

Office of Justice Programs
Science Advisory Board Meeting
January 11, 2013 Meeting Summary

Welcome and Administrative Issues

The fifth meeting of the Office of Justice Programs' (OJP) Science Advisory Board (SAB) was called to order by Al Blumstein, Chair, at 8:43 am in the Main Conference Room of the OJP building at 810 7th Street, NW, Washington D.C. Agenda at Appendix A.

The Chair welcomed the members of the SAB, and began by introducing Bill Sabol, the newly appointed Acting Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics (replacing Jim Lynch), and Greg Ridgeway, the newly appointed Acting Director of the National Institute of Justice (replacing John Loeb). Both Bill and Greg spoke briefly about the priorities for their agencies and their intentions to maintain the paths set by their predecessors.

Acting Assistant Attorney General Mary Lou Leary also welcomed the SAB members and thanked them for their continuing commitment. She noted the recent election and spoke about the renewed commitment within the Department of Justice (DOJ) to infusing OJP's work with evidence and science.

Al Blumstein raised the issue of "program development" as a concern to the SAB. He expressed interest in reports at the SAB's June meeting on how the Bureaus select which solicitations to fund; that is, what is the decision-making process and the basis for choosing those specific solicitations that will be funded and those not so chosen.. The SAB's interest in program development came up several times during the meeting with the SAB reiterating its request for Bureau briefings at the next SAB meeting.

Updates

- Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Memorandum to Executive Departments and Agencies on the Use of Evidence and Evaluation in the 2014 Budget (May 18, 2012)

Phelan Wyrick, Senior Advisor, Office of the Assistant Attorney General, provided an update to the SAB regarding OJP's response to the OMB memorandum directing federal agencies to demonstrate the use of evidence throughout their Fiscal Year 2014 budget submissions. Phelan discussed OJP leadership's series of discussions with OMB since last Spring regarding the ways in which OJP is infusing evidence into its grant-making activities, including the following: creating CrimeSolutions.gov; funding a demonstration field experiment to test a new promising probation model; and, including the Pay for Success model in its Second Chance Act grant solicitations. OJP also shared with OMB the difficulties, including the lack of a data infrastructure in most criminal justice agencies, the lack of evidence in some areas like the victims' field, and, most importantly, the formula and block grant structure for much of OJP's funding.

To assist states in moving toward funding more evidence-based programs, OJP, through the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) is encouraging partnerships between the National Criminal Justice Association and the Justice Research and Statistics Association and their memberships. BJA has also prioritized funding for crime analysts recognizing the need for analytic support in states' programming. There has also been discussion about incentivizing states to use their formula grant money for evidence-based programs by offering increased competitive dollars to those states that demonstrate progress in this area.

Phelan also handed out copies of a statement by Representative Landrieu in the December 20, 2012 Congressional Record titled "Invest Taxpayer Dollars in What Works" (Appendix B) to demonstrate Congress' interest in evidence-based programs.

- CrimeSolutions.gov

Next, Phelan updated the SAB on CrimeSolutions.gov. He distributed a series of charts that demonstrate the uptick in visits and visitors to the CrimeSolutions.gov website, particularly in the Fall of 2012 when CrimeSolutions partnered with the Criminal Justice Reference Service's distribution system (Appendix C). Phelan also advised the SAB that the operations and management of the CrimeSolutions website is being transferred from the Office of the Assistant Attorney General to NIJ in early February. In March, the website will launch a meta-analysis module that OJP feels will be particularly comprehensible and useful to the field.

Alan Leshner complimented OJP on the website overall and especially on OJP being courageous enough to include on the webpage and publicly say that certain studies do not work and that, with regard to others, we just don't yet know if they work. He was interested in whether other federal agencies were taking a similar approach. There followed some discussion about OMB's concern with so many different registries of programs and whether a universal registry was the best approach.

- OJP Diagnostic Center: Data- Driven Crime Solutions

Katherine Darke Schmitt briefed the SAB on the OJP Diagnostic Center, which is managed out of the Office of the Assistant Attorney General and provides technical assistance strategies that have an evidence base. A hand-out describing the Diagnostic Center was distributed (Appendix D). In its first full year of operation the Diagnostic Center hopes to process 30 TA requests. NIJ will assess the Center's processes. The contractor for the Center is Booz Hamilton.

OVC: Vision 21

Joye Frost, Acting Director for the Office for Victims of Crime (OVC), briefed the SAB on OVC's Vision 21, which engaged a broad group of stakeholders in a discussion about the strategic and philosophical challenges and opportunities they face in serving crime victims. The stakeholders' most singular finding was the dearth of data and research in the field. Due to this lack of data and research, even the most basic questions regarding victim services cannot be answered. The victims' field collectively lacks infrastructure, as well as an understanding of how technology can be harnessed to advance the field. Stakeholders viewed research, development of evidence-based practices, and program evaluation as the foundation of successful victim services policy and practice. The full report is scheduled to be released in February 2013.

There was discussion about the now over \$8 billion Crime Victims Fund administered by OVC and its distribution primarily for state formula violence assistance and compensation grants with less than 5 percent retained for OVC programs. Joye also discussed the statutory limitations on VOCA funding which goes for short-term direct assistance to victims and is carried out by volunteers.

Joye also talked about how OVC is advocating for more funding to go toward research and evaluation, as recommended by the Vision 21 report. Last year, OVC transferred 10 percent of its budget to BJS to fund a systematic study of victim services' infrastructure and capacity. OVC is also insisting that comprehensive grant programs include an evaluation component. David Weisburd expressed interest in how the SAB could reinforce the importance of evidence and science in the victims' field.

Rick Rosenfeld noted current research on victim-offender overlap and asked to what degree statutory or regulatory prohibitions prevent OVC from funding services for victims who are criminally involved. Joye explained that states have strict prohibitions against compensating victims who are criminally involved when victimized, but that there is more leeway in providing services to them. Vision 21 pushes the envelope on who can be a "victim."

Frank Cullen noted that OVC might want to focus on the development of model programs to showcase the principles that make for the most effective interventions since full-blown evaluations of existing programs are not likely now. Al Blumstein agreed that at least certain standard information is needed now and that the SAB could potentially help with that.

SMART Office Briefing

Linda Baldwin, Director of the Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking (SMART) gave some background on the office (Appendix E). The SMART Office was authorized in the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, which was signed into law on July 27, 2006. The responsibilities of the SMART Office include providing jurisdictions with guidance regarding the implementation of the Adam Walsh Act, and providing technical assistance to the states, territories, Indian tribes, local governments, and to public and private organizations. The SMART Office also tracks important legislative and legal developments related to sex offenders and administers grant programs related to the registration, notification, and management of sex offenders.

