

Summary

Evaluating Community Engagement

Lindsey Anderson¹, Jennifer Grove², Grace Williams³ and Ann Grand⁴

¹Innovation, Impact and Business, University of Exeter, EX4 4RN; ²College of Humanities, University of Exeter, EX4 4RJ; ³Research Services, University of Exeter, EX4 4RN; ⁴Wellcome Centre for Cultures and Environments of Health, University of Exeter, EX4 4QH.

Summary

BACKGROUND: Universities are increasingly engaging with their communities, to help enrich their research and help make their cities and regions healthier, culturally richer and more interesting places to live and work. However, measuring the effectiveness of community engagement is challenging, and it is difficult for researchers to determine, for example, whether they are reaching the people they want to reach, or whether everyone is given equal opportunity to be heard.

AIMS: We aimed to study the micro-dynamics of community engagement and identify key markers of engagement that support a successful, inclusive and equitable partnership. We also aimed to consider how new measures could be designed to help researchers evaluate the nuances of community engagement activities and help them adapt their engagement approach for different contexts.

METHODS: We reviewed the literature describing how community engagement is currently being evaluated to identify if there are established methods of measuring the nuances of community engagement. We organised three workshops with academics from the University of Exeter, and their community partners, to discuss which elements of engagement are important to them, consider whether they are worth measuring and if so, how we could design novel techniques that could capture and critically evaluate these elements of the community engagement processes and delivery.

FINDINGS: Published articles describing community university engagement rarely discuss the micro-dynamics between university and non-university members of a partnership. Even fewer published articles attempt to evaluate the nuances of the engagement process and our search revealed only one published tool designed to characterize the relationships between researchers and community members. Analysis of workshop discussions revealed a series of recognised attributes deemed to be supportive of an inclusive and equitable relationship. We grouped these attributes into six themes:

1. Physical environment of the engagement space;
2. Structure of the partnership/ governance etc.;
3. Characteristics of individuals involved;
4. Relational or group characteristics;
5. Communication between partnership members; and
6. Support or training for partnership members.

While suggestions for possible evaluation tools were proposed, attendees were divided over whether it would be helpful to evaluate all these attributes.

Contribution of authors

Lindsey Anderson (LA) conducted the literature review with screening assistance from Ann Grand and consulted with Grace Williams (GW) and Jen Grove (JG) on the findings. LA, GW and JG ran the stakeholder workshops and LA wrote the final report in consultation with GW and JG.

Background

Background

It is increasingly recognised that when universities are well-connected with their communities, they help make their cities healthier, culturally richer and more interesting places to live and work (Andrew 2017 (2)). Globally, universities are improving links with their local communities and integrating social responsibility into their mission statements for research and teaching, arguing that higher education is improved when it gives back to the society that funds it. In order to meet their social responsibilities, universities need to actively encourage community engagement and provide a platform for the exchange of problems, ideas, practices, and solutions. The University of Exeter is currently working with local stakeholders to co-create an updated Community Engagement Strategy which will be vital in underpinning the University's commitment to becoming a civically engaged, socially responsible university.

However, while universities are increasingly engaging with local communities and the wider public as partners through a diverse range of multidisciplinary activities, there are many challenges to evaluating engagement, and evaluation findings are rarely shared in publications. Indeed, a 2011 review of community university collaboration publications found only 13 papers that described an evaluative element that went beyond individual descriptions of specific projects and that might be transferable to other situations (Hart 2011 (3)).

While there are many project-specific accounts of how community engagement activities relate to teaching and learning, there is a paucity of studies that have evaluated the work performed by universities in building capacity for sustainable development at the local level (Shiel 2016 (4)). Similarly demonstrating benefits at an institutional level is more difficult, and demonstrating societal or economic impact is even more problematic and requires a longer timescale (Pearce 2008 (5)). Some of the less tangible impacts of community engagement are inherently more difficult to measure and evaluation is therefore likely to be context driven. To date there have been few attempts at producing evaluation tools that are useful in understanding the micro-dynamics of public engagement between researchers, students, community groups and community members (Hart 2011).

Calls for a common 'evaluation standard' to provide tools and guidance for evaluating *public* engagement and driving good practice have led to the development of a methodological framework to standardise good practice and to enable comparison between projects with different engagement methods, designs, purposes and contexts (Reed 2018 (6)). Our study took the first steps to developing a set of tools to help with the evaluation of the delivery of *community* engagement, and the immediate outcomes that it leads to, which could potentially fit into this methodological framework. Evaluating the pathway to impact in this way is vital, and could assist in the adaptation of engagement processes to ensure they achieve impact in different contexts (Reed 2016).

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

"Public engagement describes the myriad ways in which the activity and benefits of higher education and research can be shared with the public. Engagement is by definition a two-way process, involving interaction and listening, with the goal of generating mutual benefit." (NCCPE).

Background

For the purposes of this review, we use the term community to refer to a specific group of people who all hold something in common. They may be a community of place and share a locality or geographical place or they may be a community of interest and share an identity, an experience or cause. Community engagement is the process that facilitates the interaction between an organisation (e.g. a university) and a community (see box for a definition).

Aims:

We aimed to explore the nuances of the engagement process between researchers and community members and understand how we might capture and evaluate the micro-dynamics of the engagement process such that we can learn from and improve our community engagement activities and enhance our research into agendas such as health and social inequalities. We sought to identify key markers of successful engagement which support an inclusive and equitable partnership, and consider how bespoke outcome measures or process indicators could be designed to help us understand how they affect the authenticity of the research and the positive impact on community members. For example, we aimed to consider how we could measure:

- i. Whether we are reaching the people we want to include
- ii. Who is engaging and whose voices are being heard
- iii. The nature and quality of relationships that form and develop during the engagement process
- iv. The level of trust between non-academics and academics
- v. The transformative process of engaging

Aims of this scoping study: We aimed to:

1. Update the 2011 literature review of existing models by which universities are capturing and evaluating their community engagement practices (Hart et al., 2011);
2. Review techniques that are currently being used to capture the engagement approach, particularly in relation to understanding the nuances and dynamics of the engagement;
3. Identify gaps in current practice and reflect on how we might address them;
4. Run workshops with academics, engagement practitioners and community partners to discuss our findings, and consider priorities for future research.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

“Community Engagement is a dynamic relational process that facilitates communication, interaction, involvement, and exchange between an organization and a community for a range of social and organizational outcomes” (Johnston 2018 (1))

Literature Review

Literature Review

Methods

Electronic Searchers: We updated the searches from the 2011 review “Auditing and Evaluating University–Community Engagement: Lessons from a UK Case Study”, Hart 2011 (3). We searched the Web of Science on 3 May 2018, using the search strategy in Appendix 1, searching from 2000 to the present and imposing no restriction on language of publication.

Searching other resources: We performed reference checking and forward-citation searching of all identified articles to identify additional articles which met our criteria. We searched the “grey literature”, including conference proceedings and web-based audit tools, for evaluations of community engagement or community university partnerships which have not been published in peer reviewed journals. We also contacted experts in the field for articles or features which described tools or questionnaires for capturing the quality of community university partnerships.

Selection criteria: We sought articles which described a community university partnership or engagement with external community stakeholders and which also described the evaluation of the engagement process. We excluded articles which were not between university and community groups e.g. articles describing the delivery of a community based health intervention, or engaging students in a community of learning. We sought articles which attempted to evaluate the process of the engagement – specifically, the quality of the delivery of the engagement activities and the dynamics between and amongst researchers and community members within a partnership.

Results

Results of the Search

The electronic search yielded 11,461 titles and abstracts. An initial screening was performed within EndNote, by searching for (“universit” or “higher education”) AND (“evaluat” or “audit” or “measure”) within the abstract. The abstracts of all titles within this group were read and screened for inclusion. Articles were included if they described or related to a community university partnership and either (a) described the evaluation of community engagement; (b) reviewed different techniques used for the evaluation of community engagement; or (c) described a new evaluation tool or model; AND either (c) described or measured process (e.g. implementation, or context) indicators of engagement or (d) discussed the micro dynamics of engagement between and within university personnel or students and community members.

Sixteen peer reviewed articles in published journals were identified which discussed the dynamics of the relationship between university and community partnership members (Table 1). A further three articles were identified from forward or backward citation searching, or from separate online searches. A total of nineteen articles are therefore included in this report.

Overview of published articles

Four papers explicitly described the evaluation of a specific community university partnership. Bowen 2006 (7) described an evaluation which was designed to incorporate participation of community partners in planning, developing, and evaluating all aspects of a university-community collaborative health research partnership; Roker 2007 (8) described the external evaluation of Brighton University's Community University Partnership Programme (CUPP); Tisnado 2010 (9) identified key factors for establishing strong and effective relationships in a community-based

Literature Review

participatory research project; and Harper 2004 (10) described the collaborative development of a university-based process evaluation of community - based health interventions.

