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Presentation Overview

• Q2 FY 2015 Dashboard
• Noteworthy Items
• Yellow-flagged Items

However beautiful the strategy, you should occasionally look at the results.

Winston Churchill
Discussion Questions

- Do you see the **need for further action** in response to any of the indicators discussed today?
- What **further improvements** should we consider so that our Dashboard and accompanying materials **effectively convey the status of our work and progress toward our goals**?
Board of Governors
FY2015 Dashboard – Q2
(As of 3/31/2015)

**Influencing Research**
The University of Pittsburgh credits PCORI with being the inspiration for and central to the establishment of their Comparative Effectiveness Research Core

Our Goals: Increase Information, Speed Implementation, and Influence Research

### Funds Committed to Research – Budget=$640M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projects Awarded

- **Targeted**
- **Pragmatic**
- **Broad**
- **PCORnet**
- **Engagement**

#### Number of Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targeted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCORnet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percent of Projects Meeting All Milestones

- **Q3**
- **Q4**
- **Q1**
- **Q2**

### Completion of Projects

- **Expected**
- **Actual**

### Journal Articles Published

- By Awardees
- About or By PCORI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Awardees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About or By PCORI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Uptake of Methodology Standards

- **Q3**
- **Q4**
- **Q1**
- **Q2**

### Expenditures – Total Budget=$362M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Progress of PCORnet – Completion of Phase I

- **Phase II**
- **PFA Released**
- **Governance policies approved**
- **Obesity Cohort Project Awarded**
- **Health Systems Projects Awarded**

- **Q1**
- **Q2**
- **Q3**
- **Q4**

Legend
- **On Target**
- **Off Target**
- **Needs Attention**
- **Q1=Q1 2015**
- **Q2=Q2 2015**
- **NA=Not Applicable**
Board of Governors
FY2015 Dashboard – Q2
(As of 3/31/2015)

Our Goals: Increase Information, Speed Implementation, and Influence Research

*Influencing Research*

The University of Pittsburgh credits PCORI with being the inspiration for and central to the establishment of their Comparative Effectiveness Research Core

### Funds Committed to Research – Budget=$640M

- **Budget**
  - Q1: 100
  - Q2: 200
  - Q3: 300
  - Q4: 200

- **Actual**
  - Q1: 20
  - Q2: 10
  - Q3: 5
  - Q4: 20

### Projects Awarded

- **Targeted**
- **Pragmatic**
- **Broad**
- **PCORnet**
- **Engagement**

### Percent of Projects Meeting All Milestones

- **Q1**
- **Q2**
- **Q3**
- **Q4**

### Journal Articles Published

- **By Awardees**
- **About or By PCORI**

### Expenditures – Total Budget=$362M

- **Research Budget**
- **Research Actual**
- **Other Budget**
- **Other Actual**

### Uptake of Methodology Standards

- **PDMS**
  - **Q3**
  - **Q4**
  - **Q1**
  - **Q2**

### Progress of PCORnet – Completion of Phase I

- **Phase II**
  - **PFA Released**
  - **Governance policies approved**
  - **Obesity Cohort Project Awarded**
  - **Health Systems Projects Awarded**

Legend:
- Green: On Target
- Yellow: Off Target
- Red: Needs Attention
- Blue: NA=Not Applicable
- Q3=Q3 2014
- Q4=Q4 2014
- Q1=Q1 2015
- Q2=Q2 2015

Uptake of Methodology Standards:
- **Q3**
- **Q4**
- **Q1**
- **Q2**

Progress of PCORnet:
- **Phase II**
  - **PFA Released**
  - **Governance policies approved**
  - **Obesity Cohort Project Awarded**
  - **Health Systems Projects Awarded**

Expenditures:
- **Research Budget**
- **Research Actual**
- **Other Budget**
- **Other Actual**

### Completion of Projects

- **Expected**
- **Actual**

### Web Views

- **Q1**
- **Q2**
- **Q3**
- **Q4**

### Citations

- **Q1**
- **Q2**
- **Q3**
- **Q4**
Early Signs of Influence on Research

The Comparative Effectiveness Research Center (CERC) at the University Of Pittsburgh and UPMC

- Established in 2011 to support Patient-Centered CER at the University of Pittsburgh and UPMC
- Interest in developing this infrastructure stemmed from
  - desire to promote collaborative PC-CER across the University and UPMC
  - availability of new funding sources, such as PCORI
- CERC aims to:
  - Support high-quality PC-CER across the University through infrastructure support, training, collaborations, and strategic coordination of responses to funding opportunities
  - Promote the University’s PC-CER externally to increase funding opportunities
  - Develop new statistical and methodological approaches to advance the science of PC-CER
  - Expand the pool of researchers trained in PC-CER via interactive workshops, seminars, and meetings
  - Demonstrate the translation of PC-CER via dissemination and implementation into actions that effectively reach the patients and directly impact clinical care

“PCORI is central to the CERC and has greatly influenced work across the University”

