

# **Mobilizing Knowledge About the Development of Children, Youth, and Families: Focus on Knowledge Transformation and Learning (MKAD)**

Final Report for:

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada  
Alberta Centre for Child, Family and Community Research  
University of Alberta

June 8, 2010

Prepared by:

Shaw, K., Chapman, S. A., Pinto, D., Delling, C., Schnirer, L., Bisanz, J., & Tough, S.



## Acknowledgements

This report was prepared as part of the Mobilizing Knowledge About Development (MKAD) project, a collaboration between the Community-University Partnership for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families (CUP) and the Alberta Centre for Child, Family and Community Research (The Centre). In addition to the authors of this report, we would like to acknowledge the contributions of the following people: Rhonda Breitzkreuz, Aimee Caster, Miranda Diakiw, Katrina Fong, Hannah Goa, Marilyn Hawirko, Elizabeth Huebert, Monica Jack, Sue Lynch, Joanne Muzak, Lara Pinchbeck, Derek Preston, Nancy Reynolds, Kym Schreiner, Lily Tsui, and the MKAD Advisory Committee.

## Contact Information

Community-University Partnership for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families (CUP)  
Faculty of Extension  
University of Alberta  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Enterprise Square  
10230 Jasper Avenue  
Edmonton, Alberta T5H 4P6  
Canada  
[www.cup.ualberta.ca](http://www.cup.ualberta.ca)  
Phone: 780-492-6177  
Fax: 780-492-9084

Alberta Centre for Child, Family and Community Research (The Centre)  
6th Floor, 9925 – 109 Street  
Edmonton, Alberta T5K 2J8  
Canada  
[www.research4children.org](http://www.research4children.org)  
Phone: 780-944-8636  
Fax: 780-944-8637

## Funding

MKAD was supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (Knowledge Impact in Society grant); the Alberta Centre for Child, Family and Community Research (The Centre); and the Faculties of Arts, Education, Nursing, Medicine and Dentistry, and Rehabilitation Medicine, along with the Office of the Vice President (Research) at the University of Alberta.

## Please use the following reference to cite this report:

Shaw, K., Chapman, S. A., Pinto, D., Delling, C., Schnirer, L., Bisanz, J., & Tough, S. (2010). *Mobilizing Knowledge About the Development of Children, Youth, and Families (MKAD): Focus on knowledge transformation and learning*. Retrieved from the University of Alberta, Community-University Partnership for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families website:  
[http://www.cup.ualberta.ca/index.php?option=com\\_docman&task=cat\\_view&gid=33&Itemid=234](http://www.cup.ualberta.ca/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=33&Itemid=234)

## Executive Summary

---

The goal of the Mobilizing Knowledge About Development (MKAD) project was to study, develop, and enhance knowledge-mobilization (KM) initiatives. More specifically, MKAD's intent was to build capacity on campus and in community to engage in collaborative, interdisciplinary, sustainable relationships in support of the development of children, youth, and families. MKAD was a collaboration between the Community-University Partnership for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families (CUP) and the Alberta Centre for Child, Family and Community Research (The Centre).

Through this project, MKAD members learned KM is a social process engaging individuals and organizations as learners. Knowledge mobilization (KM) is based, in large part, on relationship building and relationship maintenance through stand-alone KM events and the development and maintenance of ongoing networks (e.g., learning communities, community-based research partnerships).

MKAD was conducted in two parts. Members evaluated activities (e.g., symposia, workshops) that are frequently used to share research evidence for application to programs and policy. In addition, MKAD members developed and implemented learning opportunities on campus and in the community to support leadership and participation in community-based research and evaluation (CBRE). CBRE can be inherently oriented to KM because partners are creating, exchanging, and applying research information together.

### **Key Accomplishments and Lessons Learned:**

#### **1. Evaluating Knowledge-Mobilization Activities (e.g., symposia, workshops, and written material)**

- a. Dissemination strategies should include content and application information (i.e., examples of how to apply the content, such as case studies and "first-hand experiences"). Opportunities to practice application of the new information are also valuable because they help build relevant knowledge and skills.
- b. Information-exchange opportunities (e.g., questions/answers, networking, group discussions) and relationship building are critical because they (i) anchor new information, (ii) allow for discussion of alternate perspectives, (iii) provide opportunities to discuss how information can be applied, and (iv) develop and strengthen relationships.
- c. During KM events, people seek opportunities to develop relationships with those who have expertise that may be different from their own (e.g., in terms of content, research, policy, or programs). Relationships facilitate learning, help support people in their work, and are key to the development of communities of practice [i.e., "groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly" (Wenger, 2006)].
- d. Information dissemination and exchange can be enhanced by providing (i) written summaries and discussion notes, (ii) participant contact lists, (iii) face-to-face forums (e.g., communities of practice), and (iv) web-based forums (e.g., listservs, social-networking tools). On-line resources may be particularly useful ways to facilitate concurrent and ongoing information dissemination and exchange.
- e. By attending KM activities, participants increase their knowledge or understanding of the topic covered (conceptual use) and may use the information from the KM activity to support a decision at work (symbolic use). Participants may also use the new

information to modify a program or practice (instrumental use), however, this is less likely.

- f. In addition to previously identified categories of information use, participants report additional categories, such as using KM-activity information to motivate and inspire, to seek further information, to share it with colleagues, and to develop relationships and partnerships.
- g. Participants perceive that their organizations are less likely to use the KM-activity information than they are as individuals.

## **2. Building Capacity on Campus and in the Community for Leadership and Participation in Community-Based Research and Evaluation**

Recognizing that community-based research and evaluation (CBRE) can be inherently characterized by knowledge mobilization (KM), MKAD developed a CBRE Workshop Series for community and campus members, a Graduate Certificate Program in CBRE at the University of Alberta, and a graduate-level course on CBRE. Additional capacity-building opportunities arose as the MKAD project progressed (e.g., customized workshops). These activities were studied as KM activities.

*CBRE Workshop Series (Please see Appendix B for additional information.)*

- a) The CBRE Workshop Series attracts a diverse range of stakeholders including researchers, program planners and developers, and policy and decision makers. For effective workshops, facilitators should anticipate and plan to accommodate this range of experience and expertise.
- b) Dialogically oriented workshops with discussions, case studies, exercises, and presentations support workshop effectiveness by helping participants to (i) engage with content through critical thinking and discussion, (ii) gain conceptual and methodological competencies, and (iii) develop relationships that may support future CBRE work.
- c) Conducting front-end evaluation (e.g., needs assessment), formative evaluation (e.g., following a pilot workshop), and then summative evaluation (e.g., end-of-workshop surveys) supports the development, implementation, and refinement of workshops as an effective KM strategy. Retrospective evaluation of workshops can also support the effectiveness of a workshop series over the long term.

*Graduate Certificate Program in Community-Based Research and Evaluation (CBRE)*

This program has been approved as an embedded, graduate credit certificate by the University of Alberta. The purpose of the program is to integrate conceptual and methodological competencies in community-based research and evaluation (CBRE) into graduate curricula to increase on-campus and in-community capacity to participate in and lead CBRE projects and to support the mobilization of findings in policy, practice, and research. To qualify for a certificate, students will, during the course of their graduate degree programs, complete four existing graduate courses including an interdisciplinary, core course on CBRE offered by the Faculty of Extension and a supervised experience in CBRE. This program will:

- Complement existing graduate opportunities in CBRE across campus.
- Systematize and reward the development of competencies and critical thinking about CBRE to help students mobilize their academic knowledge.
- Support active engagement in the establishment of CBRE partnerships among graduate students, faculty, service providers, and policymakers on campus and in local communities.

*Graduate Course: "An Introduction to Community-Based Research and Evaluation (CBRE)" (INT-D 500, University of Alberta) (Please see Appendix F for course syllabus.)*

This is the core course for the Graduate Certificate Program. The results of the evaluation of the course as a KM activity show the course objectives were met through a variety of means including the instructor, course resources, and collaborative opportunities including guest speakers, in-class discussions, and group work. The course provided a way to build knowledge and capacity about CBRE in the university context, engaging a new generation of researchers in CBRE. Students reported that they not only intended to apply what they had learned to their future research and practice, but that they also had or were intending to share this knowledge with their colleagues.

As MKAD proceeded, an appreciation for stakeholders as adult learners gradually emerged. As a result, MKAD members increasingly turned to the adult-learning literature and gained an appreciation that the greater the interactivity of activities, the more effective the benefit for learners and their participation in knowledge mobilization. This 'aha' regarding capacity building informed our KM-evaluation work.

The MKAD project was developed in response to the special challenges inherent in community-based, collaborative work and knowledge mobilization. As a result, MKAD members have an enhanced understanding of how to support the co-creation of information as it is shared, exchanged, and applied to policy and programs in support of the development and well-being of children, youth, and families.

## Table of Contents

---

Executive Summary .....	3
Table of Contents.....	6
Introduction .....	7
Activities.....	11
Findings from Evaluating Knowledge-Mobilization Activities.....	12
Results from Building Capacity in Community-Based Research and Evaluation .....	17
Lessons Learned.....	18
Next Steps for CUP and The Centre .....	20
Recommendations for Planning and Participating in KM Activities .....	21
Conclusion .....	22
References.....	24
Appendix A: Evaluating Knowledge-Mobilization Activities .....	26
Appendix B: Building Capacity for Community-Based Research and Evaluation .....	30
Appendix C: Methods of Analysis for Evaluating Knowledge Mobilization Activities.....	33
Appendix D: Measures of Information Utilization .....	34
Appendix E: Organizations and Units Represented by Participants in the CBRE Workshop Series (May 2007 – April 2010) .....	36
Appendix F: INT-D 500: An Introduction to Community-Based Research & Evaluation ....	38
Appendix G: MKAD KM Activities .....	50
Appendix H: Sample MKAD KM Activities .....	55
Appendix I: MKAD Partners and Team Members .....	56

## Introduction

---

Optimizing the development and well-being of children, youth, and families is a key goal in Canadian society, and mobilizing research-based knowledge to improve programs and policies in this area is critical for reaching this goal. Since 2006, the Community-University Partnership for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families (CUP) and the Alberta Centre for Child, Family and Community Research (The Centre) have been partners in the Mobilizing Knowledge About Development (MKAD) project. The purpose of the project was to study, develop, and enhance knowledge-mobilization (KM) initiatives that build capacity on campus and in community to engage in collaborative, interdisciplinary, and sustainable relationships that support the development of children, youth, and families.

*MKAD describes knowledge mobilization (KM) as: the movement (i.e., creation, dissemination, exchange, and use) of information (e.g., research, experiential, and “how-to” information) among stakeholder groups (i.e., researchers and community members).*

### Background

In July 2000, the Community-University Partnership for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families (CUP) was formed to improve the development of children, youth, and families by promoting interactions among researchers and community members (e.g., practitioners, policy-makers, families) in the areas of research, knowledge sharing, and lifelong learning. CUP aims to fulfill its mandate by engaging in consulting and brokering, and leading community-based research and evaluation projects.

The Alberta Centre for Child, Family and Community Research (The Centre) was created in April 2003 to improve the well-being of children, families, and communities in Alberta, Canada, and internationally, by mobilizing research evidence into policy and practice. By developing, funding, supporting, and integrating research across sectors and disciplines, The Centre provides an evidence-based foundation for identifying and promoting effective public policy and practice. The Centre creates opportunities and provides grants for researchers to exchange knowledge with policy makers and service providers through symposia, research meetings, and project-development groups.

Stakeholders (i.e., researchers and community members) affiliated with CUP and The Centre have long perceived the potential of KM to influence policy, practice, and programs. KM depends on the capacity of community members to participate in and understand research findings and on the capacity of researchers to collaborate effectively with community members. In 2005, CUP and The Centre applied for the pilot Knowledge Impact in Society grant offered by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). A needs assessment was also conducted at that time to determine local interest in developing capacity on campus and in community in the area of community-based research and evaluation (CBRE). On this foundation, MKAD was launched.

### Project Goals

The two goals were to (a) evaluate selected KM activities at CUP and The Centre to learn how to mobilize knowledge effectively in these contexts and (b) develop and implement opportunities (e.g., workshops, graduate courses) designed to build capacity on campus and in the community to work together in leading and participating in CBRE. CBRE can be inherently oriented to KM because those that are creating and using research information are working

together and learning from each other through a partnership that lasts the duration of the CBRE project (Graham et al., 2006; Leadbeater, Marshall, & Banister, 2007). For this reason MKAD members have also designed and implemented opportunities to learn about CBRE. That is, we seek to introduce people to ways of building relationships to create, share, and apply knowledge throughout a research process.

*CBRE is an approach to research and evaluation in which partners from the community, university, and/or government collaborate for mutually beneficial outcomes. Partners develop principles for working together and jointly determine the scale and scope of their projects. Partners contribute according to their diverse expertise, experiences, and interests at various times throughout the project. An overall goal of CBRE is to create, share, and mobilize knowledge in ways that can inform policy, practice, and research and evaluation.*

## Two Areas of Activities in MKAD

1. **Evaluating Knowledge-Mobilization Activities:** To enhance understanding of KM in the context of CUP and The Centre, a conceptual KM framework was developed that is intended for use by individuals and organizations seeking to improve the development and well-being of children, youth, and families. The framework was used to guide the evaluation and development of KM activities carried out by The Centre and CUP (see Appendix E).

<b>KM Activities Evaluated by MKAD</b>	
<p><b>Graduate Courses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>EDPY 612: Research Practicum in Psychological Studies in Education: Community-Based Educational Psychology (CUP)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>INT-D 500: An Introduction to Community-Based Research and Evaluation (CUP)</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Networking Circles</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>CBREnet (CUP)</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Presentations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Developmental Screening with Immigrant and Refugee Families (CUP)</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Symposia</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Early Childhood Measurement and Evaluation Resource Centre (ECMERC) Symposium (CUP)</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Families First Edmonton Learning Event (CUP)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Family Violence Policy Forum (The Centre)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>The Many Faces of Childhood Well-Being: The Early Years (2 to 6) (The Centre)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>The Many Faces of Childhood Well-Being: The Middle Years (7 to 10) (The Centre)</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Workshops</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>CBRE Workshop Series (CUP, The Centre)</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Written Reports</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Reproduction in Alberta: A Look at the Preconception, Prenatal, and Postnatal Periods (The Centre)</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Webcasts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>TV, Computers, and Outdoor Play: Their Effect on Your Child's Social and Emotional Development (The Centre, The Norlien Foundation)</i></li> </ul>

2. **Building Capacity for Community-Based Research and Evaluation:** Recognizing a need for enhanced local capacity for collaborative, interdisciplinary, sustainable knowledge creation, exchange, and application, MKAD developed the following opportunities to learn about community-based research and evaluation (CBRE) (see Appendix B):
  - A six-part CBRE Workshop Series:

### **CBRE Workshop Series**

*Workshop #1: An Introduction to Community-Based Research & Evaluation (CBRE)*  
*Workshop #2: Doing Community-Based Research (CBR) Well: Ethically & with Rigour*  
*Workshop #3: Building CBR Partnerships*  
*Workshop #4: Developing CBR Projects: The 'How'*  
*Workshop #5: Program Evaluation with a Community-Based Approach*  
*Workshop #6: Making a Difference with CBR: Mobilizing Knowledge to Inform Policy & Practice*

- The series has given rise to:
  - Customized CBRE workshops
  - CBREnet (a local learning community)
  - Curriculum development with Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH) for Research-Ethics Board members in Canada and the United States
  - Research regarding issues of ethics and rigour in CBRE
- A Graduate Certificate Program in CBRE that requires twelve graduate credits as specified below and one non-credit CBRE experience:
  - Course on the conceptual and theoretical background of CBRE (INT-D 500, *An Introduction to Community-Based Research & Evaluation*) [This is an MKAD product that has been studied as a KM activity.]
  - Course on program planning and evaluation
  - Course on quantitative research methodologies
  - Course on qualitative research methodologies

### **The Conceptual KM Framework**

Through MKAD, we at CUP and The Centre have gained insight into ways in which knowledge about the development and well-being of children, youth, and families across disciplines (e.g., health, education) is moving among an array of stakeholders (e.g., researchers and community members such as practitioners and policy makers). The knowledge that we are seeking to mobilize is diverse as it includes not only research information, but also, for example, experiential and “how-to” information.<sup>1</sup> In many cases, KM is an integral component of projects at CUP and The Centre and the roles of information creators and users blend as they co-create and share knowledge. However, the opportunities that arose in MKAD to evaluate KM activities were often ones in which KM took place near the end of a project. There were also instances where the KM activity was developed to share information that was not directly related to a research/evaluation project.

