

RTKW 10 - #EIE2023

RIDE THE KNOWLEDGE WAVE 10.....	2
#130 - EVALUATION OF THE “BUILDING CAPACITY FOR FACILITATION” INTERVENTION – A LONGITUDINAL MIXED-METHODS STUDY.....	2
#132 - COACHING STYLES IN A QUALITY IMPROVEMENT COLLABORATIVE: EXPLORING WHAT STYLES ARE COMMONLY USED AND HOW THEY CHANGE OVERTIME.	3
#45 - SUPPORTING IMPLEMENTATION IN BELGIAN PRIMARY CARE: FROM DOING WHAT IS FEASIBLE TO DOING WHAT IS IMPORTANT.	4
#147 - RESEARCH TRANSLATION FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: USING A LITERATURE REVIEW OF MODELS TO BUILD A FRAMEWORK FOR EVIDENCE USE AND KNOWLEDGE CO-PRODUCTION	5



Ride the Knowledge Wave 10

#130- Evaluation of the “Building capacity for facilitation” intervention – a longitudinal mixed-methods study

Veronica-Aurelia Costea^{1,2}, Anna Bergström^{1,2}, Mårten Åhström², Annika Bäck^{1,2}, Hanna Augustsson^{1,2}, Henna Hasson^{1,2}, Leif Eriksson²

¹Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden. ²Center for Epidemiology and Community Medicine, Stockholm, Sweden

Research aim

To report the results of the *Building capacity for facilitation intervention*, a 6-day training with integrated individual supervision, including an evaluation of the participants’ knowledge, skills, and self-efficacy of facilitation and implementation and the use of the acquired knowledge and skills after the intervention.

Setting

The project included participants from health- and social care organisations in Sweden.

Method(s)

The evaluation used a mixed-methods explanatory sequential design involving questionnaires delivered pre- and immediately post-intervention, and a questionnaire informed by the Swedish version of the Normalization Process Theory Measure eight months after the intervention. The questionnaires measured participants’ knowledge, skills, and self-efficacy in facilitation and implementation and participants’ use of a systematic implementation model after the intervention. In addition, semistructured interviews informed by Normalisation Process Theory (n=17) were carried out 10 to 12 months after the intervention. Descriptive statistics and qualitative content analysis are currently used to analyse the data collected from 3 cohorts (n=38).

Key finding(s)

Preliminary quantitative analysis shows increased knowledge, skills, and self-efficacy in facilitation and implementation after the intervention compared to before the intervention. The data analysis is currently in progress for later surveys and interviews, and more detailed quantitative and qualitative results will be presented.

Discussion

- How can facilitators be supported to perfect their craft after the intervention, what challenges do intervention developers experience when attempting to provide continuous support, and how can these be overcome?
- To what extent do facilitators have a role to build and strengthen the implementation capacity of the organisation where they work?

Challenges

A challenge was to collect interview data from all the participants in the intervention, to minimize response bias and prevent loss to follow-up. To avoid this we kept participants informed about the ongoing evaluation from the beginning and emphasized the importance of their input in the development of the curriculum.

Key highlights

The intervention curriculum, especially the interweaving of lectures and practice, was perceived as extremely useful by the participants.

#132- Coaching styles in a quality improvement collaborative: Exploring what styles are commonly used and how they change overtime.

Jay Ford¹, Aaron Gilson¹, Martha Maurer¹, Michele Gassman¹, Kim Hoffman², Bryan Garner³

¹University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, USA. ²Oregon Health and Sciences University, Portland, USA. ³Ohio State University, Columbus, USA

Research aim

Coaching is a proven implementation strategy. However, research has not examined how the coach interacts with the organizational champion. Using an adaptation of the Grasha-Riechmann framework, the project will identify coaching styles utilized by coaches and how the styles change overtime when guiding an organization through change implementation.

Setting

Thirty-nine HIV service organizations (HSOs) located in 23 states and the District of Columbia within the United States were recruited for this study. The study compared the effectiveness of two implementation approaches to integrate a motivational interviewing-based brief intervention for substance use disorders within these HSOs.

Method(s)

Implementation & Sustainment Facilitation (ISF) Strategy meetings (n=137) between coaches and HSO staff were recorded and professionally transcribed. These meetings during three six-month phases associated with preparation, implementation, and sustainment. Thematic coding classifications, related to five coaching styles Delegator, Expert, Facilitator, Formal Authority and Personal Model were developed from the Grasha-Riechmann framework. The codes were applied to a purposively selected sample of transcripts (n=66). Four coders independently coded transcripts using NVivo to facilitate text identification, organization, and retrieval for analysis. Coaching style use and changes across the three ISF phases was explored.

Key finding(s)

The Grasha-Riechmann framework is useful for identifying styles of facilitation, as well as the individual elements within those styles. Facilitator and Formal Authority were the two coaching styles predominately used. Facilitator sub-themes shifted from asking questions and providing support to supporting independent action over time. Coaches' use of Formal Authority sub styles shifted notably across time from setting expectations or ensuring preparation to offering affirmation or feedback about changes that the HSO's were implementing. Use of the Expert coaching style occurred less frequently and the use of the Delegator, or Personal Model coaching styles occurred infrequently.