Drahota 2016 (11) conducted a systematic review of community academic partnerships in the literature. It included articles which describe 54 different partnerships and contained a systematic evaluation of the collaborative process. Four further papers reviewed techniques for evaluating community engagement: Granner 2004 (12) identified published measurement tools for assessing coalition or partnership functioning; Hart 2009 (13) includes a chapter which reviews eight current approaches to evaluation in the UK and seven international approaches; McMillan 1995 (14) used data from members of 35 community coalitions to understand the predictors of empowerment; and Sufian 2011 (15) provided an overview of programme evaluation and methods of evaluating community engagement.

Eight further papers describe various models for community engagement or collaboration which included elements of evaluation. Eder 2013 (16) developed a logic model which provides the next step to supporting a collaborative evaluation structure of co-dependent relationships and developing infrastructures; Gradinger 2015 (17) produced a comprehensive typology of values represented in a broad range of texts about public involvement in health and social care research; Hart 2007 (18) described a new model which is built around seven dimensions and designed to be used as an evaluation tool in assessing partnerships (ACE); Marek 2015 (19) devised a model of effective collaboration along with an accompanying evaluation tool, the Collaboration Assessment Tool (CAT), consisting of 69 items pertaining to seven-factors: context, members, process, communication, function, resources, leadership and perceptions of coalition success; McCabe 2015 (20) described a model for collaborative working which discusses the contextual factors of partnerships, identified from the evaluation of seven public health related interventions; Trotter 2015 (21) presented a “logic model plus” evaluation model that combines classic logic model and query based evaluation designs with advances in community engaged designs derived from industry-university partnership models; Wallerstein 2008 (22) synthesised a conceptual logic model of the community based participatory research (CBPR) process which provides a framework for individual partnerships to evaluate selected characteristics and their own practices. The Wallerstein model was later used to present a summary of measures in an organised and indexed format which “provides a place to start for new and continuing partnerships seeking to evaluate their progress” (Sandoval 2012 (23)).

Pearce 2008 (5) developed REAP – described as a self-evaluation and measurement tool designed to support and encourage those involved in community engagement activities to critically reflect on and analyse their work.

Finally, one article (Arora 2015 (24)) described a new tool, the “PAIR” questionnaire which aimed to characterize the range of relationships between researchers and community members collaborating on community-based programming and research.

Describing the nuances of the engagement process

Papers were included in this review if they either described or measured the process (e.g. implementation, or context), indicators of engagement and / or discussed the micro dynamics of engagement between and within university personnel or students and community members.

We found no study which explicitly set out to evaluate the nuances of the micro-dynamics of engagement. The extent to which authors discussed the various features of the engagement process varied enormously. While several studies touched upon the importance of rudiments such as trust

Literature Review

and effective communication, few groups reported on whether or not these were actually achieved in their partnership.

Of the four papers which explicitly described the evaluation of a specific community university partnership, Bowen 2006 (7) describes a "utilisation focused" evaluation design which included an assessment of the extent to which the partnership met participants needs and expectations; an assessment of collaborative team development; and the extent to which different evaluation methods (e.g. survey or questionnaire) assess participant confidence and participation as partners.

Like several other articles, while Roker 2007 (8) alludes to the importance of the micro-dynamics of the relationship e.g. "it's essential you have to like people, get on with them, have some sort of rapport"....."being willing to listen and learn from each other" there is no notion of the need for them to be evaluated.

Tisnado 2010 (9) meanwhile identifies the following as "significant issues": transparency with respect to each partner's needs and goals; data ownership; budget and other resource issues; designated point persons; preferred modes of communication; decision- making processes; and approaches for conflict resolution should the need arise. However, the micro-dynamics of the partnership are not alluded to. Similarly, Harper 2004 (10) describes "best practices" and includes themes of building relationships; building on existing strengths and building a sense of commitment to the project, but does not discuss the finer dynamics of the partnership.

Meanwhile, Drahota's systematic review (11) aimed to find the key facilitating and hindering factors of community academic partnerships and identified twelve facilitating themes, with 53 of the 54 articles reporting at least one factor facilitating the partnership process. Seven facilitating interpersonal factors were found in this systematic review: "Trust among partners," "Respect among partners," "Shared vision, goals, and/or mission," "Good relationship among partners," "Effective and/or frequent communication," "Clearly differentiated roles/functions of partners," and "Effective conflict resolution." Other facilitating factors were "well-structured meetings", "good quality of leadership", "good selection of partners", "positive community impact", and "mutual benefit for all partners". Conversely, seven hindering interpersonal factors were identified as well: "Unclear roles and/or functions of partners," "Poor communication among partners," "Distrust among partners," "Lack of shared vision, goals, and/or mission," "Lack of common language or shared terms among partners," "Bad relationship," and "Differing expectations of partners."

Four additional papers reviewed techniques for evaluating community engagement. Granner 2004 (12) summarised measurement tools from twenty-six articles or reports representing 146 measurement scales/ indexes. For the purpose of organizing the summary tables, five general categories (which are not necessarily mutually exclusive) were used to group measurement tools: (1) Member Characteristics and Perceptions, (2) Organizational or Group Characteristics, (3) Organizational or Group Processes and Climate, (4) General Coalition Function or Scales Bridging Multiple Constructs, and (5) Impacts and Outcomes. While this article doesn't discuss the micro-dynamics of relationships, it does cite some papers which do e.g. McMillan 1995 (14).

The briefing paper by Hart (Hart 2009 (13)) describes two approaches as being useful for "understanding the micro-dynamics of public engagement between individual university personnel, students, community groups and community members": REAP (Pearce 2008 (5)) and ACE (Hart 2007 (18)). These papers are discussed in their own right below.

McMillan 1995 (14), used secondary data from 35 community coalitions organised for the prevention of alcohol and drug problems, to identify individual characteristics related to the

Literature Review

psychological empowerment of coalition members. The authors describe individual level and group level predictors of empowerment, with individual level predictors including participation levels, sense of community, and perceptions of a positive organizational climate, while group level predictors include net benefits of participation, commitment, and positive organization climate.

In the second edition of *Principles of Community Engagement* by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2011), in a chapter entitled “Program Evaluation and Evaluating Community Engagement”, Sufian 2011 (15) summarizes the central concepts in program evaluation relevant to community engagement programs, with a focus on the importance of and methods for, evaluating community-engaged initiatives. However, while the authors recommend a participatory approach to evaluation and discuss the need for getting the right people at the table and for ensuring that all voices are heard and equally valued, they do not discuss the micro-dynamics of the partnership or how to evaluate them.

The eight papers which describe models or frameworks for community engagement or collaboration tended to more explicitly outline what they considered to be important elements of the engagement process. Eder 2013 (16), for example, described “community engagement actions” and “critical foundations” for establishing and maintaining long-term relationships with community-based groups which build trust and improve research. They described bi-directional trust as a “short-term result”, while also placing it throughout the logic model (e.g., between and within communities and research/science teams, organizations, and institutions).

Gradinger’s framework comprises three overarching value systems relating to (a) normative perspectives; (b) substantive perspectives; and (c) process-related perspectives. The latter, which concerns the conduct and best practices of involvement is broken down into the value clusters Partnership/Equality; Respect/Trust; Openness/Honesty; Independence; and Clarity. While this article did not discuss how these clusters might be evaluated, the framework has since been used to evaluate several strands of involvement that were embedded within a large interdisciplinary STEM research project (Burrows 2018 (25)).

The ACE model (Hart 2007 (18)) is built around the seven dimensions of attractions, conservation, crevices, contingencies, expectations, enlightenment and emergence. It is described as an evaluation tool for assessing partnerships and provides a method of benchmarking the status of the partnership along different dimensions at its inception.

Marek’s CAT model includes a “membership” factor which refers to the individual coalition members’ characteristics, skills, attitudes, and beliefs that either contribute to, or detract from, successful coalition outcomes. Key characteristics include mutual respect, understanding, and trust as well as the ability to compromise. The “Process and Organization” factor meanwhile, identifies flexibility and adaptability as being critical for the coalition to meet the demands of the group and adapt to changes in circumstances.

The McCabe framework describes contextual factors of partnership dynamics - shared expectations; accepted power structures, respect and trust; engaged partners; good communication as well as partnership values. The authors used the model to illustrate how contextual factors within partnerships can influence what can be achieved within evaluations, the nature of evaluation findings (knowledge), and the ways this knowledge could be mobilised.

Trotter’s Logic Model Plus evaluation model describes the evaluation of the dynamics of the partnership relationships and includes a relationship dynamics component which grew out of a “best practices” assessment of university–industry research collaboration programs, and is designed to

Literature Review

monitor and provide feedback on the partnership elements of the program. Dynamics discussed include communication, joint work, trust, cooperation and conflict.