Understanding that there is insufficient research in the area of sex offender management, the SMART Office recently stepped back to refocus on the development of best practices and began a 3-phase planning program which includes: (1) assessing current research, practices, and needs of the field; (2) convening a sex offender management pre-conference forum with national experts; and (3) planning a National Symposium on Sex Offender Management and Accountability for the winter 2014. The culmination of this initiative will help guide sex offender management research, policy, and future grant making efforts.

The SMART Office also transfers funds to NIJ and OJJDP to evaluate programs targeted at sex offenders, such as testing the effectiveness of a risk assessment tool developed in Vermont, evaluating the Circles of Support reentry model across several jurisdictions, and collecting information on juvenile sex offender treatment programs.

Questions were raised about the difficulties with SORNA implementation by the states. Linda noted that the difficulties range across the many differing systems, but most involve the requirement for registration of juveniles, increased requirements for in-person check-ins, and the amount of information available to the public. Linda emphasized that the SMART Office talks with Hill staff on a proactive and regular basis with regard to these concerns, as do advocacy organizations.

With regard to assessing the effectiveness of SORNA, now that 56 jurisdictions are in compliance, the SMART Office is meeting with NIJ regarding a research methodology; however, lack of funding is a problem. Linda agreed with Ed Mulvey's suggestion that some research—especially with juveniles—could be started now to study the impact of SORNA on future offending.

Subcommittee Reports and Discussion

- Quality and Protection of Science Subcommittee

Rob Sampson reported that the January 2012 subcommittee report setting out principles that emphasize independence, objectivity, and quality for the science agencies remains essentially the same. His subcommittee hopes to see that these principles are maintained over time. Where they are violated, the SAB can serve as a “whistleblower;” that is, NIJ and BJS should feel comfortable coming to the SAB for support for these principles in ways that the federal agency cannot should they be violated.

David Weisburd raised an issue that surfaced at the NIJ Subcommittee meeting having to do with the processes NIJ staff must follow when the press or Hill staff request to speak with them regarding a “science” question-- not a “policy” issue. Mary Lou Leary assured the SAB that she would look further into any impediments in this area.

- Evidence Translation and Integration Subcommittee

Tony Fabelo reported that his subcommittee had a conference call with Phelan recently. There was discussion about the need to explain the meta-analyses and how to extract principles from that process.

- Bureau of Justice Statistics Subcommittee

Rick Rosenfeld reported on several issues raised by outgoing BJS Director Lynch in a memorandum to the subcommittee. One key issue concerns OJP's information technology capabilities which are slow to improve in the agency overall, and are especially important to BJS's work. Rick stated that it was not entirely clear how the SAB might assist in improvements to OJP's IT system, but that upgrading IT is relevant to the SAB's larger concerns about data collection and analysis capabilities in OJP. In response to a question from AI, Rick said he felt that data security was also an issue, and a big stumbling block as a result of both a resource and control problem.

Rick next talked about the retraining of census field staff for the National Crime Victims Survey and how the increased training leads to greater staff productivity and greater victimization reporting. Even so, the double digit percent increase in the 2011 reporting of victimization cannot be attributed to the increased training because the BJS used only the interviews of staff who had not been retrained for the 2011 victimization report. At BJS's request, the subcommittee assisted BJS in thinking through how consumers should interpret the 2011 survey results. The subcommittee will also consult with BJS on the release of the 2012 report, which was completed after the retraining of all survey staff.

The BJS Subcommittee spent considerable time discussing how the SAB could play an advisory role with regard to contingency plans in light of almost certain budget cuts to the agency. The view is that, in the process of contingency planning, the following should be considered: (1) what are the core functions (statutory or traditional), given the agency's mission, that must be protected and what are the important but less essential functions that could be substituted, curtailed or eliminated; (2) while there is data collection throughout OJP, BJS has the technical capability and obligation to maintain high quality data collections versus the varying quality of data collections in the other OJP offices; (3) the extent to which there would be disruption if an ongoing series was not continued; (4) the degree to which a given service is used by a large audience and is of great interest to many in the field; and, (5) some sort of cost per unit of analysis or what is an essential unit and how much is it costing the agency to produce.

- Bureau of Justice Assistance Subcommittee

Ed Mulvey reported that this subcommittee is focusing on two basic issues of value to BJA: (1) academic-practitioner partnerships and (2) identifying principles for designing effective program implementation. With regard to academic-practitioner partnerships, Cynthia Lum and Tim Bynam gave presentations at the subcommittee meeting the day before, Cynthia in the police department environment and Tim with regard to lessons learned from Project Safe Neighborhoods. Key lessons focused on having a clear vision of who your partner is and for what purpose; getting academics involved early as part of the team; reaching out to young scholars in mentor-mentee pairs; sharing common data sets and information; and, using state statistical agencies as platforms. The subcommittee sees these ideas as applicable to academic-practitioner partnerships across all of OJP, and not just BJA. BJA Subcommittee Report at Appendix F.

Kristin Mahoney, BJA Deputy Director, introduced herself and described her background. She spoke about BJA's interest in partnering in some way with the American Society of Criminology's young masters candidates' program as a way to develop new talent in the field. There followed discussion about the possibility of the SAB establishing a fellows program for all of the OJP agencies whereby the SAB could serve a matching function bringing together the needs of the OJP components and the interests of both junior and senior scholars from the academic world.

- National Institute of Justice Subcommittee

David Weisburd presented the subcommittee's report entitled "The Distinctive Role of NIJ in Research and Evaluation in the Department of Justice: A Discussion Paper from the SAB NIJ Subcommittee" (Appendix G). The paper outlines various possible roles that NIJ could play to help ensure high quality research in the current OJP environment where science is important across all of the components.

After extensive discussion, the SAB voted to accept the subcommittee report and adopt its two recommendations, which are: (1) that the AAAG convene a high-level working group within OJP to consider how best to use the subcommittee's recommendations, and (2) that OJP establish a "research coordinating council" to prevent duplication of research and evaluation efforts, and encourage collaboration in research and evaluation between NIJ and the other OJP agencies.

- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Subcommittee

Mark Lipsey reported on the subcommittee's interest in the reorganization of OJJDP and particularly how it will affect the research function. The plan has been approved and is moving toward implementation. While the previous organizational structure diffused the research functions, the new organization includes an Innovation and Research Division that encompasses three units, one of which is designated as Research, Evaluation, and Statistics. The subcommittee is pleased with the new organization.

Mark also discussed the subcommittee's interest in the implications for OJJDP from the soon to be released National Academy of Sciences Panel Report on juvenile justice reform. While the report is compatible with how OJJDP views its mission, there are a number of specific issues such as data collection infrastructure improvement where this subcommittee can play a role.

Review of SAB's Activities

Al Blumstein raised two issues for the SAB's consideration that were briefly also raised previously. The first was a request to OJP to report on the processes by which solicitations are formulated; that is, how do the offices choose among the various possible topics to establish their agendas. Al feels that understanding this decision-making process will inform the Board more fully. He would like a report on these processes and decisions at the June meeting.

