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Today’s Agenda

• Introduction to PCORI

• Key findings from PCORI awarded projects: engagement challenges and strategies

• Presentations by PCORI awardees and partners:
  ▪ Dr. Michelle Salyers and Tim Gearhart
  ▪ Dr. Elizabeth Cox and Jean Benzinger

• Discussion
At the conclusion of this webinar, attendees will be able to:

- Describe some of the common challenges and strategies related to engagement in PCORI’s portfolio of funded research projects
- Identify useful resources for patient and stakeholder engagement in research
Introduction to PCORI

Lisa Stewart, MA
Engagement Officer
Public & Patient Engagement
About Us

- An independent research institute authorized by Congress in 2010 and governed by a 21-member Board of Governors representing the entire healthcare community
- Funds comparative clinical effectiveness research (CER) that engages patients and other stakeholders throughout the research process
- Seeks answers to real-world questions about what works best for patients based on their circumstances and concerns
How Is Our Work Different?

• We fund research on which care options work, for whom, under which circumstances.
• We focus on answering questions most important to patients and those who care for them.
• We aim to produce evidence that can be easily applied in real-world settings.
• We engage patients, caregivers, clinicians, insurers, employers, and other stakeholders throughout the research process.
• This makes it more likely we’ll get the research questions right and the study results will be useful and taken up in practice.
PCORI’s Approach to Research

Patient-centeredness

- The project aims to answer questions or examine outcomes that matter to patients within the context of patient preferences
- Research questions and outcomes should reflect what is important to patients and caregivers

Patient and stakeholder engagement

- Patients are partners in research, not just “subjects”
- Active and meaningful engagement between scientists, patients, and other stakeholders
- Community, patient, and caregiver involvement already in existence or a well-thought-out plan
Our Engagement Rubric: A Valuable Resource

- How stakeholders will participate in study planning and design
- How stakeholders will participate in the conduct of the study
- How stakeholders will help communicate and disseminate study findings

Planning the Study

Conducting the Study

Disseminating the Study Results

Reciprocal relationships
Co-Learning
Partnership
Trust
Transparency
Honesty
Key findings from PCORI awarded projects: engagement challenges and strategies

Andrea Heckert, PhD, MPH
Program Officer
Evaluation & Analysis

Courtney Hall, MPH
Program Assistant
Evaluation & Analysis
OUTLINE

- Research engagement activities and effects among PCORI-awarded projects*
- Common research engagement challenges
- Common strategies and suggestions to overcome research engagement challenges

*For more information, please see links at the end of this webinar to the related PCORI webinar from September 2017 and associated publications
Information sources and methods

Awardee Engagement Report

- PCORI Research Awardees
  - N=305 awardees

Ways of Engaging-ENgagement ACtivity Tool (WE-ENACT)

- Patient & Other Stakeholder Partners
  - N=260 partners
Communities engaged in PCORI research projects
(by percent of projects)

91% PATIENTS/CONSUMERS
62% ADVOCACY ORGS
56% CAREGIVERS/FAMILY MEMBER
92% CLINICIANS
61% HEALTH SYSTEMS

96% of projects engage with at least one of these communities

PCORI projects also engage with subject matter experts (56%), representative of community-based organizations (36%), policymakers (19%), payers (17%), training institutions (17%), industry (7%), and purchasers (3%)

Note: Data from annual awardee reports collected through 6/30/17. N=305 awardees (134 projects at project year 1, 205 projects at project year 2, 119 projects at project year 3)
Note: Data from annual awardee reports collected through 6/30/17. N=305 awardees (134 projects at project year 1, 205 projects at project year 2, 119 projects at project year 3)
What do partners do in the research projects?

- Share personal perspectives (e.g., priorities, experiences)
- Provide guidance and share in decision-making for research project design, processes, and materials (e.g., outcomes studied, recruitment strategies)
- Actively participate in study conduct (e.g., recruiting participants, collecting data, sharing study information or results)

How do partners impact the research projects?

