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>> STEVEN BOYDSTON: Hi, everyone and welcome back. To remind everyone, we will be recording the rest of this conference today. All of the archived materials and presentation slides will be available on our website for the conference.

Next I would like to introduce our third presentation for the day, Melanie Barwick, a Senior Scientist in the Child Evaluative Services Program and head of the Child and Youth Mental Health Research Unit in the Department of Psychiatry at the Hospital for Sick Children. Dr. Barwick is an internationally recognized expert in implementation science and knowledge translation and has a program of research that spans, health, mental health, education and global health sectors. Her research aims to improve the implementation of evidence into practice and to broaden the research of evidence more generally to support decision making, policy, knowledge, and awareness.

Melanie, are you ready to begin?

>> MELANIE BARWICK: I am. Thank you, Steven. Can you hear me okay?

>> STEVEN BOYDSTON: We can, go ahead.

>> MELANIE BARWICK: Wonderful. Welcome, everybody. This might be the second or third time you have heard me on this conference. Not this year but in past years. And this year I want to, I have been invited to focus specifically on the evaluation of a Knowledge Translation plan and Knowledge Translation goals that we often conjure for ourselves as we develop a plan and think about who we are going to talk to, what we are going to say and what we are going to accomplish. My objectives for this little chat with you are to give you a very quick overview of Knowledge Translation, how we define it at SickKids, why it matters, remind you of the KT planning steps that I've spoken about in this forum before, and then focus in on evaluating your KT plan.

So making Knowledge Translation useful requires planning. I think we have all been in a situation where we've conducted a project or we've done some research and had in mind somewhat in the back of our heads that we were going to share this research knowledge that we accumulated, but we weren't too clear on what that was going to look like. As academics the go to sharing mechanism is peer reviewed paper, and that's well and good; or a conference presentation. Sometimes a more informal presentation or dialogue. We do these sorts of activities as par for the course. It's ingrained in us, this is what we do.

What is a little less easy to sort of wrap our heads around is to step outside of that world, that academic world and think about who else in our environments or neighboring environments might be interested in the work that we are doing, what we've discovered, and who might we invite into our knowledge user or target audience family, if you will, in terms of thinking through who do we want to talk to. To do this it requires a little bit of planning. So planning with anything that we do, I think, is useful. It actually means that you have a higher chance of actually conducting the activity that you have in mind. And at least in a Canadian context one of the -- we have several drivers for Knowledge Translation activities and Knowledge Translation planning. It is often times requested in a funding opportunity as a component or a section of a research proposal. We have a common CV framework for our health funders and other types of funders that often asks us to talk about the Knowledge Translation activities we have done.

Importantly, I think, a key driver is at the end of our research when we have to report back to our funders, there is a large section of report-back that has to do with Knowledge Translation, asking the investigators to not just report on the act at this times they engaged in to transfer knowledge but what the impact of those activities were.

Knowing that at the front end of the research endeavor is a good place to be. These are important drivers for us here.

The other thing is the kind of things that we typically do, we write paper, talk to people, go to conferences, are targeted at other scientists, people who are tuned in and have access to the literature and we often want to reach a broader group of knowledge users. This is not only a concern of people who are doing research in community health or sort of the more traditional clinical or health service or population health pillars of research. It is also important for basic scientists because if you think about who they might want to engage, although it might be a different list of knowledge users, that it might be say for someone like myself who is a health system researcher, they might want to talk to other researchers on the periphery of their area. They may want to talk to clinicians, to industry. They may have a commercialization target in mind. So they also have a broader knowledge user or target audience group to consider.

Now, sadly, we spend so much effort writing our papers and trying to get them published it's kind of sad to see how many people actually read them in the end. So even if we were only targeting our research efforts to academics or people who could access the journals, we find that is not necessarily the most engaged manner to target our main messages. We often will need to supplement our research papers with other activities. Most of the time things sit unread in journals. The same thing happens to our reports. I think this is a common experience for many people.

