



Minutes of the Steering Group Meeting Denver and Keystone, 16, 17 and 19 October 2010

Attending:	Arild Bjørndal, Mark Lipsey, Paul Connolly, Gary Ritter, Sandra Wilson, Terri Pigott, Peter Tugwell, David Weisburd, David Wilson, Aron Shlonsky, Paul Montgomery, Merete Konnerup, Mette Deding, Eamonn Noonan, Bjørn Tommy Tollånes, Camilla Chausse
Apologies:	Peter Grabosky, Gill Clark, Nick Royle
Guests:	Carolyn Di Giuseppe, Hannah Rothstein, Anne Karin Lindahl (all 19 October)
Minutes:	Eamonn Noonan

1. Adoption of minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting, in Oslo in June 2010, were approved by e-mail consultation and posted to the website in advance of this meeting.

Reports from the Coordinating Groups

2. Report from the Social Welfare Group

See attached report.

The Social Welfare Group (SWG) is struggling with the volume of work. Reviews are bottlenecking, particularly at the protocol stage. The group's managing editor, William Turner, is funded for one day a week, but this is not enough time to do the work required. Group Coordinator Krystyna Kowalski is spending much of her allotted time on co-registration issues. The Co-chairs have found some funding to provide an editorial assistant for William Turner.

An alternative is to split the work down to more defined areas. For instance, child welfare could be defined at its own area within social welfare. The group will work to identify someone who could be a child welfare editor. Arild Bjørndal has volunteered to try to find some funding for such a person.

Inactive titles must be taken out so that they do not block work on other titles.

The Education Coordinating Group (ECG) Editor, Sandra Wilson, has volunteered to help the SWG out short term, as the ECC volume of work is not too large at the moment.

Topics for joint meeting with Cochrane

The topic of the joint meeting with Cochrane is co-registration of systematic reviews and avoiding the duplication of efforts.

Comments/discussion:



- What are the advantages of co-registration for Campbell, given that Cochrane is a far larger organization?
- What routines exist to prevent duplication of work, and are they applied reciprocally?
- There is a need for better coordination of cross indexing between Campbell and Cochrane.
- There is a large overlap between the areas of interest of the two Collaborations, not least due to the increasing focus on the social determinants of health.
- How do we balance the need to maintain parallel procedures in the review process with the fact that we will continue to be an entity in our own right? Is there a case for moving towards integration with Cochrane?

Summing up:

- There is no suggestion at the moment that a new organization be found, and Campbell will continue as a separate body. This is in line with previous discussions and decisions.
- Where there is mutual agreement to co-register, there is a need on both sides for clarity on procedures.
- We need to ensure that our target groups continue to be able to access co-registered reviews.

3. Report from the Crime and Justice Group

See attached report.

The Crime and Justice Group (CJG) report difficulty in securing funding for group infrastructure. Funding for individual reviews is easier. One possibility to get funding for infrastructure would be to set up centers within universities (e.g. a Campbell Center at a given University.)

It was decided that the CJG should approach the US Department of Justice again with a view to a meeting in January 2011.

4. Report from the Education Group

See attached report.

The incoming Co-chairs and Editor of the Education Coordinating Group (ECG) are developing a strategy for advancing the group. They will work to rationalize the group and to have a clearer focus on education issues. The group wants to prioritise reviews on issues that practitioners and decision makers are interested in.

Issues/activities:

- An Advisory Group needs to be formed as soon as possible
- A clear focus for the group should be established.
- The web pages should be redesigned and the content revised.
- The role and functions of the existing subgroups needs to be reconsidered and refocused. Is the structure with subgroups a useful one?



- Disability subgroup: This has its own history, and is relatively active. The Co-chairs need to talk with John Westbrook of SEDL who is the subgroup contact.
- The two other groups are not active.

5. Report from the Methods Group

See attached report.

Training activities

There is no formal system for training activities. The group responds to what comes in. The Steering Group needs to consider if there is a need for a formal budget and structure for training activities.

