

<p>1. FOLLOW-UP ON ACTION ITEMS</p> <p><i>a. Review notes and action items from September 23rd meeting (see attachment 2)</i></p>	<p>5 min</p>
<p>2. COVID-END BASELINE PROJECT</p> <p><i>a. Updates</i></p> <p><i>b. Follow-up study</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Amena provided the group with an update</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Website scan survey</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Received responses from 18 organizations (39% response) from website scan but expecting this to increase – Jeremy sending out reminders from his email this week and we'll also remind people at the Partners meeting</i></li> <li>• <i>Heather H suggested emphasizing how quick a process it is</i></li> <li>• <i>There was agreement that we need to ensure follow-up process abides by ethics</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Social network analysis response rate – currently 30%</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Unit of analysis is tricky for organizations that are not evidence synthesis organizations and group discussed the potential need to target to full partners</i></li> <li>• <i>Some partners may be taking a group approach to answering and this could take longer, but should be noted for the interpretation</i></li> <li>• <i>Amena asked, based on preliminary analysis of 12 organizations, whether we should include the “Awareness” category (removing it adds clarity)</i></li> <li>• <i>Amena showed the network graph (thickness represents higher level of collaboration) and there was a suggestion about the need to identify the organizations who responded, and also who is a covid-end partner; and a graph view that reflects only partner-to-partner relationships</i></li> <li>• <i>Suggestion to analyze data based on the level of collaboration (snapshots at each level of collaboration)</i></li> <li>• <i>Consensus that the Awareness level is important to keep in the survey and for some of these analyses as it is important data</i></li> <li>• <i>Thinking about relationships over time, some levels may be more important than others, but we don't yet know which one</i></li> <li>• <i>Directionality of relationships allows us to analyze the discord in relationships; for directional graphs we need to exclude non-COVID-END partners; numeric representation might help with interpretation</i></li> <li>• <i>It was noted that in this survey we did ask about relationships at the start of the pandemic. We do want to repeat the SNA in the follow up study to see if new relationships have formed or if existing relationships have been strengthened (hopefully not weakened)!</i></li> </ul>	<p>15 min</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Group felt it would be really lovely to share at least one of these graphs at Thursday's partners meeting – so they are aware of what we are trying to do Unlikely to introduce bias or harms – and need to make clear that a strong response rate is critical to understanding</i></li> <li>• <i>There was consensus that a very high response rate is critical, especially for interpreting the directionality</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Sampling for qualitative study</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Challenge in that not all the groups have verified their scan data</i></li> <li>• <i>Jeremy suggested circulating the document and people like him could add some more notes about why particular organizations are here</i></li> <li>• <i>Ian noted that PROSPERO is different than the others in the category because they don't produce syntheses</i></li> <li>• <i>Tiago noted that it might be important to know whether organizations are state, charity or independent</i></li> <li>• <i>Group discussed how we will identify the organizations to interview, and agreed that purposive sampling with clear criteria (e.g., uniqueness; size (range of sizes), etc) should be fine</i></li> <li>• <b>ACTION:</b> COVID-END to send a reminder this week from Jeremy's email, we remind partners at the meeting on Thursday. We then wait until week of 19th October for second reminder and we will continue to nudge at the partners' meetings</li> <li>• <i>The working group thanked Amena for all her hard work and leadership so far</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>3. EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF COVID-END</b></p> <p><i>a. SSHRC project</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Jean-Louis Denis provided a brief overview of the approach they are taking to the study and connections to Tiago (sharing after preliminary analysis from phase 1) including a review of the website and they will be reaching out to partners soon</i></li> </ul>	15 min
<p><b>4. COVID-END LOGIC MODEL</b></p> <p><i>a. Updates from presentations to other working groups (Scoping, Digitizing, Synthesizing and Recommending)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Visited four groups and getting great feedback – it is a very useful exercise</i></li> <li>• <i>Plan is to finish the consultations and bring suggestions back to the group</i></li> <li>• <i>The groups are providing quite different types of feedback – from high level to wordsmithing e.g., simplifying logic model to make it more generic</i></li> <li>• <b>ACTION:</b> will bring suggestions back to the group when consultations are complete</li> </ul>	15 min
<p><b>5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b></p>	5 min

<p><i>a. No scheduled COVID-END meetings (partners, co-chairs and working groups) for the following weeks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>i. Week of October 12</i></li><li><i>ii. Week of November 16</i></li><li><i>iii. Week of December 21</i></li><li><i>iv. Week of December 28</i></li></ul>	
---	--