

**Office of Justice Programs
Science Advisory Board Meeting**

January 20, 2012

Meeting Summary

March 5, 2012

Contents

Remarks from Assistant Attorney General Laurie O. Robinson	1
Updates from the Science Advisory Board Subcommittees	2
Evidence Translation and Integration Subcommittee	2
Bureau of Justice Assistance Subcommittee.....	4
Quality and Protection of Science Subcommittee	6
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Subcommittee	7
National Institute of Justice Subcommittee	8
Bureau of Justice Statistics Subcommittee	9
Next Steps	10

Appendix A	Meeting Agenda
Appendix B	Science Advisory Board and Subcommittee Membership Lists
Appendix C	List of Attendees
Appendix D	Evidence Translation and Integration Subcommittee Report
Appendix E	Bureau of Justice Assistance Subcommittee Report
Appendix F	Quality and Protection of Science Subcommittee Report
Appendix G	Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Subcommittee Report
Appendix H	National Institute of Justice Subcommittee Report
Appendix I	Bureau of Justice Statistics Subcommittee Report

Office of Justice Programs Science Advisory Board Meeting January 20, 2012

Meeting Summary

The Office of Justice Programs (OJP) Science Advisory Board (SAB) convened its third meeting on January 20, 2012, at the OJP office, 810 7th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. The Board provides advice in the area of science and statistics for the purpose of enhancing the impact and performance of OJP programs and activities in criminal and juvenile justice.

The primary purpose of this meeting was for the six subcommittees of the SAB to update the full Board and OJP on their meetings and activities over the past six months. The following subcommittees presented reports: (1) Evidence Translation and Integration, (2) Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) (formed after the meeting in June 2011), (3) Quality and Protection of Science, (4) Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), (5) National Institute of Justice (NIJ), and (6) Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS).

Dr. Alfred Blumstein, SAB Chair, opened the meeting at 8:30 a.m. Sixty-one individuals were in attendance, including 16 of the 18 Board members, 10 subcommittee members, and 23 federal participants. Twelve members of the public attended as observers, none of whom provided any written or oral comments.

The meeting opened with then Assistant Attorney General Laurie O. Robinson providing an overview of progress OJP has made in infusing science across the agencies. Former AAG Robinson participated in the meeting throughout the day. A summary of her remarks follows.

Remarks from Assistant Attorney General Laurie O. Robinson

Assistant Attorney General Laurie Robinson remarked that she views the SAB as a key accomplishment during her second tenure at the Office of Justice Programs. AAG Robinson launched the Science Advisory Board in January 2011 to ensure that science is an integral part of OJP. She expressed her confidence that OJP has a strong team to continue this work, although she is leaving the agency. In this long-term effort to change the culture by infusing science into the DNA of the Department of Justice, she noted the following important accomplishments during the past 2 years: leadership in the two OJP science agencies—NIJ and BJS—with individuals with science backgrounds; the launch of the CrimeSolutions.gov Web site; Congressional approval of a two-percent set aside in the budget for research/statistics programs; and establishment of a Diagnostic Center and help desk to assist local jurisdictions in implementing evidence-based programs.

AAG Robinson expressed particular interest in the work of the Quality and Protection of Science Subcommittee. She urged the SAB to think about the need to codify in law provisions about the science agencies, including control of their reports, press releases, and timed release of their reports. The SAB is in a unique position to address issues

related to the control of science from an independent perch in ways that career staff cannot.

Further, she encouraged the SAB to look outside OJP-- as well as inside OJP-- toward building institutional relationships in this time of transition. Within OJP, she suggested inviting the Deputy Attorney General and Associate Attorney General to attend the next SAB meeting. In the outward look, she suggested that the SAB consider presenting its work at the NIJ annual conference to show how things are going from science viewpoints. When vacancies occur in BJS and NIJ leadership positions, the SAB could play a role in setting additional criteria for those positions beyond what is spelled out in the statutes. Part of the science-related work within OJP comes down to the difficult issue of staffing vacancies under the current hiring freeze which requires all vacancies to be filled from within OJP. The lack of qualified statisticians and other scientists within the other OJP agencies with specialized technical expertise affects the agency's capacity to do science.

