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Subcommittee Activities

- **Subcommittee meetings**
  - ✓ September 8
    - Pre-conference call by Fabelo with Development Services Group (DSG) to review scoring system for “CrimeSolutions.gov”
    - Post-meeting follow-up by Cullen with DSG
    - Post-meeting follow-up with CSG by Fabelo and Cabral
  - ✓ October 5
    - Review of issues and follow-up with emails with relevant parties
  - ✓ December 5
    - Review of report and recommendations
Issues Reviewed

• **Methodology and Scoring Process**
  ✓ Are there any salient issues that need to be addressed related to the peer review methodology and scoring process?
    ▪ Particular review of what “insufficient evidence” means and why is this not reported as a scoring category
      o Scoring categories: Effective, Promising, No Effects

• **Crimesolutions as main “portal”**
  ✓ Should “CrimeSolutions.gov” be the main “portal” for evidence-translation for all OJP?
    ▪ Review of similar efforts within OJP offices
      o Example: OJJDP Model Program Guide
    ▪ Review of similar efforts outside OJP but sponsored by OJP
      o Example: CSG “What Works” for Re-entry sponsored by OJP

• **Informal survey of practitioners**
  ✓ Can we get an informal, non-scientific idea of the extend that practitioners are familiar with CrimeSolutions.gov?
Crimesolutions Methodology and Scoring Process

• **Review of general methodology**
  ✓ Administered by a professional well-trained staff per requirements with Development Services Group
  ✓ 50 to 70 reviewers trained on how to apply the methodology
  ✓ Inter-reliability testing among reviewers
  ✓ Conflict-of-interest provisions
  ✓ Speed of process appropriate to meet quality of review process without lingering debates
  ✓ Dispute resolution process in place
  ✓ Transparent description of process in “CrimeSolutions.gov”

• **Findings**
  ✓ General process seems to meet scientific integrity
  ✓ Issue for further examination is reporting of programs under category of “insufficient evidence”
# Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Rating*</th>
<th>Class 1 - Strong Evidence of Positive Effect</th>
<th>Class 2 - Some Evidence of Positive Effect</th>
<th>Class 3 - Strong Evidence of Negative Effect</th>
<th>Class 4 - Strong Evidence of Null Effect</th>
<th>Class 5 - Insufficient Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective</strong></td>
<td>Must have at least 1 study in Class 1</td>
<td>May have up to 2 studies in Class 2</td>
<td>Must have 0 studies in Class 3</td>
<td>May have up to 1 study in Class 4</td>
<td>Studies do not determine Evidence Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs have strong evidence to indicate they achieve their intended outcomes when implemented with fidelity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promising</strong></td>
<td>Must have 0 studies in Class 1</td>
<td>Must have at least 1 study in Class 2</td>
<td>Must have 0 studies in Class 3</td>
<td>May have up to 1 study in Class 4</td>
<td>Studies do not determine Evidence Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs have some evidence to indicate they achieve their intended outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Effects</strong></td>
<td>Must have 0 studies in Class 1</td>
<td>Must have 0 studies in Class 2</td>
<td>Must have at least 1 study in either Class 3 or Class 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Studies do not determine Evidence Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs have strong evidence indicating that they had no effects or had harmful effects when implemented with fidelity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A single study icon is used to identify programs that have been evaluated with only one study.

A multiple studies icon is used to represent a greater extent of evidence supporting the evidence rating. The icon depicts programs that have more than one study in the evidence base demonstrating effects in a consistent direction.
“Insufficient Evidence”

List of programs presented in a “footnote” as part of the methodology pages

Program not listed under pages reporting on programs as:

- Effective
- Promising
- No Effects

http://www.crimesolutions.gov/about_insufficient.aspx
Issue of Insufficient Evidence

- **Insufficient Evidence:**
  - Studies meet minimum criteria;
  - Studies were subject to review by two reviewers;
- **But:**
  - There were significant limitations in the study design such that it was not possible to establish a causal relationship to the program’s justice-related outcomes
  - There were significant limitations in the fidelity to the program and outcome evidence such that it was not possible to establish a program’s overall effectiveness
- **Therefore:**
  - Programs were listed with “insufficient evidence”
- **Compared to studies and program that are not listed because:**
  - Did not make it beyond the screening stage, usually because the rigor of the design is clearly not sufficient
  - These programs were not reviewed
Big Picture on Numbers of Studies Screened and Reviewed

