference to the review.

The non-contextualized abstracts should be available for contextualization, translation and dissemination on the C2 website.

#### Contextualized abstracts

This is the next step in the knowledge translation chain. These types of abstracts (and other dissemination products) are of course completely under the control of the organisation that chooses to produce them.<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, the Campbell Collaboration Users Group would very much like to support and encourage the production of these types of abstracts. For this reason the group offers guidance on how these abstracts could be done. An example can be seen in *appendix 2*.

---

<sup>4</sup> However, The Campbell Collaboration does expect the organisation to acknowledge the underlying review according to international standards on how to reference research.



---

**This article is based on the Campbell Review:**

Wilson SJ & Lipsey MW: *The Effects of School-based Social Information Processing Interventions on Aggressive Behaviour, Part I: Universal Programmes & Part II: Selected/Indicated Pull-out Programmes*. The Campbell Collaboration 2006

*This article is written by the Nordic Campbell Centre. The article has been approved by the authors of the review.*

---

## **Education programmes may reduce bullying and conflicts among children**

*School-based education programmes aimed at children's ability to interpret social situations may reduce aggressive and disruptive behaviour among children. These are the findings of a systematic Campbell review of the best international research findings in the field.*

### **Trouble in the playground**

Fighting, arguments and bullying among school children is a widespread problem. Attempts are often made to counter these social problems by introducing school-based education programmes, which, in one way or another, aim to remedy violent and disruptive behaviour.

This systematic review examines one such type of education programme: the type that seeks to strengthen cognitive skills and thought patterns among children to improve their ability to interpret and respond to cues from the world around them (so-called *Social Information Processing Interventions*). The researchers examine two groups of education programmes: those aimed at entire classes and those aimed at selected children who either have behavioural problems or are at risk of developing them.

### **Positive effect**

The researchers' conclusion is clear: children who participate in this type of education programme exhibit less aggressive and disruptive behaviour than children who do not participate. The positive effect is achieved in both groups in the study, albeit with some variation in the findings:

As regards programmes for entire classes, the research indicates that short, intensive interventions – e.g. 8-16 weeks of 2-5 hours a week – are more effective than extended year-long programmes. Extended programmes may have a tendency to become routine and thus have less impact on the students.

Where the education programmes target children in special education classes, the effect is lesser than in ordinary classes. Pupils in special classes may be prone to many other problems which could reduce the impact of this type of education.

Conversely, the effect achieved appears to be especially large where the intervention is delivered outside of the regular classroom to children who are at risk for developing later behavioural problems. The researchers maintain that this may be due to the fact that children in the at-risk group have greater change potential.

### **Focus on thought patterns rather than on behaviour**

The education programmes in the research review sort under the general concept of *Social Information Processing Interventions*. This concept embodies a number of different interventions, all of which seek to train children to encode and interpret information and cues in social interaction, and to identify an appropriate response.

Through structured exercises and activities, the education programmes are designed to build the children's capacity in respect of one or more of the following six stages:

1. Encoding of own and others' cues
2. Interpretation of cues
3. Clarifying a goal
4. Identifying possible responses for achieving the goal
5. Choosing a response
6. Behavioural response enactment

The idea is that negative social behaviour, aggression for instance, may be construed as symptomatic of cognitive deficits at one or more of the above stages. The education programmes are designed to remedy these cognitive deficits.

Thus, the education focuses on building the children's cognitive skills and thought patterns rather than on directly modifying their behaviour. In this way, these education programmes are distinct from the many different types of behaviour-focused interventions currently practised. By directing attention at thought patterns instead of at behaviour, the aim is to strengthen the children's general social skills.

### **Facts about the systematic review**

All education programmes in the review were conducted during normal school hours. The research review falls into two parts. One part, which examines ordinary classes, is based on 73 individual studies, while the other part, which looks at selected children with behavioural problems or at risk of developing them, is based on 47 studies.

Programmes in the first part are delivered to essentially equal numbers of girls and boys aged 4-16. In the second part, the programme participants are primarily boys aged 6 to 16. This difference may be seen as an indication that boys generally make up the majority of pupils exhibiting at-risk or aggressive behaviour. The programmes in the second part also include more children from different ethnic backgrounds than the first part of the research review. Around half of the pupils are from lower socio-economic background families.

For both parts, the majority of the studies were conducted in the USA, while studies from Australia, Canada, Italy, Finland, Israel and India were also included.

