



a place of mind
THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

University of British Columbia
Community Based Research Initiative

COMMUNITY BASED RESEARCH VALUES AND PRINCIPLES:
WORKING GROUP DELPHI REPORT



DECEMBER 2015



a place of mind
THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

COMMUNITY BASED RESEARCH VALUES AND PRINCIPLES: WORKING GROUP REPORT

Prepared by:

Miu Chung Yan, PhD
Professor
School of Social Work

Hartej Gill, PhD
Associate Professor
Department of Education Studies

Jenny Francis, PhD Candidate
Research Assistant



Table of Contents

List of Tables	2
List of Acronyms	2
Executive Summary	3
I. INTRODUCTION	3
II. METHODOLOGY	4
A. Why Delphi	4
B. Funding	4
C. Ethics	4
D. Sample	4
E. Data collection	6
(i) Creating a list of VPs	6
(ii) Round 1	6
(iii) Workshop I and “cut off”	6
(iv) Round 2	6
(v) Round 3	7
F. Analysis	7
G. Study limitations	7
III. FINDINGS	8
A. The diversity of CBR practiced by respondents (Round 1)	8
B. VPs ranked in order of importance (Round 3)	8
C. Relevance of refined meanings (Round 2)	9
(i) Perceived relevance to their own CBR practice	9
(ii) Perceived relevance to UBC Community	11
IV. OBSERVATIONS	12
V. NEXT STEPS	13
VI. APPENDICES	15
A. VPs and Refined Meanings that received at least 67% in Round 1	15
B. VPs and Refined Meanings that received less than 67% in Round 1	17
C. Refined Meanings that received less than 67% in Round 2	19



List of Tables

Table 1: Survey Dates.....	5
Table 2: Response Rates.....	5
Table 3: Respondent Status	5
Table 4: Respondent Faculty Affiliation	5
Table 5: VPs Ranked by Importance (Round 3)	9

List of Acronyms

CBR	Community Based Research
CBR-SC	Community Based Research Steering Committee
RA	Research Associate
UBC	University of British Columbia
VPRI	Vice-President Research and International
VPs	Values and Principles
WG	Working Group on Values and Principles



Executive Summary

This study was conducted by the Community Based Research (CBR) Working Group on Values and Principles (WG), which functions under the auspices of the Community Based Research Steering Committee (CBR-SC) as part of the UBC CBR Initiative. While CBR practices cover a considerable range of relationships and designs, the CBR-SC adopted the following [working definition](#) for CBR: Community Based Research is research that is situated in a community, and is collaborative and action oriented.

The goal of this project was to identify ethical principles and values relevant to CBR. In order to ensure a broad scope of engagement among faculty and community partners from different academic disciplines, and with differing perspectives and experiences of CBR, the WG decided to employ the Delphi technique, which has been widely used to generate consensus among diverse opinions, to generate a list of CBR values and principles.

This report provides the findings from the Delphi exercise. The values and principles ranked by importance to respondents' own CBR practices were as follows: collaboration, accountability, values process and outcomes, action for positive social change, reciprocity, long term relationships, capacity building, reflexivity, equitable participation, empowerment, self-determination. Analysis and meanings of these values and principles are discussed. This should be considered an evolving document in an emerging field and the findings are offered for further discussion and refinement. It is also acknowledged that although every effort was made to be as inclusive as possible during the Delphi process, this report is only partially inclusive/representative of the diversity of perspectives and voices of CBR at UBC.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

The Community Based Research Initiative is jointly sponsored by the Offices of the Vice President Research & International and the Vice President Communications & Community Partnership. Funding for the study was provided by the VPRI Office. Contributions from the Working Group on CBR Values and Principles are gratefully acknowledged.

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Delphi exercise was to generate a list of values and principles (VPs) to be used as *reference*, not standard, for UBC researchers who engage in CBR. From April 26 to July 1, three rounds of the Delphi survey were conducted and a total of 149 completed sets of data provided by faculty members, staff and community partners were generated. Participants from the first round of the survey were also invited to a workshop at which attendees discussed the results and decided the cut-off point for items to be included in subsequent rounds.

In preparation for the study, the WG generated a preliminary list of CBR values and principles from the existing scholarly literature as well as from WG and CBR-SC discussions and events. The WG also identified three important internal limitations on its work: limited participation from faculty researchers; lack of community partners around the table; and disciplinary differences. The WG therefore sought alternative measures that could both expand the scope of engagement among faculty and community partners and also accommodate differences among academic disciplines. At a meeting



on February 5, 2015 the WG members decided to conduct a Delphi exercise. This decision was later endorsed by the CBR-SC.

The Delphi exercise started with an extensive literature review through which 13 principles and 150 refined meanings were generated. Based on the results of the three rounds, two lists of principles and refined meanings were created. The final generated lists indicate the perceived importance of the principles and relevance of the refined meanings to respondents' own CBR practice and to UBC more broadly. The qualitative data collected in the three rounds of survey indicate that understandings and practice of CBR vary significantly among respondents. Bearing this great variation in mind, we consider the two lists of principles and refined meanings to be references, not standards, for the CBR community at UBC. Finally, respondents in the third round of the survey provided some suggestions that are useful to move the UBC CBR Initiative forward.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Why Delphi

Faced with limited participation from faculty researchers and community partners, in addition to disciplinary differences, the WG chose a Delphi method for three reasons:

1. Delphi is a popular approach widely used in different fields to generate agreement through synthesis of a diverse range of expert opinions;
2. Delphi is a bottom-up process that allows participants to express and exchange views in a time-effective manner;
3. Delphi's flexible design can capture participants' perspectives regarding both disciplinary-specific as well as general CBR values and principles.

