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 >>DONNA MITRANI: So, our first presentation today is from Dr. Anne Bergen, the Director of Knowledge to Action Consulting, which offers services and evaluation, applied research, and knowledge mobilization. Dr. Bergen as helped develop and co-instruct the Encoded Mobilization Certificate Program at a University of Guelph. Her presentation, Supporting Implementation Through Engaged Evaluation, will provide an overview of how evaluation tools and methods can be used to support KT stakeholder engagement and implementation.

If you have any questions during the presentation, please ask them in the chat pod. After the presentation, Kathleen Murphy will lead an interactive discussion with reactors and conference participants. That said, Anne, are you ready to begin?

>> ANNE BERGEN: I'm ready, thank you. Okay. So, thank you so much for that introduction. I'm delighted to be here today to talk about supporting implementation through evaluation. So, my presentation you should know, unless otherwise noted, you're free to use it with attribution. I'm going to talk about evaluation through the KT project cycle. Then I'm going to turn to some tools that support KT and implementation work, including logic models or theories of change, mapping context and enabling factors, and looking at creating data use and engagement plans.

After that I'm going to turn to a couple of models for KT implementation and evaluation, looking at the communication model from John and the consolidated framework for implementation research. And finally, I'm going to wrap up with some promising practices for supporting stakeholder engagement in implementation and evaluation work. Before I get started in talking about the project life cycle, I wanted to talk a little bit about why I think evaluation is such an important and integral part of knowledge translation and implementation work.

Both with KT and implementation, you're moving research evidence into policy or into practice. And it seems that you're working with an iterative process. You can't get it all right at once. You have to learn as you go. Also with KT and implementation work, you have a lot of people working together. And it's dependent on those people learning how to collaborate and change what they're already doing. So the iterative and collaborative parts of implementation projects are supported by both evaluation, but also by stakeholder engagement. So it's the evaluation, it's a lot more likely to get the information that you're looking for.

If you think about the lifespan of a KT project, before the project you could be doing evaluation work in terms of needs assessment, looking at where the gaps might be and how you might fill those gaps, connecting with your stakeholders or end users to find out what kinds of knowledge translation might be helpful to them. If you have an intervention already in place, you might want to use process evaluation to look at the quality of what you're doing. You might want to track the quality or the quantity of the things you're producing or your output.

Or you might want to improve the things and KT products that you're creating through user experience and usability testing. Of course, after a project or at the end of a project you're going to start thinking about outcome evaluation, looking at what changed as a result of your work, identifying outcomes and impacts.

So, put another way, if you think about evaluation through that life cycle, it can help you understand the need for knowledge translation, the quality of the knowledge translation work you're doing, either as something that's a standalone one‑off activity, or part of a larger implementation initiative or program of activity. You could evaluate the reach of your KT activity, who is it connecting with, where is it being used. And again, what's changing because of that work? What's the impact of what you're doing? When you're thinking about evaluation in KT, it's often helpful to bring that work as a question, right?

So you could ask what's the logic behind what we're doing? What is the rationale for how we think that our activities are going to lead to the changes that we're looking for? Evaluation work can help you to find what success would look like within your project, both in the short term and further down the road. You could ask and investigate to what extent implementation is happening as planned, if you're implementing a known program, are you doing that in a way that has fidelity to the original plan, where have you had to adapt, what changed. You could ask what works well in different contexts and for whom.

When you're thinking about evaluation work, up front it's really important to manage expectations and to find with the people you're working with, what kind of evaluation you want to do. And depending on the context of where you're working, how much money you have and what kind of evidence you're looking for, you might want to do capital E evaluation research as opposed to capital R research, where the focus is on the research side. It might be a lighter evaluation where you're keeping track of something as you go, or a full‑on research process where you're going through an ethics board and investigating in a systematic way.

This depends on how you want to use and share that evidence, what kind of evidence you want, and what kind of resources you have. So before you start with evaluation work, talk to the people you're working with and work through those considerations.

Turning now to tools and practices that support KT and implementation work, the one I really like to start with always is a logic model or theory of change. They're similar concepts, some slight differences. I'm going to use them today pretty much interchangeably. Overall, a logic model gives you a visual summary of what your project or program is doing, how the activities lead to outcomes and longer‑term impacts. A logic model makes you get specific about how what you're doing is going to lead to some kind of change, and what that change looks like.

The other thing a logic model does is help you qualify those key assumptions. What does it mean for that activity to actually reach the outcome? What kind of enabling conditions or links need to be in place? Who needs to play a role and what act is needed to make this work? Once you summarize these items in a logic model, you can help other people understand your work. That could be staff, funders, partners, and so forth. Up on the screen now is a logic model template. And so this is a document, with permission from the Canadian Water Network, that comes from the logic model template from the University of Wisconsin‑Madison.

On the left we're mapping the input, what goes into the project activity. This could be staff, end user time, engagement. It could be the partners time, equipment, space, technology, funding, all of those things that you need to run your activity. Also on the logic model I like to keep space for identifying those necessary conditions for success, both internally and externally. What needs to be in place for this logic model to actually hold together? Then you want to map out what you're going to do. And this is a high‑level template.

