

Procedure for Registering Campbell Review Groups **Adopted by the Campbell Collaboration Steering Group, August 2003**

RATIONALE

The Campbell Collaboration (C2) is now reaching a stage in its development when the flow of people seeking to register titles is steadily increasing. At present, Campbell's review activity is organized around three umbrella substantive groups: Crime and Justice, Education and Social Welfare. Of these, Crime and Justice is the most clearly defined, and – unlike the other two – has been able to build around an already established international network of researchers. It may well be that there is no need for this group to sub-divide into smaller review group entities, but certainly the other two groupings are so broad that it is most likely that they (i) will want to so sub-divide, and (ii) will need to sub-divide if they are to attract relevant contributors with content and/or methodological expertise. For example, researchers or practitioners will more likely be drawn to a 'family violence' group, rather than a 'social welfare group', if that is where their interests and research activities lie. Further, the scope of these two groups is so broad that it would not be feasible for the editorial work involved in the preparation of reviews to be undertaken by one editorial base, as is currently the case.

In order to facilitate the creation and appropriate recognition of new C2 Review Groups, the Steering Group has approved the procedure outlined in this document as a guide for persons within C2 seeking to register a new Review Group. C2 wants to capitalize on people's enthusiasm. We also want to produce reviews of a quality that is unsurpassed (at least routinely or generally) by other agencies or research groupings. We cannot afford to produce poor quality products, particularly at such an early stage in our development. We therefore need procedures to ensure that those entities wishing to claim the Campbell *imprimatur*, must be sufficiently well resourced (in terms of expertise and available labor – whether funded or not) to ensure high quality products. Persons proposing a new Review Group for approval consideration by the international Steering Group of Campbell should insure that the proposal submitted to the Steering Group indicates the manner in which the new group:

- i. Is international in composition and scope
- ii. Aims to be inclusive and collaborative
- iii. Has a clearly identified editorial base and/or team prepared and competent to oversee the production of systematic reviews
- iv. Has a clearly defined scope that – as far as possible – differentiates its activities from the work of other Campbell Review Groups and/or relevant Cochrane groups
- v. Has a clear work plan that is likely to deliver products within a reasonable timeframe

Suggested Method to Plan for C2 Registration

Experience within the Cochrane Collaboration and the more limited experience of the Campbell Collaboration indicates the importance of organizing groups being able to demonstrate their commitment to the work, and indeed to the Campbell Collaboration, by undertaking a series of tasks and activities that will maximize the chances that the group will be effective. Essentially this means doing a fair bit of networking (across continents), homework about ‘who is doing what’ in Campbell and Cochrane (to avoid duplication, etc.), and convening an exploratory meeting of all those interested – and able to attend – to see if there is, indeed, a critical mass of people with (between them) sufficient time and resources to make a review group work. Such a meeting has proved invaluable from the point of cementing working relationships, as the nature of the work is such that being able to collaborate, to share, and work together is pivotal. ‘Breaking bread’ goes a long way to achieving this, and exploratory meetings are best held over a Friday/Saturday so as to enable people to get to know one another, to reflect on what is being planned (and how they might contribute) and of course, to minimize the cost for people traveling from abroad.

The process of developing a group should be pursued in discussion with the Convenor(s) of the relevant Campbell Umbrella Group, i.e., Crime and Justice, Education and/or Social Welfare. It must also involve discussions with the Convenor(s) of the C2 Methods Group. The relevant Convener from the Umbrella Group ideally should chair the exploratory meeting, until such time as agreement has been reached that registration should be sought, and a coordinating editor identified (at which point the chair passes to him/her). Such meetings require funding, and it is a useful indicator of the group’s potential viability that funding can be found for this decision-making event.

The work that needs to be done – or to be seriously underway – is implicit in the following checklist. A completed checklist, together with accompanying documentation, would form the basis of the Steering Committee’s consideration of whether or not a group should be registered as a recognized Review Group within the Campbell Collaboration. The proposed group should send its materials to the C2 Secretariat at which time they will be informed of the timeline for the Steering Group’s deliberations and decision. Proposing groups should continue their organizing efforts in parallel with the submission and consideration of their materials by the Steering Group but clearly indicate to all participants that the group’s official status is under review. The Executive Officer of the C2 Secretariat should be the main point of contact for the proposers throughout this process.

