

## Knowledge Translation Plan Appraisal Tool (KT-PAT)©

Grant reviewers are often tasked with assessing the quality of a proposed knowledge translation (KT) plan within a research proposal. The KT Plan Appraisal Tool (KT-PAT) guides the assessment of quality for a proposed KT plan. The intended users of the KT-PAT are grant reviewers but individuals may also find it useful to rate their own plan in a formative sense, with a view towards improvement.

High quality KT plans follow a simple methodology, as outlined in the **Knowledge Translation Planning Template**® and illustrated in related **e-learning modules**. Users are instructed to review the **Knowledge Translation Planning Template**® (KTPT) and the accompanying **videos** in advance of using the KT-PAT. Note that the KTPT and the KT-PAT pertain to developing an overarching *KT plan* designed to ensure findings will be accessible and understandable to a range of knowledge users (KU) who will benefit from them in some way. A KT plan is more general than an *implementation plan* which is specific to practice change and requires a more explicit methodology. For support on developing an implementation plan, please visit **The Implementation Game**®. All noted resources can be found here: <http://www.sickkids.ca/Learning/AbouttheInstitute/Programs/Knowledge-Translation/index.html>.

A quality KT plan is comprised of three main criteria:

- 1) **Comprehensiveness:** The plan covers the 13 elements described in the KTPT®. When a shorter plan is required or appropriate, include the minimum elements (\*).
- 2) **Alignment:** KT involves making research evidence accessible and understandable to the relevant KUs. An Integrated KT (iKT) process involves research and KT co-development with KUs throughout the research endeavour, whereas an End of Grant KT (EoG) process is less participatory and occurs when findings are known. Either way, KT planning involves developing key **main messages** that are tailored to needs and preferences of relevant **knowledge user (KU) audiences**, and linked to a purpose or **KT Goal** (i.e., to build awareness, share knowledge, inform research, facilitate change in practice, behaviour, or policy; or to commercialize an innovation). These elements are aligned with **KT strategies** that are evidence-based or informed that can achieve the stated KT goal(s), and **evaluation indicators** that will demonstrate whether the KT goal was achieved. *Note that KT goals related to practice/behaviour change involve implementation science processes, strategies, and outcomes, and will require an implementation plan.*

A quality KT plan demonstrates alignment of the core KT planning elements:

- a. the intended **knowledge user audience(s)** (Who could benefit knowing about this evidence?);
- b. the **main message(s)** for each KU audience; (What message(s) will be targeted to each KU?)
- c. the **KT goal(s)** (What is the purpose of sharing this evidence; how might KUs benefit?);
- d. the **KT strategies** that will be used to realize each KT goal; (Use KT strategies that have evidence of utility for accomplishing specific KT goals)
- e. the **metrics or indicators** that will provide evidence that each KT goal was achieved. Evaluating whether KT goals were achieved can support future use of KT methods, produce a KT publication, increase value for KUs and stakeholders

A quality KT plan description will link a main message with related KU audience(s), KT goal(s), KT strategy(ies) and evaluation indicators. By comparison, poor KT plan will merely describe KUs and KT strategies separately (i.e., not aligned) and fail to identify KT goals or means of evaluating whether goals were achieved.

- 3) **Feasibility:** Consider whether the KT plan is *feasible*, given the aims of the research; the timeline; the results; the composition, size and skills of the team (including purchased or partnered services and resources); and the proposed KT budget. Lack of feasibility can manifest as too many strategies proposed in light of available resources; or a KT plan unsupported by a corresponding budget.

To rate a KT Plan using the KT-PAT, tick the boxes that correspond to your critical appraisal of the main criteria and features. The overall appraisal will appear as poor (red), weak (yellow), acceptable (green), or excellent (gold). Reviewers can then identify areas of strength and weaknesses in their comments to the applicant.

**CAVEAT.** KT plans within funding proposals must consider (i) whether KT is required, valued, and can be budgeted for; and (ii) the space allotted for description.

COMPREHENSIVENESS	Absent <i>Feature is missing</i>	Weak <i>Feature is vaguely mentioned</i>	Good <i>Feature is briefly described, no elaboration</i>	Excellent <i>Feature is very well described</i>
Describe:				
1) Project partners* (who is involved in developing and conducting the KT plan; are KUs included?)				
2) Degree of Engagement* (when and how are KUs engaged and involved? Look for authentic KU engagement)				
3) Partner Roles* (what are partner/collaborator/KU roles relative to the project and to developing and realizing the KT Plan?)				
4) KT Expertise from project team, partners, and purchased services, relative to proposed KT strategies (is KT expertise described, if warranted?)				
5) Knowledge Users* (who are the targeted KUs? are any KUs missing that would strengthen the project?)				
6) Main Messages* (are potential MMs identified or is the process of developing emerging MMs discussed?)				
7) KT Goal(s)* (are KT goals described for each KU and MM? Is it clear what benefits may emerge from sharing the evidence?)				
8) KT Strateg(ies)* (are KT strategies identified, and are they appropriate and/or evidence-informed relative to the KT Goal?)				
9) KT Process (is the process identified as <i>integrated KT</i> and/or <i>end of grant</i> ; is there evidence of authentic engagement in the iKT process?)				
10) KT Plan Evaluation* (what methods/indicators will be used to evaluate whether the KT goals were achieved?)				
11) Resources required* (what resources are needed to conduct the KT activities and develop KT deliverables?)				
12) Budget for KT* (what funds are requested for KT activities and deliverables? Are they adequate?)				
13) Methods for KT plan execution (are the KT methods and procedures described?)				

ALIGNMENT	Absent <i>None of the features are linked/aligned</i>  <i>(e.g., description of KUs and KT strategies are separate and don't relate to each other)</i>	Weak <i>Alignment between 2 features</i> <i>(e.g., KU is linked to a specific KT strategy)</i>	Good <i>Alignment between 3- 4 features</i> <i>(e.g., main messages are linked to a KU and a strategy)</i>	Excellent <i>Alignment between 5 features</i> <i>(e.g., main messages are linked to a KU, KT Goal, KT Strategy, and impact indicator)</i>
<i>Alignment is reflected in a description that aligns each main message with knowledge user(s), related KT goal(s), KT strategies, and indicators of whether KT goals were achieved.</i>  <i>e.g., "the main message for parents is (insert MM) with the aim of (insert KT Goal, i.e., building awareness). The KT strategies to be used are (insert KT strategies), as supported by the evidence (citations). The following indicators (insert indicators) will provide evidence of KT goals attainment." (repeat as needed)</i>				
1) What degree of alignment is evident in the KT plan?				

FEASIBILITY	Absent	Weak	Good	Excellent
1) Team composition (breadth of the team includes a range of skills and competencies, expertise, perspectives – as appropriate)				
2) Availability of resources (there are sufficient resources, including people, to get the job done)				
3) Proposed KT strategies are realistic relative to timeline, budget, available resources				
4) The budget includes realistic and comprehensive costs associated with proposed KT activities				
5) The potential for KU benefit or impact is clear and can be realized if the proposed KT plan is fully executed				

**Overall Assessment:** tick the category that has the preponderance of scores

Poor 
Weak 
Good 
Excellent

**Reviewer Comments:**