I've put down KT activities in person, on paper, and on screen. You can of course get a lot more detail about the kinds of activities you're going to do for a particular project. It's also helpful to map out some of that behind the scenes work that's going on. That could be relationship development, meetings, training, any kind of pilot testing. All of those things can be part of your KT activity. And then also mapping out who those activities are directed at, who your target audiences are.

For example, if you're working in the healthcare sector, you might want to get in touch with patients and family. Maybe healthcare practitioners, maybe policy‑makers, maybe industry. It could be researchers. And you probably will have different KT activities targeted at different audiences. So spelling that out in the logic model helps you start to untangle what you're doing and with whom and what results you're hoping to see. So the outcomes are broken down into short, mid, and longer term impacts. The short‑term changes, outcomes, are more internal changes to a person, changes in knowledge or awareness or capacity.

Once you have that new information or knowledge, maybe an improved attitude towards something, motivation to change your behavior, then you get to the midterm outcomes where you're actually applying the knowledge and changing behavior or practice. Maybe you're putting evidence into policy. Maybe you're creating some new regulations or guidelines. And then way down low, those longer‑term impacts are going to be higher‑level goals that you're trying to reach. It could be improving environmental conditions, social conditions, the economy, public health, or you could be targeting institutional change.

The point is that for every project, you want to look at what you want the change, both in the short term, the midterm, and that longer term. You can start to make links between what you're doing in terms of activities and what you're hoping to see further on down the road if your activities are successful. So I've got here an overview of what these components are. If you're working with others to build a logic model, it can be helpful to frame each section in terms of these questions. So, asking people about activities and outcomes.

You might ask a researcher, what are your research and KT activities that could impact your stakeholders? Getting people to actually map out what they're doing can help them get a bigger sense of the program they're working on. Often, they understand how it works holistically, but spelling out each activity they're doing takes work. Sometimes you end up with a long list you need to condense down and bring together.

When you're looking at outcomes, you want to start with changes in knowledge. And then those larger downstream impacts at the organizational, systems, or community level. Identify for whom the changes are going to happen is really important. And for KT work in particular, I think it's really helpful to look at your external audience, and also the internal collaborators that you're working with, that implementation work. Often you have a lot of collaborators working across sectors towards a particular goal.

Trying to map who needs to know about what parts, who needs to be involved, who needs to be consulted, is really helpful in actually making a plan for what you want to do as well as for that later evaluation. And then of course those enabling conditions and assumptions. What do you need to run the program in terms of resources and thinking about the context? There may be things that are beyond your control that could impact the success of your KT work. And so mapping those out ahead of time helps you understand when you get your results why you got the results you did.

Co-creating a logic model or building a logic model with your stakeholders and collaborators can help you build shared understanding of what you're trying to do and accomplish. This is something you would do at the start of your KT project. Getting involved early with stakeholders to build a logic model. What the logic model does is, for stakeholders, it helps understand the so what of the KT work, figuring out what success should look like, and also defining measures ‑‑ what to measure, when to measure. And so this co‑creation work needs to happen through several iterations.

It's really rare that you can just sit down and bang out a logic model in a single afternoon. So you might start with the logic model on sticky notes. Then you might put it into a mind map. Then condense it into a Word document, and a cleaner Word document. If you're building a logic model, expect it to take several sessions and meetings and for people to have some time to review, make changes, and adjust it. As you're doing this work, valuing different ways of understanding the model is important.

Some people are easily able to tear apart their program. And some people see the rich tapestry of what they're trying to do. Finding ways for all kinds of people to contribute their knowledge and expertise to the model will make it a stronger model over time. One tip that I like is whenever possible, of course sometimes we're working remotely like we are today. But if you can work with tactile methods and creative methods, it's a lot more fun to make a logic model. So, bringing out the cookies, having sticky notes, getting pens and markers on the table and actually getting creative with mapping out what you want your project or KT program to do, what success looks like, is a great starting place to get people engaged in the project as well as to start on that evaluation work.

Logic models are also a practical planning and communication tool. So if you're applying for funding, you might need a logic model in place to show what you're doing to be part of the framework for the evaluation work you're doing. A logic model shouldn't be set in stone. It's a living document. It's your best current understanding of your program. So as your understanding of your program or project changes with time, your logic model should change, too. You should update your logic model as your KT project evolves. Now, a logic model is a fairly linear document.

And KT work is often very nonlinear, so you might want to create more concise diagram or longer document that explains all those nuanced interconnections. But you need to be able to translate that into a short summary that people can understand on their own. Overall, try to make your logic model as accessible as possible, both in words and format. So, what I like to do often is put some arrows in the middle and say we know this is a complex nonlinear process. We're putting it in a left to right model for ease of reading.

However, you can find that balance between representing different kinds of feedback loops and making it something that people can understand on a single piece of paper. The other piece, again, it's really important to identify those assumptions and necessary conditions. Without those, you have a model that only really holds in ideal circumstances. You haven't identified the threats to the model or the things that need to happen externally to what you're doing that supports your work. So finding a way to put those assumptions in the model makes it a stronger and more robust framework.

