



Minutes

Subject:	<i>Steering Group meeting, Oslo, Norway</i>
Date:	15, 16 & 20 May 2009
Attending:	Arild Bjørndal, Mark Lipsey, Merete Konnerup, Paul Montgomery, Eamonn Noonan, Chad Nye, Terri Pigott, Nick Royle, Aron Shlonsky, Amanda Sowden, Carole Torgerson, Peter Tugwell, David Weisburd, David Wilson
Apologies:	Robert Boruch, Steve McDonald
Guests:	Mette Deding, SFI Campbell; Julia Littell, SWCG; Knut Sundell, IMS;
Minutes:	Karianne Thune Hammerstrøm, Bjørn Tommy Tollånes

1. Opening, adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

2. Adoption of minutes

The minutes of the Freiburg SG meeting were approved without revisions.

03. Report from the Social Welfare Group

See attached report.

Paul Montgomery has been elected co-chair, succeeding Julia Littell. William Turner has succeeded Julia Littell as the group's coordinating editor.

The vast majority of reviews from the Social Welfare Group are co-registered with Cochrane. The Group sees streamlining the review process as a priority. The use of the new toolbox can speed up the process. The toolbox can also be used for a web based startup pack for new authors.

The Leonard Gibbs award will be presented for the first time during the Oslo Colloquium, and the first author of the winning review is sponsored to attend the colloquium.

Previous attempts at creating interest groups within the Group have not been successful, and the Group would rather focus on training review authors. Limited resources within the group are a constraint, especially since the coordinator is only employed in a 20% position.

04. Report from the Crime and Justice Group

See attached report.

The Crime & Justice group has recently been awarded an NPIA (UK) grant which will be used for reviews and for scoping. The group would like to perform a mapping exercise to identify areas of promise within the field, mindful also of the increased focus on evidence based policy within the new US administration.

The Group plans to produce a standard letter as a guide to reviewers, concerning issues such as relevance, methodology, sensitivity, and to develop a standard form for editorial review. Providing a stipend for peer reviews may



help speed up the process. To provide continuity, a standing group of peer reviewers could be used on a rotation basis, to avoid staleness. It is debatable whether content knowledge or methods knowledge should be prioritised. It may be worthwhile to give the methods group greater power to approve reviews.

5. Report from the Education Group

See attached report.

Ralf Schlosser has been appointed co-editor, succeeding Carole Torgerson. Julia Lavenberg has resigned from her position as coordinator. The group has developed a brochure. Subgroups within Education have been discontinued. The group is aiming to finish more reviews; it has been three years since the last completed review.

It is important to shorten the turnaround of reviews, and the Cochrane review process for hot topics may be a suitable model in this respect. It is also important to recruit more people into the group. Possible strategies include

- tracking key players from editorial boards of well-known journals; and
- re-connecting with people that were involved earlier but not recently.

Mark Lipsey & Chad Nye will chair a meeting during the Colloquium to identify people that might be interested in working with the Education Group.

6. Report from the Methods Group

See attached report.

A complete training set of powerpoint presentations will soon be ready to be presented online.

7. Report from the Users Group

See attached report.

User friendly abstracts are now available for more than 50% of the reviews. These should be made more easily available on the web page. C&J has a user representative in their steering committee. It is important to cater for advisory input from users on reviews in progress.

Additional reports

SFI Campbell, Denmark

Mette Deding, head of SFI Campbell, noted that SFI Campbell is moving towards being a review-producing unit, and not a supporting unit like it has been up until now. The funding is secured on a more permanent basis than previously. SFI is reaching out towards researchers to encourage interest for producing SRs. In this context it would be useful to be able to provide success stories (like completed reviews), as well as clarifying academic dividends for producing SRs

IMS, National institute of Health and Welfare, Sweden



Knut Sundell, head of IMS, noted that IMS is involved in primary research, risk assessment, review production and research dissemination within social work and crime, but not education. Most projects are commissioned from the Swedish Government. IMS employs internal researchers, but also bring in external researchers. Sweden is moving towards a focus on evidence based practice. IMS does not do “mapping” or reviews on reviews, but are involved in advising and making guidelines, and have established a clearinghouse (www.evidens.nu).

