



PreVAiL

Preventing Violence Across the Lifespan Research Network

PreVAiL Partnership Evaluation Project

Final Report

Anita Kothari, PhD, Associate Professor and PreVAiL Member, Western University

Jennifer Boyko, PhD, Postdoctoral Fellow, Western University

Jasmine Tung, Research Assistant, Western University

Nadine Wathen, PhD, Professor and PreVAiL Co-Lead, Western University

For the PreVAiL Research Network

www.PreVAiLResearch.ca

September 2016

Contents

Contents	2
Executive Summary	3
Background.....	4
PreVAiL.....	4
Context for this Report	4
Phase-2 Evaluation	5
Methods.....	5
Results.....	7
Description of Study Participants	7
Comparison over time of common indicators of partnership quality.....	8
Cross-Sectional assessment of mature phase-2 indicators of partnership quality	10
Assessment of the partnership in terms of impact	14
Discussion	17
Addendum: Post-Evaluation Activities	20
Limitations.....	21
Conclusion	21
References.....	22
Appendix.....	24
1. PreVAiL Partner Organizations	24
2. PIQ (Phase-2)	25
3. Interview Guide (Phase-2)	31
4. Final Coding Framework	32
5. Descriptive statistics of phases 1 and 2 PIQ responses.....	35
6. PIQ frequency data	37



Executive Summary

The PreVAiL Research Network is in its seventh year and, having achieved many milestones, can be considered both successful and innovative. It uses an integrated knowledge translation (IKT) model to ensure that research priorities and projects reflect existing and emerging needs in practice and policy, as articulated through Network and partner-level activities to identify and operationalize priorities. The IKT model also supports sharing and discussing research findings among our researchers and national and international partner organizations, as well as among our inter-linked stakeholder networks.

Phase 1 on the current evaluation (2013) demonstrated the extent to which the PreVAiL Network built, in its formative stages (2009-12), effective partnerships¹. Since then PreVAiL has continued to grow and mature. In 2014, the Phase 2 evaluation was completed to identify the quality and impacts of partnerships within the PreVAiL Network, and assess how these have changed (or not) since the Network's early stages of development. This report presents these findings, and augments them with recent activities related to partnership impact.

Two evaluation methods were used: 1) the Partnership Indicators Questionnaire (PIQ) was administered to PreVAiL members via online survey to assess partnership quality (e.g., communication, collaborative research, dissemination, partnership enhancement, etc.). 2) Phone interviews with partners (Summer 2014) that explored their involvement and satisfaction, thoughts on commitment and level of rapport within the Network, and views on how information needs are being met in PreVAiL. The PIQ data were analyzed descriptively, and the interview data coded thematically. Findings from the Phase-1 and Phase-2 PIQ were compared on common partnership indicators (communication, collaborative research, and dissemination of research) in order to assess change over time.

Highlights from the analysis of the 29 completed PIQs (response rate = 52%) and the 18 individual interviews (representing 17/20 PreVAiL partner organizations) include:

- Several common indicators of quality partnerships have increased or been maintained, suggesting clear progress in strengthening the Network and consistency in efforts to do so.
- A high-level of agreement among most of the mature indicators, suggesting that PreVAiL is exhibiting mature network characteristics. Partners are committed to the Network and have an understanding of each other's communities, which is the foundation for IKT.
- Given its strengthened capacity to support evidence-informed decisions and the availability of frameworks to guide a broad approach to evaluating impact, PreVAiL is well positioned to assess its longer term impacts.
- Feedback from partners about approaches to improving communication and meeting their variable needs can be used to strengthen the partnership, moving forward.

Overall, these findings demonstrate that PreVAiL has evolved, with high quality partnerships that have matured since its inception. The results from this evaluation will be useful in informing discussions about how to maintain the momentum of the current Network while revitalizing its structure to meet changing local, domestic and global priorities.

¹ See full text publication at <http://health-policy-systems.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1478-4505-12-25>



Background

PreVAiL

The Preventing Violence Across the Lifespan (PreVAiL) Research Network is an international research collaboration of over 75 researchers, trainees and knowledge-user partners from Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, Asia, Europe and Australia. It was established in 2009 through a five-year grant from the Institute of Gender & Health, Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR). The Network is organized around two main content areas: 1) child maltreatment; and, 2) intimate partner violence. Across these areas there is emphasis on: gender, the mental health impacts of violence; how individuals develop resilience following exposure to these negative health outcomes; and, knowledge translation (KT) and exchange.

PreVAiL uses the CIHR definition of KT, which states that it is "a dynamic and iterative process that includes synthesis, dissemination, exchange and ethically sound application of knowledge to improve the health of Canadians, provide more effective health services and products and strengthen the health care system" (1). Further, PreVAiL is based on the notion of integrated KT (IKT), whereby knowledge producers (i.e., researchers) and users (i.e., policy and practice actors) work alongside each other as equal partners throughout research projects in order to produce more relevant and useful research. According to Levin (2008), networks have a key function in mobilizing knowledge. Networks have been broadly defined as formal or informal collaborations 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 done alone (2–4). While researchers and stakeholder groups might be eager to work together as partners in a network to advance a research program, partnerships ought to be monitored periodically to ensure a smooth working relationship.

To summarize, PreVAiL is an example of a network embedded in an IKT model involving researchers and partners representing organizations comprised of practitioners, policy actors and other types of knowledge users. In order for the PreVAiL Network to be a success (i.e., to influence programs and policy in the area of child maltreatment, intimate partner violence and mental health) strong interactions supporting mutual learning and exchange among network members are needed (5). Further, to facilitate the uptake of research findings, partner organizations need to have the capacity to incorporate research in their organization (6).

Context for this Report

This report presents the findings of the second phase of PreVAiL's "Partnership Evaluation Project". The phase-1 evaluation, completed in 2013, demonstrated the extent to which the PreVAiL Network built, in its formative stages, effective partnerships among network members (7). Findings from phase-1 highlighted that:

- A key benefit of PreVAiL is the unique networking opportunities it provides such as face-to-face meetings and participating in evaluation activities.
- Partners value the interdisciplinary and cross-university nature of PreVAiL, as well as the significance of PreVAiL's integrated, life-course, gendered approach to violence.
- Partners are aware of how to get information and take advantage of the direct connections from PreVAiL.



- Communication with partners could be enhanced through more between-meeting communications that provide an opportunity to generate and maintain excitement, creating a common language and working to standardize expectations around communication modes and frequency.

Since the 2013 evaluation PreVAiL has continued to grow and mature. At the time of the phase-2 data collection, PreVAiL was in its fifth year of funding. A follow-up evaluation and critical examination of the Network's quality and impacts was timely to ensure PreVAiL has achieved its goal of bringing together researchers and partners to produce, share and use knowledge that helps children, women and men exposed to child maltreatment and intimate partner violence. This report summarizes the findings of PreVAiL's follow-up partnership evaluation (i.e., phase-2), augmented by an addendum that describes relevant, impact-oriented activities and outcomes that occurred after formal data collection for phase 2 ended.

Phase-2 Evaluation

Methods

Study design, purpose & objectives. This evaluation used a sequential mixed methods design whereby quantitative data were collected and analyzed, followed by qualitative data collection in two consecutive stages of the evaluation. This approach allowed us to integrate both types of data for the purposes of enhancing understanding of results and identifying patterns not clear from a singular research method (8). The **purpose** of this evaluation was to explore, across the PreVAiL Network, what had been done well, what processes were seen as weak, and what changes had occurred since the previous partnership evaluation. More specifically, **the study objectives** were to: 1) identify the quality and impacts of partnerships within the PreVAiL Network; and, 2) assess how the quality and impacts of partnerships have changed since the Network's early stages of development. Impact was broadly defined as positive and negative longer-term contributions arising from the Network. Phase-1 quantitative data were collected in 2011 as part of the first phase of the evaluation study. Additional data were collected in 2014 (four years after the Network was operational). Western University's Office of Research Ethics reviewed the project protocol and granted an ethics review waiver.

Sample. At the time of this evaluation there were seventy-six individuals (N=76) who were active members of PreVAiL. This includes 54 researchers (including 13 trainees) and 22 individuals representing twenty partner organizations (n=20). Appendix 1 includes a list of all these organizations.

Data collection. This evaluation included two main stages. The first stage involved assessing the quality of partnerships within the Network using data collected from the Partnership Indicators Questionnaire (PIQ). All Network members (N=76) were invited to complete the PIQ. The PIQ was created to assess the performance of a partnership between researchers and policymakers (Kothari, MacLean, Edwards, & Hobbs, 2011). The PIQ includes early, common and late indicators of partnership functioning. In phase-1 of the project, early and common partnership indicators were evaluated (communication, collaborative research, dissemination of research, research findings, negotiation, and partnership enhancement). In phase-2, common and mature indicators



were evaluated (communication, collaborative research, dissemination of research, meeting information needs, level of rapport). In both phases simple demographic questions were also included. See Appendix 2 for the PIQ.

The PIQ was made available to all PreVAiL members in October 2014 through a self-administered online survey. Individuals were sent invitations, which included a link to complete the web survey, to the email address listed on their respective membership profiles. Reminders were sent two and four weeks following the initial request.

The second stage of this evaluation involved one-on-one interviews with PreVAiL partners. All individual PreVAiL partners (N=22) were invited to participate in an interview in June 2014. The semi-structured telephone interviews were conducted between June and August 2014. Each interview explored the state of the partner's involvement with the Network, satisfaction with the partnership, thoughts on commitment and level of rapport within the Network, and how information needs are being met in PreVAiL. See Appendix 3 for the interview guide.

Analysis. The PIQ data were aggregated according to role category within PreVAiL (i.e., researcher/trainee or partner). Mean frequency scores were calculated for each indicator, and each overall dimension. Percentages for each response category were also calculated. For both phases 1 and 2 means excluded individuals who did not answer the question or selected the response "not applicable" These responses, or lack thereof, were coded as missing to ensure that means accurately reflected the views of respondents who answered the question. The percentages for each response category were calculated as was done in phase-1 (i.e., 'agree' and 'strongly agree' responses were grouped together, as were 'disagree' and 'strongly disagree'). In both phases, all denominators were representative of the total sample of the phase.

The response category percentages of the common partnership indicator dimensions (communication, collaborative research, and dissemination of research) from phases 1 and 2 were compared in aggregate to assess whether any change occurred over time.

The interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed and cleaned to remove identifiers for the purposes of systematically analyzing the text thematically (Braun & Clarke, 2006). All the transcripts were initially reviewed by one coder (JB). The same coder then reviewed the transcripts a second time using a deductive approach whereby each transcript was coded according to pre-established themes based on the interview questions. JB also reviewed the transcripts a third time using an inductive approach, whereby the interviews were coded using emergent themes closely linked to the data themselves. Drawing on a well-established approach (9), JB and another team member (JT) met to discuss and interpret emergent codes and relationships between them. This process led to merging and discarding some codes and identifying broader themes. Care was taken to document definitions of each code throughout the coding process. JT reviewed all the coding against these definitions for accuracy and to ensure trustworthiness of the process. A few minor discrepancies were resolved by discussion. See Appendix 4 for the final coding framework, which includes definitions of each code organized according to themes. During coding, the research team met on several occasions to discuss the coding progress, the themes, and then interpret the quantitative and qualitative findings in their entirety.



