Monday November 9th

DAY 2 Collaborative Agenda Setting

Welcome and Review of Agenda & Logistics (Plenary, 20 min)

6:00-6:20 AM (PT) | 7:00-7:20 AM (MT) | 8:00-8:20 AM (CT) | 9:00-9:20 AM (ET) | 2:00-2:20 PM (UK) | 3:00-3:20 PM (CET)

Implementation Solutions (Breakout group discussions, 30 min)


STRUCTURE: Each group will have a Google Doc to guide the discussion as follows:

1. List the implementation steps (15 min)
2. Determine who needs to be included (5-7 min)
3. Consider the impediments (5-7 min)
TOPICS/GROUPS:

A. **Adoption of COPE guidelines**: How do we facilitate further adoption of COPE guidelines as an industry-wide standard?
   a. Google Doc
   b. Group
      i. Yoss Arianlou, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign
      ii. Joerg Heber, Editorial Director PLOS and Editor-in-Chief PLOSOne
      iii. Hannah Heckner, Product Strategist, Silverchair
      iv. Stacey Lavelle, Senior Business Analyst, Aries Systems Corporation
      v. Deborah Poff, Editor in Chief Journal of Academic Ethics, Chair Trustee Board COPE
      vi. Sarah Robbie, Head of Research Integrity & Ethics, Taylor and Francis
      vii. Randy Townsend, Director, Journal Operations at American Geophysical Union

B. **Use of Retracted Science in Policy, Applied Science and Evidence-Based Practice**: What actions need to be taken when a retracted item has been used in a regulation, guideline, or systematic review?
   a. Google Doc
   b. Group
      i. Stephanie Boughton, Research Integrity Editor, Cochrane
      ii. Stephen Gonsalves, Division of Education and Integrity, US Office of Research Integrity
      iii. Francesca Grifo, Scientific Integrity Official, Environmental Protection Agency
      iv. Kathryn Kaiser, Assistant Professor Dept of Health Behavior, University of Alabama Birmingham
      v. Kathryn Mc Connell, Director, FDA Library, Office of Information Management and Technology
      vi. Dmitry Malkov, University of Sussex
      vii. Jodi Schneider, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

C. **Robust Dissemination of Retraction Status**: How do we assure robust dissemination of retraction status information? What are the opportunities for sharing information across different scholarly publishing services? What is needed to ensure sustainability and data quality of retraction status information?
   a. Google Doc [Day 2 - C - Robust Dissemination of Retraction Status]
   b. Group
      i. Ashley Farley, Program Officer, Knowledge & Research Services, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
      ii. Patricia Feeney, Head of Metadata, Crossref
      iii. Katie Funk, Program Manager, PubMed Central
      iv. James Leung, Product Director, Clarivate Analytics
      v. Ivan Oransky, Co-Founder of Retraction Watch
      vi. Randi Proescholdt, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
      vii. John Seguin, President and Chief Librarian, Third Iron LLC
D. Retraction Education for Researchers, Editors, and the Public: What does every researcher need to know about retraction? What does every editor need to know? What does the public need to know? Where does this happen and how?
   a. Google Doc
   b. Group
      i. Elsa Alvaro, Director of Academic Engagement, Librarian for Chemistry, and Chemical and Biological Engineering, Northwestern University Libraries
      ii. Joanne Berger, FDA Library
      iii. Daniele Fanelli, Fellow in Quantitative Methodology, Department of Methodology, London School of Economics and Political Science
      iv. David Moher, Director, Centre of Journalology, Ottawa Hospital Research Institute
      v. Barbara Ruggeri, Life & Health Sciences Librarian, Carroll University

E. End User Tools & Services: How do we get retractions and other post-publication updates into the workflow of end users?
   a. Google Doc
   b. Group
      i. Michele Avissar-Whiting, Editor in Chief, Research Square
      ii. Yuanxi Fu, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
      iii. Josh Greenberg, Program Director, Alfred P. Sloan Foundation
      iv. Karen Hanus, Director, Advocate Aurora Library, St. Luke’s Medical Center
      v. Tzu-Kun (Esther) Hsiao, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
      vi. Josh Nicolson, Co-founder and CEO scite
      vii. Elizabeth Suelzer, User Education and Reference Librarian, Medical College of Wisconsin
      viii. Nicole Theis-Mahon, Liaison Librarian & Health Sciences Collection Coordinator, Health Sciences Library University of Minnesota

F. Standards Development Process: What standards development process will help stakeholders agree on the problems posed and then reach consensus on approaches and potential solutions?
   a. Google Doc
   b. Group
      i. IJsbrand Jan Aalbersberg, Chair of the Standards and Technology Executive Committee of STM; SVP Research Integrity, Elsevier
      ii. Elisabeth Bik, Microbiome and Science Integrity consultant
      iii. Dan Kulp, Director, Editorial Development for the journals of the American Chemical Society
      iv. Christopher Lehmann, Research Integrity Officer, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
      v. Alice Meadows, Director of Community Engagement, NISO
      vi. Nathan Woods, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
**G. Taxonomy Requirements:** In order to implement a taxonomy (of retraction or of post-publication updates) what needs to be true of the taxonomy? What is needed for its successful adoption across scientific publishing?

