THE CAMPBELL COLLABORATION

DRAFT

Minutes of the Steering Group Meeting
Loyola University, Chicago
Monday 20 May and Friday 24 May 2013

Attending:	Mark Lipsey (Co-chair), Arild Bjørndal (Co-chair), Peter Tugwell, David Wilson, Aron Shlonsky, Merete Konnerup, Terri Pigott, Gary Ritter, Paul Connolly, Ian Shemilt, Howard White, Julia Littell (incoming co-chair), Eamonn Noonan, Emily Tanner-Smith, Sandra Wilson, Birte Sniltveidt, Jane Dennis, Sean Grant, Charlotte Gill, Martina Vojtkova, Karianne Thune Hammerstrøm, Bjørn Tommy Tollånes, Sissel Johansen
Apologies:	Jane Barlow, Martin Killias, Mette Deding, Knut Sundell, Heather Menzies Munthe-Kaas
Minutes:	Sissel Johansen, Karianne Thune Hammerstrøm, Eamonn Noonan

01. Opening, adoption of agenda
The agenda was adopted.

02. Minutes
Adoption of the Minutes of the previous meeting.

The minutes were adopted with one minor revision.
Page 8, sentence two is revised to read: "Reviews on topics other than interventions, eg. risk factors, diagnostics, screening…."

02. Election of new Co-chair
The Steering Group welcomed the election of Julia Littell as co-chair, to succeed Mark Lipsey at the conclusion of this meeting. The Group expressed its appreciation for Mark Lipsey's exceptional contribution as co-chair.

04. Strategic priorities of the Collaboration
a) Note on New Strategic Priorities

The note on strategic priorities drawn up by Mark Lipsey was presented. The discussion centred on the effective dissemination of the findings of reviews. It was important to refer to existing guidelines from the Users Group. Care should be taken to ensure that a summary does not make wild claims, but are based on the findings of the review.

There is a case for reexamining the process for producing user abstracts, in view of organizational developments. However, it is important to maintain an approval process and to continue to secure approval by review authors.

The Users' group has a particular role in building bridges between the research and practice, by identifying and cultivating relevant user organizations and decision makers.

Paul Connolly advocated a coordinated approach involving the website, social media and other formats. He proposed that we engage a professional organisation to examine how we do this and to advise on strategies for branding and dissemination. A look at systematic reviews from the outside would be useful. The costs involved would be modest.

Aron Shlonsky noted the need to link to Knowledge Translation organizations. One common recommendation is to be deliberate about which reviews to promote and how to promote them.

Arild Bjørndal suggested that interested parties be challenged to devote resources to this activity. Our library should be important to knowledge broker organisations. It is unclear if it will be possible for us to fund a communications position in Oslo. Would it be possible for each CG to designate a dissemination officer?

1

Howard White noted that 3ie has a communications team, and that they oblige study teams to draw up a Plain Language Summary; sometimes these need to be rewritten. A roster of good writers is useful, but takes time to develop.

Other points from the discussion:
- The role of the User's group is unclear at this point.

- It is important to provide examples of how user organizations/decision makers have actually applied the Campbell reviews.

- Our strategic survey showed a degree of dissatisfaction with the Campbell web site.

- We should look at what Cochrane's consumer group is doing in this area.

Follow-up
It was agreed that the CEO should convene a group to consider these issues further and to develop proposals to improve our dissemination activities. The coordination groups are invited to join in the effort to improve the communications with key organizations and decision-makers.

Other aspects arising from the "Note on new strategic priorities" are referred to the next steering group meeting.

b) Full Survey Report
Deferred.

05. Reports from Coordinating Groups

Social Welfare CG
There are four new reviews since September 2012, of which one is co-registered with Cochrane. The group is now concentrating on its own reviews, rather than on co-registered reviews, and seeks to develop reviews on topics such as old age, unemployment, poverty and social diversity.

The group notes difficulties in converting from the Cochrane format to our format, partly due to technical reasons. This can be very time-consuming.