Results

Description of Study Participants

Seventy-three (n=73) individual PreVAiL members were invited to participate in the PIQ component of the phase-2 evaluation and 38 participated (response rate = 52%). Nine surveys were excluded because they were mainly incomplete or blank. The final sample was comprised of twenty-nine participants (n=29). The majority of participants were researchers (n=20; 69.0%). Trainees including post-doctoral fellows (n=5) and graduate students (n=3) were included as researchers. Nine partners (31.0%) completed the PIQ. The primary activities of partners who participated were government policy development (n=4; 44.4%), research/development (n=3; 33.3%), advocacy (n=1; 11.1%), and other (n=1; 11.1%). The individual who selected “other” explained that his/her organization had multiple primary activities. One individual did not specify their role within PreVAiL, but it was assumed from their demographic information that they were a partner. The final sample of PIQ participants is summarized in table 1.

All of PreVAiL’s partners (n=22 individuals; n=20 partner organizations) were invited to participate in the semi-structured interviews. Two individuals declined due to 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 insight) and two interviews were not able to be scheduled in the allotted timeframe. In total, 18 interviews were conducted. The individual response rate was 82% and the organization response rate was 85%.

The semi-structured interviews provided insight about who the individual partners involved in PreVAiL are and their history with the Network. There were various reasons identified by partners for becoming involved in PreVAiL. Some partners were invited to participate given their professional role related to family violence, while others were invited given past scholarly activities. In some cases partners were invited by a specific principal investigator (PI) whom they knew professionally, and in other cases they were approached without any previous knowledge or relationship with the PIs or family violence related research. For the majority of partners interviewed their reasons for being involved had not changed. Although roles within or between organizations may have changed, or organizations may have altered priorities, most partners remained part of the Network because they had been asked to be part of it and the priorities of PreVAiL align with the mandate of their role and/or their organization. A handful of partners did indicate that their reasons had changed. Two of these individuals moved from trainee/researcher roles to partners, and one individual indicated that the content focus of their role changed such that it no longer fully aligned with that of PreVAiL.

Table 1 – Sample of PIQ participants by role

Role	n	Total sample (%)
All participants	29	100
Researchers (including trainees)	20	69.0
Partners	9	31.0



Comparison over time of common indicators of partnership quality

The common partnership dimensions assessed in both phases one and two were: communication, collaborative research, and dissemination of research. Table 2 presents the mean scores for each of these dimensions at phase-1 and phase-2. There was an increase in mean score in the dimensions of “communication” and “dissemination of research” and a slight decrease in the mean score of “collaborative research”.

Table 2. Mean response scores for common dimensions of partnership quality

Domains	Phase-1	Phase-2
	mean (n=36)	mean (n=29)
Communication	3.78	4.06
Collaborative Research	4.01	3.92
Dissemination of Research	3.81	3.86

The indicator-level responses within each domain were compared in terms of disagreement and agreement from phase-1 to phase-2 (see Table 3). In the domain of “communication” the indicator with the largest increase in agreement was “a common language/lexicon is used by both parties” with a 43.9% increase. Other indicators with notable increases in agreement were: “partners are acknowledged in project documents” (23.7% increase); “the same contact people continue over the life of the project” (15.4% increase); and “partners and researchers value each other’s contributions” (14.7% increase). Two indicators decreased in agreement as PreVAiL matured: “communication involved face-to-face meetings as well as telephone, mail, email, and fax methods” (10.8% decrease) and “communication is frequent” (9.3% decrease).

In the domain of “collaborative research” the indicators with the highest increases in agreement were: “joint data collection is carried out” (24% increase); “joint discussion of findings and implications takes place” (23.2% increase); “feedback is given after the final deliverable is received” (22.7% increase); and, “feedback about research reports are provided before final draft” (22.2% increase). Two indicators decreased in agreement: “research protocols are jointly designed” (5.2% decrease) and “research questions are identified jointly” (4.6% decrease).

Each of the common indicators related to the dimension “dissemination of research” were noticeably different from phase-1 and phase-2. Two of these indicators had large increases in agreement: “presentations formats are similar to those used for other communications within government or partner organizations” (28.9% increase) and “recommendations for action reflect current program and policy challenges” (23.3% increase). The indicator “stakeholders receive relevant documents” decreased by 12% from phase one to two.

Please note that Appendix 5 includes descriptive statistics of phase-1 and phase-2 PIQ data. A full account of phase-2 PIQ data is presented in Appendix 6, while the data from phase-1 can be found in Kothari et al., (2014)].



Table 3. Comparison of responses: disagreement vs. agreement, phase-1 to phase-2

INDICATORS	Disagreement ^a % (n)		Agreement ^b % (n)	
	Phase-1	Phase-2	Phase-1	Phase-2
Communication				
Communication is on-going	13.9(5)	17.3(5)	63.9(23)	68.9(20)
Communication involves face-to-face meetings as well as telephone, mail, email, and fax methods	13.9(5)	6.9(2)	69.4(25)	57.4(17)
The same contact people continue over the life of the project	0	3.5(1)	63.9(23)	79.3(23)
A common language/lexicon is used	25.0(9)	6.9(2)	38.9(14)	82.7(24)
Communication is relevant	n/a	0	n/a	89.6(26)
Roles, expectations, and criteria for deliverables are explicit	13.9(5)	10.3(3)	44.4(16)	55.2(16)
Communication is frequent	22.2(8)	24.1(7)	47.2(17)	37.9(11)
Partners and researchers value each other's contributions	2.8(1)	3.5(1)	75.0(25)	89.6(26)
Partners and researchers are acknowledged in project documents	2.8(1)	0	55.6(20)	79.3(23)
Collaborative Research				
Research questions are identified jointly	5.6(2)	0	66.7(24)	62.1(18)
The needs and constraints of partners and researchers are expressed	2.8(1)	3.5(1)	58.3(21)	62.0(18)
Research protocols are jointly designed	5.6(2)	3.5(1)	50.0(18)	44.8(13)
If relevant, joint data collection is carried out	0	3.5(1)	13.9(5)	37.9(11)
If relevant, joint data analysis is carried out	0	0	27.8(10)	48.3(14)
Joint ongoing evaluation of relevance of research (e.g. current project, new findings, new partner needs etc.) takes place	5.6(2)	10.3(3)	44.4(16)	51.7(15)
Joint discussion of findings and implications takes place	2.8(1)	6.9(2)	38.9(14)	62.1(18)
Feedback about research reports are provided before final draft	0	3.5(1)	33.3(12)	55.2(16)
Response to feedback is prompt	2.8(1)	0	41.7(15)	55.2(16)
Only a few rounds of revisions are needed before deliverable is acceptable to all	2.8(1)	0	22.2(8)	34.5(10)
Feedback is given after the final deliverable is received	2.8(1)	7.0(2)	8.3(3)	31.0(9)
Dissemination of Research				
Stakeholders receive relevant documents	0	0	36.1(13)	58.6(17)
Recommendations for action reflection current program and policy challenges	2.8(1)	3.5(1)	25.0(9)	48.2(14)
Presentation formats are similar to those used for other communications within government or partner organizations (e.g. briefing notes)	5.6(2)	10.4(3)	5.6(2)	34.5(7)

^aIncludes the frequency of all strongly disagree and disagree among total sample: phase-1 (n=36); phase-2 (n=29).

^bIncludes the frequency of all strongly agree and agree among total sample: phase-1 (n=36); phase-2 (n=29).



Cross-Sectional assessment of mature phase-2 indicators of partnership quality

Theme 1: PreVAiL members view their experiences with the Network in a positive light

The mature partnership dimensions from the PIQ included: meeting information needs, level of rapport, and commitment. Table 2 includes the mean scores for each of the mature dimensions assessed during phase-2 and Table 4 includes a comparison of responses in terms of disagreement and agreement for mature indicators. Each dimension had a mean overall score of 3.99 or more on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. There was little variation between the mean overall scores across the dimensions reflecting that overall partners and researchers answered questions in a positive manner. This finding is consistent with the interview data in that all the partners interviewed described the quality of relationships in a positive light. For example, one partner said *“I really value them [i.e., the Pls] in terms of being a resource for helping me do my work”* (ID 012) and another stated that *“there’s several people in the PreVAiL Network that I feel I could contact at any moment on any topic and so there’s that level of comfort”* (ID 001). Terms used by more than one partner to describe relationships included *“positive”*, *“helpful”* and *“high-quality”*. Even partners who were relatively new to PreVAiL had positive things to say about the Network:

“So far the only interaction that I’ve had was at this meeting. Everything seemed good at the time and, I definitely learned a lot from it.....although I haven’t had further contact with individuals, it’s because it hasn’t been related to the priorities of my current work demands, but I do definitely see the potential there and feel that the relationships were good enough that I would be comfortable contacting people as necessary.” (ID 002)

Theme 2: Opportunities exist for strengthening rapport and improving communication

Although partners were overwhelmingly positive about the quality of relationships with other PreVAiL members, they also provided suggestions for improvement. Further, the indicators with the highest responses of disagreement (i.e., disagree and strongly disagree responses combined) were from the *“level of rapport”* dimension (partners understand how things are communicated within each other’s organizations (n=4, 13.8%); and, linkages among partners enhance linkages with stakeholders (n=4, 13.8%)) suggesting that some partners perceived challenges among Network members related to being understood or with communication. Suggestions for improvement related to ways in which PreVAiL could better communicate with its partners and relay information about research being produced by PreVAiL researchers, as well as network-rated activities. For example:

“... possibly the only way that they could be improved would be to maybe push more information out ...the website is available but as a passive resource isn’t always necessarily the first thing that I think about. So perhaps notifications of various activities more frequently... These days I suppose one thinks about things like social media that push out information ... so that may be something to look at ... or even LinkedIn.” (ID 004)

“...we would never initiate the research right, but there’s never a call to say would you like to be a part of this, and I guess that’s what would be helpful” (ID 078)



Table 4. Comparison of responses: disagreement vs. agreement, Phase-2 mature indicators

INDICATORS	Disagreement ^a % (n)	Agreement ^b % (n)
Meeting Information Needs		
Partners and researchers are flexible about meeting each other's changing needs and revising plans and timelines	0	48.3(15)
Project timelines and changes have been tracked through documentation	3.4(1)	41.4(12)
Roles and responsibilities have been defined up front	3.4(1)	51.7(15)
Network purpose and objectives have been defined, documented, and referred to in an on-going fashion	6.9(2)	62.1(18)
Partners and researchers are able to understand the limits of each other's flexibility	6.9(2)	51.7(15)
Partners and researchers are able to understand research findings, their limits, and their implications for work within government or partner org's	6.9(2)	69.0(20)
Level of Rapport		
Conflict is dealt with openly, informally, and promptly	0	27.6(8)
Although more informal communication occurs, formal meetings and communication continue	3.4(1)	69.0(20)
Trust has increased between partners and researchers	0	65.5(19)
Partners and researchers show appreciation for each other's efforts	0	65.5(19)
Comfort has increased between partners and researchers	0	62.1(18)
Partners and researchers support each other publicly	0	69.0(20)
Openness has increased between partners and researchers	3.4(1)	62.1(18)
Partners and researchers provide advance notice of surprising or potentially contentious research findings or government decisions	0	34.5(10)
Partners and researchers have begun speaking a common language regarding family violence	0	69.0(20)
Partners and researchers facilitate removal of barriers for each other's work	3.4(1)	51.7(15)
Partners and researchers understand how things are communicated within each other's organizations	13.8(4)	55.2(16)
Partners and researchers understand how senior level people work and what their concerns are	6.9(2)	44.8(13)
Partners and researchers understand agendas, priorities, expectations, and limits	3.4(1)	58.6(17)
Partners and researchers understand dissemination opportunities within each other's organization	10.3(3)	41.4(12)
Partners and researchers understand opportunities for research use and impact within each other's organizations	6.9(2)	48.3(14)
Partners and researchers understand costs of monitoring, influencing, and incorporating research into decision-making	10.3(3)	34.5(10)
Linkages among partners and researchers enhance linkages with community/other stakeholders	13.8(4)	58.6(17)
Linkage among partners and researchers does not detract from previously established linkages with others	0	65.5(19)



