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>> STEVEN BOYDSTON: Our final presentation this afternoon is from Dr. Tamika Heiden, who is the principal knowledge translation Australia, a consultancy that provides specialized training solutions and support that enable clients to translate research evidence into real life impacts. Dr. Heiden's national and international work brings together researchers and research users to share, create and translate knowledge for the betterment of society. Her presentation: Have you selected, nurtured your stakeholders effectively, will explore the how-to engagements of successful outcomes and the measures you can use to evaluate your impact.

As a reminder to everyone, if you have questions during the presentation, please ask them in the chat box and after the presentation Donna Mitrani will lead the interactive discussion with reactors and conference participants. So, with that, Tamika, are you ready to begin? You may want to double‑check that you're not on mute.

>> TAMIKA HEIDEN: Good point. Thank you very much for the introduction, Steven, and thank you everyone for joining this session on what is the last session of I guess what's been a very big conference. So, as you said, I want to talk about the importance of how we connect and nurture with our stakeholders because if we're not connecting and nurturing really carefully with our stakeholders, then we're not going to be very successful in having that impact.

I am Tamika Heiden, I am sitting in Australia right now talking to you, that's the accent, and I have been working in Australia as a consultant in this area for around the last four and a half to five years, really specifically looking at knowledge translation and also really that impact end and in between all of that we know that it's about the people that we work with, the stakeholders we connect with and the importance of those relationships that drive us. So in the session I want to talk quickly about what impact is, just to get everybody on the same page, I want to then talk through partners in collaboration, I'll talk about the who, how and when of engagement, I've got a little fun activity that I'm going to get you guys to follow through with where we're going to look at different styles of behavior and preferences and then we'll talk a little bit about measuring success.

So, to start off with impact, so impact is really about, well, what I want to do here is talk through the importance of those engagement processes that we have with our stakeholders for the purpose of having an impact. Now, impact is best described through this quote by my great friend Dr. Melanie Barwick are that says that impact shows that people knew what to do with the knowledge you shared.

We know a lot of different definitions of impact, we know impact is much more than our traditional impact which was citations but now we're thinking about what are our impacts on society, what are our impacts on the environment, what are our impacts on the economy and much broader impacts on people's lives, the people who are the beneficiaries of the work that we are doing.

So impact requires us to engage with stakeholders, to use co‑creation when we're doing research and also when we're thinking about what the outcomes or particularly the outputs of that work will be, it requires working in partnership, it requires thinking about what are those deliverables that are going to be relevant to the users u what's going to be useful and is it going to be usable? Not in every case, but can we make it as usable as possible?

It's also about having ongoing relationships and in fact you may have well seen, there are a few research papers out there that show that someone's likelihood of using your research evidence is based more on the strength of your relationship with them than it is on the strength of the evidence itself. That may be a little scary to some of you, but it just goes to show the piece of the relationship piece, which ends up getting us the impact we're hoping for.

I want to start off talking about partnerships and collaborations. Why should we collaborate? Collaboration is a major component of most research productivity, it helps us to get access to new tools, to information and skills to gain international perspectives or other perspectives that may take years to develop on your own, so in partnership you'll be able to do this much quicker. It will also give you expertise to complement your own skills, which may be really important. It may also assist you in extending your research into different disciplines and we know now that there's a big push particularly in Australia but I'm sure globally about how we can use together different disciplines to strengthen innovation.

So, collaboration with an individual or with a group of internationally renowned people will certainly help raise your profile national and will internationally and also funders are very interested in that greater reach of our work. So, the varied perspectives of our stakeholders are very valuable. Am they can explain to you the context of the world. As one of my colleagues says, you need to walk in their shoes in order to understand what we're doing and how we can deliver that for our stakeholders.

I also like to think of it as getting that product to market fit, if you like, to think of a business scenario, so making sure that what you are creating is going to be relevant to that next user or the stakeholder. It's also about getting buy‑in and support, it can help us if we're working with the right stakeholders, it will strengthen anyone's position that may be opposed to what we're doing. It can also help to increase your credibility, particularly if you have one big stakeholder on board and you're trying to get others onboard, they may say, well, if you're working with them, we'll be part of it, so it can help with that credibility piece, and it gives you access to different grants and alternative funds as well, so having stakeholders involved can be incredibly powerful. I was working once with a great colleague on her grant, and we were working on a project where she was doing research on coordination development of children CDC, and she wanted to find out whether or not she could get some funding, so we were doing a grant, I said to her, who are your partners, who are the stakeholders on here, and she hadn't really thought about this, so we went through and worked it out.

When we worked out who the key stakeholders were, we found out there was one who was going to be absolutely key to her work. I said to her, do you know them? She said yeah, I know them really well. I said have you talked to them about this? She said no, why would I? It showed me sometimes we're not really thinking about the fact that we need to go and talk to these people but what was really brilliant about this is when she did go and speak to them, she ended up with having them come on as a partner but also in bringing money to that collaboration and paying for a lot of the research, so that was a really great win so we know that alone we can't do much, but together we can do a lot of stuff, and I love this quote from Helen Keller because it is so true, that when we collaborate, when we work with others, we have more brain power, we have more doing power, and we keep each other inspired. But before we can collaborate and think about that, we need to connect first, so how are we going to connect with these people? Now, this is something that people do naturally really well but it's something that other people may struggle with, so I want to talk to you about some of the things you can think about with connecting.

