



Minutes of the Steering Group Meeting
SFI Campbell, Copenhagen, 27-28 May 2012

Attending:	Arild Bjørndal, Mark Lipsey, Howard White, Peter Tugwell, David Wilson, Aron Shlonsky, Merete Konnerup, Eamonn Noonan, Terri Pigott, Gary Ritter, Ian Shemilt, Jenny Rehnman, Mette Deding, Emily Tanner-Smith, Sandra Wilson, Birte Snilstveit, Hugh Waddington, Jane Dennis, William Turner, Bjørn Tommy Tollånes, Karianne Thune Hammerstrøm, Paul Connolly, Emily Tanner-Smith,
Apologies:	Jane Barlow, Martin Killias
Minutes:	Heather Menzies Munthe-Kaas

Agenda item; Discussion points	Decision/action
01. Opening, adoption of agenda	
02. Minutes <i>Adoption of the Minutes of the previous meeting.</i>	
The minutes from the meeting in Washington August 2011 were adopted.	
Reports from Coordinating Groups	
03a. Methods CG <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Campbell and Cochrane Economic Methods Group</i> - <i>Information Retrieval Methods Group</i> - <i>Process and Implementation Methods Group</i> - <i>Campbell and Cochrane Equity Methods Group</i> - <i>Methods guidelines</i> - <i>Special Interest Group in American Educational Research Association</i> 	
<p>Status report presented (attached).</p> <p>On average, Methods group is taking about a month to get feedback on incoming reports back to the relevant CG.</p> <p>Methods guidelines have been produced, with references to useful web resources. We need to find the appropriate way to make this available on Campbell website, with the relevant links.</p> <p>The group has put a proposal to AERA for a Special Interest Group (SIG) for meta-analysis/systematic reviews. A SIG is entitled to a certain number of sessions during the annual conference. Paul Connolly is a program chair for this initiative.</p> <p>Sub-groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are a number of current initiatives on the Cochrane side. - Equity group continues to working on an extension to PRISMA - It would be useful to have a Campbell review with a substantial economic dimension, and to build a model for looking at costs. <p>CGs are invited to designate reviews which are models of best practice in one or other respect (e.g. Kinship care for the inclusion of non-RCTs). A collection of good examples</p>	<p>The SG referred further work on methods guidelines to the editors meeting (see separate minutes).</p>



could be presented on the website as guidance for review authors.

Turnaround time

CGs report that some reviews are being processed more slowly. There is one example of a long delay.

Methods seek to keep editing in house and to do in-house training in order to enhance capacity.

An alert system, based on the median processing time, should be considered, so that the key people can be notified of excessive delays.

4-6 weeks is a reasonable turnaround time for the methods review. However, a protocol also spends 4-6 weeks with the relevant CG. Clearly defined goals and benchmarks need to be established. It is very important to be clear to authors about time expectations. The C2 process is different than the journal process; while the editing process underway is time-consuming, publication following quickly on final approval.

C&J uses in-house review and can issue an action letter within 2 weeks. Many issues can be caught without an external review in first round. This allows authors to incorporate changes and return the document quickly for methods editing.

Fast track/prioritizing reviews

The need to fast track some reviews was discussed. This is relevant especially for reviews with funder-specified deadlines.

Experience to date suggests that some strategies help to speed up the process:

- Flag that a project is urgent, and indicate whether funding depends on fixed delivery deadlines.
- Give the Methods Group a steer on the needs of the project (e.g. needs full review/does not raise major issues/does not need methods assistance).
- Maintain a list of reliable referees.

It is easier to fast track reviews which fit the standard mould of a classic review, and reviews by experienced teams.

One factor which can frustrate attempts to move quickly is reliance on external reviewers.

03b. [Social Welfare CG](#)

Status report presented (attached).

The new managing editor was introduced. Jane Barlow was recently elected as SW co-chair.

The group is revising its internal processes in order to be more proactive. It is renewing its editorial board by asking individuals to confirm their active involvement, and many requests have been received from people wishing to join board. They are considering designating responsibility for specific content areas to individual members, in order to encourage engagement.

