







He Pikinga Waiora (HPW)

Implementation Framework

User Manual

2019

He Oranga Hauora



He Pikinga Waiora	
Contents	
Contents	1
Summary	3
What is this framework all about?	3
Community co-design implementation framework	4
Core Principles	4
Who can use this framework?	5
Background	7
Health inequities	7
The National Science Challenge	7
Implementation Science	8
Indigenous Implementation Science	8
Purpose	9
Theoretical Grounding: The Main Principles	
1. Kaupapa Māori	13
2. Culture-Centered Approach (CCA)	14
3. Community Engagement (CE)	16
4. Systems Thinking	
5. Integrated Knowledge Translation (IKT)	20
HPW Implementation Framework	21
Community Co-Design: Our Partners	24
Te Kōhao Health	24
Poutiri Charitable Trust	24
Healthier Lives National Science Challenge – Our funder	24
RESOURCE INDEX	25
Moving from the Theoretical to Praxis: Resource Toolkit	26
Linking Resources to HPW Components	26
The Checklist	27
A. What's going on?	
B. Who will we work with?	
C. How will we engage?	
D. What will we be doing?	
E. How can we evaluate and reflect on what we are doing?	

He Pikinga W	aiora	
APPEND	ICIES	
1.1.	Systems Map Instructions	
1.2.	Systems Map Example	41
2.1	Readiness to change measure	48
3.1	Partnership Capacity Measure	
4.1	Health Equity Assessment Tool (HEAT)	
5.1	Stakeholder analysis guide	51
6.1	Ensuring partnership represents the community	54
7.1	How to approach community members & organisations	56
7.2	How to run codesign meetings (hui)	
8.1	HPW Visioning Tool	60
9.1	Creating Values and Principles	62
10.1	River of Life	64
10.2	Reflexive Dialogue and Critical Self-Reflection	66
11.1	Developing Partnership Agreements	68
12.1	Viable Systems Model	71
13.1	Soft Systems Methodology for Setting Purpose and Design	73
14.1	Power Mapping	
15.1	Stakeholder Hui Evaluation Instructions	
15.2	Stakeholder Hui Evaluation	
16.1	HPW Process Evaluation Instructions	
16.2	HPW Process Evaluation Framework	92
17.1	Outcome Evaluation Tool	
18.1	Other Resources	



Summary

What is this framework all about?



About 40% of all health burden in New Zealand is due to cancer, cardiovascular disease, and type 2 diabetes/obesity. Outcomes for Māori (Indigenous people) are significantly worse than for non-Maori; these inequities mirror those Indigenous found in communities elsewhere. Evidence-based interventions with established efficacy may not be effective in Indigenous communities without addressing specific implementation challenges. We present an implementation framework for interventions to prevent and treat chronic conditions for Māori and other Indigenous communities.

The He Pikinga Waiora Implementation Framework has Indigenous selfdetermination at its core and consists of four elements: cultural-centeredness,

community engagement, systems thinking, and integrated knowledge translation. All elements have conceptual fit with Kaupapa Māori aspirations (i.e., Indigenous knowledge creation, theorizing, and methodology) and all have demonstrated evidence of positive implementation outcomes.

The He Pikinga Waiora Implementation Framework appears to be well suited to advanced implementation science for Indigenous communities in general and Māori in particular. The framework has promise as a policy and planning tool to evaluate and design effective interventions for chronic disease prevention in Indigenous communities. As well as improving health, the framework harnesses community knowledge and involvement, i.e. Activating Communities, so that interventions are more readily adopted.

This manual provides a summary of the HPW Framework in a single resource. Further details can be found here: <u>https://www.hpwcommunity.com/</u>



Community co-design implementation framework

This manual introduces a framework for the development, implementation and evaluation of health interventions for communities. The Indigenous Main Principles, that are the foundation for the HPW framework are described, stories from people who have used it and participated in an intervention guided by it, and a set of resources and guidelines for how to use it in your own project. We hope these resources will prove to be useful for you as you develop interventions to improve health and enhance health equity in your communities.

The HPW Implementation Framework is a participatory research approach with systems thinking that ensures shared and equitable roles for community members in phases of implementation all and



evaluation; it involves co-design; co-data collection, co-implementation, co-evaluation and coanalysis/interpretation.

Core Principles

The He Pikinga Waiora (Enhancing Wellbeing) Implementation Framework (HPW) was developed to facilitate effective and accelerated development and implementation of health intervention for chronic diseases. The framework is centred on Indigenous knowledge, methods, and philosophy (in New Zealand, Kaupapa Māori) and also integrates best practice from the international research: culture centredness, community engagement, systems thinking, and integrated knowledge translation.

Kaupapa Māori emphasizes local context and self-determination by prioritizing Indigenous history, development, and aspirations; such an approach is consistent with various Indigenous philosophies around the world.

- Culture-centredness ensures that the community has voice in defining problems and solutions, provides resources and structural change, and encourages reflexivity of the research/implementation team.
- Community engagement occurs when community members, policy makers, researchers, and practitioners share decision making and communication responsibilities.
- Systems thinking enables a holistic view of the implementation process; it considers multiple perspectives, multiple levels and multiple relationships among ideas, and yet places a boundary to the problem. No intervention can address every aspect of a problem; thus, every situation needs to consider the possibilities and then set boundaries.
- Integrated knowledge translation facilitates bidirectional learning with end users. End users are those people who implement the intervention, receive the intervention, and may disseminate the intervention in the future.

Who can use this framework?

The HPW framework has implications for funders, researchers, community and public health organizations. Specifically, this framework can be used as a planning tool to successful development guide and implementation of interventions for communities experiencing the burden of health inequities. Funders can use the framework to assess likelihood of effectiveness for proposed interventions or perhaps use this framework to rate applications that address these four elements (e.g., "bonus points" beyond established criteria). Community organizations and Indigenous tribal leaders can use these elements to help decide whether to work with researchers or policy makers proposing a specific intervention. These organizations can ask the potential



collaborators how they will foster each of the elements in the framework and whether they will work in true partnership.



Back to Contents



Background

Health inequities

New Zealand faces significant challenges relating to chronic, non-communicable diseases such as diabetes and obesity. Health inequities between Māori (indigenous people of NZ) and non-Māori are particularly concerning. Almost half (47%) of Māori (indigenous people of New Zealand) are obese (Body Mass Index >30) compared to 29% of European/Other New Zealanders. Similarly, 7.2% of Māori have diabetes compared to 5.1% of European/Other New Zealanders. Further, Māori have 1.8 times more health burden (i.e., disability adjusted life years) than non- Māori and the average life expectancy for Māori is nine years less than that of other New Zealanders. These inequities are explained by racism and the unjust distribution of social determinants of health including income, employment, education, housing, and health service inequities in access to, and quality of, health care. This injustice is underpinned by a lack of commitment by the New Zealand government toward meeting its obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi—the founding treaty of New Zealand. These inequities mirror those found between indigenous and non-indigenous populations across the globe.

The National Science Challenge

In 2012–13 New Zealand Government implemented the National Science Challenges (NSCs) initiative as a mission-led form of research funding to address 11 significant science challenges related to the environment and social/human health. The NSCs are guided by the Vision Mātauranga policy which aims "to unlock the innovation potential of Māori knowledge, resources and people to assist New Zealanders to create a better future" (p. 1).

One of the NSCs is the Healthier Lives Challenge which aims to improve the prevention and treatment of four of New Zealand's most significant non-communicable diseases: cancer, cardiovascular disease (CVD), diabetes, and obesity. Its mission is "to deliver the right prevention to the right population and the right treatment to the right patient" in order to reduce the burden of these diseases by 25% by 2025. Within this purpose and mission is a stated goal to reduce health inequities for Māori and other communities by 25% by 2025. This article describes the theoretical foundation for one of the projects in the Healthier Lives Challenge designed to address these inequities: "He Pikinga Waiora [Enhancing Wellbeing]: Making health interventions work for Māori communities." He Pikinga Waiora references the whakatauki (traditional proverb), *He oranga ngakau, he pikinga waiora,* which refers to the relationship between positive feelings and a sense of self-worth, key aspects of well-being.

Source: Oetzel JG, Scott N, Hudson M, Masters-Awatere B, Rarere M, Foote J, et al., Implementation framework for chronic disease intervention effectiveness in Maori and other Indigenous communities, Global Health 13 (2017) 69

Implementation Science

Implementation science is at the core of this intervention framework. It is about promoting interventions that work, with the aim of improving population health. A commonly used definition of implementation research is that it is the scientific study of methods to promote the systematic uptake of research findings and other evidence-based practices into routine practice, and, hence, to improve the quality and effectiveness of health services and care.

Many of our biggest human health problems have tombs of evidence-based solutions – collecting dust on a shelf. Evidence based Implementation science is trying to address the significant knowledge gap between interventions that research has shown to be effective and their delivery to communities and translation into practice.

Implementation science is the bridge between what can work (efficacy) and what does work (effectiveness). Implementation science studies commonly focus on the external validity of their findings, i.e. whether they can be applied effective to different settings and individuals.

Implementation research is needed to account for the complexities of the systems in which interventions are implemented since other approaches often fail to address these. Results of implementation research will support evidence-based policymaking that can build robust programmes to improve public health.

Implementation success is determined by a variety of factors, including the characteristics of the intervention, the stakeholder groups involved and the context in which the intervention is carried out.

Indigenous Implementation Science

There are evidenced based solutions for many of the problems that indigenous peoples face. However, research often has internal validly based on non-indigenous populations – so translation models need to be developed to ensure efficacy for indigenous settings.

The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples says that states shall take the necessary steps to meet health needs of their indigenous populations (article #24), – however - it is very clear that not enough is being done to meet health needs for indigenous peoples worldwide – New Zealand included – and this is evidenced by huge health inequities. Camara Jones – past president of the American Public Health Association says that inaction in the face of need is a marker of institutionalised racism. So indigenous implementation science

frameworks are needed to get more done – and to help indigenous communities develop our own interventions and to get our states to take the necessary steps to improve indigenous health.

Purpose

The overall purpose for creating He Pikinga Waiora was to create a framework and tools to support best practice strategies for working with Māori communities so that effective interventions are developed and implemented successfully.

This manual has been compiled and designed to provide you with an easy way to build the HPW framework into your work, project and/or organisation.

Back to Contents



Theoretical Grounding: The Main Principles

Here we explain the key principles of the HPW Implementation Framework. Each principle is briefly described. If you want to know more there is further detail in the following section and links that focus on the principle available in the relevant sections provided at the bottom of each principle.

The He Pikinga Waiora Implementation Framework provides a theoretically-sound foundation for enhancing the implementation of health interventions for Māori and other indigenous communities because it centres indigenous knowledge and self-determination. The four elements are wrapped around a centre grounded in indigenous critical theory (i.e., Kaupapa Māori) and each element is consistent with, and supportive of, indigenous knowledge creation and use.

Kaupapa Māori research is research that is by Māori, for Māori and with Māori. New Zealand's history of research being done On Māori has shaped the attitudes and feelings Māori held (and still hold) towards research. Rather than re-applying imported frameworks that are determined in other countries, Kaupapa Māori research embraces the existence and validity of Māori knowledge, language and culture by drawing upon Māori philosophies and knowledge. Often primary emphasis is on localised history, context and experience with a view to make meaningful and sustainable positive change. When research embodies Kaupapa Māori research principles it is highly likely to meet the needs and aspirations of Māori.



Fig. 1 Key elements of implementation framework for Māori communities

The four elements are related and yet each adds a distinct component to the framework.



Three characteristics underpin cultural centeredness: community "voice" for problems and solutions, reflexivity, and structural transformation and resources. The CCA theorizes that domination from various social practices produces communicative erasure through rules, practices, and procedures that limit opportunities for participation and knowledge creation. Centering the discourse with those people most affected empowers them to exercise their own agency; community members can make sense of and create localized health solutions framed by their everyday experiences.

Community Engagement (CE) is a process of collaborating with groups directly affected by a particular health issue or with groups who are working with those affected. The unique focus of CE is partnership among community members and researchers/health professionals in developing interventions. Especially when guided by principles of shared power, mutual learning, and benefits for the community, CE enables the development of strong relationships that build the capacity of the communities and researchers.

Systems thinking provides concepts, principles and methods that enables a big picture view of the implementation process. No intervention can address every aspect of a problem, so appreciating multiple perspectives, multiple levels and multiple relationships is critical to ensure boundaries are appropriately drawn around a problem and intervention.

Knowledge-translation processes offer the potential to build bridges between researchers/ academics and communities to increase the potential for research to lead to improved health

outcomes and health equity. To understand and influence change in their practice settings, health care professionals and policy makers need to understand theories and frameworks that support knowledge translation.

Back to Contents





<u>Kaupapa Māori</u> research is the outcome of Māori shifting from being the researched to becoming the researchers. The history of research On Māori has shaped the attitudes and feelings Māori held (and still hold) towards research.

Nowadays there are opportunities for Māori communities to inform, shape and control the nature of research conducted with them. Rather than simply using imported frameworks that are determined in other countries, Kaupapa Māori research draws upon Māori philosophies and knowledge to generate theory that emphasises local context thereby meeting the needs and aspirations of Māori. Framed by the <u>Treaty of Waitangi</u>, Kaupapa Māori recognises importance of prioritizing Indigenous voice.

New Zealand's history of research being done On Māori has shaped the attitudes and feelings Māori held (and still hold) towards research. We have embraced opportunities for Māori communities to inform, shape and control the nature of research conducted By, With and For them.

Rather than simply importing frameworks from other countries, Kaupapa Māori research prioritises Māori philosophies and knowledge that emphasises local context, acknowledging the <u>Crown's</u> <u>obligations as Treaty partners</u>, Kaupapa Māori research prioritizes Indigenous voice. We are interested in doing research, with, by and for Māori communities that contributes to their own aspirations and in the meantime, help meet on-going needs.

Some useful resources:

- Pihama, L., Tiakiwai, S.-J., & Southey, K. (Eds.). (2015). Kaupapa rangahau: A reader. A collection of readings from the Kaupapa Rangahau workshops series. (2nd ed.). Hamilton, New Zealand: <u>Te Kotahi Research Institute</u>
- Rangahau-Principles of Kaupapa Māori: <u>http://www.rangahau.co.nz/research-idea/27/</u>
- Katoa Ltd : <u>http://www.katoa.net.nz/home</u>
- MAI journal: <u>http://www.journal.mai.ac.nz/</u>

Culture Contored Approach

He Pikinga Waiora



CCA was developed by Professor Mohan Dutta in his work with vulnerable and marginalised communities in various countries (Dutta, 2007). It is an approach that centers culture by ensuring that the community has voice in defining problems and solutions, provides resources and structural change, and encourages reflexivity of the research team.

First, how do we ensure that the community has a voice? One of the key considerations is to create a safe space for community members to express themselves. Domination from various social practices, rules, and procedures can severely limit opportunities for marginalised communities to engage and participate. For example, community representatives that we've engaged with shared how they felt judged, belittled, and were eventually ignored at a GP reception. These are members who a highly regarded in their own communities. Thus, they no longer feel comfortable nor engage with mainstream health services. So, if we want to ensure they have a voice, the feedback we got from this group is "...[we] need to go to the community...not the other way around". To not only go to them, but to be consistent by 'turning up', 'show your face', 'dress appropriately', and to 'come to their level' So our team did! We went to the space where they felt safe and also where we would feel safe – a community social service provider. This was the space where they could express their tino rangatiratanga (self-determination) and be open about their everyday experiences – key aspects for defining problems together.

The second issue relates to the sharing of resources and making structural changes. For example, our community identified the importance of a Kaiarahi – a community champion who has strong networks and relationships in the community and with health services; who acts as the 'go-between' for 'fringe-communities' and health providers. For us as researchers, it was about enabling that process of employing a Kaiarahi to happen (money, working with community partners to specify the details, sub-contracts etc). This includes getting the health services involved.

The third issue, how can we as researchers be more reflexive in practice? Reflexivity involves selfexamination on issues such as power and privilege and how that influences the work you are doing. Reflexivity creates "spaces" to address these issues to improve how the partnership functions. What we do want to share is a working example of being reflexive. So, as researchers, we're interested in collecting data. It's a strength that we have; we have access to resources to help us collect that information. So, what we did is draft a health screening questionnaire for end-users. We started with over 80+ questions, but this was eventually whittled down to about 45 and the content was adapted to fit the community. By sharing and co-developing the questionnaire with our community partners and being reflexive about our goals and desires, we were able to develop an instrument that fits the community needs and the research needs.

Dutta MJ. Communicating about culture and health: theorizing culture-centered and cultural sensitivity approaches. Commun Theory. 2007;17(3):304-328.

Other links for your reference:

- Engage for Equity: <u>https://engageforequity.org/</u>
- Centre for Culture-Centered Approach for Research and Evaluation: <u>http://www.massey.ac.nz/massey/learning/colleges/college-business/school-of-</u> <u>communication-journalism-and-marketing/research/care/care_home.cfm</u>

3. Community Engagement (CE)



Community engagement occurs when academic researchers work in collaboration with community researchers to develop health intervention. As a result, community members should have decision making and communication responsibilities for the project. Typically, these responsibilities are shared with the academic researchers although the ideal likely is the community members eventually having more responsibility. Community engagement ensures equitable and shared roles for community members in all phases of the research; not just the co-design but co-data collection, co-implementation, co-analysis/interpretation. We consider three key issues about community engagement.

