

Leveraging user-centered design to harmonize interventions, contexts, and implementation strategies

Emily Haines, PhD Wake Forest School of Medicine <u>ehaines@wakehealth.edu</u> @EmilyRHaines

Agenda

- Overview of implementation science
- User-centered design in implementation research
- Case example in AYA cancer care to highlight:
 - Usability testing
 - Ethnographic contextual inquiry
 - Prototyping interventions and implementation strategies

		• •					•								8			0						0																
		• •			•			0	0	•		•	0 0		•						- - -								•	•										
			r					ê		Ŷ	1	e	, ,		t			ti		٦ ا		S	С				ן ר		;e	9										
			r	ņ		0		e	ŗ	Ŷ	Ŋ	e	Ņ	ņ	t	2		ti	C	1		S	С		e	er	ן ר	С	;6											
			r	ņ		0		e	ŗ	Ŷ	1	e))	ņ	t	2	al	ti	C	1		S	С		e	; ;]	С	E	9										
			r	ņ		0		e		Ŷ	1	e		n	t	2		ti	C	1		S	С		e	; ; ;	י ר ר	C	E	5										
			r	ľ				e		Ŷ	1	e			• • • •				C	1		S	С		e		 	C	E	5										
			r					C		Ŷ	ן וויי	e			: t			ti				S	С		0		י ר ר	C	:€											
			r			0		e		Ŷ		e			t	2		ti	C	1		S	С		e		ן ר ר	C	;6											
			ſ	r) 	0		e		Ŷ	<mark>ן</mark>	e	S	n	t	2		ti	C	1		S	С		e		ן ר ר	C	;€	5										
			r	r		0		e		Ŷ		e			t	2			C	1		S	С		e	• • •	י ר ר	C	; ;											
			r	r		0		0		Ŷ		e		n	t			ti	C	1		S	С		e	• •	ן ר ר	C	; (
			ſ	r				e		Ŷ		e			t				C	1		S	C		e)	C	;	5										
			r	ŗ				e		Ŷ		e			t	2			C			S	С		e		ן ר	C	÷											

Research-to-practice gap

Implementation science

 The scientific study of methods to promote the systematic uptake of research findings and other evidence-based practices into routine practice, and, hence, to improve the quality and effectiveness of health services (Eccles & Mittman, 2006)

Context

Individuals	Inner context	Outer context
• Knowledge and beliefs	 Structural 	 Patient needs and
about the intervention	characteristics	resources
 Self-efficacy 	 Networks and 	Cosmopolitanism
	communication	
 Individual stage of 		Peer pressure
change	Culture	
		External policies and
 Individual 	Implementation climate	incentives
identification with the		
organization	 Readiness for 	• Etc.
	implementation	
• Etc.		
	• Etc.	

Interventions

- Implementation often challenged by poor intervention-context fit
 - Need methods for considering the complex interplay between intervention and context
- There is no implementation without adaptation
 - Need methods to inform systematic intervention adaptation (i.e. methods for "meeting")

Implementation strategies

- "More is better" approach may burden stakeholders
 - Need approaches for identifying minimally necessary implementation strategies
- Modest effect sizes may reflect misalignment with intervention or context
 - Need methods for tailoring implementation strategies to intervention + context (i.e., methods for "meeting")

User-centered design Applications in implementation science	
User-centered design Applications in implementation science	
User-centered design	

What is user-centered design?

 A collection of methods and principles to guide the development of innovations which are responsive to the needs and constraints of their users and contexts of use

User-centered design outcomes

 <u>Usability</u>: ease with which users (e.g., patients and providers) can use an intervention in practice

<u>Usefulness</u>: extent to which an intervention does what it is intended to do

Usability

Intervention usability	Perceptual implementation outcomes	Behavioral implementation outcomes	Service outcomes
 Efficiency Effectiveness Errors 	 Acceptability Appropriateness Feasibility 	 Adoption Fidelity Reach/penetration 	 Symptoms Functioning Well-being

Intervention (the thread)

- Selecting interventions that are appropriate for users and their context
 - E.g., System Usability Scale
- Redesigning interventions to better fit users and their context
 - E.g., usability testing; heuristic evaluation

	The System Usability Scale Standard Version	Strongly Disagree				Strong Agree
		1	2	3	4	5
1	I think that I would like to use this system frequently.	0	0	0	0	0
2	I found the system unnecessarily complex.	0	0	0	0	0
3	I thought the system was easy to use.	0	0	0	0	0
4	I think that I would need the support of a technical person to be able to use this system.	o	0	0	0	0
5	I found the various functions in this system were well integrated.	0	0	0	0	0
6	I thought there was too much inconsistency in this system.	0	0	0	0	0
7	I would imagine that most people would learn to use this system very quickly.	0	0	0	0	0
8	I found the system very awkward to use.	0	0	0	0	0
9	I felt very confident using the system.	0	0	0	0	0
10	I needed to learn a lot of things before I could get	0	0	0	0	0