Now, if you're working with others to create a logic model, you might need to do some background work to get everyone on the same page about who your end users and audiences are, what needs to be included, what the context looks like, etc. This is a great place where collaborative mapping can be used to build that shared understanding. So you might want to do a SWOT analysis, or the more positive SOAR analysis. You might want to map out who's involved, who has power, who has the political sway, or what the context is and what's going on in that larger environment.

If you're working with a very large group, of course, not everyone can necessarily be involved in all parts of a logic model development. So what you might want to do is something like a reel of involvement or engagement to help people self‑identify to what extent do they want to be involved in the evaluation. Do they want to be part of that core working group? Would they like to be involved and consulted on a regular basis? Are they supportive and want to be kept up to date? Or are they just interested and would like a newsletter once a year?

Allowing people to self‑identify can get more buy‑in. The worst practice is going away by yourself and imposing your model on other people. That's a good way to disengage your stakeholders and make sure that people really don't want to pay attention to your evaluation. Another good method for looking at who your audiences are is an actor constellation, a visual diagram where you're mapping out who the players are. This could be researchers, knowledge users, or other stakeholders. You put all of these different actors with respect to the central goal, whatever you're trying to accomplish.

You can start to look how does that constellation change, how are your collaborations changing, are the same players around the table, how does it shift over the course of a project? Keeping an eye on your actor constellation can help you understand who those active champions could be for your evaluation work and for your KT project. Remember, though, that as you're doing all of this, that you're doing socially based things. Implementation, KT evaluation, it all involves multiple people. And people and relationships are hard to measure.

So my advice is be pragmatic. Use mixed methods. Collect both qualitative and quantitative information to understand what's driving the work that you're doing, whether that's stakeholder engagement, or the overall quality of your implementation, or the outcomes of your eventual project. After you make the model, it's a great practice to plan for how you're going to use data.

Evaluation works best when you plan ahead. Don't tack it on at the end. Start at the beginning and think about what you want to do. For process quality you want to figure out who are your stakeholders, how you're going to engage them, and with what quality. You might want to think about what outcomes you want to look at, what changes and for whom are you going to be tracking short‑term outcomes or longer‑term impacts. Once you've figured out what data you're going to collect it's important to get really specific about how you want to share and use that data.

It could be for program improvement, reporting, sharing with other people. But be specific about how you want to use your evaluation data. It makes it more likely people will use and make use of your evaluation results so they don't just sit there on the shelf. Being specific about how and when you want to engage with your target audiences. I think that engaged and collaborative work often takes longer than working alone. You have to involve other people. You have to set meetings. And this engagement work takes time and resources.

But planning ahead can help you manage the project and actually successfully engage within the resources you have. If you're working together and you've created a logic model, and you've created a plan for what kinds of data you want to collect, you might end up with quite a long list because lots of people want to measure different things. So what you can do then is use your logic model as a tool to prioritize what you're going to measure and when. So getting people together, again, to identify your measurement priorities, because you don't want to measure everything within a single project.

That's going to be overwhelming and you're likely going to have no way to make use of the data. Talking about what's important and possible to measure. And if it's important to measure and possible, what's the actual indicator that you're going to use to measure that specific piece? So, for example, if you want to look at the development of KT projects, you're going to have different indicators around needs assessment, ease of use, user experience than if you're doing outcome evaluation work and you need indicators around knowledge or self‑reported behavior, or organizational change.

So you're picking different indicators for different phases of your project, but you don't want to measure too much. You need to find a way to cut this down. You're going to work with people using the logic model as a basis and prioritize what to measure when. You know that everything you want to track or measure has several indicators. There's a great roundup of indicators for knowledge management and brokering. It's written for the international development field, but it's applicable in many sectors. And I turn to this.

And it's a really long document of indicators. don't use all of them at once. Try to pick indicators that are going to give you a good snapshot of what you're trying to measure. One way to go through and work with people to figure out what you want to measure is to work with the logic model and start to prioritize what's easy to measure and what's important to measure. So sometimes things you want to know about are really important, but you don't have the resources, or you need to do the evaluation the next year and you know that that change that you want to know about isn't going to be unfolding for some time.

So working with your partners and stakeholders and collaborators, prioritizing can be a great way to come to that shared understanding of what the evaluation is going to capture and when, and how you're going to use that information. This template can be a helpful paper‑based tool, or you could use it in the online setting where you bring up the logic model and start to color code or code otherwise what's easy to measure and what's important to measure. I think having a facilitated discussion about this rather than people doing this work individually leads to a stronger and more robust evaluation framework.

At the same time, you're going to have, as you're creating a detailed evaluation plan, what you want to measure and when, you know that there's going to be things that turn up that you're not anticipating. In fact, unanticipated results, both positive and negative, are a really important part of KT and implementation evaluation. Being able to understand and identify those unexpected consequences is what allows us to make implementation work better over time. So, expect the unexpected. Expect that things are going to happen that you can't predict ahead of time.

