



**Minutes of the Steering Group Meeting**

**Nashville, Tennessee, 20-23 September 2012**

**DRAFT, 10 October 2012**

<b>Attending:</b>	Mark Lipsey (Co-chair), Peter Tugwell, David Wilson, Aron Shlonsky, Merete Konnerup, Terri Pigott, Gary Ritter, Paul Connolly, Eamonn Noonan, Emily Tanner-Smith, Sandra Wilson, Hugh Waddington, Jane Dennis, William Turner, Karianne Thune Hammerstrøm, Heather Menzies Munthe-Kaas
<b>Apologies:</b>	Arild Bjørndal (Co-chair), Jane Barlow, Martin Killias, Ian Shemilt, Howard White, Mette Deding
<b>Minutes:</b>	Heather Menzies Munthe-Kaas, Eamonn Noonan

**01. Opening, adoption of agenda**

Two carry-over items from Copenhagen minutes were added under other business:

- Conflict of interest policy (from IDCG)
- Policy for completed reviews

**02. Minutes**

The minutes from the previous meeting adopted with no amendments.

**03. Emerging strategic issues**

The following is a non-exhaustive list of issues flagged in the Steering Group’s discussion on emerging strategic issues, sorted by area of activity.

**Guidance for authors**

- Clearer expectations for authors (e.g. it is not a requirement at title stage that potentially included studies exist, but this is often a de facto expectation) (flagged by MG, ID)

**Research methodology issues**

- Methods for comparing multiple interventions (e.g. network meta-analyses) (MG, CJ)
- Including implementation reviews; qualitative information in reviews; Need to expand scope of included primary studies and reduce myth that Campbell reviews include only RCTs (MG, SW)
- Better guidelines on deciding when meta-analyses is not appropriate, and guidelines on what to do if meta-analysis is not appropriate (ID; CJ)
- How to make sense of complex questions and broad questions (outside of direct interventions) (ECG)
- Adverse events (regular treatment effects rule with possible harmful effects; reviewing events that might harm people – e.g. military deployment; refugee camp) (SW)
- Advanced methodological techniques (e.g. Bayesian models, models for diagnostic test accuracy, single-subject, individual participant diary) (MG)

**Harnessing technology for review-related tasks**

- Following the development of electronic screening of titles, abstracts and fulltext (SW)

**Networks**

- Collaboration between C2 methods community (wider than CG) and methods communities of the international organizations that produce systematic reviews (MG)



**Training**

- Development of collaboration wide training strategy with clear and prioritized goals to be used as a framework for guiding workshops and training materials (MG)

**Dissemination/Outreach/Advocacy**

- Making review findings policy relevant; how to make people care about evidence (MG, ECG)
- Need to encourage primary researchers (and funders) to conduct better quality research and/or to report better. Current C2 practice is ad hoc through presentations of systematic reviews. A statement on the website for advocacy on guidelines and materials we would like to see used in journal publications would be useful. (SW)
- Customer service (both review authors and end users – policy makers and practitioners); Working with policy makers and people who should be wanting C2 products (CJ, ECG)
- Visually attractive useful products (CJ)
- Users group needs to be reinvigorated and re-conceptualized (SW)
- Competition with other groups, e.g. in K12 education field (ECG)

**04. Strategic priorities of the Coordinating Groups**

**05. Strategic priorities of the Collaboration as a whole, part I**

**09. Strategic priorities of the Collaboration as a whole, part II**

**The following is a summary of points made under Items 4, 5 and 9, sorted by five headings: production, training, dissemination, networking (including Colloquium), and funding (including administration).**

**PRODUCTION**

Priority has been increase in review production (SW)  
Building research capacity is a constant priority

We are reaching capacity regarding editorial support, but trying to expand editorial base over the next 6 months (succession planning, recruitment); Struggling with editorial capacity and establishing infrastructure/systems (e.g. checklists for review) (ID, SW)  
Editor currently copy-editing all reviews – may change as publication increases  
Developing Toolbox to walk editors through actions/steps (CJ)

