**PreVAiL**
Preventing Violence Across the Lifespan Research Network

# PreVAiL Partnership Evaluation Project
# Phase 1
# Final Report

Anita Kothari, PhD, Associate Professor, Western University

Shannon Sibbald, PhD, Research Associate, Western University

Nadine Wathen, PhD, Associate Professor, Western University

For the PreVAiL Research Network

(www.PreVAiLResearch.ca)

January 2013

**Table of Contents**

**Executive Summary**

PreVAiL is a network in its third year of operation and, having completed many milestones, can be considered both successful and innovative; it uses an integrated knowledge translation and exchange (KTE) model to ensure that research priorities and projects reflect existing and emerging needs in practice and policy, and that findings can be shared and discussed among networks of stakeholders through our existing [19 national and international partner organizations](#) and the expanding networks linked to us by these partners and our researchers. A formal evaluation was completed to demonstrate the extent to which the PreVAiL network has built, in its formative stages, effective partnerships among network members. As PreVAiL continues to grow and mature, its partnerships will continue to be monitored to ensure robust and effective KTE as well as to formally measure the impacts and outcomes of the Network.

The two objectives of this evaluation were:

1. to identify the quality and initial impacts of partnerships within the PreVAiL network;
2. to determine the capacity of partner organizations to utilize research.

To address the first objective, we used a questionnaire assessing partnership indicators (Step 1: Partnership Indicators questionnaire, PIQ), which was followed up with semi-structured interviews. To address partners' capacity for research utilization, we used a second questionnaire that assessed partner organizations' capacity to acquire, assess, adapt and apply research (Step 2: Is Research Working for You?).

Step 1. The PIQ was administered during the May 2011 research team meeting; analysis of the PIQ findings informed the qualitative interviews, which provided further insight into PreVAiL's relationships with our partner organizations. Phone interviews were conducted between November 2011 and March 2012. We explored the current state of involvement and partner satisfaction, thoughts on communication within the network and asked for input on future directions for PreVAiL. In Step 2 we assessed each partner organizations' capacity to acquire, assess, adapt and apply research through a second questionnaire 'Is Research Working for You?', which was handed out (at the May 2011 team meeting) or emailed to partner organizations for them to self-assess their capacity.

Highlights from the analysis of the 36 completed partnership indicators questionnaires and the 19 individual interviews (representing 18/19 PreVAiL partner organizations) include:

- 74% of partners interviewed report high (21% participated in >6 of 8 formal activities) or moderate (53%; 3-6 activities) involvement in PreVAiL's formal activities, which included team meetings, teleconferences and the Delphi research priority-setting process; five (n=25%) report a low involvement (< 3 events). Only one partner did not participate in any PreVAiL activities and one partner participated in all eight. This does not include informal, individual-level interactions.
- PreVAiL is perceived as a community, and our members, and their commitment to violence prevention, are essential to its success. Partners spoke highly of the benefits of PreVAiL meetings for networking, linkages and meeting international researchers.

Partners often turned to PreVAiL when they needed information; they valued the ability to 'call on' PreVAiL researchers for information, and "felt liberated to ask for advice".

- Nearly all see PreVAiL as a network that shares knowledge and most viewed face-to-face meeting as the most effective and satisfying method of sharing information, but noted the utility of the Team Newsletters, topic-specific teleconferences, and one-off conversations with researchers. PreVAiL is seen to have "opened lines of communication" and provided connections with researchers.
- However, we may also be missing out on some potential benefits to partner organizations, especially in terms of developing more practical outcomes, recommendations and resources, and focusing our communication efforts in more targeted ways. Several of our partners felt that PreVAiL's research-focused work can be, like any research, difficult to localize and make applicable for organizational purposes.
- Partner organizations were not at a stage or did not have the resources to self-assess their own capacity to use research, as indicated by the lack of completion of the "Is Research Working for You" questionnaire (despite many asking for it).

The findings reported here are considered baseline findings. The questionnaires/interviews will be re-administered in the next 2-3 years to determine if partnership relationships change as the network matures.

**Introduction**

*Context and Purpose*

In 2009, the PreVAiL (Preventing Violence Across the Lifespan) Research Network - a 5-year CIHR-funded Centre for Research Development in Gender, Mental Health, and Violence Across the Lifespan - was established with three main objectives: (1) to increase understanding and knowledge about the links between mental health impairment, substance abuse, gender and exposure to child maltreatment (CM) and intimate partner violence (IPV), both in Canada and internationally; (2) to develop, using a resilience lens, interventions to prevent or reduce CM, IPV and subsequent mental health problems; and (3) to develop and promote an integrated research and knowledge translation (KT) agenda among a network of established, new and emerging investigators and key stakeholders.

PreVAiL is an international research collaboration of over 60 researchers, trainees and knowledge-user partners from Canada, the US, the UK, Asia, Europe and Australia. The Network is organized around two main content areas – child maltreatment and intimate partner violence against women – with a significant emphasis on the mental health impacts of violence, and on how individuals develop resilience following exposure to these negative health outcomes. Another major emphasis is knowledge translation and exchange (KTE), i.e., attention to the process of moving research findings into policy and practice decision-making.

PreVAiL's approach to KTE involves the active involvement of partners in knowledge generation (where possible), dissemination, and the utilization of research findings associated with the program.  Now entering our third year of operation, it is important that we critically examine our KTE processes and structure to ensure that we are achieving our goal of bringing together researchers and decision-maker partners to produce and share knowledge that will help children, women and men exposed to child maltreatment and intimate partner violence (IPV).

The  goal of this evaluation was to explore, across the Network, what we are doing well and what could be improved, with a particular emphasis on KTE processes, and the perspectives of our knowledge user partners – consisting of 20 individuals from 19 national and international organizations and agencies (see Appendix A).

The two objectives of this evaluation were:

1. to identify the quality and initial impacts of partnerships within the PreVAiL network
2. to determine the capacity of partner organizations to utilize research

Step 1a: Partnership Indicators Questionnaire (PIQ)
The PIQ was created to assess the performance of a partnership between researchers and policymakers (Kothari, Maclean, Edwards and Hobbs 2011).  It was administered at our team meeting in May 2011. The results from this baseline assessment provide an excellent overview of where PreVAiL is situated as a new network and where we need to focus attention as we move forward. Analysis of the PIQ informed step 1b.

Step 1b: Qualitative Interviews with PreVAiL Partners
In order to examine in more depth PreVAiL's relationships with our 19 partner organizations, we conducted one-on-one interviews with our partners. These in-depth telephone interviews

with the liaisons from our partner organizations aimed to capture the current state of involvement and satisfaction of our partners with the PreVAiL relationship. We also explored their thoughts on communication within the network and inquired about where they felt our efforts should be placed as PreVAiL evolves.

Step 2: Is Research Working for You? Survey
The second step involved the administration of a questionnaire, called "Is Research Working for You", to assess an organization's ability to utilize research. Specifically, it asks questions about an organization's capacity to acquire, assess, adapt and apply research. The questionnaire was developed by Kothari and colleagues with the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation (Kothari, Edwards, Hamel & Judd, 2009).

*Background*

Knowledge translation (KT) has been defined as an interactive process of knowledge exchange between health researchers and users (Mitton, Adair, McKenzie, Patton & Perry, 2007). Knowledge mobilization, knowledge translation and knowledge to action are additional terms now used to describe the ways in which evidence derived from research, as well as practice-based knowledge, moves into practice. In this report we use the terms synonymously, but prefer the more inclusive term "knowledge translation and exchange" (KTE).

Putting research into action can provide health and fiscal benefits through, for example, more effective and efficient services, policies, and programs (Newton & Scott-Findlay, 2007; Graham et al., 2007). Many studies show that health outcomes improve if research is used consistently and appropriately in health care organizations (Grol, 2001). There are several models of knowledge translation (discussed further below) as well as understandings of what knowledge use actually means (Lavis et al., 2003; Innvaaer, Vist, Trommald & Oxman, 2002). PreVAiL uses an integrated knowledge translation (IKT) model, described by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research as follows: "*In integrated KT, stakeholders or potential research knowledge users are engaged in the entire research process. By doing integrated KT, researchers and research users work together to shape the research process by collaborating to determine the research questions, deciding on the methodology, being involved in data collection and tools development, interpreting the findings, and helping disseminate the research results.*" (CIHR, 2012)

Although IKT has significant advantages, such as real-world relevance of research, utilization of research findings, and sensitization to other perspectives and processes, it can be difficult for both parties to navigate the tension between effective collaboration and independence (Kothari & Wathen, 2012). Getting evidence into practice is a complex process that involves various disciplinary approaches, beliefs, values, and world views (Speller, Wimbush & Morgan, 2005). Further, knowledge translation is rarely a linear or rational process and many factors and assumptions complicate KT work (Greenhalgh & Wieringa, 2011). Thus, while researchers and other stakeholder groups might be eager to work together to advance a research program, such partnerships ought to be monitored periodically to ensure a smooth working relationship.

*Models for Knowledge Translation*

KTE processes are diverse with multiple potential guiding models and frameworks (Estabrooks, Thompson, Lovely & Hofmeyer, 2006); different decision-making contexts will require different approaches and strategies.  Graham et al. (2006) propose the Knowledge to Action (KTA) Cycle based on planned action theories; this model holds that knowledge must first be acquired (created, synthesized) and then applied with consideration for both the problem at hand and the context. The knowledge can be applied during various stages or activities, from identifying the gap and selecting interventions through to evaluating and monitoring outcomes. At the centre of the KTA cycle is a 'knowledge funnel', where knowledge inquiry, synthesis, and production are conducted. These three critical processes of knowledge creation and exchange tie directly into PreVAiL's three main objectives (Box 1).

---

**Box 1: PreVAiL's Objectives**

1. to increase knowledge about the links between mental health impairment, gender and exposure to child maltreatment and IPV, using a resilience lens, both in Canada and internationally;

2. to develop interventions to prevent or reduce child maltreatment, IPV and related mental health problems; and

3. to develop and use proven methods of knowledge translation and exchange to ensure that our research findings reach those who make decisions in these areas.

---

Context, defined as the larger structures and systems, including resources, accountabilities, working arrangements, politics, etc., in which stakeholders conduct their activities (Jacobson, Butterill & Goering, 2003) is an important determinant of success of any KTA initiative (Harvey et al., 2002; Kitson, Harvey & McCormack, 1998).  In order for the new knowledge to be understood, absorbed, and applied within a given context, evidence needs to be relevant to, capacity for use must exist, and there must be support for facilitation of the KTA process.

*Networks for KTE*

Another important concept for KTA (and hence for a better understanding PreVAiL) is that of networks, which have as a key function mobilizing knowledge (Levin, 2008). Networks have been broadly defined as formal or informal collaboratives between often diverse individuals and/or organizations who come together around a shared objective, share information, and coordinate activities in ways that could not have been be done alone (Gilchrist, 2006; Provan & Millward, 2001; Jassawalla & Sashittal, 1998).

To summarize, PreVAiL is an example of a network embedded in an integrated knowledge translation model involving researchers, practitioners and policymakers. In order for the network to be a success – i.e., to influence programs and policy in the area of child maltreatment, IPV and mental health – strong interactions supporting mutual learning and exchange among network members are needed. Further, to facilitate the uptake of research knowledge, partner organizations need to have the capacity to incorporate research in their organization.