Discussion

The Grasha-Riechmann framework also includes a learning style inventory which has been adapted for use in a quality improvement initiative. If the participant learning styles and the coaching styles were known at the start of an implementation study:

- How could implementation researchers use information about coaching and learning styles to conduct a randomized control trial to assign participants and coaches based on their learning and coaching styles?
- How could the structure and content delivery mechanism for coach delivered content be matched to the appropriate coaching and learning style(s) to improve uptake by the study participants?
- Challenges

Not every coaching call was recorded and not every HSO had transcripts in all three project phases. As such, our analysis was limited to 10 HSOs with transcripts across all three project phases. From that group, we utilized a purposeful sample of transcripts.

Key highlights

This project supports the use of a teaching style conceptual framework to identify coaching styles in a quality improvement initiative. It also provides insights into how coaches guide and teach staff throughout the implementation journey using these styles. Such knowledge could improve the quality of the coach and participant interactions.

#45- Supporting Implementation in Belgian primary care: From doing what is feasible to doing what is important.

Thomas Janssens - ebpracticenet, Leuven, Belgium

Research aim

Implementation actions are often designed and carried out without considering evidence on efficacy of specific implementation strategies. In a 2020 policy change, this research-practice gap became an important focus of our organization. In this study, we investigate the change in use of implementation strategies in response to this policy change.

Setting

An organization focusing on dissemination and implementation of evidence-based practice in Belgian primary care. Since 2018, the organization consults with the federal government on the scope and content of federally funded implementation projects in primary care, supports organizations in carrying out implementation projects, and provides funding for small-scale implementation projects.

Method(s)

We investigated 23 implementation projects starting between 2018 and 2023. Projects were either funded by the organization or federally funded projects for which the organization consulted on. We used project materials to code the use of different implementation strategies, according to the ERIC taxonomy (Powell et al. 2015). Using generalized mixed models, we investigated the use of specific implementation strategies, and their associations with the start date of the project (pre or post policy change), scale of the project (small vs. large), and characteristics of the implementation strategies (feasibility and importance, cf. Waltz et al. (2015)).

Key finding(s)

After the policy change, use of implementation strategies showed a stronger association with importance ratings (OR pre 1.3[0.5-3.2] vs. OR post 4.1[1.6-10.0], $p < .001$), and a reduced association with feasibility ratings (OR pre 4.2[1.9-9.0] vs. OR post 2.4[1.2-4.9], $p = .053$). At cluster level, projects were more likely to include evaluative and iterative strategies after policy change (OR: 4.0[1.6-10.0], $p = .003$). The overall number of strategies used did not change after policy change. The observed shifts in strategy use were not specific to smaller projects, but were also seen in the larger, federally funded implementation projects.

Discussion

- What is the role of funders and policy makers in the adoption of effective implementation strategies?
- Which implementation strategies can we use to close the research-practice gap in implementation practice?

Challenges

Coding for use of implementation strategies based on existing documents was challenging. Explicit documentation on the use of different implementation strategies could improve research on the use and efficacy of implementation strategies.

Key highlights

- Selection of implementation strategies in Belgian Primary care is associated with both feasibility and importance of the implementation strategy.
- A policy change focusing on the uptake of important implementation strategies resulted in a shift from doing what is feasible to doing what is important.

#147- Research translation for international development: Using a literature review of models to build a framework for evidence use and knowledge co-production

Laura Riddering, Alexandra Towns - Catholic Relief Services, Baltimore, USA

Research aim

The aim of this study was to examine five approaches to research translation relevant to international development to inform implementation practice. The study uses theory to build a conceptual framework and guidance for academics, practitioners, and donors on how to design an implementation strategy.

Setting

This study informs research translation efforts in the field of international development; we draw from literature in health, agriculture, environment, and policymaking. Scholars and donors call for development research to have an impact beyond academia, yet there is scant research that connects implementation science and development studies.

Method(s)

Two research questions guided our study: how do researchers and practitioners use evidence to inform practice, and how do researchers and practitioners co-produce knowledge to inform practice. We used a multifaceted method. First, we conducted a scoping review to establish the scope and terms. Then, we used a selective sample method and applied a rapid review methodology to examine five research translation approaches: technology transfer, evidence-based policymaking, participatory action research, knowledge translation, and integrated knowledge translation. Third, we carried out two rounds of qualitative analysis on 93 peer-reviewed articles and a comparative analysis of approaches.

Key finding(s)

Our analysis resulted in four key findings. First, we identified four intertwined factors that influence research translation: intention of evidence use, commitment to partnership, understanding of context, and investment of time and resources. Second, we found that research translation incorporates a continuum of approaches from what we call proactive to post-facto translation. Third, evidence use and partner engagement are interrelated when conducting research translation. And fourth, but not least importantly, we found that power imbalances between academics and practitioners can hinder research uptake.

Discussion

- First, how could you apply these findings in your sector? We offer the Research Translation Continuum as a tool to enable critically reflexive engagement to situate, recognize, and act upon diverse knowledge production processes.
- Second, how can these results be applied to increase the use of implementation science for international development?

Challenges

One challenge was to conduct the study in a partnership between academics and practitioners. Secondly, it was a challenge to implement the findings from this into research in an ongoing development project. To deal with these challenges, we applied the learnings from the review to our own project.

Key highlights

Implementation science is relevant for all sectors, including complex challenges like international development. There is great potential in the collective knowledge and experience of all actors to inform and improve development practice and policy; however, it is necessary to critically reflect on our own and others' positions and practices.