### **Other research in the area**

Internationally, a number of social skills studies already exist. However, the majority of these studies address social skills in a more general sense and do not have the specific focus on education programmes adopted by the present research review.

This article is based on the Campbell Review:

Wilson SJ & Lipsey MW: *The Effects of School-based Social Information Processing Interventions on Aggressive Behaviour, Part I: Universal Programmes & Part II: Selected/Indicated Pull-out Programmes*, The Campbell Collaboration 2006



This article is written by the Nordic Campbell Centre. The article has been approved by the authors of the review.

See also [www.nc2.net](http://www.nc2.net)

---

## EDUCATION PROGRAMMES MAY REDUCE BULLYING AND CONFLICTS AMONG CHILDREN

School-based education programmes aimed at children's ability to interpret social situations may reduce aggressive and disruptive behaviour among children. These are the findings of a systematic Campbell review of the best international research findings in the field.

### TROUBLE IN THE PLAYGROUND

Fighting, arguments and bullying among school children is a widespread problem. Attempts are often made to counter these social problems by introducing school-based education programmes, which, in one way or another, aim to remedy violent and disruptive behaviour.

This systematic review examines one such type of education programme: the type that seeks to strengthen cognitive skills and thought patterns among children to improve their ability to interpret and respond to cues from the world around them (so-called *Social Information Processing Interventions*). The researchers examine two groups of education programmes: those aimed at entire classes and those aimed at selected children who either have behavioural problems or are at risk of developing them.

### POSITIVE EFFECT

The researchers' conclusion is clear: children who participate in this type of education programme exhibit less aggressive and disruptive behaviour than children who do not participate. The positive effect is achieved in both groups in the study, albeit with some variation in the findings:

As regards programmes for entire classes, the research indicates that short, intensive interventions – e.g. 8-16 weeks of 2-5 hours a week – are more effective than extended year-long programmes. Extended programmes may have a tendency to become routine and thus have less impact on the students.

Where the education programmes target children in special education classes, the effect is lesser than in ordinary classes. Pupils in special classes may be prone to many other problems which could reduce the impact of this type of education.

Conversely, the effect achieved appears to be especially large where the intervention is delivered outside of the regular classroom to children who are at risk for developing later behavioural problems. The researchers maintain that this may be due to the fact that children in the at-risk group have greater change potential.

### FOCUS ON THOUGHT PATTERNS RATHER THAN ON BEHAVIOUR

---

---

The education programmes in the research review sort under the general concept of *Social Information Processing Interventions*. This concept embodies a number of different interventions, all of which seek to train children to encode and interpret information and cues in social interaction, and to identify an appropriate response.

Through structured exercises and activities, the education programmes are designed to build the children's capacity in respect of one or more of the following six stages:

- Encoding of own and others' cues
- Interpretation of cues
- Clarifying a goal
- Identifying possible responses for achieving the goal
- Choosing a response
- Behavioural response enactment

The idea is that negative social behaviour, aggression for instance, may be construed as symptomatic of cognitive deficits at one or more of the above stages. The education programmes are designed to remedy these cognitive deficits.

Thus, the education programmes focuses on building the children's cognitive skills and thought patterns rather than on directly modifying their behaviour. In this way, these education programmes are distinct from the many different types of behaviour-focused interventions currently practised. By directing attention at thought patterns instead of at behaviour, the aim is to strengthen the children's general social skills.

#### FACTS ABOUT THE SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

All education programmes in the review were conducted during normal school hours. The research review falls into two parts. One part, which examines ordinary classes, is based on 73 individual studies, while the other part, which looks at selected children with behavioural problems or at risk of developing them, is based on 47 studies.

Programmes in the first part are delivered to essentially equal numbers of girls and boys aged 4-16. In the second part, the programme participants are primarily boys aged 6 to 16. This difference may be seen as an indication that boys generally make up the majority of pupils exhibiting at-risk or aggressive behaviour. The programmes in the second part also include more children from different ethnic backgrounds than the first part of the research review. Around half of the pupils are from lower socio-economic background families.

For both parts, the majority of the studies were conducted in the USA, while studies from Australia, Canada, Italy, Finland, Israel and India were also included.

#### OTHER RESEARCH IN THE AREA

Internationally, a number of social skills studies already exist. However, the majority of these studies address social skills in a more general sense and do not have the specific focus on education programmes adopted by the present research review.

