



2024 HIGH IRI Annual Institute Agenda:

Monday September 30, 2024, to Friday October 4, 2024

Charles F. Knight Conference Center, St. Louis MO

[Day 1](#) – Monday, September 30 – Understanding the Implementation Problem – Current Conceptualizations

[Day 2](#) – Tuesday, October 1 – Strategies for Implementation – State of the Art

[Day 3](#) – Wednesday, October 2 – Exploring and Testing Implementation Strategies – Developing Perspectives

[Day 4](#) – Thursday, October 3 – Emerging Issues in Global Implementation Science

[Day 5](#) – Friday, October 4 –Symposium Day: Building Infrastructure for Dissemination and Implementation and Cancer Implementation Research Globally

Time and Location	Day 1: Monday September 30, 2024: Understanding the Implementation Problem – Current Conceptualizations			Notes
7:00 am – 8:00 am Anheuser Busch Dining Hall	Breakfast and Registration			
8:00 am – 8:30 am Session 1.0 Welcome Classroom 200	Welcome and Introduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome (Ross Brownson, Elvin Geng, Whitney Irie, Thomas Odeny) PBL – 5 minutes Introduce Design Ethnographer - Anne Trolard (Elvin Geng) Brief Icebreaker (Thomas Odeny) 			
8:30 am – 9:30 am Session 1.1 Plenary Talks Classroom 200	The Problem of Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speakers: (~ 6-7 minutes each with slides) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is evidence (Ross Brownson) What is implementation (Anne Sales) Implementation in African Setting (Nadia Sam-Agudu) Discussants: Caroline De Schacht, Crystal Chapman-Lambert, Mayuko Ito Fukunaga (~ 3-5 minutes each without slides) Moderator: Marie-Claude Lavoie 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speaker slides in appropriate Box folder by 23-Sept. Non-assigned faculty present to weigh in on discussion. Discussants provide initial, prepared reactions (see FAQ)
9:30 am – 10:30 am Session 1.2 Panel Classroom 200	Implementation as Science <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speakers: (~ 6-7 minutes each) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation research: past, present, and future (Enola Proctor) Questioning the question (Elvin Geng) Implementation research in global perspectives (Kunle Alonge) Discussants: Jepchirchir Kiplagat, Jana Jarolimova, Raagini Jawa (~ 3-5 minutes each without slides) Moderator: Andrew Kanyike 			
10:30 am – 11:00 am	Coffee Break			
11:00 am – 11:45 am Session 1.3 Debate Classroom 200	Debate Proposition: QI is Basically Implementation Research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pro: Pod 1 & Pod 5 (Jimmy Carlucci, Minh Nguyen) vs. Against: Pod 2 (Andrew Kanyike, Ruth Adekunle) Debate Judges: Rohit Ramaswamy, Enola Proctor, Kunle Alonge Moderator: Whitney Irie 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 debaters on each team, 4 minutes each speaker (16 minutes) Judges assess positions (~ 4 minutes) Moderated conversation (10 minutes) People’s choice vote (by Mentimeter) Non-assigned faculty present to weigh in on discussion
11:45 am – 12:30 pm Session 1.4 Debate Classroom 200	Debate Proposition: Implementation Research is Improving Health Disparities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pro: Pod 3 (Alison Castle, Richard Muhindo) vs. Against: Pod 11 (Marie-Claude Lavoie, Lauren Brown) Debate Judges: Carolyn Audet, Byron Powell, Nadia Sam-Agudu Moderator: Jessica Islam 			
12:30 pm – 1:30 pm	Lunch			
1:30 pm – 2:15 pm Session 1.5 Pod Meetings Breakout Rooms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet your pod, describe your projects to each other, get to know new members (Thomas Odeny) Discuss how pod will interact (including logistics) 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty leads discussion; introduces “Pod Protocol” (See Appendix)
2:15 pm – 4:15 pm Session 1.6 Problem Based Learning Working Groups Breakout Rooms	Session 1.6.1 Breakout Room 255 How to use systems science to understanding complexity in implementation systems Chair: Jessica Islam	Session 1.6.2 Classroom 200 Effective use of frameworks (e.g., CFIR, NPT) from implementation science Chair: Nancy Ngumbau Faculty: Anne Sales, Kunle Alonge	Session 1.6.3 Breakout Room 224 Understanding equity in implementation Chair: Lauren Brown Faculty: Aggrey Semeere, Nadia Sam-Agudu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unassigned fellows sign up (survey to come). Chair will select and inform <u>two</u> presenters ~ Sept 23 The 2 presenters describe projects and raise questions related to theme (~5 min each)