CHECKLIST FOR REGISTERING A NEW COLLABORATIVE REVIEW GROUP

A	PROCESS	Please tick if appropriate.
1	Have the tentative and firm plans for the new group been developed in close consultation throughout with the Convenor(s) of the relevant Campbell umbrella groups, including the Campbell Methods Group? ¹	
2	Who was notified of the plans for preparatory and exploratory meetings?	
3	Has a formal exploratory meeting been held?	
4	Was a Campbell Convenor present to chair/facilitate the exploratory meeting?	
5	What proportion of the people associated by name with the proposal were present at the exploratory meeting?	
6	Is the application for registration supported by the relevant Campbell Convenor and by any other Convenor who have worked with the proposed coordinating editor?	
B	SCOPE / TOPIC LIST	
1	Is the scope appropriate for a review group?	
2	Is the scope sufficiently broad such that a variety of reviews can be envisioned rather than just one or two?	
3	Is there a provisional topic list showing the reviews that the group considers might be performed? NB: This should not just include a list of reviews for which reviewers have already been identified.	
4	Has potential duplication with existing or pending review groups been considered?	
5	Have links been made to groups where some overlap may exist to ensure reviews are not unknowingly duplicated?	
6	Do clear and agreed mechanisms for resolving differences of opinion regarding reviews exist, i.e., to which group a particular title belongs?	
C	EDITORIAL BOARD/BASE	
1	Has a provisional editorial board been nominated by the	

¹ This refers to the overall group, rather than individual groups – how to phrase???

	group?	
2	Has a geographical editorial base been identified?	
3	Has a coordinating editor been nominated?	
4	Is the coordinating editor willing and able to provide the review group coordinator with the appropriate support (minimum 1 day per week) or willing and able to find someone who can?	
5	Are the other members of the editorial board able/willing to spend a minimum of four hours per week performing their editorial responsibilities?	
6	Is the editorial board international?	
7	Is the editorial board inter-disciplinary?	
8	Has each of the editors undertaken to prepare and maintain at least one Campbell Review?	
9	Is a review group coordinator being sought?	
10	Has computing support for the editorial base been considered?	
11	Has someone volunteered to be Criticism Editor for the group?	
D	CONTRIBUTORS	
1.	Is there a provisional list of contributors given, along with the role they might play?	
2	Is there a clear statement that the group is open to new contributors, and is collaboration voluntary?	
3	Is there multi-national representation?	
4	Are all relevant disciplines represented?	
5	Are users (both end-point users, policy makers and other relevant groups) represented in the provisional membership?	
6	Is there a plan to attract new reviewers/contributors?	
7	Is there a plan for how users are to be involved and recruited?	
E	SPECIALISED REGISTER	
1	Have the inclusion criteria for the Review Group's specialized register been made explicit?	
	Has a register already been established?	
	If so, have the search strategies been adequately outlined?	
	If not, has a planned search strategy been outlined?	

	Are these strategies adequate?	
	Is it clear that there will be no language restriction in the register?	
	Has the Secretariat been contacted to ensure that journal searching activities are coordinated, and contributions made to C2SPECTR or is there a firm commitment to do so?	
	Has someone in the group been appointed to coordinate search activities?	
	Is it clear how the trials/studies identified will be made available to reviewers?	
F	FUNDING	
1	Has funding been achieved?	
2.	If not, have plans to do so been outlined?	
G	TARGETS	
1	Has the group set targets for itself? For example:	
	Date of registration?	
	Date for review group coordinator to be in post?	
	Date of first protocols?	
	Date of first reviews?	
	Number of reviews in first five years?	
	Dates for completing retrospective hand searchers?	
	Dates for completing retrospective electronic searchers?	
H	PAPERWORK	
1	Has the appropriate paperwork been appended to the application?	
2	Letter of support from the Convener of the relevant Campbell Umbrella Group?	
3	Letter of support from the Convenor of the Campbell Methods Group	
4	Minutes of the exploratory meeting(s)	
5	Letters of support from contributors	