**Methods**

*Data Collection and Analysis*

The questionnaire (PIQ) contains partnership indicators in the domains of: communication, collaborative research, dissemination of research, research findings, negotiation, partnership enhancement, information needs, rapport, and commitment (Kothari et al., 2011) (Appendix B). Indicators provide a transparent, diagnostic checklist by which to guide the development of a partnership. Simple demographic questions were also included.

The questionnaire was administered at the PreVAiL annual project team meeting in May 2011; time was allocated on the meeting agenda to provide details about the research, to review informed consent procedures and to allow those who wished to participate the time to fill out a paper copy of the questionnaire.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted from November 2011 to March 2012. The following areas were discussed to gain further insight into partners' experiences with being part of PreVAiL, and their thoughts about what was going well and what could be improved: involvement with PreVAiL researchers and participation in formal PreVAiL activities or activities facilitated by the link with PreVAiL, as well as any active or passive sharing and/or use of knowledge arising from their relationship with PreVAiL (see Appendix C for interview guide).

*Sample*

In total, there are approximately 65 people on this project team (the number is adjusted according to how many trainees are added to, or leave, the Network). All co-investigators (researchers, trainees and partners) were invited to attend the annual meeting. Those present at the meeting (n = 57) were invited to complete the PIQ. All 22 partners (representing 19 partner organizations) were invited to participate in the semi-structured interviews.

*Analysis*

As a first step, PIQ responses were analyzed in aggregate. Second, responses were aggregated by 'researcher' (including researchers and trainees) and 'partner'; data was also organized into and/or by type of decision-making role categories (e.g., policymaking, advocacy). Frequencies were calculated for each indicator and/or domain.

All semi-structured interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed and cleaned to remove identifiers for the purposes of systematically analyzing the text (Braun and Clarke, 2006). After reading the transcripts, segments were coded inductively and care was taken to document definitions/descriptions of each code. The coder and another member of the research team came together after three transcripts were coded to ensure that code descriptions were clear and comprehensive. Then, after all transcripts were coded, another research team member reviewed all the coding to ensure trustworthiness of the process; discrepancies were resolved by discussion. Drawing on Braun's approach, the entire research team met to interpret the codes, leading to amalgamating, discarding and identifying relationships among the codes (i.e., identify broader themes); over 200 initial codes were transformed into 14 themes (Appendix D) with associated lower level codes. Descriptive data regarding specific activities and events were quantitatively summarized.

**Results**

In total 37 PreVAiL members completed the PIQ (64% response rate); one survey was omitted due to incomplete response (total sample n=36). The majority of participants were researchers (47.2%, n=17). Trainees who participated included 3 post-doctoral fellows (11.1%), and 6 graduate or undergraduate students (16.7%); for the analyses reported below, trainees (n=9) were grouped with researchers (n=17) (total 'researchers' sample n=26; 72.2% of total group). In total 9 partners (25% of sample) completed the PIQ. The primary activity of partners who participated was research/development (n=6; 66%), followed by government policy development (n=3; 33%), and advocacy (n=1; 11%). One person (2.7%) did not provide demographic information and could not be grouped according to role (Table 1 describes our sample sizes).

| Table 1: Participants/Sample | | |
|---|---|---|
| Role | Sample Size | Percent of Total Sample |
| All participants | 36 | 100% |
| Researchers (including trainees) | 26 | 72.2% |
| Partners | 9 | 25% |
| Unidentified | 1 | 2.7% |

In the following analysis 'agree' and 'strongly agree' are grouped together. We have also indicated in several places when the 'not applicable' selection was used by a large number of participants. Frequency tables are included in Appendix E.

PreVAiL's 22 individual partners represent 19 separate organizations (three organizations have co-leads); all individual partners were invited to participate in the semi-structured interviews. After three email reminders, two partners declined due to no involvement or changes in their professional roles (in these cases, while new liaisons for the organizations had been nominated, they were deemed too new to the process to provide meaningful commentary); a third interview was unable to be scheduled in the allotted timeframe. In total, 19 interviews were conducted (86% response rate), representing 17 of our 19 partner organizations (Table 2).

| Table 2: Summary of Interviews | |
|---|---|
| Invited | 22 people from 19 PreVAiL partner organizations |
| Declined (role change)/Not completed in time | 3 |
| **Total Interviews** | **19 (of 22) (86%)** |
| **Total Organizations represented** | **17 (of 19) (89%)** |

The results are presented in four sections. First, we present our findings on the quality of the partnership including a discussion of communication within PreVAiL. Second, we discuss our findings as they relate to the knowledge to action cycle, especially the knowledge funnel (inquiry, synthesis and products). Third, we describe current use of knowledge in practice and policy as a direct result of PreVAiL. Finally we look at PreVAiL as a network and report on its influence and benefit at network, host organization and community levels.

*Quality of the Partnership*

While the majority of interview questions were qualitative, one focused on the partner's participation in formal team-wide PreVAiL events and activities, as well as in formal and informal KTE/linkage activities – a total of eight types, described and summarized in Table 3.

The majority of partners participated in the face-to-face meetings in 2009 (n=10; 53%) and 2011 (n=14; 74%). Partners enjoyed these events and spoke highly of the benefits of networking, linkages and meeting international researchers. Almost all partners said they would want more face-to-face meetings; while they recognize the challenges (mainly cost), the benefits to them are clear.

The PreVAiL Delphi research priority setting process (Wathen et al., 2012) took place from July 2010 to May 2011 and consisted of two survey rounds to identify and begin to rank priorities, a teleconference round (with three calls, one each for the theme areas child maltreatment, intimate partner violence, and resilience), and small and large group discussion at the May 2011 full-team meeting to finalize the ranked list of priorities by theme area. While most partners participated in some aspect of the Delphi process (n=15, 79%), many were unsure of which specific component they participated in. The on-line surveys had the highest participation rates: fifteen (79%) of our partners completed at least one of the two whereas only six interviewees could directly recall participating in both online surveys. Nearly half of participants (47%, n=9) recalled participating in at least one teleconference; however several were unsure of which specific call. Eight of the 14 partners who attended the May 2011 meeting recalled participating in the Delphi small group discussions (42% of the total partners and 57% of meeting attendees).

When asked about other KTE activities, almost two-thirds (n=12, 63%) of partners talked about either formal or informal meetings with PreVAiL researchers (outside of team meetings). Only two partners mentioned they were involved with specific PreVAiL research projects; many were unaware of current projects. Similarly there was a lack of awareness around connecting with trainees; however, four (21%) participants did give successful examples of such linkages. Partners were more likely to talk about linking PreVAiL researchers with others in their organization (n=7, 37%), or in their broader professional network (n=9, 47%).

| Table 3: Summary of Activities/Events | |
|---|---|
| **Formal PreVAiL Team Activity** | **N (%)** |
| 1. Nov 2009 Team Meeting | 10 (53%) |
| 2. May 2011 Team Meeting | 14 (74%) |
| 3. PreVAiL Research Priority setting process (Delphi) | |
| 3a. online survey 1 | 8 (42%) |
| 3b. online survey 2 | 7 (37%) |
| Completed at least one survey | 15 (79%) |
| Completed both on-line surveys | 6 (32%) |
| 3c. CM teleconference | 5 (26%) |
| 3d. IPV teleconference | 2 (11%) |
| 3f. Resilience teleconference | 3(16%) |
| Participated in at least one teleconference | 9 (47%) |
| 3g. Discussions at May 11 meeting | 8 (42%) |
| Participated in at least one component of the Delphi | 15 (79%) |
| **Formal and Informal KTE/Linkage Activities** | |
| 4. Involved in a PreVAiL research project | 2 (11%) |
| 5. Formal or informal meetings with PreVAiL Researchers (including having them speak to your organization; participate in panels, reviews, etc.) | 12 (63%) |
| 6. Interactions with PreVAiL trainees (outside of team meetings) | 4 (21%) |
| 7. Linking PreVAiL researchers with others in your organization | 7 (37%) |
| 8. Linking PreVAiL researchers with others in your broader professional network | 9 (47%) |
| Other (specified by interviewee) | 0 |

To further analyze partner involvement, we categorized participants into three categories of involvement: high involvement (participated in 6 to 8 events), medium involvement (participated in at least 3 events) and low involvement (participant in less than 3 events). Seventy-four percent of partners interviewed reported high (21% participated in >6 of 8 formal activities) or moderate (53%; 3-6 activities) involvement in PreVAiL's formal activities, including team meetings, teleconferences and the Delphi process; five (n=25%) reported low involvement (< 3 events). Only one partner did not participate in any activities; one participated in all eight. This does not include informal, individual-level interactions.

We compared these numbers with what interview participants were actually saying about their involvement with PreVAiL and found the results to align well. Participants who felt their involvement with PreVAiL was peripheral were more likely to have low to medium involvement with the network. On the other hand, participants who were more actively involved with PreVAiL from the start and who readily discussed partnering with researchers were those who scored higher on involvement.

We then sought to understand whether involvement with PreVAiL was a marker for more positive or negative comments or thoughts about the partnering relationship and process participants had experienced. It was not always the case that those who were highly involved

had more positive things to say while those who were less involved had less positive things to say. In fact, there were several examples of participants who were not highly involved in PreVAiL events, but who were extremely impressed with PreVAiL in terms of the work accomplished, the goals set, and the networking achieved. Most participants felt that being a part of PreVAiL met their expectations and were happy with the quality of the partnership.

> *for sure it met my expectations and it's also been a privilege and a pleasure to watch PreVAiL grow and not that it had much growing to do because there was an international cadre of wonderful people involved... to watch the process and watch the networking that occurred and the opportunity for growth and development of young researchers has been really fantastic. [P-15]*

> *like most professional relationships, you know, they come to it, they increase, they decrease, they kind of you know, there's a give and take over time and that changes constantly, … I'm happy with the way it is [P-07]*

In the interviews, many participants expressed their desire to be more involved with PreVAiL network activities such as collaborating on grants, research proposals, and joint advocacy on shared issues. A few participants simply wanted to become more aware of opportunities for involvement and broader networking on both a national and international level.

Communication

All team members were asked about their experience of PreVAiL's communication processes. On the PIQ, the majority of partners (n=7, 77.7%) and researchers (n=16, 61.6%) agreed that team communication is ongoing. Most participants (n=23, 63.9%) use the same contact people for PreVAiL-related communications; 100% of partners (n=9) and 53.8% of researchers (n=14) use the same contact people. This was echoed in the interviews where partners talked about contacting only one or two PreVAiL researchers with whom they were more familiar (often the same researcher who originally engaged them with PreVAiL) as a key point of contact for PreVAiL and other related activates (one example given was contacting a PreVAiL PI to get contact information of another PreVAiL researcher to guest speak at a conference).

