

# Increasing Level of Community Involvement, Impact, Trust, and Communication Flow

Outreach	Consult	Involve	Collaborate	Shared Leadership
Some Community Involvement Communication flows from one to the other, to inform Provides community with information. Entities coexist. Outcomes: Optimally, establishes communica- tion channels and chan- nels for outreach.	More Community Involvement Communication flows to the community and then back, answer seeking Gets information or feed- back from the community. Entities share information. Outcomes: Develops con- nections.	Better Community InvolvementCommunication flows both ways, participatory form of communicationInvolves more participa- tion with community on issues.Entities cooperate with each other.Outcomes: Visibility of partnership established with increased coopera- tion.	Community Involvement Communication flow is bidirectional Forms partnerships with community on each aspect of project from development to solution. Entities form bidirectional communication channels. Outcomes: Partnership building, trust building.	Strong Bidirectional Relationship Final decision making is at community level. Entities have formed strong partnership structures. Outcomes: Broader health outcomes affect- ing broader community. Strong bidirectional trust built.

Reference: Modified by the authors from the International Association for Public Participation.

Figure 1.1. Community Engagement Continuum

#### How to use this worksheet:

This worksheet is intended to help researchers who are considering community-engagement as a component of their research project. It begins by working through a set of questions to determine where in the process community partners may be necessary and general characteristics of appropriate partners.

Who is intended to benefit from your project? Describe any segments of the population that are harder to reach or may be experiencing disparities.

What is the benefit you are trying to achieve and how does it align with community priorities? Describe your benchmark for success that will be used for sustainability decisions.

What are your plans for communicating the results of the intervention?

Where would your intervention (program, policy, system, or environmental change) ultimately be implemented and who would be the delivery agent?

How will you develop processes to make sure the intervention is delivered as intended? How will you determine the resource needs and resource availability (costs) of, and for, the intervention?

What are your plans for decision-making relative to the sustainability of your intervention?

What are your plans for decision-making relative to the sustainability of your intervention?

# **Review Criteria with Rating Scale of Possible Responses**<sup>2</sup>

# **1.** Participants and the nature of their involvement:

a.	Is the community of interest clearly described or defined?	no description	inexplicit/general description	general description but explicit	general detailed description	5 detailed description
b.	Do members of the defined community participating in the research have concern or experience with the issue?	no concern or experience with the issue	2 little concern or experience with the issue	3 moderate concern or experience with the issue	4 much concern or experience with the issue	5 high concern or experience with the issue
C.	Are interested members of the defined community provided opportunities to participate in the research process?	no opportunity to participate	2 little opportunity to participate	3 more than one opportunity to participate	4 several opportunities to participate	5 many opportunities to participate
d.	Is attention given to barriers to participation, with consideration of those who have been under-represented in the past?	no attention to offsetting barriers	2 low degree of attention to offsetting barriers	3 moderate degree of attention to offsetting barriers	4 several opportunities to participate	5 high degree of attention to offsetting barriers
e.	Has attention been given to establishing within the community an understanding of the researchers' commitment to the issue?	no attention to researchers' commitment	2 low attention to researchers' commitment	3 moderate attention to researchers' commitment	4 high attention to researchers' commitment	5 explicit agreement on researchers' commitment
f.	Are community participants enabled to contribute their physical and/or intellectual resources to the research process?	no enabling of contribution from participants	2 mostly researcher effort; some support for contribution from participants	3 about equal contribu- tions from participants and researchers	4 mostly resources and efforts of participants; researchers have some direct input	5 full enabling of participants' resources (researchers act only as facilitators

#### 2. Origin of the research study:

a.	Did the impetus for the research come from the defined community?	1 issue posed by researchers or other external bodies	2 impetus mainly from researchers; some input from community	3 impetus shared equally between researchers and community	4 impetus mainly from community; some input from researchers	5 issue posed by community
b.	Is an effort to research the issue supported by members of the defined community?	1 support for research from very few, if any, community members	2 less than half of community supports research on issue	3 community is roughly divided about research on issue	4 more than half of community supports research on issue	5 support for research from virtually all community members

## 3. Purpose of the research:

a.	Can the research facilitate learning among community participants about individual and collective resources for self-determination?	no provision for learning process	2 low provision for learning process	3 moderate provision for learning process	4 moderate/high provision for learning process	5 high provision for learning process
b.	Can the research facilitate collaboration between community participants and resources external to the community?	no potential for collaboration	2 low potential for collaboration	3 moderate potential for collaboration	4 moderate/high potential for collaboration	5 high potential for collaboration
C.	Is the purpose of the research to empower the community to address determinants of health?	1 purpose devoid of empowerment objective	2 low priority given to empowerment objective	3 moderate priority for empowerment objective	4 moderate/high priority for empower- ment objective	5 high priority for empowerment objective
d.	Does the scope of the research encompass some combination of political, social and economic determinants of health?	1 no consideration of political, social or eco- nomic determinants	2 only one or two determinants are considered	3 limited consideration of combined deter- minants of health	4 moderate consider- ation of combined determinants of health	5 comprehensive consideration of com- bined determinants