INDICATORS	Disagreement ^a % (n)	Agreement ^b % (n)
Commitment		
There is joint commitment to the network	0	82.8(24)
Partners and researchers contribute more resources, material and otherwise to the network projects	0	51.7(15)
Partners and researchers willingly provide 'extra', such as extra time or staff, to the network	3.4(1)	62.1(18)
There is an increase in joint activity around the network	3.4(1)	55.2(16)
Partners and researchers take on new roles with each other	3.4(1)	44.8(13)
On-going dialogue moves a research program or activities forward over a series of projects	6.9(2)	58.6(17)
Partners and researchers are perceived as experts in the area and referred to as such to others	0	65.5(19)
Partners and researchers introduce each other to new networks	0	65.5(19)
Partners and researchers think of each other in relation to projects, committees, etc., outside of the network relationship	3.4(1)	58.6(17)
Informal or formal infrastructure exists for linking and transferring research and information between partners and researchers	6.9(2)	55.2(16)
The partnership's work is integrated with work associated with other stakeholders	3.4(1)	44.8(13)
Partners and researchers support each other publicly	3.4(1)	65.5(19)

^aIncludes the frequency of all strongly disagree and disagree among total sample (n=29).

^bIncludes the frequency of all strongly agree and agree among total sample (n=29).

Some suggestions for improvement related to communication pertained to an interest in more on-going interactions:

"It did seem like the direct communication was infrequent. So my experience from over 30-35 years is that the most successful initiatives in our sector are premised upon widely vibrant regular communication." (ID 011)

"I think there should be a little bit more presence of PreVAiL on a regular basis. Maybe the people who are doing the research communicate a lot, but for me as a partner I don't get enough reminders, newsletters and news about it so it could slip out of my mind. (ID 013)"

Many partners expressed interest in more frequent communication, however some partners also expressed concern that using technology cannot replace the value of face-to-face interactions. Although one partner described the use of technology as a "disservice", others also provided critical input about how to use technology more effectively:

"I'm not sure that just having teleconferences builds the relationships the same way face to face does, but if there's a good reason for it I think those kind of things, like if there was a good hook, those kind of technologies would be a way to keep people connected". (ID 012)

"There are really good ways of using technology to communicate information, but they tend to be very unidirectional and it's kind of hard to have large groups of people communicating



in those forums ... If you put out a “who is interested in this topic” and had smaller groups that might be interesting ... but once you get beyond 4-5 people on a phone line or in a forum, it’s really hard to moderate. (ID 003)

In general, while partners perceive that the quality of relationships among Network members is good, strengthening communication is a specific area that could be enhanced to further improve the quality of interactions.

Theme 3: Commitment to the network is high

The mature partnership indicator from the PIQ with the highest score was “there is joint commitment to the Network” (n=24, 82.8%). Partners feel that they benefit from being involved in PreVAiL related activities and that researchers value their input. This sense of mutual gain, as described by the following two partners, might explain why partners are so committed to PreVAiL:

“... so not just within the organization, but beyond and I’ve linked [co-PI] with a number of different folks, folks who are interested in intersections between violence against women, violence against children. I always refer to PreVAiL as one of the few groups that are looking at these issues in an integrated way. Recently there was a study on burns in [country], and WHO has an initiative on burns that’s not linked to our violence against women work and I made that connection, yea, so those are the main issues that come to mind.” (ID 006)

The above example not only illustrate that partners feel that the Network is valuable to them, but that there is potential for additional benefit as further learning and sharing of knowledge produced through PreVAiL takes place.

Theme 4: Desire for more or less involvement in PreVAiL-specific sub-studies or projects

Approximately half of the partners interviewed were involved in PreVAiL specific projects or related activities over the past four years. Involvement ranged from participation in meetings to collaborating on research studies. Generally speaking, these partners indicated that involvement in specific projects went well and the experience was beneficial. Desire for any or more involvement in PreVAiL research studies varied with some partners clearly wanting to be more involved in research, and a few expressing a preference for not being more involved. One partner described their desire for involvement as follows:

“There are times where I feel disconnected from the empirical research ... because it happens elsewhere in the country ... we’re not involved in data collection, analysis, for the most part, a little maybe more than some of us, and part of that is our own time constraints, but I think that there should be ways to support more of that, that might also facilitate knowledge translation, that might facilitate a greater sense of engagement ... in terms of integrated knowledge translation having partners engaged throughout the different elements of the research process is obviously pretty useful and important.” (ID 007)

Another partner described the type of involvement that is needed as follows:

“The important thing is that we need to work at ... the link between research and policy; [being] involved in the research project is one thing, but that’s not where the link between research and policy takes place. So it’s fine to be involved, but for me the work that is



required the most is the connection between the research and the policy, that's what needs to be improved, on both. And this, as I said, needs to happen from both sides. So it's always from my perspective, that's more of the challenge than anything that we do." (ID 009)

Other partners preferred to not have any involvement in research because of time (*"I think the answer is no, not really, not because they're not interesting and exciting projects, it's just that I have been so busy with my own projects" (ID 064)*) or they did not feel research was part of their role (*"I'm not a researcher I don't necessarily see that it would match with my job" (ID 002)*). On the other hand, organizational constraints were a barrier to participating in more research. One partner described their experience attempting to get involved in PreVAiL as follows: *"Well, I received an invitation from the one of the seed fund things and I tried to get people here in [...] involved, it wasn't possible because of reasons related to the [organization] not to PreVAiL." (ID 013)* Another partner more generally described constraints to research involvement in the following way: *"when I say it could be better aligned, I'm not talking necessarily about PreVAiL having to align things, I'm thinking it's us making, using the opportunity that PreVAiL is there to work with us" (ID 009)*. Overall, a related sub-theme from the interviews is that internal processes of organizations can help or hinder participation in the Network and its work.

Theme 5: Partners share learning from PreVAiL-related activities with others

The interview questions included an opportunity for partners to describe how they shared what they learned from PreVAiL-related activities with others. Sharing generally happened more often with individuals from within their own organizations. Although not all partners were able to provide an example, some of the examples provided by partners include the following:

"Yea we have partnerships within the [...] government across disciplines, and the people who are more in the health discipline for a number of years now have been bringing to the table information about the WHO health-based approach to family violence, and I haven't necessarily seen in the past how to incorporate that approach into the work that we do in [...] and as a result of the deliberative dialogue process, I started getting ideas and understanding and it kind of gelled in my mind and how the two come together, so since I've come back I've been incorporating and sharing that knowledge into the work that I do." (ID 002)

The above example not only illustrates the extent that sharing has taken place, but also shows the potential for further learning and sharing of knowledge produced through PreVAiL.

Assessment of the partnership in terms of impact

The analysis demonstrates that PreVAiL contributed to improved knowledge, understanding, and capacity to engage in the research process. Two indicators of partnership quality from the PIQ dimension of "meeting information needs" were rated among the highest: network purpose and objectives have been defined, documented, and referred (n=18, 62.1%); and, partners and researchers are able to understand research findings, their limits, and their implications for work (n=20, 69.0%). This finding is consistent with the interview data, which indicated that involvement with PreVAiL has impacted individual partners in terms of improved knowledge and understanding:



“I wouldn’t say it’s changed my attitude, I was interested in it in the first place. When I come out of meetings like that it’s encouraging and it sort of galvanizes you to keep trying, because it kind of gets discouraging to try to look at areas that are really complicated to measure and that have a lot of support for the measurement of it, especially at the government level so I think that’s something, my interest in the topic was always there but it is encouraging, it’s always – what’s the word I’m looking for – you come out of the meetings with a renewed desire to look at those issues.” (ID 003)

The knowledge and understanding that came about seemed to be the result of collaborations and partnerships initiated through PreVAiL. As one partner stated:

“I mean, obviously I almost want to say because you cannot collaborate with people without being challenged in the way you’re thinking and expanding the way you may conduct an analysis or the way you see questions. So yes!” (ID 015)

A facet of professional work that came out during the interviews relates to whether involvement in PreVAiL strengthened capacity to engage in research. Most of those interviewed indicated that they thought their capacity to engage in research was better or improved, however, the extent of this varied. There seemed to be a range of capacity development from a little to a lot. For example, one individual stated that it *“reinforced the importance of networking and knowing what’s going on in the field and making sure you’re not duplicating the work that’s already happening” (ID 078)* and another stated that involvement *“has enlightened me to certain ideas or concerns about research in the field that I wasn’t aware of, it’s given me new perspectives on different things” (ID 067)*. A few individuals did not feel their capacity changed at all. For example, one individual indicated it increased their interest, but not their capacity, and another indicated that their capacity for advocacy improved but not for doing research.