Context (the fabric)

- Assessing context
 - E.g., contextual inquiry; diary-keeping
- Preparing context to promote receptivity to intervention
 - E.g., workflow mapping

Implementation strategies (the needle)

- Anticipating needed implementation strategies based on context assessment
 - E.g., design team workshops

- Selecting strategies that are appropriate given intervention and context
 Eq. CWIS
 - E.g., CWIS

- Tailoring/designing strategies for intervention and context
 - E.g., co-creation sessions with users

												• •		• •				• •																
		C					• • • • • •	•														0				•••	0 0 0	• • • •		• • • • • •				
		C	a	S	e	e	X	ŝ	ar	Y)	e			A		A		Cí	a	n	C	е	r	. (ar	Те					
		C	a	S	e	e	X	S	ar	\mathbf{n}	n þ		e			Ą	Y	A		Ci	a	n	C	e	ŗ	(ar	Те					
		C	a	S	e	e	X	3	ar		n P		e	i		Ą	Y	A		Cá	a	n	С	е	ŗ	(Ca	ar	Ге					
		C	a	S	e	e	X	S	ar	1	i P		e	i		Ą	Y	Ά		Cá	a	n	С	е	r	(Ce	ar	`е					
		C	a	S	e	e	X	3	ar		ľ		e	i		A	Y	A		Ci	a	n	C	e	: : :	(ar	Ъ.					
		C	a	S	e	e	X	3	ar				e			A	Y	A		Cá	a	n	С	е	r	(ar	Ге					
		C	a	S	e	e		S	ar							A		A		Cí	a	n	С	е	• •			ar	Ге					
			a	S	e	e			ar				e							Cá	a		С	e				ar	Ъ.					
			a	S	e	e														Cí	a		C	е				ar	Г е					
			a	S	e	e														Cá	a	n	C	e				ar	Ъ.					
			a	S	e	e														Cí	a		C	e				ar	T e					
			a	S	e	e														C	a	n	C	e					°e					
			a	S	e	e										A			MED		a		C	e					TE					

Background

Awareness; beliefs about compatibility

Information overload

Barriers to use

• Navigating multiple

provide or dination stem

- Limited bandwidth
- Hesitance to raise concerns without prompting

Cancer program services

Care coordination

Needs met

Conceptual model

Conceptual model

Aim	Approach
1. Review &	Usability Testing
refine the CNQ-	AYA Survey
YP	Cognitive interviews with AYAs
	Concept mapping with providers
2. Understand	Ethnographic contextual inquiry
users & context	 Guided tours with AYAs and providers from UNC
	Semi-structured interviews with provider from outside of UNC
3. Design AYA	Design Team Workshops
NA-SB and	Workshop #1
implementation	• Workshop #2
strategies	

Design team

- Me
- Providers (n=6+)
- AYAs (n=5)
- Others pulled in, as needed

		(tł	n ne	t.	e hr	rea	AC	/(ר	t		0																				
		(tł	n	t e tl	e hr	rea	ac	/(9	ר	t	i	0																				
		(tł	n ne	t t	e hr	ea	ac	/(1)		ו	t	ic																					
		(tł	n	to tl	e hr	ea	ac	/ (9		t	ic																					
		(tł	n ne	t t	e hr	ea	AC	/(t	i																					
		(tł	n ne	t e tl	e hr	ea	ac	/(t	i																					
		(††	n	t(e hr	r		/(1	t	i	0	r																			
			n	t	e			/(1	t		0	r																			
			n	t	e				9	٦	t		0	r	Ì																		
			n	t	e			• /•	9	1	t	i)	r																			
				+			•	•			+			r																			
				0							8	_ ^																					

3/8/2

Reviewing user interactions with prototype

AYA survey
 n=70 AYAs

- Cognitive interviews
 Cone
 n=5 AYAs
 n=2
 - Concept mapping n=26 providers

Refining prototype

Changes made to the CNQ-YP

- 25 items removed; 18 added; 22 revised
- Reframed item wording to ask about help "wanted" rather than help "needed"
- Anchored all items to current needs and eliminated redundant content stemming from the original CNQ-YP's multiple periods of reference
- Collapsed CNQ-YP's response scale from 5 options to 3 and added a "not sure" option
- Revised sequencing based on "follow up domains"