**Editorial support**

Aspirations:

- Priorities (in order):
  - o Campbell systematic reviews portal (priority #1, almost ready to launch – will first be hidden with a link and possibility for feedback from SG members) (responsibility of Secretariat)
  - o Improve usefulness of toolbox as an editorial tracking system (with reminders to peer reviewers, etc.) (CGs to develop a wish list and pass on to Secretariat, responsibility of Secretariat)
  - o Sustaining and supporting editor’s meetings
  - o Style guide, procedural manuals (responsibility of CGs)
- Other
  - o Consistency – not just responsibility of CGs, but perhaps a centralized position to check for consistency (copy-editor and typesetter) could be outsourced to an external host
  - o Library should be up-to-date, information should appear consistently and correctly (e.g. capitalization on titles – all words both document title and in library going forward, style guide), cleaning up discontinued projects (SW has a list of discontinued projects and suggests that other groups do this as well). Areas for improvement: search capability, citation



corrections, training for CGs on how they can improve library

More meetings with editorial board (SW)

Developing succession for editors (CJ)

Co-registration arrangement needs to be improved (SW)

## **Guidance to authors; Resources for Campbell authors**

### - *Manual*

Creating a manual; Establishing procedures and division of responsibilities (SW, ECG)

Balance between CG discretion and C2 consistency and structure – going from guidelines development to a manual for editors; Potential difficulties of Campbell level policies/structure and less discretion at CG level (SW, CJ)

### - *Information retrieval specialist*

Need for search coordinator varies across CGs, but aspiration would be to have someone available who can conduct systematic database/electronic searches for review authors with registered titles. Resource implications are ways to share, or raise funds to support this as a priority.

### - *Database access*

Exploration of the possibility of building some network among C2 supporters who are in organizations with access that allows sharing of resources in a legitimate form.

## **Preparing our capacity and expertise for new topics**

- Methods group keeps a database of peer reviewers and their expertise
- Method training for editors is not a priority – training of review authors is a higher priority. Individual editors can contact methods group or proactively seek out other training workshops on specific methods if needed
- If we decide to move into other types of review questions, relevant procedural guides will need to be developed (e.g. diagnostic, implementation)
- Methods group currently training graduate students to be able to take over eventually

## **Potentially useful relationships regarding editorial support**

- Better coordination with Cochrane efforts and liaison/participation in other groups working on systematic reviews
- Suggestion for an umbrella organization/federation in an attempt to provide uniformity across the groups
- Devolution of the users group to representatives within each CG could develop systematic database/relationships with relevant organizations
- Invite Cochrane representative to next SG meeting

## **TRAINING**

Training of review authors – development of a more systematic training strategy (MG)

### **Objectives:**

- To support authors and high potential authors to obtain the expertise they need to do reviews
- Training raises the profile of Campbell and generally attracts people to the idea of being a review author

### **More effective strategies to help people produce reviews**

- Develop online materials that are specifically tailored to authors of reviews (e.g. Step-by-step instructions for filling out templates (video format)) which can be used in live training sessions
- Outreach - Videos for why authors should engage in producing systematic reviews (purposes and



implications of doing systematic reviews) (perhaps should go under a different element under the strategic plan)

## **In-person training workshops**

- Agreed to sustain training in a Colloquium context with training on other issues besides methods (e.g. how to register a title)
- To improve organizational infrastructure to respond to requests for training - training outside the colloquium (e.g. apply for a grant to provide training for K12 education systematic reviewers)
- Two potential models: 1) initiated by Campbell who takes on costs and charges a training fee, or 2) a sponsor opens up for their own constituents and covers all costs
- Suggestion that we have goals of training to have a certain number of registered titles at the end of the (colloquium) training
- Another market is undergraduate/graduate students either via classes, or accredited training at MSc level. Good thesis topic.
- Arrange videos of workshops at Chicago colloquium and narrated videos ready for colloquium; Short narrated guidance videos on small training issues
- Spokespersons who can promote the importance of Campbell systematic reviews
  