For those that stated their professional work did improve as a result of involvement with PreVAiL, a key factor in this seemed to be the linkages created with people or organizations that could form the basis of new relationships. Several examples of new relationships started as a result of PreVAiL were mentioned. For example, one partner indicated that they made a contact at the PreVAiL meeting in 2014 (Niagara), which became useful when they became involved in francophone research (ID 009). Other examples include:

“I mean the main [way] which PreVAiL has been beneficial to me is that I have expanded my network with people, [and] experts that I work with.” (ID005)

“I’m very excited about the connections. Connecting with people in WHO and getting a sense of the work that they’re doing because we do interact with them on other issues and it’s always useful to be reminded of the different kind of policy process and language that happens at that level, the role at the WHO is so much different ... different levels of jurisdiction have such different policy environments and purposes, and so it’s always useful to get a sense of how those are stacked or linked. (ID007)

Another way that PreVAiL impacted professional work was through supporting the use of research evidence. Many of those interviewed indicated that their use of research evidence had improved. Improvement for one partner was *“in relation to knowledge translation and taking a more systematic evidence-based view towards KT and dissemination” (ID010)* while another described their experience as follows:



“... particularly the research briefs that got commissioned from PreVAiL, and were updated this year, I go to them a lot and a lot of the peer review articles too when the briefs aren’t quite enough, when we need more detail. Not lately, but I remember when I was first here I was constantly asking [co-PI] if you have something on this topic or you know about this topic and she would send me articles that were from PreVAiL members” (ID012)

A more specific example is as follows:

“Yes also I just remembered this, but very recently I used one of the PreVAiL fact sheets, for example, and I found it very useful in sort of summarizing evidence, in this case around child maltreatment and its prevention, so yes. I’ve made use of the information that [co-PI] shared on various occasions as well as the fact sheets that PreVAiL prepares that are useful.” (ID 067)

Beyond the impact of PreVAiL in terms of professional work of partners, PreVAiL also had some influence at the organizational level. During the interviews partners were asked about ways that PreVAiL may have influenced their organization. Partners provided a range of responses from “probably not” (ID 005) to “yea it has strengthened the organization” (ID 013), and some examples described the degree of influence. One partner described how PreVAiL has helped keep gender issues in the front of their mind, which then leads to gender issues being integrated into the work (e.g., reports/papers) they do (ID 064), while another indicated that PreVAiL has reinforced their organization’s commitment to common objectives (ID 011). Another example of PreVAiL’s influence at a broader level relates to being used as an entry point into content related discussions:

“we’re not the content experts, nor do we have sort of the direct influence around shaping policy, nor are we the ones that are collecting the surveillance data. So but what we do is speak to those equity concerns and, I think that the engagement with PreVAiL has given us an entry point to those discussions internally. If we weren’t engaged in PreVAiL it would be much harder for us to be at the table with the surveillance folks and with the policy folks, so in fact the connections give us a link to the discussions that are happening It gives us a seat at the internal table in a way that otherwise might not happen or would be harder to do so it, PreVAiL probably doesn’t know that, but it actually does provide that resource” (ID 007)

Partners were asked specifically to comment on the extent that PreVAiL has influenced their organization’s collective knowledge/understanding/attitude towards violence prevention related issues. Partners found it difficult to assess PreVAiL’s influence in this regard; however, some partners were able to provide insight into how this might be occurring. One partner described an occasion when research produced through PreVAiL was provided to a senior official in their organization in order to prepare them for an international meeting (ID 001). Another partner described how the PreVAiL co-principal investigators (co-PIs) provided advice to staff in their organization, which then influenced the organization’s policy direction moving forward in terms of what they will be, or not be, doing. This individual indicated that the scope of one project in particular was enhanced as a result of listening to the advice from the co-PIs (ID 012).

When asked more specifically about whether PreVAiL had influenced their organization’s capacity to engage in research, or policies/processes related to engaging in research, many partners



indicated that they were not sure or no influence had occurred. A reason given for not seeing any change is reflected by the following quote in which the partner indicates that research is not within the mandate of their organization:

“We’re not a research organization, we engage in research to support initiatives that we undertake, but there haven’t been a lot of opportunities for the research excellence presented in PreVAiL to affect us because we’re not doing research ourselves.” (ID 011)

Two partners indicated that some influence may have taken place in terms of access to resources such as experts to whom they might not have otherwise had access (ID 004; ID 078). Another partner described participation in a research project that was the result of a partnership established through PreVAiL, which led to an ethics review process being established for their organization (ID 003). For the most part, partners found it difficult to identify any change in research capacity, processes or policies arising from involvement with PreVAiL. That being said, it should also be noted that some partners did not feel that sufficient engagement had occurred yet to see any influence, or that their organization is too large for them to comment on. For example:

“I don’t know how we would prove there was. We’re certainly providing the policy makers with the evidence that comes out of PreVAiL; whether or not they take it and its influenced policy making; I couldn’t tell you.” (ID 078)

Those interviewed also suggested that it might not be feasible to expect change at an organizational level but rather a team level. As one partner stated:

“It’s a huge organization; it doesn’t move very fast so the broader level, no. And I think not much makes it move but our team yes, our department or our unit; yes, but not the broader organization.” (ID 010)

Overall, many partners indicated that PreVAiL had some impact on their organization in terms of collective knowledge and understanding, capacity to engage research, or practices/policies related to research or specific subjects. However, a few partners did not think any influence had occurred and some found it difficult to comment on such influence on behalf of their organization. Impact was most apparent among individual PreVAiL partners in terms of knowledge, understanding, and capacity to engage in the research process. The following quote seems to generally reflect the overall benefit to partners:

“Probably impacted a lot, I think because I’m just a partner I think it’s probably impacted other people a lot more because they’re probably involved in the research and sort of the day to day activities, but I certainly think it’s a worthwhile initiative. And I’m glad that is funded by CIHR, I mean there’s lots of benefits.” (ID 078 2014 08 19)

Discussion

The findings demonstrate that the PreVAiL network has evolved over the past seven years. There are several observations apparent in the evaluation results that particularly highlight how the *quality* of the Network has changed and the *impact* it has had in terms of bringing together researchers and partners to produce, share and use knowledge that helps children, women and men exposed to child maltreatment and intimate partner violence.



The first observation is that specific indicators of partnership quality have increased or been maintained over time, suggesting progress in strengthening the partnership. For example, in the domain of communication six out of eight indicators increased from phase-1 to phase-2. Notably, the indicator of “a common language/lexicon is used by both parties” increased in terms of agreement by 43.8% from phase-1 to phase-2. Similarly, in the domain of collaborative research nine out of 11 indicators increased with five of these increasing more than 20%. All three of the indicators from within the domain of “dissemination of research” also increased by more than 20% from phase-1 to phase-2. While several specific indicators of partnership quality improved, it should be noted that little change was apparent at the aggregate or domain level. This could suggest the network is only starting to realize profound change in terms of quality and that more time is required to observe the more significant differences.

Moving forward, PreVAiL could align its partnership activities more purposefully to its stage of development. Tools are available to help PreVAiL do so. For example, the Collective Leadership Institute in collaboration with a global partnership for action on sustainable and green economy developed the “Partnership Cycle Online Learning Tool” (10) in order to support the building and implementation of successful cross-sector partnerships. The tool is organized around four key stages of partnership development: 1) exploration and consultation; 2) building the partnership; 3) implementing the partnership; and, 4) sustaining, replicating, and scaling up. The tool includes details about each stage including tasks, guiding questions, and useful cautionary notes about mistakes that can be made in regards to the partnership during each stage. PreVAiL could use the tool to assess where in terms of development of the partnership it is, develop appropriate strategies for continued development, and monitor progress towards achieving long-term sustainability of the Network. PreVAiL could also learn from the experiences of SEED in their efforts to use the tool to develop an international partnership. For example, there are four types of SEED partners depending on their level and type of network involvement (partners, associates, symposium supporters and implementing partners) which help give structure to the network (11).

PreVAiL can also glean lessons from the experiences of other networks that have applied developmental models to their work. The West Virginia Rural Health Education Partnership (WVRHEP) used a five stage model of partnership (1. exploration and discovery; 2. infrastructure building; 3. performance of mission work; 4. celebration and reflection; 5. higher levels of partnership) to understand their work in terms of challenges and lessons learned about building the partnership over eight years (12). The WVRHEP learned about the importance of ensuring that those who facilitate the partnership discuss and agree upon the nature of leadership that will guide its development (12). PreVAiL’s investigators can be considered the facilitators of its partnership; thus, it is possible that a more deliberate and transparent approach to establishing, communicating and demonstrating leadership philosophy and approaches could lead to more outcomes moving forward.

Other examples of networks that have applied developmental models to their work also exist. One example comes from a community-based participatory research project focused on positive parenting practices and relationship building between parents and youth that used Erikson’s eight stages of psychosocial development (13). This study found that during the “middle-age” stage of partnership development community partners may expect study results that are not yet available; thus, it is important to share preliminary results in order to reinforce the role of community



partners in and commitment to the research process (13). Tuckman's model (i.e., storming, forming, norming, and performing) was helpful in understanding the development of a statewide tobacco prevention partnership involving a health department and multiple universities (14). A key learning from this study was the importance of acknowledging that conflicts among network partners will inevitably take place when members have different professional or personal backgrounds, or motivations for being part of the network; and that recognizing such conflict can bring understanding of group dynamics and opportunities for creating positive interactions (14). Both these studies are helpful in demonstrating how awareness of the developmental stages of a partnership can inform the type of interactions and activities that might support how the partnership further matures (13,14).

The second observation from the evaluation findings is that there was a high-level of agreement among most of the mature indicators, which suggests the PreVAiL network is evolving or has evolved into a mature network. From the domain of "meeting information needs" more than 60% of the sample agreed that the network purpose and objectives have been defined, documented, and referred to, and also that partners and researchers are able to understand research findings, their limits, and their implications for work. Similarly, from the domain of "level of rapport" 69% of the sample agreed that formal meetings and communication continue, partners support each other publicly, and that partners have begun speaking a common language regarding family violence. Mature networks can be compared to Erickson's "late-life" stage in that activities might focus on reviewing milestones and developing optimism (13). For PreVAiL this means that emphasis moving forward might be placed on celebrating the successes achieved in terms of impact in research, practice and policy focused on preventing child maltreatment and IPV, as well as developing plans for the future.

It is also worth noting that the common indicators with the highest agreement and disagreement relate to one another. That is, 82.8% of participants agreed that "there is joint commitment to the Network" and 14% of participants disagree that "partners understand how things are communicated within each other's organizations" and that "linkages among partners enhance linkages with stakeholders". Consistent with the literature (15), the joint commitment to the Network that is perceived by the partners is reflected in an understanding of each other's organizations and the benefits of the partnership beyond PreVAiL. This observation is significant because it is linked to what we know about the foundation of IKT being an understanding of each other's communities (16). A recent scoping review identified other key enablers of IKT (e.g., dedicated funding, phase approach) that may help to further assess the quality of the partnership in terms of the extent IKT has been achieved more generally, but also reminds us that certain barriers (e.g., geographical distance, unclear roles) and conditions (e.g., complexity of issue) might make it challenging for PreVAiL to move further in this direction (15).

Finally, a few key points related to the impact of PreVAiL are noteworthy. The results of this evaluation suggest that PreVAiL as a network is successful because the partnership has been strengthened over time. The PIQ data provides an indication that the capacity for change has improved and the interviews reveal some instances whereby research produced through PreVAiL was used to influence a practice or policy decision. Overall, the majority of the results suggest that the main outcome of the five years in which the Network was developing is strengthened capacity to make evidence-informed decisions and that the Network is a key enabler for attaining improved



capacity. Frameworks are available to guide a more broad approach to evaluating impact that PreVAiL can learn from (17, 18,19,20). The Research Contribution Framework helps to explain the ways research is taken up and used to influence policy and practice. While PreVAiL is better characterized as a knowledge network rather than a research generation network, nevertheless some insights can be drawn from the concept of research contributions. The framework allows for a focus on the roles of knowledge users, and examines both processes and outcomes. PreVAiL could use the framework to understand the heterogeneity of its partner organizations, as well as the processes that contribute to or detract from the partnership as it evolves. Further, it can provide a starting point for developing a broad based evaluation framework for assessing impact that takes into account how KTE efforts are linked to outcomes realized by the Network. Examination of PreVAiL's influence in local, national and international practice and policy initiatives may demonstrate the more global influence it has had.

The evaluation results remind us of the importance of considering the heterogeneity of members in a network such as PreVAiL. There was variability among partners in terms of their desire for more or less involvement in PreVAiL specific studies and KT activities (e.g., annual meetings), as well as the amount and type of communication among network members. The expressed desire for different levels and types of involvement in the current study suggest that this might be addressed from the outset of developing an international network. Doing so would support a more tailored approach to communication, engagement and KT efforts that meets the needs of those involved. A dedicated staff person to manage the PreVAiL Network may have supported this aspect. A key role for such a dedicated staff person moving forward might be to develop a PreVAiL specific knowledge mobilization plan with the understanding that network members are heterogeneous in their roles, as well as their motivations and capacity for involvement.