There is less clarity around the use of a common language, or lexicon, by all parties: while two partners (22.2%) agreed to that a common language was used, three partners (33.3%) were undecided and another three partners (33.3%) disagreed. Researchers, on the other hand, were more in agreement (n=12, 46.2%) that there was a common language. It is clear through the interviews that having a common language is both important to and valued by partners:

> *I think that's extremely important. It happens in concrete ways, you know, at [organization], we say something and then someone from PreVAiL more or less echoes what we're saying, or in publications we've put together, etc. [P-01]*

In the interviews we heard from some of our partners that there was a lack of clarity around their specific roles:

> *I'm really not sure (what my role is)…I can't really say what kind of role I have, but I was involved with the preliminary meeting and out of that I have been trying to move projects forward. [P-20]*

*I don't really have any involvement right now…. a while back when it first started I was asked to be just sort of part of a group that I guess I'm kind of a just, not really a formal advisory capacity, but I don't know what the group is called, but every now and then to just sort of ask us for some input and so there just hasn't been any request for that recently [P-18]*

When partners were asked a similar question in the PIQ, about how clarity and explicitness of roles, expectations, and criteria for deliverables, four (44.4%) agreed there was clarity, three (33.3%) disagreed and two (22.2%) were either unsure or neutral. Responses from researchers on this question showed that most researchers (n=12, 46.1%) agreed there was clarity regarding roles, expectations, and criteria for deliverables; however a significant portion (n=9, 25%) felt this question was not applicable.

While the majority of participants agreed that communication was frequent (n= 17, 47.3%), this group was made up primarily of researchers (n=13, 50%). Partners were more split: four (44.4%) felt that communication was frequent, and three (33.3%) were undecided. Six researchers (23.1%) and two partners (22.2%) felt communication was not frequent. Part of this variation in response could be due to a difference in understanding "frequent." In the interviews, partners disagreed about what ideal communication would look like (both modality and frequency), however most partners want to be more informed about PreVAiL activities. Some wanted more frequent communication (one partner suggested weekly emails); while others felt bi-monthly would be appropriate. A significant number of partners wanted more information from PreVAiL on network activities including: progress on seed funded projects; specific activities related to network objectives; and updated research findings.

Most of the participants talked about receiving too much information in general, and this meant that PreVAiL information sometimes gets overlooked. Some participants made suggestions on how to mitigate this, including more user-friendly newsletters (with email subject headings very clear and information within the body of the email clearly labeled). There were mixed results regarding the Team Newsletters. While most interview participants seemed to value the e-newsletter, there was an underlying yearning for something else or more. Some were unaware of what the newsletter was,

*I think that probably what I did on here was when I looked at it I didn't realize that it had some updates in it, because what it does is it takes you to this thing that says Welcome to the Prevail Research Network, and it, and it lays out the themes and everything which I know, I've seen before, …, but I didn't' really see that it was an update, [P-18]*

Or were unsure if they even received the newsletter. Three participants did not recall receiving the newsletter, and during the interview searched for it. This was most often followed with very pleased comments:

*… But here it is, I see now if you go to the bottom of it…. and I probably just didn't do that, you know I probably just didn't go all the way to the bottom, but that's great, I think it's great. Like for somebody like me who's just like really fast looking at emails [P-18]*

Partners talked about the format, layout and contents of the newsletters, and how each component was (or was not) useful. Participants who recalled receiving the newsletters found it very useful and liked the 'follow-able' (click-able) links and the brevity:

> *I think that that's a, what I like about it is that its brief and basically just provides you know a quick overview of the kinds of things that are available through the resource, so I think that that's very helpful. [P-02]*

> *I think the links is a good way to do it. Yea, just sort of, so you can skim it if you're just opening it and go to what interests you … like if it links something up and I'm not necessarily going to follow that in the same way as if I saw something that was you know relevant to what I was doing [P-20]*

Some partners wanted PreVAiL communication to also include more targeted or 'tailored' communication:

> *I actually expected minimal communication. And so (what is currently being done) meets my expectations, I'm not worried either way. When I, the thing is, am I able to communicate with people when I need to, and I am, so that to me is the key thing because, because the main focus of Prevail is really CM and IPV, that's not really my area; those are the main areas which generate communications, I'm not all that interested in receiving that information, I'm in information overload as it is. So when there's something specific to the resilience construct, like I'm saying, I'm on that, that's more, that's what I'm interested in and you know, I think I get you know that information, but I don't know for sure. [P-07]*

One participant suggested having a communication plan would be helpful in both fostering better awareness of what's happening with the network, but also in allowing for more engagement with the network and its research.

> *...realizing that there's some difficulties in making such a thing happen... it would be perhaps beneficial if there were an opportunity to understand from an expectation perspective what types of information you're intending to communicate, the kind of timing of when it would be available. And the reason that I'm suggesting this is that if there's something that is you know sort of important to respond to and you know, the information is being provided in a sort of a passive way I guess, then you know, that might be a way to sort of prime the pumps so to speak, so there's some relationship to the process. [P-02]*

It is clear from our data that while both involvement and communication have room for improvement, we are in a good place to move forward making positive and meaningful change in these areas.

*Knowledge Creation: Inquiry, Synthesis and Production*

PreVAiL was created with the objectives of developing and promoting an integrated research and knowledge translation and exchange (KTE) agenda among a network of established, new and emerging investigators and key stakeholders. Participants believe strongly that PreVAiL is on the right track to meeting these objectives. Participants felt a key value of the network is

that it is addressing important research areas that are often not a key focus on research agendas; this was a reason individuals wanted to be part of the network.

> *I think first of all just knowing that there's this network of researchers and a lot of them from Canada, but not exclusively, have helped to broaden our network because we can, for historical reasons, I think too work a lot with US based organizations and I think less with Canada … the first meeting, you know just realizing that there's all this expertise and all this interesting work going on, was really useful [P-19]*

Participants often turned to PreVAiL when they needed information. Some partners said they check the website to get information; this was done most often when a partner had a specific need and knew related information was available on the website, and thought that linking their organization's websites to PreVAiL (and vice versa) would be very valuable. Many participants said they valued the ability to call on PreVAiL researchers for information. In this way, participants "felt liberated to ask for advice" [P-05], indicating that being part of PreVAiL had provided a new mechanism to connect with researchers.

> *…we needed to have (information), it's quite a quick turnaround, so first of all we needed evidence, … so we wrote to a few people [from PreVAiL] who provided us with their input and expertise … [we asked them] do you have any suggestions from the literature where we could look.  And some people had the information on the top of their head, they could send us in different directions and people were very useful [P-05]*

The face-to-face meetings were very useful for partners to find out about research and meet researchers whose work was unfamiliar. In this way, partners were learning what they did not know and they found value in this.

> *I found (the meetings) fantastically useful for two reasons; one is I have a passion for lifelong learning and not feeling like I'm a context expert, being at these PreVAiL meetings really gives me a whole lot of content to learn about which is absolutely stimulating and wonderful [P-15]*

> *The meetings as I mentioned before I thought were quite useful in terms of being able to meet people to understand other types of data and resources that could potentially be brought in on different types of problems. And providing forums for discussions of some of the work that we've been involved in, and being able to being the process you know, of more broadly networking and you know, building collaborative relationships, I think all of that was very valuable. [P-02]*

The PIQ had several questions specifically about collaborative research. Findings were mixed, and many of the questions were largely not applicable to the majority of members (both researchers and partners) most likely due to the fact that few research findings were yet available. This included: 'joint data collection' and 'joint data analysis', (n=27;75%  and n=21; 58.3% respectively said inapplicable), 'feedback about research reports before the final draft' (n=20; 55.6%, said inapplicable), 'prompt response to feedback' (n=18; 50.0% said inapplicable), 'only a few rounds of revisions before the final deliverable is acceptable to all' (n=23; 63.9%, said inapplicable), 'feedback after the final deliverable' (n=25;  69.4%, said inapplicable).

For the question about 'joint discussion about findings and implications', the majority of partners (n=5, 55.5%) felt there was joint discussion whereas the majority of researchers (n=13, 50%) felt the question was not applicable. For those researchers who did respond, most agreed (n=9, 34.6%) that there was joint discussion about findings and their implications.

The majority of participants agreed (n=24, 66.7%) that research questions were jointly identified. While on the whole, the majority of participants agreed (n=21, 58.4%) that network members' needs and constraints are expressed, partners' reactions were mixed: three (33.3%) agreed, and four (44.4%) were undecided (none disagreed). When asked about joint on-going evaluation of relevance of research (e.g. current projects, new findings, new partner needs etc.) the majority agreed (n=16, 44.4%) that evaluation is occurring, however nearly an equal group (n=15, 41.7%) said the question was not applicable.

All interview participants acknowledged and agreed that PreVAiL is a network that shares knowledge. Most commonly, partners talked about the face-to-face meetings as the most effective and satisfying method of sharing information. In networking, PreVAiL has "opened lines of communication" [P-20] and provided connections with researchers.

PreVAiL was seen as an information provider/producer, and some partners also felt their role in PreVAiL was to be an 'information conduit' in their organization. This role of information conduit went both ways: partners bringing 'PreVAiL knowledge' to their organizations and partners giving 'organization knowledge' to PreVAiL; the latter was often described as providing context regarding the practical realities of organizations. Those who identified themselves as such also felt they could be doing more in this capacity:

Similarly, many partners wanted to know more and become more informed, but said they were too busy to participate with greater frequency in PreVAiL activities. "Push" methods of communication are therefore important to ensure that partners are kept updated, even if they are unable to actively engage at any given time. The most common resource cited by partners as useful were the PreVAiL Research Briefs on child maltreatment, IPV and resilience prepared and posted to the website. Partners also talked about team newsletters, teleconferences, and one-off conversations with researchers as having a role in the knowledge sharing process.

While the majority of partners were aware of the website, only a few mentioned checking it regularly. Those who did talk about the website said they found the website very helpful and would go to it to either (a) find contact information of PreVAiL team members, or (b) find a specific resource (most often the "Research Briefs"). One partner uses the website to share knowledge with colleagues:

> *probably what I've gained the most out of it was really becoming more familiar with some people's work, like [researcher name]'s work, I wasn't really familiar with that before this process and I certainly, now that I'm familiar with it, I mean I use her work all the time, in fact I just referred someone to it, a review on, on child maltreatment prevention, I just sent that to someone just the other day, so some of it is just in becoming more aware of what some other people are doing. [P-18]*

The data from both the interviews and the PIQ demonstrate that PreVAiL has, and continues to play a vital role in the knowledge creation process both internal and external to the network.

*Using Knowledge in Practice and Policy*

When participants were asked about how they have used knowledge arising from their partnership with PreVAiL, a variety of responses were given. A few participants talked about using the knowledge instrumentally, for example in presentations. Others reported actively sharing PreVAiL work, such as the Research Briefs, with colleagues. One participant explained how a face-to-face meeting (the content, the discussion and the people) truly shaped the direction of the organization:

> *So the workshop that was added to the Toronto meeting, at first I think they provided direction for the [organization], where we should go with our … surveillance, .., it's actually still not quite done I guess, but it was an important part for us to know what other experts who are moving forward.  And since we got quite a broad, you've got many different perspectives, that was really useful and the international as well as national and maybe then a very small community within Canada, and everyone basically knows each other, it was useful to get the international perspective.[P-05]*

The majority of participants used PreVAiL-generated knowledge more conceptually – that is to change or augment their own understanding of violence, resilience, and even data collection and analysis:

> *I mean there are things that I keep in mind, I think the whole discussion around resiliency for me was very interesting, I can't say that I have actually done anything in terms of putting into practice but you know, its information that's circulating through my brain as I'm thinking about other stuff that I'm working on. [P-13]*

and

> *[T]he unit never really looked at (our data) that way before, I think they looked at it sort of a storage mechanism for process use and didn't think about the possibilities that they had for analysis, so I think that that kind of way of viewing child protection and looking at it as you know, as a possible source for you know practice information really came out of the project that we started with at the first meeting. [P-20]*

How participants used knowledge in practice and policy was also captured under some of the indicators within the 'collaborative research' dimension (other indicators within this dimension have been presented elsewhere in this report). The PIQ asked specifically about disseminating, or sharing, research evidence and for these items, the majority of members reported that the following items were *not applicable*:

- Stakeholders and partners receiving relevant documents (n=21, 58.3%).
- Recommendations for action reflecting current program and policy challenges (n=21, 58.3%).
- Receiving documents in formats similar to those used for other communications within the government (e.g. briefing notes) (n=21, 58.3%).