Mary Lou Leary, then Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General acknowledged AAG Robinson's role, not only in restoring and building relationships with the Hill and with the field, but also in bringing science into the work and thinking throughout OJP. Ms. Leary, who assumed leadership of OJP upon Laurie Robinson's departure, concluded by saying that, as steward of that legacy, her intention is to increase the respect of science throughout OJP, the Department, and the field as well.

Updates from the Science Advisory Board Subcommittees

Evidence Translation and Integration Subcommittee

Dr. Tony Fabelo, Chair, reported that his Subcommittee participated in a series of meetings and conference calls focusing on CrimeSolutions.gov in three areas: the peer review methodology and scoring process, the CrimeSolutions.gov Web site as the main "portal" for evidence translation for OJP, and an informal survey of practitioners to gauge their familiarity with the Web site.

Peer review methodology and scoring process. The Subcommittee reviewed the methodology for selection and rating of programs for inclusion on the CrimeSolutions.gov Web site, and concluded that the general process seems to meet criteria for scientific integrity. Inter-reliability testing among reviewers, a dispute resolution process, and the use of a detailed coding sheet provide a reputable way of evaluating the studies. The scoring process includes three main categories: Effective, Promising, and No Effects,¹ plus a footnote on the Web site for Insufficient Evidence.²

¹ The No Effects category includes null findings and negative effects findings. As the number of programs in that category increase, this category may split into subcategories (null, negative).

² The initial goal was to get 125 program profiles up online to make the Web site functional and the information accessible. As of December 14, 2011, of the 642 programs in the tracking database, 54 were effective, 97 were promising, and 11 had no effects. After initial screening, 50 studies moved to full review but were found to have insufficient evidence.

The Subcommittee spent time probing what “insufficient evidence” means in this system. Some programs are rejected in the initial screenings for insufficient evidence, while others make it into the review process and then are rejected for insufficient evidence. The Subcommittee questioned why the studies that were rejected in the initial screening are not on the Web site while studies rejected later in the review process are listed on the Web site. This decision has implications for what CrimeSolutions.gov is accomplishing.

CrimeSolutions.gov as the main “portal” for OJP translation efforts. The goal of CrimeSolutions.gov is to be “a single, credible, online resource to inform practitioners and policymakers about what works in criminal justice, juvenile justice, and crime victim services.”³ The Subcommittee noted other OJP-sponsored “translating evidence” initiatives, such as OJJDP’s Model Programs Guide and the “What Works” Re-entry Library that will also be coming online. The Subcommittee considered whether these and other relevant programs should be posted on the CrimeSolutions.gov Web site or simply linked to the Web site.

Informal survey of practitioners. The Subcommittee conducted an informal survey seeking feedback from practitioners regarding their familiarity with CrimeSolutions.gov. The Subcommittee worked with the Council of State Governments (COSG) to survey participants in three COSG Webinars. The majority of participants found the site easy to navigate in their search for evidence-based, validated programs that will lead to more grant opportunities. This informal survey showed generally low familiarity with the CrimeSolutions.gov Web site; law enforcement was the largest group of users self-identified through these Webinars.

The Subcommittee offered the following recommendations for strengthening OJP’s CrimeSolutions.gov initiative:

- Explain more fully what “insufficient evidence” means and how programs arrive on this list. Make a distinction between programs that should be viewed as having insufficient evidence and those that should be evaluated further. Practitioners will then know that these are untried programs, with not enough evidence yet to prove they are effective.
- Examine how to integrate the key components of other evidence-translation efforts into CrimeSolutions.gov.
- Consider adding a section on key elements of effective programs (“take-away messages”).
- Develop a communication plan to publicize the CrimeSolutions.gov Web site, including publicity in trade association and program funding announcements. OJP should conduct a more systematic survey to get feedback on how frequently the Web site is used and how users view its utility. Expanding hyperlinks from other Web sites to CrimeSolutions.gov and linking all evidence translations from other agencies together would be a good strategy.