Now, you may have heard this saying, that you're the sum of the five people closest to you, so you really need to make this count. Now, it's been said that these five people will shape your success, they'll shape your interest, and they'll shape other things about you, maybe even more things than you would realize, so if you're surrounding yourself with people who never ask you tough thought‑provoking questions, you'll never be living up to your full potential to conceptualize any answers to those questions, so do the people around you represent the things you value? If they do, you're in great shape. If your five people aren't representative of the things you love or aspire to become, maybe you should reevaluate those five people who are closest to you in your work environment.

Other networks, let's talk through that, networks ‑‑ so Just Like Me are convenience networks, this is a network where you are choosing people that like you, that agree with you, we link with these people because we understand them, we usually agree with them, but they're not the most effective networks because they won't question you, they won't do those things I just said that those five people around you. The other networks are when we have weak ties, we might know them through someone, we might have a weak tie to them, these are really good relationships because they bring different insights and bring things that will challenge us.

The benefits of building your network, having this great group of people around you and a well-rounded network, people from the academic and nonacademic world will increase your opportunities for collaboration and help you reach those groups that you wouldn't otherwise possibly be able to reach, it gives you those opportunities to build trust, so if you have a good network, you're not reaching out just when you need something, and we see this to be a problem, it happens all the time where we reach out just when we're at that moment of needing to put in a grant or we need a favor from someone, but if we can build the relationship before that, then it gives us a chance to build trust and it also gives you access to other people's networks.

So, we have three kinds of networks. We have the operational networks, so these are the people that we work with every day and they help us to get our work done, but then we have our personal relation shims, these are the people we hang out with informally, these are our friends. The most important network that we have is our strategic network and these are the relationships that help us with ideas, help us get information and resources we need and that strengthen other collaborations we might have.

So great strategic networks are broad, they have a diverse range of people, they help us to ‑‑ and this is across our peers or across different companies or across other networks. We want them to be connective, and this means that you're able to reach out beyond your immediate circle of people that you know well, through your contacts you'll be able to reach out to different departments or organizations and professions to people that you wouldn't be able to connect with otherwise. We also want our networks to be dynamic. We want to constantly be meeting new people, growing your network, and not having to rely on the same network or people year to year.

We come to trust people when we know them more personally, and men have a bit of an advantage here because their professional and personal lives you can overlap, so sometimes we find with men they might be playing sport or catching up with male colleagues on the weekend, whereas women, we tend to have different types of networks because we might have things like looking after the children and we're not surrounded by the same types of people necessarily, generalizing, of course, in our networks. So, start early and take a long‑term view to building these networks. You never know how important and valuable they might be.

We need to think about connecting to the people that we need, but it's also important to think about the people we need that we don't know and how are we going to connect to them. So, thinking through the people you know, and do any of those people know them already? And if they don't, then there are some other strategies to meet them. One of my best connections happened sitting on an airplane. I had been at a conference in Australia to give some context, back about five years ago, not many people knew about the term knowledge translation or understood what it was. I had been at a conference trying to tell people what I do, a lot of people hadn't understood what I do, so I get on the plane, I'm flying back to Perth, it was a long flight, about five hours, and I go to get on the plane and I changed my seat, so I honestly believe it's complete faith that I met this person, and as I'm sitting down, this dear elderly lady sitting next to the window says to me, what do you do, dear? And I said, oh, okay, well, this is going to be difficult because I've been explaining this to people and they don't understand, so I said to her, I help researchers to make a difference in the world by sharing their research. And she looked at me and she said, oh, dear, you're a translator.

And it still gives me goosebumps telling you this story because it was amazing, I just thought, I love this woman, she knows what I'm talking about. But she went on to say I used to be a researcher myself, now I'm a philanthropist and I also sit on the board of many organizations. How can I help you? So, there are all sorts of ways that we can meet people. It's about taking the opportunity to talk to people.

What happened following that was that she introduced me to people in her network, which became incredibly valuable to meet those. So, there are those strategies. Other things might be if you don't like networking, and a lot of people don't, I get it, maybe practice. There are different types of groups you can go to. Find some where you're comfortable, maybe find something you like socially, maybe you want to join a wine appreciation group or something, so maybe joining a group where you're comfortable talking about something first as a practice.

There's also social media. I've had a lot of success in using things like LinkedIn and Twitter to connect with people who are incredibly powerful, let's say, who I never thought would really want to respond or speak to me. In fact, I've managed to use cold e‑mailing as well to just reach out to people I never knew, one example was last year when I was arranging a summit, and I reached out to the Irish director of science in Ireland, didn't know me, wrote him an e‑mail basically saying I'm not crazy, but I would really love to hear from you and this is what I'm doing, and he came back and said absolutely would love to speak to you. So sometimes those cold e‑mails can be valuable as well.

And find groups that meet regularly as well. So, think about using those social media avenues, if Europe not into social media, that's okay, think about using the live networking avenues or even e‑mail is still valuable. You just need to remember that when you are connecting with people, when you are contacting people, one of the most important things is to make sure that you're telling them why you're contacting them, not just asking for something from them.

A few other things that are important in connecting to them, and that approach to connecting with them, is to think about referral. So, it's easier to connect if you have a common connection or a touchpoint, so if you know someone who might have recommended, you can say I was speaking to so and so, they mentioned you, they said I should definitely get in touch, and that always helps. You can ask for an introduction as well. But you need to seek out some common points, some common interests, and research the person. Do your homework.