First, we need to ensure that we have approval by the community—not just individuals; someone who can speak adequately on behalf of the community. Often these are people who serve on an advisory board that is consulted throughout the project or members of community organisations that we work with throughout the project. They could also be leaders from the community governance.

Second, we need to make sure that we share resources and decision making with the community. Community organisations and members are under resourced and in demand, so we need to make sure they get the FTE to support their work on the project; 33-50% of project resources is the ideal benchmark to shoot for.

The final issue is probably the trickiest—how do we know we have represented the community well? We obviously can't collaborate with the whole community, so we need to find representatives. Often, we can find what we think are good representatives (reps) only to find out later, they weren't as influential as we thought. We need to look for three factors:

- a) people who are affected by the intervention,
- b) people who have influence on how it is implemented, and
- c) key opinion leaders (who might not always be in positions of power).

They also have to have meaningful time available to participate. It takes an iterative process to find the right representatives. You can find reps by asking community members and community organisations who you should be talking to about this project (and then follow through on this advice). You can hold

multiple stakeholder meetings to share project ideas and find out who is interested and has capacity to work with you. The key is not to take the easy path and accept reps who first present themselves. Spend time searching and making sure you have this right. It takes some initial investment and yet pays off in the end with good implementation and community support.



Other links for your reference:

- Community-Campus Partnership for Health: <u>https://www.ccphealth.org/cbpr-curriculum/</u>
- Detroit Community-Academic Urban Research Center: https://www.detroiturc.org/resources.html
- Center for Participatory Health Research: <u>https://cpr.unm.edu/research-projects/cbpr-project/index.html</u>



Systems thinking provides concepts, principles and methods that enables a big picture view of the implementation process. No intervention can address every aspect of a problem, so appreciating multiple perspectives, multiple levels and multiple relationships is critical to ensure boundaries are appropriately drawn around a problem and intervention. Soft systems thinking, which utilises systems ideas to think about problems, involves:

- 1. Making sure to engage with diverse perspectives around what the problematic situation is
- 2. Building up a 'rich picture' of the problematic situation by paying attention to how issues are inter-connected, unintended consequences, dominant voices, who is marginalised
- 3. Reflecting on the different understandings of improvement and how boundaries constrain what counts
- 4. Drawing on a variety of methods to address key issues in order to ensure that the intervention is responsive to stakeholder needs.

The system thinking approach involves engagement with multiple stakeholders (similar to what is done with community engagement to ensure representativeness) to develop a rich/complex picture of the problematic situation.

We consider how issues influence each other, feedback loops in the systems (how one thing affects others to create balance or create change in the system), intended and unintended consequences, and whose voices are dominant and whose are marginalised.

We then consider the boundaries that should be drawn around the problem such as who is included, where we will do it, what services are included, etc. From here we make choices about the intervention and select the methods of implementation to ensure we meet stakeholder needs.

Stakeholder is somewhat of a loaded term as many prefer to be called partners in the process; we are using stakeholders here as it is reflective of the literature although our stakeholders are more than interested parties.



Other links for your reference:

- The Systems Thinker: <u>https://thesystemsthinker.com/making-the-jump-to-systems-thinking/</u>
- Tools of a Systems Thinker: <u>https://medium.com/disruptive-design/tools-for-systems-thinkers-</u> the-6-fundamental-concepts-of-systems-thinking-379cdac3dc6a

5. Integrated Knowledge Translation (IKT)

He Pikinga Waiora



Integrated knowledge translation involves the moving of research knowledge into practice. When we find out that something works in a research setting, the next step is to implement it into everyday activities through end users. End users are the people who are going to implement the activities and might include doctors, nurses and patients—that is the recipients and doers.

Effective integrated knowledge translation occurs where there bidirectional learning with end users and researchers throughout the research process. Researchers can design something that works that might also be inefficient and not practical. When end users are involved early in the process, they can identify constraints and challenges to later implementation. The intervention can then be adjusted to better fit the context of the community in which the knowledge is to be applied.

Some key knowledge translation activities include planning with end users about how to translate the research into practice, brainstorming conversations about challenges and constraints, identification of resources needed for implementation and making sense of research findings so that the local context is considered.

Other links for your reference;

- Research Article about IKT: https://implementationscience.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13012-016-0399-1
- Canadian Institutes for Health Research: <u>http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/45321.html</u>



HPW Implementation Framework

The full details of our studies and the evidence supporting the framework can be found here:

Oetzel JG, Scott N, Hudson M, Masters-Awatere B, Rarere M, Foote J, et al., Implementation framework for chronic disease intervention effectiveness in Maori and other Indigenous communities, Global Health 13 (2017) 69.

When developing the HPW Framework, we undertook a systematic review of 13 studies of diabetes prevention in Indigenous communities. We drew upon the work of Gibson and Segal (2015) as an initial guide and found strong evidence that key elements predicted diabetes outcomes and blood pressure outcomes. The front page of the poster provides a summary of the HPW framework key principles. Full descriptions can be found on the Main Principles page (<u>https://www.hpwcommunity.com/the-main-principles</u>).

The coding scheme on the second page of the poster, describes levels of each of the principles in the framework from high to medium to low and negative. The presence of 'high, medium and low' variations demonstrate there is a range of possible engagement levels. Based on our research, we suggest that higher "scores" are more likely to result in better implementation outcomes. Negative values note that there are times when researchers cause harm such as when they suggest they want co-design and yet do it superficially or through victim blaming. We think this framework can be used as a visioning/planning tool and as a result has value for all parties to determine authentic co-design.

To download a copy of this poster for your reference, please <u>press here</u> or refer to our website: <u>www.hpwcommunity.com</u>

He Pikinga Wajora

HE PIKINGA WAIORA IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK



CULTURAL CENTREDNESS

Ko tōku reo, tōku ohooho, Ko tōku reo, tōku Māpihi Maurea Community voice Community is involved in defining the problem and developing the solution. Reflexivity Implementation team is reflexive and identifies adjustments to the intervention as a result. Structural transformation and resources The intervention results in significant structural transformation and resources which are sustainable over time.

Cultural Centredness

INTEGRATED KNOWLEDGE TRANSLATION Toi te kupu, toi te mana, toi te whenua

Integration of knowledge translation activities within the context of the community in which the knowledge is to be applied.

There is a process of bi-directional learning established so that information is tailored to knowledge users needs.

Community Engagement

www.hpwcommunity.com

Kaupapa Māori

He oranga ngakau, he pikinga waiora The Framework has Indigenous selfdetermination at its core. All four elements have conceptual fit with Kaupapa Māori aspirations and all have demonstrated evidence of positive implementation outcomes. The Framework is intended as a planning tool to guide the successful development and implementation of interventions. Please let us know how you are using the Framework and any feedback you have: hpwadmin@waikato.ac.nz

> Dettel, J., Soott, N., Hudson, M., Masters-Awatere, B., Rarere, M., Forts, J., Beaton, A., Bhua, T. (2017). Implementation finanework for duratic disease intervention effectiveness in Micri and other indigenous communities. Globalization and Health, 13(1), 69. doi:10.1186/s12092-017-026-8

> > Integrated Knowledge Translation

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

He urunga tangata he urunga pāhekeheke, he urunga oneone mau tonu

Partnering between researchers and community in all phases of the project. Guided by principles of action, social justice, and power sharing.

Decision-making and communication is shared and a strong partnership is identified throughout the intervention. Relationships build capacity of communities and researchers.

Systems Thinking

SYSTEMS THINKING

He tina ki runga, he tāmore ki raro Systems perspectives Intervention has a broad focus and considers: multiple perspectives, world views, values, causes & solutions. System relationships Demonstrates strong understanding of the complex relationships between variables including feedback loops, time delays and multi-level effects. Systems levels Intervention targets change at macro, meso & micro levels.

			ITATION F	RAMEWOR	HODINA
			www.hpwcommunity.com		
al centredness	Community voice	High Community involved in defining the problem and developing the solution.	Medium Community involved in either defining the problem or developing the solution.	Low Community only informed but has no direct involvement in the definition of problem or solution development.	Negative Intervention implemented in of significant community op
	Reflexivity	Explicit statements regarding reflexivity and identification of adjustments to the intervention as a result.	Methods to engage in reflexivity or state they were aware of it; adjustments to the intervention are unclear.	No evidence that the team was reflexive about its processes or no changes made in response to team learnings.	Victim blaming, unintended overt racism in intervention implementation or evalu
Cultu	Structural transformation and resource	Significant structural transformation and resources which are sustainable over time.	Intervention receives significant resources but has a limited focus on structural transformation.	Intervention receives minimal resources and is only sustainable over a short term.	Less resources available or quality resources as a resu intervention compared w intervention.
Community engagement	Community engagement	Strong community leadership. Decision- making and communication is shared and strong partnership is identified throughout the intervention.	Communication is two-way and there is co-operation to implement the intervention with a partnership becoming apparent.	The intervention team has ultimate control over the intervention and communication, which flows one-way to the community.	Intervention is placed ir community with no consulta community.
¥۲	Integrated knowledge translation	There is a process of mutual learning established so that information is tailored to knowledge users needs.	Medium level support for knowledge user by intervention team for implementing the intervention.	Minimal or no support for implementing intervention or outsiders implement the intervention for the knowledge users.	Knowledge users have major which they are not able to dis the intervention tear
Systems Thinking	System perspectives	Intervention includes the following: 1)multiple causes, 2)broad focus/multiple solutions; and 3)multiple perspectives/world views, values of multiple actors.	Intervention includes 2 of the 3 factors in the high category.	Intervention includes 1 or none of the 3 factors in the high category.	Intervention has a negative in to a lack of consideration of perspectives necessary to s implementation.
	System relationships	Demonstrates a strong understanding of the complex relationships between variables including feedback loops, time delays and multi-level effects.	Moderate understanding of the complex relationships between variables including feedback loops, time delays and multi-level effects.	Limited understanding of the complex relationships between variables including feedback loops, time delays and multi-level effects.	Intervention has a negative in to lack of consideration of relationships important implementation.
	System Levels	The intervention targets change at the macro, meso and micro levels, and provides sufficient rationale and context for each level.	The intervention targets change at 2 levels with some rationale and context for each level.	The intervention targets change at 2 levels or less without providing rationale and context.	Intervention has a negative in to lack of consideration of s levels necessary to supp implementation

Community Co-Design: Our Partners

Our partners have been pivotal in the design and refinement of the HPW framework. We have had the opportunity to partner with community organisations that have helped us shape the programme to what it is today. Our thanks go out to these organisations and the individuals inside these organisations that have been champions of the framework.

Te Kōhao Health

Te Kōhao Health is a Māori health provider at the cutting edge of service delivery to whānau, having responded to feedback from whānau and adopted learnings from other indigenous whānau and streamlined our services into a multi-disciplinary team approach that we have called 'Kia Kotahi'. This method is to ensure that whānau receive targeted holistic health care when they need it. Furthermore, this will ensure whānau have mana motuhake (control and ownership) over their health and wellbeing. They have been involved in the He Pikinga Waiora project and framework since its inception and are partners in the development of a community and whānau-based lifestyle intervention for addressing pre-diabetes and diabetes. https://www.tekohaohealth.co.nz/

Poutiri Charitable Trust

Poutiri Charitable Trust was established in 1997 to contract and develop Maori Health Providers within the Bay of Plenty region to deliver on a variety of health and wellbeing services. Poutiri Charitable Trust also delivers Mental Health, Nurse led and Podiatry clinics to address chronic conditions and support for whanau, hapū and iwi. They have been involved in the He Pikinga Waiora project and framework since its inception and are partners in the development of a lifestyle intervention for addressing prediabetes and related conditions for men and their whānau. <u>https://poutiri.org/index.html</u>

Healthier Lives National Science Challenge – Our funder

The Healthier Lives National Science Challenge is a national research collaboration dedicated to achieving healthier lives for all New Zealander. Healthier Lives is working on the prevention and treatment of four of New Zealand's main non-communicable diseases:

- Cancer
- Cardiovascular disease
- Diabetes
- Obesity

Its vision is of Aotearoa New Zealand with equitable health outcomes and a substantially reduced burden on non-communicable diseases (NCDs). Its mission is to enable delivery of the right preventions and treatments to the right populations, communities and individuals. <u>https://healthierlives.co.nz/</u>



RESOURCE INDEX

Moving from the Theoretical to Praxis: Resource Toolkit

The resource toolkit is designed to help move from the theoretical basis of the HPW framework to the practical implementation of the framework. The foundational principles are important to guide our work and they also can be hard to put into direct practice. This toolkit is organised around a checklist about five core questions to put HPW into practice. They are put into development over time.

Linking Resources to HPW Components

To help you link the resources to each of the HPW components, we list the key components that are addressed in each resource.

Resource Tool Kit	He Pikinga Waiora Principle				
What's Going On?					
Systems map	Systems thinking				
Readiness to change measure	Community engagement				
Partnership capacity measure	Community engagement; integrated knowledge translation				
Health Equity Assessment Tool (HEAT)	Kaupapa Māori, cultural centredness; systems thinking				
Who Will We Work With?					
Stakeholder analysis guide	Integrated knowledge translation; community engagement				
Ensuring partnership represents the community	Community engagement; cultural centredness				
How to approach community members and	Community engagement				
organisations					
How to run a co-design meeting?	Community engagement; systems thinking; integrated				
	knowledge translation				
How Will We Engage?					
HPW visioning tool	All Principles				
Creating values and principles	All Principles				
Reflexive dialogue and critical self-reflection	Cultural centredness; community engagement; Kaupapa				
	Māori				
Developing partnership agreements	All Principles				
What Will We Be Doing?					
Viable systems model	Systems thinking				
Soft systems methodology for setting purpose and	Systems thinking				
design					
Power mapping	Systems thinking; integrated knowledge translation				
How Can We Evaluate and Reflect on What We Are Doing?					
Stakeholder hui evaluation	All Principles				
HPW process evaluation framework	All Principles				
Outcome evaluation	All Principles				

Linking Resources to HPW Principles



This checklist identifies five key questions that evolve along the development of a health intervention. They are presented as a circle as each question influences the others and the process is a continuous cycle. We present these questions one at a time and explain the purpose of the question and provide resources that can help address the question.

The checklist is designed as a series of issues that a partnership should consider as they are developing their projects and answer the main questions. It provides a simple format for ensuring that major issues are considered.



VE QUESTIONS TO CREATE CLARITY AND STRUCTURE

1. What's going on? (context and system). We need to have a good understanding of the nature of the problem and the current system including gaps.

- □ What are the key issues?
- □ What does the system addressing these issues look like?
- □ What are the gaps in the current system?
- □ How ready are we to address this problem?
- □ Is there capacity and willingness to address this problem?
- □ Do we have the community's view on what is going on?

2. Who will we work with? (stakeholders, partners, and end users) We want to make sure to include those who have influence and are affected by what happens.

- People who will deliver the intervention
- People who will fund it
- People who will receive it
- People who can create roadblocks
- People who can make it sustainable
- □ Do we have a good representation of these groups?

3. How will we engage with each other? (process) We need to think about how we are going to work together.

- □ Principles and values to guide your partnership
- □ Assess whether we want to work together
- □ Value the mātauranga (knowledge) of the local community
- □ Shared decision making
- □ Shared communication responsibilities
- □ Mutual learning and listening
- □ Agreements for sharing resources and responsibilities
- $\hfill\square$ How can we build trust and manage conflicts?
- □ Reflect on how we are working and ensuring we are following our principles

4. What will we be doing? We need to think about the intervention and how we develop it.

- □ What evidence is available on what works and what doesn't?
- □ How can we make what is available fit with cultural values, perspectives, and local knowledge?
- □ Make sure the community is involved in the design, implementation and evaluation (those who will receive or deliver the intervention)
- □ Take a systems view in the design (multiple perspectives, multiple levels, and understanding boundaries and constraints)

5. How can we evaluate and reflect on what we are doing? (outcomes, evaluation and reflection). We need to think about what we want to accomplish and evaluate its impact and how we did it. Then, we need to reflect on how we did it and what we learnt going forward.

- □ What are the key outcomes, thinking holistically?
- □ Implementation and process evaluation
- □ Have we improved equity (or at least not made it worse)
- $\hfill\square$ Reflect on what happened and use as learning for next steps.

A. What's going on?

This question provides the background information about the health issue or issues that a community is facing. This information is the foundation for determining whether an intervention is needed or wanted. It also provides the information for whether we have the right capacity to address the key issues.

1. Systems Map (Systems Thinking)

Wicked problems' such as the prevention of chronic conditions are characterised by high levels of complexity, uncertainty and conflict. These problems are not easily understood nor are they tackled successfully using a reductionist approach, which breaks complex problems into smaller simpler problems. Constructing a systems map is intended to stimulate dialogue between stakeholders and prompt learning about the mix of policies, strategies, programmes and actions necessary to improve health outcomes and reduce health inequities. There are two resources available here. The first is a resource for how to construct a systems map. The second is a policy brief with a systems map from one of our projects to provide an example.

Appendix references: <u>1.1 Systems Map Instructions</u>

1.2 Systems Map Example

2. Readiness to change measure (Community engagement)

Just because a health issue is important to address, the community or key organisations may not be ready to make changes for whatever reason. This measure helps partners reflect on whether there is readiness to make changes.