	Faculty: Ginger McKay, Sara Malone			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brief Q&A (~ 10 minutes) whole group Faculty insights (~ 5 min each) and suggested directions (not “answers”) Small group work: Each session will break into two groups (one for each presentation), and research, discuss and compare (~60 minutes). More instructions below. Whole session reconvenes, and presenter from each session reports on groups insights (~5 min) Unassigned faculty can join any sessions, or optional faculty studios.
	Session 1.6.4 Classroom 211 Use of intervention mapping to understand implementation Chair: Aditi Ramakrishnan, Faculty: Maria Fernandez, Corrina Moucheraud	Session 1.6.5 Breakout Room 240 Design as a lens Chair: Jimmy Carlucci Faculty: Aaloke Mody, Laura Beres	Session 1.6.6 (FIT) Classroom 211 Design a needs assessment for implementation research Chair: Risa Hoffman Presenters: FIT Track Faculty: Rohit Ramaswamy, Ross Brownson	
	Session 1.6.7 Boardroom Optional Concurrent Faculty Discussions for Unassigned Faculty: Faculty-to-Faculty Working Groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Global Intersections of D&I: (Hikabasa Halwiindi, Wilbroad Mutale) Climate and D&I: (Elvin Geng) 			
4:15 – 5:00 pm Session 1.7 Pod Debrief and Adjourn Breakout Rooms				
5:00 – 5:15 pm	Adjourn			
Dinner On Your Own				

Time and Location	Day 2: Tuesday, October 1, 2024: Strategies for Implementation – State of the Art			Notes
7:00 am – 8:00 am Anheuser Busch Dining Hall	Breakfast and Registration			
8:00 am – 8:15 am Session 2.0 Classroom 200	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome and synthesis of day (Elvin Geng, Ross Brownson, Whitney Irie, Thomas Odeny) 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructions for the day
8:15 am – 9:30 am Session 2.1 Plenary Talks Classroom 200	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Solving implementation problems Speakers (~ 10 min each): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social Entrepreneurship and Implementation Research (Joe Tucker) Implementation Mapping State of the Art: Emerging Insights (Maria Fernandez) Discussants (~5 min each): Alejandra Portillo-Romero, Raagini Jawa, William Byansi Moderator: Jimmy Carlucci 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speaker slides in appropriate Box folder by 23-Sept. Non-assigned faculty present to weigh in on discussion. Discussants provide initial, prepared reactions (see FAQ)
9:30 am - 10:30 am Session 2.2 Panel Classroom 200	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lens for Solutions Panelist: (~ 5-10 min each) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crowdsourcing (Juliet Iwelunmor —Joe Tucker) State of the art on tailoring strategies (Byron Powell) Human centered design (Laura Beres) Discussants (~ 5 min each): Andrew Media-Marino, Serge Ngekeng, Kelechi Chima Moderator: Aaloke Mody 			
10:30 – 11:00 am	Coffee Break			
11:00 – 11:45 am Session 2.3 Debate Classroom 200	Debate Proposition: Implementation mapping is human centered design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pro: Pod 10 (Aditi Ramakrishnan, Nancy Ngumbau) vs. Against: Pod 7 (Sheena Mukkada, Nyanyiwe Mbeye) Debate Judges: Maria Fernandez, Anne Sales, Kunle Alonge Moderator: Jackie Hodges 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 debaters on each team, 4 minutes each speaker (16 minutes) Judges assess positions (~ 4 minutes) Moderated conversation (10 minutes) People’s choice vote (by Mentimeter) Non-assigned faculty present to weigh in on discussion
11:45 am – 12:30 pm Session 2.4 Debate Classroom 200	Debate Proposition: Strategies must be re-developed in every setting Pro: Pod 7 & Pod 11 (Matt Hickey, Deanna Tollefson) vs. Against: Pod 4 & Pod 6 (Jose Tique, Jackie Hodges) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Debate Judges: Byron Powell, Sheree Schwartz, Wilbroad Mutale Moderator: Radhika Sundararajan 			
12:30 pm – 1:30 pm	Lunch: Pod to Pod Debrief – Lessons Learned			
1:30 pm - 2:15 pm Session 2.5 Faculty Spotlight Classroom 200	Faculty Spotlight <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speakers (~ 7 minutes each) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Launching Programs in Implementation Science & Global Health: Insights from the Take Off (Kunle Alonge) Implementation Science and Global Health the NYU Experience (Corrina Moucheraud) Discussants: Marie Brault, William Byansi, Andrew Medina-Marino Moderator: Nancy Ngumbau 			<ul style="list-style-type: none">
2:30 pm – 4:30 pm Session 2.6 Strategy Development Problem Based Learning Workshops	Session 2.6.1 Location TBD Implementation Mapping: Use of the method to develop multi-level strategies	Session 2.6.2 Location TBD Crowd Sourcing Solutions – Getting Started Chair: Jose Tique	Session 2.6.3 Location TBD Qualitative & ethnographic methods in strategy design – exemplar case studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same instructions as session 1.6 above