Also how participants use knowledge in practice and policy was also explored under the 'research findings' dimension (again, other indicators within this dimension have been presented elsewhere in this report). Similarly to the 'collaborative research' dimension, many of the  research findings indicators were stated to be 'not applicable' by the majority of PreVAiL members (researchers and partners), perhaps owing to the fact that at this early stage research outcomes were not yet available:

- Research findings presented in policy-related format and language (n=18, 50%).
- Implications of findings are understood by all (n=20, 55.6%).
- Documentation of feedback to researchers (n=21, 58.3%).
- Senior government staff being aware of research findings (n=22, 61.1%).
- Research findings discussed or reflected in government meeting material and research documents (n=25, 69.4%).

Even though PreVAiL is still in early stages of being a network, and many of the research findings have not yet been published or made available to team members, the knowledge PreVAiL has created is well used, highly regarded and appreciated by partners and researchers alike.


*PreVAiL as a Network*

PreVAiL is perceived as an evolving research community whose people are essential to its success. Many of the partners value the ability to work with researchers committed to this content area. Networking is the key benefit reported by partners in the interviews, and has led to collaborations in writing papers, working on grants, and speaking at conferences/workshops.

> *(PreVAiL) put me in contact with a lot of new people working in the area of violence prevention and these people have helped us with specific projects, these people actually carried out some work for us, they helped us get in touch with other people in other parts of the worlds, so people are networking and sources of help and people who can do work for us. [P-01]*

Team members overall seemed to value each other's contribution within the network. In the PIQ 27 participants (75%) said contributions were valued and 20 (55.5%) felt they are acknowledged in project documentation. This is especially true for partners: seven (77.7%) felt both they valued each other's contribution and felt they are acknowledged in project documentation.  Most researchers agree they are acknowledged in project documentation (n=13, 50%), however ten (38%) saw this question as inapplicable.

Even though research outcomes arising from PreVAiL studies were still forthcoming, the majority of respondents agreed that being a part of PreVAiL was helpful to them. As one participant said: "*The partnership has been very positive for us. I can't really think of any drawbacks.*" [P-01]

When partner organizations' goals aligned with those of PreVAiL, participants spoke of the added value, ease of buy-in, and excitement for future collaboration. When asked why they

accepted the invitation to join PreVAiL, one partner said: "*it fit so clearly with our mandate*" [P-05]. Another said:

> *I think we have one common goal, violence against women, if there are any political actions which are supported by both of our organizations and other, that could be one of the goals for me, ..., we speak out (together) ..., regarding political topics, to the media, as organizations speaking out (together). [P-08]*

While not all partner organizations had the same goal as PreVAiL, nearly all reported on the importance of PreVAiL and the value of being part of the network. In this way, partners found value in getting together and working collectively:

> *What I valued was the chance to work with a group of committed people who were all very, seemed to be committed to these issues and that in itself was very, very valuable [P-16]*

When partners were asked about the scope of PreVAiL (national or international), some emphasized it as a Canadian source of expertise in violence research, while others talked about its international aspects, with early work to date primarily focused on Canada. Many people valued the national and international scope of PreVAiL:

> *I think it's opened up the scope for research being done in a one stop shopping to connect with national and international researchers working in some well-defined theme areas. [P-17]*

When partner priorities or scope-of-work did not exactly match those of PreVAiL, it was not seen to be a problem or a weakness; participants were very 'matter-of-fact' about it: "*that's just how it is*" [P-01] and:

> *I'm not sure that the things we're interested in are necessarily things that are on the top of your list, so I wouldn't expect that there would be a great deal of information coming out from PreVAiL on certain topics that you're not dealing with specifically.* [P-10]

The same participant went on to say that her organization is involved with many more topics than those that PreVAiL addresses, and she uses the connections from PreVAiL and the website as a resource in trying to sort out what "things" her organization might focus on.

The face-to-face meetings were valued by all participants who had participated in them; not only for networking, but also for building relationships,

> *in terms of networking, getting to know, you know, some of the people. Some of the people around the table I already know, and I kind of firmed up those relationships, you know, even more because when you see different, when you see the same people but in different context, it kind of builds the relationship a little more [P-07]*

Meetings are also very useful for hearing about content. One participant stated that "*meetings are a catalyst for conversation*" [P-17], and the majority of participants called for more face-to-face meetings, potentially on a smaller scale. It was acknowledged that resources could be a

barrier to face-to-face events, but the overwhelming positive response to the in-person meetings seemed to mask that concern.

> *we would all do a lot better if we were able to connect more frequently I think, and not withstanding what you and I are doing on the phone, these kind of meetings that are face to face are often I think very, very much more productive than what you can achieve by telephone, by email and so on and so forth, so I think we are limited of course by funding, that limitation is even more so now in the fiscal downturn and so I think Prevail is doing exceptionally well and if it had more funding and allowed for more face to face and bringing along more young researchers and so on, it would be better. But that said, it's just wonderful that we have PreVAiL and that we're able to operationalize it even during the fiscal downturn. [P-15]*

Some participants shared comments that reflected areas of potential improvement for PreVAiL and drew attention to the fact that PreVAiL is still evolving. One example was around lack of established processes for determining how, for example, specific sub-projects and initiatives are developed and carried-out, leading, perhaps, to lost opportunities.

> *I think the potential is there and I think we haven't maximized it yet, so I think it's not, I wouldn't say falling short, but I think it you know, takes time to kind of build these relationships, etc., I think that we, having a network of people from different countries that are working on similar issues, I think has a lot of potential. [P-19]*

PreVAiL may also have the opportunity to provide greater added-value to partner organizations, who express that research outputs that have more practical outcomes, recommendations and specific tools or resources are what can be most useful. Several of our partners felt that research-focused outputs can be difficult to translate to their own organizations' immediate needs, but that efforts like the PreVAiL network are a necessary step in a complex process of knowledge-to-action:

> *I'm not a researcher, I'm a policy person, so there are aspects of it that are very interesting, that meet our expectations, but the vast majority of it is at this stage anyway, too centered on the actual research process from our point of view.* [P-16]

and

> *…when we talk about you know knowledge translation .., a lot of times it's researchers, it doesn't necessarily go quite far enough. .. it might be translation to the next phase of research or scale up or something like that, but … there are people out in communities doing violence prevention every single day and .., we worry some about the fact that they're not necessarily always doing, using evidence based strategies…. what would be the best course of action given this state of the science right now…. what would we do right now, if it was our responsibility to you know, implement programs in communities to try to prevent violence, what would we do based on what we know, and I don't know, I just feel like we have a group, the network that you pulled together is such a, it's really impressive and is there a way to, to contribute to that dialogue somehow. [P-18]*

Almost all participants said that on an individual level, PreVAiL has provided personal learning in the form of hearing new research, hearing about evolution in research methods in violence research, and getting connected to Canadian and international experts in violence research. The overall positivity toward PreVAiL on both the PIQ and in interviews further demonstrates the value which PreVAiL is providing to individuals, various fields of research and the broader community.

**Discussion**

The most highly cited benefit of PreVAiL is the unique networking opportunities it provides. Nearly all participants were excited about the potential of another face-to-face event, however most also acknowledged the financial costs of such events. Face-to-face meetings enable knowledge finding, sharing, development and use activities to come together at one point in time. Many of the partners valued participating in the present evaluation interview– using it reciprocally to ask us questions about the network and getting re-engaged with PreVAiL. These kinds of between-meeting communications provide an opportunity to generate and maintain excitement, and could be enhanced through specific sub-activities.

The interdisciplinary and cross-university nature of PreVAiL is valued by partners. Others appreciated the significance of PreVAiL's integrated, life-course, gendered approach to violence, which includes violence against women, men, boys and girls, as well as a broad definition of gender roles. This more holistic approach makes the network more attractive to partner organizations, enabling it, potentially, to reach a broader audience.

While communication with partners can be enhanced, it is clear that partners are aware of how to get information (check the website) and take advantage of the direct connections from PreVAiL (directly emailing researchers). Creating a common language and working to standardize expectations around communication modes and frequency will help to solidify PreVAiL's communication efforts and in turn strengthen the network as a whole. Partners express the desire to understand what their role is, why it is important, and what more they can do. These do not need to be big tasks. Regular communications, in between team meetings, will work not only to keep partners more informed (which they have requested), but will also improve partners' sense of belonging and involvement with PreVAiL.

To increase the likelihood of success it is important to acknowledge the different communities, contexts and skills from all members; in doing so one can allow these dynamics to foster successful knowledge sharing (Bartunek, Trullen, Bonet & Sauquet, 2003). PreVAiL might consider the "next steps" not only in their communication plan, but also in larger, more visionary ways, especially given the perceptions of PreVAiL as a "research" network. Creating a vision that can be shared by all members will foster strength in the network as it grows and evolve the perception to a "research and research utilization" network.

*Next Steps*

Our analysis points to three major recommendations for PreVAiL's next steps: (1) develop a more detailed communication strategy, (2) set a clear vision for how the network will evolve, and (3) further engage with partners on KTE discussions (Table 4), detailed below.

1) There is a need for the PreVAiL team to evolve its communication strategy. When participants were questioned about their involvement in activities, their lack of participation was most often attributed to either not being aware or not knowing how. These challenges are easily solvable with the right processes in place.  We also need a more thorough understanding of what our partners really mean when they say they want "more communication." Participants differed in their ideas about communication: some felt it was not frequent enough, while others felt it was appropriate. Most agreed that regular, brief, and on-point communication was important. One participant suggested more tailored communication; this could be accomplished by streamlining newsletters, enhancing sections in the newsletters such as "Exclusively for Partners", or "Trainee Corner", where specific areas of interest could be easily accessed and expanded.  Perhaps less feasible is the idea of creating newsletters for each of the main areas of research in PreVAiL; more likely it would be beneficial to have clearer headings within the newsletter to direct individuals to the areas which interest them. Other options to improve communication include more regular teleconferences and webinars. Once a plan is developed, it will be important to evaluate the communication plan, seeking input from partners and researchers.