B. Funding

The project was funded by the office of the Vice-President Research & International (VPRI) to cover the costs of: Research Assistant (RA) salary, FluidSurvey subscription, workshop refreshments, and office supplies.

C. Ethics

The UBC Behavioural Research and Ethics Board (BREB) approved the project on March 19, 2015 (Application No. H15-00443).

D. Sample

Respondents were recruited through (a) phone, email, and in person through faculty and staff whose names were on the CBR Initiative email list; (b) individual outreach from WG members to faculty and staff from departments that did not have any members signed up for the CBR initiative; and snowball sampling of respondents from (a) and (b) who were invited to recommend one or more community partners with whom they had worked. The VPRI office also emailed all Deans with a request to forward the invitation to members of their faculties. As a result of these efforts, 106 people put their names forward, including 69 UBC Faculty and Staff (50 Faculty; 19 Staff) and 37 Community Partners. An additional 14 Community Partners were recommended to participate, but either declined or did not confirm their participation before the start of the survey. The 69 UBC Faculty and Staff included 60 respondents from UBC-Vancouver and 9 from UBC-Okanagan. One Community Partner and 1 UBC Staff person withdrew from the study during the first round. All three rounds of the survey were open to the



104 people who confirmed their participation and who did not withdraw in Round 1. The online survey was conducted using FluidSurvey in three rounds that took place from April-July 2015 (Table 1). Table 2 shows the response rates for each round.

Table 1: Survey Dates

	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
Survey dates	April 26 - May 10	May 27 - June 10	June 17- July 1

Table 2: Response Rates

	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
Total Responses	90	59	42
Completed Responses	70	43	36
Completion Rate (%)	78.0	72.8	86.0
Total Completion Rate*	100.0	61.4	51.4

*Shown as a percentage of 70 (the number of respondents who completed the first round)

The survey collected some demographic information: respondents' status as staff, faculty or community partner (Table 3), and faculty affiliation (Table 4).

Table 3: Respondent Status

	ROUND 1		ROUND 2		ROUND 3	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
UBC Faculty	47.1	33	58.1	25	44.4	16
Community Partner	38.6	27	27.9	12	27.8	10
UBC Staff	14.3	10	13.9	6	27.8	10
TOTAL	100.0*	70	100.0*	43	100.0*	36

*May not total exactly 100% due to rounding.

Table 4: Respondent Faculty Affiliation

	ROUND 1		ROUND 2		ROUND 3	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
Arts	17.1	12	25.6	11	8.3	3
Medicine	21.4	15	20.9	9	33.3	12
Applied Sciences	4.3	3	0.0	0	2.8	1
Law	1.4	1	0.0	0	0.0	0
Forestry	1.4	1	2.3	1	0.0	0
Dentistry	1.4	1	4.7	2	2.8	1
Science	1.4	1	0.0	0	0.0	0
Land & Food Systems	4.3	3	4.7	2	2.8	1
Pharmaceutical Sciences	2.9	2	2.3	1	2.8	1
Education	4.3	3	7.0	3	8.3	3
Sauder School of Business	1.4	1	0.0	0	2.8	1
Library	5.7	4	2.3	1	8.3	3
Community Partnership Unit	2.9	2	2.3	1	2.8	1
More than one faculty	5.7	4	0.0	0	0.0	0
UBC Okanagan	5.7	4	4.7	2	5.6	2
Did not specify	17.1	12	21.0	9	16.7	6
Don't know	1.4	1	0.0	0	0.0	0



TOTAL	100.0*	70	100.0*	43	100.0*	36
-------	--------	----	--------	----	--------	----

*May not total exactly 100% due to rounding.

E. Data collection

(i) Creating a list of VPs

The Delphi method is a step-wise process. The first step involved creating a draft list of values and principles (VPs) based on an extensive literature review and documents resulting from relevant discussions at UBC (WG meeting notes, Learning Exchange Dialogue, and the CBR event in October 2014). The draft list of VPs was discussed at a WG meeting on March 30, 2015 and minor adjustments were made based on WG members' feedback.

(ii) Round 1

The aim of the first round of the survey was to refine a list of VPs to work with in subsequent rounds of Delphi. The survey listed in alphabetical order 13 proposed VPs, each with a number of "refined meanings." Participants were asked to indicate whether each VP and refined meaning should remain on the list in subsequent rounds. A comment box was provided under each VP for additional comments. The final question asked respondents to describe their CBR practice. Forty-three respondents provided a total of 252 comments in the first section, and 52 respondents provided descriptions of their CBR practice.