The toolbox is in use and they are liaising with BTT on this. They plan to take over the SW pages on the Campbell website and to add content.

Co-registration with C1 has been challenging, but there are opportunities to strengthen our relationship with CDP and other C1 groups.



Co-registration

- Guidelines state that authors may choose the preferred editorial base. CDP disagrees with this approach, and does not engage with reviews as a secondary editorial base. If a review has CDP as its primary base and is co-registered with SW, CDP will use SW/C2 methods reviewers.
- Working in Archie and Revman is a requirement is a requirement for reviews registered with CDP. This is a further barrier to a C2 CG being the primary editorial base for a co-registered review.
- Wiley has indicated that an unspecified number of co-registered reviews can be published on the Campbell website
- [When engaging in co-registered projects, we will respect the decision of the co-registering group, but we will have input along the way.]
- IDCG is seeking to co-register a number of projects. They have experienced that the relevant C1 review group (not CDP or public health) was concerned that there was no written collaboration wide agreement/MoU regarding co-registration. However, such agreements can only currently happen at the review group level on the Cochrane side, and not at a collaboration wide level.

Gibbs award

- There is a continuing effort to build up an endowment in memory of Len Gibbs. One suggestion is to offer reviewers an option to donate to the endowment.

03c. [Crime and Justice CG](#)

Status report presented (attached).

CG co-chairs and editor have been working to secure funding from NIJ as a non-competitive award. This would be used to support infrastructure, and to finish reviews t of interest to NIJ. NIJ will then write user abstracts and disseminate in their networks.

David Weisburd steps down as co-chair at the next C&J SG meeting and is succeeded by David Wilson. Martin Killias is the other co-chair.

Dissemination activities

- American society Criminology conference (Nov 2011) – 3 full panels of presentations.
- Jerry Lee symposium highlights Campbell reviews (e.g. electronic monitoring)
- Stockholm criminology symposium
- COPS (US DOJ) has published Campbell reviews in booklet form (5 reviews so far) and distributed them nationally

The CJ Steering Committee meets twice a year at conferences that the members regularly attend (American criminology society; Stockholm criminology symposium).

The Committee has an international membership and serves as a public interface as well as supervising reviews in progress.

Challenges:

- They are beginning to receive unsolicited title registrations, including ones outside of the Campbell remit (e.g. review of criminology theory and correlates

The SG agreed to add a discussion on boundaries for SR questions (i.e. interventions only?) and the implications for methods training to the agenda of the strategic planning meeting in September.



of crime). They are considering policy on boundaries for review questions – it may be possible to consider things that are not interventions, but there would need to be a policy-relevant issue, for example risk prediction tools

- IDCG co-registered reviews are challenging, as some focus on a category of intervention rather than a specific intervention (e.g. funded review on violence prevention in LMIC).

Whether Campbell should focus on intervention based SRs only was discussed. If not, where are the boundaries and how far can we go into diagnostics, etc?

There is a need for improved guidelines on methods; there is currently too much diversity in how reviews are being done. If we do broaden the scope of acceptable topics, it follows that we need the capacity for appropriate methodological support.

The idea of a more peer-reviewed introduction, with a more elaborate discussion of why the issue being reviewed is relevant or important was discussed.

Client expectations on review inclusion criteria were discussed. Clients sometimes express concern about the type of evidence omitted from a review. We need to develop a common understanding around what types of evidence are admissible. Credibility among expert communities can be threatened when well known studies are ignored because of study design.

03d. Education CG

Status report presented (attached).

The ECG governance plan was put to the SG for approval and was approved. (An electronic vote on this prior to the meeting did not reach a quorum).

The ECG will meet during the colloquium to finalize its editorial board.

