



Evaluation Framework: Primary Evaluation Questions

Evaluation Question	Primary Metrics
<p>1. How can information from PCORI studies be characterized in terms of <i>usefulness</i>?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• end-user assessment of usefulness</li> <li>• extent of use (see goal #2 below)</li> </ul>
<p>2. How can information from PCORI studies be characterized in terms of <i>uptake and use</i>?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• whether results are reported back to study participants; access to PCORI study report; presentations; bibliometrics; alt-metrics</li> <li>• adoption of study findings into the study setting; incorporation into guidelines, etc.</li> <li>• speed of uptake</li> </ul>
<p>3. How can information from PCORI studies be characterized in terms of <i>impact</i>?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• decisional quality</li> <li>• information density</li> <li>• usability</li> <li>• changes in health decisions; health care; health outcomes</li> </ul>
<p>4. How does PCORI's work <i>influence others</i>?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• use of CER and PCOR terminology (funding announcements publications, abstracts, blogs, workshops)</li> <li>• endorsement, promotion, and dissemination of PCORI work (evaluation, PCORnet, etc.)</li> <li>• bibliometric indicators of PCORI evaluation work, guidance on patient-centered CER, and methods projects</li> <li>• other funders use of the following criteria in proposal review (patient-centeredness, engagement, potential speed of uptake of findings in clinical practice)</li> <li>• use of non-scientists in proposal review</li> <li>• use of training or curricula developed or funded by PCORI (attendance, use, downloads, etc.)</li> <li>• number and nature of projects co-funded by PCORI and others</li> <li>• number and proportion of studies conducted in PCORnet by investigators external to PCORnet</li> <li>• use of PCORI methodology standards on patient-centeredness in non-PCORI research</li> <li>• amount and proportion of total PCOR funding that comes from funders other than PCORI</li> </ul>
<p>5. What is the effect of PCORI's approach to <i>Topic Capture, Prioritization, and Selection</i>?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• stakeholder perceptions of TCRP process, such as, perceived influence on the content of the topic database</li> <li>• relative contributions of the patients and stakeholders in ranking submitted topics</li> <li>• indicators of dynamics in the panel discussion</li> <li>• number and type of stakeholders submitting topics to PCORI</li> <li>• PCORI projects filling identified research gaps, such as IOM and AHRQ identified research gaps</li> <li>• types of gaps documented as important to patients and other stakeholders that were not previously identified</li> </ul>
<p>6. What is the effect of PCORI's approach to <i>Merit Review</i>?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reviewer perceptions of PCORI Merit Review</li> <li>• dynamics in the panel discussion</li> <li>• change in review scores among different reviewer types (scientist, patient, stakeholder) from pre- to post discussion</li> <li>• convergence of review scores across different reviewer types pre- to post- discussion</li> <li>• unique feedback from each reviewer type in written application critiques</li> <li>• the relationship between PCORI criteria scores and overall scores for each reviewer type</li> <li>• the relationship between PCORI criteria scores, by reviewer type, and funding decisions</li> </ul>

Evaluation Question	Primary Metrics
<p><b>7. What is the effect of PCORI's unique approach to developing a PCOR community?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• number of trained merit reviewers, ambassadors, and advisory panelists</li> <li>• number of people attending PCORI events and accessing PCORI training materials</li> <li>• number of applications that come from the Pipeline to Proposal Awards</li> <li>• public perceptions of, and willingness to, engage in Patient-Centered CER projects</li> <li>• researcher perceptions of difficulty finding partners</li> <li>• stakeholder perceptions of difficulty finding opportunities for partnering in research</li> <li>• researcher and stakeholder interest in Patient-Centered CER and awareness of methods for Patient-Centered CER</li> <li>• input from patients and stakeholder partners perceived as influential, valuable</li> </ul>
<p><b>8. What is the effect of <i>Engagement in Research</i>?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• relevance of research questions for end-users</li> <li>• changes to study design resulting from engagement</li> <li>• recruitment and retention rates (including among hard to reach populations)</li> <li>• proportion of studies that complete data collection</li> <li>• time to study completion</li> <li>• to whom &amp; how research is disseminated</li> </ul>
<p><b>9. What is the effect of Engagement of patients and other stakeholders in the <i>development of research networks</i>?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• time to desired enrollment numbers</li> <li>• number and type of patient-reported outcomes (PROs) and patient-generated information (PGI) collected</li> <li>• types of personal data shared with patient participants</li> <li>• proportion of study participants that receive a summary of study findings</li> <li>• patient participant trust in network</li> <li>• patient participant awareness of the ways in which their data is used</li> <li>• number and nature of opportunities for patient participant for research engagement (pre-existing vs. new opportunities)</li> <li>• attainment of PCORI &amp; non-PCORI funding</li> <li>• number of studies conducted through PCORnet networks (including people external to the networks)</li> </ul>
<p><b>10. Compared to other CER studies, for studies conducted in the PCORnet, what is the effect of PCORnet?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• study participants trust in the research process - proxies may include recruitment, retention, decisions to share data, etc.</li> <li>• time to recruitment (including hard to reach populations)</li> <li>• retention (including hard to reach populations)</li> <li>• proportion of completed studies</li> <li>• total time for study completion</li> <li>• number and type of PROs and PGIs used</li> <li>• information on confounders available and used</li> <li>• PRO harmonization: percentage of networks that adopted the PRO common measures</li> </ul>
<p><b>11. What is the effect of including patients and other stakeholders in <i>planning dissemination</i>?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• effective communication and dissemination of results</li> <li>• increased direct-communication to patients from PCORI projects vs projects funded by others</li> <li>• to whom the findings are disseminated</li> <li>• end-user trust and understanding of findings</li> </ul>