³ Presentation of OJP in National Institute of Justice Conference on June 20, 2011.

Phelan Wyrick, Senior Advisor in the Office of the Assistant Attorney General, responded to the Subcommittee's recommendations. In regard to the coding of programs on the CrimeSolutions.gov Web site, he pointed out that there is a disclaimer on the Web site. OJP is targeting the practitioner. The decision to rate programs either as effective or as having no effects represents the highest amount of rigor. The "Promising" designation represents a lower standard of rigor. OJP is working on a module to add meta-analysis to the CrimeSolutions.gov Web site and developing criteria and standards for that work.

In regard to other translating-evidence initiatives, OJJDP has made the Model Programs Guide available for at least 10 years and will continue to provide the Guides, which probably will include some additional information from the evidence reviews. OJP plans to align the evidence reviews in the next year for Model Programs as well as for the "What Works" in Re-entry Library prior to launch. Additionally, OJP is working on a communications and marketing plan, with support from the Office of Communications.

In response to a question raised about the finding that of all the programs reviewed, only 11 have no effect, Dr. Wyrick explained that this finding is based on peer review of programs that represent the best research and that meet the most scrutiny. Another comment about the selection and review process was that identifying programs with negative, backfire effects can be as important as identifying programs that work.

The Board accepted the report of the Evidence Translation and Integration Subcommittee as presented. The full text of the report can be found at Appendix D.

Bureau of Justice Assistance Subcommittee

Dr. Edward Mulvey reported the activities of the BJA Subcommittee. Dr. Mulvey is Chair of this new SAB Subcommittee, whose members include Dr. Mark Lipsey, William Bratton, Dr. Cynthia Lum, Dr. Timothy Bynum, and Dr. Faye Taxman. The members held their initial meeting by phone on January 10 to discuss the SAB purview, their experiences with BJA, and how they might be helpful. They also met with the BJA Director and other members of the SAB on January 19. The Subcommittee is working on the following issues:

Funding for research. A large proportion of BJA funding is block grants and not available for research activities. BJA has limited resources to integrate data collection into its activities which focus on getting programs to the field. Last year BJA funded 11,000 grants.

Collaboration. BJA shows an interest in evidence integration and a willingness to collaborate in becoming more research-based. For example, NIJ has funded an evaluation of BJA's Honest Opportunity Probation with Enforcement (HOPE) program to help probationers abstain from illegal drug use.

Data collection capacity. There is a need for building practitioners' capacity to collect data because BJA does not have an internal infrastructure for collecting data or planning for data collection.

Professional evaluators. In addition to educating practitioners about data collection, there is a need for a competent pool of professionals to conduct evaluations. Many technical assistance (TA) providers may not have the science foundation to do that. The question was posed as to what extent are BJA TA providers using science and is that a conduit for evidence translation?

The BJA Subcommittee, which is newly formed and did not offer specific recommendations at this time, intends to focus on the following issues going forward:

- Role of systems-based research in the implementation of science. Why do organizations adopt certain innovations and not others? To what extent can the organizations themselves participate in the research?
- Potential to build projects off the state block grant money. States choose what to do in their states, but little is known about how that translates into criminal justice practices and programs supported by BJA.
- Evaluation requirements for BJA programs. Most of the required evaluations are not of sufficient quality to produce relevant, evidence-based information. The exception is drug court programs, whose evaluations are presented as evidence in BJA.