Appendix reference: <u>2.1 Readiness to Change Measure</u>

3. Partnership capacity measure (Community engagement; integrated knowledge translation)

Another key element about moving forward to address a health issue is whether the partnership has the capacity to address the problem. We need to make sure we have all the right people and resources to develop an effective intervention. This measure helps partners reflect on whether the partnership has the capacity to create and implement and effective intervention to effect change.

Appendix reference: <u>3.1 Partnership Capacity Measure</u>

4. Health Equity Assessment Tool (HEAT) (Systems thinking; cultural centredness)

In identifying what is going on in Indigenous communities, it is important to explore health inequities and why they exist. Understanding these inequities helps to direct partnerships in developing effective interventions. The Health Equity Assessment Tool provides a set of questions to encourage partnerships to keep an equity focus and better understand the larger context of health issues. It was created by researchers at the University of Otago, Wellington and is available at the following website:

Appendix reference: <u>4.1 Health Equity Assessment Tool</u>

B. Who will we work with?

This question addresses who should be a part of the project—this includes partners we work directly with and stakeholders who have a say or influence on what we are doing. When we work with communities, we need to select representatives. The resources in this section consider who represents the community and how we should approach potential partners.

5. Stakeholder analysis guide (Integrated knowledge translation; community engagement)

We often engage a variety of stakeholders prior to forming a partnership. We can hold a series of meetings (hui) that explore the issues and the interests in addressing the issues. This resource provides a set of guidelines for how to analyse and engage stakeholders.

Appendix reference: <u>5.1 Stakeholder Analysis Guide</u>

6. Ensuring partnership represents the community (Community engagement; cultural centredness)

We are often asked by people who engage with communities, "how do we ensure our partnership represents the community?" This resource provides questions and issues for answering this question.

Appendix reference: <u>6.1 Representing the Community</u>

7. How to approach community members and organisations (Community engagement)

Building a trusting relationship is key to effective partnership. This resource provides some tips for starting the relationship on the right track.

Appendix reference: <u>7.1 Approaching the Community</u>

7.2 How to run a codesign meeting (hui)

C. How will we engage?

This question addresses the manner in which a partnership can engage. The process by which we work together is key for developing and maintaining trust and synergy. There are several resources in this section to provide the foundation for a good process and also ensuring the process continues to work effectively.

8. HPW Visioning tool (All components)

One approach for developing a process is to engage in a visioning exercise to identify what the partnership should look like. This tool provides an introduction and steps for developing a vision.

Appendix reference: <u>8.1 HPW Visioning Tool</u>

9. Creating values and principles (All components)

All partnerships are grounded in a set of values and principles although we don't always articulate them and thus we aren't sure if we share the same values and principles. This resource provides some key values and principles that ground effective community engagement and collaborative processes. These can be useful for starting a conversation about the key principles by which your partnership operates.

Appendix reference: <u>9.1 Creating Values and Principles</u>

10. Reflexive dialogue and critical self-reflection (Cultural centredness; community engagement)

Reflexive dialogue is a key way to ensure that the partnership follows the HPW framework and also maintains and effective process. There are many challenges and power issues that result during the development and implementation of health interventions and reflexivity helps to address these issues and improve the partnership process. We offer two approaches to guide reflexive dialogue: a) River of Life and b) Critical self-reflection. The use of evaluation tools can also guide reflexive dialogue and that is discussed in another section.

Appendix reference: <u>10.1 River of Life</u>

10.2 Critical Self-Reflection

11. Developing partnership agreements (All components)

Partnerships are often aware of agreements for how to share resources and for scope of work. However, agreements can include a variety of aspects about partnering includes who owns the data, how we resolve conflicts, and strategies for disseminating the research. This resource provides some suggestions for creating a partnership agreement.

Appendix reference: <u>11.1 Developing Partnership Agreements</u>

D. What will we be doing?

This question addresses the content of the work—the intervention itself. Many times, the intervention is developed to address the key issues and challenges identified. However, health problems are products of complex systems and it is easy to forget about this complexity. The resources provided help to consider the complexity in developing and implementing a sustainable and effective intervention.

12. Viable systems model (System thinking)

The viable system model sets out the necessary and sufficient conditions required for high performing organisations. The VSM presents a generic model of organisation and can be applied 'systems' including teams, organisations, partnerships and communities. We recommend its application for complex public health interventions such as those developed using the He Pikinga Waiora framework.

Appendix reference: <u>12.1 Viable Systems Model</u>

13. Soft systems methodology for setting purpose and design (Systems thinking)

This resource introduces Soft Systems Methodology (SSM). SSM is an approach to address ill-defined problems or problematic situations are 'messes'. SSM is used to:

- 1. Gain insights into problematic situations
- 2. Set intervention purposes and develop strategic objectives
- 3. Develop shared understanding about issues and buy-in to actions

Appendix reference: <u>13.1 Soft Systems Methodology</u>

14. Power mapping (Systems thinking; integrated knowledge translation)

Power mapping is being increasingly used by partnerships that wish to shape or change the local, regional and national policies. Power mapping involves the identification of key organisational, community and individual players in the policy making environment. This resource describes a small group exercise for making and using a power map.

Appendix reference: <u>14.1 Power Map</u>

E. How can we evaluate and reflect on what we are doing?

Reflective processes have a foundation in the empowerment literature common to community psychology and public health and are a key element of Cultural Centeredness in the HPW framework. While Reflexivity does take time, it is worth the effort to ensure high functioning processes. A large-scale study of 294 partnerships in the USA (Oetzel et al., 2018 BioMed Research International) reported that the higher the quality of partnering processes, the higher the levels of intermediate and distal outcomes.

We developed three evaluation tools to help follow the framework. Two of these are geared toward process evaluation and help ensure that we are using reflective processes to following the implementation framework. Summative evaluation is focused on outcomes and includes a holistic approach to evaluating outcomes framed from Durie's work with whare tapa wha and te pae mahutonga.

Evaluation is a key part of ensuring that the work if following HPW principles and also having the desired impact. This question addresses how we can do this evaluation effectively. The tools in this section help to evaluate process and outcomes.

• Key issue is that researchers needs to be open to being told that everything isn't going well and be ready to make adjustments. This process can be key to building meaningful trust to ensure high functioning partnerships.

• Two tools have been developed, a process evaluation tool and a Stakeholder hui evaluation tool. Both of these have been designed is a way for different parties involved to reflect about the systems thinking elements from the early stages of development through to the implementation of interventions.

15. Stakeholder Hui Evaluation (All components)

We often engage a variety of stakeholders prior to forming a partnership. We can hold a series of meetings (hui) that explore the issues and the interests in addressing the issues. The stakeholder hui evaluation tool provides a series of questions to determine the effectiveness of the meeting for moving the partnership forward. The resources include the evaluation form and also instructions for using it.

Appendix reference: <u>15.1 Stakeholder Instructions</u>

15.2 Stakeholder Evaluation

16. HPW Process Evaluation Framework (All components)

Once a partnership has been formed, it is important to conduct regular evaluations of the process to ensure it is staying true to its principles. The HPW process evaluation tool provides a set of questions organised around the key principles. The responses provides feedback what is working and what might need to be improved. This tool can be useful for reflexivity as well. The downloads include the evaluation form and also instructions for using it.

Appendix reference: <u>16.1 Instructions</u>

16.2 Process Evaluation

17. Outcome Evaluation (All components)

We all want to know whether our health intervention produced desirable outcomes. This evaluation tools provides a series of questions to assess a variety of outcomes. These outcomes reflect a holistic model of health that is relevant for Indigenous communities (e.g., physical, mental, social, and spiritual). It also considers outcomes at multiple levels such as individual, family and community.

Appendix reference: <u>17.1 Outcome Evaluation Framework</u>


The following are the resources required to assist you in achieving a sustainable and equitable codesigned implementation project and partnership. The implementation framework provides a process for structuring a robust intervention and each of these resources has been carefully chosen to assist in getting you through some of the roadblocks that may have hindered true partnership in the past. Please explore each resource and use them, when the time is right to ensure you are achieving a high quality intervention that leaves the community empowered and achieves goals for all stakeholders.



Systems Map Instructions

HOW TO CREATE A SYSTEMS MAP

There are many ways of developing 'systems' maps. We place quotation marks around system in recognition that 'systems' map make explicit the mental models stakeholders hold about problematic situations.

The 'systems' map we created for He Pikinga Waoria drew on system dynamics. Here we represented the 'system' in terms of stocks (accumulated quantities, e.g., number of healthy people), flows (changes to the stocks, e.g., number of healthy people developing prediabetes), converters (variables that influence flows, e.g., screening rate), time delays (e.g., time between becoming obese and developing diabetes). Feedback loops were used to capture the dynamics of diabetes prevention (e.g., building health literacy).

Other systems methods can be used to build 'systems' map. For the purpose of this guide we set out some general advice on how to build causal loop diagrams, which are commonly used to unpack the complexity of issues including diabetes and obesity. For readers wanting to explore other approaches, the following link will take you to a free Open University course about the different ways in which problematic situations can be represented.

<u>https://www.open.edu/openlearn/science-maths-technology/computing-and-ict/systems-</u> <u>computer/systems-diagramming/content-section-0?active-tab=content-tab</u>

Developing a causal loop diagram

This section has drawn heavily on Maani and Cavana (2000) and de Pinho (2015).

Building causal loop diagrams can be a powerful way to engage with stakeholders. A causal loop diagram should in effect tell a *compelling story* about a problematic situation to help develop a shared understanding amongst stakeholders and guide steps going forward.

There are a number of steps involved in creating a causal loop diagram:

- 1. Creating a rich picture and behaviour over time graphs
- 2. Identifying variables and relationships
- 3. Representing relationships as feedback loops
- 4. Identifying points of leverage

Step 1. Creating a rich picture and behaviour over time graphs

Creating a rich picture of the problematic situation can be helpful first step as it helps to pull together thinking to date about the system including different perspectives on issues, concerns and opportunities. See the soft systems methodology guide for advice on how to construct rich pictures.

An understanding of the problematic situation can be enhanced by developing behaviour over time graphs of key features in the rich picture – see Figure 1.





Step 2. Identifying variables and relationships

A causal loop diagram consists of two elements: variables and relationships. Variables or factors impacting on the system in focus are then identified including any outcomes of interest (e.g., number of people with pre-diabetes). Variables can be hard (e.g., number of people screened for pre-diabetes) or soft (e.g., cultural responsiveness). de Pinho (2015) advises identifying 10 - 12 variables, clearly naming them using neutral nouns (e.g., 'health literacy' rather than 'good health literacy') and ensuring they are measureable and observable so that they represent quantities that change over time (e.g., 'complications' rather than 'ill health'). Deciding which variables to include (and exclude) depends on the boundaries drawn around the model. Model boundaries should be explicit and set in partnership with stakeholders were possible.

Arrows are drawn between variables to illustrate relationships. Relationships can be classified as moving in the same (+) or opposite direction (-). Take the relationship between screening and diagnosis of prediabetes as an example. As the number of at risk people are screened for pre-diabetes increases we expect that (all things being equal) the number of people diagnosed with pre-diabetes to increase. Likewise, as the number of at risk people screened for pre-diabetes decreases we can expect that (all things being equal) the number of people diagnosed with pre-diabetes to decrease. In this way, both variables move in the same direction (+) and we indicate the relationship like this:

> Number of people Number of people at risk screened diagnosed with pre-diabetes for pre-diabetes

As an example of a relationship characterised by an opposite direction, let us consider the way in which barriers to access relates to utilisation of primary care. As barriers to access reduce, we expect that (all things being equal) the utilisation of primary care increases. Likewise, as the barriers to access increase, we can expect that (all things being equal) the utilisation will decrease. In this way, both variables move in the opposite direction (-) and we indicate the relationship like this:

Barriers to access Utilisation of primary care

To help improve the presentation of He Pikinga Waiora's system map we have omitted the '+' and '-' signs and provide a narrative to build reader intuition about the directionality of the relationships.

Step 3. Representing relationships as feedback loops

The behaviour of the 'system' is determined by its structure, that is, interacting feedback loops where there is circular cause and effect between variables (hence the term causal loop).

Reinforcing feedback loops are destabilising and tend to exhibit growth or decline over time. In contrast, a balancing feedback loop is stabilising and usually indicates a 'system' is self-maintaining. Teasing out the causality in a 'system' helps us to see what kinds of feedback predominates in the 'system'.

Reinforcing feedback loops are labelled as (R) and balancing feedback loops are labelled as (B). Feedback loops are also labelled to summarise their contribution to 'system' behaviour. Our He Pikinga Waiora model contains five feedback loops that we posit accounts for dynamics of diabetes prevention in New Zealand. These are: building health literacy, reversing the pre-diabetes epidemic, recovery from diabetes, growing awareness of pre-diabetes, and moving beyond business as usual.

For example, the 'building health literacy' balancing loop. Currently diagnosis of pre-diabetes or diabetes triggers a discussion (in primary care) about lifestyle changes to delay or stop the progression of prediabetes to diabetes, or encourage self-management of diabetes to avoid complications. Healthy choices lead to healthy eating and exercise patterns which can reduce the risk of developing diabetes, and in some cases reverse pre-diabetes. However, knowledge about healthy diet and exercise is insufficient to bring about lifestyle change. The capacity to sustain a healthy lifestyle is influenced by resources to enable healthy choices (e.g., sufficient disposable income and patient/whānau peer support) and the extent that the settings where people 'live, work and play' make the healthy choice the easy choice (e.g., removing sugary drinks from schools). Public health literacy needs to be built at many different levels to avoid 'victim blaming' and stigmatising those with pre-diabetes and/or diabetes. This requires actions such as raising awareness of the social determinants of health amongst policy makers, health professionals and non-health stakeholders to establish healthy policies and practices. de Pinho (2015) recommends that causal loop model is built in an iterative way starting with the outcome of interest and then adding variables and relationships (including delays) until the model captures the behaviour of the 'system'. Avoid the temptation to include every variable – simple models work best.

Step 4. Identifying points of leverage

Feedback loops provide opportunities for interventions, which may involve breaking the chain of events, or inserting a new programme, policy or action which helps to stabilise dynamics (leverage points).

References

Maani, K., & Cavana, R. Y. (2000). Systems thinking, system dynamics: Managing change and complexity. Prentice Hall. Auckland.

de Pinho (2015) *Systems tools for complex health systems: a guide to creating causal loop* diagrams. Available at: <u>https://www.who.int/alliance-hpsr/resources/publications/CLD_Course_Participant_Manual.pdf</u>



POLICY BRIEFING

August 2017 PRE-DIABETES: A WINDOW OF OPPORTUNITY?

Introduction

∃/S/R

The purpose of this policy briefing is to set out the take home messages from an Institute of Environmental Science and Research (ESR) project that has examined how a number of different stakeholders, namely policy makers, clinicians, health managers and communities (including Māori), are responding to the problem of pre-diabetes. The attraction of tackling pre-diabetes is that it facilitates the identification of individuals and/or populations at higher risk of developing diabetes and thus the targeting of interventions to delay or stop the development of diabetes and its complications.

This project has been aligned to He Pikinga Waiora, a project funded by the Healthier Lives National Science Challenge to develop an implementation framework for activating community partnerships, indigenising evidence based initiatives and creating sustainable and effective intervention pathways.

The 'systems' map (Figure 1) depicts stakeholder views about the way in which social, economic, cultural and individual factors mediate people's risk of developing pre-diabetes, type 2 diabetes and complications. The 'systems' map is intended to *stimulate dialogue* between stakeholders and *prompt learning* about the mix of policies, strategies, programmes and actions necessary to improve health outcomes and reduce health inequities.

Why a systemic approach?

'Wicked problems' such as the prevention of chronic conditions are characterised by high levels of complexity, uncertainty and conflict. These problems are not easily understood nor are they tackled successfully using a reductionist approach, which breaks complex problems into smaller simpler problems. Our research has regarded the aetiology of type 2 diabetes ("diabetes") as a complex interacting mix of genetic, physiological, psychological, familial, social, cultural, economic and political factors. In this way, both biomedical research on specific physiological causal mechanisms and efforts to change behaviour form a necessary but insufficient basis to develop effective interventions that work in 'real world settings'. There is no simple solution. A bigger picture understanding is needed to develop a multi-level comprehensive approach to addressing diabetes.

Context

Diabetes is a common chronic condition that significantly impacts on the health and wellbeing of New Zealanders. People with diabetes are at increased risk of cardiovascular disease, kidney failure, blindness and lower-limb amputations. It is estimated that 260,000 people have diabetes, 100,000 have undiagnosed diabetes, and one out of four New Zealanders are pre-diabetic which places them at increased risk of developing diabetes and cardiovascular disease¹. Māori, Pacific Islanders Indo- Asians and people with a lower socioeconomic status are at an increased risk of developing pre- diabetes and diabetes. Healthcare costs are expected to grow from NZ\$540 million in 2006/2007 to NZ\$1.78 billion by 2021. The prevention, early detection and treatment of diabetes represents a serious challenge to health services and is a priority long-term condition for the Ministry of Health.

Diabetes is largely a preventable condition. However, while lifestyle modification interventions such as weight loss, a healthier diet and/or physical activity hold the potential to slow or prevent the onset of diabetes, there are a number of challenges to scaling up these interventions especially for

communities deemed 'hard to reach'. The challenge then is to move beyond a narrow focus on intervention efficacy to include consideration of effective implementation in specific settings with a focus on prolonging sustainability and facilitating uptake. Our 'systems' map is intended to make visible how stakeholders are responding to pre-diabetes, and identifies barriers to exploiting what some stakeholders see as a 'window of opportunity' to curb the diabetes epidemic.