And build in methods for identifying those unexpected things. So you can do this within your project team by having regular reflection meetings, talking about what's going well and what's popping up that's not going so well. You can talk to stakeholders about what they're seeing on the ground and in their own context. And then document what's happening. Don't just expect that you're going to remember because it's really important. Start to systematically write down what's changing, what you're noticing. Suddenly you have a great data source for being able to speak to those findings and consequences.

And finally, update your plans as you're learning more about how your program is actually working on the ground. You may need to go back and update your logic model or theory of change. A really nice method for looking at project impacts when you're not sure what's going to change for people is asking them about the most significant change. So this is a way that you can carry out participatory monitoring or evaluation of complex interventions. What you would do is go and collect stories from people on what the most important change was for them.

So you think about what kinds of information you want to collect, and then you connect with those stakeholders who can tell you those stories, and you then do qualitative analysis and thematically look at what kinds of changes people are talking about. What are the most common impacts for people and what are the outliers that are only happening sometimes? You can then start to compare some of these self‑reported significant changes to what you thought was going to happen in your logic model. And you may need to adjust your logic model as you're going through and seeing what kinds of changes are actually happening compared to what you thought was going to happen at the beginning of a project or program.

If you want to learn more about significant change methods there's a lot of guides out there. The better evaluation website has a lovely roundup of some tools and tips. So I'm going to turn now to some models for KT implementation and evaluation. And before I get into those, I think using a model of frameworks from the literature can really strengthen your KT evaluation work. There's a lot of different models out there, not one to rule them all. You can use the knowledge to action cycle, the consolidated framework for implementation research, or one of the many other models out there.

But by pairing and matching your work to a model, you make it easier for your work to be wrapped up in future stands of what's going on in the evaluation sector and compare to other projects. It can also help you avoid overlooking one of the many things that could be overlooked. So if you want to start with a smaller model, you've got a KT project, you want some high‑level guiding questions, I suggest starting with John's communication model. So, if you're working with stakeholders or partners, you can start by asking what research knowledge do we want to translate?

Who's our audience? To whom will we translate it? Or if you're looking back after the fact and doing outcome evaluation you could ask to whom was it translated? We targeted this one group over here, but who did we actually reach? You could evaluate who was your message, was that successful? What methods did you use for knowledge translation? What activities were your KT products created in? And then with what effect? What changed as a result of your knowledge translation work? Often, you're going to need something that's a little bit more in‑depth, especially if you're trying to do implementation work.

If that's the case there's some lovely detailed frameworks. And I especially like this consolidated framework for implementation research. This has been around since 2009. It's widely used. And what it does is it pulls together the main components of other implementation frameworks, because there's a lot of them out there and said across these frameworks, we have five major components. We have the characteristics of the intervention. We've got the outer setting, the inner setting, the characteristics of the people involved, and the actual implementation process.

(No audio)

>> ANNE BERGEN: So you can to see here that there's an adaptable periphery and a core component of the intervention. The people involved are those little red figures in the middle. And I like this diagram, but I find it a little bit confusing. What I find really helpful is to look at the subcomponents of each of the five major areas. So each main CFIR component has multiple subdomains. Within intervention characteristics, you might want to look at the source of your intervention. Is it coming from a reputable source? Based on what evidence have you created this intervention? What's the strength and quality of that evidence? What's the relative advantage of one intervention over another?

You could look at the adaptability or trialability of a particular intervention. If you're trying to decide what to implement or with what effect you're implementing, and also the complexity of what you're trying to do. Also, the design and quality, and the cost of that intervention. So if you're trying to pick an intervention, you might want to really drill down into these characteristics and start to prioritize, okay, what do we really want to do, what are our resources, what are the options, what does the evidence look like.

In terms of the outer setting, that's things like the needs and resources of patients. Cosmopolitanism is to what extent people are willing to take on outside information. There's factors like peer pressure and social norms. And then of course those external policies and incentives that can drive behavior. The inner setting is the characteristics and context of exactly where the intervention is taking place. So that could be the structural characteristics of the organization you're working in, the networks and communication available to you, the organizational culture where you're actually trying to do the work, and the climate for implementation.

For example, if you tried and failed to implement a large change project in the past year, you may have a hostile climate, which is going to make it harder for you to do your KT or implementation work. In contrast, if you're working somewhere where people have been moving towards a more learning culture in their organization, they enjoy doing evaluation work and thinking evaluatively and there's processes in place to support successful change initiatives, then there may be a more positive attitude towards implementation.

If you think about the individuals who are actually involved in that intervention, then we get back to some of those pieces that you might recognize from the logic model, so the knowledge, motivation and self‑efficacy. You could look at the stage of change that people are at, thinking about that model of behavior where people move from pre‑contemplation, to contemplation, to action. You might want to look at how people identify with the organization. Do they feel closely aligned with the organizational goals, or are they more likely to want to go out on their own.

