

# Perspectives of Scientists on Disseminating Research Findings to Non-Research Audiences

**Demetria McNeal** (✉ [demetria.mcneal@cuanschutz.edu](mailto:demetria.mcneal@cuanschutz.edu))

University of Colorado Denver - Anschutz Medical Campus <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7415-8631>

**Russell E. Glasgow**

University of Colorado Denver - Anschutz Medical Campus

**Ross C. Brownson**

Washington University in Saint Louis

**Daniel D. Matlock**

University of Colorado Denver - Anschutz Medical Campus

**Pamela N. Peterson**

University of Colorado Denver - Anschutz Medical Campus

**Stacie L. Daugherty**

University of Colorado Denver - Anschutz Medical Campus

**Christopher E. Knoopke**

University of Colorado Denver - Anschutz Medical Campus

---

## Research

**Keywords:** dissemination, research practices, stakeholder engagement, qualitative survey

**Posted Date:** April 25th, 2020

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-23829/v1>

**License:**  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

---

**Version of Record:** A version of this preprint was published at Journal of Clinical and Translational Science on December 7th, 2020. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2020.563>.

# Abstract

**Background** Little is known about practices used to disseminate findings to non- research audiences. This study describes the perspectives, experience and activities of dissemination & implementation (D&I) researchers around disseminating their research findings.

**Methods** The study explored D&I researchers' experiences and recommendations for assessment of dissemination activities to non-research audiences. Existing list serves were used to recruit scientist. Respondents were asked three open ended questions on an Internet survey regarding 1) how their dissemination activities are evaluated, 2) how they would recommend changing the system to recognize dissemination activities and 3) how they could improve their own dissemination of their work.

**Results** Surveys were completed by 159 scientists reporting some training, funding, and/or publication history in D&I. Three themes emerged across each of the three open ended questions. Question 1 on evaluation generated the themes of: 1a) promotional review; 1b) funding requirements; and 1c) absence of evaluation of dissemination activities. Question 2 on recommended changes generated the themes of: 2a) dissemination as a distinct component of research; 2b) requirement of dissemination plan; and 2c) dissemination metrics. Question 3 on personal changes to improve dissemination generated the themes of: 3a) allocation of resources for dissemination activities; 3b) utilization of non-traditional (or alternative) dissemination mediums; and 3c) identify and address issues of priority for stakeholders.

**Conclusions** The findings revealed the different types of issues D&I researchers encounter when disseminating findings to non-academic audiences and their suggestions to improve the process. Future research should consider key requirements which determine academic promotion and grant funding as an opportunity to expand dissemination efforts.

## Contributions To The Literature

Literature identifying ways in which D&I researchers disseminate findings to a non-academic audience is relatively limited. For many researchers the need for a mechanism of evaluation from both academic leadership and grant funders would encourage greater dissemination efforts.

Although D&I scientists described several reasons for lack of dissemination efforts, this study highlights the desire and explicit need.

These study findings contribute to established gaps in the literature, including ascertaining how academic settings assess researchers' dissemination of study findings to non-academic audiences and grant funder's requirements for dissemination activities.

## Background

Timely translation of the benefits of health related research is of international concern.<sup>1-3</sup> Both literature and policy assume that rapid translation of research into practice is ideal, yet delays in the operationalization of research findings into real world practice persist.<sup>1</sup> While some lag is anticipated to

ensure the safety and efficacy of new interventions or medical advances, we should aim to lessen the frequently cited 17 year lag time for 14% of evidence to reach practice.<sup>4,5</sup> Delays are seen as a waste of limited resources and an expense of potential patient benefit; however research investigating factors which affect how researchers disseminate health research outside of the academic setting (e.g. to non-research audiences) is relatively scant.<sup>6</sup>