These days, everyone typically has a social footprint or an online footprint that you can find out something. Do they blog? Have they just published a paper? Have they been this media? Is there something you can use to start a conversation? The other piece is credibility. You'll get credibility from the referral, so if someone can introduce you or if you can talk to them about someone you know that said that you should speak to them, you'll get some credibility straightaway. You'll also get credibility from your organization you work for, the publications you might have, maybe you have awards, other connections or other relationships with industry partners, so they may be credibility things depending on who it is you're connecting with. Importantly and really importantly, it's about what's in it for them and not what's in it for you. You'll get what's in it for you later. It's got to be about them first.

So, make your connection about the value and the opportunity for them, not for you. But you've got to know what value you can bring to your network as well, so over time you have to work that out and you've got to be really authentic about your connections. Don't just do it because you need a connection. Really connect with people because you genuinely want to connect with them, you want to learn from them, and you see that there's great value in that association.

So, once we have these connections, we can start to collaborate, and this is where we get into the exciting stuff. So, in order to collaborate, we want to identify our stakeholders. So, stakeholders, who are they in the first place? Well, these are people who will be able to influence or may be affected by a certain problem or action. It could be an organization that has people who will be affected or also who may have some achievement out of the work that you're doing. It's also very use to feel think about our stakeholders in different groups because often we'll have many, many, many stakeholders, so we need to group them in order to manage them a little bit better and also to know who are our primary and who are our secondary, so who is going to be immediately affected by whatever it is we're working on or who can help us to say effect any change perhaps, particularly if we're thinking about policy.

So how do we identify our stakeholders? Well, we can identify them using experts, so we can use staff or key agencies, local people, collaborators who have a lot of knowledge about a situation, who will help us to identify our stakeholders. Other times we see self‑selection, so we use announcements at meetings or in the media to invite stakeholders to come forward. Otherwise, when we're talking to someone, a potential stakeholder, they may identify someone who is more relevant or people who should be involved as well, and that will help you to identify another few stakeholders, so make sure you do ask people to suggest who those key stakeholders are who would be valuable in having their views and their interests heard.

Also, as well as those who may have a different way of looking at issues, so don't be afraid of those who might also ask you the sticky questions. There are multiple ways to identify your stakeholders, so just make sure you think about that. There are also lists, you can Google lists of stakeholders and you'll find that people have come up with lists to help that thinking process.

So, think through who should be a stakeholder. So, ask these questions to help you during that. Who are the potential beneficiaries of your work? Who might be adversely affected? So those people who may also be against it or resent change and want to resist defense it. Think about people who might be voiceless or people with existing rights. Who is responsible for taking whatever you're doing forward and making sure that the next step of this process happens? Remember, we're talking about the engagement piece of impact, and if we're hoping to bridge that gap between just developing something and actually getting it used, we need to make sure we know who is going to be taking that forward, and I use an analogy here that can be really valuable if you're sharing this with others and passing on this information, and that analogy is who are you passing the baton to? Who is going to be taking that baton? Do they know what the baton looks like?

Now I'm talking about like a running race analogy here with a baton. Do they know what it's like, are they going to drop it, can they finish the race? Because we know what happens if people don't take it, if they don't know what to do with it and if they drop it, right?

So, who has money, skills or information as well? This is where we start to really delve into thinking about stakeholders from a value perspective. So, what I would ‑‑ so I want to walk you through a model from the business world that can be useful for helping us think about our partnerships and who we should partner with. So, we need to think firstly about the building blocks of the partnership. So, the what's the purpose? So, you need to ask yourself how you can contribute to a really great experience for your partner.

A lot of people go into their partnerships without thinking through this, you know, we think about what we need from people, but how can the development of the partnership be a really great experience for both you and your partner? And does this relate back to things like the availability of people, the convenience of how you have meetings, the processes you use, the evaluation that might be part of that collaborative effort.

So, let's talk about the partnership canvas. The partnership canvas enables you to design the value of essence exchange of your partner, it creates empathy between two prospective partners on the strategic importance of the partnership to each of you. All parties will become clear about each other's strategic objectives when you design in this way, and you can use this to learn from each other about the various opportunities that there are to partner. It's really a useful tool for finding out together what opportunities exist. So, let's start with the first part of this. This is a canvas that you can easily go and download as well. We've given you the link in the slide deck. So, we start off by looking at the desired value.

So what value are you seeking in a partner? Consider things like resources, maybe you're after particular skill sets, maybe they have equipment that you need to utilize, or maybe they even have relationships with other stakeholders that you wish to reach. So, what is that desired value that you're looking for? Next, we look at the value offer. So, what is your contribution to the partnership? What do you provide, and what is going to complement the value for your partner? So, make sure that you do think really carefully about this because if there's no mutual value, then it's probably going to be the wrong partner. There needs to be a win‑win situation, particularly if you want to have trust, you want to have partners that have bought into the process and are not going to run away.