ECG recently received significant funding for review teams. Smith Richardson Foundation is providing \$150,000 over 18 months to support approximately 12 reviews, This amounts to ca. \$ 12,000 each, which is partial rather than full funding for a given project. The reviews must be of interest to the foundation. A topic list was sent with the grant proposal (distributed at the SG in Washington 2011) but this is not exhaustive. The Group seeks advice on drawing up rules for an application process for review teams. It was noted that the reviews must be of high standard, which may mean recruiting an experienced team internally rather than an open application. It was noted that the US OMB has brought an increased focus on evidence for policy.

A \$30,000 grant was received from UNA to support 3 reviews (on children and ethnic diversity). These reviews will try to inform some of the interventions under discussion through UNA. Tender criteria should focus on experience.

What Works Clearinghouse has suggested that ECG could take up sub-questions related to some of their databases in order to make better use of funding.

The question of payment to authors on completion of milestones rather than paying upfront for unfinished reviews was discussed. This is now the standard practice. In a

The SG approved the ECG governance plan.



<p>previous initiative, seed money was allocated to review authors who never completed reviews.</p>	
<p>03e. International Development CG <i>Decision point: conflict of interest for IDCG</i> <i>Decision point: Creation of a sub-group</i></p>	
<p>Status report presented (attached).</p> <p>The question of inclusion criteria and the role of an advisory group were important for this group. Discussions with the FAO revealed concerns that certain important studies had been excluded from a review in progress (Farmer field schools). The group has decided that their review teams must have an advisory group, in order to engage stakeholders early and in order to build consensus on the approach.</p> <p>3ie has in the past co-registered with Cochrane, but 3ie reports are more comprehensive on Theory of Change. They are now preparing “Extended Friendly Front End” reports. The Farmer field schools (FFS) project involves three separate reports: (1) an effectiveness review; (2) a causal change analysis (factual description of how the implementation worked); (3) a global portfolio review (documents FFS approach globally and how it is used by different agencies (IFAD & FAO))</p> <p>Another project involves a Campbell effectiveness review and a section extracting qualitative data from included primary studies. It includes a consideration of different classes of intervention included in the systematic review in order to give a causal change analysis. This gives more of a comparison than a standard Campbell review.</p> <p>These products are necessary for 3ie in order to keep policy makers on board.</p> <p>There is no stipulation in Campbell’s guidance for reviewers that only RCTs can be included in a review.</p> <p>IDCG is developing ways to bring in other types of information into Campbell reviews, but this should not undermine the systematic aspect of the reviews. Implementation studies are emerging as an important area for review.</p> <p>Exclusion tables can be used to address papers which are commonly believed to be important in the field but which do not meet the inclusion criteria.</p> <p>The SG approved the proposal to establish a Nutrition Sub-group of the IDCG.</p> <p><i>Conflict of interest policy (see also Any Other Business, below)</i> A Co-chair and Editors of IDCG are 3ie staff who also carry out reviews It is established practice that review authors do not edit their own review. There is a case for more elaborate guidelines on the inclusion of a review authors’ primary research in a systematic review.</p> <p>It was proposed that a Campbell Collaboration level policy on conflict of interest be developed.</p>	<p>The SG approved the formation of the Nutrition sub-group of the IDCG</p> <p>The SG agreed that an ad hoc working group be convened to formulate a conflict of interest policy for the Collaboration. Those interested should contact the co-chairs or CEO.</p> <p>The SG decided that the colophon of a published review should in future indicate the names of the editors of that specific review.</p>
<p>03f. User Group CG</p>	



Decision point: proposal to change guidelines for production of User Abstracts

Status report presented (attached).
 The production of User Abstracts is now centralized in Oslo.

The User's Group governance document needs revision. The production of a user abstract is currently a requirement for voting membership. A new model needs to take account of other possible contributions from interested parties.

Elections for co-chairs are due in autumn 2012.

UK independent think tank called NESTA with initiative called alliance for useful evidence.

The group's impact strategy emphasizes collaboration with partner organizations. An informal survey was conducted as the first step in identify potential national and international partner organizations (see attached document).

3ie requires a policy influence plan before a review is started. This identifies the key stakeholders (those with an interest in the outcomes of the review), and sets out follow-up actions towards them.

