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Overview

• NIJ – The new home for CrimeSolutions.gov
• Building “cumulative knowledge”

About CrimeSolutions.gov
– Our core mission: Informing practice and policy
– Our methods for building a rigorous evidence base
  • consistent evidence standard
  • transparent criteria

• New meta-analysis module
The National Institute of Justice

• The research, development, test, and evaluation agency within the U.S. Department of Justice

• Three science offices:
  – Forensic science
  – Physical/material sciences
  – Social/behavioral sciences

• AND – the new home for CrimeSolutions.gov
IMPROVING ULTRA-HIGH-SPEED APP OPERATIONS

New ultra-high-speed applications can provide real-time information and support to criminal justice and public safety practitioners in emergency situations. NIJ is issuing its latest Challenge to develop apps that measurably improve the efficiency and/or effectiveness of criminal justice and public safety services and operations. Challenge prize money totaling $150,000 is available.

Learn how to enter "Ultra-High-Speed Apps: Using Current Technology to Improve Criminal Justice Operations."

Attend a networking and brainstorming meeting on January 14 in Washington, DC.

---

Dear Colleague

Read Acting NIJ Director Greg Ridgeway’s "Dear Colleague" letter to researchers. He describes NIJ’s goals for policing research and invites you to apply for funding to study policing topics.

---

DID YOU KNOW?
Using DNA evidence substantially increases the likelihood of solving property crimes.

WATCH & LISTEN
- All NIJ Media
- NIJ on YouTube
- Research for the Real World Seminars

HIGHLIGHTS
- Join a Conversation on Automated Victim Notification Systems
  How well do automated victim notification systems work at keeping victims apprised of the status of their case?
  Join us on January 15, 2014, at 2 p.m. ET and learn about the first-ever nationwide evaluation of the Statewide Automated Victim Information and Notification program.
  Register for the webinar.

Free Shipping on Selected Titles

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Attorney General Eric Holder announced a $1.5 million grant to reimburse efforts to support victims of the Sandy Hook shooting (OVC)
- Blog supports OJJDP's Juvenile Justice Reform and Reinvestment Initiative (OJJDP)
- Bureau of Prisons holds Universal Children's Day (OJJDP)
- Finalists announced for the Partnership for Freedom Reimagine: Opportunity challenge (OVC)
- Hawai'i Hope: A new probation program boosts the statistics (NU)
- McElroy Park launches new war on crime in east Baltimore (BJA)
- OVC offers free shipping and handling on select publications (OVC)
- Sign up by January 15, 2014, to receive free NCVRW Resource Guide materials (OVC)
- Task Force on American Indian/Alaska Native Children Exposed To Violence holds first public hearing (OJJDP)

PUBLICATIONS

- A Community Court Grows in Brooklyn: A Comprehensive Evaluation of the Red Hook Community Justice Center (BJA)
- A Spur to Innovation: An Examination of the Bureau of Justice Assistance's Field-initiated Grant Program (BJA)
- Correctional Populations in the United States, 2012 (BJS)
- CrimeStat IV: A Spatial Statistics Program for the Analysis of Crime Incident Locations (NIJ)
- 'Cultural Shift': Among Findings of Second Chance Act Evaluation (NIJ)
- Developmental Sequences of Girls’ Delinquent Behavior (OJJDP)
- Federal Resources for Tribal Criminal Defense & Juvenile Delinquency Representation (BJA)
- Felony Defendants in Large Urban Counties, 2009 - Statistical Tables (BJS)
- From Courts to Communities: The Right Response to Truancy, Running Away, and Other Status Offenses (OJJDP)
- Justice Today newsletter highlights BJA’s Strategic Plan (BJA)
- Making Sense of DNA Backlogs, 2012 - Myths vs. Reality (NIJ)
- OJJDP News @ a Glance, November/December 2013 (OJJDP)

... the National Institute of Justice should direct its efforts toward building a body of cumulative knowledge that will assist the criminal justice field in its effort to prevent and control crime and improve the criminal justice system....
What “Cumulative Knowledge” might Mean for the Practitioner

