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Co-production in context

• The focus on co-production emerged from the ‘Going the Extra Mile Review’ (GEM)

• Objectives: To review the progress of public involvement (PPI) in NIHR research

• Identify barriers and enablers

• Reflect on the influence of PPI on the wider health research system in the UK and internationally

• Develop a vision for public involvement in research for 2025

GEM Methods

- A Review Panel was established to shape the Review:
  1. Online questionnaire
  2. Audio and video evidence
  3. Document review including key systematic reviews.
  4. International, third sector and industry representatives evidence panel sessions
  5. Workshops, meetings, social media
Data collected

• Eighty-two responses were received from an individual institutional, organisational or collective perspectives

• Included submissions from different parts of the NIHR, medical research charities, universities, industry and third sector bodies with a total of 538 people responding to the online survey

• Oral evidence sessions were held with colleagues from USA, Denmark, Germany, Canada and Australia.

• Thematic analysis using NVIVO
Key concepts

• Reach: the extent to which people and communities are engaged, participating and involved in NIHR research including the diversity of this population
• Refinement and improvement: how public involvement is adding value to research excellence as funded by the NIHR
• Relevance: the extent to which public priorities for research are reflected in NIHR funding and activities
• Relationships, as key to building involvement

Underpinning these concepts was co-production as the basis of the NIHR’s approach in the future
Implementation of co-production

• GEM had a range of policy recommendations to guide implementation
• Resulted in the development of NIHR Co-production Guidance and the examples of co-production
• Successful implementation requires us to think about a range of things including (from PARIHS framework):
  • Evidence – the Co-pro guidance and the evidence base
  • Context – the culture, rules and norms of research
  • Facilitation - how we move the guidance into practice
Planning for implementation

- We want colleagues to consider the utility of co-production for their themes and projects.
- It won’t always work in all contexts although our approach is to encourage exploration.
- Maybe we can regard it as a form of methodological exploration? Add it as a research question to your study?
- Your research question might be to understand how co-production works in area?
Planning for co-production

- We need to plan for co-production – explore how each element could work in a study
- Draw on evidence of co-production in your area
- Think about the context into which you are implementing – is it conducive to co-pro?
- Think through implementation strategies – how will you embed it?
- MS and SS running drop in sessions to help with planning
Capturing and reporting co-production

• Important to capture and report co-production
• Qualitative capture – narrative descriptions, thematic analysis, clear accounts of impact
• Reporting is important – tell us about it in your papers
• We are exploring the development of a matrix that would allow us to plan for an capture the key elements of co-production at project, theme and system level
• Matrix includes 6 key features, considers the project, theme and system level. Draws on evidence of effective practice at project and system level
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