It was pointed out that not all library entries have user abstracts. This is an historical issue – a number of early reviews did not have abstracts.

It is important to contact the secretariat if someone wishes to prepare a new user abstract, to avoid possible duplication of effort.

The Users group co-chairs will prepare a revision of the group's governance documents, for consideration at the September meeting.

Governance Plan

04. Review of Governance Plan

Consideration of revised version

Decision point: adoption of revised Governance Plan

Proposed changes to the governance plan were discussed at the previous meeting and had been circulated in the interim. An electronic vote prior to the meeting did not reach a quorum.

It was proposed that the revised governance plan be approved.

The SG approved the revised Campbell Collaboration governance plan.

Production of reviews

05. Production of reviews, including revisions of policy briefs

a. C2 Toolbox - support for production

Status report presented. See attached report.
 All coordinating groups are now using the Toolbox. The Editors meeting will discuss how it is working and where it can be improved.
 Status reports can be downloaded from the Toolbox – see attached PowerPoint on Report Generator (pdf).
 Editors do not have the ability to add or change dates for submission or acceptance for past events. However, if there is good reason to do so, Head Office is able give an editor

Editors and Managing Editors will decide on a common temporary timeframe for increased access to the toolbox

The SG decided that a new portal be developed



<p>the editing privilege necessary for this purpose on a case by case and time-limited basis.</p> <p>The toolbox is regularly being updated and improved.</p> <p>The Methods editing team (Terri, Emily and Josh) should be added as methods contacts for each project in the Toolbox.</p> <p>A note on Toolbox status and policy was presented. The technical security of the software has been improved. It should be noted that current solutions are based on a very modest level of funding, and that there is little prospect of a significant increase in the funding level resources. A current priority is to update contacts in the Directory so that it can be used more effectively.</p> <p>A new masthead or introductory page for the monograph series is in preparation, and awaits updated contacts for some of the editorial boards.</p> <p>It was agreed there would in future be two gateways to publications: (1) the online library, as at present, which gives access to all documents (including titles, protocols and user abstracts); and (2) a portal to the monograph series of peer-reviewed systematic reviews which would resemble a page introducing an academic journal. It is important that users are made aware that this is a peer-reviewed publication. The portal should give access to finished reviews (but not to titles and protocols), via direct links to the relevant pdf. A table of contents is recommended. A full list of editors should be easily accessible.</p>	<p>for the monograph series, Campbell Systematic Reviews.</p>
<p><i>b. Process for registering reviews from the Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services to the Campbell Library</i></p>	
<p>Under what circumstances could a systematic reviews produced by the Norwegian Knowledge Centre be included the Campbell library, given that they follow a rigorous peer process that closely parallels the Collaboration’s editorial process?</p> <p>Policy was distributed and accepted on this topic during The Keystone SG meeting agreed a policy on reviews from outside the Collaboration’s own editorial process. This involved treating an incoming review as if it were a protocol and then, if appropriate, moving forward to the draft review stage. The importance of an agreed protocol as a basis for the review was underlined. There is at present no example of a review from outside the regular channels being accepted for publication in the Campbell library.</p> <p><i>Network Meta-Analysis</i> was discussed.</p>	<p>Policy on acceptance of non-Campbell reviews was referred to the September meeting.</p>
<p>Dissemination</p>	
<p>06. Dissemination activities</p>	
<p><i>a. The Campbell Online Library</i></p>	
<p>Status report presented. See attached report.</p> <p>It was suggestion that the resource centre be expanded, also in order to attract visitors to the website.</p> <p>The possibility was discussed of making videos at the next SG meeting of interviews with</p>	