a. Google Doc

b. Group

i. Geoff Bilder, Director of Technology and Research, Crossref

ii. Nicholas DeVito, Doctoral Researcher, EBM DataLab, University of Oxford

iii. Annette Flanagin, Executive Managing Editor and Vice President, Editorial Operations, JAMA and The JAMA Network, and Executive Editor, JAMAevidence

iv. David Gillikin, Chief, Bibliographic Services Division, National Library of Medicine

v. Eefke Smit, Director of Standards and Technology, International Association of STM Publishers

---

**BREAK - 15 MINUTES**

6:50-7:05 AM (PT) | 7:50-8:05 AM (MT) | 8:50-9:05 AM (CT) | 9:50-10:05 AM (ET) | 2:50-3:05 PM (UK) | 3:50-4:05 PM (CET)

---

**Min Specs (Continue in same breakout groups, 30 min)**

7:05-7:35 AM (PT) | 8:05-8:35 AM (MT) | 9:05-9:35 AM (CT) | 10:05-10:35 AM (ET) | 3:05-3:35 PM (UK) | 4:05-4:35 PM (CET)

In the same groups from Part I, using the same Google Doc:

1. Quickly generate a list of all the must-dos and must-not-do’s that should be considered to achieve a successful outcome to the proposed actions in the first session. (5-10 min)
2. Reduce the list to the absolute minimum by dropping anything that is not absolutely essential. Ask “If we violated this spec, could we still achieve our purpose?” If the answer is “yes” - drop it. (20 min)

---

**BREAK - 15 MINUTES**

7:35-7:50 AM (PT) | 8:35-8:50 AM (MT) | 9:35-9:50 AM (CT) | 10:35-10:50 AM (ET) | 3:35-3:50 PM (UK) | 4:35-4:50 PM (CET)
What? So What? Now What? Debrief (Plenary, 40 min)

7:50-8:30 AM (PT) | 8:50-9:30 AM (MT) | 9:50-10:30 AM (CT) | 10:50-11:30 AM (ET) | 3:50-4:30 PM (UK) | 4:50-5:30 PM (CET)

1. What? What happened in the small group discussions? What did you notice, what stood out?

2. So What? Why is this important? Where is there consensus? What solutions have enough support to be feasible?

3. Now What? What actions make sense? What solutions should we as a group consider? What are the next steps?

BREAK - 15 MINUTES

8:30-8:45 AM (PT) | 9:30-9:45 AM (MT) | 10:30-10:45 AM (CT) | 11:30-12:30 PM (ET) | 4:30-4:45 PM (UK) | 5:30-5:45 PM (CET)

15% Solution (Individual brainstorming & small breakout group discussions, 45 min)

8:45-9:30 AM (PT) | 9:45-10:30 AM (MT) | 10:45-11:30 AM (CT) | 11:45 AM-12:30 PM (ET) | 4:45-5:30 PM (UK) | 5:45-6:30 PM (CET)

STRUCTURE: “What is your 15 percent? Where do you have discretion and freedom to act? What can you do without more resources or authority?”

1. 5 minutes alone to generate your own list
2. Individuals share their ideas with the small group one at a time (3 min each)
3. Group members provide a consultation to one another - asking clarifying questions and offering advice (5-7 min per person)
4. Share in Google Doc: Day 2 15% Solution Ideas or email MT Campbell

GROUPS:

1. (moved)
2. Ashley Farley, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation; Elizabeth Suelzer, Medical College of Wisconsin; Christopher Lehmann, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign; Stephanie Boughton, Cochrane; Katie Funk, PubMed Central.
3. Annette Flanagin, JAMA and The JAMA Network; Josh Greenberg (part of this time), Alfred P. Sloan Foundation; Joerg Heber, PLOS and PLOSOne; Eefke Smit, International Association of STM Publishers.
4. Dan Kulp, American Chemical Society; Alice Meadows (part of this time), NISO; Ivan Oransky, Retraction Watch; Sarah Robbie, Taylor and Francis.
5. IJsbrand Jan Aalbersberg, Elsevier; Elisabeth Bik, Microbiome and Science Integrity consultant; Deborah Poff, COPE; Randy Townsend, American Geophysical Union.
6. (moved)
8. Caitlin Bakker, Health Sciences Library Univ of Minnesota; Kathryn Kaiser, University of Alabama Birmingham; David Moher, Ottawa Hospital Research Institute; Nicholas DeVito, University of Oxford.
9. (moved)
10. Michele Avissar-Whiting, Research Square; Geoff Bilder, Crossref; James Leung, Clarivate Analytics; Jodi Schneider, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; John Seguin, Third Iron LLC.
11. Daniele Fanelli, London School of Economics and Political Science; Nicole Theis-Mahon, University of Minnesota; Dmitry Malkov, Sussex University.
12. Patricia Feeney, Crossref; Stacey Lavelle, Aries Systems Corporation; Josh Nicholson, scite.

Wrap up and looking ahead to Day 3 (Plenary, 20 min)

9:40-10:00AM (PT) | 10:40-11:00 AM (MT) | 11:40 AM-12:00 PM (CT) | 12:40-1:00 PM (ET) | 5:40-6:00 PM (UK) | 6:40-7:00 PM (CET)