Breakout Rooms	Chair: Aditi Ramakrishnan Faculty: Fernandez, Powell	Faculty: Rajesh Vedanthan, Joe Tucker	Chair: Alison Castle Faculty: Carolyn Audet, Radhika Sundararajan	
	Session 2.6.4 <i>Location TBD</i> Using Group Model Building Chair: Matt Hickey Faculty: Sara Malone, Geng	Session 2.6.5 <i>Location TBD</i> Design Workshop Chair: Minh Nguyen Faculty: Laura Beres, Anne Trolard	Session 2.6.6 <i>Location TBD</i> Strategies” for promoting implementation research (Design a short course, seminar series, or consultation model) Chair: Katrina Ortblad Faculty: Rohit Ramaswamy, Corrina Moucheraud	
	Session 2.6.7 Faculty working groups TBD			
4:30 pm – 5:00 pm	Adjourn Faculty and Cohort Photos			
6:00 pm – 8:00 pm Dinner	Dinner at Knight Center			

Time and Location	Day 3: Wednesday, October 2, 2024: Exploring and Testing Implementation Approaches: Designs and Making the Scientific Case			Notes
7:00 am – 8:00 am Anheuser Busch Dining Hall	Breakfast			
8:00– 8:15 am Session 3.0 Classroom 200	Welcome and overview of day. (Elvin Geng, Whitney Irie)			
8:15 am – 9:30 am Session 3.1 Plenary Talks Classroom 200	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speakers (~ 10 minutes each) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Special Issues in Implementation Trials in LMIC (Wilbroad Mutale) ○ Hybrid Designs – Deploying Qualitative Methods Effectively (Radhika Sundararajan) ○ Adaptive approaches in implementation research — (Danny Almirall) • Discussants (~ 5 minutes each): Esther Nwanja, Angella Musimenta, Lindsey Filiatreau • Moderator: Alison Castle 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please put slides in folder 1 week before the August 23 (Moderator please email the faculty on Aug 23 if not in there). • Ask all faculty to be present (query, comment and contribute)
9:30 am – 10:30 am Session 3.2 Panel Classroom 200	<p>New Thinking in Measurement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Panelists: (~ 7 min each) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Next gen implementation outcomes (Whitney Irie) ○ LMIC considerations (Kunle Alonge) ○ Concepts from social sciences (Radhika Sundararajan) • Discussants (~ 5 min each): Anita Kabarambi, Kylie Dougherty, Malinda Kaiyo-Utete • Moderator: Nyanyiwe Mbeye 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask all faculty to be present (query, comment and contribute)