To begin to understand KM, key researchers in the field were contacted and a review of the literature within various disciplines (e.g., health, social sciences) was conducted. **MKAD conceptualized KM as the movement (i.e., creation, dissemination, exchange, and use) of information (e.g., research, experiential, and “how-to” information) among stakeholder groups (i.e., researchers and community members).** It was acknowledged that the experience and knowledge from those engaged in the community (e.g., practitioners, policy makers) can be used to inform and guide research, and research findings can be applied to practices and policies in the community to maximize the healthy development of children, youth, and families.

Early in the MKAD project, team members realized that to study CUP and The Centre’s KM activities, **a conceptual KM framework was required that could be used to describe how**

---

<sup>1</sup> These words were used by participants of the KM activities.

**research could be used to inform policy and practice.**<sup>2</sup> The conceptual KM framework could then be used to guide the evaluation of selected end-of-project<sup>3</sup> KM activities at CUP and The Centre. Fundamental to the development of the conceptual KM framework was the work of Dobbins, Ciliska, Cockerill, Barnsley, and DiCenso (2002); Dobbins, Ciliska, Estabrooks, and Hayward (2005); Fleuren, Wiefferink, and Paulussen (2004); Graham et al. (2006); Greenhalgh, Robert, Macfarlane, Bate, and Kyriakidou (2004); Logan and Graham (1998); Rogers (2003); Rycroft-Malone (2004); and Stetler (1994, 2001). Conceptual elements from the work of these authors were selected and modified to create a conceptual KM framework that was appropriate for the MKAD context. In addition, we drew from work by Bubolz and Sontag (1993) who recognized that humans have interdependent relationships with various key contexts (e.g., organizational, societal) and that they interact with these contexts in complex ways.

As MKAD proceeded, an appreciation for stakeholders as adult learners gradually emerged. As a result, we increasingly turned to the adult-learning literature and gained an appreciation that the greater the interactivity of activities (e.g., the CBRE Workshops), the more effective the benefit for learners (Schuh, Burdette, Schultz, & Silver, 2008) and their participation in knowledge mobilization. This ‘aha’ informed our evaluation work.

Following are the key assumptions of MKAD’s customized, end-of-project, conceptual KM framework:

1. The KM process can be described by several characteristics:
  - a. It is a social process where over time new knowledge is communicated among members of a social system, which may ultimately lead to its use or application.
  - b. It is a non-linear process such that information users may move back and forth between the elements of the process (e.g., from sharing information, to making decisions, and then seeking more information).
  - c. It is an iterative process wherein information users may begin the process again at any time (e.g., after evaluating outcomes information users may take part in the creation of new information).
  - d. It is influenced by the characteristics of the *people involved* [e.g., the information creators, information users, the individuals or groups ultimately affected by the information use (i.e., children and families)] and *their key contexts* (e.g., the KM activity, their organizations, local neighborhoods, communities).
2. Key elements of the process are:
  - a. Information Creation – Takes place when information creators develop new information to be disseminated and exchanged at a KM activity. Ideally information

---

<sup>2</sup> The conceptual KM framework is a collation of assumptions taken from the work of others and modified to fit the MKAD context. The conceptual framework includes assumptions that require testing, whereas a theoretical framework includes assumptions that are based on empirical evidence and has predictive capability. We hope to continue to develop the conceptual framework further based on the findings from the MKAD project and our understanding of the KM literature. A goal would be to develop a theoretical KM framework that incorporates assumptions based on empirical evidence and has predictive capability.

<sup>3</sup> The use of the phrase, end-of-project, is used in acknowledgement of the knowledge-translation (KT) discourse used by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR). CIHR distinguishes between two types of KT: “end-of-grant” KT and “integrated KT”. The former refers to dissemination-type work near the end of a research project while the latter refers to knowledge creation, exchange, and use throughout a project. “Integrated KT” is characterized by collaboration with similarities to community-based research (CBR). (See Kitson & Bisby, 2008.)

- users are involved in this process as well and the roles of information creators and users blend as they co-create and share knowledge.
- b. Information Dissemination – A one-way movement of information that takes place during the KM activity when information creators (e.g., researchers) present information to potential information users (e.g., practitioners, policy makers) using, for example, face-to-face or written methods.
  - c. Information Exchange – A multi-directional movement of information that may take place during the KM activity through opportunities for interaction (e.g., question and answer, networking breaks, group discussions) between information creators and users, and among information users.
  - d. Evidence-Informed Decision Making – Takes place when information users decide to what degree to use the information and how to apply it.
  - e. Information Utilization – Takes place when information users actually use or apply the information gained through the KM activity (e.g., to increase knowledge or change a program or practice).
  - f. Evaluation of Outcomes – Takes place when the information creators and/or users may evaluate the impact of the information use to determine if it was beneficial for the people involved or their key contexts.

### **The MKAD Lens**

MKAD used its conceptual KM framework, along with the objectives of each KM activity and the research questions that were identified, to guide the study of KM activities carried out by The Centre and CUP. In effect, the framework, each activity's purpose, and associated research questions served as an analytic lens. MKAD used this lens to interpret the findings from each evaluation. In turn, the findings were used to inform the planning and evaluation of subsequent KM activities, and ultimately, the further development of the conceptual KM framework.

---

## **Activities**

---

The MKAD project was composed of two goals and associated sets of activities: (1) the evaluation of selected KM activities at CUP and The Centre to learn how to mobilize knowledge effectively in these contexts, and (2) the development and implementation of several opportunities (e.g., workshops, graduate courses) designed to build capacity on campus and in the community to engage in community-based research and evaluation (CBRE).

### **1. Evaluating Knowledge-Mobilization Activities**

Twelve KM activities (e.g., workshops, symposia, graduate courses, written documents) were evaluated by CUP and The Centre to learn about existing KM activities and to develop greater KM effectiveness (see the textbox on p. 8 and Appendix A). The KM activities varied in terms of (a) the point at which they took place during a research/evaluation project and (b) to what degree there was a balance between information dissemination and exchange. Various tools were used to evaluate the KM strategies, such as surveys, interviews, and focus groups. Evaluation data were collected often, but not always, at the time of the KM activity, and in many instances, again after the activity took place (e.g., follow-up surveys a year later). Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analyzed (Appendix C). The research questions addressed by the evaluations were:

1. Who are the potential information users at CUP and The Centre events?
2. How can CUP and The Centre develop effective ways to mobilize knowledge?
3. How does the KM process work in these activities?

During MKAD, KM often took place at the end of The Centre/CUP projects. However, we took the opportunity to study the CBRE Workshop Series and graduate course (INT-D 500) as KM activities as they were being developed. Findings emerging from these evaluations were then used to inform the on-going development of these capacity-building activities.

## 2. Building Capacity for Community-Based Research and Evaluation

One way to do KM is by ensuring that the research information is meaningful and relevant to potential information users. Community-based research and evaluation (CBRE) is one approach to achieving such a goal. CBRE can be inherently oriented to KM because those that are creating and using research information are working together and learning from each other through a partnership that lasts the duration of the CBRE project (Graham et al., 2006; Leadbeater et al., 2007). To this end, MKAD members have designed and implemented opportunities to learn about CBRE (see the textbox on p. 8 and Appendix B). That is, we seek to introduce people to ways of building relationships to create, share, and apply knowledge throughout a research process (i.e., “integrated” KM).

To build capacity on campus and in the community to engage in CBRE, the following activities were undertaken:

- a. *CBRE Workshop Series*: This series was designed to build capacity among those who are working with children, youth, and families in such areas as service delivery, policymaking, and research. The series consists of six distinct, full-day workshops. From the initial pilot to the end of the MKAD project, 16 workshops were offered. This series has given rise to requests for customized workshops, a new learning community (CBREnet), and an invitation to contribute to an international, CBR-training curriculum for members of research-ethics boards in Canada and the United States. CBREnet is a network open to all, in Edmonton and Central Alberta, who are interested in ongoing learning about CBRE and in establishing and maintaining CBRE relationships. Please see Appendix B for additional information about the CBRE Workshop Series.
- b. *Graduate Certificate Program in CBRE*: Over time, community members and researchers have asserted that conventional, discipline-based, graduate education only begins to prepare people for participating in or leading CBRE projects. An understanding of the principles behind interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral collaborations, large-scale project management, and political savvy can enable this work. To respond to this need for capacity, a certificate program at the University of Alberta was developed to complement graduate students' education. The program is in the final stages of approval within the University of Alberta. The core, required course<sup>4</sup> for the program has been offered twice since January 2009. Please see Appendix B for more information about the Graduate Certificate Program in CBRE.

---

## Findings from Evaluating Knowledge-Mobilization Activities

---

A variety of KM strategies and events carried out by CUP and The Centre (e.g., workshops, symposia, graduate courses, written documents) were evaluated to learn more about the KM

---

<sup>4</sup> **INT-D 500**: Introduction to Community-Based Research & Evaluation (CBRE). Syllabus available in Appendix F.

process and how to develop effective ways to mobilize knowledge in our context (see the textbox on p. 7 and Appendix A). The findings from the evaluations for each of the research questions are discussed in this next section.

### 1. Who are the potential information users?

The KM activities attracted participants who came from many professions (e.g., researchers, practitioners, policy makers, students, parents) and disciplines (e.g., health, education). Participants were mainly female and had a college or university education. However, they varied in their levels of experience and background knowledge about the content covered at the KM activities. Participants' purposes for attending KM events were similar and included such reasons as the content was related to their work or interests; and, they wanted to increase understanding about specific topics, to hear from certain speakers, to share/exchange information with others, and/or to apply what they learn to their work.

### 2. How can we develop effective ways to mobilize knowledge?

CUP and The Centre's KM activities were effective at mobilizing knowledge to potential information users. The effectiveness of the KM strategies was studied in terms of (a) organization of the activity, (b) information dissemination, (c) information exchange, and (d) information use.

- (a) *Organization of the activities.* Participants who attended the activities (e.g., symposia, workshops) thought they were well organized—they liked the venues, food, breaks, presenters/facilitators, parking, and low cost of the events. Barriers to attendance were often related to the time required to attend the KM activity and the difficulty of taking time away from work. *Cost was also mentioned as an important factor; KM activities that had no associated costs or that had costs of no more than \$30 to \$50 were deemed accessible.*
- (b) *Information dissemination.* The methods of information dissemination (e.g., presentations, handbooks) that were employed during the KM activities were viewed by participants as effective and the content disseminated was perceived to be relevant, useful, and appropriate. Participants attended the KM activities to learn more about the topic covered and to gain information that they could apply in their work or home settings, and they reported that their expectations were generally met. *Methods of dissemination (e.g., case studies, concrete examples) that provided more than one type of information, such as content, "how-to", and experiential information, were described as particularly useful.* These methods were also good at linking the dissemination and exchange that took place during the KM activity because they provided content and involved discussion and interactivity. Even more useful were KM activities that provided opportunities for participants to practice application of the newly acquired information because these opportunities helped build relevant knowledge and skills (e.g., EDPY 612 Practicum Experience course).

Participants *recommended* ways in which information dissemination could be made more effective during the KM activities. *They suggested that more information related to the content of the KM activity, a greater variety of perspectives (e.g., research, practice, policy), and more kinds of information, especially "how-to" and experiential, should be provided. The information presented should also be more accessible and understandable in terms of language and content. And finally, more case studies, concrete examples, and first-hand knowledge should be provided to better illustrate the information content.*

- (c) *Information exchange.* The majority of participants also attended the KM activities to interact with others and reported that they *took part in some form of information exchange* (e.g.,

questions/answers, networking, group discussions) during the activity. The information exchange opportunities were particularly important because they (i) helped participants better understand and make sense of the disseminated knowledge, (ii) provided participants with affirming and new or different perspectives, (iii) provided participants with additional kinds of knowledge (e.g., “how-to” and “first-hand experience”), (iv) helped participants strengthen existing relationships and build new ones with relevant people, (v) helped participants share information about their work, and (vi) helped participants develop new ideas or projects.

*Relationship building was viewed as a particularly important function of the information-exchange opportunities.* Participants were able to build relationships with others who had specific skills and knowledge (e.g., about CBRE or child development) related to the content of the KM activity. These relationships also helped participants continue to learn and exchange information after the KM activity took place. Participants perceived that the people with whom they built relationships were well positioned to provide future support to them in their work. Participants mentioned that the relationships acted as points of reference required to facilitate the development of communities of practice [i.e., “groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly” (Wenger, 2006)].

Participants continued to disseminate and exchange information *after the KM activity took place* by sharing the information with colleagues and by reconnecting with other participants. *Reconnecting with other attendees helped participants process the activity information and provided new information. For instance, participants reported talking about the KM activity, how to use the activity information, how to share the activity information with colleagues, what they did at work, and how to get buy-in from other decision-makers (e.g., policy makers).* Exchanging information after the KM activity took place with other participants also helped to build and maintain relationships in local regions and across the province.

Participants recommended ways in which they could be supported to *disseminate the activity information further* to colleagues and others. Participants suggested distribution of written summaries of the disseminated information (e.g., PowerPoint slides, handouts, references) and the information-exchange moments (e.g., summaries of group discussions). Presenters’ contact information was also requested, preferably through on-line means for accessibility purposes.

To help participants *continue to exchange information* with colleagues and attendees after the KM activities took place it was suggested that the following be provided: (i) more information-exchange opportunities during the event, (ii) a participant contact list, (iii) web-based forums (e.g., listservs, social-networking tools) after the event, and (iv) a facilitator who could manage and implement further information-exchange opportunities after the activity took place. On-line resources were mentioned as a particularly useful way of facilitating information dissemination and exchange both during and after a KM activity took place.

- (d) *Information use.* Participants reported that they and their organizations used the KM activity information during and after the activity took place. In keeping with the literature on information use, participants were more likely to increase their knowledge or understanding (conceptual use) or use the activity information to support a decision already made at work (symbolic use), than they were to use the activity information to modify a program or practice

(instrumental use; Appendix D).<sup>5</sup> Participants also reported additional categories of information use, such as using the activity information to motivate and inspire, to seek further information, to share it with colleagues, and to develop relationships and partnerships.

Participants believed that their organizations were less likely to use the KM activity information than they were. Yet, participants believed that when their organizations did use the activity information, the organizations were likely to do so in ways consistent with participant use.