New Associate Methods Editor

Terri Pigott will draw up a list of candidates for Associate Methods Editor. This is a good way to plan for succession in the Methods Group. The Secretariat will be able to give guidance on the possibility of funding for the position in due course.

Streamlining the production of reviews

There is not necessarily a shared understanding throughout the Collaboration on the standard applied on methodology questions. In order to counteract this we need to develop clearer guidelines.

There is a need to discuss how to handle reviews in which it does not make sense to do a meta-analysis and that therefore become more similar to narrative reviews. The guiding principle currently is that authors can include different kinds of designs, as long as they keep them separate in the analysis. A lack of clarity on this creates time consuming discussions on what kind of studies can be included. Having a single set of standards would make decisions on the inclusion/exclusion of studies easier. Editors need to have some place to go when in doubt.

Toolbox

The toolbox works well for Terri Pigott (Methods) and Sandra Wilson (Education). Crime and Justice have not started using the system much yet as they are finishing a lot of projects at the moment. It is easier to start using the system for new projects. William Turner and Krystyna Kowalski (Social Welfare) are struggling with the system and have not started using it.

The groups are urged to use the Toolbox as a process tool. Among other things, using the Toolbox insures against the loss of data that can happen with computer crashes. Bjørn Tommy Tollånes is the contact point on toolbox issues.

Streamlining the review process

In the interests of streamlining the review process, the Steering Group adopted the following decision:

The SG approves the following revision to the review process:



When referring a draft protocol to the Methods editor, the thematic group editor may make a recommendation that a methods review is not necessary. If the methods editor disagrees with this recommendation, within two weeks s/he will state the reason for this and proceed with a review.

In cases where a methods edit is necessary, the methods editor will decide whether or not the draft needs to be sent for external review.

The same procedure will apply to draft reviews.

All protocols and reviews will be sent to Editor-in-Chief for the Campbell Collaboration as a final quality check before publication in the Library.

6. Report from the Users Group

See attached report.

There is a lack of resources in the Users Group (UG). This limits its ability to do things at the moment. The need to recruit new people was discussed. There is also a need for a discussion on the group's membership structure now and in the future.

7. SFI Campbell update

See attached report.

8. Lower and Middle Income Countries Coordinating Group

The proposal to set up a Lower and Middle Income Countries (LMIC) Coordination Group came about as a result of our partnership with the International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie). This is an opportunity to link into expertise around the world and to spread out commitment to high quality research synthesis. The proposal involves support for the development of methods and editorial infrastructure. 3ie is relatively well resourced and is already supporting a number of reviews. They recently launched a new call for proposals involving some 50 reviews.

The new group will align with a distinct policy area. This is the case with a LMIC group, given that development policy and development assistance is seen as a separate area of work.

It is important to cater for co-registering of reviews where appropriate, and there are precedents for this among the existing groups. A development review with an education topic could therefore be co-registered with the Education Coordinating Group, for example.

Following a discussion on the name of the group, it was agreed that International Development Coordinating Group was preferable.

Decision:

- *The establishment of a new International Development Coordinating Group (IDCG), with a subsequent ratification of the Governance Plan was agreed (with one vote against).*



- *A draft governance document for the IDCG will be presented for approval at the next Steering Group meeting.*

9. Joint Cochrane/Campbell Session

See separate minutes.

10. Production of reviews

a. Revision of policy briefs

This item remains open and rests with Mark Lipsey.

b. Role of editor in chief

At present, Mark Lipsey and Arild Bjørndal are the designated editors-in-chief, but there is no formal provision for them to see reviews before they are approved.

Decision:

- *The Editors-in-Chief will be notified of the approval of each protocols. There is no obligation at this stage to wait for eventual feedback from the editors-in-chief.*
- *The Editors-in-Chief will also be notified on the completion of each review. They will be given a timeframe to comment on issues arising before the review is published in the Campbell Library.*

c. Streamlining the production of reviews

Discussed above under item 5, Methods Group report.