- Better understanding of patient and other stakeholders’ personal perspectives (e.g., priorities, experiences)
- Enhance patient-centeredness of study process and outcomes
- Enhance study design, conduct, or efficiency

Note: Data from annual awardee reports collected through 6/30/17. N=305 awardees (134 projects at project year 1, 205 projects at project year 2, 119 projects at project year 3) and partner reports collected through 6/30/2016. N = 260 partners
Challenges in engaged research

Awardees
- Identifying and inviting partners
- Integrating diverse partner perspectives
- Additional time & effort to manage engagement

Partners
- Research jargon
- Perspective is understood and valued
- Impact of one’s contributions to the study
- Project delays
- Limited connection to others

Partners & Awardees
- Scheduling logistics
- Maintaining consistent partner participation

Data from annual awardee reports and partner WE-ENACT collected through 6/30/16 (N = 261 awardees; N = 260 partners). Data also from all available reports for 50 purposively selected projects.
Because I am the primary caregiver of my son, **being able to schedule time to meet has been my greatest challenge.**

– *Caregiver/family member*

We've continued to face challenges associated with **engaging patients with serious illness. These patients are often in frail health and it is difficult for them to come to meetings on a regular basis.**

– *Awardee*

Another **challenge** with patient/stakeholder engagement is **finding a common meeting time...** since these are **busy individuals with varying priorities.**

– *Awardee*
Partner & Awardee Challenges

- Scheduling logistics
- Maintaining consistent partner participation

Strategies from Partners & Awardees

- Dedicating staff to manage engagement
- Integrating partner input for scheduling
- Being adaptable and flexible

"No one time worked, so we scheduled the meeting at two different set times, alternating between those two times every other month... Every study team member is able to attend the calls bimonthly."

−Awardee

I often take additional time to complete follow-up calls for individuals who could not make the meetings.

−Awardee
Awardee Challenges

- Identifying and inviting partners
- Integrating diverse partner perspectives
- Additional time & effort to manage engagement

Disparities in education can interfere with ability to engage all relevant stakeholders to the same extent.

–Awardee

One of the largest challenges has been accommodating differing opinions...
Striking the right balance is challenging.

-Awardee

“There were times I felt all of us couldn't understand each other clearly, which led to a little bit of frustration, from both sides.”

-Representative of patient, consumer, or caregiver advocacy organization
**Partner Challenges**

- Research jargon
- Perspective is understood and valued
- Impact of one’s contributions to the study
- Project delays
- Limited connection to others

"Sometimes folks on our committee use acronyms or abbreviations for terms or establishments that I am not familiar with and by the time the discussion pauses I'm lost. I might have a vague idea but I don't want to disrupt the momentum of the conversation for a definition."

– Patient/Consumer

The researchers need to let the partners know that no question is stupid, and need to be patient with the partners (e.g., if someone is answering slowly).

– Representative of patient, consumer, or caregiver advocacy organization

Sometimes, I am not sure that my contribution is helpful or hitting the ‘target’ for the researchers.

– Patient/Consumer
• Dedicating staff to manage engagement
• Engaging partners early and consistently
• Meeting and/or communicating frequently

During the first six months, we met with patient stakeholders prior to each conference call to make sure they felt comfortable with all of the information and had a strong voice. We no longer need to do this as they are truly part of our stakeholder advisory committee.

-Awardee

We have learned the lesson that we need to communicate earlier and more often to help research team members internalize the key points of the study. We have developed project ‘roadmaps’ to continually cover where we are in the project and where we are going.

—Awardee
Strategies from Partners & Awardees

- Dedicating staff to manage engagement
- Engaging partners early and consistently
- Meeting and/or communicating frequently
- Orienting, training and offering ongoing capacity-building opportunities
- Clarifying evolving roles and expectations

“We would like] **more training in understanding research, reading journal articles, and writing journals articles, how to analyze data.**

– Patient/Consumer

Define the purpose, the role, the input you're hoping to receive...If the team lead doesn't want a patient in the room, then don't waste the time of either the researcher or the advocate.

-Representative of patient, consumer, or caregiver advocacy organization
Strategies from Partners & Awardees

- Dedicating staff to manage engagement
- Engaging partners early and consistently
- Meeting and/or communicating frequently
- Orienting, training and offering ongoing capacity-building opportunities
- Clarifying evolving roles and expectations
- Improving group facilitation skills
- Using plain language
- Being sensitive to partners’ needs
- Creating a supportive and respectful environment

Youth involvement was a bit difficult in the first Parent & Youth Advisory Group meeting so the structure of the meeting was changed so that youth were given an opportunity to speak before adults could.

—Awardee

Round table discussions where every person’s ideas were valued equally was really important. It made it so that everyone was more willing to share honestly because they weren't intimidated or made to feel that the doctors/researchers knew better than we as parents/caregivers did.