The second issue involves carving out a non-duplicative role for the SAB with regard to OJP fellowships, both for younger and more senior scholars as a way of infusing knowledge, methodologies, and research skills into the agency. There was discussion about the research collaboration effort already underway between BJS and ASC. Mary Lou Leary noted how the SAB might be helpful in disseminating the solicitations that OJP publishes seeking fellows for the OJP bureaus that currently have very well developed fellowship programs. The Chair asked Mary Lou to consider what possible role the SAB could play in OJP's fellowship programs and report back for further discussion at the June meeting.

Mark Lipsey suggested that, at some point, the SAB needs to explore what are the boundary issues between OJP and outside researchers; that is, more comprehensively examine potential opportunities to bring external specialists into OJP, and get OJP staff more involved in the scientific community outside of the agency.

- The SAB Report on the First Two Years

After a discussion concerning a reference to "legal culture" in the draft report, the draft was approved by the Board and the Chair will transmit it to the Attorney General and other DOJ leadership next week. (Transmittal letter and report are available on OJP/SAB website)

Presentation on New Issues

Thom Feucht advised that Mary Lou Leary had convened a group to think about ways in which OJP could improve how it uses the SAB, and determine if there were any cross-cutting more discrete issues where the SAB could focus attention and offer expert advice. Out of the many topics that were submitted, Mary Lou selected three possible topics: (1) data archiving, (2) human subjects' protection, and (3) research training. Thom was then asked to present these ideas to help identify where the SAB could be most helpful. Presentation at Appendix H.

There was much discussion on all three issues following the presentation. With regard to data archiving, the Chair requested that Thom consult with a small group of SAB members—Tim Bynum, Jim Lepkowski, and others—to identify more specifically where the SAB could be helpful. With regard to human subjects' protection, the discussion turned to a recent Health and Human Services Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that will have a potentially negative impact on conducting social behavioral research. The SAB will look at this issue again at the June meeting. The Board also requested that OJP come back with a sharper focus on how the SAB might be of assistance. Finally, looking at research training, the Board recommended that OJP investigate distance learning opportunities as well as research training opportunities offered by local outside agencies. There was some discussion about having the SAB assist in identifying training opportunities that would be available to OJP staff.

Next Steps

The Chair asked all remaining members to give their ideas of what should be the next steps for the SAB. The following suggestions were made:

- Focus more effort on how we institutionalize the SAB to provide long-term continuity;
- Provide more opportunities to develop a relationship with the agency to identify further roles of science;
- Increase opportunities for exchange outside of the formal funding opportunities;
- Further define the role of the subcommittees in conjunction with the leadership of the bureaus and do so as early as possible before the meetings;
- Increase participation of outside people as SAB's time is limited;
- Involve the SAB more in personnel procedures and promotion criteria;
- Review programs and scientific underpinnings to see where science is not being incorporated;
- Review ongoing programs at SAB meetings to highlight best research and seek opportunities for feedback from the SAB;
- Incorporate OJP work into graduate student education so that young scholars can have the benefit of interaction with OJP; and
- Define the role of the SAB in specific areas.

Mary Lou Leary thanked the Board and the subcommittee members for their participation, and for the candid exchange of ideas which has produced many opportunities for working together. The chair adjourned the meeting at 3:45 pm.



Science Advisory Board Meeting

810 7th Street NW, Washington, DC
January 11, 2013

AGENDA

- 8:30** **Welcome/Administrative Issues**
Al Blumstein, Chair and Mary Lou Leary, Acting AAG
Introduction of Acting Directors NIJ and BJS
- 9:00** **Updates**
OMB Memo on Using Evidence and Evaluation
Crime Solutions.gov and Diagnostic Center
Phelan Wyrick, Senior Advisor, Office of the Assistant Attorney General
- 9:30** **OVC: Vision 21 and the SAB/Discussion**
Joye Frost, Director, Office for Victims of Crime
- 10:00** **SMART Office Briefing**
Linda Baldwin, Director, Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring,
Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking
- 10:20** **Break**
- Subcommittee Reports and Discussion**
- 10:40** Quality and Protection of Science Subcommittee (Sampson) Evidence Translation and
10:50 Integration Subcommittee (Fabelo) Bureau of Justice Statistics Subcommittee
11:00 (Rosenfeld)
11:20 Bureau of Justice Assistance Subcommittee (Mulvey)
11:45 National Institute of Justice Subcommittee (Weisburd)
- 12:10** **Lunch on your own**
- 1:15** Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Subcommittee (Lipsey)
- Review of SAB Activities and Next Steps**
- 1:30** Looking Back on the SAB's First Two Years/Annual Report/Discussion
- 2:15** Presentation on New Issues/Discussion (Thomas Feucht, NIJ)
- Data Archiving
 - Human Subjects Protection
 - Research Training
- 3:15** SAB Discussion
- 4:00** Adjourn



Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012

No. 165

Senate

INVEST TAXPAYER DOLLARS IN WHAT WORKS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, as Congress continues its work addressing our Nation's looming fiscal crisis, we must also remember that we have a responsibility to our taxpayers to improve outcomes for young people and their families by driving Federal funds more efficiently toward evidence-based, results-oriented solutions.

In August, I shared promising news from my home State, where evidence-based Federal programs, including the Social Innovation Fund, the Investing in Innovation Fund, and the High Quality Charter Schools Replication and Expansion Program, are improving education and other important outcomes for thousands of young people throughout Louisiana.

Bipartisan support for investing in what works has been growing for decades.

Under the George W. Bush administration, the Office of Management and Budget put a priority on improving the performance of Federal programs and encouraged more rigorous evaluations to assess their effectiveness.

In 2010, the Simpson-Bowles Commission Report, the "National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform," specifically recommended urging all Federal agency heads to "identify ways to shift from inefficient, unproductive spending to productive, results-based investment."

And in May of this year, the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, instructed all Federal departments and agencies to demonstrate the use of evidence throughout their fiscal year 2014 budget submissions.

At a time when America is facing enormous social and economic shifts, budget constraints at all levels of government, significant demographic changes, and an increasingly globally competitive, changing workforce, our Federal Government must continue to drive public resources toward evidence-based, results-driven solutions that work.

I believe the following principles can serve as the foundation of an "invest in what works" agenda: develop and use a common evidence framework to inform

program design and management; use evidence, data and information about performance to inform policy and drive continuous improvement in Federal programs and grantee interventions; promote innovation and flexibility and focus on outcomes rather than simply on compliance; increasingly target investments in interventions with the strongest evidence of effectiveness, as well as support the development and rigorous evaluation of promising, innovative interventions; and, seek opportunities to promote and invest in systems and communities that are collaborating to achieve significant community-wide impact or change at scale.