<p>Campbell experts for inclusion on the website.</p> <p>The search function of the Campbell Library was discussed. Is it sufficiently user friendly?</p> <p>It was noted that some titles in the library are the original titles from registration, and not the title of the final review. This is the responsibility of Editors and Managing Editors; the latest title saved in the Toolbox is what appears in the library.</p> <p>The 3ie website will now be re-launched with an improved interface. Should some of the 3ie reviews be submitted to Campbell?</p> <p>Campbell reviews are now indexed by OTseeker.</p> <p>ECG will engage graduate students to complete abstracts for reviews which do not have them, and will liaise with the secretariat.</p> <p>The treatment of updated reviews (i.e. dating, DOI, etc.) was discussed. The forthcoming Monograph series page will include instructions on how to cite old/new reviews.</p>	
<p><i>b. The website, Newsletters [visits, downloads, use, etc.]</i></p>	
<p>A status report was presented (attached).</p> <p>The new newsletter tool is available to CGs. Associated tools and benefits were discussed, e.g. tagging for directory, etc. The mailing list is a self-service subscribe/unsubscribe list, which can be maintained by each CG and is synchronized twice daily with the Directory (which updates contact information and tags).</p>	
<p><i>c. Presentations /conferences</i></p>	
<p>Not discussed</p>	
<p>Networking</p>	
<p>07. Colloquium</p>	
<p><i>a. Preview of the Copenhagen Colloquium</i></p>	
<p>The colloquium status was presented. 180-190 participants have signed up. Wednesday is expected to have the most participants. Only 10 Danish participants are expected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 170 Tuesday - 180 Wednesday - 160 Thursday <p>In some cases, responsibility for payments was unclear; this should have been clarified from the beginning.</p> <p>SFI will write an evaluation report, which will be of use for future Colloquium organizers. There is a strong case to make an open call for proposals for presentations (not just poster sessions).</p> <p>The absence of an open call reflected the decision to limit the number of parallel sessions and to focus on training. We can move towards a Cochrane model, with specific application criteria for presenters.</p> <p>There is no professional body for research synthesis. Should we consider devoting 1-2 days around the colloquium for more general presentations on research synthesis?</p>	<p>Mette to share a summary report discussing challenges/solutions to organizing a colloquium</p>



<p>The concept of a strong focus on training is quite rare. Who are we targeting as an audience? Dialogue between review producers and users is desirable. Dialogue with authors of primary studies, could address problems such as incomplete reporting and common methodological shortcomings of primary studies. The role of a local organization willing to take on the colloquium is crucial, as is the work of the program committee. Planning needs to start earlier than was possible in this case. Resources for future organizers (colloquium materials, tips, checklists) should be consolidated and made available through the website. This year SFI as local host is also running a day for users, following the conclusion of the colloquium proper. This is an interesting model for future events.</p> <p><i>Participants from LMIC</i> IDCG sponsored 5 participants from LMIC (there were 20 applicants for the bursaries, and a precondition was acceptance as a poster presenter). 3ie sponsored airfare, hotel and colloquium for participants at about 10 conferences per year. It was suggested that participants could be asked at the point of registration if they would like to donate another registration fee in order to sponsor a participant from a LMIC.</p>	
<p><i>b. Campbell Collaboration Awards</i></p>	
<p>Deferred.</p>	
<p><i>c. Next Annual Colloquium</i> <i>Mini-Colloquium of SRs in International Development</i></p> <p><i>Decision point: Process to determine the date and venue.</i></p>	
<p>It was proposed that a mini-colloquium in Dhaka be scheduled in cooperation with 3ie and IDCG. The goal is 200 participants from across Asia. The key to good attendance is to have renowned experts attend. The event will take place in December 2012</p> <p>There was a consensus that Campbell should hold a colloquium in an LMIC. The benefits of Bangladesh and Asia more generally were mentioned, including sponsorship and interest from AusAID and DfID. Beginning with a mini-colloquium has the advantage of helping to gauge the level of interest.</p> <p>2013 – Chicago (Loyola University) The planning framework for 2013 will be the “Copenhagen model” - 2 days of training, 1 day local what works seminar.</p> <p>2014 –Belfast (Queen’s University)</p> <p>It is intended to hold the 2015 Colloquium in a Lower or Middle Income Country, pending the identification of a suitable venue. South Africa, Tunisia and Cairo were mentioned as possibilities.</p> <p>There are no plans for a joint colloquium with Cochrane at present.</p>	<p>A Mini-colloquium of SRs in International Development will be a joint Campbell Collaboration and 3ie event. It will take place in Dhaka, Bangladesh, in December 2012</p> <p>The next annual Colloquium will take place in Chicago (Loyola University), in May 2013.</p> <p>The 2014 Colloquium will take place in Belfast, Northern Ireland (Queen’s University Belfast)</p> <p>It is intended to hold the 2015 Colloquium in a Lower or Middle Income</p>