Addendum: Post-Evaluation Activities

The PreVAiL Network is an on-going, active and continuing partnership. It is worth noting that the observations made from the evaluation are reinforced by activities of the PreVAiL Network that have taken place since the phase-2 data collection through early 2016 (see PreVAiL's Spring 2016 Progress Report available at: www.PreVAiLResearch.ca). In particular, the Network continues to demonstrate its impact in terms of bringing together researchers and partners to produce, share and use knowledge that helps children, women and men exposed to child maltreatment and IPV. Progress in terms of advancing the production of knowledge is apparent in that, since 2014, 13 research grants led by PreVAiL researchers were successfully funded. Also, since mid-2014, there have been 41 peer-reviewed publications and five other publications (books, chapters, technical reports) led or co-led by PreVAiL researchers. In terms of sharing knowledge related to child maltreatment and IPV, PreVAiL research has been shared through over 50 different conference presentations across five continents. Progress related to using knowledge is also evident in that five projects that were initiated in the past two years by PreVAiL partners in order to address emerging public health issues related to child maltreatment and IPV (e.g., IPV in the workplace, interventions to prevent and reduce IPV in LMICs, mapping and promoting the use of family violence surveillance data). Among these is the Violence, Evidence, Guidance, Action (VEGA) Project: Development of Pan-Canadian Public Health Guidance on Family Violence, which received \$4.5 million from the Public Health Agency of Canada to develop evidence-based guidance and curriculum that will train health and social service providers to better support the needs of victims



of violence. The PreVAiL Network continues to develop and evaluate the research impacts that have been realized since the phase-1 partnership evaluation; these are evidence that the partnership has continued to strengthen and evolve into a mature network.

Limitations

The findings in this report should be considered in light of several limitations of the evaluation approach. First, the low individual response rate for the PIQ may have been due to the online survey format. Further, each time an individual accessed the questionnaire a new version of the survey appeared. Thus, a few incomplete surveys were removed from the sample, and it is possible that more than one survey could have been completed by the same individual. Second, those who participated may represent the more satisfied or engaged Network members, which could explain the high-level of agreement across the mature indicators. Third, social desirability bias may have inflated some of the quantitative or qualitative responses (though the interviews were not carried out by a member of PreVAiL). Fourth, the activities during phase-1 and phase-2 were not the same, which could have influenced the responses on specific indicators. For example, it makes sense that collaborative research score was higher for phase-1 because there was more emphasis on this activity earlier on in the partnership (e.g., seed research grants were available during phase-1).

Conclusion

PreVAiL's initial funding cycle from CIHR is nearing an end and discussions are underway to maintain the momentum of the current Network while revitalizing its structure to meet changing domestic and global priorities. Based on the current evaluation, an immediate priority for PreVAiL may be to set a clear vision for how the Network will evolve. This vision can include a high-level communication strategy among Network members, as well as a knowledge mobilization plan that engages partners in appropriate and meaningful ways in order to maximize impact. We envision the next stage of PreVAiL as a knowledge mobilization infrastructure that bridges the gap between violence research and health policy and practice.



References

1. Graham I, Logan J, Harrison MB, Straus SE, Tetroe J, Caswell W, et al. Lost in knowledge translation: time for a map? *J Contin Educ Heal Prof.* 2006/03/25 ed. 2006;26(1):13–24.
2. Huerta T. Maintaining relationships is critical in network's success. *Healthc Pap. Canada;* 2006;7(2):28–75.
3. Jassawalla A. An Examination of Collaboration in High-Technology New Product Development Processes. *J Prod Innov Manag.* 1998 May;15(3):237–54.
4. Provan KG, Milward HB. Do Networks Really Work? A Framework for Evaluating Public-Sector Organizational Networks. *Public Adm Rev.* Blackwell Publishers Ltd.; 2001;61(4):414–23.
5. Kothari A, Wathen CN. A critical second look at integrated knowledge translation. *Health Policy (New York).* 2013 Feb 1;109(2):187–91.
6. Lavis JN, Robertson D, Woodside JM, McLeod CB, Abelson J. How can research organizations more effectively transfer research knowledge to decision makers? *Milbank Q.* 2003/07/05 ed. 2003;81(2):171–2,221–48.
7. Kothari A, Sibbald SL, Wathen CN. Evaluation of partnerships in a transnational family violence prevention network using an integrated knowledge translation and exchange model: a mixed methods study. *Health Res Policy Syst.* 2014;12(1):25.
8. Creswell J, Plano CVL. *Designing and conducting mixed methods research.* Thousand Oaks, USA: Sage Publications; 2007.
9. Braun V, Clarke V. *Using thematic analysis in psychology.* *Qual Res Psychol.* Taylor & Francis Group; 2008 Jul 21;
10. Collective Leadership Institute. Partnership Cycle Online Learning Tool [Internet]. [cited 2016 Apr 26]. Available from: <http://www.empowering-partnerships.org/>
11. Ehrensperger C, Liebl J, Rudnik J, Zürker M. *10 Years of Turning Ideas into Impact.* 2015;
12. Heady H. Principle 9: Partnerships take time to develop and evolve over time. *Partnership Perspectives.* 2000;71–94.
13. Allen ML, Svetaz AV, Hurtado GA, Linares R, Garcia-Huidobro D, Hurtado M. The developmental stages of a community-university partnership: the experience of Padres Informados/Jovenes Preparados. *Prog Community Health Partnersh.* United States; 2013;7(3):271–9.
14. McMorris LE, Gottlieb NH, Sneden GG. Developmental stages in public health partnerships: a practical perspective. *Health Promot Pract.* United States; 2005 Apr;6(2):219–26.
15. Gagliardi AR, Berta W, Kothari A, Boyko J, Urquhart R. Integrated knowledge translation (IKT) in health care: a scoping review. *Implement Sci.* London: BioMed Central; 2015 Mar 17;11:38.
16. Kothari A, Wathen CN. A critical second look at integrated knowledge translation. *Health Policy (New York).* 2012/12/12 ed. 2013;109(2):187–91.



17. Glasgow RE, Vogt TM, Boles SM. Evaluating the public health impact of health promotion interventions: the RE-AIM framework. *Am J Public Health*. American Public Health Association; 1999 Sep 1;89(9):1322–7.
18. Kuruvilla S, Mays N, Pleasant A, Walt G. Describing the impact of health research: a Research Impact Framework. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2006;6(1):1–18.
19. Morton S. Progressing research impact assessment: A “contributions” approach. *Res Eval*. 2015 Aug 14;24(4):rvv016.
20. Graham KER, Chorzempa HL, Valentine PA, Magnan J. Evaluating health research impact: Development and implementation of the Alberta Innovates - Health Solutions impact framework. *Res Eval*. 2012 Nov 14;21(5):354–67.



Appendix

1. PreVAiL Partner Organizations

Canadian Mental Health Association

Centers for Disease Control & Prevention, Division of Violence Prevention

Child Welfare League of Canada

Coalition on Community Safety, Health and Wellbeing

Defence Research & Development Canada, Resilience Group

Health Canada, Research & Surveillance, Drug Strategy & Controlled Substances Directorate

Indigenous Health Research Development Program

Institute for Circumpolar Health Research International Association for Women's Mental Health

International Association for Women's Mental Health

ISPCAN: International Society for the Prevention of Child Abuse & Neglect

Justice Canada, Family Violence

Justice Canada, Youth Justice

Mental Health Commission of Canada

PAHO/WHO–Violence and Injury Prevention,

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

Public Health Agency of Canada, Family Violence Prevention

Public Health Agency of Canada, Social Determinants and Science Integration Directorate

Status of Women Canada, Analysis and Integration

World Federation for Mental Health (WFMH)

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

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



2. PIQ (Phase-2)

Note: The original questionnaire was administered online. The formatting of the following version has been adapted from the online version.

PreVAiL Knowledge Translation & Exchange Project

PARTNERSHIP EVALUATION

Follow-up Questionnaire

Background: PreVAiL was designed using an integrated knowledge translation model. We brought together those who produce 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 the emergence and development of relationships between PreVAiL's researchers and partners. Your responses to this online questionnaire will be compared to the findings from the 2011/2012 baseline questionnaire. The questionnaire is comprised of partnership indicators in the domains of: communication, collaborative research, dissemination of research, information needs, rapport and commitment. These indicators, developed in empirical studies by Dr. 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 NOT about new research collaborations or PreVAiL's function as a research group, per se).

IF YOU ARE A TRAINEE (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.

Thank-you.

Preliminary Questions: Partner Details

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 primary activity of your organization? (check the most applicable):

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



Dimensions of Partnerships

1. COMMUNICATION (select one answer per row)

	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (disagree)	3 (strongly disagree)	4 (disagree)	5 (strongly disagree)	6 (n/a)
a) Communication is Clear						
b) Communication is on-going						
c) Communication involves face-to-face meetings as well as telephone, mail, email, and fax methods						
d) The same contact people continue over the life of the project						
e) A common language/lexicon is used						
f) Communication is relevant						
g) Roles, expectations, and criteria for deliverables are explicit						
h) Communication is timely						
i) Communication is frequent						
j) Communication is respectful						
k) Partners and researchers value each other's contributions						
l) Partners and researchers are acknowledged in project documents						

2. COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH (select one answer per row)

	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (disagree)	3 (strongly disagree)	4 (disagree)	5 (strongly disagree)	6 (n/a)
a) Joint meetings occur at most stages of research project						
b) Research questions are identified jointly						
c) The needs and constraints of partners and researchers are expressed						
d) Research protocols are jointly designed						
e) Data collection is carried out jointly						
f) Data analysis is carried out jointly						
g) Evaluation of research relevance (e.g. current project, new findings, new partner needs etc.) is carried out jointly						
h) Joint discussion occurs of findings and implications						



i) Joint meetings occur to discuss research dissemination and utilization plans						
j) Feedback about research reports are provided before final draft						
k) Response to feedback is prompt						
l) Only a few rounds of revisions are needed before deliverable is acceptable to all						
m) Feedback is given after the final deliverable is received						

3. DISSEMINATION OF RESEARCH (select one answer per row)

	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (disagree)	3 (strongly disagree)	4 (disagree)	5 (strongly disagree)	6 (n/a)
a) Multiple formats of written and/or other forms of presentation (e.g., newsletter, website summary, interim report, oral presentation) are used						
b) Partners and researchers receive relevant documents						
c) Presentation formats are in layman's terms						
d) Presentation formats include recommendations for action						
e) Recommendations for action reflect current program and policy challenges						
f) Appropriate, presentation formats are concise (e.g., less than two pages)						
g) Presentation formats are similar to those used for other communications within government (e.g. briefing notes)						
h) Community stakeholders contact partners or researchers to discuss the research findings						

4. MEETING INFORMATION NEEDS (select one answer per row)

	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (disagree)	3 (strongly disagree)	4 (disagree)	5 (strongly disagree)	6 (n/a)
a) Partners and researchers are flexible about meeting each other's changing needs and revising plans and timelines						



b) Project timelines and changes have been tracked through documentation						
c) Roles and responsibilities have been defined up front						
d) Network purpose and objectives have been defined, documented, and referred to in an on-going fashion						
e) Partners and researchers are able to understand the limits of each other's flexibility						
f) Partners and researchers are able to understand research findings, their limits, and their implications for government work						