The steering group discussed publication routines for co-registered reviews. It was agreed that it was not essential to covert these from Cochrane format, other than adding the standard Campbell colophon.

Also on publication routines, the Steering Group decided that authors should have sight of the fully formatted version prior to publication. The publication routine and timetable will be amended to cater for this.

Crime and Justice CG
The group has 35 published reviews, 16 reviews in progress and 15 protocols in progress. Funding from NIJ has unfortunately been held up due to legal complications. The group arranges panels at major conferences such as the ASC and the Stockholm Criminology Symposium. David Farrington receives the prestigious Stockholm Prize this year.

The case of the updated Scared Straight review was discussed. This is a co-registered review, but there are variations between the versions published in the Campbell library and in the Cochrane database of systematic reviews. The SG agreed that this was not desirable, and the lead author will be invited to rectify the situation.

Education CG
This group has 14 reviews, and two are nearing completion. Several projects that have become inactive, mainly due to considerable delay; this also means that the protocols out of date.

Funding from Smith Richardson is being used to disburse mini-grants. The group still awaits a decision from AERA on the application to establish a Special Interest Group. However, a training session it is organizing at the forthcoming AERA conference is fully subscribed (65 participants), indicating a growing interest in systematic reviewing. The AERA president has been very supportive.

The idea of encouraging a "Campbell corner" in key journals was mentioned. One possibility may be the Review of Education Research at Berkeley, which has new editors.

International Development CG
There were three published reviews and 24 ongoing reviews, of which 14 were co-registered.
The workload is heavier than anticipated, exceeding ten reviews a year. Accordingly they will not accept secondary registration of a review unless there are grounds for substantive input.

There are discussions with Cochrane concerning the subgroup in nutrition. It appears that nine different Cochrane groups are involved in nutrition. There is a concern to avoid duplication and to ensure that incoming title proposals are circulated widely.

The Dhaka mini-symposium on systematic reviews was well attended, though a number of local registrants did not appear. This seems to be due to political strikes which coincided with the event.

The special issue of Journal for Development Effectiveness on systematic reviews has been published on an open access basis, and has been heavily downloaded.

The group has published an information brochure on their activities.

The group wishes to set up a "satellite" in a low-income country, possibly linking in to the Cochrane initiative on global capacity.

The group noted some difficulties with co-registration, and in particular that CPHG was reluctant to accept ID editorial input on reviews funded by 3ie.

They are currently seeking an associate editor, and are interested in the idea of giving a review author the opportunity to develop as a contact editor.

User Group CG
This group is in transition, and is in the process of reforming its approach and moving towards more structured liaison both with other CGs and with knowledge translation bodies. Merete Konnerup is stepping down, and Gill Clark's term as co-chair has ended. Talks are underway with potential candidates for the co-chair positions, and the UG meeting at this Colloquium will take this further.

Methods CG
The group has been busy organizing this colloquium, and this has been time consuming. They are currently handling 26 reviews/protocols. One point to note is that Campbell needs to adopt its own guidelines where all of the Cochrane standards cannot be met.

06. Report from the Editor's meeting
a. Consideration and adoption of C2 Systematic Reviews: Policies and Guidelines

The discussions at the editors' meeting were summarized. We are close to a final version of the Policies and Guidelines document, and the process to completion is as follows:

A revised version will be posted to the Campbell website and announced in our newsletter. It will be opened for comments from interested parties. The secretariat will arrange a suitable feedback mechanism. Comments received

will contribute to a final draft, which will be submitted to the next Steering Group meeting for approval (Oslo, 18-20 October).

The editors' meeting identified many points which need attention.

Declarations of interest
In what circumstances, if any, is it sufficient for the lead author to sign on behalf of the whole group? Can this give rise to a problem around, as the lead author might not know about potential conflicting interests for all other authors?

Declarations about interest can be done at the registration of a title, but there is a case for waiting to the protocol stage. Potential conflicts of interests should be declared.

