



Engaging Working Group  
 Agenda for the Webex call on 14 July 2020  
<https://mcmaster.webex.com/meet/rise>

<p><b>1. FOLLOW-UP ON ACTION ITEMS</b></p> <p><i>a. Review notes from previous meeting (see attachment 2)</i></p>	<p>3 min</p>
<p><b>2. JISC LISTSERV SIGN-UPS UPDATES [Newman]</b></p>	<p>5 min</p>
<p><b>3. CHECK IN WITH WORKING GROUP MEMBERS ON LISTSERV</b></p> <p><i>a. Sign-ups</i> <i>b. Feedback</i></p>	<p>5 min</p>
<p><b>4. REVIEW PRINCIPLES OF BEHAVIOUR CRITERIA AND SEEK APPROVAL FROM WORKING GROUP</b></p>	<p>15 min</p>
<p><b>5. PLANS FOR FULL LAUNCH (JULY 20<sup>TH</sup>)</b></p> <p><i>a. Working group members discussed potential parameters for discussion facilitators (keeping in mind that we will not be moderating the listserv in the sense of approving posts before they are circulated to listserv members)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i. Type of engagement – e.g., addressing easily answered questions such as ‘is it true that PROSPERO approves protocols within one business day?’)</i></li> <li><i>ii. Frequency of engagement – e.g., ideally respond within a day or two on weekdays (which can include a single post that addresses a number of questions that came in over the preceding few days)</i></li> <li><i>iii. Support for engagement – e.g., Newman may be able to track online postings and flag for facilitators when there are some posts that would benefit from a response (and in some cases, alone or with Jeremy’s support, he may be able to respond directly)</i></li> <li><i>iv. Collaboration in engagement – e.g., switching days or weeks to reduce by half the amount of attention that a single facilitator in a co-facilitator pair would need to devote to glancing at the listserv and adding a post when appropriate</i></li> </ul>	<p>15 min</p>
<p><b>6. DISCUSS ORDER AND TIMELINE FOR DISCUSSION TOPICS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a. Current agreed topics for week of July 20: Packaging, then Synthesizing</i></li> <li><i>b. Previously agreed topics within the Working Group notes from June 16</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i. Maureen re-introduced suggestions (from our June 9 meeting) for potential co-facilitators for the preliminary four discussion topics for the listserv</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>15 min</p>

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Registration of synthesis titles and protocols (e.g., via Prospero) – Lesley could help here (but would prefer not to go first given the uncertainty about how much time it will take to do this well)</i></li> <li>2. <i>Open-access principles for synthesis publications – Tamara could help here</i></li> <li>3. <i>Priority setting for COVID-19 evidence syntheses – Heather could help here</i></li> <li>4. <i>Critical appraisal and strength of the evidence assessments in rapid COVID-19 reviews – Laurenz and Jenny could help here</i></li> </ol> <p><i>ii. Additional discussion topics; potential co-facilitators?</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Time stamping based on date of search (i.e., how to address a fast-moving field) – this could likely best be addressed as part of the same discussion period as critical appraisal (above)</i></li> <li>2. <i>Difference between expert opinion-based guidance and guidance developed using a robust process</i></li> <li>3. <i>Importance of beginning to transition to living reviews on priority topics that will be with us for some time</i></li> </ol>	
<p><b>7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b></p>	<p><b>3 min</b></p>