Pathways to Research Impact
SVRI 2022 Forum
Workshop
19 September 2022

Diana Arango (WBG) and Angelica Pino (SVRI)
AGENDA

• Brief introduction
• Module 1: Leading and influencing change
• Module 2: The evidence ecosystem and your research impact
• Break
• Module 3: Stakeholder engagement and partnerships
• Module 4: Monitoring and evaluating your change efforts
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Research uptake

The process of people becoming aware of and interested in your research.
Research use

What people do with your research.
Research impact

What difference your research makes.
Taking a ‘systems approach’

A perspective that:

• zooms out to see the whole picture, not just a single element

• looks at connections between the various components

• Facilitates, and relies on, the active engagement of those who have an interest or stake in outcome

Two ways to influence for change

• Researcher role includes facilitating and leading change through your research. How?
  • Transactional influence
    • Leveraging formal authority
    • Getting results by making exchanges with other people or organisations
    • Can be effective in the short term or in times of crisis
    • Most effective in hierarchical systems or organizational structures
  
• Transformational influence
  • Leveraging trust and personal relationships
  • Using inspiration, encouragement and support to motivate change in the way others think or act
  • More effective for achieving sustained change
  • Most effective contexts where collaboration is valued and hierarchy is less important

What is your goal?

Research uptake
To build awareness of, and interest in, your VAW and/or VAC research
• Collation
• Synthesis
• Dissemination

Research use
To facilitate others to use your research in policies or practices for addressing and preventing VAW and/or VAW
• Relationships
• Brokerage
• Training

Research impact
To make a difference to those affected by VAW and/or VAC by facilitating real and lasting change through your research
• Advocacy
• Co-creation and deep collaboration
• Strategies and support for sustainment
• Scale-up and spread
Research impact in policy: What can success look like?

Evidence-informed decision-making leading to:

• development and implementation of policy that is consistent with the available evidence
• funding for, and high-quality implementation of, research-supported programs & approaches that are acceptable and appropriate
• de-implementation of ineffective and inappropriate programs and approaches
• citizens have access to programs and approaches that meet their needs

...resulting in better outcomes for citizens
Guidance for researchers seeking to create policy impact

• Do high quality research
• Make your research relevant and readable
• Understand policy processes
• Be accessible to policymakers by engaging routinely, flexibly and humbly

• Decide if you will be an issue advocate or knowledge broker
• Build relationships and ground rules with policymakers
• Be entrepreneurial, or partner with someone who is
• Reflect continuously on whether you should engage, whether you want to, and whether your engagement is working
Considerations for the VAW & VAC policy context in LMICs

• Power over knowledge
• National or global reputational risks
• Policy advances often linked with broader social movements (e.g. democratisation, social inclusion)
• Policy development process can lack transparency and order
• Mistrust and suspicion of evidence (particularly, and understandably, when it is emerging from, or funded by, high income countries)
Impact in practice settings

Any setting that offers and delivers programs or services directly to people who are affected by or at risk of violence against women and/or violence against children.
The evidence-practice gap remains
What is the researcher’s role?

The researcher has an opportunity to play a role in:

• The ‘WHAT’ - Enhancing the ‘implementability’ of programs and interventions:
  • Develop or test practices that are implementable
  • Employ user-centered designs: co-design/co-creation

• The ‘HOW’ – Supporting the uptake, embedding and scale-up of the evidence of evidence-informed practices in a specific setting:
  • Support practice implementation by: providing training in a new practice or process
  • Providing post-training support
  • Building the capacity of leaders in the service organisation
Time to Practice:

Complete Section 1 of the Planning Tool
The evidence ecosystem and your research impact

Research evidence uptake, use and impact from a systems perspective
Unpacking the evidence ecosystem

DEFINITION:
A system reflecting the formal and informal linkages and interactions between different actors (and their capacities and resources) involved in the production, translation, and use of evidence. (Stewart et al. 2019)
Decision-making is also complex

- Multiple factors play a role in decision-making.
- Research evidence is just one factor.
- Our research findings are one piece of that body of research evidence that decision-makers need.
The role of research evidence