We are also being encouraged to be somewhat more accountable for the use of public funds. Funders want to demonstrate a return on investment. Often times a key driver would be academic promotion. Perhaps if you are going forward for promotion. As is the case in our own faculty in medicine here at the University of Toronto, we can go forward on teaching research or creative professional activity, and this latter category captures the community-engaged scholarship and the Knowledge Translation activities that many of us engage in. We are being asked to do more than to say what we did. We are being asked to demonstrate the impacts of the activities in which we engaged or the novel scholarly contributions we contributed to. That takes more effort. A KT plan comes into use there.

As I just said we are increasingly being required to demonstrate the impact of our research. That might be at an organizational level, funder level or even your community partners.

Lastly, we want to advance the science and practice of Knowledge Translation. There's a real opportunity here that I think is unmet in terms of sharing with one another as a larger community the sorts of Knowledge Translation activities we do and their effectiveness. And there really isn't a forum in which to do that outside of the sort of rigid academic journal forum. So I think that's something to explore. There really is an opportunity here to advance our knowledge base.

Simply if we don't plan for it it is not going to happen.

For us, knowledge translation, we use the term very broadly to capture the set of activities and processes in which we engage to ensure that people can access the research, that they can understand the research the first time and that they can benefit from the research, whatever that benefit may be. And it is important to distinguish the term KT in the manner in which I'm using it as an umbrella term, from the term implementation and they are often used synonymously, but I think there's some complication there the for us, implementation means your KT goal is to change what people are doing or to inform practice change, behavior change or policy. I'm using the term KT as Knowledge Translation to be the activities and the strategies be used initially in any instance to get people to understand the research evidence and start them on a pathway of benefits from that knowledge.

So Knowledge Translation activities are all guided by a KT goal. And these KT goals can be anything from generating awareness and interest. If you step back and think about what you do when you give a talk or you write a paper, what you are doing is not based on a synthesis of evidence. You are simply saying to a group of people who access in this preferred manner, you're saying this is what we did. This is why we did it. This is how we did it and this is what we learned and possibly these are the implications.

There are a lot of instances where regardless of where else we want to go with the knowledge sharing, at a basic minimum we are generating interest, sharing knowledge, probably informing research. And then we may want to do things like inform decision making or facilitate practice change or policy change or behavior change in the public or community. We might want to take our work down a tech transfer or commercialization pathway, in which case that would be a whole other set of procedures and strategies.

And so the boxes that you can see on the second and third row that I added sort of a tick box to are the ones where I believe the subspecialty of implementation science comes into play. And so this helps you think about Knowledge Translation, where does implementation fit, and within that where does commercialization and tech transfer fit?

Some of the common pitfalls of Knowledge Translation that we see as many of you probably have experienced, I've reviewed a lot of research proposals in my career as well as Knowledge Translation plans. I think early days of how we approached our research conceptually looked like what you see here. We were hope I can basic research would inform clinical research which would then inform practice. As you have all seen probably too many times than you can count, it takes on average 17 years or so for this journey to actually occur and it is not always entirely effective. It is a bit haphazard, hit and miss. So that's something we need to think about.

An improvement upon this is to think of conceptualization where we have this KT activity that happens to get to practice. And by practice, I really mean to get to some kind of benefit. And so we are inserting ourselves here with a set of skills and competencies that traditionally researchers or even project folks out in community organizations haven't really strengthened yet.

To take that even further we might want to if we are intending, if we have as a goal to change what people are doing, insert a special implementation component to that Knowledge Translation strategy.

One of the things I often see in terms of people's proposals, and where things fall apart, is in the alignment of a proposal. Often times you will see someone writing something about their KT plan that says something about who they are involving. So they will identify target audiences and people who are on their team, different organizations or partnerships that they have organized. And then they'll go to a second paragraph where they talk about the strategies or the KT or even implementation strategies that they are going to use.

And the problem with that is that they are disconnected. On the one hand you've told a story that says: Here is who is involved and here is what we are going to do. You may not have included there even what you think the main messages are. Certainly what is missing is the Knowledge Translation strategies serve what purpose?

When we communicate with anyone, any type of communication, we have a purpose for that communication. And the KT goal serves as the purpose of your Knowledge Translation. What we need to see is something more like this. What did you learn? Who needs to know? Who needs to know, you are identifying one, two, three, hopefully not more than that knowledge user groups or target audiences.