Developing the 'systems map'

We used systems dynamics² to create a 'systems' map of some of the big picture drivers for prediabetes, describe the ways in which different stakeholders are attempting to address pre-diabetes, and highlight some of the ways in which interventions may be undermined. Data for the 'systems' map was obtained from key informant interviews undertaken either in person or by telephone with policy makers, primary and secondary care clinicians, health promoters, researchers and patients³. Interviews

¹ People with pre-diabetes are glucose intolerant and have a HbA1c of 41-49 mmol/mol. Having pre-diabetes does not necessarily mean that a person will go on to develop diabetes. The probability of progressing from pre-diabetes to diabetes is estimated between 30 and 70 percent.

² System Dynamics enables an appreciation of complex situations where multiple variables interact, knowledge is incomplete, time lags between cause and effect are significant, and no one stakeholder has an overview of the 'whole system'.

³ A total of 24 key informant interviews were undertaken including 12 with patients from Te Kōhao Health and Poutiri Trust with pre-diabetes and/or diabetes.

⁴ For example, the *obesogenic environment* which highlights the way in which the environments that people 'live, work and play' can undermine the capacity of people to make healthy choices. This points to limitations of lifestyle interventions that assume individual responsibility and cautions against victim blaming. In this way, issues such as food insecurity, urban design, the marketing of energy dense and nutrient poor food require interventions beyond those provided by healthcare services to address structural causes.

lasted between 45 minutes to 1 ½ hours and were audio recorded. With the exception of patient interviews which were transcribed, verbatim notes were taken for all other interviews. The data was analysed thematically⁴. We describe the 'system' in terms of *stocks* (accumulated quantities, e.g., number of healthy people), *flows* (changes to the stocks, e.g., number of people progressing to diabetes), *converters* (variables that influence flows, e.g., screening rate), *time delays* (e.g., between becoming obese and developing diabetes) and *feedback loops* (e.g., balancing (B in the system))⁵.

The 'systems' map

The backbone of the 'systems' map (following Jones et al., 2006⁶) is the way in which healthy people develop pre-diabetes, recover or progress onto diabetes (without complications) and then develop diabetes (with complications). Points to note include:

• The number of healthy people is determined by the inflow of births and outflow of people developing pre-diabetes or dying with normal glycemic levels. Our goal is to maximise the number of healthy people by preventing the onset of pre-diabetes or helping those with pre- diabetes and diabetes reverse their condition.

• The 'systems' map differentiates between people with a diagnosis and those without a diagnosis of pre-diabetes and type 2 diabetes.

• Many of the risk factors that determine whether a healthy person will develop pre-diabetes and then go on to develop diabetes are thought to be the same. These risk factors are likely to influence whether a person with pre-diabetes or diabetes can recover and become healthy. We focus on two specific risk factors: genetic predisposition and people with unhealthy weight⁷. However, the system is more complex, and not all individuals with an unhealthy weight will develop pre-diabetes, and not all pre-diabetes progress to diabetes. Furthermore, individuals may have the same level of genetic predisposition but this 'genetic risk' can interact with the individual's environment (e.g., lifestyle) leading to different health outcomes.

⁵ Reinforcing feedback loops are destabilising and tend to exhibit growth or decline over time. In contrast, a balancing feedback loop is stabilising and usually indicates a 'system' is self-maintaining. Teasing out the causality in a 'system' helps us to see what kinds of feedback predominates in the 'system'. These feedback loops provide opportunities for interventions, which may involve breaking the chain of events, or inserting a new programme, policy or action which helps to stabilise dynamics.

⁶ Jones, A., Homer, J., Murphy, D., Essien, J., Milstein, B., and Seville, D "Understanding diabetes population dynamics through simulation modeling and experimentation", <u>American Journal of Public Health</u>, 96:3(2006), pp. 488-494.

⁷ People who are obese are considered at high risk of developing diabetes.

A public health approach is used to categorise leverage points because this has utility when examining the mix and spread of interventions. These levels include: primary prevention (focused on healthy people), secondary prevention (focused on risk factors) and tertiary prevention (focused on preventing and managing complications).

• The 'systems' map is necessarily a simplification of stakeholder views and is at a high level. The 'systems' map does not model the differential impact of diabetes by breaking down the stocks and flows by ethnicity, gender and age.

• The behaviour of the 'system' over time such as the increasing prevalence of diabetes and the increasing financial burden on the health system is determined by the structure of the 'systems' map. That is, by interacting balancing and reinforcing feedback loops. The 'systems' map contains at least five feedback loops, and the implications of these loops for the prevention of diabetes is discussed in the next section.



Figure 1: 'Systems' map

Key: Feedback loops

Reinforcing feedback loops are destabilising and tend to exhibit growth or decline over time. In contrast, a balancing feedback loop is stabilising and usually indicates a 'system' is self-maintaining

- Building public health literacy (B₁): This is a balancing loop. Currently diagnosis of pre-diabetes or diabetes triggers a discussion (in primary care) about lifestyle changes to delay or stop the progression of pre-diabetes to diabetes, or encourage self-management of diabetes to avoid complications. Healthy choices lead to healthy eating and exercise patterns which can reduce the risk of developing diabetes, and in some cases reverse pre-diabetes. However, knowledge about healthy diet and exercise is insufficient to bring about lifestyle change. The capacity to sustain a healthy lifestyle is influenced by resources to enable healthy choices (e.g., sufficient disposable income and patient/whānau peer support) and the extent that the settings where people 'live, work and play' make the healthy choice the easy choice (e.g., removing sugary drinks from schools). Public health literacy needs to be built at many different levels to avoid 'victim blaming' and stigmatising those with pre-diabetes and/or diabetes. This requires actions such as raising awareness of the social determinants of health amongst policy makers, health professionals and non-health stakeholders to establish healthy policies and practices.
- *Reversing the pre-diabetes epidemic (B₂)*: This balancing loop is viewed by many stakeholders as a 'window of opportunity' to address the growing prevalence of diabetes, a point at which individuals are not as adversely affected by diabetes or its complications. Lifestyle changes and drug treatment may reverse prediabetes but the potency of this loop is undermined by difficulties in sustaining a healthy lifestyle which can increase the risk that those with pre-diabetes will go on to develop diabetes. Clinically, a 'one size fits all' approach may be ineffective. Some individuals with pre-diabetes could be 'resistant' to lifestyle interventions (e.g., weight-loss might not have the desired effect) and may be benefit from taking glucose lowering drugs immediately (if acceptable) for maximum efficacy in the treatment of the disease. This loop assumes that early diagnosis of pre-diabetes will result in lifestyle change of the individual which will reverse the pre-diabetic diagnosis.
- Recovery from diabetes (B₃): This is a relatively weak balancing loop whereby people with diagnosed diabetes successfully manage to reverse diabetes, and is very much dependent on the effectiveness of secondary prevention activities to stop or delay the development of complications including cardiovascular disease and renal failure. Bariatric surgery (a tertiary prevention intervention) is the most effective method to-date for long-term amelioration of diabetes.
- Moving beyond business as usual (R1): This is a reinforcing loop that identifies that growing concern about the prevalence of pre-diabetes leads to innovative ways of supporting people to adopt healthy lifestyles, at least some of which, such as community gardens, are outside the formal healthcare system. This enhances the effectiveness of primary prevention interventions which can raise awareness about pre-diabetes and positively impact on the levels of health literacy in the community. However, the inability to scale up (and out) primary preventive initiatives due to factors such as lack of evaluation and funding diminishes their ability to raise awareness about pre-diabetes and the need to adopt healthy diets and exercise patterns. The influence of health literacy is then reduced by lack of resources and presence of obesogenic settings which create barriers to healthy choices. This loops assumes value in a community development approach.
- Growing awareness of pre-diabetes (*R*₂): This is a reinforcing loop that shows that concerns about the growing number of people with pre-diabetes (undiagnosed and diagnosed) and financial implications for the health system, influence relative priority of pre-diabetes and resources allocated to early detection (more heart and diabetes checks), service improvement (e.g., self-management and shared care projects) and innovations outside formal healthcare services (e.g., diabetes innovation fund projects). These activities heighten the visibility of pre-diabetes which in turn influences its relative priority. This loop assumes primary care is an effective place to intervene.

Policy implications

The Ministry of Health's priority areas for action⁸ include a focus on pre-diabetes, enabling effective

self-management, improving service quality, early detection of diabetes and reducing complications, and integrated care between primary and secondary health services. Individually, all these strategies to a lesser extent will reduce the burden from diabetes including health disparities. Our 'systems map' focuses on the identification and management of pre-diabetes, and in this section we consider the extent that pre-diabetes is a powerful leverage point.

While addressing the diabetes epidemic by intervening early to reduce the number of new cases of diagnosed diabetes makes sense, the effectiveness of this strategy is diluted by the system dynamics depicted in Figure 1. Some insights include:

- Success at reducing the prevalence of pre-diabetes may not necessarily decrease prevalence of diabetes in the short term given that there is uncertainty whether any individual with prediabetes will go on to develop diabetes and in addition to an aging population where people with diabetes are living longer.
- Concerted effort to screen for pre-diabetes as represented by the 'growing awareness of prediabetes' loop (R₂) may result in unintended consequences associated with unnecessary medicalization including stigmatisation, victim blaming, patients adopting a fatalistic attitude to the onset of diabetes, increasing clinician workloads and potentially diverting scarce resources from the management and treatment of diabetes. A lack of understanding about why some prediabetic individuals do not go on to develop diabetes may mean some resources focused on individuals who did not need treatment. This highlights the opportunity for basic science research to aid in the identification of pre-diabetic individuals who will and will not progress to diabetes. A clinical approach will be right for some people but not others so monitoring the unintended consequences noted above is an important activity.
- Difficulties in translating lifestyle interventions from the context of a clinical trial into a 'real world' community setting may serve as a roadblock. There are questions about the ability of primary care workforce to deliver lifestyle interventions in the ways that have sufficient fit with Māori and Pasifika needs, aspirations and values. This is also true of non-health stakeholders such as sports and recreation clubs who struggle with 'low participation' groups. The existence of 'hard to reach' clients raises further questions about the potential of lifestyle interventions to further increase health inequities as these are more readily taken up by affluent and educated individuals. In addition, variations in the quality of care received by people with diabetes raises concern about the capacity of the primary care sector (rather than particular general practices or health services) to effectively address pre-diabetes.

⁸ Ministry of Health <u>Living well with diabetes: a plan for people at high risk of or living with diabetes 2015-2020</u>. Ministry of Health, Wellington, 2015.

• A focus on lifestyle as represented by the 'building health literacy' loop (B₁) can downplay the significance of social, cultural, economic and political factors. The social determinants of health such as income, food security, safe neighbourhoods, education and housing have a powerful influence on the effectiveness of lifestyle interventions. Settings where people 'live, work and play' matter. There needs to be a shift from 'building health literacy' to 'building public health literacy' to understand how the social determinants of health impact on people's ability to make healthy choices.

- An unhealthy weight is a risk factor that is shared with various chronic conditions, and lifestyle advice will be similar for each chronic condition.
- This analysis suggests that the effective prevention of diabetes requires both the development and testing of interventions to provide people with the necessary resources so that they have the opportunity to adopt healthy eating and exercise patterns, and capacity building of various settings in order to help people make healthy choices ('health by stealth'). This also involves raising awareness about the link between diet, exercise and diabetes, but importantly includes helping people to understand how structural issues such as food marketing and transport policy influence the availability, affordability and acceptability of healthy food and exercise opportunities. Cultivating such a systemic understanding is necessary to mobilise public support for deep interventions which may challenge the status quo.
- This analysis reinforces the need to strengthen the 'beyond business as usual' (R₁) loop through experimentation and evaluation. This will require inter-sectoral collaborations that actively engage with communities to co-design meaningful interventions that make a difference in everyday lives but also attend to wider influences on community health including socioeconomic factors.
- A focus on wellness rather than pre-diabetes provides an expansive frame to sweep in different cultural understandings of health (e.g., spiritual and whānau health) in order to inform the development of culturally appropriate, acceptable and accessible interventions.
- Lastly, engaging with those communities who are least likely to benefit from health interventions (and may even be considered by some as 'hard to reach') is necessary to ensure that any innovations do not unwittingly increase inequities. One such model is the He Pikinga Waiora Implementation Framework which prioritises self-determination and consists of four elements including culturalcenteredness, community engagement, systems thinking and integrated knowledge translation⁹.

For more information contact:

Maria Hepi, Institute of Environmental Science and Research (ESR): <u>maria.hepi@esr.cri.nz</u> He Pikinga Waiora research project: <u>hpwadmin@waikato.ac.nz</u>

⁹ Oetzel, J., Scott, N., Hudson, M., Masters, B., Rarere, M., Foote, J., Beaton, A., and Ehau, T. (2017) Implementation framework for chronic disease intervention effectiveness in Māori and other Indigenous communities. *Globalization and Health*, *13*(69). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-017-0295-8

2.1 Readiness to change measure

'Readiness to change' is the degree to which members (of a community or an organisation) view a problem as important and are prepared to take action to address the problem. Part of this readiness relates to whether the community wants to address a particular health issue. A researcher may see that diabetes is a key issue for a community, but the community feels that drugs are the main issue to address right now. The other part of readiness is whether the members are prepared to take a particular action.

Recommendations

- 1. Assess the members' rating of the importance of a health issues. This can be done by examining key health statistics or other existing data or surveying the community.
- 2. Assess the member' rating of reading for implementing a change (see scale below)
- 3. After gather these data, have a conversation among the team, and other stakeholders to determine whether this is a viable project idea. Consider the following questions:
 - a) How important is this issue for the community?
 - b) Are the community members and researchers equally interested in this issue? Or is it the researchers primarily pushing the idea?
 - c) Are the community members and/or community organisations committed to implementing change?
 - d) What resources do we have available to create and implement change?

Readiness for Implementing Change Scale

(using a five-point scale from 5 = completely to 1 = not at all)

- 1. We are committed to implementing this change.
- 2. We are determined to implement this change.
- 3. We are motivated to implement this change.

Source

Shea, C. M., Jacobs, S. R., Esserman, D. A., Bruce, K., & Weiner, B. J. (2014). Organizational readiness for implementing change: a psychometric assessment of a new measure. Implement Sci, 9(7), 1-15.

3.1

Partnership Capacity Measure

Partnership has the foundational resources necessary to achieve project aims.

Partnership capacity is the foundation for long-term project success. When partnerships have skills, diverse membership, legitimacy, and connections to relevant stakeholders this facilitates commitment to culture-centeredness, which leads to stronger relationships, synergy, and community in research contributing to outcomes.

Recommendations:

- 1. Assess current level of partnership capacity to work with external decision-makers and other stakeholders (See survey questions below).
- 2. Develop vision of capacities you would like to achieve and strategies to reach them.
- 3. Develop plan for reflection on progress and determine if there are ways to build your capacities such as including new members or trainings.

Survey Questions

Measures on a 6-point Likert scale:

- 1. Skills and expertise
- 2. Diverse membership
- 3. Legitimacy and credibility
- 4. Ability to bring people together for meetings and activities
- 5. Connections to political decision makers, government agencies, other organizations/groups
- 6. Connections to relevant stakeholders

Sources:

Oetzel, J. G., Zhou, C., Duran, B., Pearson, C., Magarati, M., Lucero, J., Wallerstein, N., & Villegas, M. (2015). Establishing the psychometric properties of constructs in a community-based participatory research conceptual model. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, *29*, e188-e202.

Engage for Equity, Center for Participatory Research, University of New Mexico: <u>https://cpr.unm.edu/research-projects/cbpr-project/index.html</u>



The link to the HEAT tool is available:

https://www.health.govt.nz/system/files/documents/publications/health-equity-assessment-tool-guide.pdf

5.1 Stakeholder analysis guide

What is a stakeholder?

- We follow Freeman (1984) and define a stakeholder as any individual, group or organisation that can affect or is affected by an intervention.
- Mana whenua and tangata whenua should not be considered stakeholders. While they may well have a 'stake' in an intervention, as a treaty partner, they hold a different status than stakeholders. As such the principles of participation, partnership and protection should be applied when considering Māori interests and values.

Why do stakeholders matter?

- Being aware of who might have a 'stake' an intervention and how it is implemented is critically important.
- Stakeholders may or may not be involved in the design, implementation and/or evaluation of the intervention.
- An intervention's success depends on a variety of stakeholders including patients, whānau, community, clinicians, managers, regulatory bodies, policy makers and politicians.
- Stakeholders provide resources, know-how and the intervention's social license to 'operate' and so their interests and values must be taken into account.

Who is a stakeholder?

- "The principle of who or what really counts" (Freeman, 1994).
- There are lots of different ways of categorising stakeholders. Ultimately, who counts as a stakeholder is a matter of perspective, and depends on how the boundaries are drawn around the intervention.
- But who should be included or excluded from a system of stakeholders?
- A helpful framework is set out by Mitchell et al. (1997) who distinguishes between stakeholders based on the *power* they have, how *legitimate* they are in the eyes of others, and the ability to command attention (*urgency*). In this way, stakeholders can be classified as definitive (having power, legitimacy and urgency), dominant (having power and legitimacy), dangerous (having power and urgency) and dependent (having legitimacy and urgency).

How are stakeholders identified?