(iii) Workshop I and "cut off"

Following completion of Round 1, we held a workshop at UBC on May 19, 2015. All survey participants were invited. Twelve people attended the workshop (5 Faculty, 3 Staff, 3 Community Partners and the project RA). The objectives of the workshop were: to provide an opportunity for participants to offer feedback on the first round results; to determine a "cut-off point" below which VPs and refined meanings would not be retained in subsequent rounds; to promote dialogue among UBC staff, faculty, and community partners; and to promote the Delphi exercise and the work of the CBR Initiative.

The purpose of selecting a "cut-off point" is to determine which survey elements (VPs and refined meanings) will remain on the list for subsequent rounds of Delphi. According to the literature, the minimum cut-off is 51% and some Delphi studies employ up to 80%. Attendees at the workshop decided that VPs and refined meanings that received at least 67% approval would be retained for subsequent rounds. Workshop participants agreed that 67% is a commonly used measure of majority that produces robust results while still being fairly inclusive. The 67% cut-off point was also applied to the Round 2 and Round 3 surveys.

Workshop participants also decided on the questions for subsequent rounds.

(iv) Round 2

Round 2 focused on the *relevancy* of the refined meanings that received at least 67% approval in Round 1. Part 1 was a survey question: *On a scale of 1-5 (with 5 being "most relevant") how relevant is this refined meaning to: a) your CBR practice? b) UBC?* Each section included a comment box for respondents to share additional comments.

Part 2 was an optional question that contained a list of the VPs and refined meanings that had fallen below the 67% cut-off. We asked whether any of the VPs or refined meanings in this list were crucial to respondents' research, as well as any other comments they wished to share. Twelve people provided a total of 12 comments.



(v) Round 3

Round 3 focused on the *importance* of the VPs that received at least 67% approval in Round 1. Part 1 asked: *On a scale of 1-5 (with 5 being “most important”) how important is this VP to a) your CBR practice? b) UBC?* Each section included a comment box for respondents to share additional comments in Round 3.

Part 2 provided an opportunity for respondents to share their thoughts on possible uses of the results from the Delphi exercise (i.e. the VPs and refined meanings), as well as any other comments they wished to share. Twenty people provided a total of 23 comments.

F. Analysis

The analysis of Round 1 results was undertaken at the workshop, as described above.

To create the results for Round 2, we focused on the percentage of respondents who indicated the relevance of each refined meaning to be 4 or 5. We added the two numbers together and if they totaled at least 67% then the refined meaning was retained.

To create the results from Round 3, we totaled the percentages of respondents who indicated the importance of each VP to be 4 or 5. We then arranged the VPs in descending order based on those totals.

The additional comments that respondents provided in each round serve as a reference in the Observations section of this report to contextualise the quantitative results.

G. Study limitations

The study has a number of limitations stemming from the Delphi method and uneven participation:

- Delphi is essentially a quantitative exercise based on a majority vote; consequently, many voices and perspectives may have been excluded.
- The length of the first and second surveys may have discouraged participants from taking part in subsequent rounds, possibly leading to the drop in response rates in Round 2 and Round 3.
- A small proportion of respondents made a large proportion of the comments in Round 1 (13 people provided 141 [56%] comments). Only a few respondents made comments in Round 2 and Round 3.
- The representation of respondents across disciplines was uneven.
- In Round 3, we noticed that respondents may have defined “importance to UBC” differently: some respondents indicated what UBC “should” consider important, while others focused on what UBC currently considers important, based on their observations.



III. FINDINGS

Since the purpose of this report is to facilitate discussion among the CBR community, we include minimal interpretation from the research team. Also, we do not include the results from Round 1 in this report because the Round 1 results were mainly used to facilitate decisions regarding Rounds 2 and 3. For details of the results of Round 1, please refer to Appendices A and B.

Throughout the Delphi exercise process, we did not define “CBR” for respondents. Instead, in Round 1, we asked respondents to describe their CBR practice. The descriptions that we received set the context for understanding the Delphi results. We therefore begin with a summary of the descriptions that respondents provided.

A. The diversity of CBR practiced by respondents (Round 1)

In this section we summarise respondents’ descriptions of their CBR practice. The diversity of practice and terminology is important because CBR is an umbrella term which is understood differently according to discipline and individual researcher. Approaches mentioned included: Community Based Participatory(P) Action(A) Research(R), CBPR, CBR, PAR, PR, AR, collaborative research, Indigenist CBR, community development, community engaged scholarship, co-created research, and Indigenous research.

According to the descriptions provided, respondents’ research practices involve an extensive range of types and intensity of collaboration with community partners. Specific methods also varied widely, and included both qualitative and quantitative methods. For some researchers, CBR starts from community needs, and the research questions, methods, and actions taken are defined by community members. In other cases, research questions and methods originate with the researcher and there is no expectation that action be taken on the findings. Another key difference arose around adherence to Indigenous epistemologies and anti-racist, anti-oppressive, anti-colonial or decolonizing perspectives. For some researchers, these political perspectives are critical to their work, while other researchers resisted “political” characterizations of research or found descriptors such as “anti-oppressive” and “empowering” to be too negative and/or pathologizing, preferring more positive framings, e.g. “social justice.”