Or other personal attributes that will impact how people react to that work. And then there's the process. Do you have a high‑quality process or are you going along trying to organize the whole thing off the side of your desk? You might want to look at the success of planning and engaging with stakeholders, of executing those plans. And of course to what extent are you reflecting and evaluating? Now, just in case this wasn't enough for you, you, of course, can drill down more into each deeper sub‑do main, because this is a really detailed model, which is great because if you want to great a complex intervention with a lot of moving parts, you want to think about what those things are going to be that are going to drive the behaviors and changes you want to see.

So it's not that you have to keep an eye on everything all at once, but going through this model can help you identify the pieces that are most likely to cause the change you want to see to happen. So with implementation climate, you could look at compatibility of the intervention, the tension for change. Are people asking for change, or are they quite happy with the status quo? Whether there is incentives and rewards for doing this work. Are people getting goals and feedback, or are they in the wind hoping they're doing the right thing?

Is there a learning climate or do people not like taking on new information? And are there leadership and resources in place to make this KT intervention a success? So, this is deeper framework. You can especially for process evaluation really start to drill down into all of those moving parts that can make your KT or implementation project a success versus just kind of oh, well, that was a thing. Versus well, we shouldn't do that again. In terms of outcome evaluation, you can look at changes that would happen at the individual and organizational level and map those out.

Aptly, because it is a complex framework, there's some excellent open access resources. I would direct you to cfirguide.org where you can start to find a lot of different frameworks, ideas for strategies, and also a whole lot of research and literature on people who have used CFIR for evaluation work in implementation, what they've learned, and some best practices that they're developing.

We're going to turn now to some promising practices for supporting stakeholder engagement in implementation and evaluation work. So, if you're thinking about working with other people, that's engaged evaluation, you're not doing this on your own, you have a steering committee or team of people trying to work together towards the common goal, trying to build an evaluation framework, what's going to support having engaged evaluation versus doing the work in a silo by yourself?

First of all, plan to work collaboratively. If you're planning to work with other people as opposed to thinking I'll just do it all myself and check in at the last minute with others, it's going to work a lot better. Because if you're going to build a plan that meets the needs of multiple people, you need to plan to do that collaboratively from the beginning. At the same time, don't overwhelm people with evaluations. I find that people can focus on evaluation for a few hours at a time in a meeting, but they're not going to want to do that every day, or every week.

So if you're doing collaborative evaluation work you need to find a way to make that fit into people's busy schedules so that you're not overwhelming them with complex information and you're finding ways for them to provide input, feedback, and guide the process while not having to grapple with all of the sub‑ domains of the framework. Building trust over time and being flexible are great drivers of successful collaboration.

Another big piece is to not let people down, to match expectations and reality. And I guess also, don't let yourself down. So being practical in what you're trying to do and making sure that you're thinking about what's possible with the resources you have. So what are your timelines, your budgets, who do you have involved and what kind of expertise do you have on your team. What's the intended use of your evaluation and what are the requirements from external funders or others in terms of reporting requirements, finding ways to align what you and your collaborators want to learn about with what the funders are requiring you to report on can create an evaluation that gets all that information, but only if you plan ahead.

Think about the broader culture and climate for sharing your findings. If you're going to get evidence that people don't want to learn about, is it the right time for that evaluation? How are you going to handle that? What if you get inconvenient evidence or find that the work that you're doing doesn't have the results you were hoping for? What are you going to do with that information? How are you going to manage it if you don't get the results that you wanted?

There are some awesome evidence‑based principles. These were developed and published through the Evaluation Society and the American Journal of Evaluation. So what they did is they looked at collaborative evaluation projects and identified factors that led to those projects being more effective and successful. First, clarifying the motivation for collaboration. Why are you working together? Often people come around a table and they kind of know why they're there, but maybe your manager told you to show up. You're not quite sure about the purpose of the project. Being clear about what you're hoping to achieve together makes that practice stronger.

And then fostering meaningful relationships. This takes time. Building trust between people who are working together requires showing up, doing some work, and learning how to work together. What kinds of people do you want to work with and how can you build a collaborative group that actually has people who are all engaged and want to be there and enjoy working together. And also how do you troubleshoot when relationships go wrong and people have conflicting goals. That takes active time and attention. So turning your attention to relationship management and growing those relationships also will improve your evaluation practice.

Developing a shared understanding of what you're trying to do, creating a logic model as a group through co-creating the evaluation framework. And then of course all the way along, promoting appropriate participatory practices. If you're dealing with a lot of stakeholder groups and there are large power differentials between groups, don't ask people to represent where they're not going to be comfortable sharing and not going to be comfortable giving their opinion. So, for example, don't ask just one token participant from a group that is at a relative disadvantage to others in the room. Make sure there are multiple.

Make sure there is time and effort spent for people to have different ways to engage. Not everyone is necessarily going to be able to go on email and provide track changes feedback on a Word document. So finding ways for people to participate according to their abilities, interests, and capacity is really important in actually creating a collaborative practice as opposed to something that is just called collaborative but really isn't.