Then you are tailoring that main message to each of those Knowledge Translation audiences. You are thinking through, why am I telling them this? How do I envision that they may benefit? Thinking back to the earlier slide of the KT goals, this is where you are getting an idea of, well, I want parents to benefit in this way. I want researchers to benefit in this way. I want community organizations to benefit in this way. And you define a Knowledge Translation goal that maps to that knowledge user audience.

Then you think about, okay, how do I get to accomplishing this goal? If my goal is to develop awareness, what KT strategies might I use that will accomplish that? And then further on, how are you going to know if you were successful? How will I know that doing, for example, a set of webinars for community organizations on how to engage people with disables or what to consider in employment of people with disabilities, if it's about building awareness toward practice change, how am I going to show that that webinar actually accomplished this?

That's the kind of alignment we're talking about. One of the things we are developing here at SickKids is part of a knowledge translation certificate we run is a rubric for determining the quality of a KT plan. It's one of the criteria that our participants have at the end of a long and grueling week of Knowledge Translation learning that they have to present their KT plan. And we listen very attentively and use a rubric to help us A, listen actively, but also get a sense of comprehensiveness, alignment and feasibility of the plan.

Alignment means looking at things like is there alignment between the KT goals and each knowledge or user audience? Are they describing the intended benefit for those activities? Is there alignment between the goals of, the audience and the strategies? Is there alignment between the goals, the audience, the strategies.

We are talking about who needs to hear your message. So much of what we lay out in what we think are the best sort of evidence informed methods for knowledge translation planning and knowledge translation activity seems so simple and not something you really need to do a deep dive in your head about. It's interesting when you ask researchers: So, who are your knowledge users? They'll riff off one or two groups of people. When you start to talk to them about might this have implications for anybody else? They do come up with one or two other knowledge user audiences that they had never considered reaching out to.

So that's an important exercise to take on with your team.

How well do you know them? So how well you know your knowledge user is really informative. For one thing it tells you something about how you can find the right connection between your research evidence and the sticky thorny problems that they are dealing with in whatever context or world they're in. How do you make a connection between those two things?

It tells you something about how you might create buy-in for their interest and awareness of what you have to say. It tells you something about what their preferences are for where to go get that information and what format that information should be in.

We all learn differently. We pay attention to things differently. Some people like tactile. Some people like auditory. Some people like visual. It is about knowing enough that you can take the right knowledge translation approach, craft your message, take the right strategies and pick strategies and formats that map on to the preferences of your knowledge users.

If you think about the day of a teacher who is sort of bound by very structured day. Unionized, the time is monitored very carefully, teachers do not have time in the course of their day to go to a website to search for information. That may not be your top tier KT strategy. So that is what I mean by know your audience and figure out how well you know them.

You get a sense of how they benefit from the information you want to share. If your research evidence is instrumental, actionable, research evidence, it gives you a sense of, well, are they ready to hear it? Are they ready to act one it? And you don't know that if all you do is passively send them information at the end of your grant experience. It also gives you a sense of what barriers you might have to deal with. Finding out from your knowledge users at the get go, what are they dealing with? Why might they be interested in this research? How can we make this interesting to them or to the people that they are connected with? What formats do they enjoy the most? What will have the most tracks? Those are all important questions to ask in a planning phase.

Be practical. You know, be as specific as you can and don't try to take on more than you can actually handle. It has to do with feasibility. Do you have the available human resources to get the job done? And if you feel like you're going to target five different directions, that might be difficult to do. Failing to see if the Knowledge Translation lead to the goal, huge missed opportunity to get some traction, to have some impact, to get visibility and proper reach, get it out there in ways that people will enjoy, people will gravitate to often times we look at how communications folks and social marketers, we borrow from their tool box and that's useful for us.

If you are not getting the impact you need from your research, you are not realizing a great return on investment of the research activity. We like to think yea, we got funded and which can do the work and we will do the best job we can. We will be so thrilled when it is all over and think of your paper as a deliverable and move on to the next project.