• Decisions are not one-off acts.
• Decisions are part of a cycle of change, review, and further decisions.
• Research evidence has a role to play in every step of the decision-making cycle.
A visualisation of the evidence ecosystem

Research-supported service delivery system
(e.g., private or public service agencies, NGOs)

Research use support system
(e.g., intermediary organisations, embedded researchers)

Research synthesis and translation system
(e.g., Campbell Collaboration, What Works Centres, universities)

Research production system
(e.g., universities, NGOs, government bodies)

Wandersman et al., 2008; Sharples et al., 2013
Push Approach of Research Knowledge Transfer

Researcher driven perspective

Critique’s of the ‘push’ approach include:

• research agenda-setting activities
• stakeholder involvement
• communication and dissemination strategies (journals, mainstream media and social media)
Pull Approaches of Research Knowledge Transfer

Decision-maker perspective

• Advocating for the use of evidence in decision/policy making
• Commissioning Research
• Science advisors
• What works centres
• Public consultation/citizen engagement
Bridging the divide between ‘push’ and ‘pull’

- **Knowledge transfer**: researchers understand better realities and priorities of decision makers; decision makers understand better research and findings
- **Knowledge translation**: research evidence ‘translated’ for decision makers
- **Implementation science**
- **Co-creation/co-production**: different stakeholders working together to find answers
Integrated Knowledge Translation (IKT)

Goal: to engage potential knowledge-users as *partners* in the research process
VAW/VAC: A cross service sector

Professional networks

Law enforcement
Women, children, families
Criminal justice
Victim/survivors services
Criminal justice
An example: Interacting with research in Washington State

- How do individuals in the system addressing intimate partner violence define research, and acquire research?

- What are the processes through which research information flows through and across participating service sectors in this system?

Key informant interviews with
- Criminal justice (attorneys, public defenders, judges, n=17)
- Court- or community-based advocates (n=10)
- Law enforcement representatives (n=9)

Source: Lindhorst et al., 2022
Defining research

• Research = information gathering process
• Research = specific technique for looking at legal precedent
• Research = data already existing specific to the organisation or region
• Research = social science enterprise to produce statistics or proof that VAW/VAC is an issue

Source: Lindhorst et al., 2022
Acquiring research

“Nearly all sources identified by participants were other organizations in their local or statewide professional networks, or national agencies or governmental entities whose mission touches on IPV* in some way.”

*IPV=Intimate Partner Violence  
Source: Lindhorst et al., 2022
Figure 2. Flow of research through domestic violence (DV) serving organizations.
Mapping out the evidence ecosystem in which you work

Potential for your research evidence to make a difference.

Key role players and where you fit.

Efforts to increase the use of research evidence.
Time to Practice: Mapping out the evidence ecosystem in which you work.
Core Module 3
Stakeholder engagement and partnerships

3.1 Stakeholder Engagement – An Introduction
### Key stakeholders – Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Frontline Services</th>
<th>End-users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Funders</td>
<td>• Agencies</td>
<td>• Administrators</td>
<td>• Community workers</td>
<td>• Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legislators</td>
<td>• Coalitions</td>
<td>• Evaluators</td>
<td>• Educators</td>
<td>• Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Politicians</td>
<td>• Firms</td>
<td>• Finance departments</td>
<td>• Healthcare professionals</td>
<td>• Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policy developers</td>
<td>• Interest groups</td>
<td>• HR departments</td>
<td>• Pedagogues</td>
<td>• Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policy advocates</td>
<td>• Media</td>
<td>• Middle management</td>
<td>• Police</td>
<td>• Patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NGOs</td>
<td>• Research staff</td>
<td>• Psychologists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opinion leaders</td>
<td>• Specialists</td>
<td>• Social workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Social networks</td>
<td>• Senior leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implicit Assumption

If stakeholders are engaged in these phases ....

... then this will be easier to achieve ....