Despite these differences, a number of commonalities also became apparent. Many respondents emphasized the importance of trust, respect, and shared goals. A representative of a community organization noted, *“We only engage with researchers who include us in the research process from the beginning, and who are committed to including us in a meaningful way throughout the process.”* There was also general agreement that research results should have some benefit for the community in question, although a number of respondents cautioned that power relations and disagreements also exist within “community.”

B. VPs ranked in order of importance (Round 3)

This section reports the findings from Round 3, in which respondents ranked in order of importance the 11 VPs that remained after Round 1 (Table 5). The totals are based on the sum of the percentage of respondents who indicated the importance to be either 4 or 5. Round 1 results are shown in brackets.



Table 5: VPs Ranked by Importance (Round 3)

Perceived Importance to Their Own CBR Practice	Total	Perceived Importance to the UBC Community	Total
1. Collaboration / partnership (0.81)	100.0	1. Accountability (0.81)	96.7
2. Accountability (0.81)	97.0	2. Collaboration / partnership (0.81)	87.5
3. Values process and outcomes (0.68)	81.9	3. Action for positive social change (0.71)	75.0
4. Action for positive social change (0.71)	81.6	4. Values process and outcomes (0.68)	68.7
5. Reciprocity (0.78)	78.8	5. Reciprocity (0.78)	
6. Long term relationships (0.70)	77.7	6. Long term relationships (0.70)	
7. Capacity building (0.80)	75.8	7. Capacity building (0.80)	65.6
8. Reflexivity (0.73)	71.9	8. Equitable participation (0.72)	59.4
9. Equitable participation (0.72)	69.7	9. Empowerment (0.73)	46.8
10. Empowerment (0.73)	66.7	10. Reflexivity (0.73)	45.2
11. Self-determination (0.72)	53.1	11. Self-determination (0.72)	36.6

C. Relevance of refined meanings (Round 2)

This section lists the refined meanings that received at least 67% in Round 2. The totals (indicated in brackets) reflect the sum of the percentage of respondents who indicated the relevance to be either 4 or 5. The refined meanings are listed in descending order of relevance and according to VP. VPs are listed in the order determined by the importance ranking from Round 3 (Table 5).

(i) Perceived relevance to their own CBR practice

Collaboration / partnership (100.0)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • commitment to open dialogue and effective communication (95.2) • recognizes the diversity of skills, strengths, and expertise each collaborator brings (95.1) • research is undertaken for/with community members, rather than about/on them (90.1) • promotes co-learning (85.4) • university researchers encourage and enable all participants to contribute meaningfully to decision-making and other aspects of the research process as participants see fit (78.1) • university and community partners share power and control (73.2) • seeks to identify and address inequitable power relations among/between participants and researchers (70.0)
Accountability (97.0)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • respects local knowledge (92.0) • recognizes the resources being asked of community to be involved (87.5) • values community time (87.8) • respects and adheres to local ethical standards (85.4) • researchers are accountable to the research process (80.4) • all who are actively involved in the research are accountable to each other (80.1) • project begins as a response to a problem identified by the community (76.9) • recognizes that stories are powerful and cannot be told in certain contexts (75.0) • data is readily available and accessible to the community (72.5) • university and community partners maintain transparency throughout (72.5) • flexibility and willingness to adapt to changing community needs/interests (70.0) • respects Indigenous sovereignty (68.3)
Values process and outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • flexibility of approach while adhering to principles of equality and social justice (82.5) • involves a cyclical, iterative process of facilitating communication and understanding



(81.9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> community needs (82.5) process, which is about relationships, is equally as important as other outcomes (80.0) community participation guides the research process (70.0)
Action for positive social change (81.6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> committed to building a more just society (85.4) research begins with a topic of importance to the community (85.4) aims to improve the community by responding to identified needs (85.4) committed to positive social change (82.9) combines knowledge and action for social change (75.6)
Reciprocity (78.8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> knowledge transfer is two-way (89.8) relationships are based on mutual respect, trust, openness, and inclusiveness (89.8) different needs of community and university are acknowledged and negotiated (87.5) entails accountability in reporting results to participating communities (87.2) learning is mutual (82.5) pays attention to discrimination, systemic inequalities, history, and social location (80.0) integrates knowledge and action for the mutual benefit of all partners (77.5) involves a co-learning process (75.0) values all forms of knowing, including spiritual, holistic, cultural, local, academic (70.0) views knowledge as relational, experiential, participatory, and sacred (70.0)
Long term relationships (77.7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> involves an investment in shared relationships and shared outcomes (89.5) relationships extend beyond the funding cycle or formal end of the project (69.4) involves long-term commitments by all partners (69.3) it takes time (years) to develop the relationships of trust that are central to CBR (67.0)
Capacity building (75.8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> dissemination of findings to the community to promote education and dialogue (95.1) builds capacity in the community, including skills and knowledge transfer (89.8) dissemination of findings to the community to promote community action (88.0) dissemination of findings to the community to promote social justice and equity (83.0) community partners and university researchers learn new ways of seeing (82.9) supports and fosters leadership among all partners (70.5) includes training of co-researchers (68.3)
Reflexivity (71.9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sees participants as active subjects, rather than passive objects (89.7) requires adjusting approaches over time (84.6) recognizes that research is not value-free (84.6) openness to acknowledging, discussing and addressing power differences (80.0) involves open-mindedness and wholeheartedness (79.5) values subjectivity, personal and collective experience, and multiple perspectives (79.5) accounts for the influence of researchers' lived experience and social position (71.8) understanding of how status and privilege impact partnerships at every level (70.0) acknowledges and respects diverse epistemologies and ontologies (69.3)
Equitable participation (69.7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> emphasizes partners' unique strengths, complementary expertise, and shared responsibilities (87.5) requires identifying and reducing barriers to participation (87.5) includes community members whose voices are marginalized and often ignored (67.5)
Empowerment (66.7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> goal of engendering confidence and skills to carry local knowledge into action (75.0) celebrates the return of research data and results to the community (72.5) celebrates tasks and objectives accomplished (70.0) develops/expands critical consciousness of university and community researchers (67.5)
Self-determination (53.1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> recognizes the rights of the community to make decisions about issues that affect its members (92.5)