---

---

## THE REVIEW RESULTS AND DANISH PRACTICE

*By Sidsel Stenbak, anti-bullying-consultant*

The majority of Danish schools have experience with programmes and interventions against bullying. The described education programmes can contribute to this effort in relation to the general work with the social dynamic in classes – but only in part.

In my opinion the results of the review are not surprising because the children have been with adults who are fundamentally interested in children's lives and their social life. It is my experience that there is an observable effect when students experience that adults are interested in and take their thoughts, feelings, opinions and experiences seriously. When the children experience that they are seen and acknowledged.

It is likely that this challenge is even larger in special education classes where the children are already stigmatized and may have massive negative self-image issues. This may be the reason why the effect of the interventions is smaller in special education classes. It is my experience that adults have to pave the way to bring excluded children back into the group. The excluded child does not have possibility to do this alone due to its position of being excluded in the first place.

It is vital for a child to feel that they are "one of the group", that they belong to a community of children. In this respect the class environment is a crucial social arena in the cultural community the child is growing up in. The group represents necessary developmental potentials and, in contrast, exclusion from the group is associated with deep existential fears.

If aggression and exclusion are the norm and reflected in language use, it will become a natural part of the children's mindset and behaviour. Children decode their surroundings based on their experiences and on the community of interpretation they are placed in by the adult world.

Therefore it is necessary when working with bullying to relate to the specific teaching environment: How are teacher/student-relations; how are student/student-relations? Who has the right to define the "right way" to behave in a specific situation? If the bully says: "But, it was just a joke. You need to be able to take a joke!" then who is being belittled and considered to be wrong?

All efforts reducing bullying are welcomed in the educational world. The complexity of bullying still needs to be unravelled and this area is in many ways characterized by sporadic efforts. We are on the verge of transition in this area as evaluations and effect studies are becoming common knowledge. We – and the children – are still waiting for that day.

*The content of this box is solely the opinion of Sidsel Stenbak.*

## BULLYING AND CONFLICTS IN DENMARK

In Denmark when it comes to social problems between children, bullying is the top issue on the agenda.

According to a survey by The Danish Children's Council and The National Danish Centre for Educational Environment (DCUM) on bullying and conflicts among 9<sup>th</sup> grade students (aged 13-14) 87 % of the students are involved in conflicts at least once a month. App. 20 % are involved in conflicts at least twice a week.

The majority of conflicts are solved in a peaceful manner, but app. 14 % involve violence and app. 12 % use threats to solve conflicts.

Conflicts arise for many reasons; however the students find that misunderstandings are the primary cause.

*Source:* The Danish Children's Council & DCUM: "Mobning og konflikt 2006"

DCUM has collected data based on electronic questionnaires answered by more than 38.000 students from 4<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> grade (aged 8-15) in 428 Danish schools:

23 % reply that in their opinion foul language is always or often used in the classroom.

18 % state that they have been bullied by one or more of their classmates within the last two months

17 % state that they during the last two months have participated in bullying other students

*Source:* DCUM

### **Read more**

[www.amoktrix.dk](http://www.amoktrix.dk) Anti-bullying-consultants

[www.brd.dk](http://www.brd.dk) The Danish Children's Council

[www.dcum.dk](http://www.dcum.dk) – DCUM

[www.brugkonflikten.dk](http://www.brugkonflikten.dk) – DCUM campaign on conflicts in school

[www.dkr.dk](http://www.dkr.dk) – National Crime Prevention Council

---

**Date:** 29<sup>th</sup> of February 2008

**Author(s):** Campbell Collaboration Users Group co-chairs Merete Konnerup & Amanda Sowden

**Status:** Approved by C2 steering group at March 2008 meeting in Oslo

## **User involvement in the systematic review process Campbell Collaboration Policy Brief**

### **Background**

It is widely acknowledged that user involvement in the systematic review process is important, most notably to ensure that the review findings are credible and useful. Most systematic review guidelines, handbooks and textbooks provide information about the role that users might play and how they might be engaged in the production process.<sup>1-4</sup>

### **Who is a user?**

In the context of The Campbell Collaboration the term user refers to:

- i) people (or their representatives) who receive a service, intervention or programme
- ii) practitioners (e.g social workers, teachers, police officers, doctors)
- iii) policy-makers
- iv) researchers
- v) funders