**3. How does KM work within CUP and The Centre and other organizations with similar mandates?**

To study and develop effective mobilization activities, MKAD recognized a need to develop a context-specific conceptual framework by refining existing models to fit MKAD’s specific contexts and information user groups. The findings from the evaluations supported several of the assumptions of MKAD’s conceptual KM framework. In sum, we learned that:

- ❖ KM is a social process and opportunities for information exchange involving face-to-face interaction are a vital part of this process. Social interaction and relationship building helped participants engage with and use new information during and after the KM activities took place.
- ❖ The KM process is influenced by the characteristics of the people involved and their key contexts (e.g., characteristics of the KM activity, information creators, information users, and their organizations). For example, our findings indicated that the *characteristics of the people and their contexts influenced the likelihood of information use* (see Table 1 below).

Table 1: Characteristics of People and Contexts that Influenced the Likelihood of Information Use	
Characteristics of People and Contexts	Examples of Findings
Characteristics of the KM activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Participants who thought the KM activity was effective were more likely to report information use (e.g., conceptual, symbolic, and instrumental).</li> <li>▪ Participants who exchanged information during and/or after the KM activity were more likely to report information use (e.g., conceptual, symbolic, and instrumental).</li> <li>▪ Participants who had opportunities to apply the knowledge that they gained while they were participating in the KM activity (e.g., workshops, graduate courses) were better able to engage with the information and developed better skills.</li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> These three ‘use’ terms arise from the KM literature. The conceptualizations of each term are as yet ambiguous in the literature. It is thought that “instrumental use” is relatively rare and less prevalent than “conceptual use” (e.g., Weiss, 1981, p. 23 – cites others). Weiss (1981) suggests that decision-makers continually obtain information from a variety of sources, which leads to changes in understanding, attitudes, and behaviours over time, rather than relying upon any particular piece of new information to inform a decision.

<b>Table 1 continued...</b>	
<b>Characteristics of People and Contexts</b>	<b>Examples of Findings</b>
Characteristics of facilitators of the KM activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Presenters or facilitators who engaged the audience and were responsive to questions were effective at encouraging information use (e.g., symbolic, instrumental).</li> <li>▪ CBRE workshop participants appreciated the facilitator's style, enthusiasm, the way in which she made concepts easily understandable, and the atmosphere that she created because these characteristics created an environment that was conducive to learning.</li> <li>▪ Students in the INT-D 500 course reported the instructor was well prepared, had a high level of expertise, was respectful, and good at engaging students to reflect critically on the course content.</li> </ul>
Characteristics of participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Participants with more education, more prior knowledge, better research appraisal skills, more willingness to change, greater authority to make decisions, better resources (e.g., time, training, funding), and who valued the use of research in decision-making were more likely to report intended or actual information use (e.g., conceptual, symbolic, or instrumental).</li> </ul>
Characteristics of participants' contexts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Participants were more likely to report using the activity information when their organizations involved staff in decision-making.</li> <li>▪ Participants reported that their organizations were more likely to use the activity information when it was disseminated and exchanged with them, when their organizations valued the use of research evidence in decision-making, when their organizations valued new information in general, and when their organizations provided adequate resources to staff to implement decisions.</li> <li>▪ Lack of resources (e.g., time, funding, personnel) and opportunities were described as organizational characteristics leading to less information use.</li> <li>▪ Characteristics of other organizations or contexts were also mentioned as factors influencing the likelihood of information use (e.g., other organizational cultures, political climates).</li> </ul>

**Note:** The examples of findings listed in the table above should be considered preliminary and in need of further study to enable strong conclusions to be drawn.

- ❖ Participants engaged in information dissemination, information exchange, and information utilization during and after the KM activity, leading us to conclude that these are vital elements of the KM process in the MKAD context.

As the evaluations of the KM activities proceeded, we have reflected on the ways in which community-based research and evaluation (CBRE) is characterized by collaboration from 'start to finish'. We also thought about how such ongoing dialogue between partners would support

knowledge exchange, co-creation, and use or application. Next, we turn to a brief overview of results from the CBRE capacity-building activities.

## **Results from Building Capacity in Community-Based Research and Evaluation**

---

In this section we offer a snapshot of the results of the two primary activities of MKAD's capacity-building work (see Appendix B for a listing of activities that arose from the primary activities.)

Important to note is that collaboration between information creators and users took place during the planning stages for these two KM activities (i.e., the series and the course). An extensive needs assessment was conducted in 2006 on campus and in the Edmonton community. The report indicated strong support for the development of on-campus and in-community CBRE capacity. Graduate students, faculty members, and a wide range of governmental and community partners supported the development of a certificate program and workshops. The needs assessment informed the design and development of both the Workshop Series and the Graduate Certificate Program (including the graduate course, INT-D 500). In the initial development of the workshops in the spring of 2007, additional meetings with community groups and the MKAD Advisory Committee offered user-oriented input. Each end-of-workshop evaluation survey informed the fine-tuning of each workshop as it was piloted and then offered again. The mid-term report regarding the series helped inform the workshops offered since August 2008. Workshop participants' contributions in follow-up focus groups will continue to shape the series. Similarly, input from the first cohort of students (Winter 2009) in the graduate course informed its further development for the second cohort of students (Fall 2009).

### *CBRE Workshop Series*

The CBRE Workshop Series has attracted stakeholders (i.e., researchers and community members such as practitioners and policy makers) with a great diversity of experiences with CBRE (see sidebar on p. 9 and Appendix B for the list of workshops). Just over 20 participants participated in a typical workshop and many participants attended multiple workshops indicating that the workshop series is effectively meeting a need in the community and on campus. Organizations represented at the workshops included community agencies, municipal and provincial government, and the Universities of Alberta, Calgary, and Lethbridge. (See Appendix E for list of organizations.) Participants' prior experience with CBRE included theoretical knowledge and/or involvement in all aspects in a great variety of roles, from participant to consultant to researcher to manager. The workshops were designed to build on the expertise not only of the facilitator and guest speakers, but also on the experiences and knowledge of workshop participants. The diversity in roles and experiences enriched the workshops for other participants.

The various formats of information delivery used throughout the workshops (i.e., discussions, case studies, exercises, and presentations) and their organization (i.e., how they complemented and linked to one another) supported participants in gaining conceptual, methodological, and 'partnerological'<sup>6</sup> competencies and engaging with the information through critical thinking and discussion. The workshop format was found to support participant learning and engagement.

---

<sup>6</sup> In response to a need for a descriptor for a type of competence regarding relationship and partnership building and maintenance, MKAD coined this term, *partnerological*.

The CBRE Workshop Series is meeting a need not only among diverse community members but also academically based researchers to provide information about CBRE in a format that is supportive of their learning. The objectives of the CBRE Workshop Series are being met and there is an indication from participant responses that the knowledge they have gained has in some cases transformed their prior assumptions and perspectives. In supporting participants' conceptual, methodological, and relationship-building competencies and providing opportunities for relationship building, the CBRE workshops support participant capacity to engage in CBRE.

*Graduate Course: "An Introduction to Community-Based Research and Evaluation (CBRE)" (INT-D 500, University of Alberta) (Please see Appendix F for course syllabus.)*

The results of the evaluation show the course objectives were effectively met through a variety of means including the instructor, course resources, and collaborative opportunities including guest speakers, in-class discussions, and group work. The course provided a way to build knowledge and capacity about CBRE in the university context, engaging a new generation of researchers in CBRE. Students reported that they not only intended to apply what they had learned to their own future research and practice, but that they also had or were intending to share this knowledge with their colleagues.

## Lessons Learned

---

CUP and The Centre have responded to the purpose of the MKAD project: To study, develop, and enhance knowledge-mobilization (KM) initiatives that build capacity on campus and in community to engage in collaborative, interdisciplinary, sustainable relationships in support of the development of children, youth, and families. A great deal of progress and enhanced understanding has occurred. We have evaluated and developed effective ways to support our context of stakeholders to use research findings in decision making. We have developed a conceptual framework that depicts the process of end-of-project KM at CUP and The Centre and used this framework to guide the evaluation of strategies to engage our context in KM. We have designed and implemented opportunities for stakeholders to learn about CBRE to, for example, engage in evidence-based decision making. In addition, we have studied those CBRE capacity-building efforts as KM activities. From these activities we have identified several lessons learned:

1. *Working in partnership:* As partners in the MKAD project, we have come to appreciate anew the time required to develop collaborative relationships. A vital part of the success of the MKAD project is due to the development and maintenance of the relationship between the project partners (i.e., CUP and The Centre); between the partners and the University of Alberta; among the partners and potential information users; and among project staff. For some KM activities, collaboration between information creators and users was critical in planning stages. As time passed, staff turnover occurred, particularly as students who were mentored proceeded with their studies. Such transitions required training resources (e.g., time), yet also led to fresh perspectives and new ideas, and provided opportunities for reflection on progress within various parts of MKAD.
2. *Understanding our context:* We have learned about and appreciated intersectoral realities when using, developing, and studying KM strategies. Even as we have studied KM theory, we have also learned first-hand how to facilitate the integration of multiple perspectives, garner mutual trust and rapport, and facilitate the development and maintenance of relationships among diverse stakeholder groups in support of the development and well-

being of children, youth, and families. We have come to appreciate how 'context' is an influencing factor in our KM process.

3. *Participating in KM as a learner.* We have adopted an informal motto: 'we are learning as we go' and have found this to be a useful way to approach the progression of our work on MKAD. Early in our work, we needed to enhance our understanding of KM. To that end, we undertook to study current thinking about KM and CBRE. That foundation has proven to be invaluable for informing the design and implementation of both initiatives. We have engaged in an iterative process; as MKAD has evolved, we have applied our findings to develop further our understanding of KM theory and practice, refined the activities in which we engaged, and developed our own plan for mobilizing the results. By adopting this motto, we acknowledge that we are adult learners regarding KM like the participants of the various capacity-building events and KM activities that we studied. (For sample MKAD KM activities, see Appendix H.) In particular we have learned:
  - ❖ How to develop and implement KM activities more effectively at CUP and The Centre. For example, we have enhanced our understanding of current and potential information users and of that which makes a KM activity effective for them.
  - ❖ That the conceptual KM framework may be a good representation of the KM process within CUP and The Centre. However, more work needs to be done to learn more about the KM process within this context and to refine the conceptual KM framework. For example, we have learned that KM is a social process and that information exchange and relationship building are vital components of this process. We also found preliminary evidence that facilitation and context variables are important and will need to be incorporated in the conceptual KM framework.<sup>7</sup>
  - ❖ That as we have enhanced our understanding of KM, we have observed that learning opportunities in which individuals discuss and debate content can support the movement of that content into practice. Given that KM is a social process, time is required for this ongoing dialogue and for relationships to be built and maintained (Graham et al., 2006; Vella, 2008). During this time, learners are reflecting on their own knowledge and work contexts, considering the new content, finding connections between their prior understanding and the content, and then beginning to apply it (Vella, 2008). To that end, MKAD has built in interactive time in workshops and courses and facilitated post-event networking. In other words, while we have strived to create opportunities for participants to learn, we have also been supporting KM about CBRE.
  
4. *Facilitating change at the University of Alberta:* Various resources have been required to facilitate change at the University of Alberta. The Graduate Certificate Program in CBRE with its interdisciplinary course, INT-D 500, is precedent setting as a graduate opportunity and finding a place for it at the University has required time and funding. The program was designed, proposed, re-designed, and proposed again through two different channels within the University structure before it was approved as an embedded, graduate credit certificate. Given that little precedence for this type of credential exists at the University,<sup>8</sup> MKAD partners worked with university administration and maintained a dialogue with community members. The Graduate Certificate Program will be a first step in a new phase in the

---

<sup>7</sup> Kitson et al. (2008) view facilitators as people who work with individuals and teams to help implement evidence into practice. MKAD has learned that facilitators of KM activities can fulfill this role and that variability in facilitators can help or hinder the process of KM.

<sup>8</sup> Interest in the development of this program has been expressed from across the North American CBRE community of practice.

Faculty of Extension's graduate programming, consistent with the Faculty's intellectual domain of the scholarship of engagement.

5. *Building a community*: The MKAD project has had many impacts on the community (e.g., practitioners, policy-makers, families). We have had requests for assistance based on the awareness that CUP and The Centre are studying KM activities as related to CBRE capacity building. In addition, many people from the community have participated in the CBRE workshops, and we receive regular requests for customized CBRE workshops. A community of interest is growing around CBRE. Based on workshop participants' initiative, MKAD has helped to establish CBREnet, a network of local service providers, policy makers, researchers, students, and members of our broader communities. Through participation in CBREnet, MKAD continues to learn about the interests and needs of this learning community and applies that new knowledge to ongoing refinement of learning activities.
6. *Linking CBRE and KM*: Community-based research and evaluation can be inherently oriented to KM because those that are creating and using the information are working together and learning from each other throughout a partnership (Graham et al., 2006; Leadbeater et al., 2007). Although the KM activities studied by MKAD often took place at the end of projects, the parallel development and study of the capacity-building activities afforded an opportunity to enhance MKAD's understanding about the role of information exchange. As a result, we are considering further development of the conceptual KM framework to incorporate information exchange earlier in the process in a way that is consistent with CBRE principles. We also see the potential to study further the importance of informed facilitation within the KM process (Kitson, 2009; McWilliam, 2007; McWilliam et al., 2009) and to enhance our understanding of KM participants as adult learners with diverse learning styles (Bogenschneider, Olson, Linney, & Mills, 2000). This direction seems timely given how MKAD's work sits within what may be a societal shift characterized increasingly by "socially distributed knowledge" (Nowotny, Scott, & Gibbons, 2003, p. 180).

## **Next Steps for CUP and The Centre**

---

To design effective KM and capacity-building activities, CUP and The Centre will consider how to:

- ❖ Dedicate time to building and maintaining relationships with diverse stakeholder groups, on campus and in the community. We will devote particular attention to further understanding potential knowledge-user groups and their learning needs and interests.
- ❖ Continue to identify factors that help and constrain this relationship building and maintenance and to develop strategies in response to and in anticipation of such factors.
- ❖ Improve the effectiveness of KM activities at CUP and The Centre by:
  - Ensuring sufficient time for information dissemination and exchange;
  - Providing adequate "how-to" information;
  - Drawing on participants' real-life experiences;
  - Ensuring plenty of 'hands-on' time to practice using knowledge;
  - Exploring further how facilitation can impact the KM process; and
  - Promoting cultural shifts that will enhance information use (e.g., increasing capacity to engage in CBRE).
- ❖ Continue to dedicate resources to managing the Graduate Certificate Program in CBRE at the University of Alberta.
- ❖ Continue to facilitate the development of learning communities around CBRE. Ways to do that include participating in CBREnet; integrating the CBRE Workshop Series into

core CUP offerings; customizing CBRE workshops in response to local interest; and engaging in dialogue with people in policy, practice, and research settings (e.g., potential work together between CUP and The Centre in conversation with local First Nations communities in support of the development and well-being of children, youth, and families).

- ❖ Dedicate time to studying and refining MKAD’s conceptual KM framework, particularly in relation to the importance of concepts such as evidence-based decision making, facilitation, key contexts, and evaluation of outcomes. Consider further development of the conceptual KM framework to incorporate information exchange earlier in the process in a way that is consistent with CBRE. Ultimately work toward the development of a theoretical KM framework that incorporates assumptions based on empirical evidence and has predictive capability. Frame our understanding of KM to fit within the next generation of KM theories that visualize KM as an organic living process, that is non-linear, has feedback loops, multi-level influences, and incorporates knowledge that is context dependent (Best, Mitton, Smith, & Bitz, 2010).
- ❖ Disseminate findings from the MKAD project as broadly as possible so as to contribute to the growing understanding of KM and CBRE capacity building.