Dr. Blumstein commented further on evaluation models that aim to determine how well these BJA-sponsored programs work. An example of one model is the HOPE program (mentioned earlier) for which BJA solicited sites to implement the program and NIJ solicited an evaluator to do a cross-site evaluation. Another model is to implement multiple variants of a particular program, with each program hiring an evaluator at a local university to do the evaluation; this version has the richness of matching local programs to local needs but provides no overview of the multiple programs.

Laurie Robinson pointed out that OJP has been working with the State Administrative Agencies (SAAs) on the issue of evidence-based practices and has an ally in the National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA). OJP funds NCJA to provide technical assistance to the SAAs and do planning with the states on this issue.

BJA Director Denise O'Donnell expressed gratitude for the formation of the BJA Subcommittee and the SAB as a whole. She added that there is substantial funding that can and is being used to support evidence-based practices through the SAAs, and she welcomed the SAB's advice to help ensure that those funds are used in the best way possible.

Mary Lou Leary observed that much of the BJA funding to states is directed to putting more law enforcement on the streets, helping jurisdictions purchase equipment, and in some states supporting indigent defense programs, as well as the drug court programs, all of which are not necessarily "science-based."

Members of the BJA Subcommittee again acknowledged the challenges of sustaining a science presence in the crime and justice field at all levels, recognizing the wide variation in research and evaluation capabilities among local agencies. Their suggestion was to

consider expanding BJA solicitations to include core practices that applicants must address, such as screening assessment and treatment assignment. More research is needed on the practices themselves as well as the programs.

The Board accepted the report of the Bureau of Justice Assistance Subcommittee as presented. The full text of the report can be found at Appendix E.

Quality and Protection of Science Subcommittee

Dr. Robert Sampson, Chair, along with Dr. Alan Leshner and Dr. Jocelyn Pollock, reported the Subcommittee's activities since the last meeting in June 2011. Their goal is to design a strategy to protect and preserve science within OJP over time; the challenge is how to convert the scientific principles of independence, objectivity, and quality into practice. In exploring what quality of science means for the purposes of OJP programs, the discussion of the Subcommittee report at the meeting focused on the following three key issues.

Science integrity policy. On March 9, 2009, President Obama issued a Presidential Memorandum articulating six principles central to the preservation and promotion of scientific integrity; further guidance to heads of executive departments and agencies came from John Holdren, Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy in December 2010.⁴ One issue involves who in an agency has final say on research and statistical reports and press releases – the public affairs office or the scientists who wrote the report. For example, if a reporter calls up a scientist and asks about climate, should the scientist have to have his response cleared before giving an answer? In looking at the science integrity of other federal agencies, the Subcommittee noted that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has taken the position that no other office has the authority to clear what the scientists are saying. The SAB strongly supports the independence of the scientists with regard to the issuance of reports and press releases.

Recognition of NIJ and BJS as science agencies. In the June 2011 memo from the Office of the Deputy Attorney General (ODAG) to John Holdren, DOJ also recognized NIJ and BJS as science agencies, along with three other DOJ components: the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF). The establishment of the Science Advisory Board reinforces the Department's efforts toward instituting scientific integrity. Further, the ODAG response acknowledged that the DOJ Office of Public Affairs will not have final say regarding statistical reports and press releases from NIJ and BJS.

Field-generated research. Field-initiated projects could be a larger segment of each of the agencies. BJA, for example, has field-initiated proposals which are left open to the researchers and practitioners to specify what they want to do in a broad area. That is where a lot of good ideas can come from, especially when the principles of science are embedded in the solicitations for proposals.

⁴ John P. Holdren, Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, "Scientific Integrity." Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies, December 17, 2010. www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/scientific-integrity-memo-12172010.pdf.

The Subcommittee prepared a document defining three main principles for science agencies: independence, objectivity, and quality. A list of recommendations for adhering to each of these principles followed each definition.