I would bet you that your funder and possibly your research partners are looking for more of an extension, more value, more return on investment than simply the fact that you are padding your CV. While it is good for you to be doing that you want to be thinking about how do I really have the optimal sort of traction for the work that I've done and spent three, four, five years doing?

And then we also under realize the potential for how we contribute to KT science if we don't talk about evaluations and what we learned.

What do we mean by Knowledge Translation impact? Just mindful of the time here but I know you guys will keep me honest. I think I have until 4:15 or something like that.

My friend David Phipps has this nice distinction. Sometimes it gets confused. Knowledge Translation impact at the project level gets confused with research impact at a sort of organizational or even a KT level. There's a lot of excellent work happening in the U.K. and Australia around developing frameworks and procedures and learning a lot from initiatives that look at the impact of a body of research in an organization.

So on the one hand, we have this notion of research impact which is sort of how can we demonstrate the contribution that research makes to society or culture or public policy or health services? And it is the end game. We all want to get there and contribute to how well our organizations do or how well our KT does in terms of research impact. But what I'm talking about with Knowledge Translation impact is really the demonstrable contribution that your research or your project makes for a range of knowledge users, appropriate knowledge users, and for a range of KT goals that are specific to your research.

So it is the more proximal impact that benefits the researcher and can contribute later on to aggregate impacts of the organization.

I was recently last year in Australia working with them as they conceptualized a little bit of their research impact assessment framework and working with organizations that do a lot of research that have really focused their heads on what the KT will want them to demonstrate in terms of organizational impact. I needed to work really hard and mentioned this many, many times that whatever you can aggregate at an organizational level needs to stem from the individual KT contributions of projects underlying the organization or within the organization. So it is something to be mindful of.

So when I talk about impact, what I mean is finding indicators which might be quantitative or might be storytelling which is hugely powerful, but indicators that tell you or show you that people benefited from the knowledge you generated and that you shared with them. That can look a whole, in a whole different kind of way. There was recently on Twitter this morning a tweet about an organization that just won the dance your Ph.D. competition. Describing something to do with mathematics of braids and phenomenally exciting. I don't think I would have read a paper on it but it certainly captured my attention for five minutes, how they repped the work that they were doing. There's lots of really innovative ways to share your knowledge. We need to be thinking as we are creating these innovative ways about how we are going to capture what that does for us.

There are different evaluative approaches that we've used in the past. What I'm going to take you through are indicators of usefulness and youth and collaboration. You might have an interest in addition to or instead of indicators, learning at learning outcomes. We are trying to build awareness and share knowledge with people using Kirkpatrick model or different types of models to look at learning, behavior, results that result from the activities that we do. On the implementation side there's quite a bit on implementation evaluation, different models that allow you to evaluate the effectiveness of your implementation.

To be clear, what I'm talking about here in this talk is planning for Knowledge Translation as a general construct. I am not talking about planning for implementation as a specific type of KT activity.

So one of the resources that I strongly recommend has helped me think through some evaluation approaches for some of my own KT work is this one, this guide to monitoring and evaluating health information products and services. While the language is not indicative of KT, I think it's bang on and really useful.

And what is useful here for me in my mind is how they sort of thought through what some of the initial outcomes of your activities might be. So things like reach, things like usefulness, things like use, things like collaboration. So let me walk you through some examples of what this looks like.

So I saw Mark speaking earlier and he was talking about social media. Presumably he talked about analytics and web analytics and the kinds of things that we can pull off of the web, which is our probably, increasingly our main mode of distribution or channel of distribution. Things like reach indicators.

So who got this stuff that you put out there, that you translated? And we can think of lots of different ways to capture that. The number of, and whether it is online and it's by hits or reach or downloads or whether we are distributing things in paper copy or tangible in the real world, we can track things like where did the information go? How was it distributed? How many people wanted it? Did they ask for more? How many downloads were there? What sort of coverage, media coverage was generated by the Knowledge Translation work that you did?

And then who is linking to your information, assuming it's online? That's an indicator of value. It's a proxy indicator of value. If people are linking and saying go here, look at this, there's some suggestion there that this is a valued resource.