5. LEVEL OF RAPPORT (select one answer per row)

	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (disagree)	3 (strongly disagree)	4 (disagree)	5 (strongly disagree)	6 (n/a)
a) Conflict is dealt with openly, informally, and promptly						
b) Although more informal communication occurs, formal meetings and communication continues						
c) Trust has increased between partners and researchers						
d) Partners and researchers show appreciation for each other's efforts						
e) Comfort has increased between partners and researchers						
f) Partners and researchers support each other publicly						
g) Openness has increased between partners and researchers						
h) Partners and researchers provide advance notice of surprising or potentially contentious research findings or government decisions						
i) Partners and researchers have begun speaking a common language regarding IPV						
j) Partners and researchers facilitate removal of barriers for each other's work						
k) Partners and researchers understand how things are communicated within each other's organizations						



l) Partners and researchers understand how senior level people work and what their concerns are						
m) Partners and researchers understand agendas, priorities, expectations, and limits						
n) Partners and researchers understand dissemination opportunities within each other's organizations						
o) Partners and researchers understand opportunities for research use and impact within each other's organizations						
p) Partners and researchers understand costs of monitoring, influencing, and incorporating research into decision-making						
q) Linkages among partners and researchers enhance linkages with community/other stakeholders						
r) Linkage among partners and researchers does not detract from previously established linkages with others						

6. COMMITMENT (select one answer per row)

	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (disagree)	3 (strongly disagree)	4 (disagree)	5 (strongly disagree)	6 (n/a)
a) There is joint commitment to the network						
b) Partners and researchers contribute more resources, material and otherwise to the network projects						
c) Partners and researchers willingly provide 'extras', such as extra time or staff, to the network						
d) There is an increase in joint activity around the network						
e) Partners and researchers take on new roles with each other						
f) On-going dialogue moves a research program or activities forward over a series of projects						
g) Partners and researchers are perceived as experts in the area and referred to as such to others						
h) Partners and researchers introduce each other to new networks						



i) Partners and researchers think of each other in relation to projects, committees, etc., outside of the network relationship						
j) Informal or formal infrastructure exists for linking and transferring research and information between partners and researchers						
k) The partnership's work is integrated with work associated with other stakeholders						
l) Partners and researchers support each other publicly						

7. Please use the following space to tell us anything else about your experience with PreVAiL partnerships.

YOU ARE DONE. THANK-YOU!!



3. Interview Guide (Phase-2)

Can you tell me about your history with PreVAiL?

- Why did you become involved?
- Have your reasons for being involved changed? How so?

Can you tell me about the quality of the relationships you have with other PreVAiL members.

- What does a quality relationship mean to you?
- Based on that definition, tell me about the quality of relationships you think you have with PreVAiL members you interact with? You can comment on the convenors/co-PIs (Harriet, Donna, Nadine, Jeff, Helen) or any other member with whom you interact.
- Are there ways in which you think that the quality of relationships could be improved? (e.g. improved tools/processes, communication technology)

Have you been involved in any PreVAiL-specific sub-studies or other PreVAiL-related research projects?

- *If yes ...* Please tell me about that experience.
 - What aspects were you actively involved in (research question development, design, data collection, analysis/interpretation, knowledge translation and exchange)?
 - How did it go?
 - Have results been useful? Why or why not?
 - Were there any challenges? Please explain.
- *If no ...* Did you want to be involved but didn't have the opportunity? Can you tell me about this?

To what extent do you think your involvement with PreVAiL has impacted you as a professional?

- Changed your personal knowledge/understanding/attitude towards the research subject?
- Increased your capacity to engage in the research process?
- Linked you with people/organizations that could form the basis of new relationships/partnerships?
- Research used as a piece of supporting evidence in arguments, proposals, etc?

Have you shared learnings/information from your PreVAiL related activities with others in your organization? Can you tell me about that? Anyone else?

Do you think your work with PreVAiL has influenced your organization at a broader level? Why or why not? If so, how?

- Changed the organization's collective knowledge/understanding/ attitude towards the research subject?
- Increased the organization's capacity to engage in the research process?
- Changes in the organization's practices, policies with respect to research processes or the research subject?

That is the end of interview questions. Do you have any other comments?

Thank you for your valuable contribution to these projects. If you have questions or would like additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.



4. Final Coding Framework

NODE NAME	DESCRIPTION
Directed (guided by interview questions)	
1. History with PreVAiL	<i>Parent node.</i> Responses to specific sub-questions coded separately. Sub questions: a. Can you tell me about your history with PreVAiL? b. Why did you become involved? c. Have your reasons for being involved changed? How so?
1a. Participation in last interview	
1b. Reasons for original involvement	
1c. How reasons for involvement have changed	
2. Quality of the relationships with other PreVAiL members	<i>Parent node.</i> Responses to specific sub-questions coded separately. Sub questions: Can you tell me about the quality of the relationships you have with other PreVAiL members. a. What does a quality relationship mean to you? b. Based on that definition, tell me about the quality of relationships you think you have with PreVAiL members you interact with? c. Are there ways in which you think that the quality of relationships could be improved?
2a. What a quality relationship means	
2b. Quality of relationships with PreVAiL members	
2c. Ways that the quality of relationships could be improved	
3. Involvement in PreVAiL-specific sub-studies or projects	<i>Parent node.</i> Responses to specific sub-questions coded separately. Sub questions: Have you been involved in any PreVAiL-specific sub-studies or research projects? If yes ... Please tell me about that experience. i. What aspects were you actively involved in (research question development, design, data collection, analysis/interpretation, KTE)? ii. How did it go? iii. Have results been useful? Why or why not? iv. Were there any challenges? If no ... Did you want to be involved but didn't have the opportunity?
3a. Aspects involved in	Examples of specific aspects involved in such as: research question development, design, data collection, analysis/interpretation, knowledge translation and exchange.
3b. Assessment of involvement - how it went	
3c. Challenges	
3c. Usefulness of results	
3d. Desire for involvement	Descriptions of people who wanted to be involved but were not given the opportunity
3e. No involvement	
4. Extent that involvement with PreVAiL has impacted professional work	<i>Parent node.</i> Responses to specific sub-questions coded separately. Sub questions: To what extent do you think your involvement with PreVAiL has impacted you as a professional? a. Changed your personal knowledge/understanding/attitude towards the research subject? b. Increased your capacity to engage in the research process? c. Linked you with people/organizations that could form the basis of new relationships/partnerships? d. Research used as a piece of supporting evidence in arguments, proposals, etc?
4a. Changed personal knowledge, understanding, attitude	
4b. Increased capacity to engage in the research process	
4c. Linked with people or organizations that could form the basis of new relationships, partnerships	
4d. Used research as a piece of supporting evidence in arguments, proposals, etc	
4e. General impact on professional work	



4f. No impact on professional work.	
5. Descriptions of sharing learning or info from PreVAiL related activities with others	General responses related to - Have you shared learnings/information from your PreVAiL related activities with others in your organization? Can you tell me about that? Anyone else?
6. PreVAiL's influence on organization at a broader level	<i>Parent node.</i> Includes general responses related to influence at a broader level. Do you think your work with PreVAiL has influenced your organization at a broader level? Why or why not? If so, how? a. Changed the organization's collective knowledge/understanding/ attitude towards the research subject? b. Increased the organization's capacity to engage in the research process? c. Changes in the organization's practices, policies with respect to research processes or the research subject?
6a. Changed organizations collective knowledge, understanding, attitude towards the research subject	
6b. Increased the organization's capacity to engage in the research process	
6c. Changes in the organizations research practices or policies	
6d. No influence on organization	
Other	Use for other information provided at the end not captured by questions. Recode later if necessary.
EMERGENT (arising from data)	
Work of PreVAiL is a compliment to what partners do	PreVAiL compliments and supports the work that partners are already involved in. Partner's view PreVAiL as an extension of the work they are already doing.
Partners can access content knowledge and expertise	<i>Parent node.</i> Members and organizations part of the network bring a source of expertise in specific areas that combined together create a valuable resource in the form of knowledge.
PreVAiL seen as key stakeholder given quality of expertise	
Outcomes and outputs of involvement with the partnership	<i>Parent node.</i> Includes examples of outcomes and outputs of involvement as a result of PreVAiL
Potential to change	
Need for more concrete outcomes-outputs	
Inspiration and ideas	
On-going interactions important	Includes importance of face-to-face interactions over other forms. Members feel it is important to have more vibrant regular interactions among the network. Regular check-ins with partners allows for constant engagement and prioritizes the work of PreVAiL.
Networking leads to new partnerships	PreVAiL has opened members up to a new community of people that one can network with on PreVAiL related or personal projects. This expanded network has allowed collaborations and engagement to occur that would not have occurred without PreVAiL.
Nature of involvement has changed and evolved over time	<i>Parent node.</i> Involvement with PreVAiL has changed with a change in organizational role or as a result of natural evolution or maturity of network.
Changed role but not involvement in PreVAiL	
More information and updates about PreVAiL needed	Partners would like to see more communication about PreVAiL happenings. Additionally, partners that are not actively involved in research would like to be informed on opportunities to engage and contribute to upcoming projects.
Linking with other prevail members leads to new partnerships	The partnerships among PreVAiL members has resulted in new ventures coming to light that are not necessarily related to PreVAiL projects.
Level of comfort with PreVAiL members	Partners feel a high level of comfort with PreVAiL members. Partners would not hesitate to get in touch with another member on any given topic and would recommend PreVAiL to others as a partner on an initiative. Interactions among members are described as positive and affirmative.
It takes time to see change	Changes in their work as a result of PreVAiL will take time because of the nature of their organization, the issues or their own work.
International focus leverages a broader networking and perspective	PreVAiL focus on building a network that is both nationally and internationally focused allows for a broader perspective on the issue. The larger focus is needed because violence prevention goes beyond just



	Canada. PreVAiL has been committed to establishing global priorities in research on IPV.
Gained knowledge as a result of PreVAiL	<i>Parent node.</i> Partners have gained an enhanced importance and new perspectives about IPV as a result of PreVAiL. Many are now more informed and exposed to research that is occurring in the area of IPV.
Learning about KT processes and strategies	
Knowledge outputs are useful but not essential	
Extent of involvement and any related changes influenced by the partners organization	The extent that change may result from participation in PreVAiL depends on the type/mandate of organization (prevention vs. non); can also depend on the internal processes of organizations that help or hinder participation in the network and its work.
Examples of KT successes	<i>Parent node.</i> Includes examples that could be considered evidence of KT success.
Opportunities for better KT	
Knowledge brokering role	
Effect - Sub-networks feeding into or being created by PreVAiL	Partnerships have grown out of PreVAiL and resulted in collaborations on projects among partners that are not directly related to PreVAiL.
Early or personal relationships with PIs	Having great working relationships with the principal investigators of PreVAiL has been a positive experience.
Drawbacks to using technology	Though partners find using different technologies to communicate helpful, is it not an adequate substitution for face-to-face interaction. It is important to build opportunities to allow for face-to-face meetings to occur among partners.
Different types of relationships with PreVAiL	The relationship with one person in the network can take different forms depending on the context.
Brings people from same organization together who might otherwise not connect	PreVAiL has allowed discussions and connections to form among partners from the same organization who would not come together otherwise.
Being connected to research process is beneficial to partners	Having an increased capacity to engage in the research process is important and exciting.
Advocacy role of PreVAiL is important	PreVAiL engages in the advocacy process which is unique for a research group.
MISC	<i>Parent node.</i> Includes nodes with only one or two references that are interesting but do not appear significant.
Willingness to engage with policymakers	
Using PreVAiL research to influence decision-making	
PreVAiL time is a good investment	
Potential for further networking	
Not a primary research interest	
Lack of LMIC focus	
Interview process helps to reflect on success	
Hard working advisory comm	
Challenges are usual ones	



5. Descriptive statistics of phases 1 and 2 PIQ responses

Response options were: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Agree Nor Disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree. 6=Not Applicable was also a response option but it was not included in calculations.