	Country, pending the identification of a suitable venue.
08. Partnerships	
<i>a. Cochrane</i>	
<p>It was suggested that Campbell initiate regular (6-monthly) conference calls with Cochrane representatives.</p> <p>There was no official Cochrane representatives at this meeting. Cochrane is in the process of hiring a new CEO with a revised mandate.</p> <p>The Paris Cochrane meeting was discussed. This addressed initiatives arising from the earlier strategic review. For example, one major recommendation is to change wording in the Cochrane Handbook to disperse impression that only RCTs are included (Fit the method to the question). All review teams will be encouraged to include other types of study designs, especially when adverse events are not picked up in RCTs, but are in other types of studies.</p> <p>Recommendations included: It is preferable to complete a few reviews very well rather than many of varying quality. In order to keep reviews updated, it is suggested to identify and focus on 10 topic areas. The goal is to issue a commentary on whether a new study will change the results, within one month of the new study appearing.</p> <p>Campbell can add value to some of the method development in Cochrane (for example on complex interventions and on moderator analysis).</p> <p>It was proposed to create more meeting places for methods discussions, e.g. to participate in Cochrane methods discussions meetings. This does not require face-to-face meetings; communication groups for methods are also a possibility.</p>	<p>Eamonn to follow up on setting up regular communication/meetings with Cochrane.</p> <p>Peter will send out minutes from Cochrane meeting in Paris.</p> <p>Eamonn to follow up with David Tovey regarding participation in the Methods Innovation Fund Project (?)</p>
<i>b. SFI Campbell</i>	
<p>A status report was presented orally. SFI reorganized as of 1 January 2012. It now includes a Trials Unit headed by Mette (in addition to SFI Campbell). This focuses on setting up systems to run RCTs, and a number of large RCTs are now starting in Denmark with assistance from SFI. RCTs and evidence have become a priority for the government.</p> <p>Currently SFI Campbell has 5 reviews in progress, 3 protocols close to acceptance and 2 other protocols in progress.</p>	
<i>c. Other partners</i>	
<p><i>Swedish National Board of Health and Welfare</i> An update from the Swedish National Board of Health and Welfare (Socialstyrelsen) covered the history of institute and recent development. Twelve governmental agencies proposed to government to reduce the number of agencies involved in reviewing social care to four, one of which will be the Knowledge Agency (700 employees with a focus on</p>	Co-chair (AB) to follow up with David Tovey regarding Cochrane/EIPPIE collaboration.



best available evidence). Three other agencies will focus on Inspection, Horizon scanning, Communication/IT.

Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services

An update on the Social Research Unit at the NOKC noted that its mandate includes crime and justice, housing policies, immigration and integration, among other things. Norway also places a high priority on summarizing knowledge about child and adolescent mental health, addiction, etc.

SBU, Sweden

HTA institutes are generally of interest as partners. HTA and Campbell/Cochrane have developed in parallel with little cross-fertilization.

EPPI, UK

There are ongoing conversations between EPPI and Cochrane, on the question of integrating EPPI software into Revman.

Administration

09. Head Office

a. Annual report (including financial report and editorial infrastructure report)

Annual report presented (see attached).

The goal of the secretariat is to provide a platform for production of quality reviews and to support coordinating groups. The focus on production has been successful in that there is now a higher level of production and a larger body of work in the library. There is now a need to focus more on dissemination, to draw attention to the findings of reviews.