Identify/ contextualise challenges

Develop a research project

Plan the project

Implement the project, monitor and problem solve

Analyse, report and present findings

Disseminate and promote uptake of findings
Core Module 3
Stakeholder engagement and partnerships

3.2 Engaging stakeholders for research uptake – Challenges and strategies
What strategies are used in research-policy engagement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of strategy</th>
<th>Strategy specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Linear           | 1. Dissemination & communication  
2. Responding to formal evidence requests  
3. Facilitating access to evidence |
| Relational       | 1. Building policymaker skills  
2. Building researcher skills  
3. Building professional partnerships |
| Systems focused  | 1. Fostering leadership  
2. Rewarding and incentivizing impact and engagement  
3. Creating and embedding infrastructure |

Figure 1. What practices do research-policy engagement approaches use? Source: author image adapted from Best and Holmes (2010).

Source: Hopkins et al., 2021
## What hinders, what promotes evidence use in policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 5 barriers to evidence use in policy</th>
<th>Top 5 facilitators to evidence use in policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Availability of/ access to research – improved dissemination (n=63)</td>
<td>1. Availability of/ access to research – improved dissemination (n=65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clarity/ relevance/ reliability of research findings (n=54)</td>
<td>2. Collaboration (n=49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Timing/ opportunity (n=42)</td>
<td>3. Clarity/ relevance/ reliability of research findings (n=46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Policymaker research skills (n=26)</td>
<td>4. Relationship with policymakers (n=39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Costs (n=25)</td>
<td>5. Relationship with researchers/info staff (n=37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oliver et al., 2014
## Engagement with stakeholders – Strategies to change behaviour and increase Research Uptake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness</strong></td>
<td>Build awareness for, and positive attitudes toward Research Uptake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreement</strong></td>
<td>Build mutual understanding and agreement on policy-relevant questions and the research findings needed to answer them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication &amp; access</strong></td>
<td>Communicate and provide access to research findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interact</strong></td>
<td>Interact with decision-makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills</strong></td>
<td>Support decision-makers to develop skills in accessing and making sense of research findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure &amp; Process</strong></td>
<td>Influence the structures and processes involved in decision-making to enable better use of research findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Michie et al, 2011; Langer et al., 2016
Stakeholder engagement strategies to trigger mechanisms – practice focus

• Co-Production/ “User-centred design” of interventions, their implementation and evaluation
• Communication
• Training, professional development
• Audit & Feedback
• Use learning collaboratives
• Promoting and supporting champions, opinion leaders, formal leaders
• Form and support implementation teams, advisory boards, steering committees
• Facilitate networking
• Enable site-based knowledge exchange

Sources: Powell et al, 2015;
Stakeholder engagement strategies to trigger mechanisms – policy focus

- Conduct high-quality research – robust, timely, policy relevant, easy to understand
- Define your own role: Do you want to be an honest knowledge broker or an issue advocate?
- Communicate well – provide clear summaries of syntheses of knowledge and solutions, provide good “stories”, use a range of outputs (policy briefs, social media, blogs, podcasts, video)
- Understand the policy process, how it works and its inherently political nature
- Be accessible to policymakers – engage routinely, and flexibly,
- Build and maintain lasting relationships, make professional friends that enable you to be involved early in policy processes
- Collaborate with a knowledge broker if “selling the sizzle” is not your thing
- Reflect continuously: Should you engage, do you want to, and is it working?

Sources: Oliver & Carney, 2016
3.3 From stakeholder engagement to partnerships

Core Module 3
Stakeholder engagement and partnerships
Integrated Knowledge Translation (IKT)

- A model of research co-production, whereby researchers partner with knowledge users throughout the research process and who can use the research recommendations in practice or policy. IKT approaches are used to improve the relevance and impact of research.

- Knowledge users:
  - Policy makers,
  - Decision makers,
  - Research funders,
  - Industry,
  - Practitioners,
  - The public
  - Other investigators from different disciplines, teams or countries

Sources: Boland et al., 2020; Graham & Tetroe, 2009
Integrated Knowledge Transfer – For what, and how?

• IKT involves collaboration between researchers and research users in the research process, including
  • the shaping of the research questions,
  • deciding the methodology,
  • involvement in the data collection and tools development,
  • interpreting the findings and
  • helping to disseminate the research results.

