‘Cochrane Content’:  
Topic for the Strategic Session during Paris mid-year meetings,   
16-21 April 2012

**Purpose**

The aim of this paper is to describe a vision and early draft work plan in relation to the Strategic Session meeting

in Paris in 2012.

**Access**

Open.

**Background**

The operations and finance committee of The Cochrane Collaboration agreed at its meeting on 7th June 2011 that the Strategic Session planned for Paris in 2012 should be on the subject of ‘Cochrane Content’. The title recognises that whilst the primary purpose of The Cochrane Collaboration is to produce Cochrane Systematic Reviews, the output of the Collaboration includes the other databases within *The Cochrane Library*. In addition, it is increasingly common for elements extracted from Cochrane Reviews to be used to create derivative products in different media - including podcasts, summaries for different stakeholders including Cochrane Clinical Answers, and educational projects such as Dr Cochrane and Cochrane Journal Club.

Strategic sessions have been successful at raising awareness and contributing to strategy in a number of key areas, including the role of consumers, increasing our geographical diversity and prioritisation.

The long-term sustainability of The Cochrane Collaboration depends most crucially on its ability to create content that is relevant to decision-making in clinical care and health policy. It is essential that Cochrane continues to develop the quality, range, relevance, timeliness and accessibility of its content informed by the views of its funders and users.

The Cochrane Editorial Unit will lead the preparatory work, but this will require substantial intelligence gathering and input from people and groups inside and outside the Collaboration.

**Proposals and Discussion**

We propose that the aim of the preparatory work prior to the Strategic Session is to develop a "manifesto" for the development and growth of Cochrane content, divided into discrete sections, but forming a coherent vision.

A central part of the process of preparing for the Session is the appointment of an advisory committee, comprising members from within and outside the Collaboration. The purpose of this will be to help to steer the preparations, identify different perspectives and ideas, and to ensure the most inclusive and effective process.

The preparatory work will aim to produce a document that comprises five discrete elements, and recommendations based on each of these. The purpose of the meeting therefore will be to discuss, modify and ratify the manifesto. Given the time constraints, we will need to ensure that the meeting is focussed, efficient and constructive. The output of the meeting will be used in strategic planning, with timelines to implement proposals that gain widespread support, and to explore and describe the process by which other policies might be amended in the light of the discussions.

1. Current analysis
2. Maintaining, managing and enhancing review quality
3. Improving the Cochrane process
4. Updating
5. Innovative reviews
6. Derivative products

# What happens next?

1. We will appoint an advisory committee to oversee the programme.

2. We will share this document and take on comments, then revise as appropriate:

* Co-Eds’ Exec, MEs’ Exec, TSCs’ Exec
* Cochrane Library Oversight Committee (CLOC)
* Co-Chairs and OFC
* MARS

3. Develop plans for all work streams.

4. In parallel with other activities the leaders of each task will ensure that we pull together a concluding section of the preparatory papers looking across the different work streams to develop co-ordinated recommendations and project plans. This work will be led by the CEU.

**Document skeleton**

**1. Current position analysis**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Lead(s) identified | Harriet MacLehose and Lucie Jones |
| Stakeholders | Funders, Users and non-users, Publishers, Competitors,  Review authors, Editors and Peer Reviewers, All Cochrane  groups including consumers, Oversight Committee,  Marketing team |
| Questions to be addressed | how well are we doing now?  where is the competition?  how we can meet the needs of funders and users better?  what changes are required?  what are the success criteria?  how we can deliver the changes?  what are the resources and investment needed to  succeed? What can Cochrane learn from other organisations? |
| Process | Sharing of reports from recent user testing and  comparative data Consultation with stakeholders individually and within  groups Preparation of position paper with recommendations  and workplan  Further consultation |
| Outputs | Concise position statement  Recommendations |