—Caregiver/Family Member
• Dedicating staff to manage engagement
• Engaging partners early and consistently
• Meeting and/or communicating frequently
• Orienting, training and offering ongoing capacity-building opportunities
• Clarifying evolving roles and expectations
• Improving group facilitation skills
• Using plain language
• Being sensitive to partners’ needs
• Creating a supportive and respectful environment
• Communicating with partners on how their contributions have shaped the study

Providing detailed responses to feedback so that we know our work is valued is the most important part.
– Patient/Consumer

A quarterly update is sent to stakeholders regarding the progress of the study and how their suggestions have impacted the study.
– Awardee
The Impact of Burnout on Patient-Centered Care: A Comparative Effectiveness Trial in Mental Health

Michelle P. Salyers, PhD
Professor of Psychology
Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI)

Tim Gearhart, MSW
Vice President of Clinic Operations
Pulaski Memorial Hospital
(Formerly Four County Counseling Center, one of the partner agencies)
PCORI project origins

• Prior work in community mental health services
• High rates of burnout, developing approaches

• Meeting with new CEO of Four County
  “I believe the well-being of our service providers is directly linked to well-being of our consumers and I would like to study that”

• Partner with 2 Community Mental Health Centers (Four County and Places for People in St Louis)
• Team of researchers includes clinicians, administrators, “patients”/consumers
Burnout in mental health

– Maslach’s conceptualization:
  • Emotional exhaustion
  • “Depersonalization” (negative, cynical attitudes and feelings about consumers)
  • Diminished work accomplishment/reduced sense of job efficacy

– High levels of burnout (20-67%; Morse et al, 2011)
Figure 1. Differentiated job demands and resources within an organizational social context.
BREATHE: **Burnout Reduction: Enhanced Awareness, Tools, Handouts and Education**

- Focus on personal resources
  - Burnout is like other stress/mental health concerns
  - Help people be more aware
  - Learn skills to address it -- applying many of the same treatments we use with consumers
  - Relapse prevention framework

- Coping/renewal and wellness approaches
  - Burnout prevention principles
  - Practices
  - Personal plan/toolkit
Modules to address personal resources

- Core contemplative practices (breathing/mindfulness/imagery)
- Cognitive practices (e.g., reconnect with meaning/values)
- Physical strategies (e.g., sleep, yoga)
- Time management approaches
- Building social support and right relationships
- (Integrating into daily work life)
PCORI project aims:

1. Understand the patient experience of clinician burnout.
   - Focus groups
     - clinicians (3 groups, 27 participants)
     - patients (5 groups, 45 participants)

2. Test the BREATHE intervention using a randomized, comparative effectiveness design.
   - 206 clinicians randomly assigned: BREATHE or Motivational Interviewing
   - Randomly select about 4 adult patients for each (n = 469)
   - Follow over 12 months

3. Test a conceptual framework linking clinician burnout to patient-centered processes, engagement, and outcomes.
Our stakeholder engagement

- Co-investigators included clinicians, administrators, patients, and university-based researchers
  - Met monthly for project management, adapt methods as needed
  - Subset met weekly for recruitment
  - Involved from initial research question through analysis and write-up
- Focus groups with clinicians and patients
- Open-ended questions in surveys for clinicians and patients
- Qualitative interviews with clinicians

- We did not have a separate advisory board
How stakeholders shaped the project - Planning

- Initial research question (administrative partner)
  - Aligned with research interests -> Perfect match!
- *Aim 1: Understand the patient experience of clinician burnout*, suggested we add clinician focus groups (patient partner)
  - Expanded our understanding, led to a new paper that could incorporate both perspectives
- Interest in quality of supervision, we added specific measures of supervision (clinician partner)
  - These ended up being strong predictors of burnout and turnover. Planning a new study with them.
How stakeholders shaped the project - Conducting

- Partners led planning on when and how to recruit participants (clinicians and patients)
- Partners did the recruiting and interviewing at each site
- Pancake breakfast with matching t-shirts for researchers and clinician/administrators (missed photo op’s, though!)
How stakeholders shaped the project - Disseminating

- Teams to analyze focus group data (admin, clinician, patients, researcher)
  - Reading transcripts, meeting to discuss
  - Some involved in writing a paper
- Reviewing preliminary data, ideas for secondary analyses
  - Working overtime – administrators discussing new regulations led to new paper, involved in writing
  - Supervision quality – clinician interest, added measure, now analyzing
- Input on final report and “main” paper
  - Ongoing
Challenges