If you are doing this work, sometimes things take more resources than you think. So monitoring and responding to resource availability is important, as well as keeping an eye on your evaluation progress and quality as you're going. Promoting evaluative thinking, where people get excited about learning as they go. And possibly the most important is following through to realize use. If you're doing evaluation work but never using information, your stakeholders will get disillusioned and not buy in anymore. And they're not going to want to be as involved.

Whereas if you do the evaluation to create change, they can see that knowledge transformed into action. People are going to get excited, get more motivated to participate the next time, and you'll have strengthened those relationships. As you're going through the project, it's a great idea to pick some ways to monitor and evaluate your relationships with your stakeholders or to evaluate that stakeholder engagement. And these might be really formal and structured, or more informal. You might want to keep track of the quality and quantity of the people you're connecting with around the evaluation project.

You could look at the breadth of these relationships across sectors. And you could look at where you have one‑on‑one connections with certain individuals versus organizational relationships. You might want to count the number of meetings and workshops you're doing. How many people did you bring together and over what time period? You might want to use methods like focus groups, surveys, and interviews to check in with people about how they're doing. You can track requests and referrals to look at how information, knowledge, and ideas are flowing through your stakeholder group.

You could look at how many products are coproduced. And of course you can track social media network metrics and network analysis. There are also some great partnership analysis tools out there. So a shout out to the Victorian Health Promotion Foundation. They have a tool available online. I have a snippet of it here. You can go through with your partners and say how is our collaboration going? And this isn't something that you have to do every week or every meeting, but if you have a longer‑term collaboration for a period of months or years, things change over time.

And you really need to keep an eye on the health of your collaboration to make sure that people aren't feeling the burden of the collaboration without any of the benefit. So actually evaluating the health of your partnership and then talking about the results with your stakeholders and collaborators can help you monitor and improve those relationships and the collaboration process. Other tools for doing that, there's the partnership toolbox that's available. The partnership self‑assessment tool and the journal of extension from 1999 had a nice little tool for collaboration self‑evaluation. There are others out there, but these provide a nice roundup of options.

So, I have come to the end of my slide content. I'm going to turn it over to Kathleen to start facilitating the questions.

>> KATHLEEN MURPHY: Thank you very much for that fantastic presentation. Now Kathleen Murphy will lead us in an interactive discussion. Kathleen?

>> KATHLEEN MURPHY: Hello, everyone. It's great to have you here and see so many people, some of our old friends and some new ones from all over the world. Welcome. I am here with some other people on the line. I'll introduce them. They'll be listening. We're going to go over some of the questions from the audience chat, and then we'll discuss some other questions that we've developed based on your presentation and shared with them ahead of time. So, Shauna is with us on the line, Associate Director of Technical Assistance at the Special Education Center, Through the Center for Persons with Disabilities at Utah State University. Susan Magasi, Assistant Professor in the Department of Occupational Therapy and Disability Studies at the University of Illinois at Chicago, and Rylin Rodgers, Director of Public Policy for the Association of University Centers on Disability, with whom KTDRR also works on some other activities related to outreach.

So, I wanted to turn first to this question. Someone was wondering, given the circular iterative nature of KT activities that are directed at different audiences for different purposes, how can you capture that in a linear logic model that doesn't quite capture those differences or nuances? Is there a different way to capture those complexities in a graphic that is perhaps not as linear?

>> ANNE BERGEN: Yeah, I think so. And there's some examples out there, especially on the theory of change side that have some quite complex feedback diagrams with arrows feeding back and showing how one audience can lead to another audience. I find that those, while helpful in explaining the mechanism, are maybe a little bit less accessible in understanding the overall goals of the program. So I like to make it more linear while noting that it's not actually linear and break things out by audience.

So who is the end user or target of the activity and what do you want to change for them, and then doing that for each group. However, if you're with people who are very comfortable with box and arrow models and feedback diagrams, then you could go with that more representational of the actual complexity and maybe have a simple text‑based model on the side.

>> KATHLEEN MURPHY: Okay. That makes sense. So for those of you who have printouts, I think that the next question was in relation to slide 27. So if you remember, that was the slide that said pick different indicators for different phases of the KT implementation outcome. And then it had four categories of outcomes ‑‑ development, process, outcome, and impact. So the question was, what about implementation indicators? Are they considered development indicators?

>> ANNE BERGEN: I think it depends what stage you're at with implementation. The quality of the intervention and implementation, that could be the development side. So is it targeted and tailored to those end user audiences, is it meeting people's needs. But then it might be more about the process. I think mostly implementation work is about process quality and being able to change what you're doing or understand what you're doing based on that feedback from those process indicators.

>> KATHLEEN MURPHY: Okay, thanks. And someone also made the comment that Michael Patton's work in developmental evaluation has a lot of methods that work in more complex contexts. And Rosmin (?) is adding yes, it's about fidelity.

>> ANNE BERGEN: Yes, that can be a great tool for implementation work, especially if you're not quite sure what your intervention is going to be yet and you're working that up as you go. So that will be working with the evaluator and the implementation team to test and iterate. And in that case, Michael Patton's work is an awesome guide to that, as well as his focus on usability. So, great place to look for more information.