10:30 am – 12:00 pm Session 3.3 Problem Based Learning Working Group Breakout Rooms	<p>Session 3.3.1 <i>Location TBD</i> Issues in Hybrid Studies</p> <p>If you are conducting a hybrid study and would like to explore and discuss design or methods related to these approaches Chair: Jackie Hodges Faculty: Aaloke Mody, Radhika Sundararajan</p>	<p>Session 3.3.2 <i>Location TBD</i> Epidemiology and implementation science</p> <p>Epidemiological methods have underexplored implications for implementation research; this session will explore extending the linkages Chair: Jessica Islam Faculty: Aggrey Semeere, Nadia Sam-Agudu</p>	<p>Session 3.3.3 <i>Location TBD</i> Trials & mechanisms in implementation research</p> <p>Examine distinctive needs and opportunities in trials of implementation strategies Chair: Marie-Claude Lavoie Faculty: Elvin Geng, Sheree Schwartz</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unassigned fellows sign up (survey to come) • Chair will select and inform <u>two</u> presenters ~ Sept 23 • The 2 presenters describe projects and raise questions related to theme (~5 min each) • Brief open Q&A (~ 10 minutes) with whole group • Faculty give insights (~ 5 min each) and suggested directions (not “answers”) • <u>Group work</u>: Each session will break into two groups (one for each presentation), and research, discuss and compare (~60 minutes). More instructions below and in email. • Whole session reconvenes, and presenter reports on insights (~5 min) • Unassigned faculty can join any sessions, or optional faculty studios
	<p>Session 3.3.4 <i>Location TBD</i> Revisiting implementation outcomes and measurements</p> <p>Revisit implementation outcomes and current directions in thinking about them (e.g., acceptability, sustainability, feasibility) Chair: Nancy Ngumbau Faculty: Byron Powell, Maria Fernandez</p>	<p>Session 3.3.5 <i>Location TBD</i> Qual Methods in implementation research</p> <p>Beyond barriers and facilitators in implementation research using qualitative methods Chair: Nyanyiwe Mbeye Faculty: Carolyn Audet, Ginger McKay</p>	<p>Session 3.3.6 <i>Location TBD</i> Evaluation</p> <p>Design an evaluation for implementation science training program Chair: Choolwe Jacobs Presenters: FIT Faculty: Wilbroad Mutale, Laura Beres</p>	

	Session 3.3.7 Faculty working groups TBD	
12:00 pm – 1:00 pm	Lunch	
1:00 pm to 2:45 pm Session 3.4 Networking Cafe Breakout Rooms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modeled after the sociometric exercises and objective to create connections • Exercise to allow both Year 1 and Year 2 fellows to have 1-to-1 conversations with faculty and fellows of their choice • Four 20-minute conversations • 5-minute window between each meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fellows to fill out “network café survey” before in-person institute. • Fellows to read about persons they will meet on HIGH IRI website.
2:45 pm	Adjourn	
3:45 pm – 6:30 pm	Group Outing – See STL (Arch, Union Station, Ferris Wheel)	
7:00 pm – 9:00 pm	Dinner at 360	

