

# The RAMESES II Project:

## Developing quality and reporting standards and training materials for realist evaluation

**Date:** 20<sup>th</sup> September 2016  
**Time:** 2 pm to 3:30pm  
**Location:** Meeting Room 2  
Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences (NDPCHS)  
Radcliffe Primary Care Building  
Radcliffe Observatory Quarter, Woodstock Road, Oxford, OX2 6GG  
(for directions please see: <https://www.phc.ox.ac.uk/about/contact-us>)

**Session lead:** Dr Geoff Wong, Clinical Research Fellow, NDPCHS  
geoffrey.wong@phc.ox.ac.uk  
+44 07973 818122

### Agenda:

	<i>Timing (minutes)</i>	<i>Who's leading this</i>
Introductions	5	Geoff Wong
Outline purpose of the session	10	Geoff Wong
Refining the leaflet/document	60	Everyone
Ideas about other formats	10	Everyone
Summary and finish	5	Geoff Wong

### Expenses and other claims process:

You are entitled to claim expenses for participating in the workshop and there is also a payment for your time.

#### 1) *Expenses and honorarium*

You will be provided with an expense claim form on the day. You have to complete and sign this form and provide original receipts or tickets for public transport and parking so please come prepared to do that. If you can only provide such proof after the day please send your completed form with the receipts/tickets to me after the day. (Scanned versions are not acceptable – it must have a 'wet signature')

#### 2) *Payment*

In order to make a payment to you for your time (honorarium) or indeed to pay your expenses, the University opts to make a BACS transfer so please come prepared with the following information:

- Name
- Email
- Address
- NI Number

- UK Bank sort code
- UK Bank account number
- Bank's address

If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

Notes from PPI meeting:

Location: as per agenda

Timings 14:00 50 13:30

Present:

Geoff Wong (Project PI)

Lynne Maddocks (Department PPI coordinator - Observer)

PPI participants:

Jean N

Roger E

Mathew LC

Jo LW

Maria C

Everyone introduced themselves

GW explained the background to the RAMESES II project and the purpose of the session - namely to produce generic text that could be adapted as needed by realist evaluators for use when recruiting participants.

Participants asked for clarifications (e.g. exact audience, purpose of document/text).

Participants read the 2 sides A4 documents we had drafted.

Feedback from them:

Clarification of when it is that people would need this information - I explained this was when (for example) an service was being evaluated (i.e. when doing research). Service development might not count as research and so consent would probably not be needed.

Text was "dense" and too detailed.

Sentences too long.

Quite technical language use - issue here is to bear in mind the average (low) reading age of the population. Advice was to use simpler words.

Glossary was useful, but definitions too long and most agreed that having it at the end of the document was probably not helpful as no one would bother to flick back and forth. Perhaps embed definitions (kept as simple as possible) into the main text.

Address potential participants directly (e.g. you / your) - rather impersonal at the moment.

Avoid some words as they might alarm some people - e.g. intervention / consent.

It probably does not matter to the person who is being recruited into a realist evaluation what exactly a realist evaluation is. In other words the detail of what a RE is or is not is not likely to matter to the potential participant. So much of the detail in the text is not needed. So the text should be short and kept to 1/2 a side of A4 or 1 side A5.

Suggested format:

- seek consent
- explain what is needed from the participant
- explain why we need their help
- explain why we are doing a RE and give examples. A discussion arose on whether or not participants actually care if they are taking part in a RE or not. I raised the issue that in a RE participants were more likely to be probed about their reasoning behind certain actions. Point was raised that this would not matter as long as it was done in a sensitive manner. In effect there was agreement that the research approach being used was not likely to be important to the participants.
- If people want to know more should direct them to a website.

Agreed actions:

GW would draft new shorter participant recruitment materials based on the feedback received from this meeting

Circulate to PPI members for their feedback.

Redraft as needed from their feedback.

NOTE FOR GW - thank PPI members and ask if it would be OK if we acknowledge their contribution by name in the PPI material and also for the project report.