Follow up
The secretariat will review our routines around conflict of interest and submit a proposal for revisions to the SG. The routines should be integrated into the toolbox.

Research in languages other than English

Campbell reviews aspire to cover all relevant international research, but in certain cases and on certain topics it is reasonable to have a more restricted focus. In such cases, the authors must set out the rationale for this limitation.

One often finds abstracts in English but the full paper in other language. The challenge of dealing with other languages is well known, also in Cochrane. As a Collaboration we should develop ways to provide support to review teams when they do not themselves include the range of languages needed. A serious limitation is that translation is expensive, particularly if done by translating services.

This is possibly more of a problem with new types of reviews than with intervention studies.

Inclusion criteria should not be based on language. If potentially relevant studies are found but are not in English, the review team should check with the network for help.

Summaries of findings
The Cochrane guidelines for plain language summaries were noted. A further advantage of a simple English summary is that it makes translation easier.

The Toolbox
It was noted that the Toolbox was not originally planned as a project management system, but rather as a system to archive important correspondence around reviews. Since then it has evolved in the direction of an editorial support tool. The question now is whether to push toolbox further in this direction, or to look at available (open access) software for manuscript handling. Should we invest further in the Toolbox, or move to another platform?

Manageable low cost Open Journal options are available. The ad hoc group is asked to provide a recommendation, including implications and costings. We will also need to consider the costs of migration from one system to another, if that is the preferred option.

The Steering Group endorsed the requests of the editors' meeting concerning revisions to access rights for the Toolbox.

The option of negotiating with Cochrane regarding Archie was noted. This also entails the compulsory use of RevMan.

b) Other issues
Feedback from the Editors on the website and toolbox

Arild Bjørndal set out the main aims of the website:
- To present the Collaboration in professional way
- To provide access to our material, particularly reviews.

In addition, we seek to provide an editorial tool that will help authors and editors.

The website is maintained by the secretariat on very limited resources. It is clear that much more elaborate solutions are possible; the question is whether we can find a better platform without incurring significant costs.

There are a number of action points which can improve things. On the Website, it is important to prioritise objectives, and to make the site more user friendly. We do not have a high flow of content – we need to find ways to encourage people to provide new content. The alternative is to scaling down our ambitions and expectations. Specific suggestions were made to add the following to the home page:
- The names of the coordinating groups
- the Effect Size calculator
- training and methods resources.

Ian Schemilt pointed out that much of this concerned web design issues, which were not for the steering group to decide. Mark Lipsey agreed that professional advice on the web design would be helpful.

The relationship of the Library portal to the Campbell Systematic Reviews portal was discussed. The Reviews are especially important, and need to be given due prominence. This portal needs to look like a monograph series. The library is more of an archive, including documents which are mainly of interest to researchers rather than policy or practice communities. The relationship of these two sections needs to be worked out; one option is to merge them.

On the toolbox, a number of action points were identified. Obsolete or irrelevant documents around the toolbox should be identified and removed. The system should incorporate more project management functions. The directory needs an extensive cleanup. It was noted that the increasing use of Facebook and LinkedIn risks creating multiple lists rather than one consolidated list.

It was also noted that an alternative is to scale down ambition and concentrate on the aims set out above. It is expensive to scale up, both in terms of staffing and funding.

Follow up
The SG invited the Secretariat to draw up a plan for what can be done and how it can be implemented, also setting out the aims of our website and software solutions. This can involve engaging outside expertise.

On the recommendation of the editors, the Steering Group decided to convene an ad hoc working group to look specifically at alternative solutions for handling the editorial process. This will include Sandra Wilson (chair) and Dave Wilson.

Campbell Colloquia

07. Update on the Chicago Colloquium
Terri Piggott outlined the final preparations for the Colloquium. Graduate students are on hand to provide assistance. There are 164 registered participants.