2) PreVAiL could also clearly outline, with input from members, its vision for how the network will evolve and share this vision broadly. Any such vision should include actionable steps on how the network will foster both national and international collaboration. It would be important to recap the objectives of PreVAiL, and to track what is being done with regard to those objectives. Participants want to be more aware of the activities of the network (including updates on seed funded projects as well as opportunities for collaboration) and appreciated the reminder of past events. There is significant interest in working with and collaborating on projects – however many participants cited lack of time, or too much already going on, as key barriers. While we cannot fix those issues, two solvable challenges cited by participants are: lack of awareness of events and lack of knowledge on how to contact researchers. Similar to the potential strategies outlined above (i.e., a communication plan), possible solutions can be worked into a larger communication strategy. The vision, which might include deliverables, deadlines and plans for evaluation, can be made available for all on the website

3) It is also very promising to see the willingness of our partners to engage with us on KTE discussions – this is an excellent area for growth and future activities of the PreVAiL team (especially for those researchers involved in Theme 3 of our network). This is an area that needs to be pursued in a timely manner. All of the 15 participants who expressed an interest in receiving the "Is Research Working for You?" worksheet received it within a week, along with details about further communication/next steps in working with someone from the KTE team, although organizations have not yet committed to working with PreVAiL researchers to assess and improve their capacity to use research. To make this happen, PreVAiL needs to: (a) follow-up with partners who requested, received, and completed, the "Is Research Working for You"

worksheet; (b) assess interest and needs of partners to engage with the PreVAiL KTE team (this could include asking other/new partners if they are interested in engaging); (c) develop partner organization-specific goals (including specific needs and timeframe) in collaboration with interested partners and (d) regularly evaluate process and outcomes of this process.

| Table 4: Suggested Next Steps for PreVAiL | |
|---|---|
| Recommendation | Details |
| 1. Develop a communication strategy* | • Have a succinct communication plan, including:<br>  a. Exact dates, at regular frequency, for email communication<br>  b. Goals for communication specific to both researcher and partners<br>  c. Process/protocol in place for follow-up on projects that are PreVAiL related* (time frame, responsible parties)<br>  d. Dedicated communication staff (to deal with a-c above)<br>• Be multi-faceted including:<br>  a. Regular (quarterly) emails*; emails should be brief and on point<br>  b. Newsletters: available both in email and on-line with easy 'follow-able links'<br>  c. Face-to-face meetings*<br>  d. Targeted/tailored updates* (both on PreVAiL themes and on seed-funded projects)<br>  e. More frequent (Bi-annual) teleconferences*<br>  f. Yearly Webinars*<br>• Be available to all PreVAiL members*<br>• Evaluate the communication plan regularly: seek input from partners and researchers |
| 2. Set a clear vision for how the network will evolve* | • Develop collaboratively with interested partners* and researchers<br>• Include collaborative opportunities*<br>• Make a plan that includes deliverables, deadlines and evaluation<br>• Regularly evaluate and update plan<br>• Post publicly on website* |
| 3. Engage with partners on KTE discussions* | • Follow-up with partners who requested, received, and completed the "Is Research Working for You" worksheet<br>• Access interest and needs of partners to engage with PreVAiL KTE team<br>• With interested partners, develop partner organization specific goals (with needs and timeframe included)<br>• Regularly evaluate process and outcomes of this process |

*participant suggestion

*Limitations*

The findings need to be considered in light of potential study limitations. There was some confusion with some of the PIQ wording arising from the fact that it was originally developed for a two-party partnership (researcher – policymaker) rather than a network partnership. As well, although PreVAiL principal investigators were not involved with data collection, it is possible that social desirability bias inflated some of the interview responses. Nevertheless, this study points to several areas of PreVAiL strengths as well as areas that could use further attention for improved functioning.

*Conclusion*

According to the data presented in this report, PreVAiL is evolving, and its immediate network links are strengthening.  Moreover, PreVAiL seems to be showing signs of promoting a "network of networks" approach, as its reach is extended via both researcher and partner members. PreVAiL is well positioned to meet its knowledge translation and exchange objectives, fulfilling the requirements for successful KTE efforts as described by Bowen et al. (2005): "the importance of trusting relationships; the need for multidirectional information exchange and an ongoing forum for sharing; and the creation of research relevant to users" (Bowen, Martens & Crockett, 2005, pp 205). These, along with emphasis on all members' unique skill sets (Amabile et al., 2001), and early and intensive effort to establish common research interests and priorities (Bartunek & Louis, 1996, Wathen et al., 2012), are key strengths. PreVAiL has established, in its early stages, several enablers of KTE processes, including online infrastructure, targeted and open relationships, specific communication strategies, and a trusting climate (Orzano, McInerney, Scharf, Tallia & Crabtree, 2008). Forthcoming work will focus on identified process enablers, such as focused communication strategies and a specific growth plan.

## References

Amabile, T. M., Patterson, C., Mueller, J., Wojcik, T., Odomirok, P. W., Marsh, M., & Kramer, S. J. (2001). Academic-practitioner collaboration in management research: A case of cross-profession collaboration. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*(2), 418-431.

Bartunek, J., Trullen, J., Bonet, E., & Sauquet, A. (2003). Sharing and expanding academic and practitioner knowledge in health care. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy, 8*, S62-S68.

Bartunek, J.M & Louis, M.F. (1996). *Insider/outsider team research*. Thousand Oak, CA: Sage

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2),*77-101.

CIHR (2012). More about Knowledge Translation at CIHR; Knowledge Translation – Definition. Online Dec 8/12 http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/39033.html

Estabrooks, C. A., Newton, M. S., Norton, P., Birdsell, Judy M, Adewale, A. J., & Thornley, R. (2007). Health researchers in Alberta: An exploratory comparison of defining characteristics and knowledge translation activities. *Implementation Science, 2*(1), 192-193.

Gilchrist, A. (2006). Maintaining relationships is critical in network's success. *Healthcare Papers* 7,2, 28-31.

Graham I, Tetroe J, & KT Theories Research Group. (2007). Some Theoretical Underpinnings of Knowledge Translation. *Academic Emergency Medicine 14,*936-941.

Graham, I.D., Logan, J., Harrison, M.B., Harrison, M.B., Straus, S., Tetroe, J.M. Caswell, W. & Robinson, N. (2006). Lost in knowledge translation: time for a map? Journal of Continuing Education in Health Professions. *Journal of Continuing Education in Health Professions 26*, 13-24.

Greenhalgh, T. & Wieringa, S. (2011) Is it time to drop the knowledge translation metaphor? A critical literature review. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine 104*, 501-509.

Grol, R. (2001). Successes and failures in the implementation of evidence-based guidelines for clinical practice. *Medical Care 39*, II46-II54.

Harvey, G., Loftus-Hills, A., Rycroft-Malone, J., Titchen, A., Kitson, A., McCormack, B., & Seers, K. (2002). Getting evidence into practice: the role and function of facilitation. *Journal of Advanced* Nursing *37*, 577-588.

Innvær, S., Vist, G., Trommald, M., & Oxman, A. (2002). Health policy-makers' perceptions of their use of evidence: A systematic review. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy, 7*(4), 239-244.

Jacobson N, Butterill D, & Goering P. (2003). Development of a framework for knowledge translation: understanding user context. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy,* 8(2), 94-9.

Jassawalla, A. R., & Sashittal, H. C. (1998). An examination of collaboration in high-technology new product development processes. *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 15*, 237-254.

Kitson, A., Harvey, G., & McCormack, B. (1998). Enabling the implementation of evidence based practice: a conceptual framework. *Quality and Safety in Health Care*, 7, 149-158.

Kothari, A., Edwards, N., Hamel, N., & Judd, M. (2009). Is research working for you? Validating a tool to examine the capacity of health organizations to use research. *Implementation Science*, 4: 46.

Kothari, A., Maclean, L., Edwards, N. & Hobbs, A. (2011). Indicators at the interface: managing policymaker- researcher collaboration. *Knowledge Management Research and Practise 9*, 203-214.

Kothari, A., & Wathen, C.N. (2012). A Critical Second Look at Integrated Knowledge Translation. *Healthcare Policy*. Online Dec 8/12 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2012.11.004.

Lavis, J. N., Robertson, D., Woodside, J. M., McLeod, C. B., Abelson, J., & the Knowledge Transfer Study Group. (2003). How can research organizations more effectively transfer research knowledge to decision makers? *The Milbank Quarterly, 81*(2), 221-248.

Levin, B. (2008). Thinking about knowledge mobilization. *Canadian Council on Learning*.

Mitton C., Adair C.E., McKenzie E., Patten S.B., & Perry B.W. (2007). Knowledge transfer and exchange: Review and synthesis of the literature**.** *The Milbank Quarterly 2007*, *85*(4): 729–768.

Newton M.S. & Scott-Findlay S. (2007).Taking stock of current societal, political and academic stakeholders in the Canadian healthcare knowledge translation agenda. *Implementation Science,* 2, 32.

Orzano, A.J., McInerney, C.R., Scharf, D., Tallia, A.F. & Crabtree, F. (2008). A knowledge management model: implications for enhancing quality in health care. *Journal of the American Society for Information and Science Technology 59,* 3, 489-505.

Provan, K. G., & Milward, J. B. (2001). Do networks really work? A framework for evaluating public-sector organizational networks. *Public Administration Review*, 61(4), 414–423

Speller, V., Wimbush, E. & Morgan, A. (2005). Evidence based health promotion practise: how to make it work. *Promotion and Education 12*, 15-16.

Wathen, C.N., MacGregor, J.C.D., Hammerton, J., Coben, J.H., Herrman, H., Stewart, D.E.& MacMillan, H.L. (2012). Priorities for research in child maltreat, intimate partner violence and resilience to violence exposure: results of an international Delphi consensus development process. *BMC Public Health 12*, 684.

**Appendix A: PreVAiL Partner Organizations**

Canadian Mental Health Association

Centers for Disease Control & Prevention, Division of Violence Prevention

Child Welfare League of Canada (CWLC)

Family Violence Initiative, and Family Violence Prevention Unit, Public Health Agency of Canada

Health Canada Research & Surveillance, Drug Strategy & Controlled Substances Directorate (ODARS)

Indigenous Health Research Development Program

Institute for Circumpolar Health Research

International Association for Women's Mental Health

ISPCAN International Data Collection Working Group; Child Protection Research Center and the American Humane Association's Children's Division

Justice Canada, Youth Justice & Strategic Initiatives, Youth Justice Policy

PAHO/WHO–Violence and Injury Prevention, Sustainable Development and Environmental Health Area

Mental Health Commission of Canada

World Federation for Mental Health (WFMH)

Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC), Health Surveillance and Epidemiology

World Health Organization - Department of Violence and Injury Prevention and Disability

World Health Organization, Gender, Violence and HIV/AIDS Division

Defence Research & Development Canada, Resilience Group

Coalition on Community Safety, Health and Wellbeing

Public Health Agency of Canada, Health Determinants & Global Initiatives

**Appendix B: Partnership Indicators Questionnaire (PIQ)**

**PreVAiL Knowledge Translation & Exchange (KTE) Project**

**PARTNERSHIP EVALUATION**

**"Baseline" Questionnaire**

**Background**: PreVAiL has been designed using an "integrated knowledge translation" model – that is, we have brought together those who develop new knowledge ("researchers") and those well-placed to use it ("partners") in policy, practice, planning and advocacy in the areas of gender, mental health and violence across the lifespan in Canada and internationally.

