

## 1. INTRODUCTIONS

- a. Maureen noted that we would welcome one of the two Memorial University students when he is able to join a working group call*
  - a. Newman Dieyi, Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada*

## 2. FOLLOW-UP ON ACTION ITEMS

- a. John will update the website text as soon as all of the Synthesizing working group resources have been loaded onto the website*
- b. Maureen explained that, at the partners meeting on Thursday, she invited partners who are not Engaging work group members to play a lead role in facilitating discussions once the listserv is started*
- c. Maureen and Laurenz have begun a conversation about activities that Newman could be tasked with to support the Engaging working group (see item 3b below)*

## 3. OUTREACH

- a. Maureen noted that mail outreach to network contacts has been completed and she will now follow-up with those from whom she hasn't yet heard*
- b. Newman will now start to be involved in::*
  - 1. tracking responses/emails*
  - 2. writing a short summary of discussions from the listserv*
  - 3. providing updates regularly to the Engaging working group*
  - 4. providing updates as time permits about the listserv discussions at the Partners meetings*
- c. Maureen also invited feedback on the outreach tracking document (see attachment 3) and agreed to consider whether the additional row after each network can be addressed through the second-to-last column in the tracker*

## 4. PRIORITY SETTING

- a. Maureen re-introduced suggestions (from our June 9 meeting) for potential co-facilitators for the preliminary four discussion topics for the listserv*
  - 1. 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)*
  - 2. open-access principles for synthesis publications – Tamara could help here*
  - 3. priority setting for COVID-19 evidence syntheses – Heather could help here*
  - 4. critical appraisal and strength of the evidence assessments in rapid COVID-19 reviews – Laurenz and Jenny could help here*

*b. Additional discussion topics; potential co-facilitators?*

- 1. 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)*
- 2. difference between expert opinion-based guidance and guidance developed using a robust process*
- 3. importance of beginning to transition to living reviews on priority topics that will be with us for some time*

*c. Working group members also 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):*

- 1. type of engagement – e.g., addressing easily answered questions such as ‘is it true that PROSPERO approves protocols within one business day?’)*
- 2. 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)*
- 3. 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)*
- 4. 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*

**5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

- a. No other business was raised*