- Executive training – could be web-based (MG)
- Online training for consumers of reviews

Short narrated guidance videos on how to understand/use systematic reviews, how to use the website, presentations of review results, why funders should engage with Campbell systematic reviews

## **DISSEMINATION**

Is it Campbell's role to disseminate or merely to consolidate and summarize? There seem to be two options for how Campbell engages with users:

- Make Campbell reviews as useful as possible for policy makers and practitioners
- Make Campbell reviews research products and then, at the user interface, cultivate relationships with people who can take it from there

Policy friendly presentation of review findings with information on what interventions actually are (1-3-25 page idea) with support from an authority in the field (ID)

Adaptation of explicit expectations for reporting of reviews (MG)

Suggestion that we pick one hot-topic review per year to refigure and promote (like Cochrane special collections) (ID)

Building capacity among people in LMICs to conduct SRs (ID)

Trying to be more visible, encourage topics that are relevant, promote Campbell research through educational conferences (ECG)

Presenting tables at the beginning is an improved way of engaging with end users – which is of strategic importance (ECG)

Additional products (e.g. preliminary reports) should be considered.

Improving Library search functionality should be improved (ID). The secretariat pointed out that few if any online libraries and databases use fuzzy logic in their search engines, for reasons of cost.

## **Other Users' Group input:**

Establish partnerships for dissemination of reviews to various audiences via users group (which could exist of representatives from CGs)

Need to look at reviews and what parts are most important to which constituencies

Liaison with different users is important. Who are user communities?



- Providers, policy makers, funders, knowledge transfer organizations
- Which users are prioritized?

- Practitioners, policy-makers, searchers

## Form of the reviews

- a. User friendly, expects reviews to go more directly to users
  - b. Research products, relying on knowledge transfer (KT) relationships to produce user friendly products
- There is currently a policy paper stating that there be significant user oriented activities within each CG (origination of user abstracts) with idea of advisory group following production of a single review from the title stage, and a user group which would build collaborations with KT organizations
  - All published reviews should have executive summaries, current standard is structured abstract and plain language summary (in practice an academic abstract) but issue that there are different audiences
  - Suggestion that user group coordinator matches KT organizations or user groups (science writers or practitioners) with review teams from title stage
  - Users group has tried different models, but now a model for production (SFI and Campbell Secretariat) since practice for writing a user abstract is more important than knowing a topic area.
  - Need to maintain image of Campbell as providing high quality syntheses by producing high quality scientific reviews, supporting Users Group to publish user abstracts, but develop relationships with KT and intermediary communities in different countries and thematic areas who can share our products with their audiences.
  - Suggestion that we keep Campbell products to maximum user abstract level.
  - Suggestion to periodically highlight hot topic reviews
  - CGs must have a role within the User Group
  - ECG example of a review that includes conclusion section with clinical significance, recommendations for researchers, recommendations for researchers. This is useful but most authors don't know how to do this. Suggestion for training to authors on how to interpret results. Suggestion to write a section on interpreting results in guidelines for meta-analysis. But need to recognize limitations of authors.
  - Recommendation from Merete to add something to section 4 of policy and guidelines document on user abstracts.
  - IDCG – in protocol and review guidelines recommended that authors produce a SoF table (GRADE style) at beginning of review and in abstract.
  - Core product remains scientific review, and do what is possible to add on layers to assist readability, and to the extent that it is possible (capacity) SFI and the secretariat can continue to produce User Abstracts which other KT organizations can take further
  - Suggestion for guidelines/video on how to read a Campbell review. Mixed responses – not sure Campbell is ready yet.
  - Suggestion for inclusion of glossary of relevant terminology for every published review

## Implications

- C2 is not engaged enough in social media. LinkedIn group is more active than Facebook with more than 70 KT organizations following.
- No branding in terms of a set of messages
- Should prioritize our Campbell website
- Campbell should try to connect with KT organizations instead of end users – therefore Facebook is inappropriate
- Suggestion for a centralized communications/press officer position
- Need to redesign so that CGs are visible as thematic areas on the front page
- Managing communications person for each CG to cover Twitter, Facebook, website (analogous to managing editor positions)
- Colloquium page needs to be updated on Campbell site
- Agreed that Secretariat will explore possibilities to hire a new web designer.
- User Groups mission has previously focused on production of user abstracts, which are currently



produced by the Secretariat.