Time and location	Day 4: Thursday, October 3, 2024: Impact in Implementation Research			Notes
7:00 am – 8:00 am Anheuser Busch Dining Hall	Breakfast			
8:00 am – 8:15 am Session 4.0 Classroom 200	Welcome and Overview of day (Elvin Geng, Thomas Odeny)			
8:15 am – 9:30 am Session 4.1 Plenary Session Classroom 200	Dissemination and policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speakers (10-12 min each) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dissemination to Policy Makers (Greg Millett) ○ NIH Directions and Impact in Implementation Research (Gila Neta) ○ What kind of science does PEPFAR need (Mike Reid) • Discussants: (~ 5 min each) Angella Musimenta, Choolwe Jacobs, Kelechi Chima • Moderator: Sheena Mukkada 			
9:30 am – 9:45 am	Break			
9:45 am – 12:30 pm Session 4.2 Lightening Rounds Classroom 200 & Into Breakout Rooms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructions and Opening Talk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Science for Impact — Pearls for Specific Aims (Stef Baral) ~ 15 minutes with 5-10 minutes Q&A ○ Discussants: Lindsey Filiatreau, Marie Brault, Jephchirchir Kiplagat ○ Moderator: Aaloke Mody • Research Proposal Consultations: four 25–30-minute fellow lightening round consultations • Faculty will provide four reviews each; Year 2 cohorts will give two and receive two consultations; Year 1 will receive four consultations 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presenters to create 5-minute elevator pitch • Printer on site • Objective is to provide feedback and critique proposals
12:30 pm – 1:30 pm	Lunch			
1:30 pm – 3:15 pm Session 4.3 Issues in Implementation Research Problem Based Learning Workshop Breakout Rooms	Session 4.3.1 <i>Location TBD</i> Big data & implementation science - harnessing data for performance Chair: Deanna Tollefson	Session 4.3.2 <i>Location TBD</i> Rapid methods in the global HIV response Chair: Andrew Kanyike	Session 4.3.3 <i>Location TBD</i> Infectious diseases from NTD's and Pandemics Chair: Jose Tique	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructions similar to Session 1.6 • Each of these working groups should also provide an opportunity for research agenda setting exercise and foster thought leadership. • In 4.3, chairs will design the entire session; invite speakers from HIGH IRI fellows and faculty (expect some conflicts); organize conversation (e.g., speakers, panels); incorporate exercises as needed (e.g., nominal group technique, game storming); prework to set the stage and summarize what has been done and what gaps are; also need to review other people and their expertise to see who to reach out to; end with recommendations
	Session 4.3.4 <i>Location TBD</i> Children in global public health – implementation science priorities Chair: Sheena Mukkada	Session 4.3.5 <i>Location TBD</i> NCD HIV integration – Time for Prime Time? Chair: Matt Hickey	Session 4.3.6 <i>Location TBD</i> Design a symposium (agenda, costs, contents, dates, governance etc.) Chair: Asya Agulnik	
3:15 pm – 3:30 pm	Break			

<p>3:30 pm – 5:00 pm Session 4.4 Innovative Oasis: Guppie Research Pitch Tank Breakout Rooms</p>	<p>Session 4.4.1 Classroom 200 Speaker/Host (Thomas Odeny) Topic: Research Project Judges: Katrina Ortblad, Asya Agulnik, Daniel Almirall, Gila Neta Participants: TBD</p>	<p>Session 4.4.2 Classroom 211 Speaker/Host (Whitney Irie) Topic: Strategy Development Judges: Rachel Sturke, Anne Sales, Aaloke Mody, Rohit Ramaswamy Participants: TBD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 fellows per session - first come first serve, if full but you would still like to participate, you can email Jamie. • HIGH-IRI pitch their research ideas and compete for recognition in various categories. • Inspired by TV program “Shark Tank...” but nicer species • Further description at end of agenda
<p>5:00 pm</p>	<p>Adjourn</p>		
<p>Dinner on Your Own (Leadership Dinner – Bar Italia)</p>			