>> KATHLEEN MURPHY: There was another question from the perspective of a stakeholder. Shaun gave the example of an educational system, but we could discuss any system. What's your stakeholder, who wants to get involved with researchers ‑‑ a lot of times the presenters, because we have a researcher audience, are thinking through how researchers can reach out to stakeholders. But if the arrow is going the other way do you have tips for potential stakeholders about how to approach project developers or researchers in ways that will make those researchers welcome their contributions?

>> ANNE BERGEN: I think it can often be easier to get in touch with researchers through an intermediary organization. So, for example, if you're looking at patient‑oriented research, there might be a brokering organization that helps them connect. The patient could get in touch with them and might be able to be directed to appropriate projects. Looking at the organizational level for calls for involvement can be another option. Or even just looking at what's going on locally in terms of evaluation and saying hey, I'd like to show up for this community event and provide more input.

But it's interesting, because on the stakeholder community side, there's often not those easy ways to get involved. It's the invitation comes from the researchers. As we get more intermediary groups that are able to make those connections, it will really strengthen the evaluation work, getting it easier for different community members to get involved in evaluation.

>> Thanks. We have another question that's come up in the chat from Alaa. She has I have a question regarding engaging patients and motivating them to complete their longitudinal follow-up assessment. Are there any resources to guide such projects? Again, this is hat back on the researcher.

>> ANNE BERGEN: For sure. I think a few different ways. There's definitely resources and best practices to guide this. Doing that environmental scan, coming up with a bunch of options. In general it's how closely connected people feel to the project. Do they feel motivation to actually provide that evidence? And what are they getting in return? Is there an incentive to participate? And that incentive could be that motivation, wanting to help the research process, or it could be something more tangible like a gift card or some monetary compensation for the time that they're taking to fill out those assessments.

For longitudinal work it's really hard, where the participants are very disengaged from the project. They don't care about the evaluation or whether it succeeds and there's no incentives in place. You're asking people to do a lot of work for no benefit for them and you're going to see a ton of drop‑off. This is an on‑going challenge for all people doing longitudinal research. It depends on the project and the groups you're working with.

>> KATHLEEN MURPHY: Okay. So, before we move on to the questions that the staff had sent ahead of time to the people we have on the phone, Shauna, Susan, and Rylin, we had a discussion about the logic model itself and its utility. Did anybody have any comments on that? Susan, your question was about the logic model, how often have you used logic models in the past. So maybe that is a good segue. And don't forget to unmute yourself, reactors, if you're trying to share your wisdom with us.

>> SUSAN MAGASI: Hey. I did have ‑‑ I wanted to thank you, actually, for presenting the logic model in a way that was exciting and really showed that the logic model can contribute to the ongoing project, and is more than something just as a checkbox on a grant proposal. We do a lot of our work in a very community‑engaged kind of way. And we find that evaluation in particular is intimidating for a lot of community stakeholders, particularly people within the disability community who have maybe just not had opportunities to, you know, to learn and become comfortable with evaluation processes.

And since you emphasized that point around the voluntariness of the evaluation team and how that really strengthens it, I was wondering if you had any recommendation or insight into ways that can maybe encourage participation in evaluation with people who maybe don't know a lot about evaluation. And related to that are ways that you have found helpful in equalizing some of those power relationships in that logic model creation process.

>> ANNE BERGEN: Yeah, for sure. So I'll work backwards. I think trying to equalize some of those power differentials, you can do things like breaking up groups so that it's not all the researchers sitting at one table and all the community members sitting at another table or something like that. But also trying to make everything as plain language and fun as possible, and having those regular check‑ins about how people are doing. So that active facilitation work that you would do to make sure that people are engaged and they're feeling comfortable, and they have ways of providing feedback if that's not the case, where maybe they don't have to share that publicly at the moment.

I think in terms of getting people engaged in evaluation and excited about it, again, finding ways to make it fun. I know that evaluation is often a slog for people and not just community members, but lots and lots of service providers I work with have been burned by evaluation in the past so they're not too keen to show up to events. So doing things like bringing fun candy, having fidgets on the table, having colorful paper so it looks like a creative event as opposed to a dry session.

And also wherever possible, using arts‑based methods. People ‑‑ if they're working with something like photo voice or other art‑based methods where they're able to tell their story in a way that doesn't feel like just filling out a survey can be a lot more engaging. If you are trying to track outcomes, making sure that that process is also useful for the participant in terms of feedback on their own process. One nice measure from the UK is the outcome star that lets people who are experiencing homelessness rate what's changing for them. But they can see on the star where they've changed since the beginning.

So it's that pre‑/post‑measurement that they can see their own progress. Similarly working with an online system if you're doing a project that intervenes and you're trying to decrease depression, so people can see their scores decreasing over time if that's possible. Getting that feedback for the evaluation information is meaningful to them. And then also the evaluation has goals that will benefit those community members whether it's benefits to the larger community or to them individually so that they can see and really feel and identify those.