Acknowledging the gap in knowledge about what constitutes effective participatory processes and practices, Wallerstein 2008 (22) reviewed the CBPR literature and conducted an internet survey to identify characteristics of CBPR to help understand the conditions which contribute to effective participation. The model identified characteristics under each of four dimensions of CBPR - contextual factors, group dynamics, intervention/research, and outcomes. The second dimension of group dynamics, which describes how the practice of CBPR takes place has three sub-dimensions: the individual, structural, and relational dynamics of the partnership. At the individual level, are core values or cultural identities, cultural humility and individual beliefs. Structural dynamics refers to the nature of the team, its composition, extent of diversity, and level of complexity of membership or issues addressed and to the rules and resources used to guide the CBPR partnership, while relational dynamics are the core interactive or communicative processes used to negotiate work, relationships, and identities during the partnership. Sandoval later reviewed the existing instruments and measures framed by the Wallerstein model and reported a matrix of the measures for researchers looking to evaluate their own partnerships (Sandoval 2012 (23)).

The Partnership Assessment In community-based Research (PAIR) questionnaire (Arora 2015 (24)) was developed with community partners and was designed to characterize the range of relationships between researchers and community members collaborating on community-based programming and research. It comprises 31 closed ended items within five dimensions: communication, collaboration, partnership, benefits, evaluation, and sustainability. While the published article outlined the PAIR questionnaire, the tool itself has not yet been published. The author, however, when contacted, was happy to share the tool which is still being refined (Appendix 2).

REAP (Pearce 2008 (5)) is described by its authors as a measurement tool and is the second approach described by Hart 2009 as being useful for understanding the micro-dynamics of public engagement. REAP is based on four principles: Reciprocity, Externalities, Access and Partnership and is essentially a means of self-assessment, planning, monitoring and reviewing of community engagement activities. It is intended as a guide to thinking through potential partnerships using a practical breakdown of the component parts of REAP.

Online searches for web-based audit tools, and evaluations of community university partnerships not published in peer reviewed journals, identified several evaluation frameworks and tools for evaluating public engagement activities, e.g. The NCCPE's How to evaluation public engagement projects and programmes (NCCPE (26)) and *Changes DiCE* (27). However, we found no online resources which explicitly discuss or evaluate the micro-dynamics of engagement.

A summary of the micro-dynamics and relational attributes of community university partnerships identified in included articles is provided Appendix 3:

Comparison with other reviews

Drahota 2016 (11) conducted a systematic review of the literature, and examined the characteristics of Community Academic Partnership (CAPs) and the current state of the science, aiming to identify the facilitating and hindering influences on the collaborative process, and develop a common term and conceptual definition for use across disciplines. Drahota identified 54 papers which described a CAP and contained a systematic evaluation of the collaborative process. They analysed studies to

Literature Review

describe CAP characteristics and to identify the terms and methods used, as well as the common influences on the CAP process and distal outcomes.

Interestingly, there was no overlap between the articles identified in the Drahota review and our review. This is presumed to be primarily due to the difference in search terms (our review included terms for “university” and “higher education”, but did not include the term “academic”) and also the range of databases searched (we searched Web of Science, Drahota searched PsycInfo, Proquest, CSA Social Services Abstract, PubMed, and Business Source Premier). These differences demonstrate the complexity of community university partnerships and the lack of defined and common terms and definitions in this field.

Stakeholder Workshops

Stakeholder Workshops:

Following the literature review, we organised three workshops which brought together academics from across the disciplines of the University of Exeter, their community partners and external engagement practitioners to understand the outcomes which are important to i) communities (of place and interest) ii) researchers and iii) the university, and to unpick the elements of the engagement process which could influence whether or not these are achieved.

Methods:

All workshops took place during the working day, on University of Exeter Campuses, with two at the Streatham Campus in Exeter and a third at the Knowledge Spa, Truro, Cornwall. We used the findings from our review to identify gaps in the current practice and structured the workshops around these with the aim of considering novel techniques that could capture and critically evaluate community engagement processes and delivery.

At the start of the workshop, all participants were asked to tell us their reasons for engaging or partnering with researchers / the university or communities / external organisations. Everyone was given three stickers to “vote” using a list of reasons which were adapted from NCCPE Museum University Partnership Initiative. People were encouraged to add to this list if they couldn’t find a reason that adequately reflected their personal reasons.

Then, working in groups, we discussed:

1. Important features of a community university partnership that make it inclusive and equitable, helping both sides achieve their goals E.g. physical space, diversity of members, governance arrangements etc.
 - a. Which individual characteristics or attributes might be helpful within our partnership to nurture effective and inclusive engagement? E.g. respect, empathy.
 - i. Are they the same for both community and university partners?
 - b. Which group characteristics or “relational dynamics” might help nurture an effective and inclusive partnership i.e. the way people interact with each other in the group and the qualities or attitudes that might influence this e.g. trust.
 - c. How can researchers / facilitators ensure that the voices and perspectives of all individuals are heard?
2. Evaluating the dynamics of our partnerships
 - a. Is it important to capture whether our partnership is inclusive? E.g. it provides a safe space and supports mutual respect of values?
 - b. If so, how can we capture this?

For each question, discussions were guided by a list of reasons or attributes found in articles identified by the literature review (Appendix 4), and participants were asked to consider whether they felt that these attributes were important for nurturing an inclusive and equitable partnership. A scribe worked with each group and captured the discussion on a large sheet of paper which was later transcribed.

A mixed group of between 8 and 12 researchers and their community partners attended each workshop. Some researchers were not joined by their community partners, while others were joined by more than one. Due to the make-up of the groups, each workshop took a slightly different format, enabling us to adapt each workshop in the light of the previous one(s).

Stakeholder Workshops

All travelling expenses were paid in cash on the day and each community member was given a £10 Love to Shop Voucher as a token of appreciation for their time and expertise.

This study was reviewed and approved by the University of Exeter's Humanities Ethics Committee. Everyone attending the workshops was provided with a Participant Information Sheet and was asked to sign a consent form prior to commencement of the workshop.

Workshop 1: Five community partners sat on one table and five university personnel (a mix of researchers and engagement practitioners), plus one external engagement practitioner from the University of Bristol, sat on a second table. Each table had a facilitator and a scribe and discussed the questions relating to individual and group dynamics separately, while the entire room was brought back together to discuss how we might evaluate these dynamics in our partnerships.

Workshop 2: Six researchers, one community engagement practitioner and one community partner discussed all aspects of the workshop together, with one facilitator and two scribes.

Workshop 3: Six researchers, five community partners and one external engagement practitioner sat in mixed groups on two separate tables, each with a facilitator and a scribe. Each table discussed the questions relating to individual and group dynamics separately and the room was brought together to share their discussions.

Results

Findings from the workshops are presented in tables 2 to 4.

Reasons for engaging:

For both community partners and the university partners, the most common reason for engaging was "to have an impact on society". For community partners, other reasons included "to learn something new", "to give the community a voice" and "to access expertise." Meanwhile, university partners indicated that they engage with communities "to give the community a voice"; "to improve what we do"; "to add perspective to my research" and "to democratise knowledge".

Features of an inclusive and equitable community university partnership

Notes from the group discussions of the three workshops were transcribed and copied into an excel spreadsheet. Themes were identified in the combined data through an iterative process of reading, familiarisation and coding. Themes are presented in Table 2 which describes the elements that our participants felt are important for creating an inclusive and equitable partnership.

The data was organised into the following themes:

1. Physical environment of the engagement space;
2. Structure of the partnership/ governance etc.;
3. Characteristics of individuals involved;
4. Relational or group characteristics;
5. Communication between partnership members; and
6. Support or training for partnership members.

REASONS FOR ENGAGING

"To have an impact on society"

"To give the community a voice"

"To learn something new"

"To access expertise"

"To improve what we do"

"To add perspective to my research" and

"To democratise knowledge".

Stakeholder Workshops

Not surprisingly, the themes that emerged from the workshop echoed those identified in the literature. Mutuality was a common theme that ran through all of the discussions. There was universal recognition that neither community nor university partners would or should be expected to partner without there being some benefit in return. On a practical note, it was accepted that the physical environment, such as choice of location, and providing safe space for people to feel comfortable, played an important part in successful collaborative partnerships, and that a good mediator, or broker, who acts to bridge any gaps between the researchers and community can facilitate partnership working and knowledge mobilisation.

In order to tease out what participants felt were the important “micro-dynamics” of the relationships that formed in a partnership, we tried to identify what relational or group characteristics were important in creating an equal partnership that provides a safe space for all voices to be heard. These relational characteristics are dependent on the individual characteristics that comprise the partnership, but can be influenced by a good facilitator who is able to affect the balance and direction of the conversation in a group. Fourteen relational characteristics were identified in the workshops: turn taking; encouragement; listening to all discussions; recognising, acknowledging and utilising skills, knowledge, experiences and strengths; support; mutual respect; reciprocity / mutual benefit; empowerment; negotiation / cooperation; understanding each other (e.g. timing / rhythms); parity of esteem; flexibility; equality; trust.