So, let's talk about transfer activities. So, collaboration activities are really speaking ‑‑ this is really about how you will manage, inform, and deliver that value. So, these particular transfer activities or collaboration activities, if you like. So, this could be at any stage through the process of research in the partnership, and these transfer activities will allow the flow from each of the partners between that process of connecting and working together for complete value for both of you. Then we have the created value. So, it's really about does the partnership enable you to create some type of value that you wouldn't be able to without these partners? And what is it that you can utilize or what innovation can you come up with? Is it going to be new knowledge, new products, or new services? So, the canvas is helping you to understand if this is the right partner, and it helps you to know if you could achieve the same outcomes without them or if both get value out of this. It might be a really painful realization to make if you selected the wrong partner, but it can save a lot more hurt from having to have what we often speak about as a painful divorce in the feature you of this partnership, so thinking carefully about that.

So now I want to move into the engagement of your stakeholders, and there are things that this we need to think about here, like when are we going to engage our stakeholders? So, coming from a background of knowledge translation, I'm always saying to people, and I love with particularly thinking about applied translation and how we want to make sure that we have the right people engaged at the beginning, but that's not always the case. Sometimes we're going to want to engage different stakeholders at different stages of the process or of the project, so we need to think who is it that we need to know early on, who do we need to discuss our ideas with and formulate our ideas with, who might come on at the early stage, so after the conception but stay on until we finish.

Who do we need just at the end, and it may be that we inform them at the beginning and they say great, it's great that you're doing this, but we really have no time to be involved, but we would love to help you with disseminating this when you finish, so we would really have those people focused on working with us at the end of the project. And then we may have people who are going to take these, those people we've handed the baton to, we're going to manage this in an ongoing extended way, and an example of this would be a lot of people now in their research are developing up websites or resources online.

Now, as a researcher or as a university, you have to think about who is going to own that particular project, and if you are a stakeholder yourself watching this presentation, you need to think about is that something that you could take ownership of and are you the relevant party to take ownership of this? That would be an example of someone who is going to have an ongoing or extended relationship or degree of engagement with this particular project.

So, we need to consider power versus the interest of our stakeholders. So as an example, if you've got someone who is a stakeholder who is not that interested in your work and perhaps doesn't have a lot of influence in their organization or a lot of power, another word that's not really my favorite, I prefer the word influence, they're probably not going to be someone that is not going to be really close in the organization because they aren't that interest and don't have a lot of influence in overseeing the final decision‑making. On the other end of the spectrum, you may have someone who is of high influence that you want to ‑‑ and high power, and they're the people that you want to collaborate with closely.

So when thinking about the degree of engagement, it's important that we not only know when they're going to be part of the process, but how engaged are they going to be, how much time do you want from them, how much expertise do you need, do you have an existing relationship, so think about what's their role going to be as part of this process. So, you want to know the skills and capacity. Remember we talked about that as part of that model. So what capacity they have, what resources are they going to bring, and what type of relationship is it going to be. Please make sure that these relationships don't become passive, particularly if you want to have an impact.

So you can start to think about those high interest, high power activities, the low interest, low power that I talked about before, so what are those tools that you may use if someone of high interest and high power, maybe they're working with you on writing papers, maybe they really are part of your process, you might have a wiki, but if they're low interest and low power, maybe they're just getting a newsletter that you send out or they're just part of your social media and reading stuff that you post.

So how much you have involved with them, the time you spend on them, and the types of activities or information you share will change based on their level of interest and their level of power or influence on the outcomes of your project. So, we need to understand our stakeholders, and this is the fun part of the presentation for you guys today. I really want to think about behavior and how that affects our understanding of our stakeholders, and it's not something that we really think about too often, so we're going to do a little you activity, but first I want to talk through a couple things.

So obviously in working with stakeholders and in having an impact, because it requires knowing people, this is difficult because we're working with people, human nature and behavior and different types of personalities will all be the hardest part for us to tackle. So, if we can understand people's preferences for communication, this can be really helpful. But before we can do that, it's best if we understand ourselves. So, you may well have heard of the DISC, so D‑I‑S‑C. D stands for dominant, S stands for steady, I stands for influence, C stands for conscientious, and you can see on this particular graph that most people, 74% of the population are people focused and that means they're quite social in nature.

And 26% of people are task focused, meaning they would rather just focus on the task at hand than talk about things more socially. Then we have on one side of the equation with the C and S we have the slow ask, which is this means that people who are slower in decision‑making will ask more questions and are typically more cautious or steady, and then on the other side we have the directing and influence and the tell fast, and these are the types of people who are quite abrupt sometimes, they just want high‑level information, and I'm going to delve into more of that but first I want to go through an activity to work out what your style is. I hope you'll follow along with me and do this because it will be a bit of fun if you can.

If you have a piece of paper in front of you, that's great. So, if you do, please draw these axes and I'll get you to play along and then we'll put some comments in the box. So please if you can, that would be great. So, draw these axes on a blank page, if you will. I will keep moving through this because I'm running out of time and I would love for you to get through this. What I want you to do is I want you to think about this. What is your pace when communicating? Where on this line would you fall between being quite quick when you're ‑‑ are you action, fast paced, assertive, dynamic, bold, when you're communicating at work?

So when you're responding to e‑mails, for example, are you kind of short and prompt, or are you really deliberate, do you take the time perhaps to think about things before you act, you're giving it thought, that would include as an example in e‑mails you take a lot of time to draw them out. Hopefully you've put a dot on the line there. Now I want you to think about the line going in the horizontal direction, and I want you to put a dot on the line wherever it falls between whether you are task oriented or people oriented. So, are you more focused and logic focused or questioning maybe a bit challenging or skeptical, or are you much more agreeable with people, more social, empathizing, receptive, maybe that sort of people focus? Where would you fall between the task and the people? This is just a rough and ready way of doing this.