# 4. Process and context/methodological implications:

a.	Does the research process apply the knowledge of community participants in phases of planning, implementation & evaluation?	no use of community knowledge in any phase	use of community knowledge in one or two phases only	3 limited use of com- munity knowledge in all three phases	4 moderate use of com- munity knowledge in all three phases	5 comprehensive use of community knowledge in all three phases
b.	For community participants, does the process allow for learning about research methods?	no opportunity for learning about research	2 low opportunity for learning about research	3 moderate opportunity for learning about research	4 moderate/high op- portunity for learning about research	5 high opportunity for learning about research
C.	For researchers, does the process allow for learning about the community health issue?	no opportunity for learning about community issue	2 low opportunity for learning about community issue	3 moderate opportunity for learning about community issue	4 moderate/high opportunity to learn about community issue	5 high opportunity for learning about community issue
d.	Does the process allow for flexibility or change in research methods and focus, as necessary?	1 methods & focus predetermined; no potential for flexibility	2 mostly predetermined methods & focus; limited flexibility	3 equal blend of prede- termined methods & focus w/ flexibility	4 high flexibility; some predetermined methods & focus	5 complete flexibility; methods & focus not predetermined
e.	Are procedures in place for appraising experiences during implementation of the research?	no procedures for appraising experi- ences	few procedures for appraising experi- ences	3 some procedures for appraising experi- ences	4 many procedures for appraising experi- ences	5 comprehensive procedures for ap- praising experiences
f.	Are community participants involved in analytic issues: interpretation, synthesis and the verification of conclusions?	no involvement of participants in any analytic issue	2 involvement in one or two analytic issues only	3 limited involvement of participants in all three analytic issues	4 moderate involvement of participants in all three analytic issues	5 comprehensive involvement in all three analytic issues

### 5. Opportunities to address the issue of interest:

a.	Is the potential of the defined community for individual and collective learning reflected by the research process?	1 research process not aligned w/ potential for learning	2 limited alignment of research process w/ potential for learning	3 moderate alignment of research process w/ potential for learning	4 moderate/high alignment w/ potential for learning	5 comprehensive alignment w/ potential for learning
b.	Is the potential of the defined community for action reflected by the research process?	1 research process not aligned with potential for action	2 limited alignment of research process w/ potential for action	3 moderate alignment of research process w/ potential for action	4 moderate/high alignment w/ potential for action	5 comprehensive alignment w/ potential for action
C.	Does process reflect commitment by re- searchers & community participants to social, individual or cultural actions consequent to learning acquired through research?	1 no commitment to action beyond data collection & analysis, writing report for funding agencies	2 low commitment to social actions based on learning through research	3 moderate com- mitment to social actions based on learning through research	4 moderate/high commitment to social actions based on learning through research	5 comprehensive commitment to social actions based on learning through research

#### 6. Nature of the research outcomes:

a.	Do community participants benefit from the research outcomes?	1 research benefits researchers or external bodies only	2 researchers/external bodies benefit primarily; community benefit is secondary	equal benefit for researchers/external bodies and community	4 research benefits community primarily; benefit is secondary for researchers and external bodies	5 explicit agreement on how research will benefit community
b.	Is there attention to or an explicit agreement for acknowledging/resolving in a fair and open way any differences between researchers and com- munity participants in interpretation of results?	1 no attention to or any agreement re interpretation of issues	low attention to interpretation of issues	3 moderate consider- ation of interpretation issues	4 high attention to interpretation issues; no explicit agreement	5 explicit agreement on interpretation issues
C.	Is there attention to or an explicit agreement be- tween researchers and community participants with respect to ownership of the research data?	1 no attention to or any agreement re ownership issues	2 low attention to ownership issues	3 moderate consider- ation of ownership issues	4 high attention to ownership issues; no explicit agreement	5 explicit agreement on ownership issues
d.	Is there attention to or an explicit agreement be- tween researchers and community participants with respect to the dissemination fo the research results?	1 no attention to or any agreement regarding dissemination issues	2 low attention to dissemination issues	3 moderate consideration of dissemination issues	4 high attlention to dissemination issues; no explicit agreement	5 explicit agreement on dissemination issues

http://www.lgreen.net/guidelines.html

<sup>2</sup> Guidelines and Categories for Classifying Participatory Research Projects in Health Promotion from Green LW, George MA, Daniel M, Frankish CJ, Herbert CP, Bowie WR, O'Neill M. Study of Participatory Research in Health Promotion. Royal Society of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, 1995:43-50.

- 1. Define community and identify partners.
  - a. Begin with existing community action collaboratives to determine if your goals align with those collaboratives.
  - b. Become aware of other researchers or groups working in the community and avoid duplication.
  - c. If starting a new collaborative include organizations that interface with the intended audience. Within organizations include those with decision making authority and those who are service providers.
- 2. Learn the etiquette of community engagement.
  - a. Learning first about a community in terms of its history, culture, economic and social conditions, political and power structures, norms and values, demographic trends, and experience with research;
  - b. Sharing power and showing respect
  - c. Including partners in all phases of research and planning; and
  - d. Compensating community partners fairly
- 3. Build a sustainable network of community-engaged researchers.
  - a. GP IDeA CTR
- 4. Recognize that community engaged research will require the development of new methodologies.
  - a. Include but move beyond RCTs
- 5. Improve translation and dissemination plans.
  - a. Scientific
  - b. Community focused
  - c. Audience focused

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3292771/