	Phase-1			Phase-2		
	Mean (n)	Median	Mode	Mean (n)	Median	Mode
Communication						
Communication is on-going	3.97(30)	4	5	3.75(28)	4	4
Communication involves face-to-face meetings as well as telephone, mail, email, and fax methods	3.94(31)	4	4	3.81(26)	4	4
The same contact people continue over the life of the project	4.22(27)	4	5	4.35(26)	4.5	5
A common language/lexicon is used	3.35(31)	3	3	4.18(28)	4	4
Communication is relevant	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.44(27)	4	5
Roles, expectations, and criteria for deliverables are explicit	3.74(27)	4	5	3.84(25)	4	5
Communication is frequent	3.31(32)	4	4	3.21(29)	3	3
Partners and researchers value each other's contributions	4.42(31)	5	5	4.56(27)	5	5
Partners and researchers are acknowledged in project documents	4.35(23)	5	5	4.56(25)	5	5
Collaborative Research						
Research questions are identified jointly	4.17(30)	4	5	4.09(22)	4	4
The needs and constraints of partners and researchers are expressed	4.00(29)	4	4	4.04(23)	4	4
Research protocols are jointly designed	3.88(25)	4	4	3.75(20)	4	4
If relevant, joint data collection is carried out	3.89(9)	4	3	3.65(17)	4	4
If relevant, joint data analysis is carried out	4.00(15)	4	3	3.80(20)	4	4
Joint ongoing evaluation of relevance of research (e.g. current project, new findings, new partner needs etc.) takes place	3.95(20)	4	4	3.86(21)	4	4
Joint discussion of findings and implications takes place	4.17(18)	4	5	4.04(23)	4	4
Feedback about research reports are provided before final draft	4.27(15)	4	5	3.95(21)	4	4
Response to feedback is prompt	4.29(17)	4	5	4.05(21)	4	4
Only a few rounds of revisions are needed before deliverable is acceptable to all	4.00(11)	4	5	3.78(18)	4	3



Feedback is given after the final deliverable is received	3.30(10)	3	3	3.53(17)	4	3
Dissemination of Research						
Stakeholders receive relevant documents	4.43(14)	4.5	5	4.20(20)	4	4
Recommendations for action reflection current program and policy challenges	3.71(14)	4	4	4.00(18)	4	4
Presentation formats are similar to those used for other communications within government or partner organizations (e.g. briefing notes)	3.43(14)	3.5	3	3.56(18)	4	4



6. PIQ frequency data

Table 1 – Common Partnership Indicators

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	3.b Communication is on-going	1(3.5)	4(13.8)	3(10.3)	13(44.8)	7(24.1)	1(3.5)	0
	Partners	0	2(22.2)	0	4(44.4)	3(33.3)	0	0
	Researchers	1(5.0)	2(10.0)	3(15.0)	9(45.0)	4(20.0)	1(5.0)	0
	3.c Communication involves face-to-face meetings as well as telephone, mail, email, and fax methods	0	2(6.9)	7(24.1)	11(36.7)	6(20.7)	2(6.9)	1(3.5)
	Partners	0	0	2(22.2)	4(44.4)	3(33.3)	0	0
	Researchers	0	2(10.0)	5(25.0)	7(35.0)	3(15.0)	2(10.0)	1(5.0)
	3.d The same contact people continue over the life of the project	0	1(3.5)	2(6.9)	10(34.5)	13(44.8)	3(10.3)	0
	Partners	0	0	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	5(55.6)	1(11.1)	0
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	1(5.0)	8(40.0)	8(40.0)	2(10.0)	0
	3.e A common language/lexicon is used	0	2(6.9)	2(6.9)	13(44.8)	11(37.9)	1(3.5)	0
	Partners	0	1(11.1)	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	5(55.6)	0	0
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	1(5.0)	11(55.0)	6(30.0)	1(5.0)	0
	3.f Communication is relevant	0	0	1(3.5)	13(44.8)	13(44.8)	2(6.9)	0
	Partners	0	0	0	1(11.1)	8(88.9)	0	0
	Researchers	0	0	1(5.0)	12(60.0)	5(25.0)	2(10.0)	0
	3.g Roles, expectations, and criteria for deliverables are explicit	0	3(10.3)	6(20.7)	8(27.6)	8(27.6)	3(10.3)	1(3.5)
	Partners	0	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	0
	Researchers	0	2(10.0)	4(20.0)	7(35.0)	5(25.0)	1(5.0)	1(5.0)
	3.i Communication is frequent	2(6.9)	5(17.2)	11(37.9)	7(24.1)	4(13.8)	0	0
	Partners	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	0	0
	Researchers	1(5.0)	3(15.0)	8(40.0)	6(30.0)	2(10.0)	0	0
	3.k Partners and researchers value each other's contributions	0	1(3.5)	0	9(31.0)	17(58.6)	2(6.9)	0
	Partners	0	0	0	2(22.2)	6(66.7)	1(11.1)	0
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	0	7(35.0)	11(55.0)	1(5.0)	0
	3.l Partners and researchers are acknowledged in project documents	0	0	2(6.9)	7(24.1)	16(55.2)	4(13.8)	0
	Partners	0	0	0	1(11.1)	6(66.7)	2(22.2)	0
	Researchers	0	0	2(10.0)	6(30.0)	10(50.0)	2(10.0)	0
Collaborative Research	4.b Research questions are identified jointly	0	0	4(13.8)	12(41.4)	6(20.7)	5(17.2)	2(6.9)
	Partners	0	0	1(11.1)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)



Dimensions of Partnerships	Indicators	1= Strongly Disagree	2= Disagree	3= Neither Agree Nor Disagree	4= Agree	5= Strongly Agree	6= Not Applicable	No Answer
	Researchers	0	0	3(15.0)	9(45.0)	4(20.0)	3(15.0)	1(5.0)
	4.c The needs and constraints of partners and researchers are expressed	0	1(3.5)	4(13.8)	11(37.9)	7(24.1)	4(13.8)	2(6.9)
	Partners	0	1(11.1)	1(11.1)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	0	3(15.0)	8(40.0)	5(25.0)	3(15.0)	1(5.0)
	4.d Research protocols are jointly designed	0	1(3.5)	6(20.7)	10(34.5)	3(10.3)	7(24.1)	2(6.9)
	Partners	0	0	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	3(15.0)	8(40.0)	2(10.0)	5(25.0)	1(5.0)
	4.e If relevant, joint data collection is carried out	1(3.5)	0	5(17.2)	9(31.0)	2(6.9)	10(34.5)	2(6.9)
	Partners	0	0	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	1(5.0)	0	3(15.0)	6(30.0)	1(5.0)	8(40.0)	1(5.0)
	4.f If relevant, joint data analysis is carried out	0	0	6(20.7)	12(41.4)	2(6.9)	7(24.1)	2(6.9)
	Partners	0	0	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	0	4(20.0)	9(45.0)	1(5.0)	5(25.0)	1(5.0)
	4.g Joint ongoing evaluation of relevance of research (e.g. current project, new findings, new partner needs etc.) takes place	0	3(10.3)	3(10.3)	9(31.0)	6(20.7)	6(20.7)	2(6.9)
	Partners	0	0	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	3(15.0)	1(5.0)	6(30.0)	4(20.0)	5(25.0)	1(5.0)
	4.h Joint discussion of findings and implications takes place	0	2(6.9)	3(10.3)	10(34.5)	8(27.6)	4(13.8)	2(6.9)
	Partners	0	1(11.1)	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	2(10.0)	8(40.0)	5(25.0)	3(15.0)	1(5.0)
	4.j Feedback about research reports are provided before final draft	0	1(3.5)	4(13.8)	10(34.5)	6(20.7)	5(17.2)	3(10.3)
	Partners	0	0	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	2(10.0)	7(35.0)	4(20.0)	4(20.0)	2(10.0)
	4.k Response to feedback is prompt	0	0	5(17.2)	10(34.5)	6(20.7)	5(17.2)	3(10.3)
	Partners	0	0	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	0	2(10.0)	8(40.0)	4(20.0)	4(20.0)	2(10.0)
	4.l Only a few rounds of revisions are needed before deliverable is acceptable to all	0	0	8(27.6)	6(20.7)	4(13.8)	7(24.1)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	0	3(33.3)	0	2(22.2)	2(22.2)	2(22.2)
	Researchers	0	0	5(25.0)	6(30.0)	2(10.0)	5(25.0)	2(10.0)
	4.m Feedback is given after the final deliverable is received	1(3.5)	1(3.5)	6(20.7)	6(20.7)	3(10.3)	8(27.6)	4(13.8)
	Partners	1(11.1)	0	3(33.3)	0	2(22.2)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)



Dimensions of Partnerships	Indicators	1= Strongly Disagree	2= Disagree	3= Neither Agree Nor Disagree	4= Agree	5= Strongly Agree	6= Not Applicable	No Answer
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	3(15.0)	6(30.0)	1(5.0)	6(30.0)	3(15.0)
Dissemination of Research	5.b Stakeholders receive relevant documents	0	0	3(10.3)	10(34.5)	7(24.1)	6(20.7)	3(10.3)
	Partners	0	0	0	4(44.4)	3(33.3)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	0	3(15.0)	6(30.0)	4(20.0)	5(25.0)	2(10.0)
	5.e Recommendations for action reflection current program and policy challenges	0	1(3.5)	3(10.3)	9(31.0)	5(17.2)	8(27.6)	3(10.3)
	Partners	0	1(11.1)	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	2(22.2)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	0	2(10.0)	7(35.0)	3(15.0)	6(30.0)	2(10.0)
	5.g Presentation formats are similar to those used for other communications within government or partner organizations (e.g. briefing notes)	1(3.5)	2(6.9)	5(17.2)	6(20.7)	4(13.8)	8(27.6)	3(10.3)
	Partners	1(11.1)	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	3(15.0)	5(25.0)	3(15.0)	6(30.0)	2(10.0)