One of the caveats I want to say here, just around downloads to be mindful of, while it is a highly accessible metric to have, it only tells you who clicked. It does not tell you what they did with the information once it was in their possession. So if you are like me, I download a lot of stuff and tuck it away in little places in my life, my computer and desk, in hopes of coming back to it for something I'm working on. It doesn't mean I've worked on it right away, that I understood it or even shared it with everybody. We have to be mindful of the limitations of the download.

There's also indicators like use indicators. When you share information, is there an opportunity to ask people how they intend to use that knowledge? And you may or may not have a captive audience for long. If you are sharing knowledge in a sort of in vivo real world context, great opportunity there to get people toe jot down for you how useful was this? What do you intend to do with this information? It aligns with the intent to change literature. That's something to think about.

Maybe people have taken what you've shared and adapted it in some way. That's an indicator of value. It might be an IP hiccup, but it might be an indicator of did they find it useful enough that they could see how it could be used in their context.

Finding out whether they used the knowledge you shared to inform policy or advocacy, or to enhance programs or training, education or research. That might be a direction to go in.

Or even whether they are intending to use the knowledge to improve their own practice or performance or life or quality of life in some way. Again, another thing to consider.

For many of us especially in the health pillars of research, we do a lot of collaboration and capacity building. And up here in Canada we sometimes refer to this as integrated knowledge translation activities that align with research. But we might think of this in a Knowledge Translation way and in a planning and evaluation way, to think that if collaboration and capacity building is really a Knowledge Translation activity how do we gauge whether that was actually effective? Whether we are sharing information from the global south to others in the global south, developed countries to majority world countries, wherever that information is flowing globally or even within communities or jurisdictions. That might be important to gauge.

And we might want to even track something about our capacity building efforts.

One of the tools that I have used in a project, albeit many years ago now, is called a partnership evaluation tool. I just offer it here as an example. What I like about it is -- and there are other partnership evaluation tools out there, to be sure. But what I like about it is it gives you a sense of partnership impact through these four different sets of activities or domains of activities. The connections that result from the partnership, the learning that results, the actions that are undertaken by the partnership, and the impacts of notices actions.

And it is really done in sort of a questionnaire format at different time points during the evolution of the partnership. And in the beginning, the questionnaire looks at these questions that are nested in these four domains and essentially asks participants to imagine or predict how important it will be for them for that partnership to build their connection or how important it might be for that partnership to have an impact or undergo a series of activities together. Successive question areas go back to gauge what actually happened, what was your experience of connection and partnership and learning and so on?

And you can graft those to get a sense of where people placed their importance, which is the blue line on this spider graph, and what their actual experience is of it. Not only does this give a funder or even a project team a better understanding of how effective their partnership and KT partnership activities were, it also can be used formatively to improve on different areas as you move through the partnership and the partnership matures.

So there are plenty of impact and outcome measures out there. Sometimes it requires sitting down and going through the list and saying does this work for me? Does this work? Does this work? Anything from scans of environment or policy, capturing cultural changes, replication of a Knowledge Translation activity or product or some sort of adaptation that happens.

Can you demonstrate that what you shared in one field cross fertilized to another field or had an economic impact? Can you demonstrate that the Knowledge Translation activities allowed your partners to use research findings better than what they might have done had you not focused in that area.

Some of these things we recognize as activities we already do. Like event evaluations and satisfaction surveys. But it might surprise you to think of coauthoring of a publication as a Knowledge Translation indicator of success. If I'm truly trying to be collaborative it might be interesting to document that my academic and nonacademic partners collaborated on peer reviewed publications or other KT outputs. That's something you can track.

The number of activities that you engaged in together. Process measures in terms of events or what happens in meetings or media exposure or process information about communities of learning or communities of practice or interest. Those would be good indicators.

Then, of course, technological system indicators figure here as well. Website traffic. Resources available. Participation and growth in virtual communities of practice. Looking at network analysis, for instance, as a measure of Knowledge Translation activity in building communities. Increased access to resources. So you can sort of work your way through these lists and have an idea what it is I'm getting to.