**Purpose:** This project will evaluate, and inform, the emergence and development of relationships between PreVAiL's researchers and partners. The attached questionnaire will establish the "baseline" for how well you feel the partnerships are emerging and becoming established.  Future survey(s) of this kind, as well as targeted interviews, will help us determine the evolution and success of our partnerships.

**Instructions**: Attached is a questionnaire about <u>partnership indicators</u> in the domains of: communication, collaborative research, dissemination of research, research findings, negotiation, partnership enhancement, information needs, rapport and commitment. These indicators, developed in empirical studies by Prof Anita Kothari and colleagues, provide a transparent, diagnostic checklist by which to guide and evaluate the development of a partnership.

**IF YOU ARE A PARTNER (RESEARCH USER)**: when answering these questions, **please consider your interactions with PreVAiL Researchers** (including the co-principal investigators as well as any other researcher or research trainee affiliated with PreVAiL).

**IF YOU ARE A RESEARCHER (including post-doctoral researchers)**: when answering these questions, **please consider your interactions with PreVAiL Partners** (i.e., NOT with the PreVAiL leads or co-leads, or other researchers – this is <u>NOT</u> about new research collaborations or PreVAiL's function as a research group, per se).

**IF YOU ARE A STUDENT (PhD, Masters, Undergraduate)**: please feel free to complete the questions thinking about any interactions you've had with PreVAiL Partners; however, we recognize that these may be few or none, in which case you can opt out of doing the survey.

The questions should take about 10 minutes.
Thanks.

Preliminary Questions

1. What is your role within PreVAiL?

   ☐ Partner (please also complete Question 2, below)
   ☐ Researcher - PreVAiL co-investigator or collaborator
   ☐ Researcher - post-doctoral fellow
   ☐ Student (graduate or undergraduate)

2. If you said PARTNER, what is the <u>primary</u> activity of your organization? (check the <u>most</u> applicable):

   ☐ Advocacy
   ☐ Policy development – government
   ☐ Policy development – non-government
   ☐ Program or Service Planning
   ☐ Program or Service Delivery
   ☐ Research/development
   ☐ Other (please describe):_____

Would you be willing to speak to us in a possible future interview about your experiences with PreVAiL's partnership activities? If so, please provide your contact information:

Your name and email address: _____

Position: _____

Organization:_____

**PreVAiL Partnership Indicators Questionnaire**

Considering your experiences to date with any emerging relationships between PreVAiL Researchers and Partners, please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the presence of each of the indicators.

| Dimensions of Partnerships | Indicators | Please circle<br>1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree<br>3 = Neither agree nor disagree<br>4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly agree<br>6 = Not applicable |
|---|---|---|
| **Communication** | 1.1 Communication is on-going. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| | 1.2 Communication involves face-to-face meetings as well as telephone, mail, email, and fax methods. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| | 1.3 The same contact people continue over the life of the project. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| | 1.4 A common language/lexicon is used by all parties. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| | 2.1 Roles, expectations, and criteria for deliverables are explicit. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| | 3.1 Communication is frequent. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| | 4.1 Partners value each other's contributions. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| | 4.2 Partners are acknowledged in project documents. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| **Collaborative Research** | 1.1 Joint identification of research questions. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| | 1.2 Each partner's needs and constraints expressed. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| | 1.3 Joint designing of research protocol. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| | 1.4 If relevant, joint data collection. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| | 1.5 If relevant, joint data analysis. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| | 1.6 Joint ongoing evaluation of relevance of research (e.g. current project, new findings, new partner needs etc.) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| | 1.7 Joint discussion of findings and implications. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| | 2.1 Feedback about research report is provided before final draft. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| | 2.2 Response to feedback is prompt. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| | 2.3 Only a few rounds of revisions before deliverable is acceptable to all. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| | 2.4 Feedback is given after the final deliverable is received. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| **Dissemination of Research** | 1.1 Stakeholders and government partners received relevant documents | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| | 2.1 Recommendations for action reflect current program and policy challenges | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |

| Dimensions of Partnerships | Indicators | Please circle<br>1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree<br>3 = Neither agree nor disagree<br>4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly agree<br>6 = Not applicable |
|---|---|---|
|  | 3.1 Presentation formats are similar to those used for other communications within the gov't (e.g. briefing notes) | 1  2  3  4  5  6 |
| **Research Findings** | 1.1  Research findings are presented in policy-related format and language | 1  2  3  4  5  6 |
|  | 1.2  Implications of findings are understood by all. | 1  2  3  4  5  6 |
|  | 1.3  Documentation of feedback to researchers. | 1  2  3  4  5  6 |
|  | 1.4  Senior government staff are aware of research findings. | 1  2  3  4  5  6 |
|  | 1.5  Research findings are discussed or are reflected in government meeting material and research documents. | 1  2  3  4  5  6 |
| **Negotiation** | 1.1  Roles and responsibilities are documented. | 1  2  3  4  5  6 |
|  | 1.2  Written terms of reference for research project (or similar document). | 1  2  3  4  5  6 |
|  | 2.1  Requirements for deliverables and time lines are documented. | 1  2  3  4  5  6 |
|  | 2.2  Partners make their needs explicit (i.e., in terms of accountabilities, priorities, and long term interest). | 1  2  3  4  5  6 |
|  | 2.3  Partners document the above needs. | 1  2  3  4  5  6 |
| **Partnership Enhancement** | 1.1  Key players and senior management, where relevant, are visibly involved and supported | 1  2  3  4  5  6 |
|  | 2.1 Discussion of potential long-term plans or structure to ensure continuity of relationship. | 1  2  3  4  5  6 |
|  | 3.1  Staff with previous linkages with each other are incorporated into partnership. | 1  2  3  4  5  6 |
|  | 4.1 Discussion of respective organizational realities of research partners. | 1  2  3  4  5  6 |

Thank you.

Please return the completed form to Nadine, Anita or Joanne before leaving the meeting.

**Appendix C: Semi-Structured Interview Guide**

1. What is your current involvement with PreVAiL?
   a. Has your involvement with PreVAiL, in these first couple of years, met your expectations?
   b. Would you like to be more or less involved? How?
   c. Has your role – either in your own organization/work, and/or in how you relate to PreVAiL, changed since the beginning of PreVAiL?

2. Can you tell me about how you became involved in PreVAiL?
   a. What did the process look like? (probes: who originated the idea, you? Was it delegated? Were you contacted directly or indirectly by a PreVAiL researcher? Other partner?)
   b. How did you get 'buy-in' or organizational approval?

3. Please tell us where the PreVAiL partnership has been beneficial (to your own work, to your organization, or more generally)
   a. Are there any ways/areas is it falling short?
   (Probe re: specific examples, including specific knowledge, tools, researcher interactions, etc. that have worked/not worked)

4. a) I am going to read a list of PreVAiL activities to date; please let me know in which of these you have participated.

| YES | NO | DK | Activity |
|-----|----|----|----------|
| | | | Nov 2009 Team Meeting (Niagara-on-the-Lake) |
| | | | May 2011 Team Meeting (Toronto) |
| | | | PreVAiL Research Priority setting process (Delphi) <br>     o   online survey 1 |
| | | |     o   online survey 2 |
| | | |     o   CM teleconference |
| | | |     o   IPV teleconference |
| | | |     o   Resilience teleconference |
| | | |     o   Discussions and small groups at May11 meeting |
| | | | Specific PreVAiL research projects (e.g., secondary data analysis) |
| | | | Formal or informal meetings with PreVAiL Researchers (including having them speak to your organization, participate in panels, reviews, etc.) |
| | | | Interactions with PreVAiL trainees (outside of team meetings) |
| | | | Linking PreVAiL researchers with others in your organization |
| | | | Linking PreVAiL researchers with others in your broader professional network |
| | | | Other (please briefly describe) |

b) Overall, were these events useful? Why or why not? Would you change anything?"

5. Tell me about how you have used knowledge arising from your partnership with PreVAiL in your own work.
   a. (Probe re: specific examples, including specific knowledge and how used – instrumental, conceptual, symbolic)
   b. Can you provide an example of sharing knowledge from your partnership with PreVAiL with others inside or external to your organization? (probe re: what knowledge, with whom shared, how received, and how used, if known)

6. What are your thoughts right now on the communication from and with the PreVAiL team?
   a. What about b/w researchers and partners?
   b. What about amongst partners?  (that you are aware of)
   c. Has this changed over the past 2 years?

7. Moving forward, what are your expectations for how the partnership will evolve (i.e., for the next 1-2 years, and longer term)?
   a. Which specific activities should we undertake to enhance the partnership for you/your organization, and for PreVAiL as a whole?  Please be specific.

8. Before we conclude I want to remind you about the "Is Research Working for You" worksheet you may have been given at the May 2011 Team Meeting. You may recall this worksheet is meant to help your organization identify areas of strength, and areas for improvement in knowledge translation and exchange activities. Did you have a chance to complete this worksheet?

   YES NO

   a. (if NO) Would you like to have the worksheet sent to you again?                    YES       NO

   b. (Yes or No) Would you be interested in having someone from the PreVAiL
   Knowledge translation team work with you, and your organization, on KTE            YES       NO
   activities?

Thank you for your time. We will be interviewing approximately 20 PreVAiL partners. From there we will be analyzing the transcripts and we will get in touch with you again at that point. Are you interested in seeing a copy of your transcript, where you can make any necessary changes prior to our analysis?

 YES

 NO

Either way we will be sending you a copy of the preliminary results for you to look at, and provide edits and feedback.

Thank you again for your time today. Do you have any questions for me?

## Appendix D: Final Coding Themes

| Major Theme | Description |
|---|---|
| 1. Knowledge Use | Partners describe how they use/used the knowledge obtained from PreVAiL: symbolic, conceptual and instrumental |
| 2. Strengths and Benefits of PreVAiL | Partners talk about PreVAiL's benefits and strengths at the individual, organizational, network and community level. |
| 3. Knowledge Translation Activities (as result of partnership) | A discussion of knowledge translation activities that partners have done as a result of the partnership including dissemination of PreVAiL knowledge, research briefs |
| 4. Organizational Buy-In | A description of the process of the partner seeking organizational buy-in to be a part of PreVAiL |
| 5. Information Conduits | When partners see themselves in the role of sharing knowledge with those around them (mostly their colleagues and their organization) |
| 6. Role of Partners | How partners perceived their role in the network |
| 7. Common Goals | A discussion of cross-over (or not) between PreVAiL's focus/objectives and that of the partner's organization. |
| 8. Ideas for Improvement/Areas of Weakness | Specific ideas for how PreVAiL can improve on current processes (such as communication, seed funding and more 'face time'; most of these are included in other themes as well) |
| 9. Role of PreVAiL | Specific contributions PreVAiL has made to individuals, organizations, and to the research community as well opportunities where PreVAiL could take on more of a role |
| 10. Involvement of Partners | Partners discussed their involvement with PreVAiL |
| 11. Communication | Discussion of formal and informal communication within the network, amongst partners, and on an individual level between partners and researchers. |
| 12. Partner Challenges | Potential barriers experienced by partners in their interaction with PreVAiL at both individual and organizational levels. |
| 13. Next Steps for PreVAiL | Ideas and discussion around the evolution of the network as well as next steps as well as how current projects will/should inform future activities |
| 14. Is Research Working for You? Conversation | At the end of each interview, 5 min was spent discussing partners' interest in working with the KT team from PreVAiL |