- Structure: Proposal that each CG has a representative to the Users Group.
- Mandate: Proposal that UG acts as PR for Campbell and disseminates products to users; attend CG meetings, are an integral part of each CG, and are aware of upcoming review projects, etc. represent involvement of users in production of reviews. Users being KT organizations rather than end users
- Suggestion that we consult with people in KT to tell us what a Users Group should do
- Suggestion that we recruit members to UG from KT organizations.

## NETWORKING

Building interest in research synthesis and Campbell is important. We want to be the first stop for evidence in social services.

Succession planning (SW)

- Procedures are already in place, but need to raise consciousness around systematic identification and recruitment of future (managing) editors
- Suggestion: junior roles (such as associate editor) who could attend meetings (for Editors), utilize website and/or CG newsletters to recruit people for such roles

Continuing to collaborate with other methods groups (including Cochrane) (MG)

Include Cochrane representatives at Campbell meetings and vice versa (MG)

Recruitment of external peer reviewers and reimbursement of members of editorial boards (SW)

Investigate building links with communities of practitioners (MG)

Will present at AERA conference (paid participation) – could C2 charge people to spend time with methods group to learn about advanced specialized methods (e.g. Colloquium) (MG)

Support for review teams (e.g. advisory groups)

### Colloquium

Chicago – goal is to introduce potential authors to systematic reviews; Based on feedback of previous training at colloquia – introductory and applied (methodological topics applicable to most authors) workshops; Offer “advanced” workshops as Methodological panel discussions during colloquium

Methods sub-groups could become more involved by presenting on specialized topics (MG)

## FUNDING

Securing funding is a priority. What we need to do proactively to make Norwegian centre attractive to be funded indefinitely? Funding is currently secured until the end of 2013. We are optimistic that funding will continue, especially if we prove relevance to Norway, and this should be clear by mid-2013. It is important to explain how Campbell’s approach is in line with what can be seen as a specifically Norwegian tradition of rationality and pragmatism in public affairs.

CGs can assist by taking some of the projects that are coming to the social research unit in November – both by recruiting Campbell review teams, and by assisting as advisors.

The Social Research Unit is planning a 2-day workshop on systematic reviews in Oslo in March 2013 with key speakers from the Campbell network on key topics (also in order to demonstrate the benefit to Norway of funding for Campbell)

- Add a menu item “funders”.
- While we are confident of continued Norwegian funding, it is still a good idea to explore other options (e.g. with dedicated groups exploring opportunities in the US and UK)



- Explore recruitment of key people to liaise on developing funding (e.g. Bob Boruch, Jerry Lee) and an advisory group or process for mobilizing resources for infrastructure. Be more systematic about establishing who is interested and where resources are.
- A backup plan would be to identify possible hosts that could help Campbell survive, albeit with more modest central staffing and resources
- Developing relationships with supportive organization with ties to governments and communities
- Sub-groups may be better placed to attract funds in some cases. However, funding is likely to be available only for review production, not for infrastructure (SW)
- Funding from Smith-Richardson – 25% to editing (ECG)
- Recently granted \$100 000 from National Institute Justice (non-competitive) – some of which will support infrastructure, most to incentivize completion of ongoing NIJ relevant reviews (NIJ will then publish in NIJ journals) (CJ)

## Administration

How do we develop the Campbell Collaboration as an organization?