Following an intensive discussion on the protection of science, the Board accepted the report of the Quality and Protection of Science Subcommittee as presented. The full text of the report can be found at Appendix F.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Subcommittee

Dr. Mark Lipsey, Chair of the OJJDP Subcommittee, reported on two significant events since the last SAB meeting: OJJDP's National Conference and the change in OJJDP leadership. In October 2011, Subcommittee members attended OJJDP's national conference and a pre-conference day dedicated to research. They met with Jeff Slowikowski, OJJDP's then Acting Administrator, and gave a presentation that sparked a lively exchange with the OJJDP-funded researchers. On January 19, 2012, the Subcommittee met with OJJDP leadership as Jeff Slowikowski steps aside and Melodee Hanes assumes responsibilities as the Acting Administrator for OJJDP. Mr. Slowikowski will serve as OJJDP's Acting Deputy Administrator for Policy.

Most of the OJJDP Subcommittee activities have been exploratory to see where it could make useful contributions to the agency. Dr. Lipsey identified the following issues:

External constraints to integrating science. Much of the funding consists of formula grants. Congress also provides funding streams for solutions (like mentoring) that may not be proportional to the approaches indicated by the available research. The SAB might consider how to make statements directed to Congress (e.g., an annual letter) about more strategic funding of criminology research to address program, practice, and policy needs so as to put the views of OJP's science advisors on record.

OJJDP's research portfolio, peer reviews, and the extent to which research evidence is incorporated into solicitations for program activities. OJJDP has more of a research portfolio than is generally recognized. It has supported a number of important research projects over the years. The challenge is gaining more visibility, getting the information out and also finding how best to use it.

OJJDP's dissemination and publication activities. The nature of the science and research behind these publications (bulletins, Model Programs Guide, a new journal in juvenile justice), as well as the training and TA information being disseminated, are of interest to the OJJDP Subcommittee.

OJJDP's organizational structure, personnel, and infrastructure issues. Providing input regarding how the structuring may help or hinder research is of interest to the Subcommittee members

Melodee Hanes addressed the Board and offered her vision for OJJDP. She and Mr. Slowikowski will continue to work as a team with Marilyn Roberts, Deputy

Administrator for Programs. She welcomed the advice of the Science Advisory Board in regard to research and evaluation of OJJDP programs and best practices.

Laurie Robinson thanked Jeff Slowikowski for his contributions to OJJDP during his 3 years as Acting Administrator and credited him, as a career person, with bringing research back to the agency.

The Board accepted the report of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Subcommittee as presented. The full text of the report can be found at Appendix G.

National Institute of Justice Subcommittee

Dr. David Weisburd, Chair, provided an update on the Subcommittee's activities and its role in supporting NIJ, particularly in implementing the National Research Council (NRC) recommendations regarding independence and governance, strengthening the science mission, research infrastructure, scientific integrity and transparency, and a culture of self-assessment. The Subcommittee focused on the following three areas.

The SAB NIJ Subcommittee functioning as an advisory board for NIJ. The Subcommittee met with NIJ staff to discuss whether this was an appropriate role for the Subcommittee. In this role as an advisory board, the Subcommittee could protect NIJ's research mission within OJP, look at the standing review panels to assess success, and raise questions when NIJ seems to be heading in directions that may not be good in the long term for research. After discussion, Dr. Laub agreed to appoint staff at NIJ to work with the NIJ Subcommittee.

NIJ footprint. In the process of drafting a memo about the general role of NIJ as the research organization within OJP, the Subcommittee learned that NIJ plays a broad role, both within DOJ (e.g., responding to DOJ requests to answer certain data calls) and outside OJP (e.g., queries from such varied other federal agencies as the Peace Corps). The Subcommittee will revise the memo to address the complexities of internal operations and relationships of NIJ to other agencies as well as what institutional mechanism will enable NIJ to continue to play a leadership role.

