

Minutes of the Twenty-Second Meeting of the
Campbell Collaboration Crime and Justice Group Steering Committee
San Francisco, CA – November 16, 2010, 9:00–4:00

In attendance:

Steering Committee

Catherine Gallagher, George Mason University, USA
Peter Grabosky, Australian National University, Australia (outgoing co-chair)
Martin Killias, University of Zurich, Switzerland (incoming co-chair)
Jerry Lee, Jerry Lee Foundation, USA
Jianhong Liu, University of Macau/Southwest University of Political Science and Law, China
Friedrich Lsel, University of Erlangen-Nuremberg/Cambridge University, Germany/UK
Santiago Redondo, University of Barcelona, Spain
Phyllis Schultze, Rutgers University, USA (trial search coordinator)
Lawrence Sherman, Cambridge University/University of Maryland, UK/USA
David Weisburd, Hebrew University/George Mason University, Israel/USA (co-chair)
Brandon Welsh, Northeastern University, USA
David Wilson, George Mason University, USA (editor-in-chief)

Minutes

Charlotte Gill, George Mason University, USA (CCJG managing editor)

Invited Guests

Adam Tomison, Australian Institute of Criminology, Australia
Annie Yessine, Public Safety Canada

1. Welcome and Introductions

David Weisburd, as meeting chair, welcomed attendees to the twenty-second meeting of the Campbell Crime and Justice Group (CCJG) Steering Committee. Committee members Jan Andersson (National Council on Crime Prevention, Sweden), David Farrington (Cambridge University, UK), Jacque Mallender (Matrix Knowledge Group, UK), Peter Neyroud (National Policing Improvement Agency, UK), Jonathan Shepherd (Cardiff University, UK), Hiroshi Tsutomi (University of Shizuoka, Japan), and Peter van der Laan (NSCR, Netherlands) sent their regrets at being unable to attend the meeting.

The Steering Committee welcomed new members Jianhong Liu (University of Macau/Southwest University of Political Science and Law, China) and Santiago Redondo (University of Barcelona, Spain), and invited guests Adam Tomison (Australian Institute of Criminology, Australia) and Annie Yessine (Public Safety Canada).

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting (Stockholm, June 16, 2010) were unanimously approved.

3. Editorial Progress

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

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

In summary, 25 reviews have been published, 21 reviews are in progress, and 12 protocols are in progress.

A total of 15 individual projects have undergone some kind of editorial action since the last CCJG meeting. David Wilson has written nine editorial action letters since that date: 3 for new titles, 5 for reviews pre-peer review, and one for a review post-peer review. Since the last meeting, 3 titles, 1 protocol, and 5 reviews have been submitted for the first time; and 2 titles and 6 protocols have been approved by the CCJG Steering Committee.

Fewer final reviews have been published this year than the previous year. However, several are making good progress and should be published early next year. The Campbell Collaboration has been considering ways to speed up the review process and one of the developments is that group editors can now decide, in consultation with the methods editor, whether an external methods review is needed. The methods group deals with all the C2 coordinating groups and can become overwhelmed as a result, so this new policy will help to reduce the backlog. Within the CCJG, experimentation with peer review conference calls has been very successful. Peer reviewers like the process, and independence has not been an issue; on the contrary, discussion and debate has enhanced the quality of feedback. Calls generally take around 30 minutes. The next step is to focus on improving the timeliness of authors’ responses to editorial feedback. The goal is to publish another ten reviews before the next CCJG meeting.