**2. Monitoring and developing quality and relevance**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Lead identified | Toby Lasserson and John Hilton |
| Stakeholders | CRG staff, Methodologists, MARS, Handbook Editors,  Trainers, Other Cochrane groups, including consumers,  Editors and Peer Reviewers, IMS team, Users, Review  authors, Funders, "Super-users" including guidelines  groups, World Health Organization; Oversight Committee |
| Questions to be addressed | Are reviews doing a good job of addressing the concerns  of intended users and current and potential funders?  What changes could be introduced to improve the extent  to which they meet these needs? What can Cochrane learn from other organisations?  How good are Cochrane reviews at addressing the  questions they pose?  Do Review Abstracts and Plain Language Summaries  represent accurate and useful summaries? Are the recently developed minimum standards being  achieved consistently?  If not, what are the reasons for this and how can they be  addressed and monitored in future? |
| Process | Preparation and sharing of comparative data Consultation  with stakeholders individually and within groups Preparation of position paper with recommendations and  workplan  Further consultation |
| Outputs | Revised position paper with recommendations |

**Improving the Cochrane process**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Lead identified | Toby Lasserson and John Hilton |
| Stakeholders | CRG staff, Methodologists, Editors and Peer Reviewers,  Review authors, Centre and Fields staff, IMS team,  Workflows working group, RAC and ADAC, Trainers,  Consumers, Systematic Reviewers and Journal Editors  outside the Collaboration |
| Questions to be addressed | What are the identified problems with the current  processes? To what extent are they, or could they be addressed via  technology advancement?  What non-technological changes would be desirable,  without reducing content quality?  How feasible is the "short, downhill pipeline"?  How can changes be made without compromising the  integrity of the editorial review process?  How can we introduce changes and enhancements  without leading to CRG burn-out? How should review groups prioritise their workload and  maximise the quality of their output without  compromising equity and the need to attract and retain  new researchers? What can the Collabortion learn from other organisations? |
| Process | Preparation and sharing of comparative data Consultation with stakeholders individually and within  groups Preparation of position paper with recommendations  and workplan  Further consultation |
| Outputs |  |

# Updating

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Lead identified | Rachel Marshall |
| Stakeholders | CRG staff, Review authors, Editors, Methodologists,  Funders, IMS team, Metaxis |
| Questions to be addressed | The Cochrane Collaboration currently fails to meet its  target of every review updated every two years - is this a  feasible standard?  If not, what standard would be appropriate? How should CRGs screen and prioritise updates? How useful are the various "updating tools" in assisting  CRGs meet their targets? Is there a role for a centralised updating service? If so, how might this look and how might it operate?  What costs would be involved? What can Cochrane learn from other organisations? |
| Process | Preparation and sharing of comparative data Consultation with stakeholders individually and within  groups Preparation of position paper with recommendations and  workplan  Further consultation |
| Outputs |  |

# Innovative Reviews (new types of CR, PICOs, summaries, etc.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Lead identified | David Tovey and Sophie Hill |
| Stakeholders | Funders/ policy makers, Users - various, Methodologists,  CRG staff, Review authors, IMS team, Researchers and  research funders outside Cochrane (e.g Campbell,  Alliance, Eppi Centre, WHO) |
| Questions to be addressed | How important is it that Cochrane develop different  forms of review, introducing innovative content (e.g.  prognostic, qualitative, economic) and a broader range  of studies? If this is important, how can these innovations be  introduced and how can we manage the expectations,  methods, quality and foster innovation? |
| Process | Preparation and sharing of individual papers (prognosis,  qualitative and mixed methods, economic)  Consultation with stakeholders individually and within  groups Preparation of position paper with recommendations and  workplan  Further consultation |
| Outputs |  |

# Derivative products

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Lead identified | Lorne Becker and Deborah Pentesco-Gilbert? |
| Stakeholders | Funders, Users and non users, Publishers, all Cochrane  groups, IMS team, Metaxis,  Cochrane web team and "star trek" group |
| Questions to be addressed | What is possible now and what will the future look like  in terms of technology and knowledge in health? What are the user and funder needs that can  be addressed by derivative products and what do we  know from the user testing about the needs of users  currently and in the future? What range of derivative products would be required to  meet these needs? What business models are appropriate for derivative  products? What level of resources are needed to deliver an  appropriate portfolio of derivative products? |
| Process | Preparation and sharing of comparative data Consultation with stakeholders individually and within  groups Preparation of position paper with recommendations and  workplan  Further consultation |
| Outputs |  |