Funder Evaluation and Selection Criteria: accounting for the variety of outcomes engagement can generate
Our Sessions Common Prompts

- How can academic frameworks of research quality assessment be balanced with community knowledge frameworks of ‘quality & impacts’?

- How do multiple stakeholders in engaged research get involved in framing and assessing research quality?

- How is quality defined across different parts of the evidence to action journey (i.e., evidence generation, evidence translation, and evidence-use)?
Funders’ assessment of co-production

• Frameworks and criteria for effective assessment need to be different

• Ethical considerations

• Nature & strength of partnership

• Review panel leads and members need to be carefully chosen and supported
  - Include experts in participatory approaches
  - Trained in knowledge translation approaches (e.g., co-production)
  - Inclusion of knowledge user experts / those with lived experience of the issue

The importance of research team composition

Implementation Science Teams: Specific requirements for applicant research team composition

- Researcher and research user Co-Leads

- Appropriate composition of researchers and research users in fields relevant to the proposed research with demonstrated sufficient collective experience in IS

- Links to relevant decision-makers (e.g., health care professionals, educators, managers, policy makers, patient groups)

- Some or all members had to be actively engaged in activities linked to implementation processes within relevant settings
Specific requirements for applicant research team composition:

- **At least two team** members must be **research users** including the project co-lead.

- **At least one trainee**, with a clear plan for building that trainee’s expertise in IS through participation in the team.

- **An executive sponsor** – i.e., a research user who is a senior decision maker (executive director or higher) within the BC health system.
  
  - The executive sponsor was required to describe their commitment to the study and to IS more generally, and to their capacity to implement the intervention/program with their health authority.
Integrated Knowledge Translation Guiding Principles

1. Partners develop & maintain relationships based on trust, respect, dignity, and transparency.

2. Partners share in decision-making.

3. Partners foster open, honest, and responsive communication.

4. Partners recognize, value, and share their diverse expertise and knowledge.

5. Partners are flexible and receptive in tailoring the research approach to match the aims and context of the project.

6. Partners can meaningfully benefit by participating in the partnership.

7. Partners address ethical considerations.

8. Partners respect the practical considerations and financial constraints of all partners.

Research Quality Plus for Co-Production

RQ+ 4 Co-Pro is an approach to defining and evaluating the quality of co-production. It allows tailoring to context, values, and purpose. It can support planning, management and learning across the lifecycle of a co-production project, program or organization.

The RQ+ 4 Co-Pro Framework

1. Contextual Factors
   1. Knowledge Use Environment
   2. Research Environment
   3. Capacities for Co-Production

2. Quality Dimensions & Sub-Dimensions
   1. Rigour
      1.1 Design
      1.2 Methodological Integrity
   2. Legitimacy
      2.1 Inclusion of Local Knowledge & Ways of Knowing
      2.2 Trust, Power & Mutually Beneficial Partnerships
      2.3 Intersectionality
      2.4 Attention to Potential Negative Consequences
   3. Positioning for Use
      3.1 Relevance
      3.2 Openness & Actionability

3. Empirical & Systematic Appraisal
   Characterization of each contextual factor, dimension and sub-dimension is done using tailored rubrics. These rubrics combine quantitative and qualitative measures and draw on empirical evidence.

Quality ratings are made on an 8-point scale showing four levels of performance (or progress), and contextual factors are placed on a 4-point rubric indicating a categorical assessment. This is just one example. Scales should be designed to fit a purpose.
Some of our challenges...

• Assessment of quality co-production looks different depending on context

• Research partnership assessment training for review panel members
  ▪ Negative impacts of assessment training…
    o Additional burden on researchers, research partners, funders’ staff
    o Potential barrier to panel member recruitment
  ▪ What’s the sweet spot?
Thank you!