11. Fundraising work

The Secretariat has secured core funding for the next three years (2011-13) at approximately the same level as previously. These funds have been secured because of the strong advances made by the Collaboration as a whole in the past three year period. The key to further growth is to deliver good reviews and to contribute to the development of an evidence-based approach to social interventions. The Collaboration has now signed a renewed agreement with the Norwegian Knowledge Center for the Health Services, which provides that the secretariat will continue to be located in Oslo. (See separate agreement).

In the coming three year period, a central priority is to preserve the collaboration's infrastructure. A certain amount of funding is secured for editorial work and for external peer reviewers.

We will continue to negotiate an agreement with Norwegian agencies to fund the establishment of a review production unit in Oslo.

The larger issue is to find additional and longer term funding for the Collaboration. This can only succeed with the active involvement of the Steering Group.

The idea of a funder mechanism through our web pages was recommended (on the example of the recent innovation by Cochrane). In the interests of transparency, the information given on the website on who provides funding should be clear, accessible, and up to date.



Decision: A note on priorities and a draft budget will be circulated to the Steering Group.

12. Campbell website – what next?

The website has now existed in its present form for about two years. There is a need to review its design and to revitalize some parts of the site. In particular, we need to:

- Change the look and content of the front page
- Change the Coordinating Group pages. N.B. We are dependent on the groups themselves contributing on their own pages.
- The Library needs to be changed to look more like a monograph series.

The following have volunteered to contribute to the website revision process: Terri Pigott, Mette Deding, Paul Connolly, Aron Shlonsky, Gary Ritter.

13. Online Library – permission to publish

Pursuant to earlier decisions, our routines on permission to publish forms were revised, and we are up to date with the necessary paperwork.

There have been some queries as to the wording in the Creative Commons open access certificate. However, the wording is standard for Creative Commons.

14. Campbell activities in 2011

After ten years of operations, the format of the Campbell Colloquium is open for discussion. Should it continue to be organized on a yearly basis? Should the composition of the programme be redesigned? What format will best further the goals of the organization?

Previous Campbell Colloquia

Campbell Colloquia have created a sense of community and have helped to establish the Collaboration's profile. The meetings attract a mix of researchers and policy makers, the policy makers being largely from the local environment where the Colloquium takes place. One problem with the current format is that we do not have the capacity to follow up on these local participants after the event itself. It is also the case that Colloquia are expensive to organize, and much depends on the funding available to the local organiser.

Suggestions for future Colloquia

Joint colloquium with Cochrane: This year's joint event with Cochrane has been a success. We should consider repeating this model in future, for example at 3 to 5 year intervals.

A smaller, more research focused Campbell Colloquium would directly further our primary goal of producing systematic reviews. Such a meeting would offer training in how to do systematic reviews, but could also offer training in other research methods. There is a demand for this kind of training, and people are willing to pay for it. A smaller event could take place at a university, and it could also be scheduled during the summer months (July-August).



If the colloquium is organized as a more research focused event, it would also be important to develop ways to reach policy makers by presenting our research at key events within the respective research fields. The Crime and Justice group, for example, do this with considerable success.

The committee to plan the next Campbell Colloquium was formed: Arild Bjørndal, Mark Lipsey and Terri Pigott.

15. Keystone Colloquium – debrief so far

This year's Colloquium had 820 registered participants for the whole Colloquium, and 30 day registrations. We have not been given access to the participants list, for reasons linked to data protection. Participant feedback to date has been very positive.

In future exercises, it would be important to have more detailed discussion in advance on what format should be followed; in this case, the Cochrane model was used with very few variations, and this is not necessarily appropriate in all cases.

16. Review of the Governance plan

Deferred to next meeting.

17. Any other business

No items

18. Preparation of Campbell Business meeting

Deferred to next meeting.

19. Next Steering Group meeting

Oslo, May 2011