Previous studies investigating the variety of dissemination practices to non-research audiences are limited. One study examined dissemination practices among public health researchers to identify factors related to dissemination efforts to non-research audiences. Study results found one-third of researchers rated their dissemination efforts as poor. However, many factors were significantly related to whether a researcher rated him/herself as excellent/good, including obligation to disseminate findings, importance of dissemination to his/her academic department and expectations by employer or by funder. Though it is unclear how dissemination practices are integrated (if at all) to annual performance metrics or funding mechanisms.<sup>7</sup> Further, prior work did not extensively assess perceived or existent requirements to disseminate findings to non-academic stakeholders. A greater understanding of these issues will illustrate the actual experience of scientists as they attempt to disseminate findings to non-research audiences while navigating an academic career and being responsive to requirements by grant funders.

A recent study by Knoepke et al<sup>8</sup> characterized current practices of dissemination to non-research audiences among D&I researchers. More specifically, the study investigated potential researcher characteristics associated with greater use of various dissemination strategies. While researchers were from diverse settings (e.g. clinical and community) and routinely engaged in a variety of dissemination-related activities, there were noticeable differences in the dissemination strategies used between researchers. These findings suggest additional factors related to academic setting or funding requirements may influence dissemination-related activities.

To further explore factors related to use of dissemination strategies among D&I researchers, the current project conducted an analysis of the qualitative responses of a previously-reported survey of D&I researchers.<sup>8</sup> The aims of this analysis are to: summarize D&I researchers experience and opinions regarding dissemination activities' importance to their work; identify how they are evaluated in this area of D&I science; and summarize suggestions for how to improve the process to enhance translation to practice.

## Methods

### Sample and procedures

Sample identification and online survey administration methods, as well as return characteristics of the dataset being analyzed have been previously described.<sup>8</sup> In brief, we purposively sampled the opinions and insights of researchers with interest, training, funding, and/or publication history in D&I. The survey asked participants to report practices related to dissemination of findings to non-research

audiences, as well as described methods by which respondents engage stakeholders in research to enhance translation. The University of Colorado's Combined Institutional Review Board (COMIRB) approved the overall project.

## **Data Collection**

Surveys were distributed through Qualtrics® (when individual e-mail addresses were available) or through electronic listservs as appropriate. Listserv distributions were conducted by managers of those listservs rather than by our study personnel due to confidentiality requirements. Potential scientists for whom we had individual e-mail addresses received up to three reminder emails at one-week intervals from April-May 2018. Responses were collected anonymously and respondents did not receive any incentive for participation.

The recent Knoepke et al publication<sup>8</sup> reports quantitative results of the survey regarding D&I researchers use of different dissemination strategies. The focus of this paper is on the separate but related issue of responses to three open ended questions: 1) How is your dissemination of research findings to non-research audiences evaluated? 2) How would you improve the system for credit or recognition for disseminating research to non-research audiences? and 3) What is the one thing you could do that would most enhance your efforts to disseminate your research to non-research audiences?

## **Data Analyses**

Qualitative responses were analyzed by the primary authors (DMM, CEK), using a collaborative inductive open coding process for content analysis. Both authors are PhD-trained researchers with experience in qualitative methods, health services research, and D&I science. During coding, responses were organized into categories according to conceptual similarity, with the primary authors discussing differences throughout. The project team reviewed and agreed upon key themes that emerged from the qualitative data. Thematic saturation was achieved as further observations and analysis revealed no new themes.<sup>9,10</sup>

## **Results**

Demographic characteristics of surveyed scientists are presented in Table 1. Of the 159 scientist responses to the survey, 159 provided qualitative responses to any of the three open-response items. Specifically, we received 95 responses for questions one and two and 159 responses from question three. The majority of scientists were from university or research settings in the U.S. (69%) or Canada (13%). They were from a mix of clinical (33%) and community settings (68%). The majority were from behavioral health (43%) or public health disciplines (42%); 26% had received formal training in D&I and there was a wide distribution in years since highest academic degree. The project was approved by the Colorado Combined Institutional Review Board (COMIRB), including a waiver of written consent to participate.

