



## The Blueprint: Paradigm Project Updates

---

### At a Glance...

- The Design Teams gear up for larger-scale tests by planning small-scale virtual events and simulating prototypes with relevant stakeholders.
- In other news:
  - Meet four Black women who are working to improve artificial intelligence in a *People of Color in Tech* article.
  - Authors recommend best practices for the implementation of research impact assessment (RIA) frameworks and tools based on a literature review and semi-structured interviews in *Health Research Policy and Systems*.
  - Three examples of stakeholder engagement in research outline best practices and lessons learned.



### Latest Paradigm Project Updates

With the holidays behind us, the Design Teams are convening again to prepare for larger-scale tests.

The Design Team focused on the diversity of the health services research workforce is planning to test a small-scale version of their festival idea, which will include storytelling videos, collaborative breakout sessions, shared spaces to sustain engagement among participants after the festival itself ends, and more. Previously, the prototype consisted of a PowerPoint slide deck which engaged participants one-on-one. Shifting from a one-on-one test to a small-scale virtual event that engages a group of people marks a transitional phase in testing. As the Design Team enters this exciting new phase of prototype development and testing, they will use the takeaways from this transitional phase of

testing to further refine their idea and propel them closer to their final, large-scale festival idea.

Another Design Team, tasked with ensuring that evidence-based interventions are implemented in real-world settings, is also facing an exciting development in their prototype. Next week, they will simulate the process of selecting an intervention to address an equity problem and planning its implementation with a member of a community-based organization, a health services researcher, and a representative of a health care delivery organization. Simulation can be useful in human-centered design, allowing participants to identify the previously unrecognized holes, flawed assumptions, and successes of an idea.



### In Other News...

Below are relevant articles that touch on some of the Paradigm Project's six challenges. We hope you find these useful as you work to make a difference in your own communities and institutions.

**NOTE:** In keeping with the Paradigm Project's work to foster creative thinking by engaging with uncommon and new perspectives, articles may include provocative or non-traditional points of view. Inclusion of these articles doesn't imply endorsement, and all opinions are the authors' own.



### On Scientific Methods...

In a previous newsletter, we shared a link to a speech by the founder of Data for Black Lives, Yeshimabeit Milner. Learn more about her, and three other [Black women](#) who are trying to improve artificial intelligence in this *People of Color in Tech* article: Joy Buolamwini and her groundbreaking study on "how facial-recognition technology performed better when analyzing photos of lighter-skinned men than of darker-skinned women," Timnit Gebru and her research that "uncovered deep inaccuracies of computer vision algorithms when identifying women and people of color," and Rediet Abebe, cofounder of Mechanism Design for Social Good, which is a "multi-disciplinary research collective that uses algorithms and mechanism design to tackle inequality for historically underserved and disadvantaged communities."



### On Scientific Publishing...

Find out "how a torrent of COVID science changed research publishing in seven [charts](#)" in *Nature*. Charts show a "coronavirus cascade" of an estimated 200,000 coronavirus-related journal articles and preprints that had been published by early December, the preprint rush of "between 17% and 30% of total COVID-19 research papers," medRxiv growth, and shortened review times.



## On Making Evidence More Useful...

This recent *Health Research Policy and Systems* [article](#) examines how research impact assessment (RIA) frameworks and tools are implemented by organizations in practice. RIA “falls within a series of practices referred to... as ‘research on research.’” The authors found that little empirical evidence is reported on how organizations use RIA in practice. They recommend that research organizations (1) consider the “resources, time and leadership required to embed impact strategies... and develop methodical approaches to assessing impact;” (2) engage researchers and stakeholders as a core part of planning and assessment; and (3) recognize that RIA can bring different actors together in a mutual understanding of the research process.



## On Science Communication...

According to a research brief highlighted on *The Conversation*, “Conservatives tend to see expert evidence and personal experience as equally legitimate than liberals,” who are more likely to rely on just evidence, as found by a new [study](#) published in the journal *Political Psychology*. You can read the summary [here](#).



## On Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in HSR...

Check out this older [collection](#) of articles in the *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, titled “Breaking Through Barriers to Racial Equity.” “These articles push the envelope on discussions focused on race and racism: From [the] lead essay by Shawn Ginwright and Sai Seigel, which interrogates the efficacy of social innovation in creating long-lasting racial equity, to [the] final essay by Sharlene Gandhi, which argues that reverse mentorship can create new paths of inclusion and equity in the workplace, this series presents challenging questions and provoking ideas to break through the discriminatory barriers to racial equity across sectors.”



## On Community Engagement in Research...

You may remember that three Design Teams are working together on the challenge of establishing sustainable and collaborative partnerships between researchers and communities. This combined group continues to develop the prototype of a research process in which a designated “convener” fosters relationships among communities and researchers, and supports the co-design and undertaking of a health services research

study. To build on the lessons learned from others who have done similar work, below are three examples of engagement in research in 2020.

- **Beneciuk and colleagues** describe a collaborative process to identify a high priority research topic among those for whom musculoskeletal (MSK) pain is a concern. Partnership members “provided the catalyst for identifying shared decision making as a high priority research topic based on a wide spectrum of stakeholder perspectives and unique experiences.” Facilitators of partnership development and sustainability included a positive culture of respect and identification of patient partners as leaders of activities. Barriers included an initial focus on quantity over quality of partnerships, as well as difficulty engaging some stakeholder entities.
- Bergmeier and colleagues describe their **strategy** for the “development of the Global Health in Preconception, Pregnancy and Postpartum (HiPPP) Consumer and Community (CCI) Framework, with consumers as central to co-designed, co-complemented and co-disseminated research and translation” on “improving healthy lifestyles and preventing obesity specifically before, during and after pregnancy.” The authors used a three-step process: a CCI Workshop with representation of experts, consumers, and early-career researchers from five continents, a literature review, and collaboration with consumers. While “there is not any one particular method of choice to support effective CCI... [the authors] would emphasize that the overarching project’s goals, resources, and who may be the best people for the project will be key in guiding those decisions.”
- A third **example** describes how the Strategy for Patient-Oriented Research Chronic Pain Network navigated the issue of patient authorship. “This guidance has been co-written by a group of researchers and patient partners of the Chronic Pain Network in an effort to address [the paucity of guidance on patient authorship]. It is intended for both researchers and patient partner audiences. This guidance is meant to facilitate conversations between researchers and patient partners about authorship and/or acknowledgement regarding research projects on which they collaborate. While the overall principles of academic authorship and acknowledgement remain unchanged, nuances for interpreting these principles through the lens of patient engagement or patient-oriented research is provided.”



## Volunteer Opportunity...

Finally, if you are interested in providing feedback to our Design Teams on their prototypes via a virtual video call, please reach out to [caitlin.otter@academyhealth.org](mailto:caitlin.otter@academyhealth.org) so that she may match you to a Design Team and schedule a testing conversation with you.

AcademyHealth  
1666 K Street NW, Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20006