Evaluating the micro-dynamics of engagement

Table 3 summarises the discussions relating to how we might evaluate the engagement process, and specifically, the micro-dynamics of the relationships in the partnership.

Participants discussed techniques they already use in their partnerships, and were encouraged to think about creative ways that we can capture and evaluate the inter-relationships and dynamics in our partnerships. It was clear that while some partnerships do not formally evaluate their relationships, they would often evaluate in an informal way, often through informal discussion of what worked or didn't work. The importance of allowing time and space for reflecting on what had or had not worked was mentioned by several participants, while ethnography was also suggested as a means of examining and understanding the behaviour of the participants within a partnership. Creative methods such as storyboarding, using art to express emotions and graffiti walls were all suggested means of evaluating the engagement process.

Participants drew on their own experiences, but were also keen to draw on those of others, including experts from other sectors such as arts practitioners, science, education and museums for how they evaluate the experience of their visitors. It was also suggested that we look at other academic disciplines such as Psychology or Business Management for research which addresses the factors that influence and shape group communication.

EVALUATING MICRO-DYNAMICS OF ENGAGEMENT

“Needs to be robust, without being a questionnaire”

“Capture the conversation / narrative”

“Ask: What could we do differently / add?”

“Informal discussion”

“Ask for insights. E.g. “Explain this project to a Martian””

“Use art to express emotions”

“Space and time for reflection “

“Repository of terms / process indicators”

“Use evaluations skills from other disciplines”

“Look to e.g. Arts practitioners / scientists / education / museums “

Discussion

Discussion

Surprisingly, while there is a plethora of published research describing community university partnerships and CBPR, very few studies actually report on the dynamics of the relationship between and amongst researchers or university personnel, and their community partners. We found very few tools in the published literature designed to capture the micro-dynamics of relationships which would help partners ascertain whether they have achieved what they set out to achieve in their partnerships e.g. equity, mutuality. Indeed, while many authors stress the importance of participation and talk of the significance of e.g. trust, respect and effective communication, very few authors discuss how or why the group interaction plays out or whether or not they attempted to evaluate this. While there is much discourse on the concept of trust and respect as key community engagement metrics in the literature, they are both social phenomena and therefore subject to interpretation.

Surprisingly, comparison with another systematic review of community academic partnerships (Drahota 2016 (11)) has revealed no overlap with our included articles. Whilst this highlights that our review is not exhaustive, the facilitating factors identified by Drahota were mirrored across the literature identified in our review, demonstrating that it is representative of the literature published in this area. Similarly, the themes identified in our workshops as being important for creating an inclusive and equitable partnership echoed those identified in the literature (Appendix 3) and those by the Drahota review.

The workshops revealed mixed attitudes regarding the value of capturing the nuances of the relationships between community and university members within a partnership. There was a general appreciation that it is important to learn from our partnerships and understand how we can do things better. It was also agreed that this is usually best done immediately following, or even during the engagement process. For many participants, this is best done using an informal, reflexive discussion at, or after an event, as opposed to using a formal questionnaire or survey. However, while there was a common recognition that the relational dynamics in a partnership can influence the parity of the partnership which can, in turn affect the outcomes and success of the partnership, consensus was split over whether this could, or should be evaluated.

Allowing time and space for reflection was deemed to be an important process in understanding what had worked or what could be improved. Requiring discipline from all partners, reflexivity through, for example, the use of reflexive journals, provides on-going opportunity for contemplating all aspects of the partnership. Ethnography, the systematic study of people and cultures was also suggested as a means of examining and understanding the behaviour of the participants within a partnership.

Members attending the first workshop saw the most value in evaluating the dynamics in a partnership. This group suggested the idea of using a repository of the features that are recognised as influencing the success of an inclusive and equitable partnership, and designing a set of tools which would allow you to choose items from this repository and capture them in a quick but meaningful way. This could, for example, include a simple spider diagram where partners mark on a visual scale the level of five or six predefined indicators e.g. trust or mutual respect in the partnership. When discussed in later workshops, this idea was received with mixed enthusiasm. Some participants saw the value in this kind of tool, while others felt that this would be too prescriptive and would not allow for the nuances of the relationship to be captured.

Interestingly, one of the workshops was dominated by discontent regarding the value placed by Higher Education Institutes on Public and Community Engagement. The underlying feeling at this

Discussion

workshop was that until institutes recognise the value of engagement, resource it sufficiently and reward academics for engaging through recognition in career pathways, then there was little value in evaluating the minutiae of the process.

Overall, there was general recognition that the deployment of any evaluation and impact measure should be practical, realistic and proportionate to the engagement activity and the resources available and that any additional data collection should only be undertaken if there is time to analyse and learn from it.

We could perhaps look towards other disciplines, such as Psychology or Business Management for research which addresses the factors that influence and shape group communication; the patterns of group dynamics over time; and the correlations of these patterns with group outcomes (for example, productivity, quality decision making, and so forth). Understanding these micro-processes may help us to build more effective and sustainable partnerships.

Summary

A review of the published and online literature revealed that few articles describing community university engagement discuss the micro-dynamics between university and non-university members of a partnership. Even fewer articles report that they have captured or evaluated the nuances of the engagement process and we found only one published tool designed to characterise the relationships between researchers and community members.

Analysis of workshop discussions elucidated a series of recognised attributes deemed to be supportive of an inclusive and equitable relationship. These attributes were themed under: Physical environment of the engagement space; Structure of the partnership/ governance etc.; Characteristics of individuals involved; Relational or group characteristics; Communication between partnership members; and Support or training for partnership members. While some participants suggested the development of a repository of terms and associated tools which would assist in the evaluation of these attributes, overall, workshop participants were divided with regards to the value of evaluating these attributes.

Results: Table 1. Summary of included articles

Table 1 Summary of included articles

Author	Title	Country / Research Area	Does the paper describe the evaluation of CE or review CE evaluation techniques?	What evaluation tools / methods does it use?	Does it describe or measure process (e.g. implementation, mechanisms, or context) indicators of engagement?	Does it describe the micro dynamics of engagement between and within university personnel/ students and community members?
Arora 2015 (24)	Measuring community-based participatory research partnerships: The initial development of an assessment instrument	USA	No - it describes a new evaluation tool	Developed the Partnership Assessment In community-based Research (PAIR) questionnaire comprising of 31 closed ended items	Describes 5 dimensions: communication, collaboration, partnership, benefits, evaluation, sustainability	Yes - PAIR is designed to characterize the range of relationships between researchers and community members collaborating on community-based programming and research. PAIR was developed with community partners
Bowen 2006 (7)	A model for collaborative evaluation of university-community partnerships	Canada / health / capacity building	yes	“utilisation focused” evaluation design including five core evaluation activities : (a) confidential key informant interviews, (b) a pre-test and post-test survey, (c) process documentation, (d) participant observation, and (e) written evaluations of team meetings. Additional unobtrusive methods (e.g. monitoring of the project web site) were later added	The evaluation has six purposes: (a) assessing how well the project is meeting its initial objectives; (b) assessing the extent to which it is meeting participants needs and expectations; (c) determining evaluation questions and methodology; (d) identifying unanticipated outcomes; (e) assessing collaborative team development; (f) contributing to knowledge translation theory; and (h) component analysis	Yes - the evaluation assessed collaborative team development; Also describes the extent to which different evaluation methods assess participant confidence and participation as partners

Results: Table 1. Summary of included articles

<p>Drahota 2016 (11)</p>	<p>Community-Academic Partnerships: A Systematic Review of the State of the Literature and Recommendations for Future Research</p>	<p>USA / various</p>	<p>No - this is a systematic review of the literature. It includes articles which describe a community academic partnership and contained a systematic evaluation of the collaborative process</p>	<p>The most common type of data collected was interviews (72.2%), meeting minutes or notes (29.6%), observations (25.9%), surveys or questionnaires (22.2%), field notes (16.7%), focus group data (16.7%), grant proposals or funding progress notes (14.8%), discussions (11.1%)</p>	<p>The paper reviews characteristics of CAPs, identifying the facilitating and hindering influences on the collaborative process</p>	<p>This paper discusses facilitating and hindering interpersonal process factors Facilitating factors included: trust, respect, good relationship, effective and/or frequent communication, well-structured meetings, shared vision, goals, and/or mission, clearly differentiated roles/functions of partners, good quality of leadership, effective conflict resolution, good selection of partners, positive community impact, and mutual benefit</p>
<p>Eder 2013 (16)</p>	<p>A Logic Model for Community Engagement Within the Clinical and Translational Science Awards Consortium: Can We Measure What We Model?</p>	<p>USA / Health (clinical translation)</p>	<p>No - developed a logic model</p>	<p>The logic model provides the next step to supporting a collaborative evaluation structure of these co-dependent relationships and developing infrastructures</p>	<p>The authors link the logic model to a typology of community-academic relationships to better evaluate the effect of CE on clinical translational science. The categories—engagement, collaboration, and shared leadership—focus attention on understanding how processes for establishing and maintaining long-term relationships with community-based groups build trust and improve research</p>	<p>Describes the bi-directional trust as a “short-term result”, while also placing it throughout the logic mode</p>