• Wide-ranging knowledge:
  – “Tell me everything I need to know about ‘Topic X’ ”

• Comprehensive program knowledge:
  – “Detailed Owner’s Manual for Program X”

• Knowledge against every eventuality:
  – A complete bookshelf of Owner’s Manuals

Cumulative knowledge may not be something we deliver to practitioners, but rather a process in which we engage practitioners.
Evidence-generating Policy and Practice --

THE GOAL:
To engage the practitioner in an ongoing process of test, refutation, proof, the accumulation of evidence, and the continuous improvement of programs and processes

“Program development and adaptation” v. “Program selection”

- A single, credible, online resource to inform practitioners and policymakers about what works in criminal justice, juvenile justice, and crime victim services
- Launched June 22, 2011
About CrimeSolutions.gov

The Office of Justice Programs' CrimeSolutions.gov uses rigorous research to determine what works in criminal justice, juvenile justice, and crime victim services.

In addition to continuing to capture ongoing reviews of justice programs, CrimeSolutions.gov now also presents reviews of justice practices. A practice is a general category of activities, strategies, or procedures that share similar characteristics with regard to the issues they address and how they address them. While CrimeSolutions.gov program profiles can answer questions like “Did the ABC Mentoring Program in Anytown, USA achieve its goals?”, a practice profile might be used to answer “Does mentoring usually achieve its goals?“ See Why Programs and Practices? to learn more.

On CrimeSolutions.gov you will find:

- Research on the effectiveness of programs and practices as reviewed and rated by Expert Reviewers
- Easily understandable ratings based on the evidence that indicates whether a program or practice achieves its goals. (Program Review and Rating from Start to Finish and Practice Review and Rating from Start to Finish)
  - Effective ✓
  - Promising ✓
  - No Effects
- Profiles of programs and practices with research findings

What is the difference between programs and practices on CrimeSolutions.gov?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>A specific set of activities carried out according to guidelines to achieve a defined purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Answered</td>
<td>How effective is this specific program according to the most rigorous evaluations available?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like to:
- Learn how programs and practices are rated
- Understand how to use this information
- Search for a program or practice
- View a list of all programs and practices
- Find out who rates programs and practices
- Recommend a program or practice

Programs at a Glance

- Total Number of Programs: 293
- 13% No Effects
- 62% Promising
- 25% Effective

Practice Outcomes at a Glance

- Total Number of Practices: 14
- 47% No Effects
- 34% Promising
- 19% Effective
What Will CrimeSolutions.gov Users Find?

• Research on program effectiveness (i.e., C&E) reviewed and rated by expert reviewers
• Easily understandable ratings based on the evidence that indicates whether a program achieves its goals
  • Effective ✓
  • Promising ✓
  • No Effects Ø

⇒ AND - key program information and research findings
8. Program evidence rating

To reach an evidence rating for each program, the study-level information is aggregated.

All evidence ratings based on 1-3 studies are classified as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Rating*</th>
<th>Study Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective</strong></td>
<td>Class 1 - Strong Evidence of Positive Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class 2 - Some Evidence of Positive Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class 3 - Strong Evidence of Negative Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class 4 - Strong Evidence of Null Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class 5 - Insufficient Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Programs have strong evidence to indicate they achieve their intended outcomes when implemented with fidelity.

| Promising        | Class 1 - Strong Evidence of Positive Effect | Must have 0 studies in Class 1 |
|                  | Class 2 - Some Evidence of Positive Effect | Must have at least 1 study in Class 2 |
|                  | Class 3 - Strong Evidence of Negative Effect | Must have 0 studies in Class 3 |
|                  | Class 4 - Strong Evidence of Null Effect | May have up to 1 study in Class 4 |
|                  | Class 5 - Insufficient Information | Studies do not determine Evidence Rating |

- Programs have some evidence to indicate they achieve their intended outcomes.

| No Effects       | Class 1 - Strong Evidence of Positive Effect | Must have 0 studies in Class 1 |
|                  | Class 2 - Some Evidence of Positive Effect | Must have 0 studies in Class 2 |
|                  | Class 3 - Strong Evidence of Negative Effect | Must have at least 1 study in either Class 3 or Class 4 |
|                  | Class 4 - Strong Evidence of Null Effect | Studies do not determine Evidence Rating |
|                  | Class 5 - Insufficient Information | Studies do not determine Evidence Rating |

- Programs have strong evidence indicating that they had no effects or had harmful effects when implemented with fidelity.