What follows are reports of key themes present in the data organized by each of the open-ended question. Additional illustrative quotes are also provided in Tables 2-4.

### **Question 1: How is your dissemination of research findings to non-research audiences evaluated?**

Of the 95 responses to this question three distinct themes emerged: 1a) promotional review; 1b) funding requirements; and 1c) absence of evaluation of dissemination activities.

#### **1a) Promotional review**

Many respondents reported that when the dissemination of research findings to non-research audiences was evaluated, this evaluation occurred during an annual review. Researchers expressed a combination of ways in which the review took place. “When going up for promotion or other awards we indicate the impact our work has made on practice/policy. I also share events (i.e., policy changes) with my leadership through email.” It was also expressed that the evaluation of dissemination activities is considered under the “broad umbrella of community service”. Additionally, it was noted that evaluation of dissemination often occurred only “qualitatively” during the performance review conversation, perhaps indicating that these activities garnered less attention than more easily-quantifiable productivity.

#### **1b) Funding requirements**

Overall, there was general agreement that many, but not all, grant funders expected the dissemination of research findings. Researchers noted that “certain agencies specifically ask for this [dissemination] in an annual report” and also have “explicit expectations for our research to lead to clinical practice change.” Further, scientists mentioned specific funder requirements regarding dissemination expectations. “There is an expectation that evidence-based information and programs will be taken to the community. Number of community contacts is part of what is measured, as well as support activities of these programs in community.” Scientists reported that particular funding agencies require “completion of milestones, presentation of results at meetings of various kinds” as well as the ‘reporting of how stakeholders (including patients, caregivers, policy makers, etc.) were engaged throughout the research process’ as means of assuring the dissemination of research.”

#### **1c) Lack of acknowledgement of dissemination activities**

External evaluation of dissemination activities was often non-existent. A majority of researchers said that it is simply “not evaluated”, as demonstrated by such statements as it “is not an important part of my job.” Other respondents also noted they were either “unsure” or “not certain” if the university requires such an evaluation. “My institution only recognizes peer-reviewed research in scholarly journals; dissemination among practitioners or stakeholders is derivative by an order of magnitude.” There were a modest number of scientists that stated the information was recorded in the “CV section on dissemination” as well as through “publications, citations, media, social media etc.” Table 2 presents additional quotes of researchers’ experience with disseminating findings to non-research audiences.

## **Question 2: How would you improve the system for credit or recognition for disseminating research to non-research audiences?**

Of the 95 responses to this question three distinct themes emerged: 2a) dissemination as a distinct component of research; 2b) requirement of dissemination plan; and 2c) dissemination metrics.

### **2a) Dissemination as a distinct component of research**

Participants described the need for a clear path for promotion that is inclusive of metrics associated with disseminating research, noting to “make it more desirable to reach these audiences (more recognition within formal reports etc - not everything should be based on publications).” Specific suggestions provided by researchers were to “include it [dissemination] in metrics for academic promotion”, “recognition of practice-based reports equal to academic journals”, and “link to tenure process”.

### **2b) Requirement of dissemination plan**

Scientists agreed in general that recognition for dissemination activities would receive more attention if they were a required element of grant proposals, noting to “add a dissemination outcome or plan in grant proposals; or a requirement to report dissemination channels and impact to non-research audiences...” Even more definitively, there were specific requests for “funders require it” and that “NIH put more weight on it.” Researchers more explicitly recommended to “make it [dissemination activities] a valued component of KT [knowledge translation] plans on grant applications, include a section in manuscripts for other ways to learn about the results of this study, assign higher priority to these activities in Canadian Common CV/salary awards.”