I would encourage the administration to incorporate these principles in its fiscal year 2014 budget request, and to consider reserving 1 percent of Federal program funds for independent, third-party evaluations. These recommendations, which are consistent with the 2010 Simpson-Bowles report and the 2012 OMB memo on evidence and evaluation, would provide Members of Congress with reliable information to gauge program effectiveness and drive continuous improvement.

In pursuing this approach, we should remain steadfastly focused on equity and serving children and families in greatest need. Done right, an "invest in what works" framework can advance an equity agenda. Competitive grants can augment and help maximize the impact of important formula funding. When designing such policies, we must prioritize grantees serving children and families most in need and leverage lessons learned to improve the impact of larger scale programs. Moreover, the Federal Government should make technical assistance a priority to potentially high-impact grantees--including rural grantees--that have less expertise in preparing Federal grant applications.


I am fully committed to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to help improve outcomes for young people and their families through the development and implementation of an agenda that invests in what works.

CrimeSolutions.gov Visits and Visitors


Two Week Period



Average Visits Per Day



Visitors Who Visited More Than Once



OJP DIAGNOSTIC CENTER
Data-Driven Crime Solutions

Office of Justice Programs
Science Advisory Board Meeting
January 11, 2013



OJP Diagnostic Center — Building Out the Evidence Integration Initiative (E2I)

OJP launched E2I in 2009 with three goals to:

1. Improve the quality and quantity of evidence generated by OJP
2. Integrate evidence into program, practice, and policy decisions
3. Improve the translation of evidence into practice

OJP is using two integrated resources to put these goals to action:



Evidence Integration Initiative (E2I)

Taking
Data-Driven Evidence
and Translating it
Into Practice



Diagnostic Center Management

- **Managed out of OAAG; participation of subject matter experts (SMEs) across the DOJ and sister agencies**
- **Competitive contract awarded to Booz, Allen, Hamilton September 2011**
 - One-year performance period, plus four option years
 - Currently in option Year 1
 - Task under BJA NTTAC Contract
- **Cooperative Agreement to Fox Valley Technical College September 2012**
 - Tasks around engaging and managing SMEs



How is the OJP Diagnostic Center different from traditional technical assistance efforts?


- Diagnosis phase working with local data
- Aimed at long-term; systems change engagements
- Requires sign off by an executive or decision maker at the community or state level
- Coordinates technical assistance across DOJ and beyond
- Technical assistance strategies have an evidence base
- Follow-up data collection stage



OJP Diagnostic Center Process



- Request for assistance comes to the Diagnostic Center from a community leader, an OJP partner, or a TTAC referral.



- Stakeholders convened to review data that illuminate strengths and challenges in the community.



- Evidence-based programs demonstrated to achieve positive results in addressing the challenges identified.



- Implementation of evidence-based programs and long-term data collection and analysis to assess effectiveness.



Current OJP Diagnostic Center engagements

Stockton, CA: implementing
CeaseFire

CA Board of State &
Comm. Corrections:
community
supervision

Alaska Div. of
Juvenile Justice:
client behavior
mgmt.

Red Lake Band of
Chippewa: alternatives
to confinement

Niagara Falls, NY: crime
affecting tourism

Youngstown, OH:
addressing
violent crime

Fort Myers FL Police
Department:
addressing violent
crime clearance rates

Wash DC
Office of Victim
Services:
identifying gaps
in sexual
assault victim
services

Charlottesville /
Albemarle Co. :
mapping
services to DV
victims



OJP Diagnostic Center Products

- Case reports from engagements
- “How to” guides for communities seeking to implement evidence based programs (EBPs)
- Case studies of communities successfully implementing EBPs



FV 2012 SMART Office Grant Awards and Funded Programs

SORNA IMPLEMENTATION

FY 12 Adam Walsh Act Implementation Grant Program

Total Amount Awarded: \$13,692,206

Total number of awardees: 56

SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT

FY 12 Sex Offender Treatment Intervention and Progress Scale (SOTIPS) Project Sites

Total Amount Awarded: \$450,000

Total Number of Awardees: 2

FY 12 Sex Offender Sex Offender Treatment Intervention and Progress Scale (SOTIPS) Training & Technical Assistance Award (sole source)

Total Amount Awarded: \$200,000

FY 12 Circles of Support and Accountability (COSA) Project Sites

Total Amount Awarded: \$770,658

Number of Awardees: 1

FY 12 Circles of Support and Accountability (COSA) Training & Technical Assistance Award

Total Amount Awarded: \$500,000

Number of Awardees: 1

FY 12 Sex Offender Management Fellowship Program (Victims' Issues Category)

Total Number of Fellows: 1 (\$150,000)

FY 12 Dru Sjodin National Sex Offender Public Website

Total Amount Awarded: \$898,842

Number of Awardees: 1

SMART 2012 Partnerships:

OJJDP Youth with Sexual Behavior Problems Program (YSBP) - \$250,000

NIJ FY 12 Evaluation of the Implementation of the Sex Offender Treatment Intervention and Progress Scale (SOTIPS) - \$1.5M

Office of Justice Programs' Sex Offender Management Assessment and Planning Initiative

The evolution of sex offender management has advanced knowledge about sex offenders and sexual offending and brought about changes in the ways that criminal justice professionals supervise and treat offenders, as well as the ways in which they communicate and collaborate with others involved in the management of sex offenders. Since 1996, The Office of Justice Programs has been at the fore of promoting these changes and is in the position to now "take stock" of where research and practice in the field of sex offender management now stands. OJP and SMART are conducting a three-phase sex offender management assessment and planning initiative to collect information about research and practice in this field and guide OJP's efforts into the future.

Phase I

Assessment of Current Research, Practices, and Needs of the Field

Gather and summarize current and state-of-the-art research on sex offender management topics and practices, including:

- Incidence & prevalence of sex offending
- Etiology of sex offending
- Sex offender typologies
- Internet-facilitated sex offending
- Recidivism
- Risk assessment
- Treatment
- Management strategies
- Long-term management of risk
- Prevention
- Juveniles-specific interventions

Reach out to national membership organizations to inventory, to the extent possible, best practices and needs in:

- Prevention/education
- Victim services and outreach
- Law enforcement
- Prosecution/Courts/Judiciary
- Corrections/Reentry/Supervision
- Juvenile justice
- Registration/Notification
- State, local, and tribal locations

Phase II

Sex Offender Management Pre-conference Forum

Convene a 1 1/2 day forum at OJP February 8 - 9, 2012. Approximately 50-60 national experts in the field of sex offender management-identified through Phase I activities, past summit and symposia panelists and presenters, outreach to other OJP offices and bureaus, and recipients of grant and research awards-will be invited to participate in this conference-planning meeting.