*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.

Inconsistent evidence. In some cases, the evidence for a program may be inconsistent, for example, if there is one study indicating a statistically significant positive effect (i.e., Class 1 or Class 2); one study indicating a statistically significant null effect (Class 4); and no third study is available for consideration. In such cases, the Lead Researcher will also review both studies and make a final determination on whether a final evidence rating can be assigned.

Insufficient evidence. CrimeSolutions.gov periodically updates a static list of programs that have been reviewed by Study Reviewers, but not assigned an evidence rating due to lack of evidence. A program is placed on the insufficient evidence list if the study (or studies) reviewed received only Class 5 study ratings indicating that 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 (as outlined in the above program evidence rating chart). See the List of Programs with Insufficient Evidence.
Introducing the new “Practices” module in CrimeSolution.gov
'Meta-Analyses' Gives New Perspective to Evidence

Until now, practitioners looking for evidence of “what works” in criminal justice often had to rely largely on results from single studies at just one site, which made assembling evidence across multiple evaluations of similar programs largely hit-or-miss.

CrimeSolutions.gov has just added more than a dozen practices to its database that are based on a scientific method called “meta-analysis.” It’s a method that combines multiple evaluations of similar programs to render powerful findings of what kinds of programs and practices work.

A “program” is a specified set of activities providing precise guidance in order to achieve a specific purpose. A “practice” is a general category of programs, strategies or procedures that share similar characteristics.

You will still find evidence of specific “name-brand” programs on CrimeSolutions.gov, but the new practice ratings give you additional combined evidence from across multiple programs and evaluations.

Check out the newly reviewed practices on CrimeSolutions.gov.

In lieu of the NIJ Conference, NIJ is partnering with IACP at their annual event. Participate in our Saturday Session at IACP. Learn more.

Stay Connected with NCJRS/ Register Now!
Free registration with NCJRS keeps you informed about new publications, grant and funding opportunities, and other news and announcements. To register, visit:
https://www.ncjrs.gov/subreg.html

See more about NewsFromNIJ@ncjrs.gov.
All Programs & Practices

A Program is a specific set of activities carried out according to guidelines to achieve a defined purpose. Program profiles on CrimeSolutions.gov tell us whether a specific program was found to achieve its goals when it was carefully evaluated. The results apply to the exact set of activities and procedures used for that one program as it was implemented at the time of evaluation. Thus, the program profile tells us that a program is likely to produce the observed result if implemented in exactly the same way. A hypothetical question that might be answered by a program profile is: Did the ABC Mentoring Program in Anytown, USA achieve its goals?

A Practice is a general category of programs, strategies, or procedures that share similar characteristics with regard to the issues they address and how they address them. Practice profiles give us the average results from multiple evaluations of similar programs, strategies, or procedures. The programs, strategies, or procedures within a practice are similar because they share certain defining characteristics that are described for each practice profile on CrimeSolutions.gov. Thus, practice profiles tell us the average result across multiple evaluations. A hypothetical question that might be answered by a practice profile is: Does mentoring usually achieve its goals?