• Longer time to do most things
  – scheduling multiple people with busy schedules
  – more time to understand ways of doing things/training
  – revisions in methods—new IRB amendments
  – analyzing qualitative data with other job responsibilities
• Identifying and engaging patient partners at sites (health concerns and turnover)
Joys

- Meetings were fun, time to get to know each other (e.g., appreciative check-ins)
- Research felt more meaningful
- New ideas to better understand the study
- New ideas for future research
Project ACE: Family-Centered Tailoring of Pediatric Diabetes Self-Management Resources

Elizabeth Cox
Principal Investigator

Jean Benzinger
Parent Advisory Board Member

December 5, 2017
Diabetes Self-Management Challenges

• For over 50% of youths with Type 1 diabetes, control is not optimal

• Each family experiences unique challenges
  – Staying motivated
  – Parent and child working together as a team
  – Having needed knowledge and skills

• Diabetes control and quality of life are influenced by these challenges
Limited Uptake of Existing Interventions

- Families often don’t access self-management resources
  - Typical interventions have many sessions over 6-9 months
  - <30% agree to participate, even when paid $200
  - Lack of buy in and inconvenient scheduling

- What if these resources were “family-centered”
  - Respected families’ wants, needs, and preferences
  - Solicited their input on the education and support needed
Family-Centered Tailoring

• Self-management resources delivered in coordination with routine clinic visits for groups of ~6 families who have same survey-identified self-management barrier

• Addresses families’ challenges to uptake
  – Creates family buy-in by addressing their specific needs
  – Coordinates delivery with routine clinic visit
  – Allows limited workforce to serve many families
Research Question and Participants

• Can family-centered tailoring of diabetes self-management resources improve outcomes that matter to youth/parents?

• Outcomes: A1c, quality of life for youth and parent

• Participants
  – 200 children who are 8-16 years of age and their parents
  – Receiving routine diabetes care at two Wisconsin clinics
  – 100 usual care and 100 intervention
Stakeholders: Our Problem Solvers

• Recruiting and retaining “hard to reach” populations
  – Youths
  – Rural/inner city families

• Implementing the intervention in two different clinics
  – Different patient populations, staffing and workflow

• Developing/evaluating the intervention to optimize potential for dissemination to care systems broadly
Project ACE Stakeholder Engagement

Parent Advisory Board (PAB)
- AFCH Children’s Diabetes Center
  - 12 parents of children with diabetes
- Medical College of Wisconsin
  - 13 parents of children with diabetes

PABs meet every 4 months at their respective sites

External Advisory Board (EAB)
- **Family Partners**
  - 4 Parent and 4 Teen partners (2 from each clinical site)
- **3 Advocacy Partners**
  - JDRF Western Wisconsin Chapter
  - JDRF Southeastern Wisconsin Chapter
  - American Diabetes Association-Wisconsin
- **5 Clinician Partners**
  - AFCH Children’s Diabetes Center and Medical College of Wisconsin
  - Children’s Hospital clinicians
- **2 Administrative Partners**
  - American Family Children’s Hospital and Clinics & Medical College of Wisconsin leadership

Meets every 4 months, alternating with Parent, Youth, and Teen Advisory Boards

Youth and Teen Advisory Boards (YAB & TAB)
- AFCH Children’s Diabetes Center
  - 15 children with diabetes
- Medical College of Wisconsin
  - 13 children with diabetes

YABs and TABs meet every 4 months at their respective sites
Identifying and Engaging Partners

• What do you need from your stakeholders?

• Who can provide that?
Stakeholder Engagement Activities

Template 3: Stakeholder Engagement Activities in a Major Funded Grant

Goal
To identify stakeholder input that you would like during your major grant (e.g., PCORI or NIH) when funded.