Time and Location	Day 5: Friday, October 4, 2024: Teaching and Training in Implementation Research				Notes
7:00 am – 8:00 am Anheuser Busch Dining Hall	Breakfast				
8:00 am – 8:15 am Session 5.0 Classroom 200	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction to the day (Elvin Geng, Ross Brownson, Thomas Odeny, Whitney Irie) 				
8:15 am – 9:30 am Session 5.1 Plenary Talks Classroom 200	<p>Growing Implementation Research Globally</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speakers (~ 12-15 minutes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building Global Research Teams (Elizabeth Bukusi) Cutting Edge Teaching Methods in Implementation Research (Rohit Ramaswamy) Implementation Research in Global Oncology (Carlos Rodriguez-Galindo) Discussants: Katrina Ortblad, Risa Hoffman, Choolwe Jacobs Moderator: Thomas Odeny 				
9:30 am – 10:45 am Session 5.2 Panel Classroom 200	<p>Teaching Approaches in Implementation Science</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Panelists: (~ 5-7 minutes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Globalization of content and approach (Nadia Sam-Agudu) CFAR needs and lessons learned (Sheree Schwartz) PhD training (Byron Powell) Discussants: Derrick Abila, Sheena Mukkada, Kelechi Chima Moderator: Ross Brownson 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflections on challenges and tips for teaching implementation science
10:45 am – 11: 15 am	Break				
11:15 am – 12:15 pm Session 5.3 Panel Classroom 200	<p>Institutional Models for Implementation Research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speakers: (~ 5-7 minutes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Texas Center (Maria Fernandez) Impact Center (Wilbraod Mutale and Hikabasa Halwiindi) WashU Center (Elvin Geng, Byron Powell, Ashley Sturm) Discussants: Deanna Tollefson, Andrew Medina-Marino, Raymond Kihumuro Moderator: Anne Sales 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speakers describe the model, strategies and approaches for advancing implementation research in their respective institutions
12:15 pm – 1:15 pm	Lunch				
1:15pm – 2:45 pm Session 5.4 Working Groups Breakout Rooms	<p>Session 5.4.1 Topics in Teaching Implementation Research</p> <p>Chair: Rohit Ramaswamy Presenter: Derrick Abila, Andrew Kanyike Discussants: Nadia Sam-Agudu, Radhika Sundararajan</p>	<p>Session 5.4.2 Training Models for D&I</p> <p>Chair: Ross Brownson Presenter: Malinda Kaiyo-Utete, Lauren Brown Discussants: Wilbroad Mutale, Elvin Geng</p>	<p>Session 5.4.3 Global directions in implementation research training (D43's, K43's and beyond)</p> <p>Chair: Rachel Sturke Presenter: Choolwe Jacobs, Marie-Claude Lavoie Discussants: Angella Musimenta, Anne Sales</p>	<p>Session 5.4.4 Developing Academic – Health Systems Partnership for Implementation Research</p> <p>Chair: Hikabasa Halwiindi Presenter: Jose Tique, Caroline De Schacht Discussants: Greg Millet, Byron Powell</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentations on challenges with teaching or training and proposed solutions (~ 10 minutes each) Discussants provide reflections (~5 minutes each) Chair sets session
2:45 pm – 3:15 pm	Closing (evaluations)				

6:00 pm – 8:00 pm	Farewell Celebration – Bowles Plaza (WashU Danforth Campus)	
-------------------	---	--

Appendix FAQ:

What is a "Discussant?"

As in the previous year, Fellows will provide a short reaction to the talks. The reactions can include major take-aways, questions or points of interest. These reactions are meant to provoke further conversation. No PowerPoint is needed. Preparation will require simply listening to the talks and then making a few notes about what stands out and what you would like to either highlight, challenge or seek clarification on.

Debate

We include friendly debates as feature to the institute. Debates will be an exciting, fun way to encourage a nuanced examination of issues in implementation science. We thought debates could foster leadership skills, build confidence through taking a modest risk, incorporating some extemporaneous elements, and encouraging efficient and lively discussion. The second-year fellows of each pod will be assigned a proposition to debate with support of their faculty/mentors. We will be sending individual emails to each pod with more information regarding specific details of the propositions for the debate. You can see the agenda for your pod's debate assignments. We will follow up with individual emails to each group for more specific instructions.

How will the Networking Café work?

This exercise is meant to create links between fellows and fellows as well as fellows and faculty. Overall, we believe fostering scientific and professional networks as one of the principal functions of this program. Fellows will receive a survey before the institute and select up to five faculty and five other fellows they desire to meet. We will then create optimal matches via a software. During the Café session, matches will have an opportunity to meet for 20 minutes. We encourage fellows to review scholar and faculty profiles online ahead of time. Networking matches will be sent to Fellows and Faculty two weeks before the institute.