Results: Table 1. Summary of included articles

Gradinger 2015 (17)	Values associated with public involvement in health and social care research: a narrative review	UK Health and social care	No - developed a framework comprising three overarching value systems relating to (a) normative perspectives; (b) substantive perspectives; and (c) process-related perspectives, which concern the conduct and best practices of involvement. Each value system contains five value clusters pertaining to them.	This framework enables a structured approach to identifying what values different stakeholders attribute to public involvement, thus helping to manage potential conflict within a project and its wider organizational context.		Yes – process-related value system contains the following value clusters: (i) Partnership/Equality; (ii) Respect/Trust; (iii) Openness/Honesty; (iv) Independence; (v) Clarity.
Granner 2004 (12)	Evaluating community coalition characteristics and functioning: a summary of measurement tools	USA (public health)	This is a review which identifies published measurement tools for assessing coalition or partnership functioning	This summary identified measurement tools for coalition or partnership characteristics and functioning.	Describes tools to assess successful engagement. Measures were included in this summary if they provided at least a conceptual definition of the construct measured. Twenty-six articles or reports were identified, representing 146 measurement scales/ indexes. (1) Member Characteristics and Perceptions, (2) Organizational or Group Characteristics, (3) Organizational or Group Processes and Climate, (4) General Coalition Function or Scales Bridging Multiple Constructs, and (5) Impacts and Outcomes.	No - but includes references to some papers which do - e.g. McMillan

Results: Table 1. Summary of included articles

Harper 2004 (10)	Diverse phases of collaboration: Working together to improve community-based HIV interventions for adolescents	USA (health HIV)	Not really -it describes the collaborative development of a process evaluation but it does present the “voices” of the collaborative team	Intervention evaluation including forms, focus groups and in-depth interviews	Yes - it describes “best practices” that have generalizability to other collaborative partnerships	The "Best Practices" include themes of building relationships; building on existing strengths and building a sense of commitment to the project
Hart 2007 (18)	An ACE way to engage in community-university partnerships: Making links through resilient therapy	UK (social services / mental health)	Describes a new model which is built around 7 dimensions	ACE documents the drivers, process and outcomes of partnership working	Describes a model which is built around 7 dimensions and can be used as an evaluation tool in assessing partnerships: attractions, conservation, crevices, contingencies, expectations, enlightenment and emergence. The authors describe 7 elements of "attractions": purpose, finances, leadership, personal capital, organisational capital, status capital and Aristotelian capital.	Not really. This paper provides a method of benchmarking the status of the partnership along different dimensions at its inception
Hart 2009 (13)	Briefing paper: Auditing, benchmarking and evaluating public engagement	UK (various)	This is a briefing paper on monitoring and evaluating university public engagement. One of the chapters reviews 8 current approaches to evaluation in the UK and 7 international approaches, giving a sketch of what each one may be used for.		Yes - Includes some issues to bear in mind when deciding on which approaches might be useful e.g. Do I want to capture change over time or is this a one-off exercise? Do we want to understand what is happening at the individual project level?	Describes 2 approaches as being useful for "understanding the micro-dynamics of public engagement between individual university personnel, students, community groups and community members": REAP (Pearce 2008) and ACE (Hart 2007)

Results: Table 1. Summary of included articles

Marek 2015 (19)	Evaluating Collaboration for Effectiveness: Conceptualization and Measurement	USA (various)	The paper presents a seven-factor model of effective collaboration along with an accompanying evaluation tool, the Collaboration Assessment Tool (CAT)	CAT includes a self-reported assessment of perceived coalition success and perceived confidence in meeting its goals.	The CAT survey consists of 69 items pertaining to seven factors: context, members, process, communication, function, resources, leadership and perceptions of coalition success	The "Membership" factor refers to the individual coalition members' characteristics that either contribute to, or detract from, successful coalition outcomes. Key characteristics include mutual respect, understanding, trust and the ability to compromise. Also having the appropriate cross section of members with representatives of diverse groups
McCabe 2015 (20)	A model for collaborative working to facilitate knowledge mobilisation in public health	UK (public health)	Primarily describes the evaluation of discrete interventions and a model for collaborative working which discusses the contextual factors of partnerships.	Reflective practice and discussions within interactive workshops; mapping out and exploring differing working relationships within and across partnerships, the subsequent evaluation outcomes and the roles researchers adopted within this process.	Describes a model for collaborative working to facilitate knowledge mobilisation in public health, which includes contextual factors of partnership: dynamics/ values/ interpretation of evidence	Describes a framework of interrelated components which includes contextual factors of the partnership dynamics - share expectations; accepted power structures, respect and trust; engaged partners; good communication

Results: Table 1. Summary of included articles

McMillan 1995 (14)	Empowerment praxis in community coalitions	USA (Health - drug addiction)	Uses data from members of 35 community coalitions to understand the predictors of empowerment	Task Force Member Survey and a Key Informant Telephone Survey.	no	Describes individual level and group level predictors of empowerment. Individual level predictors: participation levels, sense of community, and perceptions of a positive organizational climate. Group level predictors: net benefits of participation, commitment, and positive organization climate.
Pearce 2008 (5)	The ivory tower and beyond: Bradford University at the heart of its communities	UK (various incl conflict research, diversity)	Authors experimented with a new approach to CE and REAP was developed in tandem with this tool	REAP self-evaluation and measurement tool	The aim of the REAP tool is to support and encourage those involved in community engagement activities to critically reflect on and analyse their work. It is a work in progress, and has been adapted from methodologies in the field of UK community development and development projects in the global south, so it is very practical. The REAP measurement tool is based on four principles: Reciprocity, Externalities, Access and Partnership (REAP).	No

Results: Table 1. Summary of included articles

Roker 2007 (8)	Making community-university partnerships work: The key success factors'	UK (various)	Yes - external evaluation of Brighton University's CUPP	Face-to-face and telephone interviews, focus groups and self-completion questionnaires involving over 50 people	Describes some of the key success factors involved in making CUPs work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a shared vision about the aims of university-community collaborations in general, and individual projects and activities in particular • mutual benefit and learning • good personal relationships and openness to new ideas and ways of doing things • individual and organisational flexibility • senior staff leadership and commitment • commitment and enthusiasm from universities and communities • organisational infrastructure and support 	It touches upon them - e.g. "it's essential you have to like people, get on with them, have some sort of rapport" "being willing to listen and learn from each other" but doesn't discuss how they can be evaluated
Sandoval 2012 (23)	Process and outcome constructs for evaluating community-based participatory research projects: a matrix of existing measures	USA (various CBPR)	No	The author uses the Wallerstein model to presents a summary of measures in an organised and indexed format which "provides a place to start for new and continuing partnerships seeking to evaluate their progress"	Yes – describes Contexts: Social-economic, cultural, geographic, political, environmental factors; Policies/trends, National /local governance and political climate; Historic degree and collaboration and trust between university and community; Community: capacity, readiness and experience; University: capacity, readiness and reputation; Perceive severity of health issues;	Describes Group Dynamics, including relational dynamics: Safety, Dialogue, listening and mutual learning, Leadership & stewardship, Influence and power dynamics, Flexibility, Self and collective reflection Participatory decision-making and negotiation, Integration of local beliefs to group process, Task roles and communication

Results: Table 1. Summary of included articles

Sufian 2011 (15)	Program evaluation and evaluating community engagement	USA (health)	Provides an overview of programme evaluation and methods of evaluating CE.	N/A. However, discusses social network analysis (SNA) for looking at social relationships or connections and the strength of these connections and for understanding a community and its structure.	Describes questions to ask when evaluating community engagement e.g. Are the right community members at the table? Does the process and structure of meetings allow for all voices to be heard and equally valued? What is the mechanism for decision-making or coming to consensus; how are conflicts handled? How are community members involved in developing the program or intervention?	Discusses the need for getting the right people at the table and for ensuring that all voices are heard and equally valued. Recommends a participatory approach to evaluation
Trotter 2015 (21)	A diagnostic evaluation model for complex research partnerships with community engagement: The partnership for Native American Cancer Prevention (NACP) model	USA / Health	Yes - The design and testing of a "logic model plus" evaluation model that combines classic logic model and query based evaluation designs with advances in community engaged designs derived from industry-university partnership models	Metric / Milestone progress. Partnership dynamics data was collected primarily through the use of the partnership survey conducted annually.	"Logic Model Plus" includes partnership dynamics feedback (partnership metrics) and traditional output metrics (Logic Model).	Model evaluates the dynamics of the partnership relationships and allows for a relationship dynamics component to monitor and provide feedback on the partnership elements of the program. Dynamics discussed include communication, joint work, trust, cooperation, conflict, etc.
Tisnado 2010 (9)	A Case Study in Chamorro Community and Academic Engagement for a Community-Partnered Research Approach	USA / health	No -but id key factors for establishing strong and effective relationships	Reflections of community and academic partners in preparation to evaluate a program of work / analysis of meeting notes and memoirs	Identifies the following as "Significant issues": transparency with respect to each partner's needs and goals, data ownership, budget and other resource issues, designated point persons, preferred modes of communication, decision- making processes, and approaches for conflict resolution should the need arise.	no