Stage 1: Planning
☐ Creating study name and/or logo
☐ Providing feedback on study design
☐ Providing feedback on proposed study implementation
☐ Defining characteristics of study participants (inclusion, exclusion criteria)

Stage 2: Conduct
☐ Developing or providing feedback on participant recruitment strategies
☐ Giving feedback and recommendations about recruitment material design
☐ Crafting language to explain the study (e.g., for recruitment materials or in-person scripts)
☐ Providing feedback on human subjects consent forms
☐ Developing or refining data collection strategies, instruments
☐ Developing strategies for subject retention over time
☐ Participating in data collection
☐ Participating in data analysis (e.g., reviewing survey data for authenticity, interpreting or coding interview transcripts, providing a validity check for qualitative research findings)
☐ Reviewing ongoing recruitment data and advising on issues
☐ Advising on economic sustainability for the intervention

Stage 3: Dissemination
☐ Interpreting research findings
☐ Advising on outlets for product dissemination (e.g., identifying non-traditional channels, developing partnerships with outside organizations)
☐ Providing stakeholder-relevant language for study products (e.g., articles, presentations, websites)
☐ Participating by stakeholders in publishing findings (e.g., writing journal articles, newsletters, websites or blogs)
☐ Presenting study results or processes at events (e.g., conferences, workshops) by stakeholders
☐ Working with health care organizations to implement effective processes into their clinic workflow
☐ Working with community or advocacy organizations to disseminate findings
Other: (Fill in yourself)

Based on the boxes you selected above, and other engagement activities you might want to propose, check what types of stakeholders or partners you want to involve in the research after you are funded.

☐ Patients
☐ Family members
☐ Caregivers (paid or unpaid)
☐ Community members
☐ Community or advocacy organizations
☐ Clinicians or other health care providers
☐ Researchers or content experts

Hospital & health system representatives (e.g., administrators, staff)
Training institutions
Policy makers
Payors
Purchasers
Industry representatives

Examples and definitions of these types of stakeholders can be found here:
http://www.pcori.org/funding-opportunities/what-we-mean-engagement/pcors-stakeholders

(Template 3 continued on next page)
Logistics Require Dedicated Resources

- Scheduling needs to be flexible to meet partners’ other commitments and needs
- Purposefully planned environment helps support engagement
- Communication is key! (and time consuming)
### Coordinating Logistics

7. Who Will Lead Stakeholder Engagement For My Project?

Stakeholder engagement requires ongoing coordination by your research team. This section will help you identify staff to take responsibility for ongoing engagement activities and prepare a project budget that accurately reflects your personnel needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Name of Person Who Will Handle Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare meeting agendas and materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up with stakeholders (email reminders, RSVPs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve meeting space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrange child care and transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrange for payments to stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase food, beverages, supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring meeting supplies: flip chart and easel, markers, pens, meeting agendas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate meetings with stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take meeting notes, write summary report of stakeholder recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write lay meeting summary to send to stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with individual stakeholders to resolve any problems related to participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Much Money Do I Need to Engage Stakeholders?

Template 5: Creating a Budget for Stakeholder Engagement

Goal
To create a realistic budget along usual grant budget categories to support needed stakeholder engagement over the life of your project

**Personnel**—who will develop materials to recruit stakeholders, recruit them, vet them, orient them to the research, set agendas and activities for them, collate stakeholder input, and integrate that input into the ongoing research?

**Equipment and Supplies**—what do you need to support stakeholder engagement (e.g. general supplies like paper, pens, nametags, envelopes, audio recorders, or flipcharts)?

**Other Expenses**—how much will you pay stakeholders for participation in your stakeholder activities, do you need to cover travel or parking, will you provide snacks or a meal, where will they meet and will there be a fee for room rental?

*Based on materials from the Wisconsin Network for Research Support, UW School of Nursing.*
Ensuring and Engaging Diverse Partners

• Partner diversity allows perspectives from many vantage points to inform the research

• What diversity is crucial for your work?
  – Families from both inner city and rural areas
  – Role diversity—patient, parent, provider, advocate, healthcare organizational leadership

• Who can help to reach these diverse partners?
# Recruiting Stakeholders

## Template 4: Stakeholder Recruitment

### Goal
To help you anticipate strategies to recruit your stakeholders

Now that you have thought about what types of stakeholders you want to involve in your research, how will you go about finding and recruiting them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What materials will you need to recruit stakeholders (e.g., flyers, mailings, advertisements, newsletters)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Do you need to connect with people outside your organization to reach target stakeholders you don’t already have relationships with (e.g., community centers with low income clients, members of specific ethnic groups, older adults)? Who are they and how will you connect with them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you need to connect with people outside your organization to reach target stakeholders you don’t already have relationships with (e.g., community centers with low income clients, members of specific ethnic groups, older adults)? Who are they and how will you connect with them?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Will you be recruiting any stakeholders in clinical settings? What resources, relationships, or buy-in do you need in order to recruit stakeholders this way (e.g., help from the clinic staff, clinic administration support)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will you be recruiting any stakeholders in clinical settings? What resources, relationships, or buy-in do you need in order to recruit stakeholders this way (e.g., help from the clinic staff, clinic administration support)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What kind of incentives will you need to provide in order to attract the stakeholders you need?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What kind of incentives will you need to provide in order to attract the stakeholders you need?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Acknowledging Contributions with Iterative Collaboration

