



Public Minutes of the COMPASS Management Board meeting

10th September 09 - Edinburgh

Present: Alison Richardson (AR) (Chair), Mike Bennett (MB), Irene Higginson (IH), Scott Murray (SM), Aziz Sheikh (AS), Michael Sharpe (MS), Dan Stark (DS), Galina Velikova (GV), David Weller (DW), Richard Garry (RG), Susie Edwards (SE), Lisa Martin (LM). **Apologies:** Marie Fallon (MF), Liz Forbat (LF), Elizabeth Davies (ED), Julia Brown (JB), Amanda Ramirez (AJR), Matthew Hotopf (MH)

Minutes from the previous meeting

The minutes of the last meeting were accepted as accurate with the following correction under the heading New Executive: "IH expressed it was probably not reasonable for her to stand for Chair as she was fulfilling both a corresponding applicant role and centre lead role". This should state "IH did not expect to automatically to put herself forward for the position of Chair, though it would be possible and IH was willing to discuss this possibility".

Corresponding applicant; ratification of proposal for Irene Higginson to become 2nd corresponding applicant

As the Board were in support and funders had agreed to the proposal, IH was formally accepted as the second corresponding applicant.

Confirmation of the new Executive Committee

The new Executive Committee was confirmed as: IH (KCL), AS (Edinburgh) and DS (Leeds). It had been previously indicated that GV would represent Leeds, but owing to commitments resulting from holding two other Chair-ships, GV would prefer to defer membership and DS will remain on the Executive Committee for the next 12 months.

New Chair of the Board

A new Chair is required to take the collaborative forward during the next period, which may be challenging due to the changes in the funding landscape and the possibility of a new government, as well as the outcomes of the Rapid Review. They will be charged with making sure COMPASS is in good shape for the future and that it delivers on its outcomes. DS and IH put themselves forward for consideration for the role of Chair. The Board discussed the pros and cons of having a competitive election. A proposal emerged that IH and DS take on the position of Chair jointly, which IH and DS felt very positive about and for which there was support from the Board. As it is a new and untested arrangement there would be a break clause at 10 months, or sooner if it became clear the arrangements were not working. An election to endorse the new Chairs would take place via postal ballot with >50% of the vote required for election.

Feedback from the Rapid Review

Mike Richards chaired the NCRI Rapid Review meeting in London, which looked at priorities for funding and the way forward. Several of the funding bodies present only sent junior representatives rather than decision makers to the meeting which was disappointing. There was however strong support for the work from the international representatives eg Neil Aaronson. The general feeling taken from the meeting was that there wasn't any money being put forward/being protected for this field. There was also a closed meeting to vote on research priorities which involved only the funding bodies; the outcomes of this meeting are not yet known.

The possibility of using the Survivorship and End of Life Care position papers as a report/prospectus to advertise COMPASS' expertise in these fields and to reinforce the importance of work in these areas was discussed. Now would also be a good opportunity to include any last comments/additions to these papers from the Wider Collaborative. It was suggested that the RSM journal would be happy to receive proposals for short series of papers such as these. The possibility of inviting representatives of funding bodies to talk to the Board about the programmes they would be accepting applications for was raised eg MRC, HTA, NIHR. A positive step would be for Board members to put themselves forward for positions on the Boards of groups such as the HTA.

Annual Report

MS referred to the latest version of the report, which includes the finances, and this will be sent off at the end of the week. The finances indicate an underspend related to staff costs, which cannot be vired to non-staff costs. Each centre will need to draw up accurate staff cost projections to be able to clarify if any underspend does exist. A line will be added to the report to clarify that any underspends (staff costs) have been addressed and appropriate plans put in place to ensure the money is spent.

Feedback from the 2009 ASM

The Board thanked IH for organising the meeting. Feedback from the ASM had been good, and people had liked the programme and speakers. The Meet the Experts session had made the programme a little busy. The next meeting would be held in Spring 2011, with dates either side of Easter to be looked at shortly. The likely location



would be either Edinburgh or Leeds or surroundings, with the emphasis on a nice venue somewhere secluded, and for the meeting to be held over 2 days to allow people to spend more time together. The idea would be to move towards implementation as a theme, as one of the objectives of the collaboratives was for the research to influence policy and be put into practice. “Science into Practice” or “Making a Difference in SuPaC Research” were suggested as possible tag lines for the conference.