Results: Table 1. Summary of included articles

Wallerstein 2008 (22)	What predicts outcomes in CBPR." Community-based participatory research for health: From process to outcomes 2	USA / health	Synthesised a conceptual logic model of CBPR processes leading to outcomes. The authors present the model and a list of characteristics for each dimension in the model	Review of CBPR literature, Internet survey, and a national CBPR advisory committee	Yes - Identified characteristics under each of four dimensions of CBPR that are critical to consider if communities and researchers are to achieve a greater understanding of the pathways by which CBPR may lead to outcomes.	Characteristics range from historical trust or mistrust to evidence of shared power, and they operate on individual, partnership, and contextual levels.
-----------------------	--	--------------	---	--	--	--

Results: Table 2. Reasons for engaging

Table 2: Reasons for engaging / partnering

(Adapted from NCCPE Museum University Partnership Initiative)

	Community members	Researchers
To learn something new	6	2
To have an impact on society	7	7
To influence how we do things	2	3
To help make the work I do sustainable	2	2
To access new spaces	0	2
To create new ideas	2	2
To grow my network	2	0
To engage with new audiences	3	0
To give the community a voice	6	4
To make a difference to me personally	4	0
To have fun	4	1
To improve what we do	1	4
To add perspective to my research	4	5
To democratise knowledge	4	4
To access expertise	5	1
To make a difference to the public	1	3
To encourage participation	1	2
To access people who can help with my work	2	1
To share knowledge and experience	4	2
To encourage a deeper level of participation by publics	1	3
To improve our knowledge base	0	0
Audience development	0	0
To create a tangible outcome e.g. publication, exhibition etc	1	0
To access new audiences	2	0
To access resources e.g. equipment	0	0
To make better use of our resources	2	1
To provide a better experience for our members	0	0

Results: Table 2. Reasons for engaging

To help the public understand the value of our work	0	1
To access new funding or income streams	1	0
To have our work underpinned by research	2	0
To access cutting edge research or new knowledge	1	0
To help with business innovation	0	1
To improve our skills	1	0
Continuing professional development for staff and volunteers	0	1
To diversify our workforce	0	0
To improve our capacity	4	0
Other Reasons / comments		
To amplify ignored voices		
To hear and value and learn from community voices		
To make my research relevant and better		
To respond to societal challenges and involving those affected		
To co-create improvements		

Results: Table 3. Features of an Inclusive and Equitable Partnership

Table 3. Features of an Inclusive and Equitable Partnership

Physical environment of the engagement space	Structure of the partnership/ governance etc	Characteristics of individuals	Relational or Group Characteristics	Communication	Support or training for Partnership members
Location of meeting - preferably off campus / in the community / easy to reach / accessible	Agreement / contract / ground rules	Energy / enthusiasm / creative drive / passion	Turn taking	Information in advance of meetings - e.g. map / directions	On-going formal support
Balance of informal setting and formal guidelines of interactions	Doesn't necessary need formal rules or structures – depending on the type of partnership / projects	Friendly / warm	Encouragement	The objective or aims of the engagement are clear, meaningful and are seen as important	Training for all partners
Spaces fit for purpose / good amenities and parking / disabled access	Support and governance	Compassion / empathy / understanding	Listening to all discussions	Agree a glossary of terms / time scales	Different support strategies for different types of researchers e.g. those who want to do it / those who have to do it, for a university to support them
Common meeting place to talk with university people on their ground	Privacy / confidentiality	Pragmatic	Recognising, acknowledging and utilising skills / knowledge / experiences and strengths	Good, clear communication - jargon free	Opportunity for one to one meetings once a year to give opportunity for free speech
Regular meetings (Not too formal)	Diversity - cross section of public and views, with a range of skills and knowledge	Bridger	Support	Common language	Build in training of engagement, communication and collaboration skills for academics
Timing of meetings	Accessibility and diversity in approach	Flexible	Mutual respect	Ask people what matters from the outset	Co-production of outputs such as journal articles
Safe space / Point of contact / box for confidential notes – to allow difficult conversations	Shared or mutually beneficial aims	Willingness to listen	Reciprocity / mutual benefit	Ground Rules — co-create and stick on wall - Refer back to these	Appreciate that partners might have the skills and desire to e.g. write articles

Results: Table 3. Features of an Inclusive and Equitable Partnership

Recognition and thank you (payment) for volunteers	Common interests / goals and shared views	Willingness to learn new skills / Open to change / new experiences / embrace uncertainty	Empowerment	Ground rules personalised for different elements of a project / meeting / activity	Social media groups / connections / networks
Refreshments	All knowledge is shared and valued	Respectful	Negotiation / cooperation	Offer different ways of engaging – catering for different personality types – having a sensibility for other personalities / ways of including them / being creative to promote participation	Offer a range of events / activities (e.g. speakers, people with diverse knowledge)
Travel expenses	Moderator / facilitator / broker	Interest and curiosity – not a political agenda or other purpose	Understanding each other (e.g. timing / rhythms)	Use different techniques to have conversations e.g. guided conversation or games	Visible point of access for public and researchers helps ensure consistency / longevity of partnership
Time – (on both sides) to reflect on progress at regular points	Meets everyone's needs	Commitment (to project and engagement)	Parity of esteem	No PowerPoints!	Go-to person who is accessible and friendly
Resources– without this it makes partnership work hard	Longevity – builds in resilience – different to one-off activities	Team player	Flexibility	Continuity and single point of contact	Promotions – word of mouth literature in libraries etc
	Understanding of each other's needs / expectations / priorities / timescales	Real world experience	Equality	Regular meetings / email/ sharing of info	Honesty/ openness e.g. if things go wrong can go for support
	Sharing of opportunities (not necessarily responsibilities)	Able to give and receive constructive feedback	Trust	Recognise and understand the power difference / balance / voice that people have in a partnership	Dedicated resources to forming partnership / maintain / constant (can neglect partnership if time-poor)
	Managing expectations – both researcher and community	Sharing knowledge and information		Good facilitator / Broker = a good communicator who engenders interest	Being flexible – ongoing maintenance to support partnerships
	Recognising the value and contributions of all partners			Stick to agenda and not go off key	Signposting for training / support

Results: Table 3. Features of an Inclusive and Equitable Partnership

	Transparency – need to be open about what each partner needs / has to achieve - This can be imposed by organisation / funder – can create tensions / challenges			Be prepared to have difficult conversations and exit procedures with mechanisms for both sides to challenge	Toolkit – basics of partnership working skills for engagement e.g. cue cards – yes / no / acronym alert
	Purposeful partnership – co created / shared on both sides (clarity)			Large print	Must be adaptable and allow reflection - Reviewing what changes can be made and measured should be part of the process
	Continuity – clear infrastructure and single point of contact			Circle discussions	
	Safe space				

Results: Table 4. Evaluating the micro-dynamics of engagement

Table 4: Evaluating the micro dynamics of engagement

Why evaluate?	How can we evaluate?
To understand what we are doing – to give it meaning	Provide opportunity for participants to say immediately after what have they achieved
For funders / institutions e.g. community engagement strategy	Needs to be robust, without being a questionnaire
For policy makers	Capture the conversation / narrative - Communication method – what does it prove / show?
To improve what we're doing	Ask: What could we do differently / add?
To enable us to replicate what we're doing	Informal discussion – what worked / didn't work / what needs to be improved
Sometimes you get positive / negative feedback from body language – it would be helpful to capture this	Ask for insights. E.g. Use 5 adjectives to describe the activity/ Explain this project to a martian
For clarity on the contribution engagement makes	Relational dynamics – making meaning out of what works
To evaluate the process / dynamics of partnership	Be creative – e.g. use a portrait artist
To demonstrate impact of activities	Use art to express emotions
To assess level of trust: High trust / equity = openness of difficult things; Low trust / equity = not as open?	Reflexivity – an on-going process: requires certain discipline and for everyone to understand the purpose
Other comments / questions	Space and time for reflection / reflexive journals – reflection on the learning process
Context is important	Depends if interested in dynamics or just success stories E.g. community engagement reported on University website
Measure and evaluation = different	Short, simple, capturing of response to activity (graffiti walls, post – its)
Engaged research = thinking outside the box - do we want to evaluate it if it means putting it back in the box?	Numbers and repeat audiences
Do we want quantitative or process evaluation – e.g. feelings and motivations?	Tookits / resources to support evaluation with community groups – resources to identify models
What are we measuring and how are we asking them?	Need tools for different groups – not one size fits all
Who is this for? Funders? Impact Case study?	Repository of terms / process indicators – might work in some situations – use mix of images / text
How should / could communities feedback to the university?	Use evaluations skills from other disciplines
Should evaluation be independent? There will be cost-implications	Use ethnography to evaluate
What do we do with the information? Evidence e.g. feeding back to university – even if they don't ask for it	External observation for different perspective
Before we can think of evaluating, we need to better enable and reward engagement, through: resources (core funding) and recognition in career pathways	Record (audio and observations) of meetings and researchers and participants use to analyse to dynamics
What is robust evidence?	Look to e.g. Arts practitioners / scientists / education / museums for how they evaluate the experience of their visitors