- View Programs
- View Practices
“A Practice is a general category of programs, strategies, or procedures that share similar characteristics with regard to the issues they address and how they address them. Practice profiles tell us about the average results from multiple evaluations of similar programs, strategies, or procedures. The programs, strategies, or procedures within a practice are similar because they share certain defining characteristics that are described for each practice profile on CrimeSolutions.gov. Thus, practice profiles tell us the average result across multiple evaluations. A hypothetical question that might be answered by a practice profile is: Does mentoring usually achieve its goals?”
15 Practices

293 Programs
### Searching for Similar Programs

#### Results in Program Records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operation Ceasefire (Boston, Mass.)</td>
<td>Crime &amp; Crime Prevention, Juvenile, Law Enforcement</td>
<td>A problem-solving police strategy that seeks to reduce gun violence, illegal gun possession, and gun violence in communities in Boston, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville (Tenn.) Drug Market Intervention</td>
<td>Crime &amp; Crime Prevention, Drugs &amp; Substance Abuse, Law Enforcement</td>
<td>A policing program that used community mobilization, strategic planning, and pulling leverage notifications to reduce drug dealing in a high-crime area in Nashville, Tenn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Ceasefire, Hollenbeck Initiative</td>
<td>Crime &amp; Crime Prevention, Juvenile, Law Enforcement</td>
<td>A policing initiative that targeted specific dangerous groups using aggressive enforcement to reduce gun violence in the Hollenbeck area of Los Angeles, Calif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Safe Neighborhoods (Chicago)</td>
<td>Courts, Crime &amp; Crime Prevention, Law Enforcement</td>
<td>A comprehensive antiviolence initiative that uses collaborative strategies to alter perceived costs and benefits of gun violence, intended to reduce illegal gun offending among youth aged 10 to 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Peacekeeper</td>
<td>Crime &amp; Crime Prevention, Juvenile, Law Enforcement</td>
<td>A policing program that targeted high-risk chronic offenders in order to reduce gun violence in Indianapolis, Indiana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii Opportunity Probation with Education (OPE)</td>
<td>Corrections &amp; Reentry, Courts</td>
<td>A community supervision strategy for substance-abusing probationers, particularly for those who have a history of domestic abuse and involvement in weapon crime.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using **Practices** *(Meta-analysis results)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Evidence Rating</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focused Deterrence Strategies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Problem-oriented policing strategies that follow the core principles of deterrence theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Spots Policing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Used by many U.S. police departments, hot spots policing strategies focus on small geographic areas or places, usually in urban settings, where crime is concentrated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Boot Camps</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Juvenile boot camps, also called shock or intensive incarceration programs, are short-term residential programs that resemble military basic training facilities and target adjudicated juvenile offenders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other CrimeSolutions.gov Content** *(Filter Results)*

- Practice Profile: Focused Deterrence Strategies
- CrimeSolutions.gov (Other)
- Meta-Analysis Outcomes
- Meta-Analysis Methodology
- Cost Evidence Base
Practice Profile

Focused Deterrence Strategies

Evidence Ratings for Outcomes:
- Crime & Delinquency: Multiple crime/offense types

Practice Description

Focused deterrence strategies (also referred to as “pulling levers policing”) are problem-oriented police strategies that follow the core principles of deterrence theory. The strategies target specific criminal behavior committed by a small number of chronic offenders who are vulnerable to sanctions and punishment. Offenders are directly contacted and informed that continued criminal behavior will not be tolerated. Targeted offenders are also told how the criminal justice system (such as the police and prosecutors) will respond to continued criminal behavior; mainly that all potential sanctions, or be applied. The deterrence-based message is reinforced through crackdowns on offenders, or groups of offenders (such as gang members), who continue to commit crimes despite the warning. In addition to deterring violent behavior, the strategies also reward compliance and nonviolent behavior among targeted offenders by providing positive incentives, such as access to social services and opportunities.

Target Population

Focused deterrence strategies generally target a specific type of group or offender, such as your own gang, members or repeat violent offenders. Many focused deterrence interventions have primarily targeted incidents of burglary and serious violence (crimes that usually involve chronic offenders). The strategies are typically part of a comprehensive citywide or regional strategy.

Cost

Evidence-Based (Meta-Analyses Reviewed)

Meta-Analysis Outcomes

Crime & Delinquency - Multiple crime/offense types
Combining the results from 10 evaluation studies, Braha and Weisburd (2012) found that focused deterrence strategies were associated with an overall statistically significant, medium-sized crime reduction effect (d=0.584). This suggests that “pulling levers” focused deterrence strategies can reduce crime.