### **2c) Dissemination metrics**

Researchers generally believe that a clear measure to capture dissemination efforts will create a path for recognition within the academic setting. There was a general consensus that the current system does not have metrics in place to evaluate dissemination, noting the need to “develop a measure for how much time and effort a researcher puts into this, what the outcomes are, and make it as important as publishing in peer-reviewed journals.” Table 3 presents additional quotes of researchers’ recommendations on ways to improve the system.

## **Question 3: What is the one thing you could do that would most enhance your efforts to disseminate your research to non-research audiences?**

Of the 159 responses, three primary themes emerged from question 3: 3a) development of skills and allocation of resources for dissemination activities; 3b) utilization of non-traditional (or alternative) dissemination mediums; and 3c) identify and address issues of priority for stakeholders.

### **3a) Development of skills and allocation of resources for dissemination activities**

Scientists felt ill-equipped to effectively disseminate research findings. Specifically, it was noted that lack of financial resources and staffing to support such efforts are strong barriers to dissemination. Scientists stated explicitly, the need to “learn dissemination skills. Have a dedicated staff to assist with effective dissemination strategies. Its time-consuming and not all researchers are good at this part, so it would be good to work with creative staff and partners on this.” Scientists largely agreed that dissemination needs to begin early in the study design process, but is actually accomplished post-hoc (if it is even considered at all). Furthermore, scientists emphasized that dissemination and traditional research activities often require different skills and hiring staff specifically to support dissemination activities would improve impact. To rectify this, it was noted to prospectively prioritize dissemination activities, for example, including in research budgets. Further, the need for resources was continually emphasized.

### **3b) Utilization of non-traditional (or alternative) dissemination mediums**

Scientists conveyed the need to increase their own use of non-traditional methods of reporting research findings. It was suggested to “create a website with regular blogs, social media posts, and press releases” to share research findings to the non-research community. It was also recommended to create “visual abstracts for sharing on social media would likely garner more attention and interest - graphic design and visuals are very helpful communication tools.”

### **3c) Identify and address issues of priority for stakeholders**

Scientists referenced both practical and logistical challenges to meeting with stakeholders and the need to partner with them during all phases of the research process, noted that “non-researchers often don't care about or want to use research, so knowing how to make them interested in it to begin with would be my silver bullet.”

Specifically, the need to “better understand their [stakeholders] priorities” was expressed as well as the need to “to develop a formal dissemination plan as part of the research plan, including stakeholders in this process.” Tale 4 presents additional quotes regarding researchers’ recommendations on ways to improve the system.

## **Discussion**

This study provides insights into how D&I researcher’s work is assessed in the academic setting with regard to dissemination to non-research audiences. Along with the recently published companion paper<sup>8</sup> that reported frequency of use of different dissemination strategies, this report identified important considerations, needs, options and alternatives for both researchers and funding agencies. D&I scientist overwhelmingly stated that methods of professional evaluation are lacking, citing an absence of recognition of dissemination activities as well as lack of resources for necessary support. In addition, scientists shared their beliefs of what might enhance the dissemination process.

D&I researchers reported a lack of acknowledgement or perceived importance of dissemination activities in annual or promotional evaluations. Researchers emphasized the need for funders to require dissemination activities as part of funding announcements and the research process, which could conceivably lead to greater emphasis on these activities in both proposals and funded projects. Finally, many scientists called for the creation and promotion of quantifiable metrics which could be applied to evaluating the impact of dissemination activities in the real-world. These metrics would theoretically help operationalize and streamline the discussion of dissemination activities during employment and promotion evaluation, incentivizing researchers to devote resources to dissemination.

The findings of this study fit into similar contexts of other studies that have explored research perspectives on dissemination. Tabak et al.<sup>11</sup> conducted a cross-sectional study of 266 public health researchers at universities, the National Institutes of Health (NIH), and CDC. The study authors compared self-rated effort to disseminate

findings to non-research audiences across predictor variables in three categories: perceptions or reasons to disseminate, perceived expectation by employer/funders, and professional training and experience. Results found one-third of researchers rated their dissemination efforts as poor. Many factors were significantly related to whether a researcher rated him/herself as excellent/good, including obligation to disseminate findings, whether dissemination was important to their academic department and expectations by grant funders. Prior studies have also found lack of internal support and expectations by funders,<sup>12</sup> as contributing factors to marginal dissemination efforts.