- Bryson (1995) provides a simple way to determine stakeholders and 'stakes'.
 - Brainstorm potential stakeholders.
 - For each stakeholder:
 - Note their expectations about the intervention, how they can influence the intervention and the extent to which stakeholder expectations have been met; and,
 - Determine what would satisfy expectations in the short term and note long-term issues.

- This technique is useful for developing a shared understanding about stakeholder interests, values and prioritises.
- The 'power versus interest grid' can provide additional insights into stakeholder dynamics
 - Brainstorm stakeholders (or draw on existing list of stakeholders);
 - Locate each stakeholder on a 2x2 grid set out in Figure 1;
 - Assess the extent that each stakeholder is a *player* (high interest and high power), a *subject* (high interest and low power), a *context setter* (high power and low interest) or part of the *crowd* (low power and low interest); and
 - Develop a stakeholder management plan. Actions include those to manage players, consult with context setters, involve subjects and monitor the crowd.
 - This technique is useful for creating robust stakeholder management plans and crafting strategic communications.

Interest in the	High	Subjects (Keep informed)	Players (Manage)		
intervention	Low	Crowd (Monitor)	Context Setters (Keep satisfied)		
		Low	High		
		Pov over interv	wer ⊂the ention		

Figure 1: Power vs. interest grid (Ackermann et al., 2005)

What assumptions are made about stakeholders?

- All interventions including policies, programmes and/or pilots make assumptions about the interests, values and capacities of stakeholders. The extent to which these assumptions are valid can significantly impact on success of an intervention including its implementation.
- The assumption rating chart developed by Mason and Mitroff (1981) provides insight into stakeholder assumptions.
 - Brainstorm stakeholders (or draw on existing list);
 - Note what assumptions are made about each stakeholder
 - o Locate each assumption on the assumption rating chart set out in Figure 2
 - Assumptions that are 'least certain' but 'most important' highlight weaknesses in the intervention. Assumptions that are 'least important' but 'least certain' lend themselves to monitoring and review.
- This technique is helpful to test and strengthen interventions.

He Pik	kinga Waiora		
		Most certain	
	Least		Most
	important		important
		Least certain	

Figure 2: Assumption rating chart (Mason and Mitroff, 1981)

References

Ackermann, F., Eden, C., and Brown, I (2005). *The practice of making strategy*. London: Sage. Bryson, J. (1995) *Strategic planning for public and non-profit organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(4), 853-886.

Further reading

Bryson, J. M. (2004). What to do when stakeholders matter: stakeholder identification and analysis techniques. *Public Management Review*, 6(1), 21-53.

Achterkamp, M. C., & Vos, J. F. (2007). Critically identifying stakeholders: evaluating boundary critique as a vehicle for stakeholder identification. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 24(1), 3-14.

Ensuring partnership represents the community

Representing and Defining the Community

Working in a participatory manner means identifying the community you are working with and who from the community should participate.

Here are a few questions to keep in mind when defining the community:

- 1) Who represents the community?
- 2) Which individuals, agencies or organizations have influence in the community and what is their sphere of influence?
- 3) Are key members community residents or do they work for community-based organizations?
- 4) Whom does the individual or community-based organization represent or report to?
- 5) Who has the time, resources and flexibility to attend partnership meetings and take responsibility for action items?
- 6) Who is defined as "outside" the community and should not be invited to participate?

It is important to keep in mind that no one organization or individual can represent an entire community. To ensure a diverse and representative partnership, members should be recruited from various sectors of the community.

Above from: Giachello AL, author; Ashton D, Kyler P, Rodriguez ES, Shanker R, Umemoto A, eds. 2007. *Making Community Partnerships Work: A Toolkit*. White Plains, NY: March of Dimes Foundation.

Representing the community is an iterative process. Holding a variety of "stakeholder"/partnership hui (meetings) can help explore who might have interest or influence in the issue and have time and resources to participate. Asking people who else should participate, who has influence, who has a valuable perspective, etc. can help identify key members. The danger of defining your partnership can be in deciding too quickly who wants to be a part of it rather than exploring who needs to be in the partnership.

Keep in mind that an effective partnership needs to be large enough to represent the community and small enough to be effective to get things done. Typically, an effective working partnership is between 5 and 15 members. This core group are the people doing the main work of the partnership. One way to involve a greater number of people is to include Advisory Boards who you might meet with quarterly (or the like) to keep informed on progress and receive feedback.

Key Discussion Questions:

Who might you involve in your partnership?

What process will you use to explore potential partners?

What structure might you use? (Core member and advisory groups)

How to approach community members & organisations

Sometimes researchers start with clear ideas of the work that is needed and aren't sure exactly who they should work with. Coupled with some of the work identified in this web site about understanding of the principles of a partnership and assessing readiness and capacity to change, this section identifies some steps and tools to learn more about the community and approach potential community members and organisations. The following strategies will help you get started.

Step 1: Identify the community

A community is a group of people with shared identity and similar characteristics They can be defined in terms of physical spaces, such as living in particular neighbourhood, or by shared elements, such as a health condition or a shared hobbie. It is important to understand how the community defines itself so that you can work from their perspective. This helps you understand what makes them a community and the resources that they hold. Note that step 1 is also covered in the previous resource of ensuring the community is represented.

Step 2: Get to know the community

If you aren't aware of the community, you probably need to do some homework and find about it. Learn about the community's strengths, needs, history, culture, leaders and resources. This learning with help to show your interest in the community and your willingness to learn and be culturally humble.

Learning about the community is ongoing and takes time. A simple web search may provide some basic statistics and yet it isn't sufficient. You can read some of the local history or talk to community members. Check to see if partnerships already exist and what you might learn about them. Learn about previous work and how those worked and if there were any problems. Also, realize that you cannot determine the community's true priorities without obtaining the community's perspective.

Step 3: Connect with Gatekeepers and Key Informants

Entering a community can be daunting if you don't have established relationships. One way to start to establish relationships and learn about the community is to talk with gatekeepers and key informants. Gatekeepers are key opinion leaders who know the community, its issues and its leaders. They may be leaders themselves. They usually work within the community and are well respected and well- known. Other people are key informants; these people aren't members of the community although have spent significant time and gained some detailed knowledge about the community. During this process make sure you are respectful and observant of the culture of the community. Finally, makes sure you do not force your agenda; rather explore possibilities and see if it is a relationship that can be built on trust and common interests.

Step 4: Meet Community Stakeholders and Possible Partners

Hopefully some of the people you talk with in step 3 will help you plan a community meeting to share your thoughts about the project and needs. These meetings can help you get to know each other, let the community assess your sincerity and trustworthiness, and generate interest and support for the project. First impressions are very important are here are some suggestions for running them:

- 1. Listen to community members as they discuss their concerns and priorities. Good listening is critical as it helps to establish trust and shows your willingness to work with the community.
- 2. Do not force your agenda or dominate the speaking time. Also, don't counter argue with community members' viewpoints about the issues. It is important to provide a broad overview of your project goals and what you hope to accomplish; just don't make it a one-sided conversation.
- 3. Ask for feedback; seek about various viewpoints and alternative perspectives. The goal is to understand the community's needs and concerns. The community may support your perspective, but don't be surprised if you have a different perspective about the project. The next steps should be decided together.
- Be honest about what you want to do and what the project can and cannot do.
 Community members don't easily forget the promises you make and will hold you accountable for these false promises.
- 5. Keep showing up. It takes time to establish a strong and trusting relationship.

Source: Giachello AL, Ashton D, Kyler P, Rodriguez ES, Shanker R, Umemoto A, eds. 2007. Making Community Partnerships Work: A Toolkit. White Plains, NY: March of Dimes Foundation.

How to run codesign meetings (hui)

HOW TO RUN A CO-DESIGN MEETING?

Initial co-design meetings are held to engage a variety of stakeholders and explore possible solutions to health problems. Other resources describe the importance of representing and approaching the community. This resource focuses on how to structure the initial meeting(s) to help define the problem and identify solutions.

The initial co-design process is useful as it should bring a variety of different stakeholders and potential partners who might bring innovative ideas and fresh perspectives. After the initial meeting(s), you will find a common core of people who want to work on the problem. Some people will drop out because of lack of time or resources; others because they feel the direction moves them away from their organisation's core business. Sometimes we need to re-engage people who might be critical to the successful implementation of an intervention. The initial meeting(s) will help identify those key issues and people.

We recommend using Design Thinking methodology as it provide a problem-solving approach that is human centred. It is a useful process for addressing complex (or wicked) problems that are ill defined and/or lack an obvious solution. The focus is on understanding human need and the defining and framing the problem around these needs. From here, new ideas are generated and prototypes are created and tested.

There are five stages to work through. While they are listed as if they are linear, design thinking is non-linear and sometimes groups need to cycle back and skip stages. The length of time for the initial meeting can be as little as two hours and as long as two days depending on the availability of participants. Specific activities can be created to help explore and expand on each of these stages depending on participant availability.

Stage 1: Empathise.

The first stage is to try to empathise and understand the human aspects of the problem you are trying to solve. This can involve talking to community members, people who suffer from a condition, people who provide health services for a condition, etc. We could also spend time in the physical environment with the people who are affected by the condition. The easiest way to do this at an initial co-design meeting is to have people from the community with the condition participate and share their stories. Other members can interview and explore the problem with them. The key is to really gain a deep and emotional understanding of what people experience and feel with their condition and when they access services. Additionally, we need to make sure we have sufficient information before we move to the next step. So, the planner will need to organise the meeting carefully by ensuring the right people are present or perhaps structure the initial meetings where everyone goes away to gather more information before coming back for Stage 2. Further, as we move forward to other stages, we may realise that we have to cycle back to Stage 1 for more information to ensure we have empathic understanding.

Stage 2: Define the Problem

The focus on this stage is to analyse the information gathered to define the core problems that the team has identified. The problems should be defined in a human-centred way and not focus on what an organisation or

your team needs; rather it should focus on what the individuals and community needs. The problem should be noted in a statement or series of statements. For example, one such statement might be "Elders need access to safe environments, strong social connections and health services that treat them with respect." The problem statements should be re-worked with the input of the affected populations who hopefully are represented at the meeting. It might be appropriate to seek out additional members to ensure the problem statement is clearly understood and widely accepted.

Stage 3: Ideate

Once we have a clear definition of the problem based on an empathic understanding of peoples' experiences, you are ready to start generating ideas for solving the problem. The goal of this stage is to try and "think outside of the square" and come up with innovative ideas. The ideas should be phrased in terms of what can we do to address the problem statement. There are multiple techniques for stimulating free thinking such as brainstorming and "worst possible idea." The purpose is to encourage free thinking and possibilities and not evaluate ideas initially. After the free thinking, ideas can be explored and evaluated in order to narrow the pool of ideas.

Stage 4: Prototype

Stage 4 is about building inexpensive prototype(s) with specified features in the product or service. The group may be divided into a number of teams if there are sufficient people present to develop competing or complementary prototypes. These prototypes should involve various art supplies that can be used to draw or build the prototype. If the solution is a service, a picture of what the service might look like can be drawn with some description provided. At the end of this stage, the group has a set of prototypes that are ready to be shared and tested. These can narrowed down so there is only one prototype or test out multiple prototypes.

Stage 5: Test

The final stage is to thoroughly test the prototypes both within the group and also outside of the group. Testing likely involves a series of interviews and focus groups with key stakeholders who can identify potential limitations and constraints and also positive features of the prototypes. The results from the testing stage might stimulate additional ideas, help you learn more about the users, or needs for more information or problem definition (and hence why the process is non-linear).

References

Waloszek, G (2012). Introduction to Design Thinking. <u>https://experience.sap.com/skillup/introduction-to-design-thinking/</u>

Dam, R., & Siang (2019). 5 Stages in the Design Thinking Process. https://www.interactiondesign.org/literature/article/5-stages-in-the-design-thinking-process

HPW Visioning Tool

- Reflect and fill in the Visioning Tool individually
- Meet with partners and reflect on similarities and differences
- Plan next steps together
- After a period of time review processes together to see if you are following intentions

One project can involve multiple communities, e.g. a geographical community, an ethnic community, a community of practitioners. Complete a template for each community.

Do each column from intervention team and community perspectives -- list both if they are different

Community voice

How groups, that the intervention is focused on are involved in defining the problem and solution

Reflexivity

Questioning the unstated and taken-for-granted power and privilege from which outsiders initiate contact with the community

Structural transformation and resources

Changing the nature of the system to better fit the community needs.

Community Engagement

The level of involvement, impact, trust and communication with community members

Integrated Knowledge Translation

How the intervention is implemented with regard to the degree that the knowledge users are equal partners with the intervention team

System perspectives

The degree to which the team demonstrate recognition that there are multiple ways of viewing issues and solutions depending on worldviews, values and interests

System relationships

Prioritises an understanding of relationships between variables/factors rather than taking a laundry list approach

ſ	He Pikinga Waiora									
								1		
	How will we know if we are surcessful?									
	0 the drift of the									
	How can we ensure this hannens now?									
	atisha	Community voice Community voice How groups, that the intervention is focused on are involved in defining the problem and solution.	Reflexivity Questioning the unstated and taken-for-granted power and privilege from which outsiders initiate contact with the community.	Structural transformation and resources Changing the nature of the system to better fit the community needs.	Community Engagement The level of involvement, impact, trust and communication with community members	Integrated Knowledge Translation How the intervention is implemented with regard to the degree that the knowledge users are equal partners with the intervention team	System perspectives The degree to which the team demonstrate recognition that there are multiple ways of viewing issues and solutions depending on worldviews, values and interests.	System relationships Prioritises an understanding of relationships between variables/factors rather than taking a laundry list approach	System levels Takes different levels of analysis into account and provides clear rationale for the choices of levels.	61

9.1 Creating Values and Principles

All partnerships are guided by a set of underlying values and principles even if they aren't articulated. Each partnership should developed a clear set of principles by which they work. The <u>HPW Visioning tool</u> is one approach to develop a common vision guided by principles. An additional approach is to brainstorm a set of values and principles that guide your partnership and draft a brief document or oral recording to articulate them. These should be viewed as dynamic and changing as the partnership grows.

To help you think about some principles, the resource includes a list of commonly accepted, general principles guiding community-based participatory research (CBPR). CBPR is an approach that is consistent with the HPW framework and in fact, HPW borrowed some of the work from the CBPR literature. This is available below.

CBPR Principles

These principles come from Israel et al 2018 and are directly quoted (pp. 32-34). The descriptions are paraphrased from the same source.

1. CBPR recognizes community as a unit of identity

Community is a key aspect of collective and individual identity. Communities develop a sense of belonging and boundaries that are relevant for its members and how they see themselves as unique and connected to others. Exploring how communities define themselves and what is important to them is a key focus on CBPR.

2. CBPR builds on strength and resources within the community

CBPR takes a strengths-based approach rather than a deficit approach. That is, researchers working from this perspective identify and build on the strengths and resources of the community to address health and social issues. These include individual skills, social relationships and commitments to the community.

3. CBPR facilitates cooperative, equitable partnership and all research phases and involves an empowering and power sharing process that attends to social inequalities

CBPR is about partnering during the entire stage of a research project from defining the "problem" to developing the research approach, collecting data, interpreting data, and applying the results. Co-design is a popular approach although CBPR suggests that it is not only co-design, but also co- implementation and co-evaluation and co-everything. The knowledge and expertise of the community members is key throughout this process.

4. CBPR promotes co-learning and capacity building among all partners

CBPR involves co-learning and mutual sharing among all partners. Academic and community researchers bring different expertise that is used in a project. The team develops further by all members benefiting from these various perspectives. Increasing capacity can help all members work on the specific project and also in other endeavours.

5. CBPR integrates and achieves a balance between research and action for the mutual benefit of all partners

CBPR is not just about researching something to better understand it. This understanding is important although CBPR emphasises an action-oriented approach. Research knowledge needs to be actively applied to address health and social wellbeing issues that matter to the community. CBPR strives to achieve social change intended to eliminate health inequities.

6. CBPR emphasizes public health problems of local relevance and ecological perspectives that attend to the multiple determinants of health and disease

CBFR addresses health problems that matter for the community. The community should determine and guide the choice of issues. In addition, the definition of the health problems should be focused on multi-level determinants— that is, there should be focus on individual choices, family relationship, community structures and social systems as they impact a holistic view of health.

7. CBPR involves systems development through a cyclical and iterative process

CBPR emphasises a systems perspectives that examines multi-level issues over a period of time. This process allows a health issue to be placed in the context of the larger social system. This process also emphasises a dynamic approach to address the system.

8. CBPR disseminates findings and knowledge gained to all partners and involves all partners in the dissemination process

From the CBPR perspective, it is important to share findings from the project with all partners involve to ensure that the community learns about what was found out. Further, this information should be shared in an ongoing process of getting feedback to better interpret and use the findings for social action. Community partners should be actively involved in this dissemination.

9. CBPR requires a long-term process and commitment to sustainability

Many of the health and social problems that exist today have developed over long periods of time and have created high levels of mistrust in social institutions. Thus, CPBR needs to make a long-term commitment to change and seek ways to make the research and outcomes sustainable.

10. CBPR addresses issues of race, ethnicity, racism and social class and embraces cultural humility

CBPR tends to be used with community partners from historically marginalised groups and 'outside' researchers and other institutional partners from more privileged backgrounds. CBPR partners need to strive to directly address and consider hard issues around ethnicity, racism and social class to combat historical wrongdoings. Cultural humility is being humble about this learning and show a willingness to grow and adapt. It is a commitment to self-reflect and examines one's own biases.