Tell me about the Mini Bootcamp

This session allows HIGH IRI fellows to receive one-to-one consultations aimed at advancing their research. Each first-year Fellow will receive four consultations. Second year Fellows will receive two and provide two. Faculty will provide four. We ask Fellows to send an aims page or an abstract to Jamie Macon one week before the institute if they have changed since the application materials. We will print out Fellow Bootcamp documents ahead of the in-person meeting and will include it in a welcome package.

Research Pitch (Guppie) Tank

Shark tank will provide a forum for fellows to pitch their research ideas, compete for recognition in various categories and see if you can get "investors" who want to collaborate. Inspired by the popular TV program Shark Tank, this session offers a platform for fellows to present their cutting-edge implementation science research ideas to a panel of esteemed judges, or "sharks." The goal of this session is to encourage creative thinking and foster a vibrant community of researchers dedicated to improving evidence-based practices.

To sign up:

1. Create a brief proposal (maximum 300 words) highlighting your research idea, its potential impact on improving implementation practices, and any preliminary findings or evidence supporting your approach.
2. Include your name, affiliation, email address, and a short bio (maximum 150 words).
3. Email your proposal as an attachment to Jamie with the subject line: "Research Pitch Tank Presenter Application - [Your Name]."
4. The application deadline is one week before the institute.
5. **For the judges:**
 - Be prepared to evaluate each presenter's pitch based on innovation, feasibility, potential impact, and alignment with diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) principles.
 - During the session, actively listen to each presenter's pitch and take notes on their strengths, weaknesses, and potential for impact.
 - After each presentation, engage in a brief Q&A session with the presenter to delve deeper into their research idea and clarify any uncertainties.
 - Following all presentations, participate in a deliberation session with your fellow judges to collectively decide the winners in each category.

What is the objective of Day 5 and Building a Center for Dissemination and Implementation?

The objective of this meeting is to thoroughly explore both the administrative and scientific aspects necessary for establishing a Center for Dissemination and Implementation at our respective institutions. On the administrative side, we will discuss how centers are created, governed, and maintained. This includes understanding where the center will sit within the institutional hierarchy, the governance structures that will oversee its operations, financial aspects such as revenue streams, and the reporting chains within the center. On the scientific side, we will address the growing need for centers dedicated to dissemination and implementation at universities. This need is driven by the rapid growth in the field, increased funding opportunities, and the necessity to centralize and share the scientific basis of dissemination and implementation research both across the field and within institutions. Our discussions will cover the main functions of such centers, including research, training, teaching, and service, and how they can accommodate and catalyze advances in this critical area of study.

"Pod Protocol" - HIGH IRI Pod Guidance (version 2024.07.29)

In the HIGH IRI Program, we employ a "pod" system designed to enhance the mentoring and development of our fellows. Each pod consists of up to four fellows and two faculty members, totaling six participants. These groups are scheduled to convene monthly throughout the year. This document aims to clarify the rationale behind the pod structure, outline the objectives, and suggest guidelines for their operation.

The essence of the pod system is to foster a longitudinal relationship among members and to provide continuous support for the fellows' academic and professional activities. This support is flexible, often aiding in the development of grant proposals and projects but also serving as a sounding board for various implementation activities and learning opportunities. This system extends the traditional mentorship model, where typically a single mentor is assigned to a fellow. However, in the pod structure, each fellow benefits from insights from two mentors. This arrangement not only offers a broader range of perspectives but also enriches the dialogue between the mentors, which in turn illuminates the discussions further. Additionally, the interaction among fellows is expected to enhance professional connections that continue beyond the duration of the project.

While the faculty and fellows of each pod can decide the format of the meetings, it is recommended to introduce some level of uniformity to ensure productive sessions. A practical suggestion is to appoint a rotating chair among the fellows. The designated chair would be responsible for organizing the meetings and setting the agendas. This role, although not labor-intensive, is crucial for maintaining order and ensuring that all members contribute to the pod's objectives.