Sally Morton, Director of CERC and PCORI Methodology Committee Member

*Influencing Research*

The University of Pittsburgh credits PCORI with being an inspiration for and central to the establishment of their Comparative Effectiveness Research Center
Early Signs of Influence on Research

At the University of Pittsburgh, PCORI is credited with motivating their:

- Establishment of a HIPAA compliant data center:
  - 20 projects currently using it
  - $13 million across all projects (PCORI and other funders)

- Development of training and educational opportunities:
  - Graduate courses and training grants (AHRQ-funded) based on the PCORI Methodology Standards
  - 54 training workshops since 2011 on PC-CER funding opportunities and review criteria, PC-CER methodology, and stakeholder engagement
  - Mock reviews for PCORI applications (assess engagement, adherence to standards)

- Emphasis on stakeholder engagement:
  - Influence apparent in existing projects
  - “These are new concepts for some of our researchers – PCORI is making them think about the stakeholders and how they can qualify to be a PCORI project”
    – Monica Costlow, CERC Project Director

- Encouragement of people at the University and UPMC to apply to be PCORI reviewers and to get involved in other PCORI activities

*Influencing Research*

The University of Pittsburgh credits PCORI with being an inspiration for and central to the establishment of their Comparative Effectiveness Research Center
Progress of Research Projects: Additional Measures

Number at top of column is the number of projects included that quarter (the denominator)
Articles Resulting from Funded Projects – Q2

- M Gilman, EK Adams et al. *Safety-Net Hospitals More Likely Than Other Hospitals to Fare Poorly Under Medicare's Value-Based Purchasing*. *Health Affairs* March 2015 (Impact factor 4.3) – 2012 Pilot Project award
Articles Resulting from Funded Projects – Q2

- A Porter, D Hynes et al. Rationale and Design of a Patient-Centered Medical Home Intervention for Patients with End-Stage Renal Disease on Hemodialysis. *Contemporary Clinical Trials* February 2015 (Impact factor 1.9) – 2013 IHS award
This collection of articles and opinion pieces provides insights into PCORI's work to advance patient-centered comparative clinical effectiveness research. The collection includes papers, articles, and commentaries written by researchers working on PCORI-funded projects and by PCORI staff, members of our Board of Governors and Methodology Committee, and others who are following our work.

PCORI is committed to the principle of transparency and openness in all of our work, including the sharing of information about our activities and the dissemination of research findings. We encourage authors to make their articles available without a subscription. In the list below, we provide links when articles are available without charge.

Results from PCORI-Funded Research Studies

**An Early Look at Rates of Uninsured Safety Net Clinic Visits After the Affordable Care Act**
[View PCORI Study](#)

**Improving Diabetes Prevention with Benefit Based Tailored Treatment: Risk Based Reanalysis of Diabetes Prevention Program**
[View PCORI Study](#)

**Advance Care Planning: A Qualitative Study of Dialysis Patients and Families**
Abstract only available
[View PCORI Study](#)

**Rationale and Design of a Patient-Centered Medical Home Intervention for Patients with End-Stage Renal Disease on Hemodialysis**
Abstract only available
Anna C. Porter, Denise M. Hynes et al., "Rationale and Design of a Patient-Centered Medical Home Intervention for Patients with End-Stage Renal Disease on Hemodialysis," *Contemporary Clinical Trials* 42 (February 2015): 1-8.
[View PCORI Study](#)
Additional Metrics for Early Dissemination and Uptake

Starting in Q3

- Average Impact Factor
- Percent of Articles in Top Tier Journals

Starting in Q4

- Citations
- Alternative Metrics (such as media coverage)
- Uptake (such as into systematic reviews or guidelines)
Discussion Questions

• Do you see the *need for further action* in response to any of the indicators discussed today?

• What *further improvements* should we consider so that our Dashboard and accompanying materials *effectively convey the status of our work and progress toward our goals*?
*Influencing Research*

The University of Pittsburgh credits PCORI with being the inspiration for and central to the establishment of their Comparative Effectiveness Research Core

Our Goals: Increase Information, Speed Implementation, and Influence Research

**Funds Committed to Research** – Budget=$640M

- Budget
- Actual

**Projects Awarded**

- Targeted
- Pragmatic
- Broad
- PCORnet
- Engagement

**Percent of Projects Meeting All Milestones**

- Recruitment
- Engagement
- PPRNs
- CDRNs

**Completion of Projects**

- Expected
- Actual

**Journal Articles Published**

- By Awardees
- About or By PCORI

**Uptake of Methodology Standards**

**Expenditures – Total Budget=$362M**

- Research Budget
- Research Actual
- Other Budget
- Other Actual

**Progress of PCORnet – Completion of Phase I**

- Phase II PFA Released
- Governance policies approved
- Obesity Cohort Project Awarded
- Phase II awarded

Legend:
- On Target
- Off Target
- Needs Attention
- NA=Not Applicable
- Q1=Q1 2015
- Q2=Q2 2015
- Q3=Q3 2014
- Q4=Q4 2014