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • those from whom information is collected have the right to protect that information (85.0)
--	--

(ii) Perceived relevance to UBC Community

Accountability (96.7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recognizes the resources being asked of community to be involved (84.2) • university and community partners maintain transparency throughout (83.7) • respects local knowledge (82.1) • respects and adheres to local ethical standards (76.9) • values community time (76.9) • researchers are accountable to the research process (74.4) • researchers are accountable to the university (74.4) • respects Indigenous sovereignty (71.1)
Collaboration / partnership (87.5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recognizes the diversity of skills, strengths, and expertise each collaborator brings (83.7) • promotes co-learning (79.0) • commitment to open dialogue and effective communication (76.3) • research is undertaken for and with community members, rather than about or on them (71.0)
Action for positive social change (75.0)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • aims to improve the community by responding to identified needs (84.9) • committed to positive social change (71.8) • committed to building a more just society (71.8)
Long term relationships (68.7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • involves an investment in shared relationships and shared outcomes (67.0)
Values process and outcomes (68.7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • involves a cyclical, iterative process of facilitating communication and understanding community needs (70.5)
Reciprocity (68.7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • different needs of community and university are acknowledged and negotiated (75.6) • relationships are based on mutual respect, trust, openness, and inclusiveness (75.0) • entails accountability in reporting results to participating communities (72.3) • knowledge transfer is two-way(70.1)
Capacity building (65.6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • involves dissemination of findings to the community to promote education and dialogue (75.6) • builds capacity in the community, including skills and knowledge transfer (72.9) • community partners and university researchers learn new ways of seeing (71.1) • involves dissemination of findings to the community to promote community action (67.0)
Equitable participation (59.4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • emphasizes partners' unique strengths, complementary expertise, and shared responsibilities (75.6) • requires identifying and reducing barriers to participation (73.1) • includes community members whose voices are marginalized and often ignored (67.0)
Empowerment (46.8)	
Reflexivity (45.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recognizes that research is not value-free (72.0) • sees participants as active subjects, rather than passive objects (69.5) • requires adjusting approaches over time (69.4)
Self-determination (36.6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recognizes the rights of the community to make decisions about issues that affect its members (75.7) • those from whom information is collected have the right to protect that information (70.2)



IV. OBSERVATIONS

The survey revealed a number of tensions, particularly with regard to the “political” versus the “objective” nature of CBR. Based on the 67% cutoff, refined meanings that included terms such as openly political, power, anti-oppression, Indigenous, and anti-colonial were dropped following the first round. However, some participants in Round 2 suggested that those refined meanings should be included in the final list. In other words, these concepts aroused strong emotions on both sides. The following comments indicate the diversity of perspectives:

Less political	More political
<p><i>“The [VPs and refined meanings] are highly charged politically ...Objectivity is actually not evil.”</i></p>	<p><i>“[CBR] is committed to building a more just society... and bringing community-based knowledge into the domain of ‘respected evidence’ that can disrupt and inform systemic structures and decision making. Part of a resurgence.”</i></p>
<p><i>“[CBR is] not about a particular ideological orientation...[although some] researchers enter CBR to pursue a political ambition, and will side with like-minded people and help them succeed.”</i></p>	<p><i>“Part of our research portfolio includes...seeking to unsettle power dynamics, to analyze power structures, to highlight situations of marginality and injustice.”</i></p> <p><i>“CBR involves...seek[ing] to make changes in the lives of people who experience some form of othering, oppression or inequity.”</i></p>

Thorough the process, we also heard a strong voice from a few respondents who repeatedly pointed out the relevance of Indigenous and anticolonial frameworks to CBR. As one respondent stated in the second round of Delphi,

“I feel strongly that the values related to Indigenous and anti-colonial frameworks need to be included, otherwise we will continue to conduct research that is colonial and creates harm. I am not sure how many Indigenous communities or partners participated in the first round, but it might be important to offer this again if the N is low.”

The question of whether “action” is an objective of CBR also provoked disagreement. While a number of respondents characterized their research as “community-based participatory action research,” others suggested that any political action comes after the research, if at all.