Table 2 – Mature Partnership Indicators

Dimensions of Partnerships	Indicators	1= Strongly Disagree	2= Disagree	3= Neither Agree Nor Disagree	4= Agree	5= Strongly Agree	6= Not Applicable	No Answer
Meeting Information Needs	6.a Partners and researchers are flexible about meeting each other’s changing needs and revising plans and timelines	0	0	5(17.2)	8(27.6)	6(20.7)	6(20.7)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	0	3(33.3)	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	0	2(10.0)	7(35.0)	4(20.0)	4(20.0)	3(15.0)
	6.b Project timelines and changes have been tracked through documentation	0	1(3.5)	6(20.7)	8(27.6)	4(13.8)	6(20.7)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	0	3(33.3)	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	3(15.0)	7(35.0)	2(10.0)	4(20.0)	3(15.0)
	6.c Roles and responsibilities have been defined up front	0	1(3.5)	7(24.1)	8(27.6)	7(24.1)	3(10.3)	3(10.3)
	Partners	0	0	3(33.3)	0	4(44.4)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	4(20.0)	8(40.0)	3(15.0)	2(10.0)	2(10.0)
	6.d Network purpose and objectives have been defined, documented, and referred to in an on-going fashion	0	2(6.9)	3(10.3)	10(34.5)	8(27.6)	3(10.3)	3(10.3)
	Partners	0	0	3(11.1)	2(22.2)	4(44.4)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	2(10.0)	2(10.0)	8(40.0)	4(20.0)	2(10.0)	2(10.0)
	6.e Partners and researchers are able to understand the limits of each other’s flexibility	0	2(6.9)	4(13.8)	8(27.6)	7(24.4)	5(17.2)	3(10.3)
	Partners	0	1(11.1)	0	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	4(20.0)	6(30.0)	4(20.0)	3(15.0)	2(10.0)
	6.f Partners and researchers are able to understand research findings, their limits, and their implications for work within government or partner organizations	0	2(6.9)	1(3.5)	10(34.5)	10(34.5)	3(10.3)	3(10.3)
	Partners	0	1(11.1)	0	2(22.2)	4(44.4)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	1(5.0)	8(40.0)	6(30.0)	2(10.0)	2(10.0)
Level of Rapport	7.a Conflict is dealt with openly, informally, and promptly	0	0	5(17.2)	5(17.2)	3(10.3)	10(34.5)	6(20.7)
	Partners	0	0	3(33.3)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)	3(33.3)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	0	2(10.0)	4(20.0)	2(10.0)	7(35.0)	5(25.0)
	7.b Although more informal communication occurs, formal meetings and communication continue	0	1(3.5)	2(6.9)	11(37.9)	9(31.0)	2(6.9)	4(13.8)



Dimensions of Partnerships	Indicators	1= Strongly Disagree	2= Disagree	3= Neither Agree Nor Disagree	4= Agree	5= Strongly Agree	6= Not Applicable	No Answer
	Partners	0	0	1(11.1)	3(33.3)	3(33.3)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	1(5.0)	8(40.0)	6(30.0)	1(5.0)	3(15.0)
	7.c Trust has increased between partners and researchers	0	0	3(10.3)	11(37.9)	8(27.6)	2(6.9)	5(17.2)
	Partners	0	0	2(22.2)	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	0	1(5.0)	9(45.0)	5(25.0)	1(5.0)	4(20.0)
	7.e Partners and researchers show appreciation for each other's efforts	0	0	3(10.3)	7(24.1)	12(41.4)	3(10.3)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	0	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	0	1(5.0)	6(30.0)	9(45.0)	1(5.0)	3(15.0)
	7.f Comfort has increased between partners and researchers	0	0	4(13.8)	9(31.0)	9(31.0)	2(6.9)	5(17.2)
	Partners	0	0	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	0	1(5.0)	7(35.0)	7(35.0)	1(5.0)	4(20.0)
	7.g Partners and researchers support each other publicly	0	0	2(6.9)	11(37.9)	9(31.0)	3(10.3)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	0	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	0	0	8(40.0)	7(35.0)	2(10.0)	3(15.0)
	7.h Openness has increased between partners and researchers	0	1(3.5)	2(6.9)	13(44.8)	5(17.2)	3(10.3)	5(17.2)
	Partners	0	0	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	0	10(50.0)	3(15.0)	2(10.0)	4(20.0)
	7.i Partners and researchers provide advance notice of surprising or potentially contentious research findings or government decisions	0	0	8(27.6)	4(13.8)	6(20.7)	7(24.1)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	0	5(55.6)	0	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	0	3(15.0)	4(20.0)	4(20.0)	6(30.0)	3(15.0)
	7.j Partners and researchers have begun speaking a common language regarding family violence	0	0	5(17.2)	14(48.3)	6(20.7)	0	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	0	3(33.3)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	0	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	0	2(10.0)	11(55.0)	4(20.0)	0	3(15.0)
	7.k Partners and researchers facilitate removal of barriers for each other's work	0	1(3.5)	7(24.1)	9(31.0)	6(20.7)	1(3.5)	5(17.2)
	Partners	0	0	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	4(20.0)	7(35.0)	4(20.0)	0	4(20.0)



Dimensions of Partnerships	Indicators	1= Strongly Disagree	2= Disagree	3= Neither Agree Nor Disagree	4= Agree	5= Strongly Agree	6= Not Applicable	No Answer
	7.l Partners and researchers understand how things are communicated within each other's organizations	0	4(13.8)	4(13.8)	11(37.9)	5(17.2)	1(3.5)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	2(10.0)	10(50.0)	4(20.0)	0	3(15.0)
	7.m Partners and researchers understand how senior level people work and what their concerns are	0	2(6.9)	9(31.0)	8(27.6)	5(17.2)	1(3.5)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	0	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	0	6(30.0)	6(30.0)	4(20.0)	1(5.0)	3(15.0)
	7.n Partners and researchers understand agendas, priorities, expectations, and limits	0	1(3.5)	6(20.7)	12(41.4)	5(17.2)	1(3.5)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	4(44.4)	1(11.1)	0	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	0	4(20.0)	8(40.0)	4(20.0)	1(5.0)	3(15.0)
	7.o Partners and researchers understand dissemination opportunities within each other's organization	0	3(10.3)	9(31.0)	8(27.6)	4(13.8)	1(3.5)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	0	3(33.3)	3(33.3)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	3(15.0)	6(30.0)	5(25.0)	3(15.0)	0	3(15.0)
	7.p Partners and researchers understand opportunities for research use and impact within each other's organizations	0	2(6.9)	8(27.6)	10(34.5)	4(13.8)	1(3.5)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	0	4(44.4)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	2(10.0)	4(20.0)	8(40.0)	3(15.0)	0	3(15.0)
	7.q Partners and researchers understand costs of monitoring, influencing, and incorporating research into decision-making	0	3(10.3)	10(34.5)	4(13.8)	6(20.7)	2(6.9)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	2(22.2)	4(44.4)	0	2(22.2)	0	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	6(30.0)	4(20.0)	4(20.0)	2(10.0)	3(15.0)
	7.r Linkages among partners and researchers enhance linkages with community/other stakeholders	0	4(13.8)	4(13.8)	9(31.0)	8(27.6)	0	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	1(11.1)	1(11.1)	3(33.3)	3(33.3)	0	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	3(15.0)	3(15.0)	6(30.0)	5(25.0)	0	3(15.0)
	7.s	0	0	6(20.7)	10(34.5)	9(31.0)	0	4(13.8)



Dimensions of Partnerships	Indicators	1= Strongly Disagree	2= Disagree	3= Neither Agree Nor Disagree	4= Agree	5= Strongly Agree	6= Not Applicable	No Answer
	Linkage among partners and researchers does not detract from previously established linkages with others							
	Partners	0	0	1(11.1)	3(33.3)	4(44.4)	0	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	0	5(25.0)	7(35.0)	5(25.0)	0	3(15.0)
Commitment	8.a There is joint commitment to the Network	0	0	1(3.5)	16(55.2)	8(27.6)	0	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	0	1(11.1)	6(66.7)	1(11.1)	0	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	0	0	10(50.0)	7(35.0)	0	3(15.0)
	8.b Partners and researchers contribute more resources, material and otherwise to the Network projects	0	0	7(24.1)	10(34.5)	5(17.2)	3(10.3)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	0	4(44.4)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	0	3(15.0)	8(40.0)	4(20.0)	2(10.0)	3(15.0)
	8.c Partners and researchers willingly provide 'extra', such as extra time or staff, to the Network	0	1(3.5)	3(10.3)	11(37.9)	7(24.1)	3(10.3)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	0	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	1(5.0)	8(40.0)	5(25.0)	2(10.0)	3(15.0)
	8.d There is an increase in joint activity around the Network	0	1(3.5)	6(20.7)	11(37.9)	5(17.2)	2(6.9)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	0	2(22.2)	4(44.4)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	4(20.0)	7(35.0)	4(20.0)	1(5.0)	3(15.0)
	8.e Partners and researchers take on new roles with each other	0	1(3.5)	6(20.7)	7(24.1)	6(20.7)	2(6.9)	7(24.1)
	Partners	0	0	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	3(33.3)
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	5(25.0)	5(25.0)	4(20.0)	1(5.0)	4(20.0)
	8.f On-going dialogue moves a research program or activities forward over a series of projects	0	2(6.9)	5(17.2)	11(37.9)	6(20.7)	1(3.5)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	0	1(11.1)	5(55.6)	2(22.2)	0	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	2(10.0)	4(20.0)	6(30.0)	4(20.0)	1(5.0)	3(15.0)
	8.g Partners and researchers are perceived as experts in the area and referred to as such to others	0	0	4(13.8)	11(37.8)	8(27.6)	2(6.9)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	0	1(11.1)	4(44.4)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	0	3(15.0)	7(35.0)	6(30.0)	1(5.0)	3(15.0)



Dimensions of Partnerships	Indicators	1= Strongly Disagree	2= Disagree	3= Neither Agree Nor Disagree	4= Agree	5= Strongly Agree	6= Not Applicable	No Answer
	8.h Partners and researchers introduce each other to new networks	0	0	5(17.2)	12(41.4)	7(24.1)	1(3.5)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	0	1(11.1)	3(33.3)	3(33.3)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	0	4(20.0)	9(45.0)	4(20.0)	0	3(15.0)
	8.i Partners and researchers think of each other in relation to projects, committees, etc., outside of the Network relationship	0	1(3.5)	6(20.7)	11(37.9)	6(20.7)	1(3.5)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	0	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	4(20.0)	8(40.0)	4(20.0)	0	3(15.0)
	8.j Informal or formal infrastructure exists for linking and transferring research and information between partners and researchers	0	2(6.9)	7(24.1)	10(34.5)	6(20.7)	0	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	0	2(22.2)	5(55.6)	1(11.1)	0	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	2(10.0)	5(25.0)	5(25.0)	5(25.0)	0	3(15.0)
	8.k The partnership's work is integrated with work associated with other stakeholders	0	1(3.5)	7(24.1)	7(24.1)	6(20.7)	4(13.8)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	0	3(33.3)	1(11.1)	3(33.3)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	4(20.0)	6(30.0)	3(15.0)	3(15.0)	3(15.0)
	8.l Partners and researchers support each other publicly	0	1(3.5)	4(13.8)	11(37.9)	8(27.6)	1(3.5)	4(13.8)
	Partners	0	0	1(11.1)	4(44.4)	3(33.3)	0	1(11.1)
	Researchers	0	1(5.0)	3(15.0)	7(35.0)	5(25.0)	1(5.0)	3(15.0)