David Weisburd raised the issue of practitioner peer-reviewers. In the Cochrane Collaboration, every systematic review is peer-reviewed by a practitioner, who will highlight issues such as policy relevance and practical relevance of the interpretation of findings. The Committee discussed whether it would be a good idea to adopt this approach in the CCJG. The overall consensus was that practitioner input would be welcome as an addition to the existing review process. Practitioners in the criminal justice field are generally not qualified in methodological and substantive issues to the same extent as practitioners in the health sciences, so they should not be able to veto a review or substitute for a traditional peer review. However, practitioner review could be extremely important in determining the demand for knowledge on the topic and how the systematic reviews could be used in practice. The Committee agreed that this would be best achieved through an advisory board of practitioners that would give their opinions on newly proposed titles and comment on final reports. This advisory board would be distinct from the CCJG Steering Committee, and the Committee would still be open to select prominent practitioner members like Peter Neyroud. Due to the number of topic areas in the criminal justice arena, a broad range of practitioners from different fields would be sought, and

smaller advisory boards would be created for each review, comprised of the most relevant people (along the lines of a journal peer reviewer list). Jerry Lee suggested that individual advisory boards should comprise no more than nine people.

Actions

1. Develop a list of potential practitioners with input from the entire Committee.
2. Develop a list of non-methodological standardized questions for the advisory boards.
3. Raise awareness of CCJG among practitioners through newsletters, links to reviews on websites etc.

Goal: Begin these actions within the next two months, and bring a proposal for moving forward to the next Committee meeting.

4. Funding

David Weisburd introduced the discussion of funding issues by describing the two main concerns for CCJG funding: new systematic reviews, and infrastructure. CCJG has traditionally had difficulty securing funding for infrastructure, such as meeting costs and travel, as compared to funding for specific reviews. Participants received a simple estimated budget for yearly infrastructure costs, which total around \$25,000 (including support for the Managing Editor position). The Managing Editor currently spends 25% of her total work time on CCJG activities, and is supported by the Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy at George Mason University, where she is employed, and editorship money allocated to David Wilson by C2. The latter funding comes from the Norwegian government, which provides some funding for overall C2 operations. Jerry Lee has supported the Managing Editor in the past, and has generously agreed to continue funding lunches and dinners at the CCJG Steering Committee meetings. Jerry also supports brochure printing for ASC. George Mason University currently supports mail and telephone costs. David Weisburd reported that these funds are secure for the next two years, but cannot be sustained indefinitely, and requested that all Steering Committee members look out for grants and foundation funding that could be used for infrastructure costs.

The Committee began a discussion about the long term vision of CCJG and how various funding sources might fit in with this. Overall, the group has had past success in obtaining funds for reviews from Jerry Lee, the British, Canadian, and US governments (National Institute of Justice), the National Policing Improvement Agency, and the Smith Richardson Foundation. However, these funds have been generally ad hoc and could not be sustained. The Steering Committee agreed that all members with connections to funding sources should be empowered to meet with them and discuss options as far as possible.

Catherine Gallagher noted that the Cochrane Collaboration also looked to training and dissemination strategies as well as reviews and infrastructure, and that it is important to seek funding for these types of activities, as they also help to drive up demand. David Weisburd agreed that C2 was interested in following the same model and that Catherine could take the lead on this process as the link person between Cochrane and C2.

Lawrence Sherman noted the growing importance of Asian countries, and suggested that it might be worth considering setting up Campbell centers around the world. David Weisburd agreed to contact Sue-Ming Yang in Taiwan to gauge possible interest in setting up such a center. Jianhong Liu agreed that Taiwan or Hong Kong might be fruitful locations for this type of venture.

Jerry Lee also suggested quick scoping for evidence as a way to help to convince funders of the need to do more primary research and systematic reviews. He will work with Jon Baron at the Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy to develop guidance on how to do this. The Committee also agreed that further progress on these topics could be made when David Weisburd and Friedrich Lösel visit China in the coming months. All Steering Committee members are empowered to discuss funding issues with funders and officials in their countries as appropriate.

5. Update from Springer Publishing

David Weisburd introduced Katie Chabalko, the new editor for criminology at Springer. The previous editor, Welmoed Spahr, regularly attended CCJG meetings. She has now moved on to manage several different areas, but will be keeping criminology in her purview.