Appendices

Appendix 1: Search Strategy

1. (ti = (communit* near/8 engag*))
2. (ti = (communit* near/8 universit* near/8 partner))
3. (ti = (communit* near/8 higher education* near/8 partner))
4. (ti = (communit* near/8 collaborat*))
5. (ti = (public* near/8 engag*))
6. (ti = (public* near/8 universit* near/8 partner))
7. (ti = (public* near/8 higher education* near/8 partner))
8. (ti = (public* near/8 collaborat*))
9. (ti = (stakeholder* near/8 engag*))
10. (ti = (stakeholder * near/8 universit* near/8 partner))
11. (ti = (stakeholder * near/8 higher education* near/8 partner))
12. (ti = (stakeholder * near/8 collaborat*))
13. (ti = (civi* near/8 engag*))
14. (ti = (civi * near/8 universit* near/8 partner))
15. (ti = (civi* near/8 higher education* near/8 partner))
16. (ti = (civi* near/8 collaborat*))
17. (ti = (citizen* near/8 engag*))
18. (ti = (citizen * near/8 universit* near/8 partner))
19. (ti = (citizen* near/8 higher education* near/8 partner))
20. (ti = (citizen* near/8 collaborat*))
21. (ti = (community* near/8 involv*))
22. (ti = (community* near/8 coalition*))
23. (ti = (public* near/8 involv*))
24. (ti = (public* near/8 coalition*))
25. (ti = (stakeholder* near/8 involv*))
26. (ti = (stakeholder* near/8 coalition*))
27. (ti = (civi * near/8 involv*))
28. (ti = (civi * near/8 coalition*))
29. (ti = (citizen* near/8 involv*))
30. (ti = (citizen* near/8 coalition*))
31. 1 or 2 or 3 etc
32. (ti = audit)
33. (ti = evaluat*)
34. 32 or 33
35. 31 AND 34

Appendices

Appendix 2: The Partnership Assessment in community-based Research (PAIR) Measure

The goal of this questionnaire is to understand the relationship between researchers and school/community members working together on projects.

Below is a list of sentences that describe how researchers and school/community members work together to do research in the community.

The term “partner” is used to describe the person you are working with in your research.

Before completing the measure, pick ONE partner who best represents the relationship between you and the organization with which you are partnering.

Please pick ONE partner even if you work with multiple partners.

When completing all items, please have this person in mind and consider the whole length of time you have worked with this person.

My Name: _____ My Partner’s Name: _____

My Organization: _____ My Partner’s Organization: _____

I am a: Researcher Community/School Member

My Partner is a: Researcher Community/School Member

How long have you worked with this partner? :

Less than 1 year 1-2 years 3-5 years Over 5 years (indicate how many: _____)

How much does the relationship you have with this partner affect how you feel about your partner’s organization? Not at all Very little Somewhat Very Much Greatly

Read each phrase and circle the one answer that best describes the relationship between you and your partner on a scale of

1 = “Almost Never True,” 2 = “Occasionally True,” 3 = “Sometimes True,” 4 = “Often True,” or 5 = “Almost Always True” for you and this partner.

Please consider the same partner for each item.

Almost Never True 1	Occasionally True 2	Sometimes True 3	Often True 4	Almost Always True 5
---------------------------	------------------------	---------------------	-----------------	----------------------------

1. My partner discusses ideas with me.
2. My partner shares resources (e.g. materials, space, etc...) with me when appropriate.
3. I believe my partner tries to improve our partnership.
4. There is open communication between me and my partner

Appendices

5. I believe my partner values my views.
 6. I try to understand the strengths and difficulties of my partner's setting.
 7. I discuss ideas with my partner.
 8. I believe my partner tries to understand the strengths and difficulties of my setting.
 9. My partner and I divide responsibilities in a way that is acceptable to me.
 10. My partner and I contribute to research through our partnership.
 11. My partner and I talk about how our partnership is working.
 12. I share resources (e.g. materials, space, contacts, etc...) with my partner when appropriate
 13. My partner talks with me when problems arise.
 14. My partner and I work together to make decisions when appropriate.
 15. I respect my partner.
 16. The community benefits from this partnership.
 17. My organization benefits from this partnership.
 18. I feel trusted by my partner.
 19. The relationship is worth the amount of time I invest in it.
 20. I talk with my partner when problems arise.
 21. I benefit personally from this partnership.
 22. My partner and I share responsibility for making decisions when appropriate.
 23. My partner and I are committed to making our partnership work well.
 24. I trust my partner.
 25. I value my partner's views.
 26. I benefit professionally from this partnership.
 27. I believe my partner tries to understand the culture of my organization/community.
 28. My partner and I work together to create our goals.
 29. I feel respected by my partner.
 30. I try to understand the culture of my partner's organization/community.
 31. I try to improve our partnership.
 32. Will the process of filling out this questionnaire influence how you will work with your partner?
If so, how?:
-

Appendices

Appendix 3: Summary of included articles: identified micro-dynamics and relational attributes of community university partnerships

Arora 2015

- Communication
- collaboration
- partnership
- benefits
- evaluation
- sustainability

Bowen 2006

- meeting participant needs and expectations
- collaborative team development

Drahota 2016

- Trust
- Respect
- Shared vision, goals, and/or mission
- Good relationship among partners
- Effective and/or frequent communication
- Clearly differentiated roles/functions of partners
- Effective conflict resolution

Eder 2013

- critical foundations for success
 - bi-directional trust
 - reducing barriers to communication and collaboration
 - stronger relationships with schools / public health etc
 - ethical framework
 - Novel methods
- Changed communities
 - community empowerment
 - altered view of university research
- changed academe
 - altered view of community engaged research / community
 - multidisciplinary collaborative engaged research
- sustained community-university collaborations
- changed participants
 - increased recruitment / retention
 - greater diversity
 - representative cohorts
 - increased trust

Appendices

Gradinger 2015

Process-related perspectives, which concern the conduct and best practices of involvement.

- Partnership/Equality:
 - Sharing power and decisions in equal, reciprocal, and collaborative PI processes.
- Respect/Trust:
 - Respecting diversity, values, skills, knowledge, and experience in mutually beneficial PI processes.
- Openness/Honesty:
 - Processes and attitudes being open, honest, flexible, and committed to PI
- Independence:
 - Processes, facilitation, and evaluation being independent.
- Clarity:
 - Purpose, processes, communication, and definition of PI being clear.

Harper 2004

- Building relationships
- Building on existing strengths
- Building a sense of commitment to the project

Hart 2007

- attractions
 - purpose
 - finances
 - leadership
 - personal capital
 - organisational capital
 - status capital
 - Aristotelian capital (not about charity and self-sacrifice – it enhances our work)
- Conservation
 - What are the unique differences that need to be conserved?
 - What difference does one partner have that another would like?
 - What are the similarities?
- Crevices
 - What holes might we fall down?
- contingencies
- expectations
 - what kind of relationship do you expect to have?
 - What model of knowledge exchange is implied in this particular relationship?
- Enlightenment
 - How do we change as a result of joint enterprise?
 - How have things changed around here?
 - What have we learnt to do differently?
- Emergence
 - What new space might open/has opened up?
 - What does it look like?

Appendices

- Can we go so far as to describe them as spheres of innovation?

Marek 2015

Membership refers to the individual coalition members' characteristics, skills, attitudes, and beliefs that either contribute to, or detract from, successful coalition outcomes. Some of the key characteristics of members in an effective coalition include:

- mutual respect
- understanding
- trust
- ability to compromise
- flexibility and adaptability
- effective Communication

McCabe 2015

Contextual factors of partnerships

- Dynamics
- Values
- Interpretation of evidence
 - Cohesive / shared/consensus vs
 - Fragmented / divergent/incongruent

McMillan 1995

- What individual characteristics are related to the empowerment of coalition members?
- What organizational characteristics are related to the collective empowering of members?
- What organization characteristics are related to a coalition being organizationally empowered to succeed in achieving its objectives?

