RESEARCH ARTICLE

Assessing excellence in community-based research: Lessons from research with Syrian refugee newcomers

Rich Janzen, Joanna Ochocka

Centre for Community Based Research, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.

Corresponding author: Rich Janzen; rich@communitybasedresearch.ca

Appendix

Table 1   Summary of indicators used in self-reflection[1]

	Outcome category	Sub-category	Indicators used
Research engagement	Driven by community	Evidence of community entry being engaging and relevant	• Clear list of stakeholders affected by the issue under study • Gatekeeper involvement in research exploration • Translators used in research exploration • Community members' co-applicants on research proposals • Research purpose supported by community stakeholders and seen as valuable and useful to community • Financial resources shared with the community

Table 1   continued

	Outcome category	Sub-category	Indicators used
Research engagement		Evidence that those most affected by the issue under study control the research agenda	• Research placed high value on experiential knowledge of community members • Community members took ownership over research process, including data collection and data management • Stakeholders responded to drafts of research proposal • Community researchers were hired, trained and mentored • Community members gave input to guide each step of research activities
		Evidence that research aligned with community norms, needs and capacities	• Research carried out in a way that honoured community traditions and ways of acting and knowing • Community members able to react to and resolve ethical challenges (e.g. via steering committee) • Appropriate and relevant language used
	Meaningful participation	Evidence of collaborative research structure	• A cross-stakeholder steering group guided research process, with clearly defined roles/responsibilities equitably negotiated • Clearly defined responsibilities for research team members • Partnership principles of working together defined and respected • New researchers hired, trained and mentored
		Evidence of reciprocal participation among research partners	• Research partners experienced 'synergy' of working as a team towards a common goal • Ongoing reflection on project learnings and impact among partners • Community stakeholders contributed to recruiting research participants and to disseminating research findings • Research partners stayed with the project to the end • Trusting relationships were built that lasted beyond the project

Table 1   continued

	Outcome category	Sub-category	Indicators used
Research rigour	Quality/useful data and interpretations	Evidence of rigorous methodology	• Research methods appropriate for the research purpose and research questions • Method triangulation (i.e. multiple methods) leading to utilisation-focused learning and action • Accepted procedures for sampling, recruitment and data gathering • Diverse stakeholder perspectives incorporated when sampling research participants • Ethical review conducted prior and during the study that included consideration of community benefits and harm
		Evidence of rigorous analysis	• Data analysis linked to the study purpose and main research questions • Comprehensiveness of stakeholder perspectives involved in data analysis (analysis triangulation) and verification • Data analysis that followed quantitative and qualitative standards of quality

Table 1   continued

	Outcome category	Sub-category	Indicators used
Research impact	Knowledge mobilisation	Evidence of research partners implementing a knowledge mobilization strategy	• KM strategies appropriate for intended audiences • Active involvement of a range of community partners in contributing to KM products • Community forum to share research findings • Peer-reviewed, policy-related and community-related KM products created and disseminated
		Evidence of research partners responding to knowledge mobilization request from others	• Requests for research findings from community members, policy-makers, and academics • New stakeholders show interest in the research • Stakeholder groups acknowledge usefulness of the research • Research findings support new funding applications
	Mobilisation of people	Evidence of short-term mobilisation	• Knowledge exchange events held (e.g. forum, policy roundtable) • Stakeholders applied knowledge and implemented action • Additional dollars leveraged by research to implement action
		Evidence of long-term mobilisation	• Community-based research valued by community members, with capacity to use it again in the future • Community members demonstrated capacity to enact personal and collective change • Research influenced local and national activities and policy

Table 1   continued

	Outcome category	Sub-category	Indicators used
Research impact	Societal impact	Unique to each project	• Innovative and strengthened local refugee support system created in a way that is scalable and sustainable (study 1) • New interventions to support refugee newcomer youth and parents created (studies 2 & 3) • Federal government policies altered and new policies introduced to support refugee support system change (study 1) and new interventions (studies 2 & 3). • Greater capacity towards a resettlement 'learning community' in Waterloo Region (all 3 studies)

[1] Indicators used were adapted from sample indicators found on CBRET.

Table 1   continued