Count as of December 14, 2011

- Programs in Tracking Database: 642
- Programs Pending Initial Screening: 266
- Screened Programs: 376
- Ineligible Programs: 132
- Eligible Programs Moved to Full Review: 212
- Eligible Programs Awaiting Full Review: 32
- Reviewed: Insufficient Evidence: 50
- Reviewed: Effective: 54
- Reviewed: Promising: 97
- Reviewed: No Effects: 11
Rationale for “Insufficient Evidence” Framework

• **Project Mandate**
  ✓ The project’s mandate has always been to provide a broad array of programs and practices found to have some methodologically rigorous evidence on their effectiveness (or lack of effectiveness)

• **Assumption about Target Audience Needs**
  ✓ Assumption that target audiences visit the site primarily to find programs and practices that likely can help them achieve certain objectives and audiences are alerted to programs they should avoid ("No Effects" programs)

• **Insufficient Evidence as a Footnote**
  ✓ “Insufficient Evidence” category a presently listed at least show programs that site visitors should at best approach cautiously

• **Insufficient Evidence as Score May “De-value” Utility**
  ✓ An “Insufficient Evidence” in the scoring category could over time “muddy the waters” since the number of programs with insufficient evidence could quickly outnumber those with evidence, and site visitors might be confused about how to use such information
**Consensus and Recommendations Regarding Issue of Insufficient Evidence**

- **Subcommittee Consensus:**
  - It is important to know which programs had some evidence but in which we cannot say if they work or not work
  - Programs that are politically “hyped” as successful may be in the category of “insufficient evidence” and stating this is important

- **Recommendations:**
  - Make the list of insufficient-evidence programs more consumer friendly
  - This might involve at least two revisions:
    - A) Have a more informative statement as to how programs arrive on this list by incorporating and updating the flowchart for the selection criteria presented here
    - B) Make distinction between programs that did not make the list because of “inadequate” evidence vs. programs in which the evidence was “insufficient” to draw a conclusion
  - Then say that we are listing these programs for two reasons:
    - (1) To inform practitioners and policymakers that these programs should be viewed as having insufficient evidence; and,
    - (2) To highlight possible programs that should be evaluated further whether at the federal, state, or local level
CrimeSolutions.gov as Main Portal for OJP Translation Efforts

• **Goal Seems to be CrimeSolutions.gov as Main Portal for OJP**
  ✓ Stated goal of CrimeSolutions.gov:
    ▪ “A single, credible, online resource to inform practitioners and policymakers about what works in criminal justice, juvenile justice, and crime victim services”
      o June 20, 2011 presentation of OJP in NIJ Conference

• **Issue**
  ✓ There are other OJP or OJP-sponsored web sites with “translating evidence” information
    ▪ NIJ has as a priority the translation of evidence initiative
    ▪ OJJDP has a “model programs” site that also “scores” evidence
    ▪ OJP is also sponsoring the “what works” re-entry library administer by CSG
Example of OJP Translation Efforts

http://www.crimesolutions.gov/about_MPG.aspx
Is this study going to eventually listed in “Crimesolutions”?

A Randomized Trial of Healthy Families New York (HFNY): Does Home Visiting Prevent Child Maltreatment?

Authors: Kimberly DuMont, Kristen Kirkland, Susan Mitchell-Herzfeld, Susan Ehrhard-Dietzel, Monica L. Rodriguez, Eunju Lee, China Layne, and Rose Greene

This study evaluated the effectiveness of a state-administered home visit program, Healthy Families New York, based on the Healthy Families America (HFA) model, in preventing child maltreatment and risk of delinquency. This study presents evidence to suggest that involving families in home visiting services early on promotes positive experiences within the home during the early years of life for both the mother and child. These benefits include healthier birth outcomes, healthy parenting and positive school experiences. Researchers concluded that HFA-based programs can produce lasting effects with a diverse population.

Read the complete report A Randomized Trial of Healthy Families New York (HFNY): Does Home Visiting Prevent Child Maltreatment? (pdf, 156 pages)
Upcoming CSG “What Works” in Re-entry Library

What Works

The Resource Center, in partnership with the Urban Institute and the Prisoner Reentry Institute at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, will establish a “what works” library for the National Reentry Resource Center Web site. The process will include collecting lessons learned from practitioners and policymakers, an extensive review of published works, and a thorough scan of the field to determine what works in prisoner reentry, which will be summarized and distilled in a rigorous, yet practitioner-friendly, manner.
Recommendations Regarding CrimeSolutions.gov as Main Portal