- Demographics
- Participation
- Perception of the community
- Perception of the organisation



Empowerment

Pearce 2008:

REAP

- Reciprocity
- Externalities
- Access
- Partnership

Appendices

Roker 2007

- Rapport
- Willing to listen
- Willing to learn

Sandoval 2012 (adapted from Wallerstein 2008)

Group Dynamics	Individual Dynamics	Relational Dynamics:
Structural dynamics Diversity	Core values Motivations for participating Personal relationships Cultural identities / humility	Safety Dialogue, listening and mutual learning Leaderships and stewardship Influence and power dynamics Flexibility
Complexity Formal agreements		
Reel power/resources sharing Alignment with CBPR principles Length of time in partnership	Bridge people on research team Individual beliefs, spirituality and meaning Community reputation of PI	Self and collective reflection Participatory decision-making and negotiation Integration of local beliefs to group process Task roles and communication

Sufian 2011

- Getting the right people at the table
- Ensure all voices are heard and equally valued

Trotter 2015

- Partnership dynamics feedback – partnership metrics
- Traditional output metrics

Tisnado 2010

- transparency with respect to each partner's needs and goals,
- data ownership,
- budget and other resource issues,
- designated point persons,
- preferred modes of communication,
- decision- making processes, and
- approaches for conflict resolution should the need arise.

Appendices

Wallerstein 2008

Structural dynamics

Diversity

Complexity

Formal agreements

Real power/resource sharing

Alignment with CBPR principles

Length of time in partnership

Individual Dynamics:

Core values / cultural identities

Cultural humility

Individual beliefs

Community reputation of PI

Relational Dynamics

Congruence of core values

Dialogue / mutual learning

Leadership / stewardship

Influence / power dynamics

Flexibility

Self and collective reflection

Participatory decision making and negotiation

Integration of community beliefs to group process

Appendices

Appendix 4: Features of an inclusive and equitable partnership discussed in Workshops (summarised and adapted from the published and grey literature)

Structural dynamics	Individual characteristics or attributes	Group characteristics or attributes:
Diversity	Fair and open approach	Co-operation
Complexity	Respect (of e.g. diversity, values, skills, knowledge and experience)	Inclusivity
Democratic	Responsive to new ideas	Equality - Sharing decisions, power and influence
Accountable	Empathy	Effective Communication
Longevity of partnership	Motivations for participating	Rapport
Formal agreements and rules	Personal relationships (outside of the group)	Safety
Fair	Cultural identities	Dialogue which:
- Shares power - People attend as equals	Humility vs arrogance	- Is inclusive
- Shares resources	Understanding of the roles, rights, and responsibilities of all participating members	- is a two-way process
- Stakeholders share responsibility for the agenda and the process	Bridges people on both sides of the partnership	- delivers practical solutions to real problems
- The process allows equal weight to be given to all views	Individual beliefs, spirituality and meaning	- are recorded visibly and transparently
Careful expectation management	Willing to listen	- seek to identify and build on common ground
Alignment with established community engagement /Community based participatory research (CBPR) principles	Willing to learn	Mutual learning
Understanding or interpretation of issues or evidence i.e.	Willing to compromise	Leadership and stewardship

Appendices

- Cohesive / shared/consensus vs	understands the roles, rights, and responsibilities of all participating members	Flexible / adaptable
- Fragmented / divergent/incongruent	willing to distribute power in a manner that is in the partnership's best interest	Collective reflection
Organised - Partners select or are assigned roles and	feels ownership in the way the group works	Participatory negotiation and decision-making
responsibilities according to their interests and strengths	adaptable	Integration of local beliefs to group process
Independent professional facilitators	participates in decision-making	Task roles and communication
Clear purpose	leadership	Listening - All voices heard
Clear, transparent, rigorous processes		All voices equally valued
Processes build trusts		Bi-directional / Shared trust
The process allows for interests, values, feelings, needs and fears		Bi-directional / Shared respect
The process seeks to encourage new understanding and improved relationships		Sharing credit for successes
The process seeks to move the focus from the past to the future		

References

References

1. Johnston KA. Toward a theory of social engagement. *The Handbook of Communication Engagement*. 2018:17-32.
2. Andrew J. <http://wonkhe.com/blogs/universities-to-the-rescue-harnessing-institutions-superpowers> 2017 [
3. Hart A, Northmore S. Auditing and evaluating university–community engagement: Lessons from a UK case study. *Higher Education Quarterly*. 2011;65(1):34-58.
4. Shiel C, Leal Filho W, do Paço A, Brandli L. Evaluating the engagement of universities in capacity building for sustainable development in local communities. *Evaluation and program planning*. 2016;54:123-34.
5. Pearce J, Pearson M, Cameron S. The ivory tower and beyond: Bradford University at the heart of its communities. *participatorylearningandaction*. 2008:82.
6. Reed MS, Duncan S, Manners P, Pound D, Armitage L, Frewer L, et al. A common standard for the evaluation of public engagement with research. *Research for All*. 2018;2(1):143-62.
7. Bowen S, Martens PJ. A model for collaborative evaluation of university-community partnerships. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*. 2006;60(10):902-7.
8. Roker D. Making community-university partnerships work: The key success factors'. *Community-university partnerships in practice*, National Institute of Adult Continuing Education, England and Wales. 2007:18394.
9. Tisnado DM, Sablan-Santos L, Guevara L, Quitugua L, Castro K, Aromin J, et al. A Case Study in Chamorro Community and Academic Engagement for a Community-Partnered Research Approach. *Californian journal of health promotion*. 2010;8(SE):39-51.
10. Harper GW, Bangi AK, Contreras R, Pedraza A, Tolliver M, Vess L. Diverse phases of collaboration: Working together to improve community-based HIV interventions for adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 2004;33(3-4):193-204.
11. Drahota A, Meza RD, Brikho B, Naaf M, Estabillo JA, Gomez ED, et al. Community-Academic Partnerships: A Systematic Review of the State of the Literature and Recommendations for Future Research. *Milbank Q*. 2016;94(1):163-214.
12. Granner ML, Sharpe PA. Evaluating community coalition characteristics and functioning: a summary of measurement tools. *Health Education Research*. 2004;19(5):514-32.
13. Hart A, Northmore S, Gerhardt C. Briefing paper: Auditing, benchmarking and evaluating public engagement. National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement, Bristol. 2009.
14. McMillan B, Florin P, Stevenson J, Kerman B, Mitchell RE. Empowerment praxis in community coalitions. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 1995;23(5):699-727.
15. Sufian M, Grunbaum J, Akintobi T, Dozier A, Eder M, Jones S, et al. Program evaluation and evaluating community engagement. *Principles of Community Engagement*. 2011.
16. Eder MM, Carter-Edwards L, Hurd TC, Rumala BB, Wallerstein N. A Logic Model for Community Engagement Within the Clinical and Translational Science Awards Consortium: Can We Measure What We Model? *Academic Medicine*. 2013;88(10):1430-6.
17. Gradinger F, Britten N, Wyatt K, Froggatt K, Gibson A, Jacoby A, et al. Values associated with public involvement in health and social care research: a narrative review. *Health Expectations*. 2015;18(5):661-75.
18. Hart A, Aumann K. An ACE way to engage in community-university partnerships: Making links through resilient therapy. 2007.
19. Marek LI, Brock D-JP, Savla J. Evaluating collaboration for effectiveness: Conceptualization and measurement. *American Journal of Evaluation*. 2015;36(1):67-85.
20. McCabe KE, Wallace A, Crosland A. A model for collaborative working to facilitate knowledge mobilisation in public health. *Evidence & Policy*. 2015;11(4):559-76.

References

21. Trotter RT, II, Laurila K, Alberts D, Huenneke LF. A diagnostic evaluation model for complex research partnerships with community engagement: The partnership for Native American Cancer Prevention (NACP) model. *Evaluation and Program Planning*. 2015;48:10-20.
22. Wallerstein N, Oetzel J, Duran B, Tafoya G, Belone L, Rae R. What predicts outcomes in CBPR. *Community-based participatory research for health: From process to outcomes*. 2008;2.
23. Sandoval JA, Lucero J, Oetzel J, Avila M, Belone L, Mau M, et al. Process and outcome constructs for evaluating community-based participatory research projects: a matrix of existing measures. *Health Education Research*. 2012;27(4):680-90.
24. Arora PG, Krumholz LS, Guerra T, Leff SS. Measuring community-based participatory research partnerships: The initial development of an assessment instrument. *Progress in community health partnerships: research, education, and action*. 2015;9(4):549-60.
25. Burrows L, McCormack J. 'Doing it for themselves': a qualitative study of children's engagement with public health agendas in New Zealand. *Critical Public Health*. 2014;24(2):159-70.
26. NCCPE. How to.....evaluate public engagement projects and programmes 2017 [Available from: https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/sites/default/files/publication/evaluating_your_public_engagement_work.pdf].
27. Changes. DiCE: planning and evaluation 2019 [Available from: <http://changesuk.net/resources/dice/>].