Katie provided participants with handouts about the Springer Evidence-Based Crime Policy book series and the Journal of Experimental Criminology. The book series currently has three titles in progress and one forthcoming: GIS, Counterterrorism, Health Policies and Outcomes, and Corrections Treatment. Springer is still seeking proposals for the series, and interested authors should contact the series editors, Lawrence Sherman and Heather Strang.

The Journal of Experimental Criminology is now in its sixth year, and downloads are increasing every year. This year, Springer has for the first time been able to track where downloads come from around the world: they are mostly from Europe and the USA. The journal is still under evaluation with ISI, but other rankings have been very favorable. In the SJR rankings, the Journal had citations and impact factors around the same as the Journal of Quantitative Criminology, and higher than Justice Quarterly and the British Journal of Criminology.

Springer also has a new product: Springer Briefs. These publications fall between journals and books in scope, and are concise research summaries. They are on a short publication timeline but are still peer reviewed. They are available as e-books, or can be purchased for \$24.95. The Springer website also features a new keyword search function.

6. Update on the Cochrane Justice Health Field

Catherine Gallagher reported on her efforts to bridge the gap between Campbell Crime & Justice and the Cochrane Collaboration through the Cochrane Justice Health Field. The field was officially registered as a Cochrane entity in September 2010. Like C2, Cochrane has review groups, but also has fields that cut across review groups in different areas. The Justice Health Field facilitates reviews on topics related to improving health or healthcare delivery among people who are under the supervision of a justice agency. So far they have one review co-registered with Campbell. George Mason University (GMU) will be hosting the Justice Health Field as part of the US Cochrane Center, and will bring in some funding and resources that will also benefit CCJG. This will launch next year, and will bring in post-docs and graduate students and increase the capacity to align efforts between Cochrane and C2, particularly the CCJG, which is also currently centered at GMU.

The Committee congratulated Catherine on her successes. A discussion followed about how best to integrate the two groups. Catherine noted that efforts to build an infrastructure for the Justice Health Field could be applied to CCJG and C2 more generally. The Field could link with the Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy at GMU, particularly its systematic reviews program, as a resource and additional link to CCJG activities. There would also be an opportunity to provide training for reviewers, which would both speed up the review process and

allow for faster responses to policy requests. The first step for the Field is to organize Cochrane's role in US policymaking and practice. They are already working with congressional groups and looking to other countries, such as Australia, for successful models.

7. Systematic Reviews in Germany

Friedrich Lösel updated the group on recent developments in Germany concerning Campbell systematic reviews. A special issue of a journal similar to *American Psychologist* concerning the translation of research to practice was recently published and very well received. The issue included an article about C2 written by Friedrich. The German Research Council is now interested in investing in evidence-based policymaking and reviews. Previously they only funded primary research. This interest resulted in the organization of a workshop, and the possibility of a future project involving research, infrastructure support, and training. Friedrich's colleague Andreas Beelmann has also received a professorship specifically focused on research synthesis and training.

Germany has similar concerns to the US in terms of wanting to look at a broader picture, beyond the very specific topics that have been the focus of Campbell reviews. Further, some of the CCJG reviews are not relevant to Europe, such as drug courts and Scared Straight, which are US-specific interventions. Santiago Redondo has sent out surveys to countries around Europe to find out what kinds of research and interventions are going on there; Friedrich plans a similar exercise. A discussion followed on how CCJG can reconcile its policy that reviews cannot be limited to a specific country with funders' and policymakers' desires to see research on the topics most relevant to them. David Wilson and David Weisburd noted that such reviews could fit the C2 framework if they focused on the policy rather than the country. Thus, a review focusing "only on German studies" would not be eligible, but "on studies of a certain policy that is of important relevance to Germany" would be acceptable. Eligible studies would come from Germany and perhaps other countries with similar concerns. Friedrich agreed that this would help increase interest in C2 among funders who are sympathetic to the group's work, but require a national or regional focus when funding projects.