• More practice/ policy relevant research questions
• Usable findings that relate to a pre-defined knowledge-practice gap
• More relevant implementation strategies supporting the uptake of research findings
• Deepened understanding of each other’s worlds = enhanced social and relational capital for future IKT work

Source: Kothari & Wathen, 2013
## What does it take? The Integrated Knowledge Transfer Capacity Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Conditions conducive to IKT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (O) Culture or philosophy of IKT             | • The organizational culture is seen to promote and foster IKT  
• IKT is recognized by the organization at the highest levels in its goals, strategic plans, performance measures, and operational budget, and advocated by senior leadership  
• The organization actively promotes collaboration across departments or units |
| (O) Dedicated resources to support IKT       | Dedicated resources are allocated for IKT including leaders, coordinators, space, forums and information systems                                                                                                           |
| (O) IKT linked to organizational priorities  | IKT resources and activities are linked with organizational goals                                                                                                                                                    |
| (P) Identifying collaborators and initiating IKT | • Staff members are aware of individuals for the purpose of collaboration, and how to identify them  
• A directory is in place by which to identify researchers or research users for the purpose of collaboration  
• Staff members are empowered to take the responsibility for initiating collaboration |
| (P) Linkages are facilitated by brokers or embedded positions | • Intermediaries or facilitators are in place specifically to support IKT  
• Researchers are embedded in departments or units  
• Researchers and research users are familiar with each other’s HSPR needs and values |
| (P) Critical volume of researchers           | Expertise is in place or available, incl. scientists with knowledge and skill in various disciplines and research methods                                                                                                    |
| (P) Forums offer opportunities for interaction | • A variety of in-person and technology-enabled forums support interaction that may give rise to, or enables IKT  
• Researchers and research users initiate, lead and participate in IKT forums |
| (I) IKT skill or knowledge                   | • Staff are familiar with the concept of, and approaches for IKT  
• Education and training are in place or available to develop value and skills for IKT among staff of all levels |
| (I) Time IKT                                 | Time for IKT is accommodated or scheduled                                                                                                                                            |
| (I) IKT is incentivised and recognised       | • Staff members are accountable for IKT activities  
• Time spent on, and the outcome or impact of IKT activities are recognized in performance reviews |
Addressing power differentials in community stakeholder engagement

**REFLECTION IS IMPORTANT**

1. **Where is the decision-making power?**
   Think about the existence and distribution of formal authority, resources, interests, conflicts, structures and processes among your stakeholders—how will you need to weigh and navigate these?

2. **Where is there a lack of decision-making power?**
   Think about ideas and stakeholders that may have been excluded or neglected in relation to your research (uptake) work—how can they be better engaged and involved?

3. **What are potential blind spots?**
   Remember that you may not be aware of power differentials reproduced in your research (uptake) work. Use “critical friends” (e.g., team members, colleagues, research partners) to identify these.

Balanced stakeholder collaboration in IKT

- Skilled facilitation/deliberation
- Information support (equal access to research findings, training, resources)
- Strength in numbers – add stakeholders/partners
- Informal social interaction with all
Integrated Knowledge Transfer Framework Adapted to DV

- Culture or philosophy of IKT
- Dedicated resources to support IKT
- IKT linked to organisational priorities
- Dedicated leadership within an authorising environment

- Identifying collaborators and initiating IKT
- Linkages are facilitated by brokers or embedded positions
- Critical volume of researchers
- Forums offer opportunities for interaction
- Partnerships and collaboration through capacity building particularly with survivors

- IKT skill or knowledge
- Time for IKT
- IKT is incentivised and recognised
- Multiple strategies using different kinds of evidence for diverse purposes and emerging populations

Integrated Knowledge Translation Capacity Framework (Gaigliardi and Dobrow 2016)
Time to reflect and practice:

• Who are your stakeholders?
• How do you want to engage your stakeholder
• What IKT capacities exist in your research environment and which you could build on in your work with knowledge translation?
• How could you contribute to building further IKT capacities in your research environment?

Future reading “Let’s avoid reinventing the wheel” co-authored by Jacqui Cameron, Cathy Humphreys, Anita Kothari and Kelsey Hegarty
4.1 So what? The importance of monitoring and evaluating your change efforts
It’s not common...