Business meeting: Eamonn will give a short presentation on finances etc. and will introduce the key figures from the respective groups.

08. Campbell Collaboration Awards 2013
Frank Schmidt was unable to attend, but Russ Whitehurst will attend and has been invited to speak at the gala dinner.

Production of reviews

09. Production of reviews

10. Dissemination activities
a. The Campbell Library
b. The website, Newsletters [Key Performance Indicators]
c. Presentations at conferences, etc.
d. Other

These items were discussed together.

The secretariat has prepared an overview of selected performance indicators for the website and library (traffic, downloads etc.) Suggestions on other indicators to follow are welcome.

The question of an **impact factor** for our monograph series was discussed. A key requirement for qualifying for an impact factor was regularity of publication; we need to be able to guarantee a certain number of reviews a year. It is not a problem to produce more than the stated minimum or to vary the publication schedule. It is however difficult to get an impact factor; comparatively few new journals are admitted. The development of Google Scholar among other things is also making ISI and impact factor less relevant.

The Steering Group agreed that we should continue to work towards obtaining an impact factor.

It was also agreed that the words "A systematic review" should be added to titles as a matter of routine; this helps visibility in searches.

Campbell has adopted an **open access** policy. There was some discussion of the implications of this. An agreement with a publisher could conceivably generate income (though this is not a given), but has the downside of restricting access to our reviews. We should continue to discuss this, and indeed to focus on the larger question of generating funding. We should look to create opportunities for donors to make contributions. The possibility of inviting voluntary contributions for downloaded reviews should also be examined.

It was agreed that we need to add content to the website regularly. All are welcome to contribute short notices and news items. The extent to which Coordinating groups actively update their own sections of the website varies a great deal.

Our **newsletter** is a useful resource, and it is integrated with the toolbox and directory. This is a text only newsletter, as a result of a policy decision to minimize problems with different browser platforms and spam filters. How to develop the newsletter should be discussed, as part of a larger consideration of our communications strategy.

13. CEO / Head Office: Annual report
The annual report and financial report were circulated, together with a note on the renewal of the funding agreement with the Norwegian Knowledge Centre.

2012 was a landmark year, with a record number of reviews being published. The Copenhagen Colloquium was also very successful. However, the Oslo office reports capacity constraints related to its direct engagement in the work to promote a greater focus on evidence in social policy and practice in Norway. Campbell staff have been centrally involved in the successful establishment of a new unit to produce systematic reviews for six Norwegian agencies. Since the start of 2011the CEO has been working 50% on Campbell and 50% on the research unit; in the near future he will again be free to focus entirely on Campbell matters. An external evaluation of this work has been positive, and the progress of the initiative promises dividends for Campbell in the future.

We are assured that the Knowledge Centre plans to renew the funding agreement with Campbell, at the same level of funding as at present. This however means that we will continue to be subject to resource constraints. The expansion

of staff or operations beyond the present modest levels will require the mobilization of new resources. Absent this, increased funding for specific activities – such as the website – can only be managed if there are corresponding savings in other areas. Maintaining the present editorial infrastructure remains a priority and this has clearly contributed to the higher rate of completion of reviews.

It was suggested that Campbell was not getting enough out of its cooperation with the welfare section at Kunnskapssenteret, and that things needed to change. A priority for the secretariat is to seek avenues to additional funding.

Networking

11. Colloquium

Report from CG meetings at the colloquium
The Coordinating Groups reported on group meetings during the colloquium.