## **Recommendations for Planning and Participating in KM Activities**

---

In this next section, we offer recommendations for effective ways to plan and attend KM activities so as to facilitate the movement of knowledge into practice and policy. The recommendations arise from the implications of MKAD’s work.

### **To Plan Successful KM Activities:**

- ✓ When planning activities, use collaborative approaches and facilitate discussions with information creators and users.
- ✓ Use a combination of strategies (e.g., face-to-face and written); it is crucial to incorporate social interactivity.
- ✓ Adapt the KM activity to target the expected audiences and their contexts.
  - Provide an adequate balance of dissemination (e.g., presentations) and exchange opportunities (e.g., Q/A, networking, group discussions),
  - Include diverse perspectives (e.g., research, evaluation, practice, policy),
  - Include various kinds of information (e.g., new research, “first-hand experience”, “how-to”),
  - Provide research information concurrently with “how-to” information.
    - Invite information creators to include “how-to” information within their presentations (e.g., case studies, concrete examples).
    - Design information exchange opportunities (e.g., group discussions) to help participants create “how-to” information and practice application of information.
  - Ensure the information disseminated is accessible (i.e., in terms of language and content).
- ✓ Facilitate continued dissemination and exchange among participants and their colleagues after the event.
- ✓ When possible, use on-line resources to disseminate and exchange information. Make registration information and presentation slides available prior to the KM activity and make additional resources available after the KM activity (e.g., participant contact lists, on-line forums). Consider how emerging social media might assist in KM efforts.
- ✓ Identify barriers and facilitators of the KM process (e.g., characteristics of the people involved and their key contexts) and develop strategies to address them. For example:

- Design advertising to target people who have some experience in the topic addressed by the KM activity or prepare them ahead of time by identifying necessary prior knowledge and skills. Also target people who have decision-making authority, come from organizations that value the use of research in decision-making, and have the resources available to implement these decisions.
- ✓ Encourage participants to monitor information utilization after the event and evaluate outcomes for the people involved and their key contexts.

### **To Enhance Participation in KM Activities:**

- ✓ Choose KM activities based on your level of experience and background knowledge. If necessary devote time to building some basic knowledge and skills prior to the KM activity.
- ✓ Make participating in knowledge-exchange opportunities and building relationships priorities. Ask questions of presenters and facilitators, network with others during breaks, and make an effort to participate in group discussions.
- ✓ Make sharing and exchanging information with colleagues in your organization and other attendees a priority after attending the activity. Check with activity planners to determine if additional resources are available (e.g., on-line summaries, on-line networking resources) to facilitate these activities.
- ✓ Use opportunities to exchange information with others to:
  - Talk about what you do and learn what others do,
  - Obtain new and different perspectives,
  - Find others with relevant skill sets who might be in a position to help or support you in your work,
  - Obtain and create “how-to” information,
  - Talk about the barriers and facilitators to information use, and
  - Talk about how to adapt the information to your context.
- ✓ Consider other options that can facilitate KM, such as enlisting the help of opinion leaders or champions in your organization.
- ✓ Monitor the information utilization in which you and others in your organization engage and consider evaluating the outcomes of this information use.
- ✓ Advocate for the creation of a culture in your organization where the use of research in decision-making is valued and people have the skills, training, and resources necessary to implement decisions.
- ✓ Consider *participating in communities-of-practice* related to your area of interest. “Groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly” (Wenger, 2006).

---

## **Conclusion**

The MKAD project, a partnership between the Community-University Partnership for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families (CUP) and the Alberta Centre for Child, Family and Community Research (The Centre), was developed in response to the special challenges inherent in community-based, collaborative work and knowledge mobilization. This project has enabled CUP and The Centre to recognize multiple types of knowledge and to understand how KM is a social process engaging individuals and organizations as learners. Knowledge mobilization (KM) is based, in part, on relationship building and maintenance whether in one-off KM events or in ongoing networks (e.g., learning communities). Building capacity about collaborative, partnership research, which may be characterized by KM, can be done in ways that support ongoing KM if adult learners have a role in shaping the learning communities that emerge.

Based on this partnership, we move into the future with enhanced understanding of how to support the co-creation of information as it is shared, exchanged, and applied in support of the development and well-being of children, youth, and families.

## References

---

- Best, A., Mitton, C., Smith, N., & Bitz, J. (2010, March 16). *Systems strategies for knowledge implementation: A review of conceptual models*. Paper presented at the 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual National Institutes of Health Conference on the Science of Dissemination and Implementation: Methods and Measurement held in Bethesda, MD.
- Bogenschneider, K., Olson, J. R., Linney, K. D., & Mills, J. (2000). Connecting research and policymaking: Implications for theory and practice from the family impact seminars. *Family Relations, 49*(3), 327-339.
- Bubolz, M., & Sontag, S. (1993). Human ecology theory. In P. Boss, W. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. Schumm, & S. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach* (pp. 419-448). New York: Plenum Press.
- Dobbins, M., Ciliska, D., Cockerill, R., Barnsley, J., & DiCenso, A. (2002). A framework for the dissemination and utilization of research for health-care policy and practice. *The Online Journal of Knowledge Synthesis for Nursing, 9*(7), 149-160.
- Dobbins, M., Ciliska, D., Estabrooks, C. A., & Hayward, S. (2005). Changing nursing practice in an organization. In M. Dobbins, D. Ciliska, C. A. Estabrooks, & S. Hayward (Eds.), *Evidence-based nursing. A guide to clinical practice* (pp. 172-200). Philadelphia: Elsevier.
- Fleuren, M., Wiefferink, K., & Paulussen, P., (2004). Determinants of innovation within health care organizations. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care, 16*(2), 107-123.
- Graham, I., Logan, J., Harrison, M., Straus, S., Tetroe, J., Caswell, W., et al. (2006). Lost in knowledge translation: Time for a map? *The Journal for Continuing Education in the Health Professions, 26*, 13-24.
- Greenhalgh, T., Robert, G., Macfarlane, F., Bate, P., & Kyriakidou, O. (2004). Diffusion of innovations in service organizations: Systematic review and recommendations. *The Milbank Quarterly, 82*(4), 581-629.
- Kitson, A. L. (2009). The need for systems change: Reflections on knowledge translation and organizational change. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 65*(1), 217-228.
- Kitson, A. L., & Bisby, M. (2008). *Speeding up the spread: Putting KT research into practice and developing an integrated KT collaborative research agenda*. Background Paper sponsored by the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research as a primer for the KT08 Forum being held in Banff, Canada from June 9-11, 2008.
- Kitson, A. L., Rycroft-Malone, J., Harvey, G., McCormack, B., Seers, K., & Titchen, A. (2008). Evaluating the successful implementation of evidence into practice using the PARIHS framework: Theoretical and practical challenges. *Implementation Science, 3*(1). Retrieved Feb. 23, 2010, at: <http://www.implementationscience.com/content/3/1/1>
- Leadbeater, B., Marshall, A., & Banister, E. (2007). Building strengths through practice–research–policy collaborations. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America, 16*(2), 515-532.
- Logan, J., & Graham, I. (1998). Toward a comprehensive interdisciplinary model of health care research use. *Science Communication, 20*(2), 227-246.
- May, R. B., Masson, M. E. J., & Hunter, M. A. (1990). *Application of statistics in behavioral research*. New York: Harper & Row.
- McWilliam, C. L. (2007). Continuing education at the cutting edge: Promoting transformative knowledge translation. *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions, 27*(2), 72-79.
- McWilliam, C. L., Kothari, A., Ward-Griffin, C., Forbes, D., Leipert, B., & South West Community Care Access Centre Home Care Collaboration (SW-CCAC). (2009). Evolving the theory

- and praxis of knowledge translation through social interaction: A social phenomenological study. *Implementation Science*, 4, 4-26. Retrieved Feb. 16, 2010, from <http://www.implementationscience.com/content/4/1/26> .
- Nowotny, H., Scott, P., & Gibbons, M. (2003). 'Mode 2' revisited: The new production of knowledge. *Minerva*, 41, 179-194.
- Reed, G. M., Dilfer, K., Bufka, L. F., Scherer, M. J., Kotze, P., Tshivhase, M., et al. (2008). Three model curricula for teaching clinicians to use the ICF. *Disability & Rehabilitation*, 30(12), 927-941.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Rycroft-Malone, J. (2004). The PARIHS framework - A framework for guiding the implementation of evidence-based practice. *Journal of Nursing Care Quality*, 19(4), 297-304.
- Schuh, L., Burdette, D. E., Schultz, L., & Silver, B. (2008). Learning clinical neurophysiology: Gaming is better than lectures. *Journal of Clinical Neurophysiology*, 25(3), 167-169.
- Stetler, C. (1994). Refinement of the Stetler/Marram model for application of research findings to practice. *Nursing Outlook*, 42(1), 15-25.
- Stetler, C. (2001). Updating the Stetler model of research utilization to facilitate evidence-based practice. *Nursing Outlook*, 49(6), 272-279.
- Thorne, S., Kirkham, S. R., & MacDonald-Emes, J. (1997). Focus on qualitative methods. Interpretive description: A noncategorical qualitative alternative for developing nursing knowledge. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 20(2), 169-177.
- Thorne, S., Kirkham, S. R., & O'Flynn-Magee, K. (2004). The analytic challenge in interpretive description. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 3(1), 1-21.
- Vella, J. K. (2008). *On teaching and learning: Putting the principles and practices of dialogue education into action* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Weiss, C. (1981). Measuring the use of evaluation. In J. A. Ciarlo (Ed.), *Utilizing evaluation: Concepts and measurement techniques* (pp. 17-33). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Wenger, E. (2006). *Communities of practice: A brief introduction*. Retrieved Feb. 16, 2010, from: <http://www.ewenger.com/theory/index.htm> .

## Appendices

### Appendix A: Evaluating Knowledge-Mobilization Activities

<b>KM Activities Evaluated by MKAD</b>				
<b>KM Activity</b>	<b>Date / Location</b>	<b>Activity Type</b>	<b>Participant Information<sup>9</sup></b>	<b>Evaluation Reports</b>
Family Violence Policy Forum (The Centre)	November 1-2, 2006 / Calgary, AB	Policy Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100 participants</li> <li>• 22 survey responses (note: only 42 surveys were distributed)</li> <li>• 68.3% female</li> <li>• 22.7% researchers, 13.6% service providers, 4.5% students, 36.4% policymakers</li> </ul>	Summary of Findings (2007) Follow-Up Evaluation Report (2008)
EDPY 612: Research Practicum in Psychological Studies in Education: Community-Based Educational Psychology (CUP)	2006-2007 / Edmonton, AB	Graduate Practicum Course	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Semi-structured interviews at start and end of course</li> <li>• Students, community supervisors, and seminar instructor included</li> </ul>	Summary of Findings (2009)
Families First Edmonton Learning Event (CUP)	April 26, 2007 / Edmonton, AB	Learning Event	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 111 participants</li> <li>• 34 survey responses (31% response rate)</li> <li>• 67.6% service providers, 5.9% policymakers</li> </ul>	Summary of Findings (2007)
Reproduction in Alberta: A Look at the Preconception, Prenatal, and Postnatal Periods (The Centre)	Distributed May 2007 / Calgary, AB	Written Report Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 28 survey responses (10.2% response rate)</li> <li>• 96.4% female</li> <li>• 10.7% researchers, 46.4% service providers, 17.9% clinicians, and 14.3% administrators</li> </ul>	Evaluation Report (2007)

<sup>9</sup> Note that for participant roles, 'Other' was provided as a category, but results of this category were not reported here.

KM Activities Evaluated by MKAD				
KM Activity	Date / Location	Activity Type	Participant Information	Evaluation Reports
CBRE Workshop Series (CUP, The Centre)	May 29, 2007 to October 30, 2009 / Edmonton, AB	Workshops	<p><b>Initial survey:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 158 participants total</li> <li>• 144 survey responses from across the 10 workshops</li> <li>• 58.8% researchers, 29.0% service providers, and 12.2% policymakers</li> </ul> <p><b>Focus Group Interviews</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 interviews</li> <li>• 9 participants total</li> <li>• 2 male, 7 female</li> <li>• 4 researchers, 3 policy makers, 2 practitioners</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluation Mid-Term Report (2008) Evaluation Report (2010)</p> <p>Interviews Evaluation Report (2010)</p>
The Many Faces of Childhood Well-Being: The Early Years (2 to 6) (The Centre)	November 2007 / Edmonton, AB	Symposium	<p><b>Initial survey:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 481 participants</li> <li>• 190 survey responses (39.5% response rate)</li> <li>• 95% female</li> <li>• 4% researchers, 77% service providers, 1% parents/caregivers, 6% policymakers</li> </ul> <p><b>Follow-up survey:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 42 survey responses (33% response rate)</li> <li>• 88.2% female</li> <li>• 10.0% researchers, 80.0% service providers, 10.0% policymakers</li> </ul> <p><b>Follow-up Interviews</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• semi-structured interviews</li> <li>• 10 participants total</li> <li>• 9 female, 1 male</li> <li>• 3 policymakers, 6 practitioners, 1 with multiple roles</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluation Report (2008)</p> <p>Follow-Up Evaluation Report (2009)</p> <p>Interviews Evaluation Report (2010)</p>

KM Activities Evaluated by MKAD				
KM Activity	Date / Location	Activity Type	Participant Information	Evaluation Reports
Early Childhood Measurement and Evaluation Resource Centre (ECMERC) Symposium (CUP)	February 13, 2008 / Edmonton, AB	Symposium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 90 survey responses (40.2% response rate)</li> <li>• 88% female</li> <li>• 14% researchers, 58% service providers, 8% students, 2% parents/caregivers, and 18% policymakers.</li> </ul>	Evaluation Report (2009)
TV, Computers, and Outdoor Play: Their effect on your child's social and emotional development (The Centre, The Norlien Foundation)	November 2, 2008 / Calgary, AB	Webcast (i.e., on-line seminar)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 46 survey responses (9.8% response rate)</li> <li>• 90.0% female</li> <li>• Role information not collected</li> </ul>	Evaluation Report (2010)
The Many Faces of Childhood Well-Being: The Middle Years (7 to 10) (The Centre)	November 2008 / Calgary, AB	Symposium	<p><b>Initial survey:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 167 survey responses</li> <li>• 92.5% female</li> <li>• 7.1% researchers, 86.5% service providers, and 6.5% policymakers</li> </ul> <p><b>Follow-up survey:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 39 survey responses</li> <li>• 90.9% female</li> <li>• 2.6% researchers, 12.8% service providers (mgmt), 61.5% service providers (front-line), 2.6% policymakers.</li> </ul>	Evaluation Mid-Term Report (2009) Evaluation Report (2010)  Summary of Findings (2010)
CBREnet (CUP)	2008-2009 / Edmonton, AB	Networking Circle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11 survey responses (10.0% response rate)</li> <li>• 90.9% female</li> <li>• 36.4% researchers, 18.2% service providers (mgmt), 18.2% students, and 9.1% policymakers.</li> </ul>	Evaluation Report (2009)

<b>KM Activities Evaluated by MKAD</b>				
<b>KM Activity</b>	<b>Date / Location</b>	<b>Activity Type</b>	<b>Participant Information</b>	<b>Evaluation Reports</b>
Developmental Screening with Immigrant and Refugee Families (CUP)	2008-2009 / Various	Presentations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 23 survey responses</li> <li>• 95.7% female</li> <li>• 4% researchers, 13% service providers (mgmt), 70% service providers (front-line), and 4% policymakers</li> </ul>	Summary of Findings (2010)
INT-D 500: An Introduction to Community-Based Research and Evaluation (CUP)	Winter 2009 / Edmonton, AB	Graduate Course	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7 survey responses</li> <li>• Respondents were graduate students enrolled in INT-D 500</li> </ul>	Evaluation Report (2009)

## Appendix B: Building Capacity for Community-Based Research and Evaluation

### ***CBRE Workshop Series***

This series has been designed for individuals who are working with children, youth, and families in such sectors as service delivery, policymaking, and research. While each of the six workshops has unique content and specific goals, two over-arching goals characterize the series:

- ❖ To increase the capacity of community members, including service providers, policy makers, researchers, and other stakeholders to engage in community-based research and evaluation (CBRE) in support of the development of children, youth, and families.
- ❖ To support networking and the development of partnering relationships toward participating in CBR projects.

