



1. FOLLOW-UP ON ACTION ITEMS	5 min
<p>a. Review notes and action items from previous meeting (see attachment 2)</p>	
2. COVID-END BASELINE PROJECT	20 min
<p>a. Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response rate is 95%, 42/44 organizations responded, and expecting responses from the remaining 2 • Amena presented graphs for social network analysis conducted with the AUB information specialist, however the details of the statistical measures have to be discussed further <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Graph 1: showing all levels of interaction across the partners and the other evidence synthesis organizations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ thickness of the edges is by weight, so it's showing the level of collaboration and cooperation (the scale of the survey from 1 to 7) and the size of the nodes is by the degree, so it's showing the number of links indicated by the organization ○ colour is not interpretive and needs to be checked ○ certain peculiar observations include: Cochrane Central's node is not as big as Cochrane Australia. Jeremy mentioned that Cochrane Australia contains the work of the living guidelines so perhaps there has been a level of confusion on the participants' part on whether they're responding on a personal, organizational or a COVID-specific project context ii. Graph 2: showing all levels of interaction but only for COVID-END partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Showing the partners and all levels of collaboration ○ Size is an indication of the number of links ○ Removes a lot of the noise ○ An example: University of Putra's node is large and perhaps that is because most of their links are about awareness (so it's only aware of the existence of the other organizations) ○ Suggestion: consider graphs in a decreasing manner, so removing level 1 iii. Graph 3: increasing levels of collaboration for COVID-END partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Showing level 1: awareness ○ Suggestion: consider the decreasing levels of collaboration iv. Graph 4: showing two levels of collab: awareness and communication 	

- v. Graph 5: showing three levels: awareness, communication, cooperation
- vi. Graph 6: showing four levels: awareness, communication, cooperation and coordination
- vii. Graph 7: showing five levels: awareness, communication, cooperation, coordination and collaboration
- viii. Graph 8: showing six levels: awareness, communication, cooperation, coordination, collaboration and partnership

What is the best approach to represent these graphs?

- Maybe subtraction rather than addition of levels would be the best approach
- Generating a brief narrative that contains: what are the key learnings and key insights of the graphs
- **ACTION: Amena to generate these narratives with the help of the statistician and bring back to the Sustaining WG to further discuss interpretation**
- Suggestion: remove level 1 as it creates a lot of noise and probably distorts the data because it treats all interactions as the same
- Suggestion: using the typology of organizations that has been developed for the sampling purpose and examining within group dynamics to see if patterns emerge that can shed a perspective on the analysis. This might help with the noise created by level 1
- Jeremy, Amena, Elie have to think about how best to group the organizations and speak to the statistician to see how to play with groupings and what kind of information emerges from it
- We need to do some face validity check too
- Sylvia asked whether the lines reflect **both** organizations indicating a link or **one** organization indicating that link – for example Cochrane Central and University of Putra because Sylvia did not indicate that link in her response. So how reciprocal are the relationships between organizations?
- Amena said that graph shows both links, however, Amena needs to check in with the statistician
- Tiago stated these are common ‘issues’ in social network analysis, that when respondents are identifying their networks, they don’t make distinctions between their own organization and a part of an organization that is an officially or legally a separate part but respondents interpret as the same. However, there are ways to direct respondents to think about collaboration in a certain direction or approach

What is helpful for us to try and do about this?

- Start with the subtraction rather than addition (starting from the higher level and subtracting down)
- Is it appropriate for the group to look at ‘kinks’ in the data and go back to partners letting them know that of these observations or do we accept the data as it is and acknowledge these as limitations of SNA?

- Tiago stated that it shouldn't be an issue from a methodological perspective to approach respondents and 'direct' them a bit with certain answers (the wording will need some massaging) and this can be seen as cleaning the data
- Group can look at the data and do a member check in which we send partners a matrix of their responses (and maybe one of the graphs too) and ask if that is what they meant or if it's a good representation of their responses. For example, we can ask them 'we've noticed that there wasn't a link indicated here, such as Cochrane Central and Cochrane Ireland, can you check that one?'
- To summarize: start off with the highest level and subtract down in order to get clarity, use the typology reference to group and help adjust for some of the more obvious collaborations that might have been omitted, and to do a member check with a matrix of respondents' responses
- Amena needs to talk to Elie about revisiting ethics on these approaches
- Jeremy asked if is there a way to cluster groupings in the graph, for example clustering HTA groups in the representation of the graph?
- **ACTION: Amena to check if the SNA software utilized allows clustering to be represented**

- **ACTION: Amena to notify Jeremy on the remaining partner organizations that have to complete the SNA and Jeremy to send out remainder emails**
- For the qualitative phase, the pilot testing is completed.
- **ACTION: Invitations will be sent out this week after Amena checks a few things with ethics**

b. Follow-up study (to potentially include funders engagement)

- Baseline study is to assess partners' initial COVID-19 response and engagement with COVID-END in the early months
- What is the timing of the follow-up study?
 - For the SNA, we might want to follow up around late March or April as then it will be around 12 months since the onset of our baseline study
 - Study design would include: SNA and further qualitative study
 - Timing, purpose, and methodological approach for the follow up study might depend which kind of hypothesis we come up with about how this network will change through time and/or how it affects partner organizations
 - We want to capture some of the partners' stories' about moving up (or down) the scale of collaboration
 - The baseline qualitative study will be helpful to inform the questions that we want to ask in the follow-up study

<p>3. COVID-END LOGIC MODEL</p> <p>a. Discuss feedback from working groups (see attachment 3)</p> <p>b. Discuss potential work stream operational plan for working groups (see attachment 4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jeremy provided an update that there are discussions around the re-structuring of the working groups, such as creating groups that are more linked to the core COVID-END projects, for example: Profiling with the inventory, Prioritizing with the horizon scanning and Advocating will help with the advocacy role • For the logic model, the group needs to think about the changes to the working groups might change certain nuances of the logic model • Anticipate that in the next 2 weeks, the Secretariat will have formalized the next phase and perhaps can provide a presentation to be used to think about the existing logic model, the working groups' feedback and if the new structure is fit for purpose 	<p>30 min</p>
<p>4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p> <p>No other business was raised</p>	<p>5 min</p>