Altmetrics are a new sort of family of metrics that have been proposed as an alternative to what I would typically called a productivity metric which is your publications, your personal citation indices and so on. And I make a point when I speak with academics to remind them that a lot of what we track as impact for an academic is actually a productivity indicator rather than an impact indicator.

And we can use these altmetrics which basically cover everything from citation counts to other aspects of impact of work. It is sort of in these altmetrics -- Mark would probably say it has this circular thing has a name to it which escapes me at this point, but it gives you an idea of how much interaction occurred for the Knowledge Translation activities and outputs that you put out there.

How much should you evaluate the information you put out there on the web? One of the research teams I'm working with is led by Pierre Dupuis at Montreal University here. He has been working with an organization in Quebec that produces and advocates for good parenting. It's a parenting website actually. They have been testing the Information Assessment Method or the IAM. The IAM is a little electronic survey that sits in the bottom corner of your screen that, people who are visiting the website can click on and that produces or basically activates a questionnaire of a very small number of questions related to whether the reader found the information useful, reliable, engaging, factual. Did anything seem glaringly wrong?

So they have been looking at how the IAM is working for website information. We are going to be using that here for our parent-facing, public-facing program for hospital for SickKids. It's a tool that gets you thinking about how you might assess the quality and usefulness of the information we put on the web which takes you a little deeper than hits and downloads.

Many of you are probably familiar with the Knowledge Translation Planning Template which takes you through a KT plan, a strategic planning approach. This is for Knowledge Translation, not for implementation specifically.

How much time do we have here? You are identifying your project partners and how engaged they are at different parts of your research or your project, what roles they will take on, whether you need expertise on the team relative to Knowledge Translation and where that might come from. So for instance, that might spur you to go and find an organizational partner because you don't have KT expertise in your organization, but another partnership organization does. So that might give you a strategic partnership you hadn't thought of before.

Who are your knowledge users? So who are you targeting this information to? And you know, being mindful as you go through this list and identify for yourselves who this information could be useful for, and think about have you included any of those people in your project team who are going to be a little bit more closely integrated and actually conducting the work from the get go.

What do you think you might learn? What do you think you might share with those audiences? Than and then aligning that to, you are going to be sharing this information with what goal in mind? You can say for audience 1, which happens to be consumers or the public, we are going to share information about whether our project or our tool was effective. What we want to do in the sharing is to generate interest and awareness and maybe, if the tool is ready for prime time and has good rigorous replicated evidence, maybe start them on a pathway to implementing that tool.

And then align that again with the KT strategies that you might use to get to that KT goal. And there's a range of them listed here.

This is a little bit, column 9 is a bit more grantsmanship and more Canadian context in terms of thinking through when Knowledge Translation is actually occurring in your endeavor. But I think it's useful regardless of where you are. If you have an interest in Knowledge Translation it's useful to know what is appropriate. Are we integrating this and doing Knowledge Translation as we conduct the work of this research? Or is that not necessarily appropriate? Or even needed? And what we are going to do rather is situate our Knowledge Translation activities at the end of the grant.

And this large beige section, column ten is about asking yourselves about impact and evaluation beginning where do you want to have an impact? Healthcare? Practice? Policy? Research knowledge?

How are you going to know that you achieved your KT goal? This gets us back to the indicators I listed.

On the right-hand side of that column are more sort of guiding questions for evaluation because there are often situations where the researchers are not the only stakeholder involved in thinking through what might we measure in our KT activities that could be valuable? You may have other stakeholders who have a different perspective on evaluation. Asking what the other stakeholders value in the evaluation, what they say they need from the evaluation might be a direction you could go in. Here is a set of guiding questions for that conversation.

And then mapping resources, budget items in column 13 is really the KT methodology. What is your method? What is your procedures for implementing your webinars or your brochures or whatever it is you are developing? How is that actually going to look?

I don't expect you to read what is on this slide because it's a lot. I often, often get asked: Once you finish that planning and you are writing this up for a proposal, let's say, how do you write it up? This is just by way of giving you an example of something I had done for a project. The way I write it up essentially is to have a paragraph that talks about the integrated Knowledge Translation in terms of who, what, where, what the goal is, what the strategies are and how are we going to know we were effective in our integrated KT, so this nice alignment.