For scientists, the inclusions of dissemination activities as an academic measure is an important step that fulfills the requirement of performing 'scholarship'. Sharing research findings with the non-research community is an essential step to decreasing the 17-year gap that exists in translational science. The experiences provided indicate a growing awareness of and value for stakeholder engagement, but few suggestions were made regarding specifically how to pragmatically and effectively engage stakeholders throughout the research process. Many scientists noted barriers to working with stakeholders, and some proposed the importance of understanding stakeholder priorities and including them in the research process from inception as a means of improving dissemination efforts.

The use of a variety of dissemination practices to reach non-research audiences (e.g., publication, meetings, webinars) has previously been described by Brownson et al.<sup>7</sup> One challenge to dissemination in clinical settings is competing priorities among stakeholders. For researchers, the priority is often on discovery (rather than application) of new knowledge, which is reflected in academic promotional standards. By comparison, practitioners and policymakers often prioritize practical ways for applying discoveries for their respective settings. This misalignment of priorities persists, as researchers recently reported their primary role as identifying effective interventions, not disseminating findings, particularly to non-research stakeholders.<sup>8</sup> The current study highlights the misalignment of priorities as it seems researchers prioritize promotional requirements while the academic structure establishes guidelines that may not necessarily consider dissemination of research.

In recent years, novel disciplines such as quality improvement, informatics, and innovation have endeavored to redefine the scope and nature of scholarly work in medical schools: however other academic disciplines have lagged.<sup>13</sup> While current literature shows that many academic promotion and tenure committees in the United States have adapted and modified their appraisal systems to reflect changes in the research environment, though it is not a common practice recognized across the greater academic milieu. Further research is needed to: a) identify ways to address the themes noted in this study, b) understand how to increase the priority for disseminating study findings to diverse audiences among D&I researchers, employers and funders, and c) testing the most effective ways to share results outside of academic settings.

## Limitations And Future Directions

Although informative, this study has several limitations. First, the survey was conducted online as opposed to in-person interviews or focus groups, which reduced the opportunity to use prompts or to follow up with scientist for additional information. Second, the scientists sampled primarily specialize in public health, health services and D&I research, overlooking basic science researchers which may disseminate differently (e.g. through the patent process) and experience different academic and grant funding expectations.

Although a number of themes emerged from comments concerning needs, few specific innovative recommendations or examples emerged from researchers whose area of expertise is dissemination and implementation. Recommendations for future research and action might include case reports on the impact of requiring reporting of D&I activities in evaluation of researcher performance and more specific requirements by funders and sharing and evaluation of different metrics of dissemination to non-research audiences.

## Conclusion

Bridging the persistent gap between scientific discovery and application to real-world policy and practice will require a host of structural changes to the incentive structures surrounding health research, as well as to the individual practices of D&I researchers. In this project, we summarized perceived need for support from the perspective of D&I scientists, including the need to: 1) streamline the reporting and quantification of dissemination activities to non-research audiences for the purpose of employment evaluations, 2) more meaningful integration of dissemination planning into research at the design and proposal stage, and 3) develop skills in dissemination activities outside of academic publications and presentations, including those more likely to reach audiences of practitioners and policymakers. Future experimentation and documentation of efforts to implement these recommendations should help reduce the research-translation gap.

## Abbreviations

D&I  
dissemination and Implementation  
COMIRB  
Combined Institutional Review Board  
CV  
Curriculum vitae  
KT  
Knowledge translation  
NIH  
National Institute of Health  
CDC  
Center for Disease Control.