Advisory Group membership

The list of current and former members of the Advisory Group was recapped, and the Board was informed that Dr Karen Poole (Assistant Director, NCRN) has joined the group after invitation by Jane Cope (Chair). The Board were asked whether they would like to add any new members to refresh the group at this stage. The BMJ “Making a Difference” campaign, which includes work on EOLC was raised, and it may be advantageous if somebody from this group was on the Advisory Group. The possibility of co-hosting the final ASM with the BMJ was brought up, and an initial approach to ascertain interest would be made.

Extra funds for years 4 & 5 paper – revised allocations

The reasons for reallocating some of the extra funds to reimburse those people that had formally been on the Exec/Corresponding Applicants to recognise the time they had invested were recapped. The Centre leads will discuss how best to invoice for the funds.

RSM meeting

The Board agreed that the joint RSM/COMPASS/CECo meeting programme looked interesting and had broad support. Suggestions for speakers would be welcomed.

User Involvement

The new Consumer Research Panel is looking good, and participants have a wide range of useful skills – these will be circulated to the collaborative. It is hoped that some of the members of this panel will be able to attend meetings/ASM. This would be helpful as currently there are only 2 people to call on, so additional resources would reduce the load. The panel should be contacted through Marilyn Kendall. There was support for a UI masterclass.

Wider Collaborative

There were no issues raised for this item

Post-doctoral Fellow & statistician reports

The reports were tabled and acknowledged (see appendix)

AOB

- ED was congratulated by the Board on her promotion to Reader.
- MB has been awarded an NIHR programme development award.
- AS is now methodology editor of PLoS Medicine and associate editor of JRSM.
- IH has been awarded an MRC method development grant in EOLC jointly with CECO. There is now a link between Strand 1 work and the EPCRC collaborative. The group is now a WHO collaborating centre.
- SM has an SDO grant starting October 09 and is co-applicant on another. The annual primary palliative care conference organised in conjunction with CECO/PCRS will be held in Cambridge next year.
- DS is making progress with the NCSI review work and the children/young people work.
- MS has been shortlisted for the Psychiatric Academic of the Year 2009 award. Recruitment for the lung cancer trial is underway throughout Glasgow and beyond, and progress is ongoing with the distress study and touch screen work. Laura Hodges – COMPASS post doc - is now back from maternity leave, and Alan Wigglesworth is the new business manager.
- GV highlighted Penny Wright’s NIHR award, and also 2 small grants from Dimpleby Cancer Care and Breast Cancer Campaign. A major issue recently has been a delay in the CRUK project due to problems with researchers being permitted to screen eligible patients. This was resolved through the National Information Governance Board Ethics and Confidentiality Committee (NIGB ECC), but took a long time. ****GV is happy to offer advice to others experiencing similar problems****. The 2009 BPOS conference will be held in Cardiff on 3rd-4th December, and the deadline for abstracts is 18th September 09.
- DW reported that the NCRl SuPaC lung cancer grant work is ongoing (systematic review).
- AR will start her new job in Southampton on Monday 7th September 2009. The Board thanked AR for her time as Chair of the Board.

Next COMPASS meetings:

Advisory Group – Friday 6th November 2009 (London)

Board meeting – Tuesday 26th January 2010 (Leeds)



Appendix: COMPASS postdoctoral research fellow and statistician progress report

Name: Gao Wei

Period covered by report: 27 May 2009-1 Sep 2009

Date report submitted: 1 Sep 2009

Objectives at start of this reporting period (as written in the last progress report):

- Shared GHQ data analysis: refining the analysis, finalizing the clinical aspect draft and prepare submission to peer-reviewed journal; proceed to analyze data focusing on methodological comparisons after the completion of the clinical paper;
- Pooled Zarit data analysis: See current drafts and submitted papers through to next steps towards publication, making revising and submitted papers/revising as appropriate;
- Exploring more opportunities from existing data resources; identify other potential opportunities for data analysis of measures and outcomes, contributing to COMPASS collaborative and Strand I objectives;
- Familiarize and update relevant statistical methodologies (eg. missing data and longitudinal data analysis) in the areas of palliative care and cancer studies;
- Contribute to conference calls and collaborative activities.