As of 3/31/2015
Appendix

Slides available to answer questions about Methodology Standards use and uptake:

- Adherence of Awarded Applications
- Use by Researchers
- Experience of Applicants
- Experience of Merit Reviewers
Uptake of Methodology Standards

We are also tracking:

- Adoption
- Endorsements
- CE/CME (Q3)
- Uptake into Curriculum
- Use of PCORI-developed Curriculum (2016)
### Adherence of Awarded CER* Applications to PCORI’s Methodology Standards at Time of Award

**Adherence by Standard Category (average across 3 cycles - 88 applications)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Number of projects (N)</th>
<th>% Adherence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standards for Formulating Research Questions</td>
<td>RQ-1 Identify Gaps in Evidence</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ-3 Identify Specific Populations and Health Decision(s) Affected by the Research</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ-4 Identify and Assess Participant Subgroups</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ-5 Select Appropriate Interventions and Comparators</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ-6 Measure Outcomes that People Representing the Population of Interest Notice and Care About</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient-Centeredness</td>
<td>PC-1 Engage people representing the population of interest and other relevant stakeholders in ways that are appropriate and necessary in a given research context.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC-2 Identify, Select, Recruit, and Retain Study Participants Representative of the Spectrum of the Population of Interest and Ensure that Data Are Collected Thoroughly and Systematically from All Study Participants</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC-3 Use Patient-Reported Outcomes When Patients or People at Risk of a Condition Are the Best Source of Information</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC-4 Support dissemination and implementation of study results</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Adherence of Awarded CER* Applications to PCORI’s Methodology Standards at Time of Award**

*Adherence by Standard Category (average across 3 cycles – 88 applications)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Category</th>
<th>Number of projects (N)</th>
<th>% Adherence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards for Data Integrity and Rigorous Analyses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR-1 Assess Data Source Adequacy</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR-2 Describe Data Linkage Plans, if Applicable</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR-3 A priori, Specify Plans for Data Analysis that Correspond to Major Aims</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR-4 Document Validated Scales and Tests</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards for Heterogeneity of Treatment Effect (HTE)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTE-1 State the Goals of HTE Analyses</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include Methods applications*
From Our Survey of Researchers: Which best describes your experience with the following resources for research methods? (N=506)

- CONSORT Reporting Guidelines: 53% I have used this resource, 28% I am familiar but have not used it, 20% I am not familiar with this resource.
- AHRQ Methods Guide for Effectiveness and Comparative Effectiveness Reviews: 39% I have used this resource, 37% I am familiar but have not used it, 23% I am not familiar with this resource.
- PRISMA Reporting Guidelines: 40% I have used this resource, 33% I am familiar but have not used it, 28% I am not familiar with this resource.
- STROBE Reporting Guidelines: 25% I have used this resource, 32% I am familiar but have not used it, 32% I am not familiar with this resource.
- HSRMethods.org: 68% I have used this resource, 26% I am familiar but have not used it, 6% I am not familiar with this resource.
- PCORI Methodology Standards (N=465): 30% I have used this resource, 51% I am familiar but have not used it, 20% I am not familiar with this resource.

Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) reporting guidelines; Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) reporting guidelines; Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) reporting guidelines
From Our Survey of Researchers: Please indicate the activities for which you used the PCORI Methods Standards. Mark all that apply. (N=135)
From Our Survey of Researchers: What could be done to encourage researchers to involve patients and/or caregivers as partners? Mark all that apply. (N=465)
From Our Researcher Survey: How difficult was it for you to respond to the following PCORI application criteria when proposing your study design? (N=272)
Percent responding ‘Very Difficult’ or ‘Somewhat Difficult’

- Involving patients and other stakeholders as partners in the research: 41%
- Adherence to PCORI’s methodological standards: 26%
- Researching a diverse study population with respect to age, gender, race, ethnicity, and clinical status: 21%
- Studying in real-world settings: 19%
- Outcomes that are meaningful to the patient population: 19%
From Our Researcher Survey: Which of the following are reasons that you have not applied for PCORI funding? (N=182)

- PCORI’s funding criteria does not align with my area of research: 34%
- The effort to complete a PCORI proposal given size and length of award: 34%
- Lack of clarity in PCORI’s funding requirements: 23%
- PCORI’s requirement to engage patients and other stakeholders: 20%
- Frequent changes to PCORI’s application process: 19%
- Difficulty adhering to PCORI’s methodological standards: 14%
- Concern about PCORI’s longevity: 10%
- PCORI’s merit review process involving patients and stakeholders: 8%
From Our Applicant Surveys:
I understood how to use the PCORI Methodology Standards to develop my research proposal
From Our Applicant Surveys:
Applying the PCORI Methodology Standards strengthened the scientific rigor of my proposed research
From Our Merit Reviewer Surveys:
I understood how to use the PCORI Methodology Standards to evaluate my assigned application

*Asked only of Scientist reviewers
From Our Merit Reviewer Survey:
The PCORI Methodology Standards were a useful resource for evaluating the technical merit of my assigned applications.