Source

Israel BA, Schulz AJ, Parker EA, Becker AB, Becker AB, Allen AJ et al. Critical issues in developing and following CBPR principles. In: Wallerstein N, Duran B, Oetzel JG, & Minkler M. editors. Community- based participatory research for health: advancing social and health equity, 3rd edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2018. p. 31-46.

0.1 River of Life

The River of Life is a tool that can help a partnership reflect on it histories, motivations and influence on the partnership and how it has developed. This tools builds on the work of Paulo Freire to encourage reflexive dialogue. The purpose of the tool is to develop a communal narrative about what has brought the partnership together and the work it is doing. It provides the narrative using a set of guided questions and the metaphor of a river that allows partners to acknowledge, celebrate, reflect on, change and sustain the processes and goals for the project. It encourages a look at the internal partnership dynamics and also the external institutional, political, economic, and historical constraints and opportunities that shape the partnership.

The following is a brief summary of the exercise. For details, see facilitation guide and examples of Rivers of Life at: http://cpr.unm.edu/research-projects/cbpr-project/facilitation_tools.html

Objective:

To help partnerships reflect on the histories and influences that motivation partners to work together and also on the goals, processes and results of your partnership work.

Time:

60 minutes (few minutes to individually reflect, 45 minutes for teamwork and 15 minutes to reflect).

Materials:

Sheets of paper, coloured markers, flipchart, scissors, magazines, construction paper and glue.

Procedures:

Explain the value of a river as a symbol for many cultures as it reflects life, growth and change. As partnership, engage in the following steps:

Step 1: Each member of the partnership reflects independently about: When and why did you join the partnership? What is important to know about your community? What important events and changes have you seen?

Step 2: Lay out a long sheet of paper and other art supplies so that together you can draw your partnership river of life.

Step 3: Draw the river of life considering the beginnings, the influences, the obstacles, and the peaceful moments.

Step 4: Make a historical timeline with dates below the river of life. Relate important historical events as well.

Step 5: Reflect on the river of life considering the following questions:

- 1. What stood out for you?
- 2. What were facilitators for the partnership?

3.

What were some of the challenges?

- 4. How could you use this River of Life in your work?
- 5. How would you like the river to flow going forward?

Source: Sanchez-Youngman S, Wallerstein N. Partnership river of life: creating a history time line. In: Wallerstein N, Duran B, Oetzel JG, & Minkler M. editors. Community-based participatory research for health: advancing social and health equity, 3rd edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2018. p. 375-378.

10.2 Reflexive Dialogue and Critical Self-Reflection

The key aspect about critical self-reflection is to find a process that works well and challenges you to consider key issues that impact partnering and also address issues around health inequities. The key is to honestly push oneself to understand how your identities influence you and how that may be influencing the partnering process. It is about honestly assessing issues of ethnicity, culture, racism, power and privilege as these are issues that many partnerships are address if they are addressing health equity in Indigenous communities.

One approach to critical self-reflection is presented here and is based on the work of Cheryl Hyde (2018). It involves a four-step process of understand the self and exploring how that impacts on the partnership.

Step 1: Our Complex Cultural Selves

The first step is to explore and understand one's own identities and how they impact us. These include the values, attitudes, beliefs, practices, and rituals that shape who we are and how we act all of which flow from the various groups of which we are members. As part of this exploration, the following inventory may be helpful. This can be completed directly or can simply be used as a reflective tool.

Identities	What values, actions or	How do you understand	What privileges do you
	messages are associated	this aspect of yourself?	have? What privileges
	with this identity?	How do others see you?	have you been denied?
			How have you
			responded?
Gender			
Ethnicity			
Class			
Sexual orientation			
Nationality			
Other			

Cultural identity inventory

p 2: Privilege and Power

This step builds on the inventory in step one and considers that some of the identities are dominant or privileged. These privileged identities have power related to access to economic, political and education among other resources. By contrast, some of these identities have a subordinate status. These statuses related to social structures and social determinants of health and wellbeing. This step involves reflecting on how these identities are privileged and not privileged and how that may impact the partnership.

Step 3: Understanding Different Vantage Points

A key aspect of this step is to seek understanding of how we see ourselves and how others see us. These may not be the same—we may see ourselves as open and humble and other may experience us as closed and a "know-it-all." Further, what you may consider to be a central part of your identity, others may not even consider. In completing the inventory, it is important to push yourself to consider an honest reflection about these different vantage points.

Step 4: Synthesis and Next Steps

Hyde suggests reviewing the inventory, your reflection and considering four questions:

- a) What are your overall reaction to this information?
- b) Does any dimension stand out as particularly important to your overall cultural identities?
- c) What have you learned about yourself?
- d) What next steps in this process do you see yourself taking?

Addressing these questions can help you move forward. For example, you may consider further education to better understand your identities or those of other groups. Perhaps there are some skills that you want to develop or relationships you want to build. To guide these next steps, you might want to consider ways that your identities are a) assets to your practice, b) challenges to your practice and c) areas for improvement.

Given that we are focusing on addressing health inequities, particularly in Indigenous communities, understanding identities, and particularly issues of power and privilege, are important. We need to understand the ways that our identities are reflected in the discussion and in the approach that we are taking to address the health issues. We need to make sure that we are not inadvertently silencing some viewpoints during our discussion. We also need to make sure that different perspectives are integrated into the work. Part of working effectively is to navigating these differences and ideally integrate these differences to enhance the quality of the work. Thus, a final part of this last step is to dialogue about our partnership processes to see how it reflects our identities and whether it is integrative of various identities.

Source: Hyde C. Challenging ourselves: Critical self-reflection on power and privilege. In: Wallerstein N, Duran B, Oetzel JG, & Minkler M. editors. Community-based participatory research for health: advancing social and health equity, 3rd edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2018. p. 337-344.

11.1 Developing Partnership Agreements

Many partnerships develop agreements for how they will work. These agreements can be informal or formal although a large study of US community-based research partnerships found that having a formal agreement was a promising practice that is associated with better resource and power sharing in particular (Oetzel et al, 2018). Agreements can include a variety of features and partnerships need to review what features matter to them. There are a variety of ways and approaches to develop agreements. This file is based on the suggestions of Rodriguez Espinosa and Richmond (2018) and considers a variety of features for formal agreements. Not all of these features have to be included and it is up to the parties to identify the most important features.

Purpose

A purpose statement provides a general overview of the aims of the partnership and what it is trying to accomplishment. It may also provide a list of key terms and working definitions to provide clarity.

Mission and vision

A mission and vision statement can be an alternative to a purpose statement or provide further elaboration of it. A mission and purpose are very similar while a vision often provides and aspirational goal for what is a desired outcome (e.g., improved health equity).

Project Values and principles

Another resource in this web site provides an overview of key CBPR principles and encourage identifying key values and principles for the partnerships. Some formal agreements include those principles, while other partnerships leave them out of the formal documents.

Respective Responsibilities

Many agreements include the key responsibilities for each partner or stakeholder group involved in the partnership. These responsibilities provide a scope of work for each partner and help to organise efforts and also reduce misunderstandings about expectations and deliverables. These can be identified as specific deliverables, work responsibilities, key performance indicators or milestones. This section (or a separate section) should also specify how the resources are going to be distributed and who is responsible for making decisions about resources including the hiring of project staff. This section can also include the agreement period and specific deliverable dates.

Data-Related Issues

As these types of projects involve research, there are ethical responsibilities in data collection and management. The following are often considered:

Involvement in data collection

Data collection procedures must comply with research ethics protocols and usually are covered in separate documents. However, the formal agreement may specify who is involved in data collection efforts and the procedures they need to follow to adhere to ethical protocols.

Data ownership and data sharing

Data ownership, sharing and data use agreements are especially important for partnerships with multiple teams in order to avoid potential conflicts. Indigenous communities are especially concerned about data ownership and sharing given past misuse of data.

Data storage

Agreements may consider issues about who is going to store the data and how it will be done. This is particularly important for projects collecting identifiable data; agreements should outline steps for protecting participant confidentiality.

Procedures for project modifications

Given the fluid nature of CBPR research, it is not uncommon for changes to the project to occur. Agreements can be used to identify the procedures for introducing and approving modifications (e.g., establishing a committee to review and approve modifications).

Publication, Writing, and General Dissemination

Sharing of research findings through conference presentations, journal articles and reports for the community and stakeholders is a key aspect of partnered projects. Agreements often include elements to describe the process of identifying authorship and approval of publications to ensure equitable collaboration and honouring all who participate. Some of the specific elements that might be included are the following:

General dissemination

This aspect of an agreement might identify key milestones or responsibilities for sharing research findings (e.g., to community groups, to funders, to stakeholders, etc.). These might identify who is responsible for meeting the general dissemination responsibilities as well.

Publications, review processes, and opportunity for collaborative dissemination

This section identifies the process for reviewing and approving publications and other dissemination efforts. This might be done by a subcommittee of the partnership. This section should also specify how people can be involved in writing teams and the means by which information will be shared about ongoing writing opportunities, particularly for junior researchers and community members. Finally, it should also consider the criteria for authorship. Such criteria should likely consider journal publication standards as well, but could include: "a) Individuals who contribute substantially to the manuscripts concept, design, data analysis, or implications; b) Individuals who provide essential expertise for example academic, indigenous knowledge, historical, cultural relevancy; and c) Individuals who review or make substantive comments or edits on at least one draft." (Rodriguez Espinosa & Richmond, 2018, p. 389). The criteria may also identify ways to identify the order of authors and student authorship around thesis/dissertation. Publication guidelines acknowledgement

Some people contribute to a project and yet may not meet the criteria for authorship. Others may facilitate and support relationships that the project depends on. These contributions can be specified in an acknowledgement section that is included in all dissemination efforts. The agreement can specify the means by which this acknowledgement will be written.

Resolving grievances

CBPR partnerships often include various forms of conflict and thus a process for resolving grievances is often included. These can specify formal grievance processes (e.g., nominating a person or group for arbitration) or specify a set of principles for how the partnership is going to address conflict. Some partnerships may be terminated and the conditions for such a termination should be specified.

Other sections to consider

nination

An appendix listing those parties referred to in the agreement, subcommittee membership, health and safety plans, contingency plans and advisory boards may be helpful.

Example Agreements

For comprehensive example, see Engage for Equity (E2): http://cpr.unm.edu/common/new-engage-for-equity-data-publish-agreements-2017-.pdf

For comprehensive tribal examples, see the Indigenous Wellness Research Institute (IWRI): http://health.iwri.org/tribal-colleges-universities-drug-and-alcohol-problems-andsolutions-study/

See source below for further URLs identifying examples.

Source: Rodriguez Espinosa P, & Richmond A. Partnership agreements: A practical guide to developing data sharing, ownership and publishing agreements. In: Wallerstein N, Duran B, Oetzel JG, & Minkler M. editors. Community-based participatory research for health: advancing social and health equity, 3rd edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2018. p. 385-392.

12.1 Viable Systems Model

Viable System Model guide

- The Viable System Model (VSM) was developed by Stafford Beer and sets out the *necessary* and *sufficient* conditions required for organisational viability. That is, the capacity to successfully adapt to changes in social, economic, technological, cultural and political environments.
- The VSM provides a theoretically and methodological robust way to managing complexity.
- The VSM can be used to design high performing organisations or evaluate weaknesses that impact on organisational sustainability.
- The VSM presents a generic model of organisation and can be applied 'system' including teams, organisations, communities and economies. For example, Foote et al. (2014) used the VSM to help a diverse set of stakeholders design an integrated approach to addressing family violence in New Zealand.
- We recommend its application for complex public health interventions such as those developed using the He Pikinga Waiora framework.
- The VSM posits that a viable organisation requires five subsystems. These are:
 - **System 1 Operations** ('the doing bits of a system') which deliver the goods and services to achieve the organisation's purpose. Operational units interact with organisation's external operating environment including clients, communities and other organisations.
 - **System 2 Coordination** which ensures that the various operational units work together in a way that avoids 'sub-optimisation' (e.g., standardisation, scheduling of resources).
 - System 3 Management which ensures that the various operational units are appropriately tasked, resourced, and held accountable for their performance. System 3 manages for 'collective impact' (cf: System 2). The management subsystem is responsible for ensuring that any organisational policies are communicated.
 - System 4 Intelligence which tracks developments in the external operating environment, and identifies opportunities and threats.
 - System 5 Policy which sets purpose and ethos of the organisation, and ensures that the 'inside and now' orientation of the System 3 Management subsystem is balanced with the 'outside and future' orientation of the System 4 Intelligence subsystem.
- These subsystems are organisational *functions* are not **necessarily** the responsibility of any one individual or group.
- The VSM also highlights the important role that information and control channels play in ensuring that the five subsystems are in *balance*. Key homeostats include:
 - **System 1 and 3 relationship** where operational goals, resourcing and accountability arrangements are determined;
 - System 1, 2 and 3 relationship that ensures the operational units have necessary autonomy to respond to any challenges;
 - System 3 and 4 relationship where decisions about *how* the organisation will adapt to changes in its external operating environment are made; and
 - System 3, 4 and 5 relationship which resolves conflict between short vs. long term and internal vs. external perspectives.
- Figure 1 sets out a viable system representation of a family violence prevention system.
- Organisational pathologies ('problems') occur when subsystems are missing, ineffective or not in balance. For example, a weakly developed (or non-existent) System 5 - Policy subsystem can lead to lack of agreement on organisational purpose leading to lack of clarity about what activities will make a difference.
- The VSM provides a template that can be applied at different levels defined by geography, target population etc (e.g., local, regional, national). This recursiveness considerably reduces the complexity associated with multi-level comprehensive public health interventions. In this way, a viable system at the national level can be decomposed into a number of viable systems at the regional level (e.g., regional services), which in turn can consist of a number of viable systems at the local level (e.g., specific services).


Figure 1: VSM (Adapted from Foote et al., 2014)

VSM Template

- 1. Identify a 'system in focus' e.g., public health intervention, a cross-sector collaboration, a health service.
- 2. Develop an appreciation of the 'system in focus'
 - a. Undertake a stakeholder analysis (see stakeholder analysis guide)
 - b. Identify key issues, problems and opportunities
- 3. Define the purpose of the 'system in focus'
 - a. Utilise PQR or CATWOE method (see soft systems methodology guide).
- 4. Collect views from key stakeholders about the presence and effectiveness of System 1-5 and homeostats. This template utilises Hildbran and Bodhanya's (2015)³ diagnostic questions:
 - a. What are the main operations of the system?
 - b. How do the operational units relate and work together?
 - c. How are the operational units coordinated? What mechanisms ensure operations run smoothly?
 - d. What are the important committees, procedures and structures that facilitate the good operation of the system?
 - e. Who is managing the system as a whole and through what mechanisms?
 - f. How are resources allocated, and accountability negotiated?
 - g. Who is looking at future trends, opportunities and threats, and investigates their impact on the system in the long term? How are plans made to deal with them?
 - h. Why does your system exist in the way it does, and what binds this system together?
- 5. Based on (4) identify organisational strengths and weaknesses including any pathologies.
- 6. Develop improvements to enhance the viability of the 'system in focus'.

Hildbrand, S., & Bodhanya, S. (2015). Guidance on applying the viable system model. *Kybernetes*, 44(2), 186-201.

Back to Index

³ Hildbrand, S., & Bodhanya, S. (2015). Guidance on applying the viable system model. *Kybernetes*, 44(2), 186-201.

13.1 Soft Systems Methodology for Setting Purpose and Design 'Hard' and 'soft' systems

- Systems ideas have been applied to various problematic health issues including diabetes and obesity. Systems is relatively novel within public health and not without challenges.
- While all systems approaches are committed to understanding problems holistically, commitment to holism (i.e., whole greater than sum of the parts), the use and conceptualization of specific systems concepts varies depending on approach. There is a range of soft, hard, and critical traditions including general systems theory, system dynamics, cybernetics, complex adaptive systems, soft systems methodology, and critical systems thinking. For example, the concept 'system' provides illustration of differences between hard and soft approaches. From the hard perspective, a 'system' is an entity that exists in the real world such as a health system. Much of the literature on quality improvement in health adopts this perspective. In contrast, the soft approach regards a 'system' as a way of organising thinking about problematic situations.

Soft Systems Methodology

- Soft Systems Methodology (SSM) was developed by Peter Checkland and colleagues over a 30 year programme of action research (e.g., Checkland, 1981; Checkland and Scholes, 1990; Checkland and Poulter, 2006). SSM has been extensively used in areas such as health services research (e.g., Vandenbroeck et al., 2014), information systems development (Winter et al., 1995) and evaluation (e.g., Foote et al., 2009).
- For an accessible introduction to SSM principles, methods and practices see Checkland and Poulter's (2006) Learning in action: a short definitive account of soft systems methodology and its use for practitioners, teachers and students.
- SSM is an approach to addressing ill-defined problems. Such problematic situations are 'messes'. That is, complex sets of interacting issues that are resistant to definition and solution. Messes cannot be solved but need to be managed on an ongoing basis.
- SSM is used to:
 - 1. Gain insights into problematic situations
 - 2. Set intervention purposes and develop strategic objectives
 - 3. Develop shared understanding about issues and buy-in to actions
- Unlike 'hard' systems approaches, SSM is agnostic about whether systems exist in the real world. Instead, SSM draws on systems concepts to create a process of learning which examines the different viewpoints held about a problematic situation and encourages a shared understanding about what actions are desirable and feasible. That is, likely to led to improvement.
- A soft systems study is undertaken in collaboration with stakeholders and structured around four principles:
 - 1. Finding out about the problematic situation;
 - 2. Developing models of purposeful activity to direct inquiry about the problematic situation;
 - 3. Comparing (2) with (1) to develop a collective understanding about the problematic situation and determine what actions might constitute an improvement; and
 - 4. Structured dialogue about desirable and feasible changes.
- Finding out about the problematic situation
 - Information about the problematic situation is collected using a variety methods including interviews, hui, documentary analysis, observations and surveys. The complexity of issues is visually represented as a rich picture highlighting key inter-relationships and possible boundaries (see Figure 1 for an example). Analyses of the intervention including the context and power relations also deepen an appreciation of what change is desirable and feasible.