Each workshop is structured to support participant interests and needs, building not only on the expertise of workshop facilitators and guest speakers but also on participants' experiences and knowledge. This approach is consistent with 'dialogue education' (Vella, 2008), characterized by immediacy, engagement, respect, and safety. These characteristics, in turn, are consistent with CBRE as a way to create and share knowledge to inform research, policy, and practice. Given the complex nature of and the relationships that characterize CBRE projects, interactive workshops that draw on multiple sources of expertise (i.e., not only facilitators but also participant peers) may be critical to achieving learning objectives (Reed et al., 2008).

In the original SSHRC<sup>10</sup> proposal, three distinct workshops were proposed and each was to be offered once over a 3-year period. Through careful planning and use of resources, six distinct workshops were developed and offered multiple times (i.e., 16 workshops over three and a half years). A mean average of about 20 people participated in a typical workshop, and many participants attended multiple workshops. Since 2007, CBRE Workshop Series participants have come from over 75 organizations and 20 units associated with the University of Alberta (U of A) (please see Appendix E). The total number of participants to date is 365.

Specific information for each workshop is as follows:

#### **Workshop #1:**

- An Introduction to Community-Based Research & Evaluation (CBRE)
- Offered: May 29, 2007; Nov. 2, 2007; Feb. 29, 2008; Oct. 30, 2009

#### **Workshop #2:**

- Doing CBR Well: Ethically and With Rigour
- Offered: Nov. 23, 2007; Mar. 28, 2008; Nov. 20, 2009

#### **Workshop #3:**

- Building CBR Partnerships
- Offered: Apr. 18, 2008; Oct. 23, 2008; Jan. 29, 2010

#### **Workshop #4:**

- Developing CBR Projects: The 'How'
- Offered: May 23, 2008; Feb. 19, 2010

#### **Workshop #5:**

- Program Evaluation with a CB Approach
- Offered: Jan. 30, 2009; Mar. 26, 2010

---

<sup>10</sup> Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

**Workshop #6:**

- Making a Difference with CBR: Mobilizing Knowledge to Inform Policy and Practice
- Offered: Feb. 27, 2009; Apr. 16, 2010

**Graduate Certificate Program in Community-Based Research & Evaluation**

This program has been designed for currently registered graduate students in a Master's or PhD program at the University of Alberta. The program goals are:

- ❖ To integrate conceptual and methodological competencies in community-based research and evaluation (CBRE) into graduate curricula for the purpose of increasing capacity to participate in and lead CBRE projects to support the mobilization of findings in policy, practice, and research.
- ❖ To provide an opportunity for graduate students at the University of Alberta to learn about CBRE in an interdisciplinary manner that complements their individual programs of study.
- ❖ To support the mobilization of CBRE knowledge in policy, practice, and research and evaluation.

The certificate program models partnerships in research and evaluation between university and community partners.

The requirements of the certificate are:

- ❖ Twelve graduate credits as specified below and one non-credit CBRE experience are required for the certificate.
  - Satisfactory completion of \*3 (INT-D 500) *An Introduction to Community-Based Research & Evaluation*. Please see additional information on this page.
  - Satisfactory completion of a 3-credit graduate-level course on program planning and evaluation
  - Satisfactory completion of a 3-credit graduate-level course on quantitative research methodologies
  - Satisfactory completion of a 3-credit graduate-level course on qualitative research methodologies
  - Satisfactory completion of a non-credit supervised CBRE experience

The core, required course for the Graduate Certificate Program is INT-D 500, *Introduction to Community-Based Research & Evaluation (CBRE)*. It was offered for the first time during the Winter 2009 term at the U of A and offered again in Fall 2009.

*INT-D 500: An Introduction to Community-Based Research & Evaluation (CBRE)*. The purpose of this course is for students to develop a theoretical and conceptual foundation for undertaking CBRE in their current studies and future research, practice, and/or decision-making (e.g., as in policymaking). The course has four objectives:

1. To develop an understanding of CBRE in terms of diverse ways of understanding knowledge and how it is created.
2. To study various philosophical positions regarding CBRE and to consider how they inform, explicitly and implicitly, research design and implementation.
3. To engage in trans-disciplinary discussions and collaborative work with course participants including students, the instructor, and guests.
4. To develop critical thinking, reading, and writing skills in preparation not only for meeting course and program requirement but also for future work and lives.

**Customized workshop programming:**

- Creative Aging Symposium, University of Alberta, Edmonton (June 2009)
  - "Introduction to CBR"

- Invited workshop
- Rural Integrated Community Clerkship Program, Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry, U of A (August 2009)
  - CBRE Workshop Series (3 days)
- Trainee Research Methodology Course, Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry, U of A (September 2008, September 2009):
  - “Introduction to CBR”
  - Customized, two-hour workshop (80-100 participants)
  - Led to a collaborative poster presented in the 2009 Festival of Teaching, U of A and submitted for a second presentation at the International Conference on Residency Education (ICRE) hosted by the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada in September 2009 in Victoria, BC
- Enhancing Qualitative Understanding of Illness Process and Prevention (EQUIPP), U of A (March 2009)
  - “Introduction to CBR”
  - Guest seminar
- Women & Children’s Health Research Institute Research Days, U of A (November 2008)
  - “Introduction to CBR”
  - Customized, two-hour workshop
- International Institute for Qualitative Methodology (IIQM) *Thinking Qualitatively* Conference (June 2008)
  - “Introduction to CBR”
  - Day-long workshop

***CBREnet (Community-Based Research & Evaluation Informal Networking Circle)***

- 2008 - Two gatherings (June, Oct.)
- 2009 - Two gatherings (Jan., June)
- Format: Introductions, Invited speaker, Open discussion, Networking

***Research-Ethics Board (REB) Workgroup – Training Curriculum for Members re: CBR***

- Sherry Ann Chapman, representing CUP, has been networking and offering leadership in Canadian and American research-ethics review circles in collaboration with other participants in this Workgroup.
  - The Canadian Subcommittee’s efforts within the Workgroup appear to have contributed to the extension of the community-consultation process managed by the Interagency Panel on Research Ethics and the Secretariat on Research Ethics.
  - Citation for the draft curriculum: IRB-REB Workgroup on Community-Engaged Research. (2009 – DRAFT). *IRB/REB Curriculum on Ethical Considerations in Community-Engaged Research*.

## Appendix C: Methods of Analysis for Evaluating Knowledge Mobilization Activities

At the beginning of the MKAD project, team members intended to conduct quantitative and qualitative analyses of the evaluation data. We soon realized that an additional customized approach would be useful to address some of the research questions. An iterative approach was used; throughout the analysis of projects, preliminary descriptive findings from the quantitative analysis informed the study of the qualitative data which in turn informed the quantitative analysis. Below is a discussion of quantitative, qualitative, and customized approaches that were employed to analyze the evaluation data.

**Quantitative Analyses** - Descriptive information was obtained for each of the quantitative questions on the evaluation tools (e.g., surveys) in the form of frequencies/percentages or means. Both parametric and nonparametric statistical tests were used. However, the results from the parametric tests were used to summarize the findings; parametric tests may be more familiar to readers and considered to be relatively robust even when statistical assumptions are violated (May, Masson, & Hunter, 1990). When sample sizes were too small, these variables were not used in these analyses of relations between variables as strong conclusions could not be drawn. An alpha level of 0.05 was used for all statistical tests. In cases where participants did not provide a response to a question or did not accurately follow the instructions to the question, missing data values were assigned for that question.

**Qualitative Analyses** - Qualitative data analysis of interviews and some of the open-ended questions was conducted using an approach called “interpretive description” (Thorne, Kirkham, & MacDonald-Emes, 1997; Thorne, Kirkham, & O’Flynn-Magee, 2004). This approach “provides direction in the creation of an interpretive account that is generated on the basis of informed questioning, using techniques of reflective, critical examination, and which will ultimately guide and inform disciplinary thought in some manner” (Thorne et al., 2004, p. 6). A dialectical approach was taken to interpret the data by employing MKAD’s conceptual KM framework, studying the data, revisiting the framework, and returning to the data. By studying the responses individually and across the sets of questions for a particular evaluation tool, commonalities and variations were considered. Data were grouped into categories and interpreted relative to the objectives of the KM activity. The researchers’ goal was to identify categories (whether they were within or across questions) rather than to abstract the findings into a theory.

**Customized MKAD Analysis** - Drawing on MKAD members’ diverse expertise and the above methods, the analysis of most of the short-answer survey responses was conducted using an iterative categorization process; MKAD members identified this approach as short-answer morphs (SAMs) analysis. A research assistant first read the responses to each individual survey question and then identified and coded ideas in these responses. These codes were examined and combined into *subcategories*, which were then labeled. Subcategories were examined and combined where possible into higher-level *categories*. SAMs analysis was conducted in response to the survey questions, which were based on research questions articulated prior to data collection. (This contrasts with the *interpretive description* analysis, which addresses research questions in a wider theoretical context without specific guided questions.) *Categories* that directly answered each survey question were identified and named. Other categories that did not directly address the survey question, but which introduced a new idea or aspect of the objective of the survey question, were also identified and named.

## Appendix D: Measures of Information Utilization

Information utilization was measured quantitatively and qualitatively. Three quantitative categories of information utilization were measured in the evaluations: conceptual use, symbolic use, and instrumental use (e.g., Weiss, 1981). The categories of information use, their definitions, and samples of the questions that were used to measure each category of information use are provided in Table 1 below.

Quantitative Measures of Information Use			
Sample Survey Questions			
Information Use Category	Definition	Participants	Participants' Organizations
Conceptual Use	Where information leads to new knowledge, new ideas, new interpretations or understandings of issues, or changes in thinking, but no changes in decisions take place.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what degree has your knowledge about the topic increased because you attended the KM activity?</li> <li>To what degree have your opinions or attitudes toward the topic changed because you attended the KM activity?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what degree was the information used by others in your organization to increase their knowledge about the topic?</li> <li>To what degree was the information used by others in your organization to change their opinions or attitudes about the topic?</li> </ul>
Symbolic Use	When people use information to legitimate their views or decisions, or as a rational for a decision already made.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what degree did you use the information to support or justify an existing decision that you had already made at work?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what degree was the information used by others in your organization to support or justify an existing decision that had already been made at work?</li> </ul>
Instrumental Use	Where information induces users to make decisions, take actions or inactions that would not have been made otherwise.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what degree did you use the information to directly influence a new decision that you would not otherwise have made in your work?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what degree was the information used by others in your organization to directly influence a new decision that would not otherwise have been made at work?</li> </ul>

*Note:* All survey questions assessing information use were rated by participants using a 5-point Likert scale that ranged from 1 = Not at all, to 5 = Extremely.

Information utilization was also measured qualitatively using open-ended questions. For example, a sample open-ended question that was used to measure participants' information utilization was as follows: "*Please describe in more detail the ways in which you used the information from the KM activity.*" A sample open-ended question that was used to measure information utilization by participants' organizations was as follows: "*Please describe in more detail the ways in which others in your organization use the information from the KM activity.*"

## Appendix E: Organizations and Units Represented by Participants in the CBRE Workshop Series (May 2007 – April 2010)

ABC Head Start  
 Alberta Advanced Education & Technology  
 Alberta Alcohol & Drug Abuse Commission  
 Alberta Association for the Accreditation of  
   Early Learning & Care Services  
 Alberta Bone & Joint Health Institute  
 Alberta Cancer Board  
 Alberta Centre for Active Living  
 Alberta Centre for Child, Family & Community  
   Research  
 Alberta Children & Youth Services  
 Alberta Children's Services  
 Alberta College of Social Workers  
 Alberta Conflict Transformation Society  
 Alberta Employment, Immigration & Industry  
 Alberta Health & Wellness  
 Alberta Hospital, Edmonton  
 Alberta Innovates – Health Solutions  
 Alberta Justice, Court Services  
 Alberta Seniors & Community Supports  
 Alexis Health Services  
 Arusha  
 Bosco Homes  
 Calgary Health Region  
 Calgary Youth Justice Society  
 Canadian Arab Friendship Association  
 Canadian Forum of Civil Justice  
 Canadian Outcome Research Institute  
 Capital Health Edmonton  
 CASA Foundation  
 Catholic Social Services  
 Central Alberta Child & Family Services  
 Authority  
 City of Edmonton  
 Cold Lake First Nations  
 Community Rehabilitation Preschool Team  
 Community-University Partnership for the Study  
   of Children, Youth, & Families (CUP)  
 Concordia University College of Alberta  
 Edmonton Community Adult Learning  
   Association  
 Edmonton John Howard Society  
 Edmonton Mennonite Centre for Newcomers  
 Family & Community Support Services, Bon  
 Accord  
 Family Linkages Foundation of Alberta  
 La federation des parents francophones de  
   l'Alberta  
 Franco-accueil  
 Glenrose Rehabilitative Hospital  
 Greenway Consulting Services Ltd.

Housing & Urban Affairs  
 Intercultural Communication Institute  
 John Howard Society of Alberta  
 Kids Kottage  
 Lansdowne Child Care & Family Centre  
 McMan Youth, Family & Community  
   Services Association  
 Mill Woods Family Resource Centre  
 Misericordia Community Pediatric Research  
   Group, M  
 MITAA  
 Mountain Plains  
 Multicultural Health Brokers  
 Oliver Centre  
 Partners for Kids and Youth  
 Perfecting Tomorrow  
 Public Health Agency of Canada  
 Queensland University Technology,  
   Australia  
 SEARCH Canada  
 Success by 6  
 Suddards & Associated Consulting Inc.  
 Taylor University College  
 Terra Association  
 The Africa Centre  
 The GRIT Program  
 The Mustard Seed  
 Treaty 8 First Nations of Alberta  
 United Way of the Alberta Capital Region  
 University of Lethbridge  
 Vibrant Communities Edmonton  
 YMCA of Edmonton

**University of Alberta:**  
 Centre for Health Promotions Studies  
 City-Region Studies Centre  
 Community Service-Learning  
 Faculty of Education  
 Department of Educational Policy Studies  
 Department of Family Medicine  
 Department of Gastroenterology  
 Department of Pediatrics  
 Department of Sociology  
 Faculty of Agriculture, Life & Environmental  
   Sciences  
 Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry  
 Faculty of Nursing  
 Faculty of Physical Education & Recreation,  
 Human Ecology  
 Institute for Stuttering Treatment & Research  
 Learning Solutions, Faculty of Extension

Population Research Lab  
Research Services Office  
The Steadward Centre  
Stollery Children's Hospital  
University of Alberta Libraries

**University of Calgary:**  
Faculty of Medicine, University of Calgary  
Faculty of Social Work, University of Calgary  
University of Calgary – Foothills Hospital

## Appendix F: INT-D 500: An Introduction to Community-Based Research & Evaluation

Community-University Partnership for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families (CUP)  
Faculty of Extension, University of Alberta<sup>11</sup>

### Course Syllabus<sup>12</sup> Fall 2009

Instructor: Sherry Ann Chapman, PhD  
Email: [sherryann@ualberta.ca](mailto:sherryann@ualberta.ca)  
Web page:  
[http://www.cup.ualberta.ca/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=124&Itemid=237](http://www.cup.ualberta.ca/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=124&Itemid=237)

Office hours: By appointment

Class meets: 1. Weekly, in-person seminars (Wednesday afternoons, 1:00-3:50 pm)  
First class: **2 September** 2009  
Last class: **2 December** 2009  
2. Some group work may be conducted on-line in eClass (i.e., WebCT):  
<https://vista4.srv.ualberta.ca>

Location: Enterprise Square, Room: 2-976

Teaching Assistant: Hannah Goa - [hannah.goa@ualberta.ca](mailto:hannah.goa@ualberta.ca)  
E-Learning Specialist: John Sinclair - [john.sinclair@ualberta.ca](mailto:john.sinclair@ualberta.ca)  
Teaching and Learning Services, Faculty of Extension

---

#### Table of Contents:

Course Description (from University Calendar)  
Course Purpose  
    Course Objectives  
Course Format  
Assignments  
Seminar Schedule & Required Readers  
Assignment Information  
    1. Group Project (two parts)  
    2. Papers (two)  
    Formatting the group and paper assignments  
    Policy for late assignments

Grade Evaluation  
Student Responsibilities

---

<sup>11</sup> This course offering is part of the Mobilizing Knowledge About Development (MKAD) project, a collaboration between the Community-University Partnership for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families (CUP) and the Alberta Centre for Child, Family and Community Research (The Centre). For more information about the project partners, please visit [www.cup.ualberta.ca](http://www.cup.ualberta.ca) and [www.research4children.org](http://www.research4children.org).

