



LUDWIG  
BOLTZMANN  
GESELLSCHAFT  
Open Innovation in Science Center

# EVALUATOR GUIDELINE

Pilot Call for Public & Patient Involvement and  
Engagement in Research 2021

Deadline for applications: 31<sup>st</sup> October 2021, 5pm CET

# TABEL OF CONTENT

- 1.0 CALL OVERVIEW..... 3
- 2.0 KEY DATES..... 4
- 3.0 AIM OF THE CALL ..... 4
- 3.1 LEVELS OF INTERACTION ..... 4
- 4.0 EVALUATION PROCESS ..... 5
- 4.1 Overview ..... 5
- 4.2 Procedure of evaluation process..... 6
- 4.3 Panel of experts ..... 7
- 5.0 ASSESSMENT..... 7
- 5.1 Assessment criteria ..... 7
- 5.2 Assessment categories ..... 8
- 5.3. Assessment questions ..... 8
- 6.0 TERMS OF REFERENCES ..... 9
- 7.0 CONTACT ..... 9
- 8.0 APPENDIX ..... 9

## 1.0 CALL OVERVIEW

The **PPIE Implementation Program** (2020-2023) of the Ludwig Boltzmann Gesellschaft Open Innovation in Science Center is funded by the Austrian National Foundation of Research, Technology and Development, and intends to support researchers and their organizations implementing meaningful and active involvement of patients and the public in research. This second pilot call has a total budget of max. EUR 600.000.

<b>PPIE Implementation Program</b>	
Short description	Implementation activities that foster active and meaningful patient and public involvement in research.
Funding available	Max. EUR 60.000 per project
Funding rate	100%
Project duration	6-12 months
Cooperation partners	Not necessary for application
Eligible applicants	Representatives of following organizations located in <u>Austria</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Research organizations</li> <li>- Public Universities and Universities of Applied Sciences (FH)</li> <li>- Private universities</li> <li>- Associations or other civil society organizations</li> </ul>
Eligible costs	Honorarium for patients and the public Travel costs for patients and the public, and researchers Other goods and services: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Catering etc. and collaboration software</li> <li>- Room rent for meetings and workshops</li> <li>- Small equipment</li> </ul> Subcontracting for third parties Overhead costs up to 20% of all cost categories
Non-eligible costs	Personnel costs for researchers Research and office infrastructure Costs for patents and licensing, and research software
Payment rates	Lump sums - 80% payment in the beginning and 20% at the end of project
<b>Important information</b>	
Total budget of call	Max. EUR 600.000
Submission deadline	31 <sup>st</sup> October 2021, 5pm CET
Application language	English
Contact person	Mag. Dr. Raphaela Kaisler, MSc Tel: (01) 513 27 50 - 62 Email: <a href="mailto:ppie@lbg.ac.at">ppie@lbg.ac.at</a>
Website	<a href="https://ppie.lbg.ac.at">https://ppie.lbg.ac.at</a>
Application platform	<a href="https://calls.lbg.ac.at/login">https://calls.lbg.ac.at/login</a>

## 2.0 KEY DATES

Call launched	1 <sup>st</sup> September 2021
Call submission deadline	31 <sup>st</sup> October 2021, 5pm CET (online)
Application assessment	December 2021- January 2022
Funding announcement	February 2022
Project start	March 2022

## 3.0 AIM OF THE CALL

Research shows that early and continuous involvement of the public and patients has a positive impact both on conducting more patient-centered research and on how research is conducted, namely towards more involvement of patients in research activities, and that this significantly impacts research findings. Involving the public in research empowers people with lived experience and improves the quality and impact of research (Staley, 2009). Engaging citizens and patients in research co-design is one of the key tools to drive innovation processes within the European research landscape (Mazzucato, 2019). In order to ensure that research is highly relevant to the public, there is a need for meaningful involvement of end-users with the aim to reduce ‘research waste’ and bring science and society closer together (Glasziou 2016; Chalmers 2009). Involving the public in research empowers people with lived experience and improves the quality and impact of research (Staley, 2009).