Maintenance & availability of background documents (SW)

## Decisions under Items 4, 5 and 9:

Develop a sub-group on resources and funding to develop a strategy for how to move forward (responsibility: to be determined).

On communicating reviews to users, we need to identify action points and propose a division of responsibility. Specific action plans should be brought to the Chicago SG meeting (Merete (?)).

## Action points under Items 4, 5 and 9:

Slides with a presentation on why knowledge is growing at a research synthesis (meta-analysis) level instead of at a primary study level to be circulated (Mark).

Ensure titles are all capitalized going forward (in document and in library). (Editors)

Develop and circulate a wish list for the Toolbox and send to the Secretariat (Editors and managing editors).

## 06. Report from the Editor's meeting

This section is based on a note by Mark Lipsey (see attached)

The following points were discussed. SG decisions on specific points are noted.

### 1. Expansion of type of Campbell review

Campbell reviews are in general reviews of the effectiveness of interventions. However, there is no explicit statement that limits reviews to interventions. We now have in progress examples of different kinds of review. It is now advisable to establish explicit guidelines in this matter.

Supplementary pieces to existing reviews (which may also be conducted by a different team than the original review team) can be an interesting option. (To rule this out completely risks making ourselves irrelevant). However, there should in all cases be clear relevance to decision-making in policy or practice.

As and when additional modules or chapters are planned, it is necessary to provide both guidelines and editorial support, as we have for intervention reviews. This is particularly the case for implementation reviews (which tend to be more qualitative). There are three categories of different reviews to consider: (1)



those concerning policy, or an area where RCTs are not practicable (e.g. military deployment); (2) reviews which are more qualitatively oriented (e.g. risk factors, diagnostics, screening) – while these are not about interventions as such, they are however related to an intervention; and (3) reviews which are implementation oriented (barriers, facilitators).

It is possible that the inclusion of other review types would enhance the case for permanent funding in Norway.

On prognostics/diagnostics, it was suggested that we adopt Cochrane methods (with support from a trusted methods person). For qualitative reviews, it was suggested that this be treated in the first instance as a supplementary piece, and with suitable caveats.

ECG reports a need to look at a broader range of studies, since there is a shortage of effect studies

It was noted that implementation reviews can often look like narrative reviews, and it remains unclear what a high quality narrative review looks like.

**Decision:** Of these other categories of reviews, Types (1) and (2) may be discussed on a case-by-case basis by CGs as we build up our own practices around different types of reviews. It is important CGs share experiences from such cases with each other. Type (3) can be taken on; these will not be published as a Campbell Systematic Review, but will be treated as a supplement to an SR. Mark will draft and circulate language on this decision for inclusion in the draft Policies and Guidelines document, as soon as possible.

## 2. Co-registration with Cochrane

Co-registration has a number of advantages for Campbell. However, the precise editorial and approval process for such reviews is still unclear. CDPLPG (hereafter DPG) historically has a dual (and unique) identity a group affiliated both to Cochrane and to Campbell, and this special status means that DPG co-registered reviews need to be differentiated from reviews co-registered with other Cochrane groups. SW notes that a great deal of time and attention has gone on co-registration issues, and they want an arrangement which reduces this.

**Decision:** An internal sub-committee will meet to prepare a meeting with Cochrane (Aron's responsibility). A leadership level meeting between Campbell and Cochrane will be organized in order to discuss an overarching agreement covering both procedures and the division of responsibility at an organizational level.

## 3. Stipulations on updates of reviews

The following proposal was submitted:

The stipulation that authors specify a time-frame for an update of a review will be dropped. Instead, each topic will be opened for a new review after 5 years. The original review team will be notified and given the first opportunity to conduct the update. If the original team does not take up the topic, a new team has the option to use the original review. If they wish, new teams may make arrangements with the original team for collaboration, sharing of materials, etc. The original team has no obligation to participate, but the new team can make use of the information in the original published review and protocol as they wish (with due credit and citation).

