Public Involvement Impact Assessment Framework development project case study

Summary

About: This resource describes how the project to develop the PiiAF carried out its own assessment of public involvement impact through an internal evaluation

What: A description of the methods used for the internal evaluation is followed by key documents used to collect the data along with information sheets

Who: For project teams who would like support in developing an impact assessment plan

How: Use the example to think about how you will carry out your public involvement impact assessment

Introduction

The project to develop the Public Involvement Impact Assessment Framework was funded by the Medical Research Council and was a multi-centre, multi-stage methodological study. In order to explore the processes and outcomes of the public involvement approaches adopted in the study an embedded internal evaluation was undertaken. This case study is intended to provide an overview of how the internal evaluation of the project’s public involvement was carried out. A formal and detailed discussion of the findings of the evaluation can be found in the internal evaluation report.

Background to the evaluation

The Äldre Väst Sjuhärad (ÄVS) framework, was adopted at the start of the study to frame the internal evaluation. The framework is guided by the principles of Guba & Lincoln's (1989) authenticity criteria. These have been reworded to make them understandable for all stakeholders in research. The model was developed by the Swedish Äldre Väst Sjuhärad centre to ensure a fit between the participatory and process oriented principles central to the centre’s work and the way they sought to evaluate the centre (Nolan et al 2003, Hanson et al 2006).
Four values are identified that reflect fundamental issues of equity, reflexivity, and the need for action within participatory research. These are:

1. Equal access for different stakeholders;
2. Enhanced awareness of the position/views of self and others;
3. Encouraging action by providing a rationale for change;
4. Enabling action by providing the means to achieve change.

These principles were used as a basis to start the internal evaluation process, and to finally review the study at the end. Intervening reviews were developed iteratively and picked up on issues raised in previous reviews.

**Aims of the evaluation**

The Internal evaluation aimed to evaluate the impact of public involvement on the research process and outcomes.

The objectives were to:

- ascertain if involving members of the public in different involvement roles (user/researcher, PAG, AN) will make it more likely that the study:
  - use appropriate data collection tools (Delphi)
  - develop public friendly products (Guidance/publications)
- use the Äldre Väst Sjuhärad (ÄVS) framework to initiate an evaluation of:
  - equality of access for different PI stakeholders in the study;
  - extent of enhanced awareness of the position/views of self and others;
  - how action is encouraged, and enabled within the study
- critically review the appropriateness of the ÄVS framework for an internal evaluation

**Method**

*Participants*

A formative internal evaluation was undertaken with the project team (n=14) and with Public Advisory Group members (n=7).

*Measures*

The evaluation comprised four elements: a baseline review; periodic reviews; on-going reflections and a final review.
1. A *baseline review* (see appendix 1) of prior experiences and perspectives about user involvement that all project team and PAG members brought to the study.

2. A series of *periodic reviews*¹ completed during the course of the study

3. *On-going reflections* (see appendix 2) and *specific incidents* (see appendix 3) could be documented by members of the project team about events, processes and issues that were relevant to the internal evaluation of the study in between the periodic reviews

4. *Final review* (see appendix 3) completed by both project team and PAG members towards the end of the project.

Five rounds of the Internal Evaluation were undertaken with project team members (n=14) at approximately 5-month intervals. Three rounds of the evaluation were carried out with PAG members (n=7) (See Box 1 for an overview).

---

1 Copies of the periodic review templates are not available because they were developed in response to specific issues raised within this project. We strongly recommend that periodic reviews should be related to the specific issues raised within your project.
The baseline review template and Round 1 data collection tool were developed in a collaborative way led by the Internal Evaluation Co-ordinating group. A draft tool was developed and circulated for consultation amongst the project team members, including the service user researchers for comment and feedback. The first periodic review round comprised a series of open questions based on the dimensions of the AVS Framework. For each subsequent round the questions were reconsidered, to ensure they reflected the issues raised in the previous review and current status of project.

Guidance about how to complete the forms was provided (see appendix 4). The forms were e-mailed out with deadlines for their return. Reminders about returning the forms were sent by the research project administrator. The forms were returned to the administrator who allocated code numbers and anonymised them before forwarding them onto the Internal Evaluation Co-ordinating group.