National experts and OJP staff will gather to discuss findings from Phase I literature review and practice/needs inventory. This "peer review" discussion will further refine what is known about the current state of sex offender management, gaps in research and practice, and the needs of the different disciplines involved in this work.

The literature review, best practice/needs inventory, and findings and recommendations from the pre-conference institute will be made available to the public in 2013.

Phase III

National Symposium on Sex Offender Management and Accountability

The next National Symposium on Sex Offender Management and Accountability will be held in Winter 2014. Participants will include law enforcement professionals, supervision and corrections officers, prosecutors and members of the judiciary, as well as researchers and other practitioners in the field of sex offender management.

Recommendations from Phases I and II of this Initiative will be used to shape the agenda of the Symposium. Participants will learn from national and local experts and government officials about the latest and most promising practices in adult and juvenile sex offender management, including prevention, investigation, arrest, prosecution, sentencing, correctional programming, reentry, supervision, treatment, registering, and tracking sex offenders across the country, as well as current research on these topics.

The culmination of this initiative will help guide OJP's sex offender management research, policy, and grant making efforts into the future and provide direction to the field on how best to protect the public from sexual violence.

January, 2013 Report
Subcommittee on Bureau of Justice Assistance
Office of Justice Programs - Scientific Advisory Board

I. Introduction

This report summarizes the activities of the Subcommittee on the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) of the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) for the Office of Justice Programs based on its activities for the period from January 1, 2012 to January 1, 2013. Members of the subcommittee are: Edward Mulvey (chair), Alfred Blumstein, Timothy Bynum, Anthony Fabelo, Edward Latessa, Mark Lipsey, Cynthia Lum, and Faye Taxman. This subcommittee is the newest of the SAB subcommittees; its first meeting was in January, 2012.

Prior to the initial meeting of the subcommittee, BJA director, Denise O'Donnell, and her staff liaisons, Elizabeth Griffith and Edward Banks, met with Alfred Blumstein and Edward Mulvey to discuss current activities of BJA and potential opportunities for collaboration. At both of the subcommittee meetings (in January and June, 2012), Denise O'Donnell and several staff members provided detailed information about the programs and priorities for BJA. Since the initial January meeting, the subcommittee has had two phone conferences and Edward Mulvey has had several conversations with Elizabeth Griffith, Edward Banks, and Denise O'Donnell about potential projects and activities.

It is necessary to keep the mission of BJA in the forefront of discussions about potential future activities. BJA provides leadership and services for the development of programs and criminal justice policies that support local, state, and tribal justice strategies to achieve safer communities. BJA, the largest arm of the Office of Justice Programs in terms of annual expenditures, has a broad mission to support and inform programming in criminal justice. Its overall goal is to improve the functioning of the criminal justice system by bringing evidence-based, promising, and innovative practices to the field and stimulating innovations in the criminal justice system.

This has two implications for structuring activities involving the SAB. First, operational effectiveness is paramount, and initiatives are considered valuable if they improve service provision or justice system processing. Similarly, BJA wants knowledge generation that is rooted in the realities of "real world" service provision and criminal justice systems operations. Second, BJA has a broad reach and highly varied set of programs, making it prudent to think in terms of targeted areas rather than agency-wide projects. Circumscribed efforts focused on particular programs or funding initiatives should be more manageable and likely to succeed. There is the potential for focused projects to inform broader BJA strategies and policies, but the preferable approach is incremental, rather than systemic, change. These considerations have framed the subcommittee deliberations about potential future activities.

II. Assets of BJA for collaborative activities

BJA has several significant organizational assets. Most notably, it has receptive, highly competent administration and staff. Our discussions to date have been frank exchanges of views about opportunities and barriers for increasing the scientific base in the operations of BJA. It is clear that the director and top staff members have an enthusiasm and openness to ideas that make successful collaborations likely. They have demonstrated a commitment to improving the quality of their work and several impressive examples of their continuing efforts to ground their approaches in sound social science. Agency personnel have been open to sharing information about their internal operations and the data collected in the field from their initiatives.

There also appears to be an existing culture within the agency that values and promotes the idea of collecting and considering empirical information. There is an explicit message from the director on down regarding the need to have data rather than anecdotes regarding the scope of a problem and the impact of an initiative. As a result of this orientation, the agency can point to several current initiatives that integrate empirical data collection and the development of models for sound practice. These include the Justice Reinvestment Initiative, smart policing projects, the Second Chance Act demonstration projects, and the development of specialty courts. The difficulties of translating research findings into routine practice are acknowledged as challenges that have to be taken on directly.

BJA officials also point out a recent history of working effectively with NIJ on joint projects. These include the current evaluation of the Project H.O.P.E. model for intervening with high-risk probationers and the evaluations of the Second Chance Act projects for promoting positive prisoner re-entry. In both of these initiatives, BJA implements a potentially innovative and effective model in a way that accommodates a research design to assess program effects. BJA funds the implementation of the model and NIJ funds the evaluation component. These efforts are seen as templates for generating useful information about the feasibility and impact of putting seemingly efficacious program practices into broader operations.

The subcommittee's initial impressions are that BJA has considerable potential to engage in both the development of innovative practices and the generation of knowledge about the implementation of approaches already empirically demonstrated to be effective. The scope of BJA activities provides a rich laboratory. The positive energy and inquisitiveness of the staff provides a resource for both in-house and collaborative activities with potentially high impact.

III. Potential Areas for BJA/SAB collaboration

The subcommittee has identified two areas for potentially fruitful projects over the next year. These two areas were chosen after numerous discussions among BJA staff and subcommittee members. These areas represent opportunities to use the skills and resources of the SAB to promote the development of innovative practices and to promote the translation of scientific knowledge into ongoing practice. They represent areas where the expertise of the SAB subcommittee members can be put to good use to promote activities central to the mission of BJA.

A. Promotion of academic/practitioner partnerships. Partnering with academic institutions provides an obvious strategy for BJA to expand its evaluation and research capacities. Prior efforts in this regard, however, have often been disappointing. It is clear that not all academic researchers are equally skilled at evaluation and research and that many academics are ill suited or uninterested in questions related to improving practice in justice settings. In addition, young researchers often receive inadequate training in applied methods and policy relevant research. Finally, many academic institutions do not reward researcher-practitioner partnerships, often making it ill-advised for junior faculty to spend the considerable amount of time required to make these collaborations work effectively.