Updated reviews will be treated as new reviews and will go through the full C2 editorial process, whether prepared by the original team or a new team. The process may be expedited where there are few or no changes to the original protocol.

An updated review will appear in Campbell Systematic Reviews as a new publication with acknowledgement and citation of the prior version. In the Online Library, the prior version of the review and the protocol will still be available, but will be marked to indicate that they have been superseded by more recent documents.



In the case of hot topic reviews, CGs may at their discretion initiate an update before 5 years have elapsed.

**Decision:** The proposal was approved as submitted.

#### 4. Completed systematic reviews from other sources

In October 2010 the SG adopted the following policy:

*Authors who have completed a systematic review outside of the C2 editorial process may submit it to the editor of a Coordinating group for possible inclusion in Campbell Systematic Reviews. The CG editor, in consultation with the CG co-chairs and other editors, as appropriate, will first decide if it should be considered and may reject it at that point. If it is not rejected, the editor will then provide feedback to the author about what revisions, if any, are required for it to be appropriate in content and format for a C2 review. When received, a manuscript with appropriate content and format will be reviewed following the same procedures applied to all draft systematic reviews under consideration for inclusion in Campbell Systematic Reviews.*

Two amendments to this policy are proposed: (1) it is a requirement that the review be put into the Campbell format; (2) the front page or colophon will note that the review came through a different channel (and in cases where there is no protocol, it will be explained why this is the case).

**Action point:** The changes are approved; the policies and guidelines document will be amended accordingly.

#### 5. Journal publication of Campbell review findings

There is a clear distinction between the review published in the library, which is a monograph, and a journal article. These are not identical, even if they concern the same study and report the same findings. There is a need for consistency across CGs.

There should be restrictions on timing and order of publication. IDCG's Governance Plan stipulates that the Campbell review must come first and that a journal article must reference the Campbell review.

There are concerns that authors use Campbell editorial support, only to then submit their work as a journal article and not as a Campbell review.

The wording in the current version of the draft guidelines is as follows:

*Campbell reviews are monographs that are typically longer and more detailed than journal article versions of a systematic review and Campbell Systematic Reviews is explicitly presented as an only monograph series. The Campbell collaboration places no restriction on publication of the findings of a Campbell systematic review in a more abbreviated form as a journal article either before or after the publication of the monograph version in Campbell Systematic Reviews. [Note: For co-registered reviews, Cochrane may require publication in the Cochrane Library before journal publication]. Some journals, however, have restrictions that preclude publication of findings that have been, or will be, reported elsewhere and authors considering publication in such a journal should be aware of possible conflict with publication of the monograph version in Campbell Systematic Reviews. Publication in a journal after publication or "in press" status in Campbell Systematic Reviews should acknowledge the Campbell version and include a citation to it.*

*The issue here is one of timing. E.g., IDCG statement on this is that C2 reviews should be published either before, or at the same time as, publication in other journals, i.e., that journal publication cannot precede C2 publication (with alternate arrangements negotiable with CG if this is at odds with a journal's policy).*

The Co-publication statement (adopted in Oslo in 2009) is attached.

**Decision:**

- The Oslo 2009 policy statement will be amended on the lines of the wording given above.
- In addition, it is provided that if a protocol is approved, authors must indicate that the article is based on findings from an ongoing Campbell review.
- A provision to “recommend that the relevant CG be notified of journal publications which precede library publication” will be included in permission to publish agreement for review authors, and in the Policies and Guidelines document.
- The Policies and Guidelines document will be revised accordingly.

**6. Other points arising from the Editors meeting****Decision:** The Steering Group approved the following recommendations:

- *Risk of bias* section in protocol and final review: use “suggest” in draft Guidelines
- Recommend an *External validity* section in protocol and final review
- Include “systematic review” at the end of each title, to assist searching from this point forward.
- SG should form a working group consisting of methods group and coordinating group representatives, to work together to adapt MECIR to C2 purposes (Emily and Terri to follow up).
- Specify time to completion for protocols and reviews: one year title to protocol; two years protocol to review; extensions to be granted on a case-by-case basis
- The Methods group should be copied on action letters both for protocols and for reviews

A policy of reimbursing peer reviewers was adopted in 2008 as an incentive to encourage more rapid feedback. Practice varies across groups as regards providing reimbursement for peer reviews by editorial board members, and not all groups have editorial boards.