Methods:
There is a very engaged methods community. There is interest in Campbell branded (methods) poster sessions, and they will revisiting the question of a separate methods stream at colloquiua in order to cater for more specialized topics from subgroups. There was some discussion of systematic review software.
A number of new contacts expressed interest in doing peer reviews.
The membership list of the group needs updating.
The question of a LinkedIn group was discussed. Guidelines documents for reviewing qualitative research were also discussed; Ian Shemilt will follow up on this.
Terri Piggott's term as co-chair is coming to an end, and there is a need to elect a new co-chair. Terri is likely to stay on as editor.
On the question of reforming or creating subgroups, or of dormant subgroups, it was noted that the modalities should be set out in each group's governance plan.
Karin Hannes indicated that she was stepping down as co-chair of the Process and Implementation subgroup, in order to concentrate more on the Cochrane side.
Eamonn Noonan separately spoke to Karin about the "Belgian Campbell" website, which has no official status, to request that the name be removed. We are however interested in discussing how to establish an affiliation. Ian Shemilt noted that Karin was a good and competent colleague.

Social Welfare:
The group is interested in working more closely with the Users' Group, to involve them in production and translation outside. The idea is attractive, and can help us extend our reach. The Group is planning to set up a facebook page, to be run by Jo Yaffe, to create new opportunities for members to interact. Invitations to join the facebook page will be sent on the mailing list.

Education:
Many of those who attended are already involved. The importance of user friendly abstracts was stressed. A major issue is how to make people care about what we are doing, given that we have many reviews on key topics in the pipeline.
Much time has gone on cleaning up the library, to identify inactive projects, and to look for a roommate type website to help people to take up dormant projects. A quick follow up mail shot after this colloquium was recommended, to capitalize on the enthusiasm that has been generated.

International Development:
The group is at full capacity in terms of reviews that they can handle. They seek to identify people who are willing to take on one review a year as content editor. The Cochrane Public Health Group (Jodie Doyle) and DFID were represented at the meeting.
A key learning is that funding on its own is not sufficient to deliver a review; there needs to be people with expertise. Developing competence is crucial.

Projects funded by 3ie do not get any money unless they submit something by an agreed deadline. It was also noted that the project development phase has its own demands, that the importance of good preparation at the protocol stage must be communicated to funders. This is critical to ensure that the review team has a firm grasp of the project. The group is anxious that projects facing a delivery deadline can be prioritised in the editing process where necessary.

Crime and Justice:
A number of people expressed interest in getting involved, including some with review experience. It is important to create roles for people to give them experience, also with a view to preparing for succession in key positions. Functions such as an Ad hoc advisory group, a newsletter group, or a LinkedIn-monitor group can be useful, not as false titles but as stepping stones.

Users group:
The SG was informed that two people have stepped forward to take the group forward following the conclusion of Merete's term. They will build on recent discussions with other interested parties. It is likely that the group will be reformed under a new name. It was noted that reform of the group must be conducted in accordance with the Collaboration's Plan of Governance; the SG has a right of approval of a substantial reorganisation. The Steering Group agreed that the CEO should reach out to the designated co-chairs and invite them to the Oslo meeting.

The group expressed its deep appreciation for Merete Konnerup's contribution over many years.

Feedback/ learning points on the Colloquium as a whole
A number of points emerged from discussions on the Colloquium.

- It went very well.
- The combination of the **poster session with a reception** was very successful and contributed to useful conversations and networking.
- The **schedule** was intense (e.g. lunch during plenaries). Would it be possible to add another day, or to reduce the number of moderated panels? The downside of a one day conference is that it may attract fewer participants. To an extent, the venue dictates the programming schedule.
- It is a challenge to arrange a conference that goes across academic sectors and also seeks to be of interest to policy and practice communities. A balance is needed between internal focus (methods) and outward focus (content).
- The **training workshops** should be labeled as professional development opportunities.
- It is important to survey people's preferences.
- The **business meeting** is not representative; attendance is limited to those attending a given colloquium. We need a business meeting in the interest of transparency. Perhaps it could be combined with breakouts for coordinating groups. We make SG minutes and key documents available on website; we could be better at letting people know that they are available. The business meeting should include short reports from the coordinating groups.
- Arrangements for **group meetings** was discussed. After the day's proceedings and before dinner may not be the best time, and it might be better not to have all meetings at the same time. It is also possible to organize breakfast meetings, and spread them over different days, as Cochrane does. We should also consider whether group meetings in the traditional sense are obsolete, and can be replaced by electronic communication (e.g. Facebook). Another option is a meet and greet style (speed dating) as in Cochrane.
- To date we have alternated annually between North America and Europe. We should consider a wildcard **venue**, for example every third year. Suggestions for alternative locations include South Korea, South Africa and Melbourne… There should be a preference for a developing country.
- There is support for another joint colloquium with Cochrane should the occasion arise. Cochrane's next colloquiua are scheduled for Hydrabad in 2014, Vienna in 2015, and South Korea in 2016
- This year's event may have a relatively modest deficit, chiefly related to a shortfall in guaranteed hotel bookings. The SG decided that the Collaboration's funds may be used to cover this shortfall.