For end of grant, to lay it out in goals. The goal might be to develop awareness. How are you going to do that? With whom? So how are we developing awareness with researchers? How are we developing awareness with practitioners? How are we developing awareness with policymakers?

Within each of those paragraphs there's a section there on what we are going to track in terms of impact indicator. So you can download the Knowledge Translation Planning Template on my website. There is a game that allows you to use a card deck along the same principles to have a manipulatable experience with a bunch of cards. Your team assembled around the table to start to plan your KT plan. That's just a different format really forgetting to the same end.

We recently developed two eLearning modules. The one on the left is sort of an overview of how we envisage Knowledge Translation much the same way I described it at the beginning of this seminar. Really to help people wrap their heads around the fact that when we talk about Knowledge Translation, it's something broader than simply practice change.

The module on the right is a module that we developed to take people through the Knowledge Translation Planning Template. You might have seen it, heard of it, used it once and you step away from it for a period of time and you need to be reminded about how to make it work for you.

So with five minutes to spare, which is unusual for me because I usually have way too much information to share, I am done, Steven. So it is back over to you and however you want to move forward from here.

>> STEVEN BOYDSTON: Great. Thank you, Melanie. We did have a lot of discussion in the chat surrounding the differences and similarities between communication, or communication science and Knowledge Translation. I thought you might want to give a perspective from your point of view on what those similarities or differences might be.

>> MELANIE BARWICK: Hmm. That is something that we see a lot of the time in discussion. And in fact, a group of us, some of whom might be on this call, David Phipps, Rosanna, Michael Johnny and others, Gary Meyers, we got together a couple of years ago to hash this out because it was a conversation up here and if I can just frame it a little bit in a Canadian context even though I know it's a pervasive issue. As the profession of Knowledge Translation specialists or knowledge brokers, whoever we label them, started to grow and develop here in a range of different organizations, what happened was these people started in new roles where there had been long standing communications departments. So a little bit of friction, a little bit about what is your job? What is my job? So on and so forth.

And we had a forum presentation and debate, really a discussion about this. And from that debate that we invited people to, we wrote a paper. And it is published in scholarly research -- oh, gosh. When we are on a break I'll think about what it is and I'll post the link in the chat box so everybody can have it.

But we did try to unpack sort of what is communication and what is Knowledge Translation. I mean, top of line things to say about this. There's a great deal of overlap. The whole idea here is for researchers and their teams to borrow from the communications tool box in terms of modes of communication, channels of communication, style of communication, to help us to become better communicators of our own research evidence.

And there are some differences as well. So we sort of position strategic communication versus Knowledge Translation. And Knowledge Translation is communication about research evidence. Whether we want to call that research communication, it is really specific about Knowledge Translation and sorry, about research evidence. Whereas strategic communications can be communications typically about an organization. About something else entirely. So the topical piece is a distinguishing feature.

The other is whilst both strategic communication and Knowledge Translation have their own metrics of evaluation, they are somewhat different. The reason that they are somewhat different is that the goals of communicating are different, as I've outlined for you at least nine different possible Knowledge Translation goals. Not all of those are communication goals. Right?

So a communication goal could be change awareness, but it wouldn't necessarily be change behavior as a result of this communication.

And so I am mind full that we are at 4:14 and I'm rambling on. I will find that proper citation and put it out there so people can go and have the paper. It's a debate paper. It's not like we figured it all out and this is what we are saying rules. It is up for conversation. I guess the last thing I'll say about that is as we have been training Knowledge Translation professionals and we have a panel at the end of that week, many of them have talked about how they have in their own organizations surmounted and really found some useful strategies for how to work collaboratively with their communications folks and how to make it work for them so that the tensions maybe not disappear, but dissipate. And I'll stop there.

>> STEVEN BOYDSTON: All right. Thank you very much, Melanie. That was a very thoughtful answer to that discussion.

I do want to also mention that Melanie, you will be hosting a webcast with the Center on Knowledge Translation for Disability and Rehabilitation Research, Implementation to Outcomes. I know Donna will talk about this more in the coming discussion session.