Domestic violence research dissemination

| KM Team Members involved | Jude Carey (Management Fellow round 1); Nadya Anscombe (Communications Officer); Becca Robinson (Management Fellow round 2) |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Aim | Supporting researchers in designing dissemination plans and increasing the Management Fellow's understanding of research and dissemination |
| Local lead organisation | University of Bristol (Gene Feder) |
| Research funding | NIHR Applied Programme grant |

What happened?

All KM team members were attached to a team and the Management Fellow JC was embedded within a domestic violence research study team. During her attachment and in collaboration with the trial manager, JC developed and implemented a dissemination strategy. This consisted of carrying out a stakeholder mapping exercise, meeting with those who might be interested in research findings such as health and social care commissioners and running a workshop with the study team and stakeholders to agree the dissemination strategy.

The dissemination strategy consisted of:

- in response to PPI suggestions, filming and editing three short videos of researchers and voluntary sector workers talking about their work. These were uploaded to a Domestic Violence YouTube channel for this purpose.
- developing and updating a study website
- drafting two briefing notes for research papers
- establishing a Twitter account to promote output such as scientific papers, briefing notes, videos and events (DV_Bristol). Following as of April 2016 = 186.
- creating a mailing list of 355 non-academic contacts from the third sector, health and social care commissioning, safeguarding leads, public health and clinicians with help from the communications manager to pass on news and to create invitations to a conference. List size as of April 2016=417.

An end of programme conference for the PROVIDE research programme grant was the major event. The Management Fellow, the Communications Officer and the trial manager worked together to design an event of interest to non-academics using innovative knowledge mobilisation elements. For example, a targeted proportional

Case study written June 2016 with data from the 3rd KM team evaluation (April 2016)

ticketing approach was used to ensure representation of Public Health, commissioning, primary care and mental health professions alongside third sector and academic staff. The conference programme was designed for a non-academic audience with sufficient time for discussion after each presentation to stimulate cross-sector responses. Pecha Kucha style presentations were encouraged to focus on results and implications rather than methodology. The researchers were offered a chance to practice their oral presentations to JC and NA, who made suggestions so that researchers could tailor the presentations to non-academics.

JC carried out an in-depth evaluation of the conference based partly on work from the Australian Primary Health Care Research and Information Service. She found:

- 60% of the 111 attendees were non-academics of whom about 60 returned evaluation forms
- 89% agreed or strongly agreed that the conference had broadened their knowledge of the subject. (6 were neutral)
- 97% agreed or strongly agreed that the conference had stimulated their thinking on the subject. (2 were neutral)
- 93% agreed or strongly agreed that attending the conference would impact on their future work (3 were neutral, 1 disagreed)

The mix of participants was useful

[JC] was crucial in helping us design that (the conference), so that we had then this lovely mixture of researchers, service providers, DV service providers and commissioners...the kind of, the interaction that happened between those groups at the event I think was very, actually, very helpful.

Study team members who were interviewed stated that JC and others had also helped to make the conference more accessible to diverse audiences:

So I was juggling at one point and... somebody had ... helium balloons to represent different things and, so everybody could do what they wanted ... in their three minutes and did different things, so it was really great for us cos we were able to be a bit more creative.

The impact of the dissemination activities on policy-makers was substantial. Nationally, PROVIDE outputs were incorporated into a London Councils good practice guide on domestic and sexual violence. More locally, the Management Fellow and study team worked directly with domestic violence commissioners by commenting on draft proposals for re-commissioning local domestic violence services. Subsequently, two researchers from Bristol University were invited to sit on the Bristol Domestic and Sexual Abuse Strategy Group. Researchers also presented to the Bristol Men and Boy's Stakeholder Group and the Management Fellow contributed to development of guidelines for national and local implementation teams. The second round Management Fellow (BR) supported ongoing commissioner engagement by arranging further meetings to share research findings.

Comments from the study team on JC's involvement include:

[JC] made a substantial contribution because we were at the sort of half way through a [research] programme grant with some very real patient benefit type outcomes in prospect [and getting help with the KM elements] made a tremendous contribution.

[JC] helped across the board, you know, senior, junior researchers [and] got them thinking about what concrete [activities] need to be done for KM.

Since JC left, several other outcomes have taken place including:

- JC drafted the KM section of the successful (£2.5 million) follow-on RE-PROVIDE programme grant application and has a role as co-applicant/KM lead. She has been funded for 2 hours dedicated KM input per week on this 6 year study, which incorporates an entire year for dissemination activities.
- The trial manager was selected to attend the Health Innovation Programme to where she won the award for best business idea with the most social impact. Team members then received three months of funding from HEFCE and Innovate UK to work with commissioners and others to develop a not-for-profit business to disseminate and implement findings. Although the KM team had no input into the grant application, the fact that the domestic violence team applied for and won this recognition is a marker of the changing culture around KM.

| What helped? | What didn't help? |
|--|---|
| The KM literature review performed as part | Availability – some researchers were |
| of JC's development assisted her in | no longer actively involved in the |
| developing a dissemination strategy. | PROVIDE study and had little time to |
| | get involved in dissemination. |
| Embeddedness within the research team | JC left just when the programme grant |
| | finished and dissemination became |
| | key. |
| Personal enthusiasm, drive, interest, and | Researchers were located in more |
| willingness to learn | than one centre and so it was difficult |
| | to develop a good working relationship |
| | over distance. |
| Working within an established successful | Research impact is not currently |
| team with pre-existing emphasis on applied | perceived as linked to career |
| research and working with multiple | progression for researchers and may |
| stakeholders. | not be viewed as a priority regardless |
| | of their interest in getting their |
| | research into practice or policy |
| JC 'got the politics' and understood the | |
| complexities and importance of getting the | |

Case study written June 2016 with data from the 3rd KM team evaluation (April 2016)

| message across. | |
|---|--|
| The research group lead and trial manager | |
| had previous experience in KM activities | |
| and were passionate about making a | |
| difference. | |
| Willingness of both parties to invest time, | |
| energy and support. | |
| JC provided extra capacity – an extra pair of | |
| hands | |
| NA's communication and social media | |
| expertise | |
| LW's managerial and pastoral role | |
| Ongoing involvement of the KM team | |

What can we learn from this?

- Management Fellows, in collaboration with others, can be *pivotal in developing more accessible and creative dissemination methods* for applied research.
- Researchers need training and practice in developing dissemination skills.
- Despite the enthusiasm of lead researchers, the excellent knowledge brokering skills of the Management Fellow, extra capacity in terms of time from the Management Fellow and the communications officer, *carrying out dissemination activities can still be challenging*, not least because these are *not highly prioritised within academic progression* schemes and because of *short-term research contracts* that finish before non-academic dissemination takes place.
- The longer term impact of incorporating can have some *desirable anticipated results*, such as a *follow-on grant with explicit KM* activity built in. But there may also be *unexpected outcomes* such as contributing to a movement where *researchers apply for and win entrepreneurial funding* to disseminate their findings.