The SG expressed its appreciation of the excellent work of the Local organisers, led by Terri Pigott.

b. Next colloquium (Belfast, 2014)
The next colloquium will take place in Belfast, with Paul Connolly in charge of the Local Organising Committee. The dates will be finalized as soon as possible, depending on room availability in Queens University in May and June 2014.

Paul Connolly noted a particular interest in training in Ireland. More philanthropic funding if studies. The programme outline remains to be defined, but the model of two days training and two days of conference is attractive. The Copenhagen model with a day for national policy and practice communities was discussed.

Queens can provide one large plenary room and breakout rooms. Depending on the locale, the approximate capacity would be 200.

Gary Ritter was designated as chair of the Scientific Program committee. Birte, Emily, Jane Dennis, Charlotte (to be confirmed), Karianne and Julia are members. Eamonn will take care of liaison on practical matters.

There was support for the idea of keeping registration costs as low as possible, as this can help participation levels.

There are a number of potential sponsors, such as Belfast Tourism.

c. Planning for 2015
The possibility of holding the 2015 colloquium in South-Africa was discussed. Howard White will contact Ruth Stewart in Johannesburg.

12. Partnerships
a. Cochrane Collaboration

The Steering Group welcomed Mark Wilson, CEO of the Cochrane Collaboration.

Mark set out Cochrane's current strategic priorities. There is explosive growth in everything - authors, production, usage, with 5,5 million downloads of reviews in 2012. Half the world now has free access to reviews. Cochrane has a strong internal focus, and needs to have more outward focus. There is a knowledge translation gap.

It has a complex structure which is overly reliant on individuals, in the transition from the founders to new young leadership. It is overly reliant on revenue through the library, and is now moving towards Open Access. This also means that there will be new diversified products in order to generate income.

A new strategic framework to 2020 will be presented at the Quebec colloquium in September.
The goal is for Cochrane to be the go-to resource for synthesized evidence in health.The existing organization is not optimal but this is where they are. One issue is a proper membership basis, which has never been implemented.

Arild Bjørndal thanked Mark for his presentation. More communication between the organizations is good for us, and we hope it is also good for Cochrane.

Mark Lipsey asked about plans to make reviews more accessible.

Cochrane reviews are freely available to subscribers and will be freely available to everyone after 12 months. There is a need to offer users added value for which they are willing to pay.

They have just started a rapid review product. It is not yet clear what this will entail; a team in Ottawa is taking the lead. Cochrane Innovations is a private offshoot to develop commercial products. We need to develop and invest in a variety of tools and products.

The issue of methodological research on the credibility of rapid reviews was raised.

Future membership arrangements for individuals will be part of a broader governance reform, linked to financing. This will not be a primary source of revenue. The possibility of organizational membership may also be provided for. Campbell is in a similar position, and the secretariat was invited to follow up on membership options for the future.

b. SFI Campbell
c. Other partners
Not discussed

Other
14. Any other business
Steering group members who could not attend should be encouraged to attend the Oslo meeting.

Mark Lipsey handed over to Julia Littell as Co-chair.

15. Next SG meeting
The next SG meeting takes place in Oslo, Norway, on 18-20 October 2013. The venue is the Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services.