The Committee agreed that Friedrich should meet with European policymakers and discuss topics for reviews of relevance to specific countries. David Weisburd also agreed to follow up with Eamonn Noonan about the possibility of obtaining funding from the European Union if reviews with specific benefit to Europe in general could be produced.

8. New Systematic Reviews

Catherine Gallagher reported on the progress of the Topic Mapping Subcommittee. The Subcommittee first convened 18 months ago to map out the field and identify important topics for systematic review. This was presented in Stockholm and the Committee requested further work on prioritizing topics for solicitations.

The Committee discussed strategies for translating the groundwork set by the Subcommittee into active solicitation of new topics. One suggestion was to have the Steering Committee members scan their own countries for policy relevant issues that have not been reviewed yet. These issues could be recorded using a web-based form. Catherine noted that previous attempts to develop such a form on the Campbell Collaboration website have not been successful, but new ideas for a form could initially be pilot-tested within the CCJG Steering Committee. Another suggestion was to ask authors who have published systematic reviews through other outlets to consider updating them for the Campbell Library, or agreeing to another

review team conducting an update and registering the review with Campbell. David Weisburd noted that at the recent Campbell Collaboration Steering Group meeting in Colorado, a decision was made to create a policy that meta-analyses not originally conducted for Campbell could be submitted and converted to C2 format without the need to go through the title registration and protocol phases. Catherine has put together a list of non-Campbell reviews on crime and justice-related topics. The advantage in seeking the registration of these reviews is that there is already an identified literature on the topic so there is no risk of an empty review, and the authors already know how to do meta-analysis. Jianhong Liu added that topic areas should also be driven by demand, especially from specific regions.

David Weisburd stressed the need to move from the preliminary work of the Topic Mapping Subcommittee to actively soliciting new reviews. The Committee agree that the Subcommittee should become a permanent standing committee of the CCJG Steering Committee. The new committee would bring a list of suggestions for new titles to each meeting. Catherine Gallagher remains the chair of the Committee, and the original members, Martin Killias, Friedrich Lösel, Jacque Mallender and Tony Munton would continue in their roles. Phyllis Schultze would also join the new committee. A large block of time will be set aside at the next meeting to discuss new topics.

9. Report on Recent Meetings

(a) European Society of Criminology, Liège, September 8-11, 2010

Martin Killias reported on a successful ESC meeting. David Farrington and Maria Ttofi presented their CCJG Bullying Prevention review, and Martin presented on sanctions.

(b) Australian & New Zealand Soc. of Criminology, Alice Springs, September 28-30, 2010

Peter Grabosky reported that around 25 people attended his Campbell session, although it had to be compressed due to scheduling issues. Most of the attendees were already knowledgeable and interested in CCJG. He also highlighted the recent 4th annual conference on empirical legal studies at Yale University, which was attended by academics such as Tom Tyler, Frank Zimring, and Tracey Meares. Around 150 people attend this conference. Peter suggested that this might be a good forum for CCJG to become involved.

(c) Campbell/Cochrane Colloquium, Keystone, CO, October 18-22, 2010

David Wilson reported on the first joint Campbell/Cochrane Colloquium. As with previous Colloquia, there was limited CCJG representation. However, the Jerry Lee Lecture by David Weisburd was very well-received. Methodological presentations by Campbell and Cochrane groups were successful and there were opportunities for crossover of ideas. The meeting also proved fruitful for developing relationships with Cochrane entities; for example, the C2 co-chairs and Cochrane executives met, and the C2 managing editors met with the Cochrane Managing Editors' Executive.

The developments from the C2 Steering Group meeting have already been reviewed in the present meeting. The main developments already discussed were streamlining the methods review process and procedures for bringing existing systematic reviews into the Campbell library. There was also some discussion around the future of C2 Colloquia. The Colloquia have been held around the world and usually attract different groups depending on the local area. This has been useful for increasing C2 exposure, but the Steering Group is now looking to increase production of new reviews, and is considering focusing on this rather than outreach. Future

meetings may focus on this even if they will attract fewer attendees. The next C2 Colloquium may be held at George Mason University, but the details are still being considered.