<sup>12</sup> "Policy about course outlines can be found in §23.4(2) of the University Calendar." Retrieved 20 July 2009 from: <http://www.registrar.ualberta.ca/calendar/Regulations-and-Information/Academic-Regulation/23.4.html#23.4>.

“Public office, in my opinion, doesn’t work, won’t work, unless there are really strong grassroots organizations to pressure elected officials. That holds for me too because my plate is so full. I’m only one person. The community [has to] help keep me focused.”  
-Policymaker<sup>13</sup>

“At strategic moments [the community partner] has been able to bring literally hundreds of community voices into the public decision-making process.” -Academic Partner<sup>3</sup>

“A researcher asked us about the definition of disability. At first we talked about personal limits, but now we talk about the power of voice.” -Program Participant<sup>3</sup>

---

### **Course Description (from University Calendar)**

“An introduction to conceptual and methodological foundations of community-based research and evaluation in the health and social sciences, particularly pertaining to the development of children, youth, and/or families. Seminar format. Prerequisite: Consent of instructor.”

### **Course Purpose**

For students to develop a theoretical and conceptual foundation for undertaking community-based research and evaluation (CBR&E) in their current studies and future research, practice, and/or decision making (e.g., as in policymaking).

### **Course Objectives**

1. To develop an understanding of CBR&E in terms of diverse ways of understanding knowledge and how it is created.
2. To study various philosophical positions regarding CBR&E and to consider how they inform, explicitly and implicitly, research design and implementation.
3. To engage in transdisciplinary discussions and collaborative work with course participants including students, the instructor, and guests.
4. To develop critical thinking, reading, and writing skills in preparation not only for meeting course and program requirements but also for future work and lives.

### **Course Format**

We will engage in *in-person, seminar discussions* and *on-line, group activities*. In addition to the instructor, several guest facilitators will participate throughout the course.

#### *Instructor’s note*

I have grounded the course in a CBR&E philosophy that values multiple kinds of expertise and shared responsibility in the design and undertaking of community-relevant research. Accordingly, I am designing the course to support you as experts on what you seek to know and on your own lives. I believe that you bring particular abilities, skills, and life experiences to your meaning making. In addition, I believe that you have a responsibility for your own learning. Although I have structured the course to provide some parameters within which learning can happen, I am anticipating that you will wish to customize what and how you learn. I believe that this approach reflects the nature of CBR&E in terms of collaboration, partnership, and an investment in time, for co-constructing rather than prescribing courses of study.

---

<sup>13</sup> UC Berkeley School of Public Health & PolicyLink (2008) (pp. 8, 23, 25). Retrieved 30 Aug. 09: <http://www.policylink.org/site/c.lkIXLbMNJrE/b.5137443/apps/s/content.asp?ct=6996033> .

Here are a few instances of this philosophy in action:

1) Required readings:

I encourage all of us to study the required readings in advance of each week's class to be prepared to discuss the reading material relative to each week's topic. Please be prepared to share first impressions of each article. Draw on your past experiences and knowledge toward introducing new thoughts to the discussions and engaging with the various facilitators each week.

2) Marking:

Please review the assignment information section of this syllabus and the accompanying handouts. By Wed., 16 September 2009, please let me know if you have suggestions for the marking criteria. I would be interested to consider developing the criteria further to ensure their meaningfulness for class members.

*Regarding the on-line group work*

In collaboration, John Sinclair, E-Learning Specialist, and I have created an eClass (also known as WebCT) environment for your reference and use. Into this environment, we have and will continue to post course resources. In addition, the environment is intended to support your group work, should you in your small groups choose to use eClass tools.

**“What is eClass?”**

The eClass Learning Management System (LMS) is a great tool for organizing and delivering on-line course content.” From 21 July 2009:

<http://www.elearning.ualberta.ca/eClass/info.php>

Please see the handout, *Computer Setup*, for directions for accessing eClass at the University of Alberta. If you need assistance with eClass:

See: <https://vista4.srv.ualberta.ca>

OR

Contact [john.sinclair@ualberta.ca](mailto:john.sinclair@ualberta.ca), E-Learning Specialist in the Teaching and Learning Services unit in the Faculty of Extension.

**TIP:**

When composing your eClass contributions, work in Word (or other word-processing software) and save your work; then cut and paste your contribution into eClass. This will create a back-up copy of your contribution in the event that it disappears into cyberspace when you “Post” it.

**Assignments**

<u>Assignments:</u>	<u>Mark Distribution (% of total mark):</u>	
-Short Papers (2):	50%	Each paper is worth: 25%
-Group project (2 parts):	50%	Details:
		Memo of Understanding is worth: 35%
		Process Reflection is worth: 15%

**Seminar Schedule & Required Readings<sup>14</sup>**

All readings required for the course are listed in the following pages. Most of the readings will be

<sup>14</sup> After clicking on the hotlinks below, you may be asked to supply your University of Alberta CCID. After you enter that information, you should be taken to the article or a page from which you may click on the article. On occasion, you may have to scroll to a second page of listings to find the particular article.

available through hotlinks in the University of Alberta Library system. A few readings will be circulated in the in-person seminars.

**Week                      Date                      Topic & Readings**

**1                              2 Sept. 09                      Conceptualizing CBR&E – Getting Started**

Young, E. (2003). *The story of somewhere: A new narrative for community*. National Conference of Community Leadership Organizations, Calgary, AB. Available: [http://tamarackcommunity.ca/downloads/index/EYoung\\_StoryofSomewhere.pdf](http://tamarackcommunity.ca/downloads/index/EYoung_StoryofSomewhere.pdf)

**2                              9 Sept. 09                      Essential concepts and roots in CBR&E**

❖ Guest speaker: **Cindy Jardine**, Department of Rural Economy, University of Alberta

Smith, M. K. (2001). 'Community' in the *Encyclopedia of Informal Education*. Available: <http://www.infed.org/community/community.htm> .

Wallerstein, N., & Duran, B. (2003). The conceptual, historical, and practice roots of community based participatory research and related participatory traditions. In M. Minkler & N. Wallerstein (Eds.), *Community-based participatory research for health* (pp. 27-52). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons. **To be circulated.**

*Optional readings:*

Freire, P. (1970). Chapter 1. In *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (pp. 43-69). Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos. With an introduction by Donaldo Macedo. 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary edition. New York: Continuum. **To be circulated.**

Lewin, K. (1946). Action research and minority problems. *Journal of Social Issues*, 2(4), 34-46. Available: <http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=16473285&loginpage=Login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

**3                              16 Sept. 09                      Reflecting on Power & Consensus-Based Decision Making**

❖ Guest facilitator: **aRiel Bowering**, The Alberta Public Interest Research Group <http://www.apirg.org/welcome/index.php>

Schnarch, B. (2004). *Ownership, control, access, and possession (OCAP) or Self-determination applied to research: A critical analysis of contemporary First Nations research and some options for First Nations communities*. Ottawa: First Nations Centre, National Aboriginal Health Organization. Available: <http://www.research.utoronto.ca/ethics/pdf/human/nonspecific/OCAP%20principles.pdf>

Wallerstein, N. B., & Duran, B. (2006). Using community-based participatory research to address health disparities. *Health Promotion Practice*, 7(3), 312-323. Available: <http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1524839906289376>

**4                              23 Sept. 09                      Thinking and Working Collectively**

❖ 2<sup>nd</sup> half of class: Using consensus-based decision making to decide composition of groups for the group project

Cargo, M., & Mercer, S. L. (2008). The value and challenges of participatory research: Strengthening its practice. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 29, 325-350. Available:

<http://arjournals.annualreviews.org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/toc/publhealth/29/1>

Steinhauer, E. (2002). Thoughts on an Indigenous research methodology. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 26(2), 69-81. Available:  
<http://proquest.umi.com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/pqdlink?index=15&did=325001231&SrchMode=3&sid=1&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1251675264&clientId=12301&aid=1>

5 30 Sept. 09 Managing CBR&E projects together

- ❖ Guest speaker: **Laurie Schnirer**, Community-University Partnership for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families (CUP)

Butterfoss, F. D. (2006). Process evaluation for community participation. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 27, 323-340. Available:  
<http://arjournals.annualreviews.org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/toc/publhealth/27/1>

Flicker, S. (2008). Who benefits from community-based participatory research? A case study of the Positive Youth Project. *Health Education & Behavior*, 35(1), 70-86. Available:  
<http://heb.sagepub.com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/cgi/reprint/35/1/70>

6 7 Oct. 09 Ethical according to whom?

- ❖ Guest speaker: **Carrielyn Lund**, CIETcanada
- ❖ First paper due by 9 am.

Boser, S. (2007). Power, ethics, and the IRB: Dissonance over human participant review of participatory research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13, 1060-1074. Available:  
<http://qix.sagepub.com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/cgi/reprint/13/8/1060>

Flicker, S., & Guta, A. (2008). Ethical approaches to adolescent participation in sexual health research. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 42(1), 3-10. Available:  
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.07.017>

OR

See archived webcast (26 Mar. 08; see p. 6 of the archives):  
<http://epresence.ehealthinnovation.org/epresence>

7 14 Oct. 09 Using qualitative and quantitative methods together in CBR&E

- ❖ Guest speakers: **Jeff Bisanz** and **Maria Mayan**, Community-University Partnership for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families (CUP) and the Women and Children's Health Research Institute (WCHRI)

Required readings are to be announced.

8 21 Oct. 09 Rigorous according to whom?

Melrose, M. J. (2001). Maximizing the rigor of action research: Why would you want to? How could you? *Field Methods*, 13(2), 160-180. Available:  
<http://fmj.sagepub.com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/cgi/reprint/13/2/160>

Morgan, D. L. (2007). Paradigms lost and pragmatism regained: Methodological implications of combining qualitative and quantitative methods. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1, 48-76. Available:  
<http://mmr.sagepub.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/cgi/reprint/1/1/48>

9 28 Oct. 09 Community-based approaches to evaluation

- ❖ Guest speakers: **Rebecca Gokiert, Winnie Chow, &/or Rebecca Georgis**, Early Childhood Measurement & Evaluation members, Community-University Partnership for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families (CUP)

Cockerill, R., Myers, T., & Allman, D. (2000). Planning for community-based evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 21(3), 351-357. Available:  
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/109821400002100306>

Smith, M. K. (2001, 2006) 'Evaluation' in the *Encyclopedia of Informal Education*. Available:  
[www.infed.org/biblio/b-eval.htm](http://www.infed.org/biblio/b-eval.htm) .

10 4 Nov. 09 Institutionalization of CBR&E

- ❖ Second paper due by 9 am.

Caine, K. J., Salomons, M. J., et al. (2007). Partnerships for social change in the Canadian North: Revisiting the insider-outsider dialectic. *Development and Change*, 38(3), 447-471. Available: <http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7660.2007.00419.x>

Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., & Becker, A. B. (2001). Community-based participatory research: Policy recommendations for promoting a partnership approach in health research. *Education for Health*, 14(2), 182-197. Available:  
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=6387606&loginpage=Login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

#### Optional reading:

Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., & Becker, A. B. (1998). Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 19, 173-202. Available:  
<http://arjournals.annualreviews.org/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/toc/publhealth/19/1>

No Class 11 Nov. 09 Remembrance Day and Fall-term break

11 18 Nov. 09 CBR&E as KM-oriented

- ❖ Guest speaker: **Rhonda Breitzkreuz**, Department of Human Ecology, University of Alberta
- ❖ Group projects – MOU written documents due on-line by 9 am.

Bogenschneider, K., Olson, J. R., Linney, K. D., & Mills, J. (2000). Connecting research and policymaking: Implications for theory and practice from the Family Impact Seminars. *Family Relations*, 49, 327-339. Available:  
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2000.00327.x>

Leadbeater, B., Marshall, A., & Banister, E. (2007). Building strengths through practice-research-policy collaborations. *Child & Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 16(2), 515-32. Available: <http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chc.2006.11.004>

*Optional reading:*

UC Berkeley School of Public Health Team (Minkler, M., Breckwich Vásquez, V., Chang, C., Miller, J.) & PolicyLink Team (Rubin, R., Glover Blackwell, A., Thompson, M., Flournoy, R., Bell, J.). (2008). *Promoting healthy public policy through community-based participatory research: Ten case studies*. A project of the University of California, Berkeley, School of Public Health and PolicyLink, funded by a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Available: <http://www.policylink.org/site/c.lkIXLbMNJrE/b.5137443/apps/s/content.asp?ct=6996033>

12 25 Nov. 09 Indicators of success in CBR&E

Flicker, S., Savan, B., McGrath, M., Kolenda, B., & Mildenerger, M. (2008). 'If you could change one thing...' What community-based researchers wish they could have done differently? *Community Development Journal*, 43(2), 239-253. Available: <http://cdj.oxfordjournals.org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/content/vol43/issue2/index.dtl>

Kreuter, M. W., Lezin, N. A., & Young, L. A. (2000). Evaluating community-based collaborative mechanisms: Implications for practitioners. *Health Promotion Practice*, 1(1), 49-63. Available: <http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/152483990000100109>

Seifer, S. D. (2006). Building and sustaining community-institutional partnerships for prevention research: Findings from a national collaborative. Corporate author: Examining Community-Institutional Partnerships for Prevention Research Group. *Journal of Urban Health-Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 83(6), 989-1003. Available: <http://www.springerlink.com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/content/x326h5u74208/?p=b50a6cb52cb4af686cca9b2968b0ca2&pi=13>

13 Last class 2 Dec. 09 Group Projects – Process-Evaluation Presentations

## Assignment Information

### 1. Group Project (two parts)

Mark distributions (% of total course mark):

- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (written component)
  - 35% Due: 18 November 2009
- Process-Evaluation Presentation (oral component)
  - 15% Due: 2 December 2009

Group-project work in courses is undeniably challenging. A group project is a key feature of the course because working in dialogue with others is consistent with the nature of CBR&E. To support diverse learning styles, the group project will have both a written component and an oral presentation.