**Appendix E: PIQ Data Tables**

### PreVAiL Partnership Indicators Questionnaire Frequencies

| Dimensions of Partnerships | Indicators | 1 = Strongly disagree | 2 = Disagree | 3 = Neither agree nor disagree | 4 = Agree | 5 = Strongly agree | 6 = Not applicable | No Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Communication** | **1.5 Communication is on-going. (All)** | 3(8.3) | 2(5.6) | 2(5.6) | 9(25) | 14(38.9) | 5(13.9) | 1(2.8) |
| | 1.1 Communication is on-going (P) | 1 (11.1) | 1 (11.1) | 0 | 3(33.3) | 4 (44.4) | 0 | 0 |
| | 1.1 Communication is on-going (R) | 2(7.7) | 1(3.8) | 2(7.7) | 6(23.1) | 10(38.5) | 4(15.4) | 1(3.8) |
| | **1.6 Communication involves face-to-face meetings as well as telephone, mail, email, and fax methods. (All)** | 2(5.6) | 3(8.3) | 1(2.8) | 14(38.9) | 11(30.6) | 5(13.9) | 0 |
| | 1.2. Communication involves face- to –face meetings as well as telephone, mail, email and fax methods. (P) | 0 | 1(11.1) | 0 | 3(33.3) | 4(44.4) | 1(11.1) | 0 |
| | 1.2. Communication involves face-to-face meetings as well as telephone, mail, email and fax methods. (R) | 2(7.7) | 2(7.7) | 1(3.8) | 11(42.3) | 7(26.9) | 3(11.5) | 0 |
| | **1.7 The same contact people continue over the life of the project. (All)** | 0 | 0 | 4(11.1) | 10(27.8) | 13(36.1) | 8(22.2) | 1(2.8) |
| | 1.3. The same contact people continue over the life of the project. (P) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3(33.3) | 6(66.7) | 0 | 0 |
| | 1.3 The same contract people continue over the life of the project. (R) | 0 | 0 | 4(15.4) | 7(26.9) | 7(26.9) | 25(96.2) | 1(3.8) |
| | **1.4. A common language/lexicon is used by all parties. (All)** | 1(2.8) | 8(22.2) | 8(22.2) | 7(19.4) | 7(19.4) | 5(13.9) | 0 |
| | 1.4. A common language/lexicon is used by all parties. (P) | 1(11.1) | 2(22.2) | 3(33.3) | 1(11.1) | 1(11.1) | 1(11.1) | 0 |
| | 1.4. A common language/Lexicon is used by all parties. (R) | 0 | 5(19.2) | 5(19.2) | 6(23.1) | 6(23.1) | 4(15.4) | 0 |
| | **2.2 Roles, expectations, and criteria for deliverables are explicit.(All)** | 0 | 5(13.9) | 6(16.7) | 7(19.4) | 9(25.0) | 9(25.0) | 0 |
| | 2.1. Roles, expectations, and criteria for deliverables are explicit.(P) | 0 | 3(33.3) | 1(11.1) | 2(22.2) | 2(22.2) | 1(11.1) | 0 |
| | 2.1. Roles, expectations, and criteria for deliverables are explicit.(R) | 0 | 2(7.7) | 5(19.2) | 5(19.2) | 7(26.9) | 7(26.9) | 0 |
| | **3.1 Communication is frequent. (All)** | 5(13.9) | 3(8.3) | 7(19.4) | 11(30.6) | 6(16.7) | 4(11.1) | 0 |
| | 3.1. Communication is frequent. (P) | 1(11.1) | 1(11.1) | 3(33.3) | 4(44.4) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 3.1. Communication is | 4(15.4) | 2(7.7) | 4(15.4) | 7(26.9) | 6(23.1) | 3(11.5) | 0 |

| Dimensions of Partnerships | Indicators | 1 = Strongly disagree | 2 = Disagree | 3 = Neither agree nor disagree | 4 = Agree | 5 = Strongly agree | 6 = Not applicable | No Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | frequent. (R ) | | | | | | | |
| | **4.1 Partners value each other's contributions. (All)** | 1(2.8) | 0 | 3(8.3) | 8(22.2) | 19(52.8) | 4(11.1) | 1(2.8) |
| | 4.1. Partners value each other's contributions. (P) | 0 | 0 | 1(11.1) | 2(22.2) | 5 (55.5) | 1(11.1) | 0 |
| | 4.1. Partners value each other's contributions. (R) | 1(3.8) | 0 | 2(7.7) | 5(19.2) | 14(53.8) | 3(11.5) | 1(3.8) |
| | **4.3 Partners are acknowledged in project documents. (All)** | 0 | 1(2.8) | 2(5.6) | 8(22.2) | 12(33.3) | 12(33.3) | 1(2.8) |
| | 4.2 Partners are acknowledged in project documents. (P) | 0 | 0 | 1(11.1) | 2(22.2) | 5(55.5) | 1(11.1) | 0 |
| | 4.2 Partners are acknowledged in project documents. (R) | 0 | 1(3.8) | 1(3.8) | 6(23.1) | 7(26.9) | 10(38.5) | 1(3.8) |
| **Collaborative Research** | **1.7 Joint identification of research questions. (A)** | 1(2.8) | 1(2.8) | 4(11.1) | 10(27.8) | 14(38.9) | 6(16.7) | 0 |
| | 1.1 Joint identification of research questions. (P) | 0 | 1(11.1) | 0 | 4(44.4) | 3(33.3) | 1(11.1) | 0 |
| | 1.1 Joint identification of research questions. (R) | 1(3.8) | 0 | 4(15.4) | 6(23.1) | 11(42.3) | 4(15.4) | 0 |
| | **1.2 Each partner's needs and constraints expressed. (A)** | 1(2.8) | 0 | 7(19.4) | 11(30.6) | 10(27.8) | 7(19.4) | 0 |
| | 1.2 Each partner's needs and constraints expressed. (P) | 0 | 0 | 4(44.4) | 1(11.1) | 2(22.2) | 2(22.2) | 0 |
| | 1.2 Each partner's needs and constraints expressed. (R) | 1(3.8) | 0 | 3(11.5) | 10(38.5) | 8(30.8) | 4(15.4) | 0 |
| | **1.3 Joint designing of research protocol. (A)** | 1(2.8) | 1(2.8) | 5(13.9) | 11(30.6) | 7(19.4) | 11(30.6) | 0 |
| | 1.3 Joint designing of research protocol. (P) | 0 | 1(11.1) | 2(22.2) | 2(22.2) | 2(22.2) | 2(22.2) | 0 |
| | 1.3 Joint designing of research protocol. (R) | 1(3.8) | 0 | 3(11.5) | 9(34.6) | 5(19.2) | 8(30.8) | 0 |
| | **1.4 If relevant, joint data collection. (A)** | 0 | 0 | 4(11.1) | 2(5.6) | 3(8.3) | 27(75.0) | 0 |
| | 1.4 If relevant, joint data collection. (P) | 0 | 0 | 1(11.1) | 0 | 0 | 8(88.8) | 0 |
| | 1.4 If relevant, joint data collection. (R) | 0 | 0 | 3(11.5) | 2(7.7) | 3(11.5) | 18(69.2) | 0 |
| | **1. 5. If relevant, joint data analysis. (A)** | 0 | 0 | 5(13.9) | 5(13.9) | 5(13.9) | 21(58.3) | 0 |
| | 1.5 If relevant, joint data analysis. (P) | 0 | 0 | 1(11.1) | 1(11.1) | 1(11.1) | 6(66.6) | 0 |
| | 1.5 If relevant, joint data analysis. (R) | 0 | 0 | 4(15.4) | 4(15.4) | 4(15.4) | 14(53.8) | 0 |
| | **1.6 Joint ongoing evaluation of relevance of research (e.g. current project, new findings, new partner needs etc.) (A)** | 0 | 2(5.6) | 2(5.6) | 11(30.6) | 5(13.9) | 15(41.7) | 1(2.8) |
| | 1.6 Joint ongoing evaluation of relevance of research (e.g. current | 0 | 1(11.1) | 1(11.1) | 3(33.3) | 1(11.1) | 3(33.3) | 0 |

| Dimensions of Partnerships | Indicators | 1 = Strongly disagree | 2 = Disagree | 3 = Neither agree nor disagree | 4 = Agree | 5 = Strongly agree | 6 = Not applicable | No Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | project, new findings, new partner needs etc.) (P) | | | | | | | |
| | 1.6 Joint ongoing evaluation of relevance of research (e.g. current project, new findings, new partner needs etc.) (R) | 0 | 1(3.8) | 1(3.8) | 8(30.8) | 4(15.4) | 11(42.3) | 1(3.8) |
| 1.8 | **Joint discussion of findings and implications. (A)** | 0 | 1(2.8) | 3(8.3) | 6(16.7) | 8(22.2) | 17(47.2) | 1(2.8) |
| | 1.7 Joint discussion of findings and implications. (P) | 0 | 1(11.1) | 0 | 2(22.2) | 3(33.3) | 3(33.3) | 0 |
| | 1.7 Joint discussion of findings and implications. (R) | 0 | 0 | 3(11.5) | 4(15.4) | 5(19.2) | 13(50) | 1(3.8) |
| 1.1 | **Feedback about research report is provided before final draft. (A)** | 0 | 0 | 3(8.3) | 5(13.9) | 7(19.4) | 20(55.6) | 1(2.8) |
| | 2.1 Feedback about research report is provided before final draft. (P) | 0 | 0 | 1(11.1) | 2(22.2) | 1(11.1) | 5(55.6) | 0 |
| | 2.1 Feedback about research report is provided before final draft. (R) | 0 | 0 | 2(7.7) | 3(11.5) | 6(23.1) | 14(53.8) | 1(3.8) |
| 2.2. | **Response to feedback is prompt. (A)** | 0 | 1(2.8) | 1(2.8) | 7(19.4) | 8(22.2) | 18(50) | 1(2.8) |
| | 2.2 Response to feedback is prompt. (P) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3(33.3) | 3(33.3) | 3(33.3) | 0 |
| | 1.2 Response to feedback is prompt. (R) | 0 | 1(3.8) | 1(3.8) | 4(15.4) | 5(19.2) | 14(53.8) | 1(3.8) |
| 1.3 | **Only a few rounds of revisions before deliverable is acceptable to all. (A)** | 0 | 1(2.8) | 2(5.6) | 4(11.1) | 4(11.1) | 23(63.9) | 2(5.6) |
| | 2.3 Only a few rounds of revisions before deliverable is acceptable to all. (P) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1(11.1) | 1(11.1) | 6(66.7) | 1(11.1) |
| | 2.3 Only a few rounds of revisions before deliverable is acceptable to all. (R) | 0 | 1(3.8) | 2(7.7) | 3(11.5) | 3(11.5) | 16(61.5) | 1(3.8) |
| 2.5 | **Feedback is given after the final deliverable is received. (A)** | 1(2.8) | 0 | 6(16.7) | 1(2.8) | 2(5.6) | 25(69.4) | 1(2.8) |
| | 2.4 Feedback is given after the final deliverable is received. (P) | 0 | 0 | 2(22.2) | 0 | 0 | 7(77.7) | 0 |
| | 2.4 Feedback is given after the final deliverable is received. (R) | 1(3.8) | 0 | 4(15.4) | 1(3.8) | 2(7.7) | 17(65.4) | 1(3.8) |
| 1.1 | **Stakeholders and government partners received relevant** | 0 | 0 | 1(2.8) | 6(16.7) | 7(19.4) | 21(58.3) | 1(2.8) |