Action is not a goal of CBR	Action is a goal of CBR
<p><i>“CBR should not be tied to action - it is about discovery, not necessarily action. This suggests removal of individual and community self-determination.”</i></p>	<p><i>“[CBR] moves research to action to improve and transform colonial structures, relations, practices, and dynamics.”</i></p>
	<p><i>“[CBR involves] a commitment to social action according to the needs expressed by the community-based participants.”</i></p>

Participants expressed additional differences over issues related to accountability and ownership. Some respondents indicated that researchers should be primarily accountable to participants or community partners, while one stated, *“It is the funder who ultimately pulls the strings and the community needs to pay close attention to this.”*

Based on these findings, we propose the following questions for further exploration:

- a. What does “political” mean in the context of CBR, and how political should CBR be? Should CBR be “openly political”?
- b. Should CBR always intentionally aim at “solidarity” and making positive social change?
- c. Should CBR have a “predetermined” outcome?
- d. Does CBR entail different forms of accountability compared to other methodologies?
- e. Is “action” an objective of CBR? What is the relationship between CBR and action?
- f. Is CBR only for marginalized/colonized groups and/or Indigenous communities? To what extent should CBR be informed by a particular discourse?

Finally, respondents noted that the importance of particular VPs may vary at different stages of the CBR process. For instance, some VPs usefully inform the relationships among researchers and community partners, while other VPs pertain more to other aspects of the research process. Therefore, we may need to further explore the “referential” value of each VP in accordance with various stages and aspects of CBR.

V. NEXT STEPS

In Round 3, respondents shared their thoughts on how the results of the Delphi exercise could be used.

Respondents suggested that the results could be adopted in practice through

- discussions in an accessible online website, PPT, workshop, research orientation events and formative feedback sessions
- inclusion in UBC policies and procedures
- discussions at Associate Deans or Deans’ meetings
- creation of a CBR toolkit for researchers and community partners
- development of a reference guide for the Office of Research Services
- inclusion in courses / sessions for students
- promotion through formal mentorship

Respondents also indicated that the results can be useful as reference:



a place of mind

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

- to guide research proposal development
- to evaluate tenure and promotion cases
- to inform UBC's internal grant review processes
- as the basis of a formal or informal collaborative research agreement
- to guide the development of community partnerships
- to initiate dialogue among researchers and community partners
- in the creation of standards for community engagement
- to advocate for institutional support and recognition of CBR
- to identify areas where UBC/UBC departments could build capacity
- to inform UBC's strategic planning

We conclude with this powerful comment from a Delphi respondent: *“As a community partner, I would like for all researchers at UBC to be required to refer to the VPs as they begin the process of developing relationships with community partners.”*



VI. APPENDICES

A. VPs and Refined Meanings that received at least 67% in Round 1

1. Accountability (0.81)

- respects local knowledge (0.88)
- recognizes the resources being asked of community to be involved (0.82)
- values community time (0.83)
- flexibility and willingness to adapt to changing community needs/interests (0.85)
- researchers are accountable to the research process (0.70)
- researchers are accountable to the university (0.68)
- all who are actively involved in the research are accountable to each other (0.89)
- project begins as a response to a problem identified by the community (0.69)
- data is readily available and accessible to the community (0.78)
- respects and adheres to local ethical standards (0.86)
- university and community partners maintain transparency throughout (0.84)
- recognizes that stories are powerful and, in some cases, cannot be told in certain contexts (0.79)
- respects Indigenous sovereignty (0.78)

2. Action for Positive Social Change (0.71)

- committed to positive social change (0.67)
- committed to building a more just society (0.83)
- research begins with a topic of importance to the community (0.85)
- combines knowledge and action for social change (0.73)
- aims to improve the community by responding to identified needs (0.72)
- achieves a balance between research and action (0.67)

3. Capacity Building (0.80)

- builds capacity in the community, including skills and knowledge transfer (0.92)
- supports and fosters leadership among all partners (0.80)
- includes training of co-researchers (0.83)
- involves dissemination of findings to the community to promote education and dialogue (0.81)
- involves dissemination of findings to the community to promote community action (0.79)
- involves dissemination of findings to the community to promote social justice and equity (0.77)
- community partners and university researchers learn new ways of seeing (0.85)

4. Collaboration / Partnership (0.81)

- equitably involves all partners in the entire research process (0.79)
- research is undertaken for and with community members, rather than about or on them (0.86)
- university researchers encourage and enable all participants to contribute meaningfully to decision-making and other aspects of the research process as those participants see fit (0.73)
- partners co-develop grant applications and research proposals (0.80)
- commitment to open dialogue and effective communication (0.87)
- university and community partners share power and control (0.67)
- promotes co-learning (0.89)



- seeks to identify and address inequitable power relations between participants and researchers 0.67
- includes mechanisms to address power imbalances among researchers and community members 0.76
- recognizes the diversity of skills, strengths, and expertise each collaborator brings 0.83

5. Empowerment (0.73)

- includes the goal of engendering confidence and skills to carry local knowledge into action (0.84)
- develops or expands the critical consciousness of university and community researchers (0.75)
- celebrates tasks and objectives accomplished (0.72)
- celebrates the return of research data and results to the community (0.77)

6. Long Term Relationships (0.70)

- involves long-term commitments by all partners (0.75)
- it takes time (years) to develop the relationships of trust that are central to CBR (0.69)
- relationships extend beyond the funding cycle or formal end of the project (0.74)
- involves an investment in shared relationships and shared outcomes (0.80)