PPIE stands for ‘**Public and Patient Involvement and Engagement**’ in research. The **PPIE Implementation Program** aims to involve citizens and patients in research processes and activities according to the definition of the National Institute of Health Research (NIHR, UK):

*“User or public and patient involvement in research means doing research ‘with’ patients and the public so they are not just participants in the research. This requires users to have a say in the decisions made about research, so that the methods and outcomes are more appropriate to research participants and patients.”*

### 3.1 LEVELS OF INTERACTION

The degree of interaction between researchers, patients, and the public is measured by the ways in which they are involved. This can include patients and the public taking part in research studies, patients actively providing and disseminating research to the general public through different formats, or even patients and the public becoming actively involved in the research process. We distinguish between three levels of activities (INVOLVE NIHR, UK):

- **PARTICIPATION:** Citizens and patients take part in research studies.  
E.g., being recruited in clinical trials, completing questionnaires, participation in interviews and focus groups.
- **ENGAGEMENT:** Information and knowledge about research is provided and disseminated.

E.g., dissemination of research to public (via media, social media), raising awareness of research through media, science festivals and open days at universities and research centers.

- **INVOLVEMENT:** Citizens and patients are actively involved in research.

E.g., as grant holders and co-applicants, through identifying research opportunities, agenda setting, members of project advisory and steering groups, co-developing patient information or materials, undertaking interviews with participants, and carrying out research.

Depending on the activity and degree of involving patients and public members in research, several levels of involvement can be differentiated: from purely receiving information about research projects (passive) to getting involved in research decision-making and becoming equal collaboration partners (active). From the perspective of a researcher, introducing PPIE components into research projects and research governance may increase the general empowerment of those who are affected by research and introduce a shift of power and ownership towards patients and the public.

The **PPIE Implementation Program** aims to fund implementation activities with patients and the public in the area of **‘active involvement’ across the different phases of the research cycle** (from setting the agenda to interpreting data).

For further information about PPIE see the **‘PPIE How to Guide for Researchers’** that is freely available at the open access repository Zenodo under <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3578321>.

## 4.0 EVALUATION PROCESS

### 4.1 OVERVIEW

The following graph provides an overview of the evaluation process:



## 4.2 PROCEDURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS

The Pilot Call of Patient and Public Involvement and Engagement is a one-stop process. Applications are only accepted via the online LBG Calls platform (<https://calls.lbg.ac.at/login>). Any other format of submission (e.g., via email and post) and submissions received after the deadline will not be assessed.

The evaluation process consists of the following steps:

- **Formal check of eligibility:** The LBG PPIE Team checks the 'level of involvement' and 'study level' and forwards eligible applications to the panel of experts for assessment within three working days after the submission deadline.
- **Individual assessment:** Panel experts individually assess all eligible applications based on the evaluation criteria via the online system of the LBG Calls platform and provide scoring and short comments for each assessment criterion of each project.
- **Selection meeting:** After the individual assessment, the LBG PPIE team provides the panel of experts with the mean scores for each application and criterion.
- Each expert gets assigned to a fixed number of proposals for which he or she presides over the discussion (e.g., introducing the content of the proposal etc.).
- The experts discuss the projects exceeding the threshold of 60 points and above in the online Selection meeting lasting for at least two hours. The LBG PPIE team provide all necessary documents and agenda for the Selection meeting.
- All panel experts have equal votes and have to reach consensus about promoting projects for the funding recommendation. In case of disagreement, projects with similar ranking and strength will be preferred.
- The LBG PPIE team records and documents the Selection meeting and outcome, and act as observers without voting rights. The LBG PPIE team is not allowed to interfere in the discussion at any time.
- **Implementation recommendation:** The panel of experts mutually agree on a written recommendation providing a short statement and score for each assessed project based on the overall ranking and discussion in the 'Selection meeting'.
- **Implementation decision:** The LBG Management Board mutually agrees and decides based on the recommendation of the panel of experts, which PPIE projects will be supported.
- The supported projects will be notified via e-mail and receive the cooperation contract within one week after the implementation decision was made.
- The supported projects will start their work promptly after both parties sign the cooperation contract.
- Unsupported projects will be notified via e-mail within two weeks after the implementation decision was made. Projects scoring above the threshold will receive feedback form the panel of experts; unfortunately, we are not able to provide feedback to project below the threshold. However, the principal investigators may contact the LBG PPIE Team for further consultation and feedback on their project.