Description of progress (confine to no more than 250 words):

- Shared GHQ data analysis: we've now had an advanced-stage draft on clinical aspects paper; we are now waiting for further comments from group members. We will submit it to peer-reviewed journal;
- Pooled Zarit data analysis: The short-forms of ZBI manuscript has been formally accepted and now is in press in the Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. We've refined the full-scale ZBI analysis and the draft manuscript is being reviewed by investigators;
- Day care data analysis: Paper from this analysis have been formally accepted by Supportive Care in Cancer; we've completed pre-publishing proof readings and admin processes. This paper is in press.
- Through exploring the opportunities of secondary data analysis to develop/establish more wider collaborations with internal and external researchers (Strand I researchers, COMPASS statisticians) through participating regular teleconference, seminar, scientific meetings etc.;
- Updates and conference calls ongoing.

Objectives for next reporting period:

- We will start the methodological analysis on GHQ data soon after the submission of the clinical paper;
- We've been granted access to GPRD data under MRC license, we will proceed to analyze this data once the GPRD office release data to us;
- Exploring more opportunities from existing data resources; identify other potential opportunities for data analysis of measures and outcomes, contributing to COMPASS collaborative and Strand I objectives;
- Familiarize and update relevant statistical methodologies (eg. missing data and longitudinal data analysis) in the areas of palliative care and cancer studies;
- Contribute to conference calls and collaborative activities.

Name: Annet Kleiboer

Period covered by report: June 2009- August 2009

Date report submitted: 3rd September 2009

Objectives at start of this reporting period (as written in the last progress report):

Training

- Several Masterclasses have been planned for the coming year, local research seminars will be attended and user-involvement training will continue.

Collaboration communication

- Continue working together with S2 collaborators, collaborators in Leeds on the review, the Edinburgh Compass group and other post-docs.

Research

- Data collection for the persistence of distress study will be ongoing.
- The study determining the feasibility and acceptability of the IVR system will be ongoing.
- The thematic review on psychological distress will be finalised this summer.

Description of progress (confine to no more than 250 words):



Training

- One Masterclass was organised (Richard Lilford 'A framework for service delivery interventions').
- Training in user-involvement is ongoing. Plans to start a Compass user-involvement group are in progress (Marilyn Kendall, Carolyn Morris).
- Local research seminars are ongoing.
- The Compass Annual Scientific meeting was attended and a poster about the ongoing thematic review on psychological distress presented.

Collaboration communication

- S2/S3 meetings have continued and are planned for the coming year. Post-docs have contact on a regular basis.

Research

- Substantial progress on the thematic review on psychological distress has been made and the results will be available in October.
- Evaluation of the IVR system is ongoing. A brief questionnaire has been developed to ask patients about their views on the system.
- Work on patients' views on different methods of symptom assessment is submitted.
- The paper on concerns of cancer patients with MDD is submitted.
- The study on the natural history of distress study has started in Glasgow and Edinburgh.

Objectives for next reporting period (6 months):

Training

- Several Masterclasses have been planned for the coming year, local research seminars will be attended and user-involvement training will continue.

Collaboration communication

- Continue working together with S2 collaborators and other post-docs.

Research

- Data collection for the persistence of distress study will be ongoing.
- The study determining the feasibility and acceptability of the IVR system will be ongoing.
- Finalise thematic review on psychological distress.

Name: Lucy Ziegler

Period covered by report: May-September 2009

Date report submitted: 5 September 2009

Objectives at start of this reporting period (as written in the last progress report):

- Complete stage 1 of Delphi study
- Prepare 2nd review paper for publication (reporting data by disease site)
- Submit review paper for publication
- Continue EPCRC collaborations

Description of progress (confine to no more than 250 words):