- **Recommendations:**
  - OJP should examine how to integrate key components of other “evidence-translation efforts” into “CrimeSolutions.gov”
    - Select from NIJ studies key studies to highlight in CrimeSolutions.gov
    - Link or merge with “what works” library of CSG
  - Start exploring the utility of “meta analysis” to make statements in cohesive program or policy areas that merit examination
  - Start exploring adding a section to CrimeSolutions.gov on elements of effective programs (“take away messages” for each area)
    - Example of Latessa’s presentation to OJP
Non-scientific Survey of Practitioners

• **Issue:**
  ✓ Feedback from practitioners regarding familiarity and use of “CrimeSolutions.gov”

• **Method:**
  ✓ Simple and non-scientific due to best available resource at this time for a survey
  ✓ Short survey given to practitioners participating in three CSG sponsored webinars in October and November

• **Webinar Titles and Dates**
  ✓ Innovations in Substance Abuse Treatment: Continuing Care and Medicated-Assisted Treatments for the CJ Population – October 25, 2011
  ✓ How and Why Probation Departments Should Partner with Families? - November 22, 2011
Innovations in Substance Abuse Treatment: Continuing Care and Medicated-Assisted Treatments for the CJ Population – October 25, 2011

Participants 548

Familiar/Used CrimeSolutions.gov 8% (43)

223 Stated Profession

56% - Law Enforcement
28% - Social Work
9% - Research/Education

Referred by:
39% from OJP Website
29% from Employee
29% from Other

Purpose:
36% find effective program at state
30% - Find about Evidence-Based Practices
18% - Other

86% - Law Enforcement
18% - Social Work
6% - Education/Research
17% - Other

• All users found easy to navigate
• Most users reported using 1-2 times

Participants
720

Familiar/Used
CrimeSolutions.gov
9%
(67)

285 Stated Profession

49% - Law Enforcement
31% - Social Work
8% - Education/Research
12% - Other

Referred by:
27% from OJP Website
36% from Employee
37% from Other

Purpose:
None Reported

• All but one user found easy to navigate (98.3%)

• Most users reported using 1-2 times
How and Why Probation Departments Should Partner with Families? - November 22, 2011

Participants
332

Familiar/Used
CrimeSolutions.gov
18%
159

Stated Profession

61% - Law Enforcement
11% - Social Work
11% - Research/Education
18% - Other

Referred by:
39% from OJP Website
36% from Employee
25% from Other

Purpose:
None Reported

60% - Law Enforcement
20% - Social Work
7% - Education/Research
13% - Other

- All but one user found easy to navigate (93%)
- Over half of users reported using 1-2 times
- About 15% used the site more than 8 times
Issue and Recommendations Regarding Familiarity with CrimeSolutions.gov

• Issue
  ✓ Non-scientific survey of practitioners indicate low familiarity with CrimeSolutions.gov

• Web metric report below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biweekly Dates</th>
<th>Unique Visitors</th>
<th>Average Visits per Visitor</th>
<th>Visits</th>
<th>Average Visits per day</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 17-30</td>
<td>16,108</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>23,245</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1-15</td>
<td>7,651</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>13,739</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 16-31</td>
<td>6,365</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>12,088</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1-15</td>
<td>3,934</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>8,941</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 16-31</td>
<td>5,573</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>12,240</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1-15</td>
<td>5,501</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>11,707</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 16-30</td>
<td>4,772</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>11,063</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1-15</td>
<td>3,863</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>10,355</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 16-31</td>
<td>4,861</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>11,881</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1-15*</td>
<td>6,336</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 16-30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1-15*</td>
<td>7,502</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>14,150</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From Nov. 13th -Dec. 5th two of three servers were not generating data, so these numbers may actually be larger.

**Due to server issues there is no data during this biweekly period.
• Recommendations
  ✓ OJP needs to develop a communications plan to publicize the web site
    ▪ Publicity in “trade” group and associations
    ▪ Publicity as part of program funding announcement
    ▪ Publicity by other OJP agencies
  ✓ OJP should conduct a more scientific survey to get more comprehensive feedback on use/utility of CrimeSolutions.gov
  ✓ Should expand reach of “hyper links” back to CrimeSolutions.gov
    ▪ Presently 93 hyper links
      o Example, link from dc.state.fl.us
• Explore “science opportunities” with BJA
• Relationship between “Diagnostic Center” and the CrimeSolutions.gov effort
  ✓ “Diagnostic Center” update needed for further discussion
• Plans for integrating “meta analysis” into CrimeSolutions.gov
• Plan for expanding/adding “take away” messages from each area
  ✓ Principles of effective programs
• More in-depth focus group on the use and utility of CrimeSolutions.gov