**Goals:**

- i) To serve as an opportunity to collaborate with others on a practical task in a way that applies course content and requires the application of CBR&E principles and values. In this way, students will:
  - a. Learn about collaborative research through first-hand collaboration with class peers; and
  - b. Co-develop with group members strategies for navigating challenges and for celebrating successes when working with diverse perspectives and ways of knowing.
- ii) To develop a starting-point template for the development of memoranda of understanding (MOU's) for CBR&E in the future.
- iii) To develop a starting-point template for process evaluations for CBR&E in the future.

**Description:**

Students will work in small groups collaborating as hypothetical partnerships based on the case-study information provided and reflecting on their group structures and processes.

This project has two parts (written and oral):

- i) The development of a written, memorandum-of-understanding (MOU) document for the assigned case study; and
- ii) An oral presentation exploring the collaborative process undertaken by the group to develop the MOU and integrating the course's weekly themes and readings.

The eClass on-line environment is one tool that groups may choose to use for their collaborative work.

**Marking will be based on:**

- Demonstrated understanding of:
  - ❖ the purpose of an MOU for CBR&E work.
  - ❖ the potential usefulness of an MOU for the assigned case study.
  - ❖ CBR&E principles and values.
- Practical nature of the MOU as a useful tool over time for the hypothetical partnership.
- Thoughtful reflections (i.e., the process-evaluation presentation) on the collaborative process of developing the MOU (e.g., how did the collaboration work? What would you do differently if you were to do the group project again? What "rang true" from the course readings and discussions? What didn't?).
- Demonstrated use of course and other resources.
- Grammar, spelling, APA formatting.

Each group will be asked to post their MOU document in eClass on 18 Nov. 2009 and present their process evaluation on 2 Dec. 2009.

**Additional information will be provided in a separate handout.**

**2. Papers (two)**

Mark distributions (% of total course mark):

- First paper: 25% Due: 9 am on 7 October 2009
- Second paper: 25% Due: 9 am on 4 November 2009

**Goal:**

To explore and reflect on **two different aspects** of community-based research and/or evaluation (CBR&E) relative to what you are learning:

- a) about your own perspective(s) (as a researcher, practitioner, decision maker, and/or broader-community member);
- b) from others in the course regarding their perspectives (i.e., as researcher, practitioner, decision maker, and/or broader-community member);
- c) about diverse philosophical positions regarding CBR&E;
- d) about diverse conceptualizations of knowledge and how they are created; and
- e) regarding your substantive research interest (e.g., in early-childhood development).

Please select two different topics from those addressed in the course on a weekly basis and/or on a conceptual dimension of the Group Project (within the Memorandum of Understanding or the Process Evaluation). Focus on one topic for the first paper and focus on a different topic for the second paper.

If you have another topic (beyond the suggested topics) that you wish to address as the focus of either of your papers, please discuss with the instructor by 16 Sept. 2009 for the first paper and by 14 Oct. 2009 for the second paper.

Both papers should include:

- ❖ A brief description of the CBR&E topic and a brief review of relevant literature to provide context or background for readers.
  - Please draw on relevant literature *in addition* to the required readings in the course.
  - The majority of your references should be from the **peer-reviewed literature**.
- ❖ An argument presenting the significance of that aspect in the evolving field of CBR&E.

Length of each paper: 10 pages (not including references) (double-spaced)

**Marking will be based on:**

- Insightful and innovative thinking regarding:
  - the selected topic of CBR&E.
  - the significance of that aspect to participating in and/or leading a CBR&E project.
    - Including at least one recommendation for readers to inform their own work in CBR&E.
- Demonstrated critical application of the course content to your research and/or practice interests.
- Demonstrated ability to write:
  - an academic paper (i.e., in the form of an essay, with an introduction, clear argument, and conclusion).
  - for readers across diverse, academic disciplines.
- Grammar, spelling, APA formatting.

**Additional information will be provided in a separate handout.**

**Formatting the group and paper assignments**

Please use the most recent formatting style of the American Psychological Association:

<http://www.library.ualberta.ca/guides/apa/index.cfm> .

This website has useful summaries of formatting guidelines:

<http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/> .

**Policy for late assignments**

Please submit assignments by e-mail or by hand to the instructor. If submitting by e-mail, please copy (cc) your own e-mail account as an electronic record that you have sent your assignment by the assigned deadlines. Starting at the due date/time, for each 24 hours that an assignment is late, the mark for the assignment will be reduced by 20% (unless there is a documented medical reason or family emergency). In other words, immediately after the due date/time, the mark will be reduced by 20%. Twenty-four hours after the due date/time, the mark will be reduced by 40%, and so on.

“Where the cause is incapacitating illness, a student must present a University of Alberta Medical Statement Form. The University of Alberta Medical Statement Form must be completed and signed by the treating physician or recognized health care provider (e.g., a University of Alberta Health Centre physician, a student's own family physician, a walk-in clinic physician, an emergency department physician, a dentist, or a psychologist...). In other cases, including domestic affliction or religious conviction, adequate documentation must be provided to substantiate the reason for an absence....

**Note:** The University of Alberta Medical Statement Form may be downloaded from the On-line Services section of [www.registrar.ualberta.ca](http://www.registrar.ualberta.ca), and is available at the University Health Centre. It is important for students to be aware that a Medical Statement Form cannot be provided by the University Health Centre if they were not examined by a UHC physician at the time of their illness.”

Retrieved 20 July 2009: [http://www.registrar.ualberta.ca/calendar/Regulations-and-Information/Academic-Regulation/23.4.html#23.4\(2\)](http://www.registrar.ualberta.ca/calendar/Regulations-and-Information/Academic-Regulation/23.4.html#23.4(2))

**Grade Evaluation**

Marking and Grading:

“§23.4(5) **Assigning Grades:** Grades reflect judgments of student achievement made by instructors. These judgments are based on a combination of absolute achievement and relative performance in a class. The instructor should mark in terms of raw scores, rank the assignments in order of merit, and, with due attention to the verbal descriptions of the various grades, assign an appropriate letter grade to each assignment.”

**Course Grades Obtained by Graduate Students:**

Descriptor	Letter Grade	Grade Point Value
Excellent	A+	4.0
	A	4.0
	A-	3.7
Good	B+	3.3
	B	3.0
	B-	2.7
Satisfactory	C+	2.3
	C	2.0
	C-	1.7
Failure	D+	1.3
	D	1.0
	F	0.0

Retrieved from the University Calendar, 20 July 2009:

<http://www.registrar.ualberta.ca/calendar/Regulations-and-Information/Academic-Regulation/23.4.html>

## **Student Responsibilities**

### **Academic Integrity**

The University of Alberta is committed to the highest standards of academic integrity and honesty. Students are expected to be familiar with these standards regarding academic honesty and to uphold the policies of the University in this respect. Students are particularly urged to familiarize themselves with the provisions of the Code of Student Behaviour (on-line at [www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/secretariat/studentappeals.cfm](http://www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/secretariat/studentappeals.cfm)) and avoid any behaviour which could potentially result in suspicions of cheating, plagiarism, misrepresentation of facts and/or participation in an offence. Academic dishonesty is a serious offence and can result in suspension or expulsion from the University." Retrieved 20 July 2009 from §23.4(2)(c) of the University Calendar: <http://www.registrar.ualberta.ca/calendar/Regulations-and-Information/Academic-Regulation/23.4.html>

#### **30.3.2(1) Plagiarism**

No Student shall submit the words, ideas, images or data of another person as the Student's own in any academic writing, essay, thesis, project, assignment, presentation or poster in a course or program of study.

#### **30.3.2(2) Cheating**

30.3.2(2)a No Student shall in the course of an examination or other similar activity, obtain or attempt to obtain information from another Student or other unauthorized source, give or attempt to give information to another Student, or use, attempt to use or possess for the purposes of use any unauthorized material.

30.3.2(2)b No Student shall represent or attempt to represent him or herself as another or have or attempt to have himself or herself represented by another in the taking of an examination, preparation of a paper or other similar activity. See also misrepresentation in 30.3.6(4).

30.3.2(2)c No Student shall represent another's substantial editorial or compositional assistance on an assignment as the Student's own work.

30.3.2(2)d No Student shall submit in any course or program of study, without the written approval of the course Instructor, all or a substantial portion of any academic writing, essay, thesis, research report, project, assignment, presentation or poster for which credit has previously been obtained by the Student or which has been or is being submitted by the Student in another course or program of study in the University or elsewhere.

30.3.2(2)e No Student shall submit in any course or program of study any academic writing, essay, thesis, report, project, assignment, presentation or poster containing a statement of fact known by the Student to be false or a reference to a source the Student knows to contain fabricated claims (unless acknowledged by the Student), or a fabricated reference to a source.

#### **30.3.6(4) Misrepresentation of Facts**

No Student shall misrepresent pertinent facts to any member of the University community for the purpose of obtaining academic or other advantage. See also 30.3.2(2) b, c, d and e.

#### **30.3.6(5) Participation in an Offence**

No Student shall counsel or encourage or knowingly aid or assist, directly or indirectly, another person in the commission of any offence under this Code."

Retrieved 20 July 2009:

<http://www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/governance/pdf/2008%20Aug%20Don't%20Cheatsheet.pdf>

The following is from *Truth in Education "A Guide to Academic Integrity for Graduate Students"*. NB. Collaboration section (p. 8)

"...any and all collaboration must be appropriately acknowledged.

Group Projects – Group projects are one way to capitalize on the benefits of collaboration. In this context, the whole is certainly greater than the sum of its parts. It takes a certain amount of creativity for a group of individual students to learn how to work together effectively. Students working on group projects should be aware of the following:

- If your name is on the assignment, you are responsible for everything in that assignment, whether or not you participated in every section. Carefully review all the material submitted by other students in your group.
- Ask questions of the professor if your group is confused about expectations.
- It may be helpful to include a section describing the role of each student within the group, if appropriate for that project.
- Understand that everyone has different approaches to their work. Your group, whether you were assigned or chose to work together, will likely have to negotiate your process before you even begin the assignment.
- It is helpful for the group to agree upon a mechanism to deal with any conflict that arises as you work together.” (p. 8)

Retrieved 20 July 2009: <http://www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/TIE/pdfs/AI%20Grad%20Guide.pdf>

**Specialized Support & Disability Services** (2-800 Students' Union Building) “promotes and coordinates the efforts of University departments and off-campus agencies in meeting students' needs and provides services, which help to equalize educational opportunities for students.”

Retrieved 20 July 2009 from: <http://www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/SSDS/>

**Academic Support Centre:** For assistance with writing and learning skills and time-management skills. Retrieved from 20 July 2009 from:

<http://www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/academicsupport/nav01.cfm?nav01=23896&>

**Centre for Writers:** <http://www.c4w.arts.ualberta.ca/>

NB. During the term, circumstances may arise that require a change to the course syllabus. Such a change will be made only with fair warning and/or general class consent. See:

<http://www.registrar.ualberta.ca/calendar/Regulations-and-Information/Academic-Regulation/23.4.html#23.4> (from 4 Jan. 2009).

## Appendix G: MKAD KM Activities

### Oral Presentations

- Chapman, S. A., Auger, S., Austin, W., Henneveld, D., & Lund, C. (2010, March). *Multi-vocal ethics: An ongoing conversation in collaborative research*. Invited panel presentation at the Community-University Engaged Research Showcase III, Faculty of Extension, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A., Seifer, S. D., Shore, N., & Tobin, J. (2009, February). *Developing a training curriculum on community-based research for Institutional Review Boards/Research Ethics Boards (IRBs/REBs): Challenges and opportunities*. Invited panel presentation on behalf of the IRB/REB Workgroup Community-Campus Partnerships for Health at the 2009 National Conference of the National Council on Ethics in Human Research (NCEHR), Ottawa, ON. See: <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/irbhome.html#Committee>
- Chapman, S. A., & Shaw, K. (2008, December). *Knowledge mobilization: Theory and evaluation in a pilot project*. Presentation in the Research-Refresher Series in the Faculty of Extension, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.
- <sup>+15</sup>Huebert, E., & Chapman, S. A. (2008, September). *Studying community-based research workshops as a capacity-building tool for mobilizing knowledge*. Paper presented at the 2008 Conference of the Research Transfer Network of Alberta, Banff, AB.
- Shaw, K., Chapman, S. A., & Jack, M. (2008, September). *Knowledge mobilization: Theory and evaluation*. Paper presented at the 2008 Conference of the Research Transfer Network of Alberta, Banff, AB.
- Chapman, S. A. (2008, May). *Passing the talking stick: Discussing a checklist for rigour in CBR*. Roundtable discussion at the CBR Symposium at Douglas College, Coquitlam, BC.
- Chapman, S. A., & <sup>+</sup>Fong, K. (2008, January). *Community-based research (CBR) workshop series: Growing a learning community!* Main-stage presentation at the University of Alberta's Inaugural Festival of Teaching, Edmonton, AB.
- Tsui, L., <sup>+</sup>Fong, K., & Chapman, S. A. (2007, October). *Community-University Partnership for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families*. Presentation to the Alberta Teachers Association Joint Stakeholders Committee on Children and Poverty, Edmonton, AB.
- Mayan, M., Chapman, S. A., Schnirer, L., & Bisanz, J. (2007, April). *The "essential" nature of CBR*. Oral presentation at the Qualitative Health Research Conference, Seoul, Korea.
- Tsui, L., Chapman, S. A., Bisanz, J., & Schnirer, L. (2007, April). *Towards a better understanding of knowledge mobilization*. Facilitated session at the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health 10th Anniversary Conference: Mobilizing Partnerships for Social Change, Toronto, ON.

### Workshops

- Chapman, S. A. (2010, June). *An introduction to CBR*. Invited full-day workshop. Thinking Qualitatively Conference, International Institute for Qualitative Methodology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A., & Roche, B. (2010, May). *Community-based participatory research (CBPR) ethics*. Invited pre-conference workshop. Eleventh conference of the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH), Portland, OR.
- Chapman, S. A. (2010, April). *Community-based research (CBR) Workshop #6: Making a difference with CBR - Mobilizing knowledge to inform policy and practice*. Community-

---

<sup>15</sup> Indicates a student member of MKAD.