Figure 1: A rich picture of water use (Winstanley et al., 2016)

• Developing models of purposeful activity

- In SSM, problematic situations are explored using models of purposeful activity.
- SSM assumes that action to understand or improve a problematic situation is purposeful. That is, intentional.
- These models represent 'relevant systems' that might improve the problematic situation.
- Models of purposeful activity can be developed using PQR formula and sharpened up using CATWOE method.
 - The PQR formula expresses a 'relevant system' in terms of a "way to do [P], by [Q] in order to achieve [Q]".
 - CATWOE stands for C(lient), A(ctor), T(ransformation), W(orldview), O(wner) and E(nvironment).
 - The T(ransformation) and W(orldview) set out the improvement and the perspective from which the improvement is seen as desirable The T(ransformation) is expressed in terms of moving from an undesired state to a desired state ("undesired state→desired state")
 - The A(ctors) define who will carry out the T(ransformation).
 - The C(lient) defines who benefits (or is disadvantaged) from the T(ransformation), and the O(wner) determines who can stop the T(ransformation) from happening
 - The E(nvironment) details what must be taken as a given when undertaking the T(ransformation)
 - See Table 1 for an example.
- Multiple models of purposeful activity are created in order to prevent premature narrowing of perspectives on improvement.
- Models of purposeful activity are given expression as conceptual models which set out what activities have to logically occur in what order to give effect to the T(ransformation). Activities are brainstormed, expressed with verbs up-front, and placed in relationship to one another (see Figure 2 for an example).

Table 1: Developing a community environmental action plan (Adapted from Foote et al., 2009)

PQR: To develop a [o	community environmental action plan] by [pooling together the knowledge of					
stakeholders and Māo	stakeholders and Māori] in order to [achieve coordinated action]					
T(ransformation)	Community fail to understand the state of the environment $ ightarrow$ Community					
	understand the environmental priorities					

He Pil	kinga Waiora						
	C(lient)	Fish and Game, Māori, community members, conservationists, recreationalists,					
		farmers, individual landowners, environment					
	A(ctors)	Community leaders, Regional Council staff (e.g. engineers, scientists),					
		government agencies, interest groups, business, Māori, individual landowners					
	W(orldview)	The role of the regional council is to support community (be on tap, not on top)					
	O(wner)	Powerful (articulate/'loud') actors with a negative view of the community action					
		plan, government agencies, council elected representatives					
	E(nvironment)	Funding, time, information or understanding, willingness of participants to resolve					
		issues					



Figure 2: Conceptual model of creating a community environmental plan (Foote et al., 2009)

• Comparing models of purposeful activity with the problematic situation

- The models of purposeful activity provide a structure way to inquire about the problematic situation.
- Activities set out in the conceptual model are checked against the 'rich picture' to determine:
 - Does the activity occur in practice?
 - If not, should the activity be done?
 - If yes, how well is the activity done? How might the activity be improved?
- Structured dialogue about desirable and feasible changes
 - The process of systematically comparing the models of purposeful activity with the problematic situation will surface a number of actions that may lead to improvement. SSM encourages accommodation rather than consensus. That is, actions that participants can live with.
 - Actions are then implemented and evaluated.

References

Checkland, P. (1981). Systems thinking, systems practice. Chichester: Wiley.

Checkland, P. & Scholes, J. (1990). Soft systems methodology in action. Chichester: Wiley.

- Checkland, P., & Poulter, J. (2006). *Learning for action: a short definitive account of soft systems methodology and its use, for practitioners, teachers and students*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Foote, J., Ahuriri-Driscoll, A., & Hepi, M. (2009, July). Systemic evaluation of community environmental management programmes. *In Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the International Systems Science Society*, Brisbane, Australia.
- Vandenbroeck, P., Dechenne, R., Becher, K., Eyssen, M., & Van den Heede, K. (2014). Recommendations for the organization of mental health services for children and adolescents in Belgium: use of the soft systems methodology. *Health Policy*, 114(2-3), 263-268.
- Winter, M., Brown, D. H., & Checkland, P. B. (1995). A role for soft systems methodology in information systems development. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 4(3), 130-142.
- Winstanley, A., Ahuriri-Driscoll, A., Hepi, M., Baker, V., & Foote, J. (2016). Understanding the impact of democratic logics on participatory resource decision-making in New Zealand. *Local Environment*, *21*(10), 1171-1184.

He	Piki	nga	Wai	ora
FIC	1 1 1 1 1 1 1			VIA

Temp	late

Creating a rich picture (Walton and Foote, 2016)

- All perspectives are valid
- No judgements on the quality of drawing
- Use pictures fist, and words second to clarify (if needed)
- One pen, one 'artist' at a time.
- Ask questions. Discuss. Engage.

Developing purposeful activity systems

• Review the 'rich picture' and identify potential improvements

Potential improvements:

1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	

- Use PQR formulae or CATWOE method (or both) to clearly articulate what is meant by EACH potential improvement.
- If PQR:
 - \circ Unpack the improvement in terms of "do [P], by [Q] in order to [R]"
 - [P] is the change that results in an improvement, [Q] is the means by which the change is brought about, and [R] is the rationale (or 'pot of gold') for the improvement

The change [P]: _____

The means [Q]: ______

The reason [R]: ______

- If CATWOE
 - Start by unpacking the improvement in terms of the T(ransformation) and the W(orldview)
 - \circ Express the T(ransformation) in terms of undesired state \rightarrow desired state.
 - Brainstorm possible W(orldviews). That is, any assumptions that makes the T(ransformation) meaningful.
 - Brainstorm remaining elements including C(lients), A(ctors), O(wner) and E(nvironment)

Create conceptual models for each PQR and/or CATWOE

- Brainstorm 7 \pm 2 logical activities that *have to take place* to bring about the T(ransformation)
- Remove any duplicates, identify activities which can happen independently of others and identify those which dependent are other activities
- o Place activities in sequence and add any significant relationships
- o Review conceptual model for clarity
- o Include monitoring and evaluation activity to complete the conceptual model

Activities:

1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		

Independent activities:

1.	 	 	
2.			
3.			
4.			

Dependent activities



Comparing models of purposeful activity with the problematic situation

- Review rich picture and conceptual models
- Systematically compare the activities in the conceptual models with what is known about the problematic situation
 - o Does the activity occur in practice?
 - o If not, should the activity be done?
 - o If yes, how well is the activity done? How might the activity be improved?
- Brainstorm and record possible actions

DD	Activity	In practice?	Evaluation	Possible actions
	1			
	2			
	3			
	4			
	5			
	6 etc			

Structured dialogue about desirable and feasible changes

• Review possible actions noted above

He Pikinga Waiora

• Debate: to what extent are the actions desired and feasible?

Back to Index

4.1 Power Mapping

Power mapping is being increasingly used in participatory research by partnerships that wish to shape or change the local, regional and national policies. Power mapping involves the identification of key organisational, community and individual players in the policy making environment. These are people who have strength and influence in supporting or opposing a particular policy change. The exercise is ideally designed for a small group of people (Falbe et al., 2018).

The first step is to select a specific policy that your group wants to help pass or defeat. As a group, complete the following steps:

- 1. Identify the policy targets or those people and organisations that have power to make a policy change.
- 2. Identify other key stakeholders or players in this situation—people, communities or organisation that may be affected by the problem or policy and have potential influence. Some of these stakeholders may present later once the policy issue is more prominent so it is important to try to anticipate those parties too.
- 3. Write your policy objective on the top of a sheet of paper and draw three columns: supporters on the left, neutral/undecided in the middle, and opposition on the right. Put targets in circles (power to make change) and put other players in squares. The size of the circles and squares should indicate the relative power and/or stake that people have; larger shapes are for entities with a lot of power or a lot at stake and smaller with less power or less at stake. The relative size can consider the resources, size, skills and intensity of the issue for the entity. Draw the shapes as overlapping when entities have shared interests.

Example Power Map Template

Policy Goal or Objective:___



Adapted from Falbe et al. (2018)

- . If it is an election or decision year, consider the donations or perks that have been received by the targets and players in a position of influence.
- 5. Given the current understanding, choose the three most important entities to influence and consider the following:
 - a. What is most important: strengthen supporters, persuade the neutral/undecided or weaken the opposition?
 - b. When should you approach these entities (if at all)?
 - c. Is more information needed to make the map more accurate?

For an example of the use of a power map, see the following source:

Source: Falbe J, Minkler M, Dean R, & Cordeiero J Power mapping: A useful tool for understanding the policy environment and its application to a local soda tax initiative. In: Wallerstein N, Duran B, Oetzel JG, & Minkler M. editors. Community-based participatory research for health: advancing social and health equity, 3rd edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2018. p. 405-410.

Back to Index

15.1 Stakeholder Hui Evaluation Instructions

Background information

Stakeholder engagement is a key part of the He Pikinga Waiora Implementation Framework. Specifically, the research shows that intervention quality and implementation effectiveness are stakeholders are engaged throughout the process. One key tool for this engagement is the use of stakeholder hui; meetings where multiple stakeholders are brought together to learn about the complexity of particularly health problems and also attempt to develop interventions to address the complex issues identified.

The Stakeholder Hui Evaluation Tool is designed as process evaluation and help the team move forward with further stakeholder engagement. The tool is composed of three sections:

1) usefulness and open-ended feedback, 2) closed-ended questions measuring three key areas—system thinking, engagement and participation, and outcomes, and 3) demographic information. This tool should be administered at the end of the hui and participants should complete it anonymously. It can also be administered electronically through a survey-monkey type devise. If in person, the data need to be entered into a spreadsheet for analysis (e.g., SPSS, Excel, etc.). The remainder of this document discusses how to use the information for evaluation purposes.

Using the information for evaluation

The information gathered from this tool should be used to reflect on what worked well in the hui and how to move forward if future meetings are required. The first step is identify where you partnership is at (i.e., data analysis). The second step is to figure out what it means and what next steps should be (i.e., reflecting on the data).

Data Analysis

The data can be analysed in multiple ways. Qualitative data can be read with common responses noted. There are a number of open-ended questions in the tool which allow you to get people's perspectives in their own words. Usually, the analysis of the qualitative data is to get a flavour of how people felt about the hui—what they liked and didn't like.

Quantitative data (closed-ended questions) usually provide descriptive information about perceptions related to the three areas in section 2. The descriptive information about perception can consider individuals items within the three categories or at broad category level (average of each of the items for systems thinking, engagement & participation, and outcomes). Typically, a mean and standard deviation from all of the participants are provided. The scores of each item or average will range from 1 (not at all) to 6 (complete extent). Scores that are in the 5-6 range generally indicate high performance on the item or area. Scores in the 3-4 range indicate room for improvement, while scores in the 1-2 range demonstrate problematic areas. High standard deviation (>1) indicates a lot of difference in the responses, while low standard deviation (<.5) indicates consistent responses. The first item in section one is rated on a 1-5 scale so scores >4.5 are high, 3.5-4.5 as somewhat high, and <3 as need for improvement.

Frequency counts can be obtained for the demographics. We don't recommend comparing the information in section 2 along demographic lines as these hui usually don't involve more than 20 people.

Reflecting on the Data

The data analysis simply tells us what is and where there might be some areas of concern. The next step is to take the data back to the participants, organisers or other collaborators and have a conversation about the meaning of the data. This opportunity for reflection is critical to the development of strong stakeholder hui. These meetings have strengths and areas for improvement and if future meetings are planned, some adjustments in the structure or participants may be indicated from the data. For example, we have one hui where participants really like the hui and perspectives shared and also suggested that a broader range of stakeholders and end users be included in future hui. This reflection doesn't have to be a major undertaking—sometimes a short meeting can be sufficient to self- evaluation, reflect and move to the work.

Back to Index

5.2 Stakeholder Hui Evaluation

Thank you for your contribution to this hui/workshop. Answers to this questionnaire will be used to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the methods we have used in the hui/workshop.

Section 1

1. How useful was this hui/workshop for you? Please tick appropriate box.

□ Not at all useful □ Not very useful □ Neutral □ Somewhat useful □ Very useful

• What are 3 ways it was useful?

2. What is the thing you liked best about this workshop?

3. What is the thing you liked least?

Section 2

Workshops can achieve a number of different purposes (although no one hui/workshop can achieve all purposes). Please help us to understand what purposes were achieved in this workshop by answering the following questions organised around 3 different categories.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Please tick appropriate box.

<u>Statement</u>	Not at all	Small extent	Moderate extent	Great extent	Very great extent	Complete extent	
Understanding about the System and Big Picture							

1. Participation in this hui has helped me to recognise that there are many different				
2. Participation in this hui has helped me to gain a better idea about different influences on pre-diabetes/diabetes.				
3. Participation in this hui has helped me to think more clearly about positive and possible changes.				
4. Participation in this hui has helped me to express my own 'cultural' viewpoint (i.e. as Māori, Pākehā, other ethnicity).				
5. Participation in this hui has helped me to see the complexity of the issues.				
6. The intervention we are developing targets changes at multiple levels.				
Any other comments about understanding th	e big pic	ture?		

<u>Statement</u>	Not at all	Small extent	Moderate extent	Great extent	Very great extent	Complete extent
Engagement & Participation						
1. The discussion in this hui built on resources and strengths in the community.						
2. This hui emphasizes what is important to the community (culture, environmental and social factors) that affect wellbeing.						
3. Suggestions I made within this hui were seriously considered.						
4. This hui allowed us to communicate in a respectful manner.						
5. To what extent has the hui involved the end users of the intervention?						
6. To what extent have the barriers and facilitators for adoption been considered for this intervention?						
7. To what extent have relevant stakeholders been included in the development of the intervention?						

Any other comments about engagement & participation?

Outcomes				
1. This hui helped us develop an intervention that is largely supported by those who participated.				
2. This partnership has the ability to bring people together for meetings and activities to further develop the ideas we have created in this hui.				
3. The partnership has connections to relevant stakeholders to effectively implement the ideas we have created in this hui.				
4. I am satisfied with the intervention we have developed (or are developing) in this hui.				
Any other comments about outcomes?	·			

Section 3

These are for descriptive purposes only. Please circle:

- Yes 1. Are you a community partner?
- Are you an academic/research partner? Yes 2. No
- 3. Sex?

Male Female Other

No

- Which ethnic group do you belong to? Please tick all that apply: 4.
- New Zealand European
- Māori
- Samoan
- Cook Island Māori
- Tongan
- Niuean
- Chinese
- Indian
- Other (such as DUTCH, JAPANESE, TOKELAUAN). Please state:

Back to Index

16.1 HPW Process Evaluation Instructions Background Information

The type of partnerships we are considering for this tool are between the community and researchers who are working to improve community health, particularly for Māori. The community is whomever the intervention is targeting change. For example, it might involve patients if the target is health gain or behaviour change, clinicians if the target is health services, or the larger community if the target is enhance population health. The community is often represented by individuals and/or organisations that serve the community. The researchers are usually academics or other organisations whose primary aim is to conduct research about health interventions. The questions can be changed to reflect the specific partners in your project.

The questions centre around the core elements of the He Pikinga Waiora implementation framework: community engagement, culture-centeredness, systems thinking, and integrated knowledge transfer. This framework identifies positive practices for engaging in these type of partnerships.

Most of the items should be assessed at the early stages of the partnership and then regularly (e.g., annually) throughout the development. There are a few items that should be assessed after the partnership has developed its intervention (or at least close to developing the intervention).

This tool should be administered to all members of the research team in an anonymous manner. A simple approach is to provide it as an on-line survey which also makes it easy to compile responses. A paper-pencil version can be use although it means data entry has to be done separately.

Using the Information for Evaluation

The information gathered from this tool should be used to reflect on what is working in your partnership and what might need to be changed or improved. The first step is identify where you partnership is at (i.e., data analysis). The second step is to figure out what it means and what next steps should be (i.e., reflecting on the data).

Data Analysis

The data can be analysed in multiple ways. Qualitative data can be thematised or simply having common responses noted. Quantitative data can be considered along the following levels:

- a) Rate the performance of the partnership
- b) Identify areas for disagreement in perceptions
- c) Compare demographic groups

Rating Performance

The first step is often to rate the performance of the partnership. We want to determine whether our partnership is doing well. When rating the performance, you can consider multiple levels:

- a) Individual items
- b) Broad category level (average of each of the items for community-engagement, culturecenterendess, systems thinking, and integrated knowledge transfer)
- c) Sub-category level (for the sub-categories of community-engagement and culture-centerendess; average of items in each of the sub-categories)

The scores of each item or average will range from 1 (not at all) to 6 (complete extent). Scores that are in the 5-6 range generally indicate high performance on the item or area. Scores in the 3-4 range indicate room for improvement, while scores in the 1-2 range demonstrate problematic areas.

