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Key messages

- Lots of potentially beneficial health research gets done but doesn’t get used
- “Using research” is complex
- Health care organizations are well-positioned to foster research use
- We’re learning more about how organizations could improve health care through engagement in research
Defining research

Systematic investigations or inquiries designed to produce knowledge that may be applied to other settings or cases
Key messages

Lots of potentially beneficial health research gets done but doesn’t get used
One view of research...

by Jove... I think I've found a cure for CANCER!

and cut off our funding?! The hell you have...
Attempts to move the needle

➢ Health research funding agencies have evolved:
  ▶ From “fund and forget” to responsive to health priorities

➢ Funding is more targeted

➢ Researcher-decision maker partnerships are now often a condition of award
Key messages

Lots of potentially beneficial health research gets done but doesn’t get used

“Research use” is complex
Assumption that if research results are relevant, there will be uptake

Underestimate what’s involved in uptake

Decision maker-researcher partnerships are important, but only part of the story
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Health care organizations are well-positioned to foster research use
Organizational engagement in health research: A solution?

There is a widely held assumption that organizational engagement in research leads to improved health care performance and patient care, but we lack...

- direct empirical evidence that is synthesized
- analysis of the mechanisms for research use

Hanney et al, 2013
The review question:

Engagement in research: does it improve performance at a clinician, service and organizational level in health-care organizations?
The Hour-Glass Three Stage Review

Stage 1. Planning and mapping
A wide ranging initial mapping of various potentially relevant bodies of knowledge to inform analysis of research engagement leading to healthcare improvement, including possible theoretical perspectives and mechanisms.

Stage 2. Focused review
The focused review concentrated on one central strand, seeking evidence of whether engagement in research improves healthcare processes or outcomes. 10,398 papers identified; 473 full papers read; 33 papers included in focused review.

Stage 3. Wider review
The analysis expanded into the wider review which drew on the mapping and focused review to explore the mechanisms by which research engagement might improve healthcare.
What the review tells us...

- Organizations in which the research function is fully integrated into the organizational structure can out-perform those that pay less heed to research/outputs.

- However...engagement in research is only one of many influences on performance. Disaggregating how these mechanisms operate in complex systems is not straightforward.
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What does research engagement look like?

- Participation in research
- Providing training
- Improving infrastructure
- Reflecting research in organizational structures

Hanney et al, 2013; Ellen et al, 2013
Some models

- National Institutes of Health Research Collaboration for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care (CLAHRC)
- Veterans Health Administration
  - Quality Enhancement Research Initiative
- Agency for Health Care Research and Quality
  - Integrated Delivery Systems Research Network
How can we measure research engagement?

A framework to evaluate research capacity building in health care, Cooke, 2005
**Island Health Research Capacity Building Initiative - DRAFT**

**Vision:** A robust, self-sustaining health research community on Vancouver Island, playing an essential role in the delivery of health services, and improving health status and health care for the Island's population.

### Inputs
- **VIHA Strategic Plan / Priority Areas (to be renewed for 2014-2018)**
- **VIRCH Business Plan**
- **Funding**
  - **Personnel**
  - **Researchers (Internal)**
  - **Reviewers**
  - **VIHA corporate support services (HR, IT, Finance, contracts, Corporate planning, privacy office)**
  - **Consultants**
- **Facilities**
  - **Data/Technology/Platforms**
    - Research ethics/operations data management
    - Research Data Capture (online)
    - Secure Data Management Platform for Individual studies (service)
    - Health Research Enablers
    - Cerner/HER access for research
- **External to VIHA**
  - **Research Capacity Building (other) \(\times\)**
  - **Sponsorship / Grant Support**
  - **Regulatory Requirements**
    - **Privacy legislation**
    - **Canada Food and Drug Act**
    - **Good Clinical Practice**
    - **Tri-Council Policy Statement**
    - **EU**
  - **Funding**
    - **Personnel**
    - **Researchers (External)**

### Activities
- **Compliance**
  - Ethics and privacy processes
  - Standard operating procedures
  - Research governance policies
  - Research Integrity Committee
  - Internal Compliance Assessment Program
  - Corrective & Preventative Action program (CAPA)
- **Capacity**
  - Permission to contact program (RSP)
  - Planning Forums
  - Research education program (public)
  - Research education program (internal)
  - Research outreach in central and northern Island
  - Grant facilitation
  - Research Electronic Data Capture program (REDCap)
  - Clinical research support
  - Clinical research business development
  - Knowledge translation training
  - Knowledge translation promotion
  - Statistical Support (RSS)
  - Develop model to enable access to data holdings
- **Collaboration**
  - Research entity
  - Formal agreements
  - Collaborative planning processes & activities
  - Research partnerships
- **Funding**
  - Competitive grants program:
  - Catalyst Awards (S)
  - Research Support Awards (S)
  - Qualified Investigator Development (QID) Program (S)
  - IMP Summer Student Research Scholarship (S)
  - Seed Funding Awards (S)
  - KT Poster Awards (S)
  - Collaborative Team Grants (S)
  - Grant applications by type:
  - $5000 grant awarded
  - $5,000 grant awarded
  - $5,000 grant awarded
  - $5,000 grant awarded

### Outputs
- **Compliance**
  - Extent of implementation
  - # of Internal assessment findings
- **Capacity**
  - # of partners in PIC program
  - # of researchers in PIC program
  - # of patients in PIC program
  - # of researchers recruited into research studies
  - # of types of research studies undertaken
  - # of new PIC funds secured
  - # of research studies under way
  - # of completed research studies
  - # of new PIC funds secured
- **Collaboration**
  - # of formal agreements signed
  - # of potential partners signed to work on research entity
  - # of active research partnerships
  - # of new non-VIHA funding for health research arising from business development
  - # of research/PT projects identified and that were actually implemented
  - # of new PIC funds secured

### Short Term Outcomes
- **Barriers to doing research decrease, incentives to do research increase**
- **Increased security of research data**
- **Increased compliance with SOPs, policies and research protocol**

### Medium Term Outcomes
- **High quality research activity increases; capacity for uptake increases**
- **Increased in high quality research personnel**
- **Increased research activity, quality & utility (increased relevance to patients)**
- **Increased dissemination & use of research evidence to inform health system & practice**
- **Increased integration of research into practice**
- **Increased external funding to Vancouver Island to support health research**
- **Increased efficiency of health research enterprise**
- **Increased responsiveness of health research enterprise to strategic opportunities**
- **Improved reputation of health research destination**
- **Increased research awareness**
- **Increased skills of researchers and research users**

### Long Term Outcomes
- **Research Capacity Efforts Contribute to System Change**
  - **Enhanced recruitment & retention of skilled health professional workforce**
  - **Improved health services**
  - **Increased patient / consumer satisfaction**
  - **Improved population health outcomes**
  - **Reduced health inequalities**
  - **Decreased health system costs**
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What can organizational leaders do?

- Make the commitment:
  - Intentionality is key
- Measure organizational readiness
  - Tools are available
- Develop and resource a plan
  - Literature offers a range of approaches
What steps can funders take?

- Stop asking for miracles
- Provide clarity on roles and responsibilities
- Don’t conflate academic impacts with wider impacts
- Support research on organizational engagement in research
What can we do together?

- Partner on implementation research
- Share success stories
- Talk about research impact
Thank you!

Bev Holmes, VP Research and Impact
Michael Smith Foundation for Health Research
bholmes@msfhr.org
PANEL DISCUSSION