In response to concerns raised amongst the team about the independence of the process, there was an option to complete the periodic review and on-going reflections forms anonymously. The baseline review form however provided identifiable information so anonymity could not be assured. This process was reviewed by the team part way through the project.

Data analysis
The completed and, in most cases, anonymised forms were analysed by the Internal Evaluation team, for each round. Responses were coded using a template based upon the question foci. The key issues were identified, summarised and presented to the wider project team for discussion and decisions on actions.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Baseline review template for project team and Public Advisory Group (PAG) members

Baseline Reflections on Public Involvement (*Project Team*)

Completed by:

1. For how many years have you been involved in PI work in research and service development?

2. Can you name the activities/studies/projects/initiatives you have been involved with that addressed public involvement issues?

3. What roles did you adopt in these activities? Eg User/Researcher/User-researcher/Commissioner/Funder/Policy maker/Other

4. Why have you engaged with PI in these activities?
**In thinking about all the PI work you have undertaken can you reflect on the following questions?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of PI:</th>
<th>Why do it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process of PI:</td>
<td>How do/did you do it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact and outcomes of PI?</td>
<td>What difference does it make?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context of PI?</td>
<td>What broader movements have shaped your public involvement work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of PI?</td>
<td>Did you establish the impact and outcome of public involvement in these activities? If so, how?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THANK YOU**

**ADD IN INSTRUCTIONS FOR RETURNING FORM TO PROJECT TEAM**
1. For how many years have you been involved in public involvement in research and service development?

2. Can you name the activities/studies/projects/initiatives you have been involved with?

3. In what way were you involved in these projects? E.g. member of an advisory group/user research/member of research team/workshop participant /other

4. Why have you participated in these public involvement activities?

In thinking about all the Public Involvement work you have undertaken can you reflect on the following questions?

Please expand these sections as needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of public involvement:</th>
<th>Why do it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Process of public involvement:**  
How do/did you do it? |  
|---|---|
| **Impact and outcomes of public involvement?**  
What difference do you think public involvement made/makes? |  
| **Context of public involvement?**  
What broader influences or movements have shaped your public involvement work? |  
| **Assessment of public involvement?**  
Was the impact and outcome of public involvement in these activities assessed? If so, how? |  
| **Any Other Comments:** |  

**THANK YOU**

**ADD IN INSTRUCTIONS FOR RETURNING FORM TO PROJECT TEAM**
### Appendix 2: On-going reflections template for project team and Public Advisory Group (PAG) members

**Ongoing Reflections for established study (Project team)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed by:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(may be left blank)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **What have you learnt about PI** ADD IN DATE OF LAST REVIEW PERIOD

2. **What do you think has gone well from the perspective of PI, since DATE OF LAST REVIEW PERIOD**

3. **What do you think needs improving with respect to PI work in the project?**

4. **In this period, can you identify ways in which our approach to PI has shaped:**
   i. The way the project has been run?
   ii. The outcomes of what we have done?

We have identified a number of ongoing issues from the previous period(s) that we would like to review. Here we ask you to reflect on how these issues have been addressed and changes made.

**ADD IN PROJECT SPECIFIC QUESTIONS HERE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any other comments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**THANK YOU**

**ADD IN INSTRUCTIONS FOR RETURNING FORM TO PROJECT TEAM**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. What do you think has gone well about your involvement with the project since you started working as a public involvement member with this project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What do you think needs improving about your involvement in the public involvement work of this project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How well has the project team communicated with you since you became involved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How do you raise any questions or concerns you have about the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What can we improve or change about the way we work with you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU

ADD IN INSTRUCTIONS FOR RETURNING FORM TO PROJECT TEAM

---

2 Use the terminology used within your project
Appendix 3: On-going reflections template for project team and Public Advisory Group (PAG) members

Reflections on Specific Incidents during Project (*Project Team and PAG*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed by:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Event: e.g. E-mail/teleconference/project meeting | |
| Who was present? | |
| What went well? | |
| What was difficult? | |
| In what ways was your voice heard or not? | |
| What did you learn about PI and your perspective on this? | |
| What did you learn about other’s perspectives on PI? | |
| What can we do differently? | |