- EPCRC collaborations actively continue. Systematic review presented in the EPCRC session alongside presentations by their depression workgroup at the EAPC Congress, Vienna May 2009.
- Delphi study stage 1 complete: focus groups consisting of a total of 27 participants have been undertaken to gain user perspectives on measures. Primary analysis completed.
- Delphi study stage 2: twenty two of 37 participants approached have completed online Delphi so far. Reminder letters sent 3 September 2009 and awaiting further responses from participants. Study closes 14 September 2009
- NCSI review. Search strategies developed and all searches run. Screening and preliminary data extraction has taken place on 183 systematic reviews. 9,500 RCT's. Preliminary findings to be presented at NCSI consultation Event on 16 September 2009.
- First systematic review paper written and submitted to Journal of Clinical Oncology. The manuscript passed the preliminary review process and was invited for full review but was declined after this stage. Currently implementing reviewers comments prior to re-submitting to another journal
- Second paper from systematic review on hold until decision made about whether to split primary paper to improve coherence.



Outputs

- Measuring psychological distress: A systematic review of self-report measure performance at key stages of the cancer illness trajectory. Ziegler, L Hill, K Neilly, Hill K, Higginson IJ, Bennett MI, Murray S, Stark, D Under revision for resubmission
- Ziegler L Hill K Stark DA (2009) A systematic review of self-report measures for emotional distress in oncology compared to assessment using standardised clinical interview. PSYCHO-ONCOL 3 18 p322 2009 11th Congress of the European Association of Palliative Care; Vienna, Austria
- Psychological distress in cancer and palliative care. Views from the UK COMPASS Collaborative. Ziegler, L Hill, K Neilly, Hill K, Higginson IJ, Bennett MI, Murray S, Stark, D

Objectives for next reporting period:

- MCS review completed and report submitted for incorporation into final consultation document.
- Second stage of Delphi study completed and analysis complete
- Paper from systematic review re-submitted for publication
- Report from first round of Delphi study written

Name: Louise Atkins

Period covered by report: 28 May 09 – 03 September 09

Date report submitted: 03 September 09

Objectives at start of this reporting period (as written in the last progress report):

1. Review of quality assurance of complex interventions: submission as an analysis paper to BMJ in July/August 2009
2. Contribute to the development of quality assurance strategies for a radiographer-delivered psycho-educational intervention to promote early presentation in older women with breast cancer
3. Qualitative study of the impact of complaints on hospital doctors: complete write up and submission of paper to Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine within the next reporting period
4. Systematic review of the mental health of doctors, nurses and allied health professionals: completed by end June 2009
5. Systematic review to determine the effectiveness of training non-mental health professionals to deliver psychological interventions: completed by end 2009

Description of progress (confine to no more than 250 words):

1. Review of quality assurance of complex interventions: the paper is in advanced draft format will be submitted as an analysis paper to the BMJ in the next reporting period
2. Contribute to the development of quality assurance strategies for a radiographer-delivered psycho-educational intervention to promote early presentation (PEP Intervention) in older women with breast cancer: progress to date on this workstream includes compiling a proposal for refining a package of quality assurance for the PEP Intervention for use in future randomised controlled trials and possible NHS implementation
3. Systematic review of the mental health of doctors, nurses and allied health professionals: the final report is currently being written up and will be completed early in the next reporting period. The final report will be produced in collaboration with Professor Matthew Hotopf and Dr Sam Harvey (Dept. of Psychological Medicine, King's College London) who, together with Drs Bee Laird and Max Henderson, have recently conducted a Department of Health-funded review of the mental health of health care professionals
4. Systematic review to determine the effectiveness of training non-mental health professionals to deliver psychological interventions: this workstream will be progressed in 2010
5. Qualitative study of the impact of complaints on hospital doctors: due to competing priorities, this work stream has not been progressed as anticipated. If time resources permit, this study will be written up and submitted to Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine within the next reporting period

Objectives for next reporting period (6 months):

1. Review of quality assurance of complex interventions: submission to BMJ in the next reporting period
2. Contribute to the development of quality assurance strategies for a radiographer-delivered psycho-educational intervention to promote early presentation (PEP Intervention) in older women with breast cancer: To continue refinement and piloting of a package of quality assurance for the PEP Intervention. It is anticipated that this will be completed by end of 2009
3. Systematic review of the mental health of doctors, nurses and allied health professionals: completion of final report early in the next reporting period
4. Qualitative study of the impact of complaints on hospital doctors: this work will be revisited in the next reporting period to determine whether time resources are available to complete write up