## Declarations

**Ethics approval and consent to participate:** The project was approved by the Colorado Combined Institutional Review Board (COMIRB), including a waiver of written consent to participate.

**Consent for publication:** Not applicable.

**Availability of data and materials:** The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available on the Open Science Framework. More limited datasets are available under any reasonable data use agreement with the Principle Investigator (Knoepke).

**Competing interests:** The authors declare they have no competing interests.

**Funding:** Dr. Knoepke is supported by a career development award from the American Heart Association. Dr. Daugherty is supported by grants from the National Institute of Health (R01 HL133343, DC0169065). Dr. Brownson is supported by the National Cancer Institute at the National Institutes of Health (grant number P50CA244431) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (grant number U48DP006395).

**Author's contributions:** DMM and CEK conducted the data analyses. All authors reviewed, edited and approved the final manuscript.

**Acknowledgements:** We would like to acknowledge the support from the University of Colorado School of Medicine as well as the Dissemination & Implementation Program at the Adult & Child Consortium for Outcomes Research & Delivery Science (ACCORDS). The findings and conclusions in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official positions of the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the American Heart Association.

## References

1. Morris ZS, Wooding S, Grant J. The answer is 17 years, what is the question: understanding time lags in translational research. *J R Soc Med.* 2011;104(12):510–520.
2. Glasgow RE. What Does It Mean to Be Pragmatic? Pragmatic Methods, Measures, and Models to Facilitate Research Translation. In. Vol 402013:257–265.
3. Brownson RC, Colditz GA, Proctor EK. *Dissemination and implementation research in health: translating science to practice.* Oxford University Press; 2018.
4. Westfall JM, Mold J, Fagnan L. Practice-based research—"Blue Highways" on the NIH roadmap. *Jama.* 2007;297(4):403–406.
5. Green D. Translating evidence into practice. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology.* 2014;56(12):1132–1133.
6. Ward V, House A, Hamer S. Developing a framework for transferring knowledge into action: a thematic analysis of the literature. *J Health Serv Res Policy.* 2009;14(3):156–164.
7. Brownson RC, Jacobs JA, Tabak RG, Hoehner CM, Stamatakis KA. Designing for dissemination among public health researchers: findings from a national survey in the United States. *American journal of public health.* 2013;103(9):1693–1699.
8. Knoepke CE, Ingle MP, Matlock DD, Brownson RC, Glasgow RE. Dissemination and stakeholder engagement practices among dissemination & implementation scientists: Results from an online survey. *PLoS One.* 2019;14(11):e0216971.
9. Creswell JW, Hanson WE, Clark Plano VL, Morales A. Qualitative research designs: Selection and implementation. *The counseling psychologist.* 2007;35(2):236–264.
10. Wicks D. The coding manual for qualitative researchers. *Qualitative research in organizations and management: an international journal.* 2017.
11. Tabak RG, Stamatakis KA, Jacobs JA, Brownson RC. What predicts dissemination efforts among public health researchers in the United States? *Public Health Rep.* 2014;129(4):361–368.
12. Tabak RG, Reis RS, Wilson P, Brownson RC. Dissemination of health-related research among scientists in three countries: access to resources and current practices. *Biomed Res Int.* 2015;2015:179156.
13. Bunton SA, Mallon WT. The continued evolution of faculty appointment and tenure policies at US medical schools. *Academic Medicine.* 2007;82(3):281–289.