**Decision:** The Steering Group decided that all peer reviewers (including external reviewers, editorial board members, or co-chairs) may seek reimbursement; and that they should be given the option of donating the reimbursement to Campbell (for example for the Gibbs award).

**07. Preparation of Campbell Colloquia****a. Chicago, 21-23 May 2013**

See attached powerpoint slides

**Venue:**

- Water tower campus & Corboy Law Center, School of education, Loyola University Chicago
- Accommodation to be reserved at Marriott Hotel and Residence Inn
- Plenaries at Kasbeer (max. capacity 200)
- Cocktails and poster sessions at Regents

**Programme**

- General framework is the same as Copenhagen
- CG representatives on planning committee are Gary, Aron, Merete, Hugh, Charlotte
- One call for posters and papers; committee will decide if submissions go to panel, poster, or are not included (for presentation slots, preference will be given to Campbell reviews and to technical topics related to systematic reviews)
- Training sessions can be either methods, technical support and advocacy/preaching

**Plenary**

- Matt Stagner is confirmed
- 4 spots left (one is for Jerry Lee lecture).
- Howard White to be invited for opening plenary, on why systematic reviews are important.
- Call for proposals to issue Oct 15. Deadline for submissions Dec 15. Response to applicants in Jan.



## Advertising

- Conference website to be launched in January (also for registration etc.)
- C2 Website front page must be updated with dates.
- Use original Campbell logo

## Action points:

Bob Boruch and Howard White to be contacted regarding introductory plenary

CGs to forward suggestions for plenary speakers to planning committee

Call for proposals to be issued Oct 15

## b. Mini-colloquium, Dhaka, 3-7 December 2012

NB: dates changed to 11-14 December.

## c. Belfast, 2014

Not discussed

## 08. Campbell Collaboration Awards 2013

The call for nominations for both awards will be published on the website at the end of October and announced in our newsletter. CGs are encouraged to draw attention to the process, and also to submit nominations. The deadline for nominations is the end of November 2012. Following input from the Awards Advisory Group, the SG will decide on the awards by electronic vote in March (Secretariat to coordinate).

## 10. Partnerships

Deferred

## 11. Head Office - interim report

Oral report from the CEO on status of funding to The Campbell Collaboration and activities of the Secretariat.

## 12. Election planning

### Co-chair election

Mark Lipsey's second term as co-chair ends in May 2013. General call for nominations, but SG members encouraged to send suggestions for potential candidates to co-chairs or CEO.

### Elections for CGs

An updated overview of election dates/procedures for the various CGs needs to be compiled.

**Action point:** CGs are requested to confirm of end of term dates, which will be posted on the website (Heather to follow up).

## 13. Any other business

### Carried over from Copenhagen 2012 Meeting: Draft of C2 conflict of interest policy

A draft was distributed during meeting. Comments and feedback are invited. A revised draft will be submitted for adoption at the Chicago SG.



**Action point:** An electronic version of the latest draft paper will be circulated with a deadline (TBD) for comments and feedback (Mark to follow up).

**Carried over from Copenhagen 2012 Meeting: Policy for completed reviews**

A note by Mark Lipsey regarding Campbell publication of completed reviews was distributed. This remains the policy of the Collaboration.

**Peabody meta-analysis database (see attached powerpoint)**

An overview was given of the Peabody Research Institute meta-analysis database. This includes predictors with more than 120,000 effect sizes and correlations from school related outcomes to juvenile delinquency.

**14. Next SG meeting**

Chicago, Monday 20 May (all day) and Friday 24 May 2013 (half day SG, half day Editor's meeting).