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The primary purpose of the proposal was to set a prospective research agenda for WREN.

Long-term objectives:

• Establish a working group to complete the research agenda, and revise it regularly
• Develop sound future research proposals in keeping with the vision set forth in the research agenda
• Successfully fund and implement research proposals to address the research agenda
• World Café with ~120 participants
• 84 questions derived
• 4 primary themes:
  • What is the most effective healthcare team to help empower patients to make sound health decisions and manage chronic conditions?
  • Can having patients set and articulate their life health goals change health outcomes?
  • What preventive measures could be enhanced to prevent chronic diseases? How can we best enable people to fully apply these to live their best lives?
  • Chronic Disease Causes, Treatment & Cures
Working Group

• Patient advocates:
  • Jeff Perzan, JD, American Diabetes Assn., WI Diabetes Advisory Group
  • Deb Constein, Arthritis Foundation of WI
  • Augustine Tatus, MA, UW Patient & Family Advisor & Burn Unit volunteer

• Clinicians:
  • Al Musa, MD, Dean Health System
  • Jill Kietzke, RN, UW Health - Mt. Horeb
  • Shahida Munim, MD, Internal Medicine Associate

• Clinician researchers:
  • David Feldstein, MD, UW General Internal Medicine
  • David Hahn, MD, MS, WREN/Family Medicine & Community Health

• WREN Staff:
  • Regina Vidaver, PhD
  • Amanda Hoffmann, MPH
  • Denise Grossman
Key Topics & Voting Results

- Understanding what patient-centric questions matter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Healthcare Team</th>
<th>Life Health Goals</th>
<th>Preventive Measures</th>
<th>Barriers &amp; Other Factors</th>
<th>Communication &amp; Information</th>
<th>Health Literacy</th>
<th>Metrics that Matter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Voters</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinicians</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Led to de-emphasis of issues around team structure
Question Prioritization

Process:
• In-person voting for initial consolidation
• Use of online voting software to finalize top tier
• Consensus building
• Focused discussion, revision, and refinement throughout
• Literature reviews
• Assessment of potential fundability/ability to implement
Question Development

• All members asked to contribute brief written summaries
  • Brief background/rationale
  • Potential Specific Aims
  • Potential approaches
• Discussion and refinement
  • Three prioritized questions
  • One “BHAG”, likely harder to fund
• Presentation to WREN Steering Committee
Question Development

• Important feedback led to preamble addition:

All questions are designed to be implemented in ways that make them maximally generalizable to the broadest possible populations, including **vulnerable populations**, defined as groups of people who are disadvantaged in some way. Typically, these populations **have less power** than the majority of their peers and **fewer resources to dedicate to their health**. We are committed to ensuring our research questions and the approaches we take are **inclusive**.
Does systematic implementation of recording, monitoring, and revising patient-identified SMART goals into the EHR improve outcomes for patients with newly-diagnosed pre-diabetes or Type 2 diabetes?
Question 2: Patient-Important Outcomes

Can the PROMIS global health instrument be used across any chronic condition to guide clinicians in understanding and treating their patients better?

http://www.healthmeasures.net/explore-measurement-systems/promis
Question 3: Meaningful Metrics

Does measurement and public reporting of PROM-generated quality results improve care and outcomes for patients with depression? If so, how, and to what degree?
Can the use of a tool such as the *Health Goal Finder* improve patients’ ability to develop meaningful life health goals? Does the use of the tool make setting & accomplishing smaller, SMART goals more feasible? Will use of the tool increase patient engagement & self-management skills to achieve SMART goals more effectively?
Next Steps

• Collaborators for Meaningful Metrics identified – planning first proposal submissions Fall 2016

• Identifying collaborators for other questions (let us know if you’re interested in working with us!)

• Subsequent proposals
Questions?

Comments?

Regina.Vidaver@fammed.wisc.edu
Amanda.Hoffmann@fammed.wisc.edu
DLHahn@wisc.edu