>> KATHLEEN MURPHY: Okay. Arts‑based method, based on art as opposed to based on, you know, survey design. If you Google or search for arts‑based evaluation, you'll come up with a lot of different ideas.

>> SUSAN MAGASI: And this is Susan again. And do you as the research team re‑translate those arts‑based measures into more standard metrics that would then be, say, appealing to an academic audience or a funder? It's the step of how you take the creative work and translate that again to people that have different expectations in terms of what evaluation looks like.

>> ANNE BERGEN: For sure. You might need to do some quantitative measure collecting at the same time as the arts‑based work, but if people do fun work that showcases what they're doing, it's easier to tell the story about the individual, which gets the buy‑in from funders. And the person is more willing and happy to fill out a survey that might get you the quantitative change score or metric you need. Mixed methods all the way. Sometimes you can go full arts‑based evaluation and not have to translate it, but usually you have to find a way to make that a little bit more ‑‑ other forms of evidence that are going to appeal to an academic or funder audience as opposed to just a whole bunch of photo‑voice presentations.

>> Great. Thank you very much. I'll turn it over to the next respondent now.

>> KATHLEEN MURPHY: So, the presentation did a great job of talking about different ways to monitor and evaluate stakeholder engagement. It gave some specific measures. So, Shauna, could you describe examples of ways that you may have used to evaluate stakeholder engagement?

>> SHAUNA CRANE: Hi. Yes. The organization that I work for takes things a little bit differently than everything that's been talked about here where we train stakeholder groups about what their jobs are as stakeholders in advisory situations and that sort of thing rather than recipients of research or trying to transfer that knowledge. And so the perspective is from training stakeholders. And we use evaluation to assess how they're going to use the information they learned and what they felt like the most important thing was, and how they're going to use that in their efforts as a stakeholder of the particular advisory group that they happen to be in.

So our evaluation approach is a little bit different. And the questions are simple, but the best thing that they do is to make the trainee for how to be a good stakeholder actualize what they're going to do. How are they going to use it? We make sure we evaluate their understanding of their advisory role and stakeholder role rather than an advocacy role. And that evaluation ends up just putting the nail in the lid to make sure that's understood.

>> KATHLEEN MURPHY: Absolutely. So, thinking about evaluation, Anne did a great job of pointing out that different kinds of evaluation come up at different points in the life of a project. And this is directed especially at Rylin. What types of questions do you think should be from the get‑go in that needs assessment to ensure research projects are hearing the expressed needs of stakeholders?

>> RYLIN RODGERS: This conversation highlighted a couple of critical things. I loved the call‑out of plain language as a critical component of making sure that whatever the questions that are posed are accessible and understood by the audience. I think that's an interesting component. Also, the discussion around tokenism or the challenge of having authentic representation from diverse perspectives that are affirmed and able to participate really is a significant challenge that, you know, really bears an important amount of attention on an ongoing basis. Some of the barriers we were discussing, one of the earlier questions when a participant was wondering how to be engaged from an individual perspective, and some of the challenges of not having a broader scope of brokers in terms of that.

The one piece that I haven't heard, and I wonder if it had been considered at all, is the identity piece around stakeholders. The term patients has been used from several examples for this discussion. Many members of the disability community would not use the term to self‑identify as patients. So when reaching out and starting the discussion with stakeholders and making sure that the questions are right, I think that's an important piece. The other one, similar to outside the box about using art space, is the intention to leave space for unexpected questions and things that a researcher and those that have done the preliminary work haven't brought to the table to allow our stakeholders to raise those perspectives.

They may uncover new directions for us going forward.

>> KATHLEEN MURPHY: Perfect. Thanks, Rylin. So there is just one other comment in the audience. Anne, I don't know, are there any tools that you know of that help train stakeholders? I guess it might depend on the specific project.

>> ANNE BERGEN: Yeah. For sure. I think a specific resource isn't coming to mind, but if you search for community researcher training you'll find some options there. And again, going back to that photo‑voice work there should be a bunch of resources about framing stakeholders as evaluators ‑‑ training them ‑‑ or to be part of an evaluation team that goes along with that. That should be a starting police.

>> Go ahead.

>> SUSAN MAGASI: I just wanted to mention that PCORI Institute has been doing research here in the United States, and they have been emphasizing more community engagement in research and have been investing some resources in training. They use the term patient, in training community members and "patients" to engage more in the research process in general. Not specifically knowledge translation, because that's not a framework that they use. But there are some nice resources that are evolving from there.

>> Oh, also, community campus partnerships for health should have some resources around that.

>> Great. So, thanks for bringing up PCORI. Our American Institute for research does house the PCORI Center. You're right, their focus is primarily in transition into plain language summaries of funded work. It's a little bit more narrow than the kinds of things we're talking about today. But just thought I'd let you know that that is out there. So, I think, is there anything reactors or anyone else on the line that jumps to mind that you really want to close us out with?

Okay. Well, I'll give it back to Donna, who will bring us to our next session.