Several activities could promote more productive working relationships between BJA and educational institutions as well as improve the training of young researchers in how to do solid, applied studies in the criminal justice system. BJA could establish and require the collection of “core” data sets for particular types of projects, like mental health courts or other specialty courts. Although administrative data sets can vary considerably from site to site, a funding requirement might be the collection of primary data using certain instruments. This would create an attractive resource for researchers, i.e., a large, multi-site data set that individual researchers cannot feasibly collect on their own. These data sets could provide the framework for collaborative projects involving practitioners and researchers, mechanisms for training experiences with graduate students, and valuable sources of information about program operations or impacts. In addition, BJA could expand their current efforts to sponsor joint training programs for academic researchers to work with practitioners and for practitioners to work with academics. Programs to place practitioners or policy makers in academic settings and vice versa (e.g., visiting fellow programs) have been done successfully by several foundations, and these could provide models for such efforts. Other programs to provide academic trainees with experience in practice settings would give young researchers exposure to the realities of service provision and the difficulties of choosing a useful research question at a critical time in their professional development. Improving the collaborative skills and training of academic researchers to do sound, applied work relies on providing resources and experiences that get them out of their standard academic environment, confronting the reality of issues connected with the criminal justice system. Each of these possibilities will be explored over the coming year.

B. Development of principles to guide effective implementation of specific programs. It has become clear to program personnel, funding agencies, researchers, and policy makers that the implementation of particular “name brand” programs does not guarantee success. The development of information about which programs work, i.e., the identification of program models with empirical evidence of their effectiveness, is necessary, but not sufficient, to improving service delivery. These efforts have to be accompanied by the generation of information about *how* programs work well and the conditions and procedures that maximize the likelihood that a sound program will work well in the field. It is necessary to develop principles to guide program implementation; to make sure that evidence-based practices are being put into practice as intended and are in environments that will maximize their chances of success.

The BJA subcommittee and BJA staff have taken on the challenge of identifying and testing principles to guide program implementation in several areas of BJA funding. The idea is

to move beyond the notion of simply packaging evidence-based practices for implementation, and instead on supporting the implementation of proven practices according to principles connected with effective programming in an area. The experience of identifying the principles of effective drug courts will serve as a template for this approach, and the approach taken in these efforts will be applied to other areas of interest.

Two operating principles will guide the development of principles of effective interventions. First, these initiatives should start small with focused efforts, picking programs and locales that have the resources and expertise to participate competently in data collection about the implementation process and outcomes. Second, there should be consistency in the variables collected across multiple sites, and the types of variables collected about program operations should be seen as relevant and feasible considerations by program personnel. Other federal agencies (e.g., SAMHSA) have attempted these types of projects, and future efforts should be informed by these projects.

IV. Summary

BJA presents a potentially very valuable site for collaboration with the SAB. Together, the BJA subcommittee and BJA staff have identified two areas where the SAB could help strengthen the science in BJA operations. The agency is energetic, open, and competent. Moving this agenda ahead in these two areas is the challenge for the coming year.

The Distinctive Role of NIJ in Research and Evaluation in the Department of
Justice

A Discussion Paper from the SAB NIJ Sub-Committee

December 23, 2012

The National Institute of Justice Sub-Committee (NIJSC) of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) agreed that a key issue in defining the research process at the Office of Justice Programs (OJP), and the Justice Department (DOJ) more generally, is the desired role of NIJ in research and evaluation commissioned or conducted outside NIJ. The NIJSC began with the assumption that NIJ involvement in research more generally in OJP (and DOJ) was consistent with its mission. As the research arm of the OJP and the Department of Justice, it seems natural that the NIJ should have some role in research conducted throughout the OJP and DOJ.

At the same time, the scope of NIJ's distinctive mission is unclear. Should scientific research be the sole responsibility of NIJ or should each OJP agency be expected to have or develop a significant research capacity? Should there be a mixed model in which NIJ is an agency whose job is primarily basic research and other agencies have a primarily program and technical assistance role but in which research is supported? The purpose of this discussion paper is to assist the SAB and the Assistant Attorney General in recommending policies that would articulate more clearly the role of NIJ in research in OJP and elsewhere in the Justice Department. The NIJSC is concerned that without attention to this issue, NIJ's distinct role in OJP will become unclear and that in the long run this will both affect the research quality of work in OJP (and DOJ more generally) and the viability of NIJ as a key organization in justice research.

The problem discussed by the NIJSC reflects in part a positive advance in the Justice Department. Evidence-Based Policy has become a key part of policy making decisions in OJP. Indeed with programs like CrimeSolutions.Gov, OJP has taken significant steps to become an evidence-based agency. This focus on evidence-based

policy has naturally led all of the agencies within OJP, and others in the Justice Department, such as the Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services (COPS), to look to research and evaluation as methods of defining not only what programs to support, but to encourage evaluation and other types of research in their programs.

But the sub-committee was concerned that absent a clear policy regarding NIJ's distinctive role in research, these efforts at the OJP would not necessarily meet the standard of high quality research that is an essential component of the evidence based paradigm. For example, field-based assessment and evaluation of programs requires strong scientific rigor. But if there are not clearly articulated standards for such assessments and evaluations, they may fall prey to weak methods. Agencies without strong research infrastructures in this regard may not have the resources available to assess and ensure high quality research. Similarly, agencies with a strong program mission may have less ability to ensure objectivity in research assessments, or high quality data development in programs. Our goal in this discussion paper is to offer broad models for ensuring the highest quality research and evaluation in all OJP and DOJ crime and justice programs.

Research is defined broadly for Justice in the Code of Federal Regulations (28 CFR §46.102(d) as a “systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. Activities which meet this definition constitute research for purposes of this policy, whether or not they are conducted or supported under a program which is considered research for other purposes. For example, some demonstration and service programs may include research activities.” We follow this broad definition for the purpose of our discussion. We see

research as including not only development of systematic data and analytic methods for hypothesis testing and other scientific use, but also as including systematic evaluations of policies and programs. In this context, however, research is not simply auditing of programs as part of efforts to monitor spending. Data collection and analysis meant to understand more broadly the nature of programs or policies or to evaluate their development and effectiveness are necessary components of a high-quality research program.

We believe that the use of research in this context is becoming more common in OJP and DOJ agencies. For example, it is not uncommon for BJA to request some assessment of outcomes of programs supported, and OJJDP has for many years by statute supported research efforts to build better delinquency prevention programs. BJS, of course, has always included an important data collection and analysis function related to criminal justice statistics. COPS has become an important agency for advancing data collection in policing, encouraging police/researcher collaborations, and funding assessments or evaluations of COPS program initiatives. Our purpose in this memo is to open up discussion of what role NIJ should play in the research process more generally at OJP and DOJ, and to propose models that would ensure that NIJ will continue to have a unique function within OJP that supports the research function as fully as possible in DOJ.

What Are the Possible Roles that NIJ Could Play?

In our discussions with NIJ and other OJP agencies, we have learned of ongoing discussions and cooperation that seek to coordinate research efforts. There are a number of models now developing for NIJ involvement in research in other agencies. For example, the new field trials based on project HOPE provide a model in which BJA and NIJ have worked in close collaboration to develop both programmatic and evaluation components for the program. In this case, NIJ has taken the major role in implementing the evaluation. But we also learned of programs – for example, those that revolve around using police data for “predictive” or “smart” policing – in which NIJ, BJA and COPS all have ongoing knowledge-building programs without significant coordination of program development or evaluation.