Integrating physical and social sciences at NIJ. Dr. Laub asked the Subcommittee to look at the integration of physical and social sciences and how to improve that relationship within NIJ. Subcommittee members held two phone meetings and met with NIJ staff the day before the SAB meeting. They asked staff in the physical sciences how the SAB could be helpful, and reviewed the NRC report and the earlier National Academy of Science report for physical science questions that should be addressed. In the context of forensic science, the Subcommittee looked at issues of certification and methodologies for minimizing subjectivity in forensic exams and asked what role the SAB could play in this area.

Laurie Robinson affirmed NIJ as the research agency within DOJ with the expertise in research as well as evaluation. Additionally, she advised the SAB to factor in the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Office and the Violence Against Women

Office (VAWO), both of which fund a lot of work along this line as well. Considering NIJ's position of scientific leadership, the Subcommittee felt that care must be taken to ensure that this does not undermine the scientific thinking of all other OJP components and affect hiring people of scientific background in other agencies. The Subcommittee recognized the tension here that remains.

Dr. Laub expressed his appreciation of the Subcommittee's willingness to consider the complexities of NIJ and of its continued guidance in exploring what it means to be the lead science agency within DOJ.

The Board accepted the report of the National Institute of Justice Subcommittee as presented. The full text of the report can be found at Appendix H.

Bureau of Justice Statistics Subcommittee

Dr. Rick Rosenfeld, Chair, summarized the Subcommittee's activities, which included several conference calls and a meeting the night before with BJS Director Jim Lynch and other BJS staff. The general sense of the Subcommittee is that, despite a critical staff shortage, the agency is moving forward, with strong leadership throughout the agency.

BJS's collaboration with the FBI and Census Bureau. The Subcommittee asked BJS for an update on its efforts to become more involved in the analysis of the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) data, which comes out of a division in the FBI. BJS created and enhanced an interactive, analytic capability for UCR data analysis, and the FBI adopted it as its own. Another issue is BJS's relationship with the Census Bureau, which administers the National Crime Victim Survey (NCVS) in the field. The Subcommittee had no further advice as BJS is moving ahead clearly and will come to agreement with the Census Bureau or make other arrangements to ensure the continued vitality of that important victim survey.

Lack of resources for institutional research. OJP receives requests from all parts of government for information on a topic, and from Congress for a rapid response to a pressing issue, and the OJP components respond, as that is their mandate. BJS has no budget line to support that service. The Subcommittee asked the Board and others to think about the science implications of budget decreases of up to 50 percent and the lack of staffing at BJS, including vacancies for managers of its major statistical units. The Subcommittee asked whether those positions within BJS could be exempted from the hiring freeze at DOJ in order to recruit the skilled statisticians and scientists BJS needs to carry out its mission.

This issue sparked concerns about the role of the SAB in relation to resources and staffing issues—avoiding the appearance of lobbying for agency resources or staff and focusing on the implications of those shortages for science. Given the level of staffing, what is it that BJS cannot do well because of the lack of statisticians and scientists? It was not the Subcommittee's view that currently BJS is incapable of carrying out its core functions, but rather the possibility that persistent staffing shortfalls may compromise those core functions.

The Board grappled with the issue of resource constraints and their impact on science. Some noted that there are many positions within OJP that cannot be filled, and the agencies need new skills to develop the kind of agenda the Board envisions. Others stressed that the SAB's mission is to give scientific advice, not management advice, and to do otherwise could diminish the Board's credibility. Some felt that the staffing for science agencies cannot be thought of in the same way as staffing for other agencies. Board members made the distinction that not having enough money to do new research is different than having a staff shortage that places longitudinal data at risk. A shortage of statisticians at BJS could lead to missing years in the data series it generates.

The Board agreed on the broad principle that the SAB jurisdiction is only to comment to the extent that the issue affects scientific quality. It is specific to the Board's oversight to express its concern that there are not enough statisticians in BJS and that could impact the quality of the science.

The Board accepted the report of the Bureau of Justice Assistance Subcommittee as presented. The full text of the report can be found at Appendix I.