8. Strategic Plan: next steps

a. *Lessons from Cochrane Collaboration's strategic review (incl. Update on Cochrane)*
Presented by: Nick Royle

The webpage for the Cochrane report discussed can be found here: <http://www.cochrane.org/ccsg/review>

The core activities of the organization include the production of systematic reviews, but it is also important to try other activities and to continue with innovations that are successful. Both C1 and C2 are virtual organizations; swarm theory provides a useful analogy for their organizational structure. There are differences between the Steering Groups; in C1, Steering Group members represent someone; in C2 Steering Group members have “responsibilities”.

Cochrane is highly dependent on voluntary participation, and it is crucial to encourage people's enthusiasm. High quality is important in reviews, and an additional criteria for this is relevance - the possibility of being used by practitioners/policymakers. Are we catering for this?

b. & c. *Updating of guidelines; Revision of Policy Briefs*

The Cochrane handbook moves toward less strict expressions regarding methods using terms like “fit for purpose” instead of terms like “hierarchy”, “pyramid” etc.

There has been a discussion in the Methods Group on how to handle the handbook. Should C2 use the Cochrane Handbook as a basis with our without additional briefs to adjust for differences between the two organisations?

One solution could be to provide executive summaries of guidelines and policy briefs (“brief policy briefs”) to create an easier overview of briefs on website. This should be done within a year.

A planning group was formed: David Wilson from C&J, Julia Littell from SW, Carole from Education, Methods: Peter Tugwell & Terri Pigott, Secretariat: Bjørn Tommy Tollanes, User Group: Merete Konnerup Chair: Mark Lipsey

9. Review production: procedures and bottlenecks

a. *Letter from Knut Sundell, IMS*

See attached letter.

Two issues were discussed: How can and should Campbell deal with those who need to do reviews within a different framework? How should we handle results from different study designs pointing in different directions?



There is a need for consensus and clarity, as there seems to be different standards for different groups. Greater clarity is needed about procedures to deal with differences about approving or rejecting a protocol. [N.B. There is a formal appeals process from Coordinator to Editor, via the Co-Chairs and finally the Steering Group].

The option of developing a “fast track” system for title proposals and protocols should be developed, where review teams are faced with short deadlines imposed by funders. It would help to make a standard form for submitting a title proposal available through the website. Campbell should consider concluding an agreement with IMS in order to encourage more registrations.

b. Strategies to deal with increased throughput

The toolbox is under development, but should soon be up and running. This will help streamline the process and should make it easier to deal with increased throughput.

c. Use of the new “Toolbox” for project tracking

Decisions: All Coordinating Groups will now use the title Managing Editor for the position of Coordinator.

Their rights need to be clarified in the system.; i.e. they should be able to do all that Editors do with the exception of approvals.

d. Online training courses

The idea of the Methods group holding Protocol workshops was discussed. The existing Resource Center on the C2 website should also be developed as a place for training and more. A workgroup was formed to look into this, consisting of Aron Shlonsky, Merete Konnerup Jeff Valente, Amanda Sowden(?)

e. Register of “burning questions”

The website now includes a page where burning questions can be nominated. A limited number of suggestions have been made to date.

10. The 2009 Colloquium

The Colloquium as a whole was considered very successful. There was discussion of the need to include plenary speakers from each of our thematic fields.

11. Campbell Online Library

a. Campbell Systematic Reviews: Role of editor-in-chief

See attachment.

Decisions:

D1: The following statement is approved:

The editor-in-chief will oversee, coordinate and carry ultimate responsibility for publication rights. The editor-in-chief will not intervene in relation to the content of approved reviews, unless a need appears for essential corrections, for example in the case of a significant factual error.

D2: *Editor-in-chief:* Mark Lipsey and Arild Bjørndal will serve as Editors-in-chief for this co-chair period.

D3: Details will be described and clarified in the revision process of the governance plan.



We should encourage production and impact now that we have a professional monograph series, and protect the “Campbell brand”. The title/role is part of this work.

Elements of the Governance Plan may need revision, in view of developments over the past year. Questions that need to be addressed include details on the election/hiring of the Editor-in-chief, and the Appeals process on decisions about titles and protocols. A group comprising Julia Littell (chair), Eamonn, David W., Bjørn Tommy (Arild/Mark) was asked to examine this and to report to the next SG meeting.

b. Copyright and Permission to publish; Co-publication

See attachment.