David Weisburd noted that there is a space for two CCJG members on the International C2 Steering Group. He and David Wilson currently hold these positions. However, the Steering Group encourages turnover and David Weisburd's term is ending. Martin Killias stated his willingness to take over David Weisburd's position. David Wilson may be able to continue his term for as long as he remains editor, because the C2 editors are also supposed to attend the meetings. David Weisburd agreed to clarify with Eamonn Noonan the rules for Steering Group representation.

10. Upcoming Meetings

(a) American Society of Criminology, San Francisco, CA, November 17-20, 2010

Participants received a handout listing the three Campbell panels on the agenda for the current ASC meeting. Two of the panels feature presentations of systematic reviews, and the third focuses on methodological issues around conducting systematic reviews and meta-analysis. The Committee thanked Brandon Welsh for organizing the panels this year, and Jerry Lee for providing CCJG brochures for all conference attendees. Brandon agreed to organize panels again at next year's ASC meeting.

(b) 2nd Asian Society of Criminology conference, Chennai, India, December 8-11, 2010

Jianhong Liu highlighted this upcoming conference. Peter Grabosky is attending and will present a paper introducing the Campbell Collaboration. David Weisburd may also attend.

(c) Jerry Lee Symposium, Washington D.C., May 2-3, 2011

Lawrence Sherman is organizing this year's Jerry Lee Symposium, and the organization of future Symposia will alternate between the University of Maryland and George Mason University. This year's format will be switched from previous years: systematic reviews will now be presented on Day 2, and Day 1 will feature Dan Nagin's policy work around the theme of "less prison, more police." It is hoped that many police chiefs will attend this day.

(d) Stockholm Criminology Symposium, Sweden, June 13-15, 2011

Brandon Welsh agreed to organize a CCJG presence at the Symposium. The Stockholm Prize winners for 2011 are due to be announced during the current ASC meeting.

(e) World Congress on Criminology, Kobe, Japan, August 5-9, 2011

Hiroshi Tsutomi and Jianhong Liu will both attend this conference. Hiroshi has organized a Campbell panel featuring David Weisburd, Jan Andersson, and Peter van der Laan.

(f) European Society of Criminology, Vilnius, Lithuania, September 7-10, 2011

Martin Killias will organize a Campbell presence.

Annie Yessine also drew attention to an evidence-based crime prevention conference being planned for Fall 2011/Spring 2012 in Ottawa, Canada. She will contact Charlotte Gill to consider CCJG participation.

11. Evolution of the CCJG Steering Committee

Effective this meeting, Peter Grabosky stepped down as CCJG co-chair and committee member. The Committee thanked Peter for his service, particularly his persistent “behind the scenes” work on improving the website and outreach in Australia and Asia. The Committee hopes that Peter will continue to stay in touch and offer his advice and thoughts as the group moves forward. Peter was presented with a commemorative plaque and a bottle of wine at the previous evening’s dinner.

Martin Killias is the new CCJG co-chair, and will serve for three years, renewable for a further three years. To ease the transition of co-chairs, David Weisburd will continue as co-chair for another two years, until 2012. He will then be succeeded by David Wilson.

The Steering Committee now has 18 members. The Committee continues to seek ideas for representatives from African nations. Several names were put forward for Canadian representatives (with a focus on Francophone Canadians, as the Committee currently has no French-speaking representatives), and Australian representatives. Suggestions are also sought for Italian and South American representation.

12. Date and Time of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Campbell Crime and Justice Group Steering Committee will be held in Stockholm. The proposed date is June 15, 2011 (possibly starting at lunchtime and ending with dinner), but a discussion will be held over email to ensure that this is the best date for most Committee members, as attendance at the Stockholm meeting has generally been lower than attendance at the American Society of Criminology meeting.