



# PCORI Evaluation Group

Ninth Meeting  
October 15, 2014

Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute

# Agenda for Today

- 🌱 Looking back and status updates
- 🌱 Communicating about PCORI evaluation work
- 🌱 Lessons learned for evaluation: Provonost, 2014
- 🌱 Key Take-Home points

**Dec 2013 In-person Kick-off:**

- Brainstorming and prioritizing evaluation questions
- Metrics for strategic goals

**Jan 2014:**

- Measuring engagement and its impact in PCORI projects

**Feb 2014:**

- Metrics for strategic goals
- Evaluation Framework and prioritization of evaluation questions

**March 2014:**

- Measuring engagement and its impact in PCORI projects
- CER Surveys: researchers, patients, & clinicians

**April 2014:**

- Measuring goal #1: *useful* information

**May 2014:**

- Overview of current data collection plans
- CER survey: Researchers

**June 2014:**

- PCORI Dashboard: metrics & visuals

**July 2014:**

- Need for an external evaluation for overall impact of PCORI?
- Methods for evaluating merit review

**HISTORY OF THE  
PCORI EVALUATION  
GROUP**



# Status update: PCORI Evaluation Framework

- Evaluation questions, metrics, and data sources outlined and prioritized to guide evaluation projects
  - Impact evaluation work underway for 5 of 7 sections of the framework
    - *What is the impact of PCORI's approach to Topic Generation and Research Prioritization?* → to be discussed at November PEG meeting
    - *What is the Impact of PCORI's Approach to Communication, Dissemination, and Implementation of information from funded research?* → to discuss after release of PCORI's D&I framework (Dec 2014)

# Status update: Measuring Progress on PCORI Strategic Goals

- 🌐 Goal 1: Useful information
  - Applying usefulness criteria to the CER portfolio
- 🌐 Goal 2: Uptake of information
  - Tracking early indicators of dissemination
- 🌐 Goal 3: Influence research
  - Building repository of examples of PCORI's influence
- 🌐 Future activities:
  - Track additional metrics as study findings are available and implemented

# Status Update: PCORI Dashboard

- Used for quarterly reporting to PCORI Board of Governors
  - Improvements in data to populate the dashboard and the visual presentation
- Future activities:
  - Update dashboard as more advanced metrics of PCORI strategic goals are available
  - To development dashboards for each department in alignment with the organizational dashboard

# Status Update: CER Surveys

| Survey Sample | Status  |
|---------------|---|
| Patients      | Data collection complete  |
| Clinicians    | Data collection in progress (expected completion: Nov 2014)                     |
| Researchers   | Data collection in progress (expected completion: Oct 2014)                     |
| Caregivers    | Working group assembled, draft survey developed (expected completion: Dec 2014) |

## Future activities:

- Public webinar(s) and blogs
- Scientific manuscripts and presentations
- Follow-up surveys (track changes over time)

# Status Update: Measuring Engagement in PCORI Projects

- Ways of Engaging- ENgagement ACtivity Tool (WE-ENACT)
  - Baseline and annual reports from researchers and patient and stakeholder partners
- Data collection underway
  - 1<sup>st</sup> year report: 39 researchers & 22 patients and stakeholders completed
  - Baseline: Winter 2014 projects starting now
- Future activities:
  - Ongoing data collection from all projects
  - Learning webinars for awardees (2 times/year)
  - Public webinar(s) and blogs
  - Scientific manuscripts and presentations



# Status Update: Evaluating PCORI Merit Review

- Applicant and reviewer surveys conducted after each review cycle
  - Analysis of trends across all review cycles complete
- Reviewer group interviews at least 2 cycles/year
- Analysis of merit review scores ongoing
- Future activities:
  - Public webinar planned for Dec 2014
  - Scientific manuscript(s) from surveys, group interviews and score analyses
  - Analysis of reviewer critiques

# Communicating PCORI Evaluation Work

- We want to communicate our evaluation framework and the breadth of our evaluation projects
  - To diverse audiences
  - Quickly
  - Simply

# PCORI Evaluation Activities



PCORI Evaluation Activities are guided by several groups representing diverse healthcare stakeholders:



**Board of Governors (BOG)**



**PCORI Advisory Panel on Patient Engagement (PEAP)**



**Methodology Committee (MC)**



**PCORI Evaluation Group\*** includes representatives from the BOG, PEAP, MC and external experts

PCORI has three strategic goals. Here is how we track our progress to achieve them:



We created criteria to assess the potential usefulness of information from PCORI-funded studies.

The Science Oversight Committee (SOC) of the BOG focuses on this goal.



We will track dissemination of study results, uptake of PCORI results in health decision making, and changes in clinical practice.

The Engagement, Dissemination and Implementation Committee (EDIC) of the BOG focuses on this goal.



We track how researchers and other research funders adopt PCORI's approach to patient-centered CER.

The Research Transformation Committee (RTC) of the BOG focuses on this goal.

The PCORI Evaluation Framework organizes our questions about PCORI's approach to CER and how we will answer these questions. *These questions and our approach to answering them are continually refined because even as we begin to answer the initial questions, new ones arise.*

## What is the overall impact of PCORI and our research portfolio?



We are assessing the potential usefulness of information from PCORI-funded studies to the end users of the information.



# Questions about the Evaluation One-Pager

- What works well in this document?
- What can we improve?
- What other opportunities should we leverage in order to increase awareness of PCORI's evaluation work among the Board, Patient Engagement Advisory Panel, and external stakeholders?

# Pronovost & Jha, 2014<sup>1</sup>

## Did Hospital Engagement Networks Actually Improve Care?

Peter Pronovost, M.D., Ph.D., and Ashish K. Jha, M.D., M.P.H.