- University Partnership for the Study of Child, Youth, & Families (CUP) and Alberta Centre for Child, Family & Community Research (The Centre), Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A. (2010, March). *A talking circle: Community-based research, ethics, and Aboriginal health*. Invited customized facilitation for Aboriginal Child Health Working Group. Faculty of Agriculture, Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A., Gokiert, R., Georgis, R., & Mercier, T. (2010, March). *CBR Workshop #5: Program evaluation with a CB approach*. CUP & The Centre, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A. (2010, February). *CBR Workshop #4: Developing CBR projects - The 'how'*. CUP & The Centre, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A. (2010, January). *CBR Workshop #3: Building CBR partnerships*. Community-University Partnership for the Study of Child, Youth, & Families (CUP) and Alberta Centre for Child, Family & Community Research (The Centre), Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A. (2009, November). *CBR Workshop #2: Doing CBR well - Ethically and with rigour*. CUP & The Centre, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A. (2009, October). *CBR Workshop #1: An introduction to community-based research & evaluation (CBR&E)*. CUP & The Centre, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A., Hyshka, E., Mayan, M., Mercier, T., & Schnirer, L. (2009, September). *An introduction to CBR*. Medical Residents' 2009 Trainee Research Methodology Course, Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A., & Hyshka, E. (2009, August). *CBR&E Workshop Series*. Three-day, customized series for the Rural Integrated Community Clerkship Program, Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A. (2009, June). *An introduction to CBR*. Invited workshop for the 2009 Creative Aging Symposium, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A. (2009, February). *Community-based research (CBR) Workshop #6: Making a difference with CBR - Mobilizing knowledge to inform policy and practice*. Community-University Partnership for the Study of Child, Youth, & Families (CUP) and Alberta Centre for Child, Family & Community Research (The Centre), Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A., Seifer, S. D., Shore, N., & Tobin, J. (2009, February). *Preparing Research Ethics Board (REB) members to review community-based research: An interactive workshop*. Invited workshop facilitation on behalf of the IRB/REB Workgroup Community-Campus Partnerships for Health at the 2009 National Conference of the National Council on Ethics in Human Research (NCEHR), Ottawa, ON.
- Chapman, S. A., Chow, W. W., & Gokiert, R. J. (2009, January). *CBR Workshop #5: Program evaluation with a CBR approach*. CUP & The Centre, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A., & Schnirer, L. (2008, November). *An introduction to CBR*. Women & Children's Health Research Institute (WCHRI) Research Day, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A. (2008, October). *CBR Workshop #3: Building CBR partnerships*. CUP & The Centre, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A., Mayan, M., & Schnirer, L. (2008, September). *An introduction to CBR*. Pediatrics' 2008 Trainee Research Methodology Course, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A., & Schnirer, L. (2008, June). *An introduction to CBR*. Full-day workshop. Thinking Qualitatively Conference, International Institute for Qualitative Methodology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A., Huebert, E., & Tsui, L., (2008, May). *Doing CBR ethically: Growing a new ethics system*. Workshop session at the CUexpo 2008, Victoria, BC.
- Chapman, S. A. (2008, May). *CBR Workshop #4: Developing CBR projects - The 'how'*. CUP & The Centre, Edmonton, AB.

- Chapman, S. A. (2008, April). *CBR Workshop #3: Building CBR partnerships*. CUP & The Centre, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A., & Huebert, E. (2008, March). *CBR Workshop #2: Doing CBR well - Ethically and with rigour*. CUP & The Centre, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A. (2008, February). *CBR Workshop #1: Evaluations and beyond - An introduction to community-based research & evaluation (CBR&E)*. CUP & The Centre, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A., & Huebert, E. (2007, November). *CBR Workshop #2: Doing CBR well - Ethically and with rigour*. CUP & The Centre, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A. (2007, November). *CBR Workshop #1: Evaluations and beyond - An introduction to community-based research & evaluation (CBR&E)*. CUP & The Centre, Edmonton, AB.
- Schnirer, L., & Chapman, S. A. (2007, July). *An introduction to CBR*. Full-day workshop. Thinking Qualitatively Conference, International Institute for Qualitative Methodology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A. (2007, May). *CBR Workshop #1: Evaluations and beyond - An introduction to community-based research & evaluation (CBR&E)*. CUP & The Centre, Edmonton, AB.

### Guest Lectures

- Chapman, S. A. (2009, September). *An introduction to CBR*. HECOL 100, Introduction to Principles and Practice in Human Ecology, Department of Human Ecology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A. (2009, March). *An introduction to community-based research (CBR)*. Graduate-level seminar for EQUIPP (Enhancing Qualitative Understanding of Illness Process and Prevention), A CIHR STIHR Program, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A. (2008, October). *An introduction to CBR*. HECOL 100, Introduction to Principles and Practice in Human Ecology, Department of Human Ecology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A. (2008, March). *An introduction to community-based research*. Presentation to SOC 518: Qualitative Methods in Social Research, Department of Sociology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A. (2007, October). *An introduction to community-based research*. Presentation to HECOL 100: Introduction to Principles and Practice in Human Ecology, Department of Human Ecology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

### Evaluation Reports

- Delling, C., Shaw, K., & Chapman, S. A. (2010). *CBR&E workshop series evaluation: Report on focus group interviews*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre.
- Delling, C., Shaw, K., & Chapman, S. A. (2010). *The many faces of childhood well-being: The early years (2 to 6) symposium evaluation follow-up report for interviews*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre
- Pinto, D., Shaw, K., & Chapman, S. A. (2010). *CBR&E workshop series needs assessment*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre.
- Pinto, D., Shaw, K., & Chapman, S. A. (2010). *INT-D 500: An introduction to community-based research and evaluation. Evaluation report*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre.
- Pinto, D., Shaw, K., & Chapman, S. A. (2010). *Presentations on developmental screening with immigrant and refugee families. Evaluation survey*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre.
- Pinto, D., Shaw, K., & Chapman, S. A. (2010). *The many faces of childhood well-being: The middle years (7 to 10) symposium follow-up report*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre.
- Pinto, D., Delling, C., Shaw, K., & Chapman, S. A. (2010). *CBR&E workshop series evaluation*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre.

- Pinto, D., Delling, C., Shaw, K., & Chapman, S. A. (2010). *TV, computers and outdoor play: A free on-line seminar for parents. Evaluation report*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre.
- +Fong, K., & Chapman, S. A. (2009). *MKAD summary of findings: The EDPY 612 practicum experience*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre.
- Pinto, D., Delling, C., Shaw, K., & Chapman, S. A. (2009). *CBREnet evaluation report*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre.
- Shaw, K., & Chapman, S. A. (2009). *Measuring early childhood development for prevention and intervention. Symposium evaluation report*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre.
- Shaw, K., Chapman, S. A., +Fong, K., & Schreiner, K. (2009). *The many faces of childhood well-being: The middle years (7 to 10) symposium evaluation report*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre.
- +Fong, K. (2008). *International policy forum on family violence: A follow-up evaluation*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre.
- +Huebert, E., & Chapman, S. A. (August 2008). *CBR workshop series: May 2007-May 2008. Midterm summary report*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre.
- Shaw, K., Chapman, S. A., +Fong, K., & Jack, M. (2008). *The many faces of childhood well-being: The early years (2 to 6) symposium evaluation report*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre.
- Shaw, K., Chapman, S. A., & Schreiner, K. (2008). *The many faces of childhood well-being: The early years (2 to 6) symposium evaluation follow-up report for survey 2*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre.
- +Fong, K., & Breitzkreuz, R. (2007). *Evaluating a written report as a knowledge-mobilization strategy: The Reproduction in Alberta report*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre.
- +Fong, K., & Tsui, L. (2007). *FFE learning event summary*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre.
- Jack, M., & Chapman, S. A. (2007). *Knowledge exchange at a policy forum: Findings from an Evaluation of the International Policy Forum on Family Violence*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre.

## Papers

- Chapman, S. A. (2009). *'Homestretch' report - Mobilizing Knowledge About Development (MKAD): Focus on Knowledge Transformation and Learning*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre.
- +Fong, K. (2008). *From individuals to organizations: A review and application of diffusion of innovations*. Research-project paper for the Industrial Internship Program in Psychology at the University of Alberta.

## Poster Presentations

- Shaw, K., Delling, C., Chapman, S. A., & Pinto, D. (2010, March). *A framework for mobilizing knowledge in support of children, youth, and communities*. Poster session presented at the Community University Engagement Showcase III: Towards A More Engaged University, Edmonton, AB.
- Shaw, K., Delling, C., Pinto, D., Chapman, S. A., & Schreiner, K. (2010, March). *An interdisciplinary knowledge mobilization framework for the field of child development*. Poster session presented at the 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual NIH Conference on the Science of Dissemination and Implementation: Methods and Measurement, Bethesda, MD.
- Shaw, K., Pinto, D., Delling, C., Chapman, S. A., & Schreiner, K. (2010, March). *Measuring research use: A mixed-methods approach*. Poster session presented at the 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual NIH Conference on the Science of Dissemination and Implementation: Methods and Measurement, Bethesda, MD.

- Delling, C., Shaw, K., Pinto, D., Chapman, S. A., & Schreiner, K. (2009, November). *Planning successful knowledge mobilization strategies*. Poster session presented at the Women and Children's Health Research Institute Research Day, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A., Mayan, M., Schnirer, L., Pinsk, M., & Hyshka, E. (2009, January). *Capacity building in community-based research (CBR): A Dialogue-Education approach*. Poster presented at the University of Alberta's 2009 Festival of Teaching, Edmonton, AB.
- Chapman, S. A., Shaw, K., Bisanz, J., Schnirer, L., Jack, M., & Tsui, L. (2008, November). *Mobilizing knowledge about the development of children, youth, and families (MKAD): Focus on knowledge transformation and learning*. Poster presented during the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration of the Social Sciences & Humanities Research Council of Canada, University of Alberta, Edmonton.

### Manuscripts in Preparation

- Chapman, S. A. "CBR Workshop Series: The actualization of the scholarship of engagement."
- Chapman, S. A. "Scaffolding the future of CBR: Development of a graduate-certificate program in CBR."
- Chapman, S. A., & Bisanz, J. "Rigour in CBR: According to whom?"
- Chapman, S. A., & Huebert, E. "CBR and 'ethics': Growing a new ethics-review system."
- Chapman, S. A., Mayan, M., Schnirer, L., So, S., & Bisanz, J. "The institutionalization of community-based research (CBR): A discourse analysis of exclusivity."
- +Fong, K., & Chapman, S. A. "EDPY 612 evaluation in terms of practica as a medium for building CBR capacity."
- +Goa, H., & Chapman, S. A. "INT-D 500's design and use of group work to build CBR capacity."
- Mayan, M., Chapman, S. A., Schnirer, L., So, S., & Bisanz, J. "A critical analysis of the emergence of CBR principles."

### Other Products

- Chapman, S. A. (in progress). *Passing the talking stick: Rigour in community-based research (CBR)*. Podcast in development.
- Community-University Partnership & Alberta Centre for Child, Family & Community Research. (2008). *CBR workshop series*. [Brochure]. Edmonton, AB: Chapman, S. A., Pinchbeck, L., & Tsui, L.
- +Huebert, E., Chapman, S. A., & Pinto, D. (2009, September) *Resource list for community-based research and evaluation (CBR&E)*. Edmonton, AB: CUP & The Centre. Available at [http://www.cup.ualberta.ca/index.php?option=com\\_docman&task=cat\\_view&gid=31&Itemid=234](http://www.cup.ualberta.ca/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=31&Itemid=234).
- Tsui, L. (2006). *A handbook on knowledge sharing: Strategies and recommendations for researchers, policymakers, and service providers*. Community-University Partnership for the Study of Children, Youth, & Families (CUP). Edmonton, AB: Authors. With editing contributions from: S. A. Chapman, L. Schnirer, & S. Stewart. Available at: [http://www.cup.ualberta.ca/component?option=com\\_docman/task,cat\\_view/gid,23/Itemid,133/index.php?option=com\\_docman&Itemid=234](http://www.cup.ualberta.ca/component?option=com_docman/task,cat_view/gid,23/Itemid,133/index.php?option=com_docman&Itemid=234).

## Appendix H: Sample MKAD KM Activities

### Planning Successful Knowledge Mobilization Strategies

Christine Delling<sup>1</sup>, Kelly Shaw<sup>1</sup>, Dorothy Pinto<sup>1</sup>, Sherry Ann Chapman<sup>1</sup>, Kym Schreiner<sup>2</sup>  
<sup>1</sup>Community-University Partnership for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families, Faculty of Extension, University of Alberta, <sup>2</sup>Alberta Centre for Child, Family and Community Research

### Planning Checklist

- ✓ Use multiple KM strategies (e.g., workshops, webcasts)
- ✓ Include diverse perspectives (e.g., research, practice, policy)
- ✓ Include various kinds of information (e.g., research, how-to)
- ✓ Make the information accessible (e.g., content, language)
- ✓ Include time for questions and answers (Q&A)
- ✓ Include networking breaks
- ✓ Facilitate group discussions (e.g., large and small)
- ✓ Work collaboratively – involve audiences in KM planning
- ✓ To facilitate change, address people with:
  - decision-making authority
  - education and experience
  - contexts that value the use of research in decision-making

### How to get started:

**CUP Knowledge Sharing Handbook:**  
[www.cup.ualberta.ca](http://www.cup.ualberta.ca) → go to Documents tab

**Research Impact:** [www.researchimpact.ca](http://www.researchimpact.ca)

**CHIR KT Clearinghouse:** <http://ktclearinghouse.ca/>

Or contact us

**MKAD at CUP:** [www.cup.ualberta.ca](http://www.cup.ualberta.ca)  
**ACCFCR:** [www.research4children.com](http://www.research4children.com)  
 or [cdelling@ualberta.ca](mailto:cdelling@ualberta.ca)

This presentation was created as part of the Mobilizing Knowledge About Development (MKAD) project, a collaboration between the Community-University Partnership for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families (CUP) and the Alberta Centre for Child, Family and Community Research (ACCFCR).

Poster handout for the Women and Children's Health Research Institute Research Day (November 25, 2009)

### The Mobilizing Knowledge About Development Project

Posters at the 3<sup>rd</sup> NIH Conference on the Science of Dissemination and Implementation, March 15-16, 2010:

- An Interdisciplinary Knowledge-Mobilization Framework for the Field of Child Development
- Measuring Research Use: A Mixed-Methods Approach

For questions, suggestions, or feedback please contact:

Kelly Shaw  
 Community-University Partnership  
 for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families [www.cup.ualberta.ca](http://www.cup.ualberta.ca)  
 University of Alberta 780.492.6177  
 Edmonton, AB, CANADA [cup@ualberta.ca](mailto:cup@ualberta.ca)

Sample business cards handed out at the NIH 3rd Annual Conference on the Science of Dissemination and Implementation (March 15, 2010)

## Appendix I: MKAD Partners and Team Members

- MKAD partners included representatives from the Community-University Partnership for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families (CUP) and the Alberta Centre for Child, Family and Community Research (The Centre).
- The reporting and communication structure for the MKAD project was as follows. The project manager and others who worked directly on the project formed the MKAD26ers, which was later termed the MKAD Posse. The MKAD Posse reported to representatives from the project partners, who formed the MKAD Project Management Team. The highest level of reporting was to the MKAD Advisory Committee, which was formed of representatives from the CUP Steering Committee and The Centre.
- Following is a list of the reporting committees and the associated staff:

### **MKAD Advisory Committee**

Sue Lynch (Co-Chair)  
 Nancy Reynolds (Co-Chair)  
 CUP Steering Committee Members

### **MKAD Project Management Team**

Jeffrey Bisanz (CUP)  
 Sherry Ann Chapman (CUP)  
 Laurie Schnirer (CUP)  
 Kelly Shaw (CUP) (Project Manager)  
 Suzanne Tough (The Centre)

### **MKAD Posse**

Sherry Ann Chapman (CUP)  
 Christine Delling (CUP)  
 Dorothy Pinto (CUP)  
 Kelly Shaw (CUP) (Project Manager)

### **Additional Contributors to MKAD**

Rhonda Breikreuz (project direction, January 2007 – August 2008)  
 Aimée Caster (communications support through The Centre, 2006 – 2010)  
 Miranda Diakiw (administrative support, 2006 – 2007)  
 Katrina Fong (project assistance, May 2007 – August 2008)  
 Hannah Goa (project and teaching assistance, 2009 – 2010)  
 Marilyn Hawirko (administrative support, 2007 – 2010)  
 Elizabeth Huebert (project assistance, September 2007 – March 2008)  
 Monica Jack (liaising between The Centre and CUP, 2006 – 2008)  
 Joanne Muzak (project assistance, May – July, 2009)  
 Lara Pinchbeck (project assistance, 2008)  
 Derek Preston (project assistance, May – August 2008)  
 Kym Schreiner (liaising between The Centre and CUP, 2008 – 2009)  
 Lily Tsui (project assistance, 2006 – 2008)