1. INFORMATION

	I want more information about:	Agree	Somewhat agree	I have enough information about this concern	Not sure
1	My cancer diagnosis				
2	The short-term side effects of treatment				
3	The long-term side effects of treatment				
4	What will happen when treatment finishes				
5	My disease status				
6	My test results				
7	What to do if I have side effects from my treatment				
8	How my genetics may or may not have impacted my diagnosis and treatment				

2. CANCER CARE TEAM

	I want my cancer care team to do a better job of:	Agree	Somewhat agree	My cancer care team is doing this already	Not sure
9	Respecting me as an individual, not just a cancer patient				
10	Offering to talk to me in private, without my family or friends				
11	Explaining what they were doing in a way I can understand				
12	Encouraging me to ask questions				
13	Engaging me in decision-making about my treatment and respecting my decisions				
14	Asking me about my treatment concerns				

3. PHYSICAL HEALTH

	I want more help with:	Agree	Somewhat agree	I have enough help with this concern	Not sure
15	Managing pain				
16	Managing my medications				
17	Managing physical side effects of treatment				
18	Managing feeling tired/ fatigued				
19	Managing loss of walking ability				

40

	(1	he)r fat	ht	C)	¢																	
	(1	he)r fat	orio	C)	¢																	
	(1	he	Dr fat	nt orio	.e	¢																	
	(t	he)r fak	nt ori	.e	¢																	
	(†	he)r fat	nt orie	с)	¢																	
	(1	he)r fat	nt ori	.e	¢																	
	(1	he)ľ fat	nt ori	.e	¢																	
	(1	he)r fat	nt orio	: e	¢																	
) و	Dr	ht	:e	¢																	
)ر	Dr	ht	e	¢																	
)ر	Dr	h	e	¢t																	
			J r	ht	6	<u>(</u> †																	

Identifying contextual factors

Domain	Example Questions (for providers/staff)
User group characteristics	 What is your role in caring for AYAs with cancer? What experience do you have with cancer needs assessment tools or asking AYAs about their needs?
User tasks	 Given your current task load, would you be able to administer a needs assessment to all AYAs? When? As part of which task?
Technical & physical environment	 Where do you currently record information about needs expressed by AYAs? (In the electronic health record? Is it easy to find?)
Organizational environment	 Does your institution support the establishment of systems or processes specifically for AYAs? How do you communicate with other providers in your institution?

43

Contextual factors \rightarrow usability requirements

Ethnography finding	Requirement for AYA NA-SB
AYAs are tech-savvy and use a broad range of technologies to manage their cancer	Electronic delivery of AYA NA-SB should be considered.
AYAs' appointments are long and exhausting; there are multiple periods of "deadtime" when they are waiting	If delivered in person, AYA NA-SB should be delivered to AYAs during appointment "deadtime".
When diagnosed, AYAs are often in shock and in high distress, and may not know what their needs are yet	AYA NA-SB should not be administered immediately upon diagnosis.
Providers use the EMR to document and communicate about AYAs' needs.	In the future, AYA NA-SB should interface with EMR.

Changes made to context

Workflow

- AYA nurse practitioner to introduce NA-SB during initial consultation
- AYA social worker to review NA-SB with AYA during subsequent follow-up visit and initiate referral pathways
- AYA program director to provide administrative support
- Communication/ documentation
 - AYA to receive link to NA-SB via patient portal message prior to visit with social worker
 - AYA social worker to record initiated referral pathways in EHR note (initially)
- Technology
 - NA-SB to be administered via REDCap (initially), requiring provider interface with REDCap

|--|--|--|

Anticipating implementation strategies

Establishing interface with EMR/ other documentation method Variation in AYAs' treatment and appointment schedules Capacity of AYA social workers to respond to needs Coordinating across disease groups/ disparate physical locations Workflow disruptions Staffing burden Bandwidth of AYAs to use services/resources offered to them Provider buy-in

Lack of centralized physical space for AYA programming Coordinating across pediatric and adult oncology AYAs' time

Leadership buy-in

						0																			
			S	C	k	ŝ	S	ic) DI																
		D	S	C	J	S	S	i		n															
		D	S	C	K	5	S	ic		n															
		D	S	C	J	5	S	ic		n															
		D	S	C	1	S	S	ic	כו	n															
		D	S	C	1	5	S	ic	כו	n															
			S	C	1	S	S	ic		n															
			S	C	1	5	S	ic		n															
			S	C		S	S	ic																	
			S	C		5	S	ic																	
			S	C		S	S	ic																	
			S	Ċ		S	S	ic																	
			S	Ċ		S	S	ic																	