Typical meeting agendas can vary widely based on the needs and interests of the pod members, but here are some examples that could be useful:

- Meetings can be used to present and critique grant proposals. In this case, one of the fellows may present aims in development and solicit feedback from both pod members as well as faculty. Aims could be sent to people a week before the meeting to allow preparation but can also be presented in real-time depending on the availability of the members. Issues of design, measurement, analysis could be discussed.
- Discuss papers in progress, which allows for constructive feedback from both peers and faculty about methods (e.g., hybrid designs), how to frame the argument, specific issues about where to send papers, how to position papers for certain journals, and related issues.
- Some pods or mentor/fellow pairs might choose to collaborate on joint written outputs, tackling methodological issues, or producing review papers.
- Some pod meetings serve as a platform for professional support, particularly valuable as many fellows are navigating similar career transitions. This setup not only facilitates networking but also fosters a supportive community where fellows can share experiences and advice.
- Pods might opt for a less structured format, focusing on discussing challenging topics or exploring new literature as part of a journal club. This flexibility allows each pod to tailor its activities to the fellows' developmental stages and interests.

In addition, we have several suggestions and requests for the faculty. During pod meetings, faculty may want to document successes or career transitions that would be useful for program communications and evaluation. For example, if someone in the pod wins an award or receives a promotion, if the pod faculty could let Jamie Macon know, it could be included in the newsletters. Provide feedback to the leadership when needed about tweaks to the pod schedule or format, or the pod composition. In conclusion, while the format and specifics of the pod activities can be adapted, establishing a basic agenda and a system for rotating chair responsibilities at the outset of each year is advisable. This initial structure will help in organizing the pods effectively, allowing them to evolve into a vital component of our fellows' professional growth and development.

Problem Based Learning Working Groups for Implementation Research

[Working Groups Sign Up Sheet](#)

We seek to blend the core principles of PBL with actionable steps tailored to educational goals, emphasizing participatory learning, real-world application, and leadership engagement. We are trying a problem-based learning approach in part because people have found some of the foundational concepts in implementation science opaque and at times seemingly unlinked to the real problems people are trying to study and solve. This format will also serve as practice for moderating sessions at scientific meetings, which many of you may already be doing or will soon be tasked with, in which you will inevitably end up trying to wrangle cohesion and sense from a conversation or discussion. Specific format is in the agenda.

If there are, say, four or five people working on one question in session 1.6.2 (which is on use of theories and frameworks), maybe the presenter question is "which framework is best for me there are so many." Each one of the four group members might then be asked to consider how to apply a specific implementation science framework (e.g., Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR) or Normalization Process Theory) to the presenter's problem and spend some time investigating how to use this framework to address the problem (including looking online for precedents, etc.). When the hour is almost up, members will gather and present key insights from their research, detailing how each theory or framework could address the case study's unique challenges, with a synthesis and comparison of findings.

Example of PBL: Here is an example of how a group of five individuals might conduct a short problem-based learning (PBL) session focused on understanding how to best use theories and frameworks in implementation science. To reiterate, the objective is to explore and understand the application of different theories and frameworks in implementation science, identifying their unique characteristics, similarities, and differences, and determining their appropriateness for various scenarios. The group is given a case study about a healthcare organization attempting to implement a new injectable HIV prevention medication (or mental health screening tool, or etc.). The organization has encountered resistance from staff, and initial training sessions have not been as effective as anticipated. The group's task is to select and apply appropriate implementation science theories or frameworks to address these challenges. Step 1: Initial Discussion: The group discusses their preliminary thoughts on why the implementation of the EHR system might be facing challenges based on the case study details. Step 2: Assign Research and Mapping Tasks: The group divides the task among themselves to research specific theories and frameworks. For example, one member might investigate the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR), another explores Normalization Process Theory, etc. Each member summarizes the key components of their assigned framework or theory and explains how it could be applied to the case study. Step 3: Regroup, Synthesize and Compare: Members present their findings to the group. As each theory or framework is presented, the group discusses its strengths and limitations in the context of the case study. The group could debate which theory or framework (or combination thereof) would be most effective

for the EHR implementation case. They discuss why the selected approach(es) is best suited to the scenario, considering factors like organizational culture, resistance to change, and the specifics of the technology being implemented.