Meta-Analysis Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meta-Analysis</th>
<th>Literature Coverage</th>
<th>Number of Studies</th>
<th>Number of Study Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meta-Analysis 1</td>
<td>2001 - 2010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Braha and Weisburd (2012) examined the effect of “pulling levers” focused deterrence strategies on crime. To be included in the review, studies had to meet three criteria: (1) the program had to have the core elements of a “pulling levers” focused deterrence strategy; (2) a comparison group was included; and (3) at least one crime outcome was reported. Eligible studies must have measured the effects of focused deterrence interventions on officially recorded levels of crime at places or crimes by individuals.

The search process was conducted between May and September 2010. Several search strategies were used to locate studies: (1) a keyword search of online abstract databases; (2) a review of bibliographies of previous literature that examined the effectiveness of pulling levers focused deterrence strategies; (3) searches of seminal “pulling levers” focused deterrence studies; (4) a search of bibliographies of narrative reviews of police crime prevention efforts and past Campbell Collaboration Systematic Reviews of police crime prevention efforts; and (5) hand searches of leading journals in the field. In addition, 59 leading scholars in criminology and criminal justice were sent a list of eligible studies in September 2010 to identify any unpublished studies that did not appear in conventional databases or other reviews. The search process yielded almost 2,500 distinct abstracts. This was eventually narrowed down to 10 studies for inclusion.

All 19 studies used quasi-experimental designs to examine the impact of focused deterrence strategies on crime. Seven evaluations used quasi-experimental designs with non-equivalent comparison groups and two evaluations used quasi-experimental designs with near-equivalent comparison groups created through matching techniques. One evaluation used a quasi-experimental design that included non-equivalent and near-equivalent comparison groups. Six of the studies were published in peer-reviewed journals, three were unpublished reports, and one was a published report. All of the studies were released after 2000. The studies were conducted in small, medium, and large urban cities across the United States, including Boston, Mass.; Lowell, Mass.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Stockton, Cal.; Los Angeles, Cal.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Newark, N.J.; Chicago, Ill.; Rockford, Ill., and Nashville, Tenn. Six of the studies evaluated the effects of pulling levers strategies on serious violence caused by street gangs or criminal activity groups (Boston, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Los Angeles, Lowell, and Stockton). Two studies focused on crime reduction driven by street-level drug market interventions (Nashville and Rockford), and two studies focused on the effects of focused deterrence strategies on individuals (Chicago and Newark).

The standardized mean difference effect size (also known as Cohen’s d) was calculated for reported outcomes in each study. A random effects model was used to estimate the overall mean effect size. To examine the potential effects of publication bias on the analyses, the trim-and-fill procedure was used to estimate the effect of potential data censoring on the outcome.
CrimeSolutions.gov
Practices Scoring Instrument

Contents

Part I. Screening
  Step 1. Identifying an Eligible Meta-Analysis

Part II. Quality Ratings
  Step 1. Quality Ratings on Individual Items
  Step 2. Overall Meta-Analysis Quality Rating

Part III. Evidence Summary and Validity Ratings
  Step 1. Evidence Summary
  Step 2. Validity Ratings

Part IV. Final Evidence Ratings
  Step 1. Selecting the Best Available Evidence (Summative Scores)
  Step 2. Statistical Significance of the Best Available Evidence
  Step 3. Final Ratings Based on Best Available Evidence
Part I. Screening

Step 1. Identifying an Eligible Meta-Analysis

What qualifies as an eligible meta-analysis? If ‘NO’ to any of the items below, the research review does not qualify as a meta-analysis eligible for inclusion in CrimeSolutions.gov. If ‘YES’ to all items, proceed to Step 3.