The agreement covering funding for the secretariat runs to the end of 2013, as does the agreement creating the Knowledge centre's Social research unit. In this period we need to demonstrate the need for both to continue, and to deliver work that gives a fair return on the investment made in these initiatives. It was noted that in theory it is possible to move the secretariat to another location after 2013.

A report on editorial infrastructure presented. Social welfare received an increase in support due to the focus on social welfare in the new Social Research Unit in Oslo. Methods received a slight increase as well, since all reviews go through the Methods group. It was noted that the SW group had also received a grant in Canada to assist with the expenses connected to the managing editor.

b. 501 c3 board meeting

Minutes circulated separately.

c. Election procedures

Decision point: Adoption of guidelines on election procedures

Decision point: Creation of an election/search committee

An overview of current election procedures, with proposed guidelines on how to carry out an election, was circulated and discussed.

The Users Group will prepare a note summarising membership



<p>The number of voting members varies from group to group. SW has ca. 200, C&J 18, while the number for ECG is uncertain. C&J is more cautious about voting members to protect the interest/principles central to the Campbell method.</p> <p>Criteria to distinguish between voting members and associated members seem to vary across groups, and there is a case to standardize this.</p> <p>A Note should be drawn up to summarise membership status and voting procedures in the respective coordinating groups.</p> <p>Groups should note that the Directory can and should be used to maintain membership and voting lists; appropriate tags can be added to denote full or associate member status.</p>	<p>status across CGs.</p>
<p>Other</p>	
<p>10. Any other business</p>	
<p><i>a. Access to databases (Birte Snilstveit, IDCG)</i></p>	
<p>A note on Access to Databases was presented (see attached). It was proposed that Campbell look at agreeing on a number of databases and explore options for garnering institutional access to these. Database access is an issue for both smaller institutions and LMIC review teams. Currently there is a danger of geographic bias depending on the databases subscribed to in the different countries.</p> <p>Editors agree that the authors seek and request access to databases outside their country/institution, etc. Editors are trying now to connect people from different universities/areas on an ad hoc basis. Concerns were expressed over the costs associated with such an initiative.</p> <p>It was proposed that the limited access to databases be facilitated through the Campbell website.</p> <p>CGs were invited to indicate relevant databases to which they would like access. The possibility of exploring options and finding a funder for access to databases was discussed.</p>	<p>The Norwegian Knowledge Centre and John Evers (3ie/ IDCG) will follow up on acquiring access to databases.</p>
<p><i>b. IDCG Conflict of Interest statement</i></p>	
<p>A document circulated by IDCG was presented.</p> <p>It was proposed that one co-chair from each CG examine the document, with a view to creating a collaboration wide document for adoption in Nashville.</p> <p>An ad hoc committee comprised of Aron Shlonsky (SW), Gary Ritter (ECG), Dave Wilson (C&J) and Howard White/Peter Tugwell (IDCG) will look through IDCG Conflict of Interest policy and suggest amendments to cover individual group needs and then generalize to collaboration. A revised document should be presented for discussion in Nashville.</p>	<p>The SG referred this matter onwards to the September meeting</p>
<p>11. Next SG meeting</p>	
<p>The next SG meeting takes place in Nashville, Tennessee, USA in September 2012 (Friday 21, Saturday 22 & Sunday 23 September).</p>	<p>Co-chairs and CEO will work together to advance</p>



As provided for in the Governance plan, the SG should meet for strategic planning every second year. This will take place in Nashville as part of the year's second steering group meeting.

The Strategic plan is in need of revision, and preparatory work should be undertaken in advance of the Nashville meeting. Skype meetings are recommended in the lead up to discussions in Nashville.

It is proposed that each CG discuss a short list of priorities while the Co-chairs develop a short list for the collaboration as a whole.

Input from partners is invited on the value of working with Campbell, and on the challenges involved.

It was suggested that the range of Campbell products (including addressing evidence on things other than interventions) be considered in the strategic planning process.

Survey Monkey will be used to get feedback from stakeholders.

the strategic planning process.