Whatever the model that OJP adopts for coordinating and reinforcing the quality of the research function, these discussions suggest the importance of the development of a “research coordinating council” that would have representatives from all OJP agencies, and from other DOJ agencies that have interest in research (such as COPS). Such a council should meet regularly and discuss proposed research and evaluation efforts. Such discussions should prevent overlap in research and evaluation efforts, and maximize synergies among programs that would allow for more efficient and higher quality research and evaluation efforts.

We identified four main models for NIJ involvement and participation in the broader research-related activities of OJP and of DOJ. We think these models provide the broad parameters of reasonable and productive directions that could be taken. We

describe the four possible models we have identified at this juncture below and point out some possible advantages and disadvantages of each. But in moving toward any of these models, we think a more general review of the research and evaluation function at OJP is needed and should be coordinated by the Assistant Attorney General.

1) *NIJ as the Manager of All Research Activities*

Consistent with NIJ's statutory mission, the agency might be expected to manage directly all research activities in the OJP (and perhaps other DOJ agencies such as COPS). It is important to note at the outset that this role would not apply to an agency that has a specific research capacity as defined by its mission. This is the case with BJS, which is clearly the agency best suited to collect and analyze data on criminal justice statistics. OJJDP also has a defined statutory research function, and this as well has to be recognized in any effort to manage more effectively the research function. However, in this model NIJ would oversee all research-related functions in which these role-exceptions did not directly apply. This would apply to both basic research and evaluation research.

Advantages: The advantage of this approach is that it would integrate all research activities, and ensure that all have met high research standards. Many other agencies in OJP and DOJ do not have a strong capacity for research, and are not expected to develop such capacities as part of their core mission. This model would place all research under the review of the agency within DOJ whose core mission is the research function.

Disadvantages: This approach would likely overwhelm NIJ's capacity even if existing staffing expectations were fully met, especially given the increased research needs of other agencies. For this approach to be effective, it would require a major increase in the development of the scientific capacities of NIJ. The NIJSC thought this unlikely given the present fiscal realities, and accordingly this scenario would be difficult to implement successfully. Another disadvantage is that NIJ would become more deeply involved in the activities of other agencies. This would likely present significant organizational problems within OJP and DOJ more generally. We are concerned, for example, that an ongoing involvement of NIJ staff in programs in other agencies may interfere with rather than assist the operations of these programs. Finally, this model may be outmoded. Despite a lack of clarity in statutory authority related to research, under current leadership, all OJP agencies are developing with a model of having some type of independent research capacity.

2) NIJ as Having "Right of First Refusal" for all Research Activities

In this model, NIJ would not necessarily take on all research responsibilities. Rather, it would be given the right to define which programs should be supervised by NIJ. In this case, if NIJ saw a specific program as having strong enough scientific relevance, it would have the right to take charge of the research process. This model also might involve NIJ providing some review of all research activities in OJP and DOJ, with NIJ identifying some projects for direct supervision, and commenting on the research activities of others without the direct involvement of NIJ.

Advantages: This approach would not necessarily require NIJ to increase its scientific capacity greatly because it would require effort only in cases that NIJ defined as reaching some specific threshold. At the same time, the scientific quality of key research programs would be more likely to be assured.

Disadvantages: In this scenario, other agencies would not benefit greatly from NIJ's research mission and technical expertise. Moreover, it would allow NIJ to play a leadership role in defining and encouraging high quality research throughout OJP only where such involvement would be particularly salient and represent a strong value added (in the view of NIJ staff). In this scenario, it likely would be difficult to develop clear standards for the research missions of other OJP and DOJ agencies. We are particularly concerned with the quality of field research initiatives in which assessment and evaluation are key components of program development. We recognize that, for example, BJA now involves researchers in order to encourage high quality work in these programs. But we think NIJ has a key role to play in developing methodologies for such assessments and evaluations, and in defining quality standards.

3) *NIJ Would Have Responsibilities for Research Within NIJ or upon the Request of Other Agencies (the "status quo")*

This is in essence the status quo for NIJ, in which NIJ carries out its own research activities and does not have any role or responsibility for research activities in other agencies unless they specifically ask for such involvement and NIJ agrees to assist or

contribute. In this model NIJ would define the research activities of its own funding base. Its involvement in research in other OJP or DOJ agencies would be limited.

Advantages: This is the simplest model to carry out. It would leave it up to other agencies to request involvement by NIJ when they see it as appropriate. It would not create any need for greater capacity in NIJ, and would allow NIJ to focus on projects over which it has full and direct control. It could partner with other agencies, which is already an approach that is taken.

Disadvantages: This scenario would require that other OJP agencies, and agencies like COPS, develop strong research capacities without any guidance or input from NIJ. Absent those research capacities, it is impossible to guarantee that research and evaluation would be developed and reviewed at an adequately high scientific level. This role in the long run is likely in our view to undermine the role of NIJ as the “research arm” of OJP, since there is a growing body of research and evaluation that is being conducted at OJP—and this scenario if continued would lead to NIJ not having involvement in a large part of the OJP research function. Of course, the present situation follows this model to some degree, and we would advise a more thorough assessment of this process by the Assistant Attorney General before drawing any definitive conclusions.

4) NIJ as the Research Leader and Resource Agency of OJP and DOJ

In this model NIJ would be seen as a key resource for all research in OJP and DOJ. It also would continue to play a role in programs in which its help is requested, such as the Project HOPE. But it would not have the responsibility to manage the research

portfolios of other agencies. Rather it would set standards for review, and support research programs in other agencies. For example, NIJ could develop scientific development programs for staff in other agencies that would clarify and define how research processes should be carried out. It might bring staff members from other agencies for “fellowships” at NIJ, which would give them greater experience in research and evaluation. We think, in this regard, that NIJ must place greater emphasis on the development of research and evaluation capabilities to support other OJP and DOJ programs. Perhaps the creation of an “evaluation division” at NIJ would assist this process, since evaluation is a key part of research activities in other agencies. Grant programs on developing field evaluation methods, data collection tools, and experimental designs are required to advance the “how to” of field evaluations in crime and justice. Moreover, this role would require increasing NIJ staff with expertise in research and evaluation methods. We think this investment in additional scientific training of existing personnel, and the addition of new staff, would be critical to advance the OJP scientific mission.

As part of this role, NIJ might screen programs in other agencies for research and evaluation opportunities, and assess efforts after programs are completed. NIJ in this context would play a role as a quality assurance agency for research in OJP and DOJ .