Now you what I want you to do is between the two dots that you've drawn, I would like you to mark an X, as you can see like in this example, and that will be your style. So hopefully everyone has done this, and then if we look at what overlaps where your style is, this is what we can see. So, what we can see for the example that I'm using is the star in the C box. If you can, it would be great if you could just quickly in the chat box please tell me what you came up with. Did you fall in the C, D, I or S? Because it would be really great to get a feeling for what everyone is. Influence. Thank you for sharing you that, that's great, that you did this. Okay. Now I'll talk through what these mean. Once now that you know what they are, you'll get an idea for what this means. Perfect. In between the boxes. Fantastic. There's always one. So that's interesting. Perfect. Perfect. Okay. So, as I go through these, you might realize that this is you or that maybe you're sort of a softer version of where you sat, but great. Thanks for playing along. Let's overview the styles and then I'll tell you how to tell what other people are.

So, if you were a D, this means you are direct and decisive, sometimes you get described as dominant, you prefer to lead, you have high self‑confidence, you're really that bottom line, don't give me any fluff, just give me the bottom line. If you're going to talk to someone who is a D, you want to give them the what and not the how. If you're an I, then you are said to be influential and inspiring, so you're on the more social side of the D and I kind of equation. You're not afraid to be the center of attention. You're enthusiastic, talkative, persuasive, you trust others naturally, you focus on the big picture, you don't like the details so much, you're just happy to have the big picture, you're very social. If you're dealing with someone who is an I, you want to follow up with them, socialize, show them excitement and you can be excite being what you're telling them. These types of people like people who are enthusiastic.

If you are a C, then that means you're accurate, precise, detail oriented and conscientious, analytically, they're very analytical, systematic, very careful about decisions, they want to know the research or the other things behind it. They set very high standards for themselves and others. So for those of you out there who have put C, and there are a number of you, you're probably saying yes, nodding your head, they want proof and testimonials, these are the type of people that if they're stakeholders, for example, they're going to want to know the value of working with you, that other people have worked with you and it's been successful or that you're working with other people, they want to trust you. You've got to be really prepared and structured speak to go a C because they're going to want the detail. You have to answer how and why, and you have to be able to address any concerns they might have.

And for those of you that were an S, steady, stable and predictable, even tempered, friendly, they listen well, they prefer close personal relationships, they're very open, but you have to earn their trust, so you really have to build trust with these people. These are the type of people that when you meet them, you're going to have to meet these people a few times before they really trust you and they want to work with you, so it gives you an idea of the different styles of people so that when we're trying to create those connections, we know what we need to do. Now, I'm conscious was time so I want to teach you how to spot someone else's style, so really quickly, we're going to do the same exercise, this your mind I want you to think of someone that you have difficulty in connecting with or that you haven't hit it off with, someone that you have difficulty working with, so have the axes again and we'll go through the same activity. So, what's their pace? Are they quick or deliberate? I'll give you a couple seconds, put the dot on the line.

I'm going to work through this quickly, sorry. So hopefully you've got a dot. Then again on the horizontal line, where do they sit between that task, logic focused, questioning, or the people focused, more social, agreeable, receptive, and hopefully you had someone in mind and hopefully you've managed to put on here. Just flip back ‑‑ I'll just flip back in case you didn't get the first one, so hopefully you've got two dots again on those lines. And now I want you to put an X again between the dots and then I want you to put where you were and where they were. So, when you have this chart here, now you know where the D and the I and S and C is, you'll be able to see where they sit. Sometimes when I do this activity, what I find is that we find that people who don't get along are either exactly the same, so you're butting heads because you're exactly the same, or you're really opposite. So, you might be incredibly social, and this person doesn't really care for being social, they just are want you to give them the one‑line answer and then get out of their way, or it might be the other way around that you're a one‑line person and they want to chat. So, you're butting heads. Now, the important thing to remember here is it's not about your style, it's actually about their style. Does this resonate with anyone?

Did anyone find that they've come up with something and they're going oh, yeah, okay, I get it? I hope so. Perfectly. So hopefully you found what that person might be and maybe you can start to think about what is their preference, and when you are dealing with other people, unfortunately we have to pack our preferences and work to someone else's preference and that's the only way we're actually going on survive. I like that, someone is pleading the fifth. I like that. You would use this when things aren't going well with your stakeholders, so if you're having difficulties, really start to think about how they structure their e‑mails for example, or are they always turning up to meetings late and running out of time, so this will help you to really start to build those relationships or if you're trying to deliver information to them, writing a big long e‑mail report is not going to help if they would prefer a one‑list, basically a shopping list to select from, so really think about how you structure that information, and I'm happy to answer more questions about that with we get to the question time. So, I just want to keep moving, make sure I get to the end in the next five minutes, but please, you may have some questions about that process and really do think about that. So, are you nurturing your relationships? Are you thinking about the people you work with?