### 4.3 PANEL OF EXPERTS

The panel of experts is an external and independent body to ensure an objective assessment of applications of the PPIE call. The panel of experts consists of following representatives:

- Two international senior researchers in the field of patient and public involvement
- Two Austrian representatives of the public thereof one patient and one public member in the field of public health
- Two young persons (16-30 years) with basic knowledge of scientific processes

The tasks of the panel experts include:

- Individually assessment of applications online
- Presence and discussion at the three hours online Selection meeting
- Chairing the online Selection meeting for assigned applications
- Formulation of written implementation recommendations including project scores
- Provide comments and recommendations to improve the projects above the threshold based on the discussion in the Selection meeting

## 5.0 ASSESSMENT

### 5.1 ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The proposed involvement activities have to meet the formal funding criteria are further assessed by the panel of experts. The experts' assessment of the project applications is based on the following four criteria:

- **Quality of involvement (level of involvement and study level):** This criterion assesses the extent to which the project conducts research activities "with" patients or the public, rather than conducting research "about" them. It looks at the ways in which patients or the public are involved and whether the approaches chosen are adequate for the participatory goals of the project. The proposed participatory activities must be included in at least one phase of the research cycle (define research question - design research method - collect data - analyze and interpret data - disseminate findings) and/or in scientific governance (e.g., advisory board, collaborative project management, etc.).
- **Impact of involvement:** This criterion evaluates the added value that participants can derive directly from the project. It therefore evaluates which concrete benefits (e.g. solutions, skills, decisions, etc.) the participants can expect. It is also part of this criterion to evaluate the sustainability of the measure e.g., achieved through a continuation of participation in the institution or other aspects of the activity.
- **Implementation:** This criterion assesses whether the work plan is appropriate to the proposed activities (e.g., methods, number of people involved, frequency of participation, diversity of the group, level of participation).
- **Feasibility:** This criterion evaluates whether the planned work steps and activities are described in a concrete, plausible and comprehensible manner. The methods chosen, the frequency of the participation activities and their logical connection for the project objectives are evaluated.

## 5.2 ASSESSMENT CATEGORIES

Once you have reached a conclusion about the project application, please **score each assessment criterion** of the application on a rating scale from 1-5 as follows:

Scoring	Scoring Guide
5 - excellent	Criterion is fulfilled in best possible way.
4 - very good	Criterion is properly addressed with an allowable weakness.
3 - good	Criterion is properly addressed with some weakness.
2 - satisfying	Criterion is poorly addressed.
1 - unsatisfying	Criterion is not or not properly addressed.

**Max. 20 points per expert** can be reached for each application. Each application is evaluated by 3 experts (one expert of each type) and can therefore score maximum 60 points. Applications scored below 2 on average (i.e., less than 8 points in one criterion or less than 24 points in total) shall not be considered in the recommendation and decision. The overall score serves as a guide for further discussion on the selection of projects for funding.

## 5.3. ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

The following question should guide the experts in assessing the applications:

Criteria	Guiding questions
Quality of involvement	To which extent does the level of involvement and study level address the scope of the call (active and meaningful involvement of patients and the public)? Is there active and meaningful involvement of patients and/or the public? Does the proposal reflect the pilot call's understanding of participation?
Impact of involvement	To which extent do the proposed involvement activities add value to the target group and/or society? Is a continuation of participation beyond the project plausible? Can other projects/stakeholders/institutions benefit from the project's planned outcome?
Implementation	Are the planned participation activities sufficiently and comprehensibly described? To which extent is the work plan adequate to the proposed activities and aims in terms of methods used, frequency of involvement, number and diversity of patient and/or public involved? Are the described evaluation efforts reasonable and adequate?
Feasibility	To which extent are the proposed involvement activities feasible in terms of budget and time line?

Not as part of the evaluation, but in order give feedback to the applicants and to learn from the process, the experts are also asked to indicate how understandable the application was written.



## 6.0 TERMS OF REFERENCES

The Ludwig Boltzmann Gesellschaft specifies the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the expert panel for each separate assessment (see Appendix). The Terms of Reference contain specific information about the research unit to be assessed and/or about elements that the panel of experts must consider. The panel of experts has to sign the ToR in order to start with the assessment of the applications.

## 7.0 CONTACT

If you have any queries please contact us via e-mail under [ppie@lbg.ac.at](mailto:ppie@lbg.ac.at). Please find further information and all documents and templates on our website at <https://ppie.lbg.ac.at>.

Contact the LBG PPIE team:

- Mag. Dr. Raphaela Kaisler, MSc - Tel: (01) 513 27 50 62
- Thomas Palfinger, BA - Tel: (01) 513 27 50 68

## 8.0 APPENDIX

Please find the Terms of References (ToR) attached.