• Researchers lack the time and resourcing to take the ‘next step’ with their research evidence
• Strategies for enhancing research uptake, use and impact are not consistently defined or used
• The goal posts move as priorities evolve

...but it’s important

• Our research uptake, use and impact strategies should be subject to evaluation so we can:
  • Learn what works
  • Do more of what works
  • Stop doing what doesn’t work
Gagliardi & colleagues planned a systematic review to synthesise studies that empirically evaluated ‘integrated knowledge translation’ strategies.

- Any strategy intended to build and maintain an ongoing relationship between researchers and stakeholders so that they can do mutually beneficial projects.

- Not enough published articles to conduct a systematic review.

- Scoping review with 13 studies.

- Unable to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of strategies.
  - Small number of eligible studies.
  - Limited detail in the published articles about what strategies were used and how.
  - Mixed findings.

- “the strategies that achieve beneficial outcomes remain unknown”

Planning for monitoring and evaluation

Planning for research impact

- The plan shows what needs to be monitored
- Monitoring informs improvements to your plans
- Monitoring data used in evaluation
- Evaluation highlights areas needing close(er) monitoring
- Monitoring progress towards achieving impact
- Evaluation highlights areas needing close(er) monitoring
- Planning for research impact

Evaluating your efforts to enhance research impact

Findings inform future planning

Using a Program Logic as a Planning Tool

- Inputs
- Activities
- Outputs
- Outcomes
- Impact
Your opportunity to create ‘good enough’ evidence

- Qualitative enquiry and case study methodology are often de-valued, but can be a good fit
- Consider pragmatic, cost-effective ways to gather evidence

For Inspiration

- Recently developed methodological framework
- ‘Good enough’ → ‘Gold standard’
“With sufficient time and resources, there are now evaluation methods that can be used to monitor and assess almost any impact arising from research.

Knowing what delivers impact (and what does not) can help researchers and research evaluators anticipate challenges and avoid using methods that are unlikely to work or that might lead to unintended negative consequences.”

Core Module 4
Monitoring and Evaluating your Change Efforts

4.2 Evaluating stakeholder engagement
Are research-policy engagement activities evaluated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy type</th>
<th>Strategy specification</th>
<th>N activities</th>
<th>% activities evaluated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Dissemination &amp; communication</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal evidence requests</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitating access to evidence</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>Building policymaker skills</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building researcher skills</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building professional partnerships</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems focused</td>
<td>Strategic leadership</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rewarding impact</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating and embedding infrastructure</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oliver et al., 2022
# Key engagement design flaws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key flaw</th>
<th>Guiding questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unclear aims</td>
<td>• What exactly is the overarching purpose of engaging stakeholders and/or building partnerships as part of your project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Unclear outcomes                   | • Based on your purposes, which outcomes do you want to achieve through the engagement of stakeholders and the building of partnerships?  
  • How can you measure these outcomes?  
  • Are your strategies the appropriate choice for your desired outcomes? |
| 3. Lack of theory use                 | • Are their theories that can help you to better understand and describe what stakeholder engagement/partnership building approach you should use in your project? |
| 4. Insufficient acknowledgement of context | • What is the context in which your stakeholders operate – what are its key characteristics?  
  • What does this mean for how you might best engage stakeholders and build partnerships? |
What to measure when assessing the influence of community stakeholder engagement on research uptake?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do research outputs emphasise insights and findings most relevant to the community?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How community-oriented and -driven is the dissemination of research findings?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are dissemination activities targeting community?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do community partners attend events, present at conferences and in other ways serve as champions for the research?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are there other clear “community footprints” in the dissemination work (e.g., are community partners co-authors on papers, lead- or co-presenters in meetings)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the uptake of research findings been accelerated because stakeholders engaged in the project actively promoted this uptake during the project or after it was finalized?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can we observe any changes in local priorities, policies or in use of local resources to which the research has contributed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can we observe any changes in local practices (including, e.g., their quality, accessibility, costs etc.) to which the research has contributed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Esmail et al., 2015
Core Module 4
Monitoring and Evaluating your Change Efforts

4.3 Outcomes and measurement for research uptake, use and impact
What does ‘success’ look like?
**Success in research uptake**