And it's really important to think about that trust. This is what I was talking about in the beginning. The fact that when people trust you, they will be more likely to use your evidence‑based on that trust rather than even on the strength of the evidence. So using some of these processes to understand ourselves, but also to then take a step back and look at why something might not be working or why you might not be getting a response to that e‑mail that you sent out, it may just be that you've sent out a lovely long e‑mail to someone who just wants a one line, and it might even be that they feel guilty and won't respond to you because they want to respond with one line, and sometimes I know from my own experience that if someone has written you a really great e‑mail, you kind of think how can I ‑‑ I just want to say great, thanks, but it's a little rude because they've gone to all this effort. So, I'll give you one tip on that.

The thing I've started to do to get around that is to cut and paste and just respond to each of their points they've made because then I can sort of do my one‑liner without having to actually insult them by not writing a long e‑mail. That's one way I've gotten around it. But really do think about it. Some of you put in that you were an I or D might find like me that you get an e‑mail, you write a one‑line response and then go back and put in the niceties at the top of the email, like oh, yeah, hi, so and so, hope things are well, then you've got the one‑liner which was the response or the point of the e‑mail that you were writing in the first place.

So, I want to just talk about perspective. So, one of the things I've noticed and that fascinates me is that there is a real difference between needs and wants. So, needs are things that we perceive that people want or should you do, so we always know what other people should do, right? We know what's best for them. And these needs are based on our personal values you and our beliefs. So, we all have this lens, and this lens comes from how we've grown up, our background, the things we've been exposed to.

Our wants, so wants are the things that people are willing to commit to and are ready to do. So, we don't want to make that assumption about those needs. So, wants will drive people's behavior to make you decisions. So making sure that we meet with our stakeholders, we know enough about them to listen to what they really want, so with we heat with people and we're having conversations, take an empathetic substance where we start ‑‑ empathetic stance where we start to not see the world through our lens, but understand that they have a different lens and see the world through their lens, so what they're telling us is true for them, even though it may not be true for us and is we may not believe t but if we're to work out what other people want and the wants are the things that are going to drive their behavior to make decisions, then it's critical that we just try to remove our lens for a while and see other people's point of view, so we can use empathy to do that.

If you want to evaluate these partnerships, which is really important if we're talking about evaluation, then there is a great tool that you can use, so there's a Victorian health in Australia partnerships analysis tool which is designed to help organizations develop a clearer understanding of their collaborations, there are other partnership tools out there, and there may have been some others talked about already in the conference, but it helps you to reflect on the partnerships, it will also help you to focus on strengths of future partnerships or new partnerships, and you can use it to assess the partnerships ongoing to make sure that you don't come across any issues that may affect that partnership and ruin the relationship because we know how important that piece is. And then you want to evaluate the impact of your stakeholders.

So, you've managed your relationships, and everyone has survived, it's a good sign that you're going to have an impact. You're working in partnership, which is also another good sign. You know, if you've solved a problem for a partner, then you're likely to have an impact, but you're only going to solve a problem if you know what it was they wanted and if you've really thought about the trust and you've thought about how you're going to work with them, and that there's value for everyone, and also another way to evaluate your impact is that they're happy to keep working with you. There are a lot of stakeholders we find who never want to work with people again. That will be a real telling thing.

So if you're thinking also it may be that for impact that money, time, or something else has changed for those stakeholders or those partners because of the work that you did together, and that would be a great way to think about evaluating your impact on the stakeholders, so it's really about what was the impact for them, what did they use and what did that mean to their organization, their industry or their business? When we're talking about impact finally, there are elements of successful impact the that we need to think about. So, what are the indicators of our impact that we're going to use? So, what does success look like for our partner? What are the activities or the outputs we're going to use to share that? Are we doing new you training? Are we developing little videos to help people with things? Are we sharing a report?

There are many, many different types of activities for different stakeholders. And what is the evidence of impact? What will be our measure, our final thing that shows had us? What piece of paper, what dollar change, are what reference will show us that that is evidence of our impact? So, we need to have all three. If we don't have any indicators in mind for impact at the beginning, then we're really not going to know what we're trying to measure or what we're trying to change. If we don't use any activities, that means we're not really translating that evidence, we're not passing that baton in the way that we need to. And if we don't have evidence, then we're not going to be able to prove that we had the impact we were hoping to have. So, if we want to demonstrate high impact, we need to really consider all three elements of impact.

Thank you for listening. And Donna I'm going to hand over to you to you facilitate the questions.

>> Thank you very much, Tamika, and as you said, Donna, we'll be going to you for the interactive discussion.

>> DONNA MITRANI: Thank you, Steven, and thank you so much, Tamika, that was a great presentation. I in particular really enjoyed the interactive activity, so thank you for that.

So for our final discussion of this conference, we're going to bring back our reactors Jennifer Weaver, Eileen Brennan and Lorraine Johnson, but before we turn it over to them, we're going to address some questions from our participants, so our first question comes from Annette, and she's saying, networks, do you think coffee shop meetings are better or are other methods better?

>> TAMIKA HEIDEN: Personally, it depends on the stakeholder or partner, because some people won't have time. I'm a coffee person, but I'm on the social side of that equation, so for me, the coffee meeting is always great. I like to have a few coffees a week. I love coffee. But also, I find for me, face to face, I'm a social person. When I meet people face to face, then, you know, I build a really good relationship. However, there will be people who aren't quite as comfortable with that, so it's really about getting to understand different styles of different people as well. But in the first instance, as we know, the highest percentage of people are on the social side, so I would recommend trying to meet with people face to face.