Next Steps

The Board considered writing a letter to the Attorney General and Deputy Attorney General stating briefly the work of the SAB over the last year and expressing concern about the fact that two science agencies in OJP have fewer resources this year and particularly about the possible inability of BJS to continue its statistical series with the diminished resources and staffing. However, based on intensive discussions, the Board members decided that a comprehensive annual report is needed first to define the role of the Science Advisory Board within OJP and describe what the SAB has accomplished during its first year.

The report will include, among other items, some of the Board's concerns about how resource constraints impact science. Another theme is institutional legacy, including the mechanisms to put into place that would persist beyond personnel changes in the various agencies. Other ideas for the report included assessments of the current situations within each agency through interviews, information on grants awarded on specific topics, and recommendations of what should stay the same and what should be improved. The process of compiling the annual report may provide more direction in identifying the cross-cutting issues (e.g., how do we get the science to practitioners and how do we learn from practitioners?).

In addition to looking back over the last year and reporting on the Board's mission and accomplishments, the Subcommittees will continue their work with the specific OJP components as well as the work of evidence translation and integration and protecting the quality of the science within OJP. Specifically—

- The Evidence Translation and Integration Subcommittee will continue to explore ways of marketing the CrimeSolutions.gov Web site to practitioners and researchers. It will expand the explanation and discussion of insufficient evidence and the

distribution showing that 95 percent of the programs are promising. Members expressed interest in playing a role in BJA and translation of evidence.

- The newly formed Bureau of Justice Assistance Subcommittee will identify some priorities for input and discussion before the next full Board meeting. How to move science into technical assistance, which is central to much of what BJA does and is a topic of particular interest to the Subcommittee.
- The Quality and Protection of Science Subcommittee, having done its job in articulating the principles that would be applicable across the agencies, would be willing to work with other committees toward applying the principles to specific agencies.
- The OJJDP Subcommittee will continue to examine how to make OJJDP's research portfolio more visible and useful, to look into the science behind its training and technical assistance materials, and to consider how OJJDP's organizational structure may help or hinder research.
- The National Institute of Justice Subcommittee will continue to examine the operations and problems that NIJ has in order to bring the SAB's expertise and experiences to bear on the issues at hand. NIJ Director Laub expressed interest in working with the SAB as an advisory board similar to what the NRC report suggested.
- The Bureau of Justice Statistics Subcommittee will continue to address the NCVS/Census issue as well as the potential impact of the lack of statisticians and scientists within BJS. One avenue to explore is how to stimulate young scholars to collaborate with BJS. Offering graduate students and young faculty members opportunities through unpaid internships has the benefit of increased analysis of the microdata at BJS. The SAB, with its broad range of professional associations represented within the membership, could come up with a strategy to make these kinds of programs more visible in the scientific communities.

The Board as a whole agreed that each agency is doing its own job well, and it is time to think of what OJP-wide, cross-cutting issues the Board could address in moving from science to practice in the real world. Ongoing issues to address included codification and embedding science in the DNA of DOJ as well as how the science is impacted by OJP's relationships with DOJ, the Attorney General, and Congress, and how these processes go forward in the future. The Board learned more about the political influences of what is funded and evaluated and how that is related to the type of programs that are included in what works. The consensus was that resources are not unrelated to science, and the Board is recognizing the problems and articulating the impact on science. The Board members continue to clarify the role of the Science Advisory Board—what to comment on, roles, authority.

Laurie Robinson urged members of the Board to think about education of colleagues at DOJ and on Capitol Hill about science and independence issues and the integrity of the

science, as well as how important this is to raise in its annual report for the benefit of OJP as well as the Assistant Attorney General and the Attorney General. Her parting words: “I am thrilled about the existence of this Science Advisory Board.”

The next scheduled meeting of the SAB is June 20, 2012. The meeting will coincide with the NIJ conference, June 18–20, 2012, in Arlington, Virginia.

Dr. Blumstein adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.