Goal: To improve awareness of and interest in the evidence about what works to improve secondary school attendance for girls in the Pacific Islands amongst NGO program staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible outcomes of interest</th>
<th>Possible indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Accessibility of the research evidence                            | • No. of proportion of journal articles published open-access  
• No. of online, non-technical research outputs (e.g. blog post, social media post)  
• No. of presentations to NGOs  
• Whether research outputs utilise key words that are picked up by search engines (e.g. first 5 pages of Google search) |
| Relevance & usability of the research evidence                    | • Stakeholder feedback shows satisfaction with the research that was available                                                                   |
| Appetite for research evidence                                    | • Number of journal article downloads  
• Website hits  
• Blog/social media comments  
• Event/presentation attendance rates  
• No. contacts initiated by NGOs |
## Success in research use

**Goal:** For NGO staff to use the available evidence to shape the design of secondary school attendance programs, improving alignment with the evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible outcomes of interest</th>
<th>Possible indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Instrumental use:** research evidence directly influences decisions | • Citation of research in NGO program documents  
• Evidence-based intervention strategies described and operationalised in manuals and training  
• De-investment in programs that do not align with the evidence |
| **Conceptual use:** research evidence provides new ideas or perspectives | • Changes in knowledge, attitudes and beliefs about an issue and/or how to address is |
| **Tactical use:** research evidence used to justify a position or lobby for changes | • Citation or summary of research in NGO funding submissions  
• Mention of research findings in speeches to stakeholders, funders  
• Number of advocacy actions/events that promote change in line with research findings |
| **Imposed use:** research evidence is required to meet standards / criteria | • Use of research evidence is mentioned as a requirement in funding guidelines  
• Evidence-based practice change is mandated by an organisation |
**Success in research impact**

Goal: Girls in the Pacific Islands have improved educational attainment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible outcomes of interest</th>
<th>Possible indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reduced barriers to secondary school attendance | • Improved availability of safe transport  
• Changes in familial knowledge, attitudes and behaviours towards school attendance  
• Improved satisfaction and enjoyment amongst girls |
| Improved school attendance | • Change over time in no. and % of girls in program who attend school each day, week, month  
• Change of time in no. and % of girls in program to have 90% attendance rate each month |
| Improved school completion | • Change over time in no. and % of girls in program who achieve a high school diploma |
Success in research impact...another example

**Goal:** NGOs have improved cultures of evidence use for program design and delivery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible outcomes of interest</th>
<th>Possible indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened capacity for evidence use</td>
<td>• Improved understanding and confidence amongst staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of new partnerships with researchers or knowledge brokers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened commitment to evidence use</td>
<td>• Number of training events, spaces, or initiatives for staff that explicitly focus on evidence use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organisation allocates resources dedicated to enabling evidence use (e.g. expert staff, subscription to online repositories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accountability for evidence use is evidence in guidelines, KPIs,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inspired by Stephen Covey

[Image credit: https://researcheffectiveness.ca/conceptualizing-research-outcomes-and-impacts/]
Research uptake and use

• Website statistics
• Citation tracking
• Validated tools to measure knowledge, attitudes, behaviours
• Stakeholder interviews
• Document review
• Practice observations

Research impact

• OECD monitoring data
• Population level surveys
• National statistics
• Routinely collected health and social outcome data from service delivery organisations
4.4 The ‘nitty gritty’: Detailed planning for your monitoring and evaluation
Developing a measurement matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Data source(s)</th>
<th>Measurement / extraction methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practice change</strong>: Improved mental health screening rates for victim survivors</td>
<td>% clients who complete mental health screening tool</td>
<td>Case files</td>
<td>Practice Nurse audits case files at end of every month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
'some assume a linear model, while everybody recognises that linear development, from idea through research to impact, is a simplification of a much more complex process—“science meanders” said Greenhalgh.'

Richard Smith BMJ Opinion blog post, 2018
Final considerations

Data ➔ Insights

• Active review and response
• Consider: what is the data telling you and how will you respond?
  - Are you making progress or staying in one place?
  - Do you need to adapt or iterate your approach?
  - Do you need to revise your goal?

Sharing your learnings

• How will you enable other researchers to learn from your efforts?
• Are there capacity-building opportunities?
Time to practice:
Complete section 4 of the Planning Tool