Advantages: This approach would not demand the same level of resources required by an approach in which NIJ would actually supervise and run research activities throughout OJP. But at the same time it could lead to the development of clear and consistent standards for research in other agencies. It also could lead to long term quality assurance of research and evaluation throughout OJP.

Disadvantages: At present, NIJ does not have the capacity to do this well. It would require a new focus on scientific capabilities and knowledge in NIJ (though not as large an investment as scenarios that involve direct supervision of research in other agencies). In turn, this scenario would require a greater investment in scientific and research staff in other OJP agencies, though it is important to note that OJP agencies have in recent years begun to invest in such capabilities already. Moreover, we want to emphasize that this approach would require that NIJ be able to fill open positions, and when possible increase its present mandated staff numbers.

Developing Research Capacities at NIJ and Other Agencies

The NIJ subcommittee believes that each of the scenarios above could be successful in enhancing the scientific quality of OJP's programs. Moreover, our recommendations are not meant to be limiting, and we would encourage the Assistant Attorney General to examine our suggestions and draw from them other possible approaches to improving the research function at OJP.

At the same time, we have come to general conclusions regarding these models. In our view, a model that invests all research functions in NIJ (scenario 1) is neither realistic nor beneficial. It is simply not practical for NIJ to manage all research in OJP. Nor do we think it is beneficial in the broader advancement of evidence-based policy to restrict research activities in other agencies to the degree that this model suggests. Irrespective of whether OJP adopts our suggested models, or other models, we think it important to recognize that the increasing use of scientific evidence and approaches more widely in OJP is a positive outcome of the movement towards evidence-based policy in the OJP and DOJ.

It is our view as well that scenarios 2 and 3 would in the end have long-term negative consequences for the quality of research and evaluation at OJP. For NIJ to simply do well in managing what it defines as the “elite” components of research at DOJ, or only its own research portfolio (as is the status quo), would leave much research and evaluation without significant NIJ input. This scenario might benefit NIJ as an agency in the short run, but it would leave much field research and evaluation outside the realm of NIJ’s rigorous science mission. Moreover, it is likely to lead to NIJ losing its unique identity in OJP, which in the long run could erode NIJ’s core research mission.

We also think a clear definition of NIJ’s research role will produce the best evidence-based policy at DOJ. The present process, which has not dealt directly with the NIJ role, can lead to good outcomes through the good will of participating agencies, a process that is common today. But we do not believe that the OJP leadership will always follow this model without broader institutional support, direction, and encouragement.

For this reason, the committee has come to the conclusion that model 4, or some variant of this model, provides the best approach for managing and encouraging high quality research throughout OJP and related parts of DOJ. It has the advantage of enhancing research quality throughout, while also enabling each OJP agency to pursue its own agenda in collaboration with NIJ and the others as needed. It can lead to advancement in research methods, while at the same time building up capacity in all agencies. It provides for monitoring of quality without requiring that NIJ actually manage the large array of research and evaluation efforts in other OJP agencies.

Overall, scenario 4 would require a significant new investment in research and evaluation staff at NIJ, beyond the additional funds provided through the set aside. NIJ

should focus on developing significant expertise in important areas of evaluation and research, for example, development of an in-house capability in designing experimental and quasi-experimental studies, or in modeling solutions to problems of causal inference in observational studies. Of course, NIJ today has many talented staff members, who could take on some of these roles. But the increase of responsibilities required by the new realities of research in other agencies will require a concerted and systematic effort to increase the staff and science base at NIJ.

In any model that has other agencies carrying out or supervising their own research functions, it will be necessary to concentrate on building their research capacities. We think it better to recognize this at the outset, identify the role of NIJ, and then build such capacities, rather than allowing a situation in which practices and research quality standards are inconsistent. The present orientation to science of OJP agencies provides a particularly fruitful time to focus on increasing the quality of science in the advancement of evidence-based policy in OJP.

We recommend as a first step that the Assistant Attorney General convene a high level working group within OJP to consider how to best use our recommendations. Such a working group would be able to collect more information on the scope of the research function within OJP and DOJ, and the specific organizational and staff requirements that would be needed to better coordinate research efforts and to ensure that NIJ maintains its unique role in OJP. We think that a “research coordinating council” also is required to prevent duplication of research and evaluation efforts, and to encourage collaboration in research and evaluation between NIJ and other OJP agencies.

Proposal on New Issues for the SAB:

Some ideas for possible new “cross-cutting”
SAB subcommittees

Background

- OAAG asked bureaus for input:
 1. How to make greater use of the valuable resource that is the SAB
 2. Suggestions for new issues for the SAB to consider
- Proposals for new “cross-cutting” subcommittees

Subcommittee Proposals

- “Ad hoc” subcommittees
- About 12 months duration
- Relevant to multiple bureaus or all OJP
- Proposed process:
 1. Staff briefings to subcomm on a designated topic
 2. Subcomm deliberates and reports out
 3. Disband

Three Proposed Topics

- OJP programs for data archiving and secondary data analysis
- Human subjects protection in OJP grant programs
- OJP research training issues and infrastructure
- Other topics

Data Archiving

- Primarily involves NIJ, BJS, and OJJDP
- Long-standing program
- Archive infrastructure (NACJD) and data analysis grant programs (e.g., DRP)
- Activities and costs:
 - \$1.5-2.0M/yr across three bureaus for archiving
 - \$200k-300k/yr for secondary analysis grants
 - Other (training, workshops)

Data Archiving, cont'd

- Questions to consider re-archiving
 - Value? Return on investment?
 - Ways to increase efficiency?
 - New technology?
 - Implications for privacy?
- Questions re secondary analysis
 - Right level of funding?
 - Target audiences?
 - Target data?

Human Subjects Protection

- DOJ's HS regulations oblige OJP bureaus to ensure protection of human subjects' welfare and privacy
- Importance of good working relationship with IRBs
- On-going monitoring and training efforts
- Recent developments:
 - New OJP IRB
 - New OJP working group on HS issues
- Emerging issues:
 - DHHS Proposed Rule Changes on HSP
 - Standardizing the OJP Privacy Certificate

HSP, cont'd

- Questions to consider regarding OJP HSP
 - Are all human subjects in OJP grants provided adequate protections?
 - OJP's support and guidance to the field?
 - Input to DHHS proposed rule changes?
 - Assessing the OJP IRB

Research Training in OJP

- OAAG's commitment to making science a priority within OJP
- "Holdren" memorandum on science integrity
- Professional development across the bureaus
- Specific budget provisions for training
- Questions:
 - What knowledge goals? For whom?
 - Untapped training resources?
 - Role of conferences, writing, and other core activities?

Acknowledgements

- AAG Mary Lou Leary
- Marlene Beckman
- OAAG work group
- Bill Sabol, BJS
- Brecht Donoghue, OJJDP
- Alix McLearen, NIJ
- Cheri Crawford Watson, NIJ

Questions and Discussion