## Tables

Table 1: Characteristics of respondents for qualitative items

<i>Domain</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>n(valid %)</i>
Work venue	University or Research Org (U.S.)	126(68.9)
	University or Research Org (Canada)	24(13.1)
	University or Research Org (other)	14(7.7)
	Private nonprofit	5(2.7)
Primary Research Setting	Clinical (In- or Outpatient)	50(32.5)
	Community	104(67.5)
Training	<4 years out	19(10.9)
	5-9 years out	54(30.9)
	10-14 years out	31(17.7)
	15-19 years out	71(40.6)
	Behavioral Health	82(42.5)
	Medicine	23(11.9)
	Public Health	81(42.0)
	Health Services Research	69(24.9)
Support	CDC Prevention Research Centers Affiliate	14
	NIH or CIHR Funding	90
	PCORI Funding	25
	Other Funding	85
Experience	Have Worked in Setting Where Their Research Would be Implemented	125(69.1)
<i>Note: Total n varied by item, valid %= percentage of those who responded</i>		

Table 2. Sample quotes from question 1: how is your dissemination of research findings to non-research audiences evaluated?

Themes	Sample quotes
Theme 1a: promotional review	<p>"When going up for promotions or other awards we indicate the impact our work has made on practice/policy. I also share events (i.e., policy changes) with my leadership through email."</p> <p>"Under the broad umbrella of community service which is valued less than academic research and teaching."</p>
Theme 1b: funding requirements	<p>"It is part of the selection criteria used in the grant proposals that fund our work."</p> <p>"Report of how we disseminate in annual review...required in reports to the funding agency."</p> <p>"Not evaluated by employer but yes evaluated by funding agency."</p>
Theme 1c: lack of acknowledgment of dissemination activities	<p>"It's not really evaluated. I create KT [knowledge translation] plans and materials with my supervisor but once we implement the plan it's treated as a checked box on a to-do list."</p> <p>"It's actually not really evaluated. It's sort of a side note in our giant dossiers."</p>

Table 3. Sample quotes from question 2: how would you improve the system for credit or recognition for disseminating research to non-research audiences?

Themes	Sample quotes
Theme 2a: dissemination as a distinct component of research	<p>"Make it more desirable to reach these audiences (more recognition within formal reports etc. - not everything should be based on publications)"</p> <p>"If it became a requirement, I think that would naturally result in some type of recognition in yearly evaluations, resulting in "credit" of some type"</p> <p>"Make it a separate item (rather than within service to the community) when evaluating career advancement (e.g., tenure, promotion, etc.)"</p>
Theme 2b: requirement of dissemination plan	<p>"Universities include in promotion, journals include in manuscripts, funders include in grant applications."</p> <p>"Incorporate it into promotion and tenure guidelines for academic appointments and in consideration for VA promotion to GS14 status for investigators and increase amount of grant funding to pay for this."</p>
Theme 2c: dissemination metrics	<p>"Having a clear definition of what dissemination to such an audience entails, and accordingly using it by the party giving that credit. The answer is hard to give as it also depends on who is giving the credit."</p> <p>"First, you have to crack the measurement nut. In the same way that the coin of the research dissemination realm is number of publications, citations, and journal impact factor, some equivalent, reliable and valid assessment of impact needs to be developed. Assuming such a metric exists or is developed then the next step needs to be working with the leadership to get them to see and accept the value of such an assessment, as well as the value of this performance dimension in the overall domain of performance for researchers."</p>

Table 4. Sample quotes from question 3: what is the one thing you could do that would most enhance your efforts to disseminate your research to non-research audiences?

Themes	Sample quotes
Theme 3a: development of skills and allocation of resources for dissemination activities.	<p>“Better understanding of how to reach the audiences for scale-up.”</p> <p>“Have a dedicated staff person for communication and dissemination support.”</p>
Theme 3b: utilization of non-traditional (or alternative) dissemination mediums	<p>“Visual abstracts for sharing on social media would likely garner more attention and interest - graphic design and visuals are very helpful communication tools”</p> <p>“Produce lay summaries in patient facing research newsletters”</p>
Theme 3c: identify and address issues of priority for stakeholders	<p>“[Establish] advisory board engaged from proposal to dissemination.”</p> <p>“Change the funding paradigm so it supports partnership and co-inquiry rather than single disease/time limited projects. Change the focus to context, and what the context needs now/next.”</p>