Checklist (see detailed instructions for each item following the checklist)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Literature search. Did the literature search include at least two sources and provide evidence that unpublished literature was sought in the search?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Primary outcomes. Does the meta-analysis report on at least one eligible outcome (defined below)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Control groups. Do all studies included in the meta-analysis include an appropriate control, comparison, or counterfactual condition?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Reporting of results. Does the meta-analysis report effect sizes that represent the magnitude of the treatment effect?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Combining different types of relationships. If a quantitative synthesis of effect sizes is reported (i.e., a mean effect size is reported for multiple studies), do all effect sizes in the combination index the same type of relationship?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Publication date. Were at least 50% of the studies included in the meta-analysis published/available on or after 1980?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Age of samples. Are the included samples in the meta-analysis restricted to either adults or juveniles? Or, are mean effect sizes for adults and juveniles reported separately?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II. Quality Ratings

Step 1. Quality Ratings on Individual Items

Within each program and practice category, use the following criteria to rate each meta-analysis defined as eligible for consideration in Part II. Note: prior to completing the quality coding of a meta-analysis, it is important to identify all other published copies of that meta-analysis or its protocol. This will often be necessary when coding meta-analyses that were published in journal articles and Campbell or Cochrane Collaboration reviews (which will generally provide more detailed information that will be useful during coding).

Quality Rating (see detailed instructions for each item on following pages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating (1-3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Eligibility Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Comprehensive Literature Search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Grey Literature Coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Coder Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Methodological Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Outlier Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Handling Dependent Effect Sizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Effect Size Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Weighting of Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Analysis Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Heterogeneity Attentiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Publication Bias</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Practice rating continued:

Part III. Evidence Summary and Validity Ratings
   Step 1. Evidence Summary
   Step 2. Validity Ratings

Part IV. Final Evidence Ratings
   Step 1. Selecting the Best Available Evidence (Summative Scores)
   Step 2. Statistical Significance of the Best Available Evidence
   Step 3. Final Ratings Based on Best Available Evidence

See www.CrimeSolutions.gov for more details on ratings
Launched with 15 Practices:

- Adult Boot Camps
- Juvenile Boot Camps
- Adult Drug Courts
- Juvenile Drug Courts
- Interventions for DV Offenders: Duluth Model
- Interventions for DV Offenders: Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy
- Neighborhood Watch
- Mentoring
- Formal System Processing of Juveniles
- Truancy Interventions
- Focused Deterrence Strategies
- Hot Spots Policing
- Psychotherapeutic Approaches for Victims of Sexual Assault
- Second Responders Programs
- Juvenile Awareness Programs (Scared Straight)
The Importance of CS Practices

• Expands “name-brand” programs by providing evidence on basic, more generic program activities

• Acknowledges the way evidence accumulates across similar programs

• Encourages a more sophisticated approach to selecting programs and solving problems

• Provides researchers with stronger incentives to conduct rigorous evaluations
Challenges

• How quickly can we populate the new module with (meta-analysis-based) Practices?

• What will users (particularly practitioners) make of the new Practices module?

• Influence on the research field and production of MAs?
ONE OTHER ISSUE –
“INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE”
About CrimeSolutions.gov

Programs with Insufficient Evidence

CrimeSolutions.gov periodically updates this list of programs that have been reviewed by Study Reviewers, but not assigned an evidence rating due to limitations of the studies included in the program's evidence base. Programs are not placed on the insufficient evidence list because of weaknesses in the program design or conceptual framework. Rather, a program is placed on the list if the study (or studies) reviewed (1) had significant limitations in the study design or (2) lacked sufficient information about program fidelity so that it was not possible to determine if the program was delivered as designed.

The Process of Reviewing and Rating a Program's Evidence of Effects on CrimeSolutions.gov

Steps 1-3 Screening
- Program's evaluation studies identified and screened to form a program's evidence base.

Steps 4-6 Review
- Initial screening identifies an evidence base that meets the minimum standards for review. It undergoes further review via the scoring instrument.

Steps 7-8 Rating
- After full review, reviewers fed enough evidence for a rating.

CrimeSolutions.gov Web Site
- Effective Program
- Promising Program
- No Effects Program
- Insufficient Evidence list on CrimeSolutions.gov
Thank you!

Questions?

Thom Feucht

National Institute of Justice
thomas.feucht@usdoj.gov