>> DONNA MITRANI: Thank you, Tamika. Actually, there was a pretty robust discussion in addressing this question on the chat, and a few folks recommended essentially doing online‑type meetings, through social networks, I'm just curious if you've ever done this or if you have any social networks that you would recommend folks to use if they wanted to organize a meeting in that way.

>> TAMIKA HEIDEN: Yeah, there's been a couple things. I was really, really fortunate, a big radio celebrity here in Australia, I sent him a tweet once when I wanted to get his attention, and it turns out I got his attention and he actually wrote me a message on Twitter and then told me to call him, so I did. And that was a collaboration born in that way. In terms of actually platforms, there are lots of groups on LinkedIn, there are Facebook groups, even in the professional realm there are Facebook groups. I'm a real fan, though, of if you are connecting online with people, and you are planning to sort of take that partnership or relationship to the next level, that you meet face to face online, you can do that.

There are plenty of tools around with Skype or Zoom or other things where you can now meet with people, talk to them face to face, and you may never have met them, and I do this all the time, then I come to other countries and I meet people and they say it's like I know you because we've spoken face to face so many times just online at distance. So, I think yes, we can definitely do that. There are those avenues, like I say, with LinkedIn, again, just try different things and see what's going to work for the type of stakeholder that you have. I hope that answers your question.

>> DONNA MITRANI: Thank you. Yes, thank you. Our next question comes from Rebecca, and she's asking whether you have any templates or general suggestions of what to write when reaching out to someone via social media.

>> TAMIKA HEIDEN: That's a great question. There are some templates around from the business world, and I'm happy if you e‑mail me, I'm happy to share, I have the one I use for LinkedIn, but the rule of thumb is there are a couple rules of thumb that will help you, one is, for instance, if you're connecting with someone on LinkedIn, don't use the standard concludes line that they give you when you can write a message. You always want to write a message, but you want to introduce yourself a little bit or you might want to stay to the person, we're both connected to so and so, or we're both in the same group, or the work that can you are doing really aligns with my thinking, and I would like to connect with you, or I saw this webinar you did or I was very interested in this thing you did and I would love to connect with you. So, you need to spark their interest.

The Twitter one that I was giving you the example of, a radio personality who I think is a reasonably good communicator who has been doing it for over on 2 years, and the message that I wrote to him was, I would love to know how you make science palatable or would love to discuss with you how you make science palatable for the public. And obviously that spurred his attention. So, you need to spur people's attention. The other one that I use that is a little bit of a ‑‑ it's a bit cheek can I, but I always say to people ‑‑ cheeky, I say I would love to meet with you because I would love to learn more about what you're doing. Rarely do you get someone to stay I don't want you to learn from me. It's kind of flattering when people want to learn from you.

>> DONNA MITRANI: Thank you. So, our next question comes from Annette. This is distort of a you two‑part question. So, Annette is asking, how do you keep control of your projects? In her attempt to build partnerships, she's had people steal ideas and get funding to implement them without her and without meeting her to be her partner, that being said, what information is beneficial to opening partnership with people or asking seemingly legitimate questions of people about details you.

>> TAMIKA HEIDEN: That's a tricky question. I guess it depends, I'm trying to think without knowing more about Annette, if you're a researcher and you're worried about people ‑‑ I'm getting a feeling it's about people taking the idea and working without you, and so it's a really fine line because we have to be careful that we're not giving too much away, and I've just had an experience with a friend who has been with this.

But I also believe that you can give enough information away because if the power of what you're giving is in the implementation of that and that's your area of expertise, then it doesn't matter. So I'll give you a business analogy, and it might not work, but when I started my business, people said you share too much information, you give too much for are free, but of the reality is if you give more, people understand that you're an expert in the space, and then they want you to come and do the things they know you can do. It might not cross over to the question that you're asking, so I'm sorry if it doesn't, but hopefully that helps a little.

>> DONNA MITRANI: Thank you, Tamika. As mentioned earlier, we have three reactors on the phone with us today, Jennifer Weaver, Lorraine Johnson, and Eileen Brennan. So, I'm going to turn the discussion over to them and pose some questions that we had sent them ahead of time. So, our first question for this afternoon is for Jennifer Weaver. When considering the pace and priorities of researchers versus practitioners, many times it steams as though researchers are very deliberate, methodical and focused on logic. While businesses and/or policymakers, for example, are typically more people focused, dynamic and fast paced. Is this something you've experienced? If so, how do you work to find a common middle ground, and if you could instantly find the answer to one research question, what would it be?

>> TAMIKA HEIDEN: Wow.

>> DONNA MITRANI: Yeah. I agree. It's an intimidating question, specifically the latter, if you could find the answer to one question first.

>> I'm trying to tackle that first, I believe here in the United States or implementation science is that it's still taking us almost two decades to have new evidence implemented into practice, and if we think about this from the patient perspective, anyone that's a consumer of healthcare may be receiving care that is based on evidence from two decades ago, and I think that's something that all of us could care about, so in the spirit more of knowledge translation and the theme of this conference and today with stakeholder engagement, I would want to know if we are able to move research into practice more rapidly, are we able to do this when engaging stakeholders throughout the process?

So, to kind of flesh out a little bit further to understand the impact of stakeholder engagement you by trying to understand not just how we include them but when we include them in the research process from the conceptualization of research to the dissemination and implementation throughout the sustainability of that new knowledge.

