

# Creating Truly Equitable Community- University Partnerships

Presenters:

Dr. Colleen MacQuarrie  
(UPEI Psychology Department)

Dr. Rosemary Herbert  
(UPEI School of Nursing)

- UPEI research team members: Dr. Philip Smith, Lorraine Begley
- Thank you Prince Edward Island Tobacco Reduction Alliance (PETRA)

# Context

## An invitation to partner with PETRA

- 15 community & government organizations
- Priority: reduce children's ETS exposure
- Smoke Free Homes committee invitation
  - ▶ Social marketing & community engagement campaign: design, implementation, assessment

# Method

- 20 members Smoke Free Homes Committee
- 4 individual semi-structured interviews over 3 years
  - ▶ Involvement in the project
  - ▶ Impact of a research component on functioning of an activist group
- Thematic analysis of transcribed texts
- Longitudinal analysis

# Foundational Values

- Respect for each partner's contribution
- Recognition of each partner's expertise
- Courteous & transparent communication

# Core Processes

- Shared Leadership
- Consensus Decision making
- Transparent & Inclusive Communication
- Staff Support
  - ▶ Essential to the work of the group
- Negotiated Time lines
  - ▶ Authentic compromises
- Shared feeling that the work was important

# Lessons Learned

## Implications for Knowledge Mobilization

- **Initiating & Sustaining Collaborative Partnerships**
  - Relevance, fidelity, long term interest in results
- **Building in Reflexivity & Communication**
  - Confidence, validity, credibility
- **Making Consensus Decisions & Negotiating Timing**
  - Enhanced valuing of the work
- **Sharing Leadership & Balancing Power**
  - Diversified ownership and stake
- **Valuing Diversity & Respecting Various Expertises**
  - Maximizing trustworthiness of the knowledge

# Mutuality & Cohesion

- *I guess I'm having trouble seeing the difference between what the goals of the researchers and the community members being any different. And they were the same. (P15,T2)*
- *I think our goals have been fairly well realigned to suit each other. I know that there were adjustments made in the research piece according to our goals. So that it wasn't all one way. We didn't have to adjust all of our schedule and work or goals for to meet the needs of the research piece. (P6,T3).*

# Mutuality & Cohesion

- *Certainly, I see my role as being very different from the researchers. (P6,T1).*
- *And they have to be clear on what they're doing. And, so that one area doesn't take over the other. And, I'm not saying the researchers are doing that. They're not doing that. In fact, you have to really think, "Who is the researcher?"... so that's obviously not happening, you know. You sort of have to think and remember the committee and who is the researcher and when you have to do that you realize that people are pretty equal, right? (P7,T1)*

# Mutuality & Cohesion

- *I think we work in a very democratic way with a very good understanding that, you know, there's expertise on both sides and that that kind of shared expertise is going to help us move forward. (P2,T4)*
- *I think that adding the research component has really changed and validated a lot more of our work. (P1,T4)*

# Conclusions

## Better Practices for Knowledge Mobilization

- Maximal knowledge flow through a network
  - Synergy of Collaborative processes
  - Create authentic, sustainable partnerships
  - Results are trusted, understood, and useful
- Research funded with grants from
  - Canadian Institutes of Health Research
  - Prince Edward Island Health Research Programme
  - Canadian Tobacco Control Research Initiative
  - Sociobehavioural Cancer Network of the National Cancer Institute of Canada with funds raised by volunteers of the Canadian Cancer Society.

# What implications does this have for your work?

- If have questions...
  - [Cmacquarrie@upei.ca](mailto:Cmacquarrie@upei.ca)
  - [Rherbert@upei.ca](mailto:Rherbert@upei.ca)