Usability testing

Benefits	Challenges
 Identifies usability and usefulness	 Making decisions about who counts as
issues with intervention at any point	a user and which individuals represent
in development	users more broadly
 Provides valuable source data for	 Prioritizing divergent feedback from
design team prototyping workshops	different user groups
 Can be done with small number of	 Requires multiple iterations to use it
participants	effectively

Ethnographic contextual inquiry

Benefits	Challenges
 Elicits in-depth data on users, their tasks, and their context 	Can be time intensive
 Particularly helpful for understanding the multilevel, non-rational, or difficult-to- 	 Large amounts of data generated can be cumbersome to analyze and interpret
quantify contextual processes influencing implementation and sustainment	 Requires the researcher to be nimble as they move through the participant's context without being overly intrusive
 Sheds light on the differences between what people say and what people do Provides valuable source data for design 	 Participants must be sampled carefully so as not to sacrifice all breadth of information for depth
team prototyping workshops	 Can position the researcher in difficult or emotionally charged situations, bringing us face-to-face with the hardships faced by the populations we study

Design team prototyping workshops

	Benefits	Challenges
•	Engages users in analysis to promote a shared understanding of context	 Presenting project data in a way that is digestible to design team members
•	Provides platform and methods (e.g., translation tables, storyboards, personas, scenario of use) for	 Weighing the importance of user feedback with the feasibility of design solutions
	translating contextual data into intervention adaptations, context modifications, and implementation strategies.	 Inexpert application of UCD methods may lead to 'feature creep,' in which new ideas are incorporated into the intervention without careful consideration and evaluation of the effects of the added
•	Builds buy-in among prospective users	features

Next steps

• NA-SB

- Pilot underway
- Additional refinement
- Scaling up to diverse health systems
- User-centered design in implementation science
- Ethnography to study implementation context

	<u> </u>	<i>y</i> c	.111	H y	• FN		al	110	29) °																					
	G	ש ב	m	iĥ	, P		ai	n	م	•																					
		110		63		VV	v a						<u>1, C</u>	<u>70</u>																	
		ha	in		C				oł	າຕໍ	اد	lfh	ר י	ч Ч	h																
		×	4		~		L	V	71)																			
	<u> </u>		11		70	21	ti	C	21	n	C		2																		
												•																			

References

Balas, E. Andrew, and Suzanne A. Boren. "Managing clinical knowledge for health care improvement." (2000).

Benotti E, Goodwin C, Henrich N, Jurczak A, Karlage A, Singal R: Context Assessment for Implementation Success. Atlas Initiative.

Brown, C. H., Curran, G., Palinkas, L. A., Aarons, G. A., Wells, K. B., Jones, L., . . . Cruden, G. (2017). An overview of research and evaluation designs for dissemination and implementation. Annual Review of Public Health, 38(1).

Brooke, John. "Sus: a "quick and dirty 'usability." Usability evaluation in industry 189 (1996).

Damschroder, Laura J., et al. "Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for advancing implementation science." *Implementation science* 4.1 (2009): 1-15.

Dopp, Alex R., et al. "A glossary of user-centered design strategies for implementation experts." Translational behavioral medicine 9.6 (2019): 1057-1064.

Eccles, Martin P., and Brian S. Mittman. "Welcome to implementation science." (2006): 1-3.

Haines, E.R., Dopp, A., Lyon, A., Witteman, H.O., Bender, M., Vaisson, G., Hitch, D., Birken, S. (under review). Harmonizing evidence-based practice, implementation context, and implementation strategies with user-centered design: a case example in adolescent and young adult cancer care. Implementation Science Communications.

Johnson, Constance M., Todd R. Johnson, and Jiajie Zhang. "A user-centered framework for redesigning health care interfaces." Journal of biomedical informatics 38.1 (2005): 75-87.

Lyon, Aaron R., and Eric J. Bruns. "User-centered redesign of evidence-based psychosocial interventions to enhance implementation—hospitable soil or better seeds?." *JAMA* psychiatry 76.1 (2019): 3-4.

Lyon, Aaron R., et al. "The Cognitive Walkthough for Implementation Strategies (CWIS): A Pragmatic Method for Assessing Implementation Strategy Usability." (2020).

Maguire, Martin. "Methods to support human-centred design." International journal of human-computer studies 55.4 (2001): 587-634.

Proctor, Enola, et al. "Outcomes for implementation research: conceptual distinctions, measurement challenges, and research agenda." Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research 38.2 (2011): 65-76. 3/8/21 WAKE FOREST SCHOOL OF MEDICINE 55