7. Participation (0.72)

- includes community members whose voices are marginalized and often ignored (0.71)
- emphasizes partners' unique strengths, complementary expertise, and shared responsibilities (0.84)
- requires identifying and reducing barriers to participation (0.86)

8. Values Process & Outcomes (0.68)

- process, which is about relationships, is equally as important as other outcomes (0.83)
- flexibility of approach while adhering to principles of equality and social justice (0.81)
- involves a cyclical and iterative process of facilitating communication and understanding community needs (0.74)
- community participation guides the research process (0.70)

9. Reciprocity (0.78)

- knowledge transfer is two-way (0.87)
- learning is mutual (0.79)
- involves a co-learning process (0.84)
- relationships are based on mutual respect, trust, openness, and inclusiveness (0.89)
- entails accountability in reporting results to participating communities (0.75)
- integrates knowledge and action for the mutual benefit of all partners (0.75)
- different needs of community and university are acknowledged and negotiated (0.81)
- pays attention to discrimination, systemic inequalities, history, and social location (0.74)
- values all forms of knowing, including spiritual, holistic, cultural, local, and academic (0.76)
- transformation of fundamental structures: views knowledge as relational, experiential, participatory, and sacred 0.69

10. Reflexivity (0.73)

- requires ongoing critical reflection to develop awareness of social location and positionality (0.69)
- requires understanding of how status and privilege impact partnerships at every level (0.72)
- involves an openness to acknowledging, discussing and addressing power differences (0.81)



- values subjectivity, personal and collective experience, and multiple perspectives (0.75)
- values emotion (0.67)
- acknowledges and respects diverse epistemologies and ontologies (0.71)
- disrupts notions of insider/outsider, researcher/researched, subject/object (0.69)
- requires adjusting approaches over time (0.81)
- co-researchers examine their assumptions about each other (0.72)
- involves open-mindedness and wholeheartedness (0.72)
- sees participants as active subjects, rather than passive objects (0.80)
- accounts for the influence of researchers' lived experience and social position (0.68)
- addresses power relations/is openly political: recognizes that research is not value-free (0.83)
- accounts for the influence of researchers' lived experience and social position (0.68)

11. Self Determination (0.72)

- recognizes the rights of the community to make decisions about issues that affect its members (0.82)
- those from whom information is collected have the right to protect that information (0.76)

B. VPs and Refined Meanings that received less than 67% in Round 1

1. Accountability

- meets the political/policy needs of the community (0.62)
- seeks to resolve conflict between the dominant values of the academy and community values (0.64)
- researchers are accountable to the wider community (0.66)
- researchers are accountable to outside funders (0.62)
- researchers are accountable to the entire ecosystem (0.49)
- scholars embrace the methodologies of the communities they work with (0.63)
- honours community partners through remuneration (0.46)
- acknowledges and respects the land where the research takes place based on the idea that researchers answer to all relations, including animals, plants, and the earth (0.66)
- data belongs to the community (0.65)

2. Action for Social Change

- committed to critiquing the status quo (0.42)

3. Addresses Power Relations / Is Openly Political (0.58)

- seeks to destabilise the control of professionals and experts in their creation of knowledge (0.29)
- is a form of political engagement that critically examines systems of power and privilege (0.56)
- names and unsettles relationships of power (0.49)
- involves a shift in power (0.32)
- entails an acceptance of vulnerability on the part of the university researcher (0.59)
- attends to social inequalities (0.59)
- problematises systematic relations of power in the social construction of knowledge (0.44)
- challenges assumptions of objectivity that are the source of control in the positivistic enterprise (0.59)
- a fundamental principle includes university researchers locating themselves at the outset (0.47)
- solidarity is key - research is for and with less powerful peoples (0.37)



- based on an anti oppression framework (0.41)
- based on a counter-colonial or decolonizing framework (0.53)
- based on an Indigenous framework (0.38)
- involves a commitment to social change and taking an active role in that change (0.66)
- assumes a political purpose and action to research (0.45)

4. Capacity Building

- is an intervention to enhance the capacities of community participants (0.61)

5. Collaboration / Partnership

- involves an equitable division of funds based on contributions to project (0.57)
- commitment to working towards sharing power more equally (0.65)
- community partners control the research process (0.23)
- community partners control the use of community knowledge and community resources (0.53)
- university researchers and community partners participate equally in all aspects of the project (0.44)
- stakeholders collectively decide the focus of research includes collaboration and building of partnerships with diverse Indigenous nations and peoples (0.62)
- research partners share all assets (0.50)
- participants increase control over their lives (0.57)

6. Empowerment

- participants and researchers connect their personal troubles to powerful social, political, and economic systems rather than to individual failings alone (0.54)

7. Long Term Relationships

- collaboration is not a one-off event (0.65)
- university researchers develop prevailing relationships with participants (0.56)
- university researchers develop prevailing relationships with community partners (0.63)
- has no clear beginning or end (0.35)

8. Participation

- ensures an equitable participation of university and community partners (0.65)
- focuses on the most marginalised groups in society (0.46)
- based on anti-oppression principles (0.45)
- based on a decolonizing framework (0.47)