Generally, this is in line with other organisations producing systematic reviews. For example, the Cochrane Collaboration is committed to user involvement and encourages review authors to seek and incorporate user views (consumers, clinicians, etc).<sup>2</sup> The Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) at the University of York, UK uses the term user to refer to any person or group who might potentially use the findings of a review.<sup>1</sup> All systematic reviews produced by CRD have an advisory group, containing a range of users who input at various stages throughout the process. Similarly, the EPPI-centre based at the University of London refers to the importance of user involvement and gives users of services, practitioners, policy makers, researchers, employers and members of the public as examples of users.<sup>5</sup> Other organisations such as the Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE), UK use the term stakeholder to refer to service users and carers, practitioners, policy makers and researchers and recommends ideally that all stakeholder groups be involved in the review process.<sup>3</sup>

### **How can users be involved in the systematic review process?**

Users have contributed to systematic review production in various ways, for example by identifying and prioritising review topics, defining review questions and important outcomes, conducting reviews, editing review protocols and reports, and disseminating and implementing review findings in practice. Users also contribute in other ways, for example by enhancing scientific quality through discussion about intervention integrity

---

(what type of contamination should reviewers look for) and transferability (external validity).

### **User involvement in Campbell systematic reviews**

User involvement is central to the ten principles governing the production of Campbell systematic reviews:

- *Collaboration*, by internally and externally fostering good communications, open decision-making and teamwork
- Building on the *enthusiasm* of individuals, by involving and supporting people of different skills and backgrounds
- *Avoiding duplication*, by good management and co-ordination to maximise economy of effort
- *Minimising bias*, through a variety of approaches such as scientific rigour, ensuring broad participation, and avoiding conflicts of interest
- *Keeping up to date*, by a commitment to ensure that Campbell Reviews are maintained through identification and incorporation of new evidence
- Striving for *relevance*, by promoting the assessment of interventions using outcomes that matter to people making choices in education, crime and justice, and social welfare
- Promoting *access*, by wide dissemination of the outputs of the Collaboration, engaging potential users of evidence, taking advantage of strategic alliances, and by promoting appropriate prices, content and media to meet the needs of users worldwide
- Ensuring *quality*, by being open and responsive to criticism, applying advances in methodology, and developing systems for quality improvement
- *Continuity*, by ensuring that responsibility for reviews, editorial processes and key functions is maintained and renewed
- Enabling *wide participation* in the work of the Collaboration by reducing barriers to contributing and by encouraging diversity.

To date, user involvement has occurred mainly through the Nordic Campbell Centre (NC2). NC2 has established reference groups for 15 of the Campbell reviews they support financially. User involvement is sought early in the review process and includes a broad range of users.

A spectrum of user involvement in the systematic review process is proposed, ranging from determining the scope of the review and the outcomes of relevance, to determining the need for a review and involvement throughout all stages of production and dissemination. Each of the three co-ordinating groups (Social Welfare, Education and Crime and Justice) will determine the extent of user involvement within their respective groups. The Users group can help in identifying users through its various networks.

User involvement will develop over time, but as a starting point it is recommended that authors establish an ‘advisory’ or ‘user’ group to oversee the production process. The

---

advisory group needs to be a manageable size, as input will need to be coordinated to inform key decisions throughout the review process. Generally, the broader the review question the broader the experience required. Terms of reference can be used to ensure clarity about what is required and tasks might include one or more of:

- Refining the review question
- Defining the boundaries for the interventions and populations to be included
- Setting priorities for outcomes to be assessed
- Suggesting important background information that clarifies issues from different perspectives
- Identifying studies for inclusion
- Helping to interpret the findings of the review
- Commenting on the review protocol and draft report
- Contributing to the dissemination plan and helping to disseminate the findings to relevant groups.

## References

1. Khan K, ter Riet G, Glanville J, Sowden A, Kleijnen J. *Undertaking Systematic Reviews of Research on Effectiveness. CRD's Guidance for those Carrying Out or Commissioning Reviews*. Vol. CRD Report Number 4 (2nd Edition). 2001, York: Centre for Reviews and Dissemination.
2. The Cochrane Collaboration. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions 4.2.6*. 2006, Oxford: The Cochrane Collaboration.
3. Coren E, Fisher M. *The Conduct of Systematic Research Reviews for SCIE Knowledge Reviews*. 2006, London: Social Care Institute for Excellence.
4. Petticrew M, Roberts H. *Systematic Reviews in the Social Sciences*. 2006, Oxford: Blackwell.
5. EPPI-Centre. *Involving representatives of all those who might have a vested interest in a particular systematic review helps to ensure that it is a relevant and useful piece of research*. [cited 2008 Feb 12]; <http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/Default.aspx?tabid=169>.