| Dimensions of Partnerships | Indicators | 1 = Strongly disagree | 2 = Disagree | 3 = Neither agree nor disagree | 4 = Agree | 5 = Strongly agree | 6 = Not applicable | No Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **documents(P)** | | | | | | | |
| | 1.1 Stakeholders and government partners received relevant documents(P) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1(11.1) | 3(33.3) | 5(55.5) | 0 |
| | 1.1 Stakeholders and government partners received relevant documents (R) | 0 | 0 | 1(3.8) | 5(19.2) | 4(15.4) | 15(57.7) | 1(3.8) |
| | **2.1 Recommendations for action reflect current program and policy challenges(A)** | 1(2.8) | 0 | 4(11.1) | 6(16.7) | 3(8.3) | 21(58.3) | 1(2.8) |
| | 2.1 Recommendations for action reflect current program and policy challenges(P) | 0 | 0 | 1(11.1) | 2(22.2) | 1(11.1) | 5(55.6) | 0 |
| | 2.1 Recommendations for action reflect current program and policy challenges(R) | 1(3.8) | 0 | 3(11.5) | 4(15.4) | 2(7.7) | 15(57.7) | 1(3.8) |
| | **3.1 Presentation formats are similar to those used for other communications within the gov't (e.g. briefing notes) (A)** | 1(2.8) | 1(2.8) | 5(13.9) | 0 | 2(5.6) | 21(58.3) | 1(2.8) |
| | 3.1 Presentation formats are similar to those used for other communications within the gov't (e.g. briefing notes) (P) | 1(11.1) | 1(11.1) | 2(22.2) | 0 | 0 | 5(55.6) | 0 |
| | 3.1 Presentation formats are similar to those used for other communications within the gov't (e.g. briefing notes) (R) | 0 | 0 | 3(11.5) | 5(19.2) | 2(7.7) | 15(57.7) | 1(3.8) |
| **Research Findings** | 1.1 **Research findings are presented in policy-related format and language(A)** | 0 | 2(5.6) | 5(13.9) | 4(11.1) | 6(16.7) | 18(50) | 1(2.8) |
| | 1.1 Research findings are presented in policy-related format and language(P) | 0 | 2(22.2) | 2(22.2) | 0 | 1(11.1) | 4(44.4) | 0 |
| | 1.1 Research findings are presented in policy-related format and language(R) | 0 | 0 | 3(11.5) | 4(15.4) | 5(19.2) | 13(50) | 1(3.8) |
| | 1.2 **Implications of findings are understood by all. (A)** | 0 | 0 | 7(19.4) | 5(13.9) | 3(8.3) | 20(55.6) | 1(2.8) |
| | 1.2 Implications of findings are understood by all. (P) | 0 | 0 | 3(33.3) | 0 | 1(11.1) | 5(55.6) | 0 |
| | 1.2 Implications of findings are understood by all. (R) | 0 | 0 | 4(15.4) | 5(19.2) | 2(7.7) | 14(53.8) | 1(3.8) |
| | 1.3 **Documentation of feedback to researchers. (A)** | 0 | 0 | 4(11.1) | 3(8.3) | 7(19.4) | 21(58.3) | 1(2.8) |
| | 1.3 Documentation of feedback to researchers. | 0 | 0 | 1(11.1) | 1(11.1) | 1(11.1) | 6(66.7) | 0 |

| Dimensions of Partnerships | Indicators | 1 = Strongly disagree | 2 = Disagree | 3 = Neither agree nor disagree | 4 = Agree | 5 = Strongly agree | 6 = Not applicable | No Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (P) | | | | | | | |
| | 1.3 Documentation of feedback to researchers. (R) | 0 | 0 | 3(11.5) | 2(7.7) | 6(23.1) | 14(53.8) | 1(3.8) |
| | **1.5 Senior government staff are aware of research findings. (A)** | 0 | 1(2.8) | 7(19.4) | 3(8.3) | 2(5.6) | 22(61.1) | 1(2.8) |
| | 1.4 Senior government staff are aware of research findings. (P) | 0 | 1(11.1) | 2(22.2) | 0 | 0 | 6(66.6) | 0 |
| | 1.4 Senior government staff are aware of research findings. (R) | 0 | 0 | 5(19.2) | 3(11.5) | 2(7.7) | 15(57.7) | 1(3.8) |
| | **1.5 Research findings are discussed or are reflected in government meeting material and research documents. (A)** | 0 | 1(2.8) | 4(11.1) | 3(8.3) | 2(5.6) | 25 (69.4) | 1(2.8) |
| | 1.5 Research findings are discussed or are reflected in government meeting material and research documents. (P) | 0 | 1(11.1) | 1(11.1) | 0 | 1(11.1) | 6(66.6) | 0 |
| | 1.5 Research findings are discussed or are reflected in government meeting material and research documents. (R) | 0 | 0 | 3(11.5) | 3(11.5) | 1(3.8) | 18(69.2) | 1(3.8) |
| **Negotiation** | **1.1 Roles and responsibilities are documented.** | 0 | 2(5.6) | 5(13.9) | 9(25) | 8(22.2) | 10(27.8) | 2(5.6) |
| | 1.1 Roles and responsibilities are documented. (P) | 0 | 0 | 4(44.4) | 1(11.1) | 2(22.2) | 1(11.1) | 1(11.1) |
| | 1.1 Roles and responsibilities are documented. (R) | 0 | 2(7.7) | 1(3.8) | 8(30.8) | 6(23.1) | 8(30.8) | 1(3.8) |
| | **1.2 Written terms of reference for research project (or similar document). (A)** | 1(2.8) | 1(2.8) | 2(5.6) | 8(22.2) | 7(19.4) | 16(44.4) | 1(2.8) |
| | 1.2 Written terms of reference for research project (or similar document). (P) | 1(11.1) | 1(11.1) | 1(11.1) | 1(11.1) | 1(11.1) | 4(44.4) | 0 |
| | 1.2 Written terms of reference for research project (or similar document). (R) | 0 | 0 | 1(3.8) | 7(26.9) | 6(23.1) | 11(42.3) | 1(3.8) |
| | **2.1 Requirements for deliverables and time lines are documented. (A)** | 0 | 0 | 6(16.7) | 11(30.6) | 5(13.9) | 13(36.1) | 1(2.8) |
| | 2.1 Requirements for deliverables and time lines are documented. (P) | 0 | 0 | 4(44.4) | 2(22.2) | 1(11.1) | 2(22.2) | 0 |
| | 2.1 Requirements for deliverables and time lines are documented. (R) | 0 | 0 | 2(7.7) | 9(34.6) | 4(15.4) | 10(38.5) | 1(3.8) |
| | **2.2 Partners make their needs explicit (i.e., in terms of** | 0 | 0 | 5(13.9) | 13(36.1) | 5(13.9) | 12(33.3) | 1(2.8) |

| Dimensions of Partnerships | Indicators | 1 = Strongly disagree | 2 = Disagree | 3 = Neither agree nor disagree | 4 = Agree | 5 = Strongly agree | 6 = Not applicable | No Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | accountabilities, priorities, and long term interest). (A) | | | | | | | |
| | 2.2 Partners make their needs explicit (i.e., in terms of accountabilities, priorities, and long term interest). (P) | 0 | 0 | 2(22.2) | 3(33.3) | 2(22.2) | 2(22.2) | 0 |
| | 2.2 Partners make their needs explicit (i.e., in terms of accountabilities, priorities, and long term interest). (R) | 0 | 0 | 3(11.5) | 10(38.5) | 3(11.5) | 9(34.8) | 1(3.8) |
| | 2.3 Partners document the above needs. (A) | 0 | 1(2.8) | 8(22.2) | 8(22.2) | 4(11.1) | 13(36.1) | 2(5.6) |
| | 2.3 Partners document the above needs. (P) | 0 | 0 | 4(44.4) | 2(22.2) | 1(11.1) | 2(22.2) | 0 |
| | 2.3 Partners document the above needs. (R) | 0 | 1(3.8) | 4(15.4) | 6(23.1) | 3(11.5) | 10(38.5) | 2(7.7) |
| Partnership Enhancement | 1.1 Key players and senior management, where relevant, are visibly involved and supported(A) | 1(2.8) | 0 | 5(13.9) | 8(22.2) | 8(22.2) | 13(36.1) | 1(2.8) |
| | 1.1 Key players and senior management, where relevant, are visibly involved and supported(P) | 0 | 0 | 2(22.2) | 3(33.3) | 3(33.3) | 1(11.1) | 0 |
| | 1.1 Key players and senior management, where relevant, are visibly involved and supported(R) | 1(3.8) | 3(11.5) | 0 | 5(19.2) | 5(19.2) | 11(42.3) | 1(3.8) |
| | 2.1 Discussion of potential long-term plans or structure to ensure continuity of relationship. (A) | 2(5.6) | 0 | 6(16.7) | 7(19.4) | 10(27.8) | 10(27.8) | 1(2.8) |
| | 2.1 Discussion of potential long-term plans or structure to ensure continuity of relationship. (P) | 0 | 0 | 4(44.4) | 2(22.2) | 2(22.2) | 1(11.1) | 0 |
| | 2.1 Discussion of potential long-term plans or structure to ensure continuity of relationship. (R) | 2(7.7) | 0 | 2(7.7) | 5(19.2) | 8(30.8) | 8(30.8) | 1(3.8) |
| | 3.2 Staff with previous linkages with each other are incorporated into partnership. (A) | 1(2.8) | 0 | 3(8.3) | 10(27.8) | 8(22.2) | 13(36.1) | 1(2.8) |
| | 3.1 Staff with previous linkages with each other are incorporated into partnership. (P) | 0 | 0 | 1(11.1) | 4(44.4) | 2(22.2) | 2(22.2) | 0 |
| | 3.1 Staff with previous linkages with each other | 1(3.8) | 0 | 2(7.7) | 6(23.1) | 6(23.1) | 10(38.5) | 1(3.8) |

| Dimensions of Partnerships | Indicators | 1 = Strongly disagree | 2 = Disagree | 3 = Neither agree nor disagree | 4 = Agree | 5 = Strongly agree | 6 = Not applicable | No Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | are incorporated into partnership. (R) | | | | | | | |
| | **4.1 Discussion of respective organizational realities of research partners. (A)** | 0 | 1(2.8) | 4(11.1) | 8(22.2) | 7(19.4) | 15(41.7) | 1(2.8) |
| | 4.1 Discussion of respective organizational realities of research partners. (P) | 0 | 1(11.1) | 2(22.2) | 2(22.2) | 2(22.2) | 2(22.2) | 0 |
| | 4.1 Discussion of respective organizational realities of research partners. (R) | 0 | 0 | 2(7.7) | 6(23.1) | 5(19.2) | 12(46.2) | 1(3.8) |