9. Process vs. Outcomes

- process, which is about relationships, is more important than outcomes (0.18)

10. Reciprocity

- based on an anti-oppression framework (0.44)
- based on a decolonizing framework (0.48)

11. Reflexivity

- demands critical reflection on one's own positionality (0.66)
- challenges the dictates of modern "objective" science and assumptions of a distanced objectivist research stance (0.50)
- acknowledges that people are multiply located (0.64)
- recognizes nonhumans as political actors (0.31)



- researchers and community members examine their assumptions about each other (0.65)
- researchers and community members take difference seriously (0.57)
- is not Eurocentric (0.56)

12. Self Determination

- results in improvements in the lives of participants, as they define change or improvement (0.59)
- requires a high degree of community partners' ownership and regulation of the research process (0.55)
- a community participates in analysing its own reality (0.56)
- a community participates in analysing its own reality to enact social transformation for the benefit of the participants (0.66)
- community maintains ownerships and control of research process and outcomes (0.46)
- the project is conceived by the community (0.48)
- starts from people's needs and interests, not an idea or hypothesis held by a university researcher (0.53)
- gives primacy to the needs and interests of those at the bottom of social hierarchies (0.54)

13. Transformation of Fundamental Structures (0.57)

- seeks to change oppressive conditions (0.56)
- fundamentally challenges the structures of oppression (0.54)
- moves research to action to transform the conditions at the root of classism, sexism, racism, heterosexism, ableism, colonialism, ageism, speciesism, and other forms of oppression (0.56)
- moves research to action to undermine and transform colonial structures, relations, practices, and dynamics (0.50)

C. Refined Meanings that received less than 67% in Round 2

Relevance to respondents' CBR practice:

Accountability

- researchers are accountable to the university (51.2)

Action for Positive Social Change

- achieves a balance between research and action (53.7)

Collaboration/Partnership

- includes mechanisms to address power imbalances among and between researchers and community members (65.9)
- equitably involves all partners in the entire research process (65.8)
- partners co-develop grant applications and research proposals (65.0)

Reflexivity

- requires ongoing critical reflection to develop awareness of social location and positionality (60.0)
- values emotion (55.0)
- co-researchers examine their assumptions about each other (53.9)
- disrupts notions of insider/outsider, researcher/researched, subject/object (51.3)



Relevance to UBC:

Accountability

- flexibility and willingness to adapt to changing community needs/interests (65.8)
- recognizes that stories are powerful and, in some cases, cannot be told in certain contexts (57.9)
- data is readily available and accessible to the community (53.9)
- project begins as a response to a problem identified by the community (51.3)

Action for Positive Social Change

- combines knowledge and action for social change (63.1)
- research begins with a topic of importance to the community (57.9)
- achieves a balance between research and action (32.4)

Capacity Building

- includes training of co-researchers (65.7)
- supports and fosters leadership among all partners (57.9)
- involves dissemination of findings to the community to promote social justice and equity(57.9)

Collaboration/Partnership

- equitably involves all partners in the entire research process (63.2)
- university and community partners share power and control (63.1)
- seeks to identify and address inequitable power relations among and between participants and researchers (62.1)
- includes mechanisms to address power imbalances among and between researchers and community members (60.5)
- university researchers encourage and enable all participants to contribute meaningfully to decision-making and other aspects of the research process as those participants see fit (60.5)
- partners co-develop grant applications and research proposals (56.7)

Empowerment

- celebrates the return of research data and results to the community (62.1)
- includes the goal of engendering confidence and skills to carry local knowledge into action (58.3)
- develops or expands the critical consciousness of university and community researchers (56.7)
- celebrates tasks and objectives accomplished (55.6)

Long Term Relationships

- relationships extend beyond the funding cycle or formal end of the project (47.3)
- it takes time (years) to develop the relationships of trust that are central to CBR (44.5)
- involves long-term commitments by all partners (41.6)

Values Processes & Outcomes

- flexibility of approach while adhering to principles of equality and social justice (64.8)
- process, which is about relationships, is equally as important as other outcomes (62.1)
- community participation guides the research process (51.3)

Reciprocity

- pays attention to discrimination, systemic inequalities, history, and social location (64.8)
- involves a co-learning process (59.4)



- values all forms of knowing, including spiritual, holistic, cultural, local, and academic (58.3)
- integrates knowledge and action for the mutual benefit of all partners (58.3)
- views knowledge as relational, experiential, participatory, and sacred (51.3)
- learning is mutual (43.9)

Reflexivity

- involves an openness to acknowledging, discussing and addressing power differences (62.1)
- values subjectivity, personal and collective experience, and multiple perspectives (61.1)
- involves open-mindedness and wholeheartedness (61.1)
- accounts for the influence of researchers' lived experience and social position (58.3)
- acknowledges and respects diverse epistemologies and ontologies (57.6)
- requires understanding of how status and privilege impact partnerships at every level (54.0)
- co-researchers examine their assumptions about each other (52.7)
- requires ongoing critical reflection to develop awareness of social location and positionality (45.9)
- disrupts notions of insider/outsider, researcher/researched, subject/object (44.4)
- values emotion (43.2)