A memo on this subject was slightly modified and approved in the version attached. The revised agreement will be distributed for signature to the authors of existing protocols and reviews.

c. Co-registered reviews

See attachment

Decisions:

There is a need for greater clarity on the situation of protocols and reviews which are co-registered with the Cochrane Collaboration. Wiley has produced a draft agreement allowing Campbell to publish co-registered reviews. The Steering Group agreed that an agreement on this topic should be concluded.

It is important that co-registration is not mistakenly understood as dual publication. Karianne Hammerstrøm will contact Deja Vu to clarify this. Other formal agreements on this should be considered as necessary.

d. Withdrawal of protocols and reviews

See attachment.

Decisions:

D1. A protocol or review may be declared outdated by the Editors of a Coordination Group. The reasons for doing so should be explicitly stated.

D2. Outdated reviews will be kept in their entirety, but a new front page will be added, clearly stating that the contents are out of date and stating the reasons for this. If the reason for withdrawal is lack of recent updates, “Outdated” [or a similar term] will be added to the title of the review, so that the out-of-date-status is possible to see from the review’s reference in the Library as well. Decisions on how to handle flawed/erroneous reviews will be made when and if such a problem occurs.

D3. When a project has been submitted to two or more CGs, the question of withdrawal of documents will be considered on the basis of the guidelines/policy of the lead CG.



D4. The date of the last search should be added to the front page of each review: “The search for studies ended on dd.mm.yy”

There was a discussion on the merits of allowing external comments about our reviews and other documents to be posted to our website. It was pointed out that individual Coordinating Groups already have the opportunity of posting articles including external comments on their own sections of the website. The future provision of a open forum within the library proper is dependent on the availability of adequate resources, on the designation of a moderator, and on clarification of the moderator’s responsibilities. The secretariat will investigate possible solutions in these areas.

e. *Proposal of a “Campbell papers & essays” series*

Decisions:

D1: Campbell will establish an occasional online series under the Campbell umbrella: “Campbell Papers & Essays” (as distinct from Campbell Systematic Reviews).

The essay series will allow us to publish and collect relevant non-review papers written by people involved in the Campbell Collaboration in the broad sense. An example would be the collection of papers that appeared recently as a 3ie Working Paper. The essay series would appear occasionally and would be included in the Campbell Library, clearly distinguished from our systematic reviews.

D2: The editorial board should be decided by the Steering Group.

f. *Presentation of the redeveloped and redesigned library*

All Campbell reviews in the library now incorporate a fully formatted three-page cover. Up to this year, reviews have not otherwise been reformatted. Is it proposed to fully apply the new format and design to all newly approved reviews.

It was proposed that a link to the Cochrane Handbook should be provided centrally within the library.

12-13. Preparations for the 2010 Colloquium (October 2010)

Preparatory committees

- Terri Pigott represents Campbell in the Workshop Committee
- Hannah Rothstein is in the Programme committee.
- Campbell should also be represented on other committees, and those interested are encouraged to become involved where possible.

Plenary speakers

A fair proportion of Colloquium plenary speakers should come from Campbell or from Campbell’s fields of interest.

MoU with the organizers

A MoU with the organizers is in preparation.



All CGs are encouraged to start thinking about their respective activities and objectives in relation to the Keystone Colloquium.

14. Partnerships

a. There was a discussion on the promotion of Campbell activities in the US, and on the possible establishment of a US centre. The need for a centre focused on translation of research to policymakers was also considered.

15. Fundraising

It was recalled that infrastructure funding in Norway is in place up to December 2010. It is important to secure funding beyond that date, and where possible to expand funding for both infrastructure and for review production.

It was noted that it has generally been easier to get funding for specific reviews than for infrastructure, and that this remains the case.

16. Budget and administration

The tax return for 2008 for the Pennsylvania-registered 501c3 foundation has been filed; an update on the status of the foundation will be provided in October. The CEO reported that the financial burden of the Colloquium will impact the budget position for the rest of the year. It will be important to avoid new expenditure above what is provided for in existing projections, and to balance unforeseen additional expenditure with corresponding savings in other areas.

Other sub points were deferred to the next meeting.

17. Any other business

Deferred.

18. Place and date of next meeting

The Steering Group decided to hold the next meeting in Washington, D.C. at a date to be confirmed.

[Note: the date was subsequently confirmed as 27-28 October 2009].