THANK YOU

*ADD IN INSTRUCTIONS FOR RETURNING FORM TO PROJECT TEAM*
Appendix 4: Guidance on how to complete the internal evaluation for project team and Public Advisory Group (PAG) members

**Guidance for Internal Evaluation (Project team)**

We would like to capture information about the process of this study in four ways:

1. A baseline review of prior experiences and perspectives about public involvement in research that we bring to the study, to be completed by ADD IN DATE.
2. ADD IN NUMBER periodic reviews are to be completed across the life of the study. These will take place in ADD IN DATES. The questions asked on the, periodic review form will be reviewed prior to being sent out, to ensure they reflect the issues raised in the previous review and current status of project. We will send out the new form and reminders for completion at the appropriate time.
3. On-going specific reflections can be documented by anyone about events, processes and issues that are relevant to the internal evaluation of our study. We will ask for these to be submitted on an on-going basis when we collect the periodic reviews.
4. A final summative review will be undertaken towards the end of the project which will ask for perspectives and reflections about our experiences and learning across the whole project.

**Questions and Answers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is to complete these forms?</th>
<th>All members of the project team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much information should people write?</td>
<td>This element of the project is only one aspect, so people do not need to invest a large amount of time in this process. As some people may have more experiences of PI than others this may take longer for completion of the Baseline Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will the information be collected?</td>
<td>Forms will be e-mailed out with deadlines for return of completed forms. These will be e-mailed to NAME OF PERSON³ who will forward them onto the Internal Evaluation lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will happen to this information?</td>
<td>The completed forms will be reviewed and analysed by the Internal Evaluation team: ADD NAMES. A synthesis of the key issues and themes will be made at each time point (Baseline review, period 1, period 2 etc). This will be presented at the next project meeting for consideration and decisions about future actions by the team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can people complete these anonymously?</td>
<td>There is an option to complete the Periodic Review, Final Review and Specific Incident forms anonymously. The Baseline Review will provide identifiable information. The issue of anonymity and the process of submission will be reviewed as we proceed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ If anonymity required suggest this is an intermediary administrator who collates the responses and anonymises them

SIGNED

DATED
Guidance for Internal Evaluation with Public Involvement Members (PAG)

As part of the process of undertaking this study the project team is keen to look at our own work in this area. We are undertaking this internal evaluation as a series of periodic reviews with all members of the project team. We would also like to capture information about the process of this study for Public Involvement members attached to the project. This will occur in three ways:

1. A baseline review of prior experiences and perspectives about public involvement that Public Involvement members bring to the study, to be completed by the end of ADD DATE.
2. ADD NUMBER periodic reviews to be completed. These reviews will take place in ADD DATES. The questions asked on the periodic review form will be reviewed prior to being sent out, to ensure they reflect the issues raised in the previous review and the current status of project. We will send out the new form and reminders for completion at the appropriate time.
3. A final review which asks you to consider your experiences across the whole project.

Questions and Answers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is to complete these forms?</th>
<th>All members of the project team and public involvement members.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much information should people write?</td>
<td>This element of the project is only one aspect, so people do not need to invest a large amount of time in this process. As some people may have more experiences of public involvement than others, this may take longer for completion of the Baseline Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will the information be collected?</td>
<td>Forms will be e-mailed out with deadlines for return of completed forms. These will be e-mailed to NAME OF PERSON⁴ who will forward them onto the Internal Evaluation lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will happen to this information?</td>
<td>The completed forms will be reviewed and analysed by the Internal Evaluation team: ADD NAMES. A synthesis of the key issues and themes will be made at each time point (Baseline review, period 1, period 2 etc). This will be presented at the next project meeting for consideration and decisions about future actions by the team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can people complete these anonymously?</td>
<td>There is an option to complete the Periodic Review and Final Review forms anonymously. The Baseline review will provide identifiable information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ If anonymity required suggest this is an intermediary administrator who collates the responses and anonymises them.

SIGNED

DATED