Advisory Boards
- Engage in meaningful dialogue
- Generate feedback, ideas & effective solutions
- Get partner buy-in & commitment

Research Team
- Review feedback
- Revise plans
- Address issues & implement solutions
- Generate new meaningful questions
Engagement Impacted Recruitment and Retention

• 73% of eligible families agreed to participate, took less time, matched population demographics

• Intervention group was planned as 4 group sessions
  – 69% of participating families attended at least 3 of the 4 intervention group sessions; 82% attended at least 2
  – Rescheduled only 4 of 128 group sessions!
Engagement Informed Data Collection

• Decided process and timing for data collection and reminders
  – Phone reminder references email
  – 3 weeks before and 3 days before

• Over 24 mo, A1c lab every 3 mo, surveys every 6 mo
  – 82% of A1c values were collected
  – 84% of surveys were completed; <1% missingness
Engagement has Helped our Work…

• Recruit and retain participants

• Be engaging and accessible for hard to reach populations

• Balance the needs of participating families with the clinical constraints

• Collect high quality, complete data
Stakeholder Experience of Engagement

• Safe place

• Unexpected benefits
  – Conversations with teenage son before/after
  – Networking with others/friendships
  – Feel part of something
Engagement Resources

Toolkits:

• Sustaining Engagement of Blended Stakeholder Boards
  https://www.hipxchange.org/SustainingEngagement

• Hard-to-Reach Patient Stakeholders: An Engagement Guide (HARPS)
  https://www.hipxchange.org/HARPS

• Toolkit on Patient Partner Engagement in Research (TOPPER)
  http://www.hipxchange.org/TOPPER

Other Resources:

• Patient-centred outcomes research: brave new world meets old institutional policies. Chung JS, Young HN, Moreno MA, Kliems H, Cox ED. Fam Pract. 2017 Jun 1;34(3):296-300. PMID: 28122843

• PCORI 1st Annual Meeting Plenary Panel Highlights videos
  https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL2i6nTuOk4qAS6kHCB8546Yw8PNXrg-ka

Upcoming Event!

• June 2018 – Stakeholder Engagement in Clinical Trials Short Course
  2017 Course Information: http://conferences.union.wisc.edu/translational/
Discussion

• Which aspects of today’s webinar are most meaningful to you?

• What else would you like to learn?
  ○ Effects of engagement on partners

• How does today’s webinar resonate with your own work?

• How do these strategies and resources to prevent and overcome engagement-related challenges add to the growing body of promising practices?
Resources

**The PCORI Engagement Rubric: Promising Practices for Partnering in Research.**
Sheridan S¹, Schrandt S¹,², Forsythe L, Hilliard TS³, Paez KA³; Advisory Panel on Patient Engagement (2013 inaugural panel).

**Conceptual and practical foundations of patient engagement in research at the patient-centered outcomes research institute.**
Frank L¹, Forsythe L, Ellis L, Schrandt S, Sheridan S, Gerson J, Konopka K, Daugherty S.

**Methods and impact of engagement in research, from theory to practice and back again: early findings from the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute.**
Forsythe L¹, Heckert A¹, Margolis MK¹, Schrandt S², Frank L³.

PCORI Engagement Rubric

Info Sheet on Patient and Stakeholder Partner Roles
Previous **PCORI in Practice** webinars

- **Patient and Stakeholder Engagement in Research: Making a Difference in PCORI Projects**
  - webinar information
  - archived webinar

- **Patient and Stakeholder Engagement in Research: Strategies for Initiating Research Partnerships**
  - webinar information
  - archived webinar

- **Community Engagement in Research: Practical Tips for Researchers and Community-based Organizations**
  - webinar information
  - archived webinar

See other resources for the [Webinar Series on How PCORI Is Advancing Patient-Centered Outcomes Research](#)
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Following this event, the slides, a recording, and additional materials for this webinar will be posted to https://www.pcori.org/events/2017/patient-and-stakeholder-engagement-research-engagement-challenges-strategies-and
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