- The CMS Partnership for Patients Program (PPP) was a collaborative of 26 HENs (hospital engagement networks), with each HEN representing more than 3,700 hospitals
- The PPP was intended to be a learning collaborative, enabling the identification and dissemination of effective quality-improvement and patient safety initiatives, to achieve the goal of reducing the rates of 10 types of harms and readmissions

# Discussion: Pronovost & Jha, 2014<sup>1</sup>

- CMS reported positive results of its PPP evaluation:  
“the rates of early elective deliveries had dropped 48% among 681 hospitals in 20 HENs and that the national rate of all-cause readmissions had decreased from 19% to 17.8%”
- Pronovost & Jha disagree:  
“Three problems with the agency’s evaluation and reporting of results raise concerns about the validity of its inferences: a weak design, a lack of valid metrics, and a lack of external peer review for its evaluation.”

# Discussion: Weak study design

- The problem: Pre–post design with single points in the pre and post periods not specified a priori; no concurrent controls
- Challenges for PCORI:
  - Identification of “pre” time point and data sources
  - Limited access to controls
  - Observational designs for most evaluation projects
- Solutions:
  - Examination of within PCORI variability
  - Triangulation of multiple data sources- including both qualitative and quantitative
  - Others?

# Discussion: Lack of valid metrics

- 🌐 The problem: Did not use standardized and validated clinical performance measures
- 🌐 Challenges for PCORI: There are no validated measures for patient and stakeholder engagement in research, for the incorporation of the patient and stakeholder perspective in merit review, etc.
- 🌐 Solutions:
  - Plan for psychometric evaluation of PCORI developed measures
  - Others?



# Discussion: Lack of external peer review

- The problem: CMS publically presented inferences about its evaluation without independent evaluation or peer review
- Challenge for PCORI: We want to disseminate findings to the public rapidly through multiple channels
- What level of external review is necessary before public presentations of PCORI evaluation data? By whom and how much? For which methods of dissemination (e.g., public webinar, white paper, scientific manuscript)?

# Questions about Provonost & Jha, 2014

- In what ways do the critiques in this article apply to PCORI's evaluation work?
- Recommendations for other recent resources to guide PCORI evaluation work broadly?

# Key Take Home Points

- PCORI has a number of evaluation projects well underway- many findings will be shared this winter internally, to the scientific community, and the public
- PCORI's evaluation framework guides its evaluation work. A lay friendly summary of this work has been developed
- PCORI is consulting the literature to guide its evaluation work (e.g., Provonost & Jha, 2014)
- Others?

# Reference

1. Peter Pronovost and Ashish K. Jha. Did Hospital Engagement Networks Actually Improve Care? NEJM Perspective, August 21, 2014. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp140580

# Appendix

---

# Goal #1: Usefulness Criteria

## User-Driven

- The **end-users** (patients, clinicians, payers, organizations, health systems etc.) of the information have been identified (e.g., in the literature, through engagement with partners).
- The end-users (patients, clinicians, payers, organizations, health systems etc.) have **identified this information would fill a critical gap** (e.g., end-users generated the research questions).
- The end-users have **committed to using the information** (e.g., systems administrators/clinicians/etc. have committed to implement the intervention)

## User-Focused

- The research **assesses options** that are relevant for the end users of the information.
  - The end-users were involved in choosing or developing the options.
- The research **assesses the outcome(s)** that will comprehensively address the needs of the end-users.

## Real-World Users

- Results can provide a **clinically** (in addition to statistically) **significant answer**. The study would provide a clear answer, rather than calling for further research.
- Results can inform decisions of end-user(s) with **specific characteristics, conditions, and preferences**.
- Results can be **scaled/spread** beyond the traditional study setting for a wider net impact.

# Goal #2: Uptake

## Dissemination

*(Measure for all PCORI funded studies)*

- Results reported back to study participants
- Access to PCORI study report
- Presentations:
  - Scientific/professional audiences
  - Lay audiences
- Bibliometrics:
  - # of Publications
  - Time to publication
  - Impact factor
  - Citations
- Alternative metrics for key groups (patients, clinicians, payers, etc.):
  - # manuscript downloads
  - # manuscript bookmarks
  - Media coverage
  - Social media coverage

## Uptake and Use

*(Measure for a subset of PCORI funded studies)*

- Adoption of study findings in the study setting
- Incorporation into:
  - Systematic reviews
  - Patient and consumer education materials
  - Graduate Medical Education (GME) or Continuing Medical Education (CME)
  - Practice guidelines
  - Decision making infrastructure (e.g. electronic decision aids, clinical reference tools)
  - Payer policies
  - Institutional, local, state, and national policy

## Impact: Changes in Health Decisions or Care and Outcomes

*(Measure for small set of exemplar studies)*

- Improvement in health decisions or health care quality and improved health outcomes in relevant populations

*Note: Most of these metrics are typically not measurable until after study completion, and in many cases, are typically not measurable until several years after study completion.*

# Goal #3: Influence

- We are now or soon will be measuring:
  - Endorsement, Promotion, and Dissemination of PCORI work
  - Use of PCORI Methodology Standards for Patient-Centeredness
  - Use of PCORI approaches:
    - Topic Generation and Research Prioritization
    - Merit Review
    - Engagement
    - Communication and Dissemination
  - Use of PCORI guidance re: Patient-Centered CER
  - Use of PCORI-supported curricula or training
  - Collaborations/Co-funding with other funders
- We will have to wait a few more years to measure:
  - Use of PCOR Methods evidence
  - Use and support of PCORnet



# Evaluation Framework