However, I do agree, and I think in regard to the earlier statement, in regard to researchers having more ‑‑ requiring more time, being more logical or more thoughtful about the process, whereas in the business world maybe they're getting things done a little bit faster, they're really trying to meet different metrics or different goals. There's one thing that's really stood out to me in the start of my research career is trying to kind of almost do like a little pilot test of your idea to see is this idea even worth pursuing? Are people interested in it?

By going through some different mechanisms. And there is an article that I had read about it in the past, and I thought you that this was a unique way of trying to determine if there was interest from various stakeholders, and are if so, then it may be something worth pursuing, and if there's no interest, then maybe it's time to move on to another idea. But yeah, if anyone else has any comments about that question or has an answer to what one research question they would want to answer, I think it would be really interesting if they posted it in the chat box. Great question.

>> DONNA MITRANI: Thank you. I know that it was a pretty big question, so I appreciate your response.

Our next question is for Eileen, and as a researcher, if you were able to imagine the perfect partnership with enormous impact, what would that look like to you? Could you build off that relationship to expansion you work in support of the research? What are the primary barriers to achieving that goal?

>> EILEEN BRENNAN: This is a wonderful question, and I'm kind of at the other end of the research career. I've been working with some team members for 20 years, and the perfect partnership actually is a long-term partnership for me. I did appreciate what Tamika said about people moving in and out of partnership, but I think the long-term collaborators are extremely valuable. They have a large impact if the collaborators are also very diverse, that if you're including people from different sectors, but also people from different cultural groups, from different generations in the partnership you, you I think will wind up having greater impact.

I have been working with some people for over 20 years on improving training on people who are providing services to children and then to young people and youth, and it's important, I think, to get those partnerships going at the very beginning of programs or processes, helping with the design, and having that diversity be present in the design process so you actually wind up reaching more people, and then to really negotiate with that partnership and come up with a product that everyone can live with, and as Tamika said, there are different styles, and some people take longer time to get to a point where they're comfortable, but getting the most people comfortable also has getting the most people on board with the process. And then having these partners be willing to reach out to get more people involved and have a wide network of people involved and moving toward the same end, whether that's purely training or research or knowledge translation, but getting the partnership to be more extensive.

And then I do want to say something that hasn't been emphasized in this entire conference. I really think it's important for stakeholders to be involved in interpreting the results of whatever research or projects you're engaged in, and then to include them in writing up and reporting what you found, include them as authors in reports and even sometimes in peer‑reviewed articles, so that their voice is part of the final output.

>> DONNA MITRANI: Thank you so much. So, our final question is for Lorraine, and you know, Lorraine, to be an effective partner, Tamika mentioned many things that researchers can do. Some examples are building trust and respect, nurturing relationships, and understanding people's preferences. Have you seen or experienced an example of where a researcher or practitioner has executed these strategies well?

>> LORRAINE JOHNSON: That's a very interesting question. I think where I have seen it done well is where people start off on an egalitarian footing, which usually, I mean, from my experience, has been somebody like PCORI has stepped in and provided the funding and required a certain amount of engagement from different stakeholders so that the bar is set quite highway. I think it's very difficult to walk into somebody else's space. So, if you walk into the space of three or four researchers who have been working together for a period of time, it's really hard to get your own seat in a way you that makes a difference and engages a conversation that's not informed by prior habits.

So that's one thing I would say. I would say on a personal basis, what we're doing at Lyme disease.org is I mentioned we launched a patient registry that has 11,000 patients with Lyme disease in it, so that registry is patient driven research. It's a very different model. And there, what I have found to be effective in terms of partnerships is I walk in, when I give a presentation, I talk about what our goal is, which is to develop a research engine that will accelerate the pace of research in dime disease, and I spell out the components of that engine. I didn't come up with this. Graft came up with it.

So, it's not like I'm that forward thinking. But by doing that, people ‑‑ and then at the end of my presentations, I say, if anybody out there, you know, we need a lot of collaborators. If anybody out there is building a bio repository or is putting together, thinking about clinical endpoints or is thinking about ‑‑ and you go through the list, and then people have approached us, and I think that that has helped with alignment of interest because the people who then approach us are people who have an interest, and then the question becomes, okay, you have an interest, you have a capacity to help really sort of move this project forward, and we see how we might align.

>> DONNA MITRANI: Thank you, Lorraine. So, we're coming to the end of the session period, and before I toss the baton back over to Steven, I just wanted to check in with you, Tamika, to see if you have any closing thoughts or comments that you wanted to make based on the discussion that we just had.

>> TAMIKA HEIDEN: No, I think the one thing that stood out for me was the point, and I'm sorry, I can't remember who made it, about the fact that having stakeholders involved in the process of looking at the findings and the outcomes from the research and the results, I think, yeah, that's absolutely an interesting point, and I think I'm personally going to look into some more of that work as well, and thank you also for, Jennifer, sharing a paper in the chat box, it looks interesting. From my end, no, the only thing was I just learned how to say baton in North America rather than baton, sorry.

(laughter).

>> DONNA MITRANI: Well, thank you, thank you again Tamika, for a fantastic presentation, thank you to our three reactors, Jennifer Weaver, Eileen Brennan and Lorraine Johnson for the great discussions throughout the day. With that, I'll pass it back to Steven. Thank you.