Looking for Disagreements

Sometimes some partners think things are going very well, while others perceive problems. Identifying points of disagreement offers an opportunity to identify why there is difference and where that difference lies. There are two straightforward ways to identify difference:

- a) Measures of variation such as standard deviation
- b) Frequency counts

Standard deviation is quickly calculated by excel or other software packages. A standard deviation of 1 or above usually indicates there is a good deal of variability in the partnership on the respective item or category.

Frequency counts means counting the number of responses each category received (e.g., how many say complete extent on a specific item). When most people select a response or nearby response (complete extent and very great extent), we conclude very little variability. When people are responding across the categories or there is a mix of high and low responses, we conclude there is a lot of variability.

Demographic Comparisons

If we identify differences, we often are interested in why those exist. We don't want to signal out individuals, but we may want to know if there are some patterns to the responses. In this case we can compare the demographic groups that we think are important. For example, do community members and researchers differ in how much influence they think they have? Or, do Māori and Pākehā have different perspectives about how much capacity is being built.

Reflecting on the Data

The data analysis simply tells us what is and where there might be some areas of concern. The next step is to take the data back to the partners and have a conversation about the meaning of the data.

This opportunity for reflection is critical to the development of the partnership. All partnerships have challenges and disagreements as well as periods of low productivity and feeling stuck. This process evaluation provides an opportunity for the partnership to identify areas that might need to be improved, changed or addressed. Without this evaluation, the partnership runs the risk of letting key problems fester and develop, which may hurt the effectiveness of implementing an intervention. This reflection doesn't have to be a major undertaking—sometimes a short meeting can be sufficient to self-evaluation, reflect and move to the work.

If problems or challenges are identified, the partnership will need to think about what to change in their own process. Here are a few guides to consider within the categories and sub-categories of the process evaluation tool.

Community engagement

Collectively, these items related to the strength of community engagement as a shared endeavour. Community engagement is highest when all partners share responsibility and control of all the phases of the project. The specific items relate to sub-categories of community engagement.

a. Readiness to Change. These items reflect the degree to which the community or community organisations are ready to change. If these items are low, especially as rated by the community, it is very important for the partnership to identify why there isn't readiness to change. Perhaps there are constraints that can be resolved. Not being ready to change will likely leads to challenges in later stages.

b. Commitment to Engagement. These items reflect the degree to which partners are committed to the principles of strong community engagement. Such commitment reflects a willingness to work as equal partners. If these items are low, it would be worth revisiting the nature of the partnership and whether this commitment can be changed. Low commitment to engagement will likely lead to an unequal relationship and resentment later in the partnership.

c. Trust. These items reflect the level of trust in the partnership. If these items are low, it is worth having a dialogue about why trust isn't present. Sometimes having a good intense discussion or conflict about trust can be enough to demonstrate commitment to work together and help to establish trust (i.e., if we can get through some tough conversations, we can work together). Low trust that isn't addressed usually ends up hurting the effectiveness of the partnership.

d. Influence. These items reflect the degree of influence that all partners have. All partners should have the ability to influence the partnership. If these items are low, consider changing the agreements or the way that meetings are run to make sure all partners have a say in the workings of the partnership. If low influence continues, partners often withdraw and limit their effort to the partnership because they don't think their work really matters.

synergy. These items reflect the level of connectedness and ability to work effectively together. An effective partnership achieves synergy. If these items are low, it is worth discussing what is inhibiting the achievement of synergy. Usually the quality of relationships and dialogue is low in these situations so it might be worth thinking about improving communication in the partnership.

f. Shared Control of Resources. These items reflect whether there is shared control of resources. Ideally, the community and the academic partners should have some control of resources. If these are low, consider developing MOUs or subcontracts that enable partners to have some control over resources.

g. Personal Capacity. These items reflect the level of capacity that individuals develop. One component of community engagement is that all partners should benefit from their work. If some individuals aren't developing skills and capacity, consider implementing some trainings or send partners to training to develop skills. If these items are low early in the partnership, it may not be a problem as these are longer-term outcomes.

h. Organisation Capacity. These items reflect the level of capacity that the organisations participating in the partnership are developing. Similar to personal capacity, the partnership should benefit the organisations represented. If these items are low, ask your partner how they can benefit more from the partnership. If these items are low early in the partnership, it may not be a problem as these are longer-term outcomes.

 Sustainability. These items reflect the degree to which the partnership is sustainable beyond the initial funding period. If these are low, consider whether you want to sustain the partnership and if so, seek ways to integrate the work into the strategic plans/mission of the organisation(s).
 Further additional funding sources can be sought to sustain the work.

Culture-centeredness

Collectively, these items relate to the degree to which the community has agency and power to create change in the community and whether that change is reflective of the cultural perspectives of the community. The specific items compose several sub-categories.

a. Agency/Community involvement. These items reflect the degree of community involvement in the phases of the research and intervention. When there is high level of community involvement, we can assume there is agency to define the problem and identify solutions that fit the culture of the community. If these items are low, identify ways that the community members can be more involved in the work of the project. Often they are only consulted about these components and they should be doing the work.

b. Reflexivity. These items relate to the level of collective reflection about the nature of the partnership and the relationships among the partners. This reflection can be about the quality of the relationships and communication and also about whether positions of privilege are addressed

meetings. Such reflection can improve the quality of the working relationships among members.

c. Power Sharing. The items reflect the level of power sharing that exists in the partnership. Community members should have power to implement all aspects of the project in conjunction with academic partners. If these items are low, consider ways that power is implicitly communicated by academic partners and ways to diminish that implicit power.

d. Partnership Capacity. These items reflect the level of skills and resources the partnership has to carry out the work of the partnership. If these items are low, consider adding additional stakeholders to the partnership either as members or as part of advisory boards.

e. Community Transformation. These items reflect the level of change that occurs as a result of the work of the partnership. The items assume that the goal of the project is to create some level of improvement in the health or conditions of the community. If these items are low early in the partnership, it really isn't a problem as these are longer-term outcomes. You might ask whether you think you are going to transform the community. If it is later in the partnership, you might consider changes to the work or intervention.

Systems Thinking

Collectively, these items reflect the level of "big picture" thinking about the context and problem being addressed. Systems thinking involves the complexity of the larger structures in society and how those affect the work of the partnership. It also involves integrated multiple perspectives and multiple level of analysis. In short, systems thinking involves addressing complex relationships and realising that health problems do not get resolved with simple fixes. If these items are low, it might be worth involving additional stakeholders who can help you think about the problem from a different perspective.

Integrated Knowledge Transfer

Collectively, these items reflect the degree to which end users of an intervention are involved in the creation of the intervention. For example, you might be developing a new "wrap around care service" for diabetes patients that nurses are to implement. High-level of integrated knowledge transfer would involve nurses early in the process to help create and trouble shoot the new intervention. When the end users are not collaborators, they tend to be resentful for lack of involvement and/or have problems implementing the new intervention because they don't understand it. A colleague of mine used to say, "when you build a better house, you might want to ask the occupants what they'd like to see in that house since they are the ones who are going to use it." If these items are low, involve the key end users in the partnership.

Back to Index

16.2 HPW Process Evaluation Framework

PROCESS EVALUATION TOOL

The following questions are useful for partnerships to self-evaluate their progress in developing interventions. All of the items are self-report and based on how you feel the partnership is doing at the current time. Please tick the box use the following scale for most of the items:

- 1) Not at all
- 2) To a small extent
- 3) To a moderate extent
- 4) To a great extent
- 5) To a very great extent
- 6) To a complete extent

Community Engagement

Item	Not at all	Small extent	Moderate extent	Great extent	Very great extent	Complete extent
Readiness to Change						
1. The community (organisation) is committed to implementing this change.						
2. The community (organisation) is determined to implement this change.						
3. The community (organisation) is motivated to implement this change.						
Commitment to Community Engagement						
4. This project builds on resources and strengths in the community.						
5. This project emphasizes what is important to the community (culture, environmental						
and social factors) that affect well-being.						
 This project views community-engagement as a long term process and a long term commitment. 						
Trust						
7. I trust the decisions others to make about issues that are important to our project.						
8. I can rely on the people that I work with on this project.						
9. People in this partnership have confidence in one another.						
Influence						
10. Suggestions I make within this partnership are seriously considered.						

He Pikinga Waiora						
partnership makes.						
12. I am able to influence the work on this project.						
13. My involvement influences the partnership to be						
more responsive to the community.						
Partnership Synergy						
14. Develop goals that are widely understood and supported in this partnership.						
15. Recognize challenges and come up with good solutions.						
16. Respond to the needs and problems of your stakeholders or community as a whole.						
Shared Control of Resources						
17. Both community and academic partners hire personnel on the project.						
18. Both community and academic partners decide how to share financial resources.						
19. Both community and academic partners decide how to share in-kind resources.						
Items for later stages in partnership	Not at all	Small extent	Moderate extent	Great extent	Very great extent	Complete extent
Personal Capacity						
1. Participating in this project enhanced my own reputation						
2. Participating in this project developed my capacity or expertise.						
3. Participating in this project increased my ability to acquire additional financial support.						
Agency Capacity						
 Participating in this project enhanced my organisation's reputation. 						
 5. Participating in this project enhanced my organisation's ability to affect public policy. 6. Participating in this project increased utilisation of my organisation's expertise or services. 						
Sustainability						
7. I am committed to sustaining the community-						
academic relationship with no or low funding						
8. This intervention is likely to continue forward after this funding is over.						
9. In trying to sustain our partnership, we carefully						
evaluate funding opportunities to make sure they meet both community and academic						

He Pikinga Waiora Culture Centeredness

Item	Not at	Small	Moderate	Great	Very	Complete
	all	extent	extent	extent	great	extent
					extent	
Community Involvement/Agency in Research				-		
1. Community partners are involved with developing community-based theories of the problem						
or intervention.						
2. Community partners are involved with background research.						
3. Community partners are involved with choosing research methods.						
4. Community partners are involved with interpreting study findings.						
5. Community partners are involved with recruiting study participants						
6. Community partners are involved with implementing the intervention.						
7. Community partners are involved with designing interview and/or survey questions.						
8. Community partners are involved with writing reports and journal articles.						
9. Community partners are involved with giving presentations at meetings and conferences						
Reflexivity						
10. Our partnership has discussions about our partnership's role in promoting strategies to						
address social and health equity						
11. Our partnership evaluates together what we've done well and how we can improve our						
collaboration.						
12. Our partnership reflects on issues of power and privilege within the partnership.						

He Pikinga Waiora Increased Power 13. As a result of this project, community members have increased participation in the research process. 14. As a result of my participation in this project. I can talk about the project in other settings such as a community or political meeting. 15. Community members can voice their opinions about research in front of researchers/clinical experts. Partnership Capacity to Create Change 16. The partnership has diverse membership to work effectively towards its aims. 17. The partnership has legitimacy and credibility to work effectively towards its aims. 18. The partnership has ability to bring people together for meetings and activities 19. The partnership has connections to relevant stakeholders to work effectively towards its aims. Items for later stages in partnership Complete Not at Small Moderate Great Verv all extent extent extent great extent extent Community Transformation 1. The project has resulted in policy or practice changes. 2. This project has improved the overall health status of individuals in the community 3. This partnership has acquired additional resources to meet its aim 4. This project has improved the overall environment in the community.

Systems Thinking

Item	Not at	Small	Moderate	Great	Very	Complete
	all	extent	extent	extent	great	extent
					extent	
1. Participation in this project has helped you to recognise that there are many different						
points of view on pre-diabetes/diabetes.						
2. Participation in this project has helped you to gain a better idea about different						
influences on.						

3. Participation in this project has helped you to think more clearly about positive and possible changes.			
 Participation in this project has helped you to express your own 'cultural' viewpoint (i.e. as Māori, Pākehā, other ethnicity). 			
5. Participation in this project has helped you to see the complexity of the issues.			
6. The intervention we are developing targets changes at multiple levels.			
7. Participation in this project has helped you to see the complexity of the issues.			

Integrated Knowledge Transfer

Item	Not at all	Small extent	Moderat e extent	Great extent	Very great extent	Complet e extent
1. To what extent has the project involved the end knowledge users in the intervention and evaluation design?.						
2. To what extent are the knowledge users committed to considering application of the findings when they become available and is this application achievable in the particular practice, program and/or policy context?						
3. To what extent will the project's findings be transferable to other practice, programs and/or policy contexts?						
4. To what extent has the barriers and facilitators been considered for adoption in other contexts?						
5. To what extent has the reasons needed for wider-scale adoption been considered?						
6. To what extent has relevant stakeholders been included in the development of the intervention?						



Thank you so much for participating in this interview. The purpose of this study is to take an in-depth look at the process we have been using in our participatory research project. We hope to better understand what is working and what may need improvement in our project.

- 1. What do you think is working well in this project?
- 2. What do you think could be improved?
- 3. How well are we following the implementation framework in our work?
- 4. How are the working relationships between the academics/researchers and the community?
- 5. How successful do you think this project will be?

Demographic Questions

1.	Are you a community partner?	Yes	No	
2.	Are you an academic/research partner?	Yes	No	
3.	Gender?	Male	Female	Other

- 4. Which ethnic group do you belong to? Please tick all that apply:
 - New Zealand European
 - □ Māori
 - □ Samoan
 - Cook Island Māori
 - □ Tongan
 - □ Niuean
 - □ Chinese
 - □ Indian
 - Other (such as DUTCH, JAPANESE, TOKELAUAN). Please state:

Back to Index

17.1 Outcome Evaluation Tool HE PIKINGA WAIORA OUTCOME AND IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION FRAMEWORK FOR PRE-DIABETES/DIABETES AND RELATED HEALTH CONDITIONS

The He Pikinga Waiora Outcome & Implementation Evaluation Framework consists of three key components: a) levels of health intervention (Maunga model from our research team), b) the model of hauora: whare tapa wha⁴ and c) the model of health promotion: Te Pae Mahutonga⁵. Figure 1 illustrates the connection of these three elements.

The Maunga model is guided by socio-ecological theory and public health philosophy that individual behaviour and public health are shaped by facets at multiple levels and often beyond the control of individuals. The model includes four levels of health intervention where the top of the model has maximal impact on few individuals and the bottom of the model has small impacts on lots of people. Health equity impacts are found more at the bottom of the model.

- a) Individual—interventions are targeted at individual behaviour change and health improvements. They might include highly individualised interventions such as bariatric surgery or slightly broader lifestyle interventions for self-managed care. These interventions have great effect for those who receive the intervention and yet smaller impacts on health equity.
- b) Clinical—interventions are targeted at improving health services and connecting people to care. These interventions might include new systems for data collection and monitoring of patient-level data, the development of new service pathways, and introduction of best practice guidelines for people newly diagnosed with diabetes or pre-diabetes.
- c) Community—interventions are targeted at the neighbourhoods, maraes, etc. These interventions target change in the quality of the community overall such as enhanced walking trails, community gardens, and improvement in the obesogenic environment such as healthy kai in stores and schools.
- d) Population—interventions are targeted at the large-scale population. These include policies that tax sugary beverages or efforts to improve socio-economic conditions.

⁴ Durie, M. (1998). *Whaiora: Māori health development*. Auckland, NZ: Oxford University Press.

⁵ Durie, M. (1999, December). Te Pae Mahutonga: a model for Mäori health promotion. *Health Promotion Forum of New Zealand Newsletter* 49, 2-5.



Health interventions impact various health and health equity outcomes. Our framework considered two models of health that explain key outcomes within each of the levels of the model. Whare tapa wha defines health (haurora) from a holistic perspective consisting of four core elements:

- a) Tinana-physical wellbeing
- b) Hinengaro-mental and emotional wellbeing
- c) Wairura-spiritual wellbeing
- d) Whānau—social wellbeing

These elements generally frame the outcomes of individual, and to some extent, clinical interventions.

Te Pae Mahutonga is a model of health promotion that fits well with the community and population interventions with some relevance to individual and clinical interventions as well. The model includes the four central stars of the Southern Cross represent four key tasks of health promotion, and two pointer starts represent leadership and governance) of health promotion:

- a) Mauriora (cultural identity)—access to language, culture and cultural institutions
- b) Waiora (physical environment)—access to a healthy physical environment
- c) Toiora (healthy lifestyles)—positive development and harm reduction that is culturally relevant
- d) Te Oranga (participation in society)—participation in the economy, education, research, and decision making
- e) Ngā Manukura (community leadership)—effective community and health leadership with good communication among stakeholders
- f) Te Mana Whakahaere (autonomy)—control and self-governance of research and health promotion activities

Within this framework, we have developed a list of measures for elements within the model. The list is meant to be comprehensive so as to provide options for researchers and practitioners so that they can determine the best fitting constructs for their intervention and their local context. It is not an exhaustive list and can be added to. It is organised around questions and measures for patients/community members, clinicians, and researchers (i.e., community and population-level assessments). There is a table for each of these targets for intervention outcomes and also implementation processes. For each table, there is a summary matrix with elements/constructs related to the model, specific scale, number of items and sources. Under that table are the specific items for review.

List of Tables:

- 1. Outcome Measures for Patients/Community Members
- 2. Outcome Measures for Clinicians
- 3. Outcome Measures for Researchers
- 4. Implementation Measures for Patients/Community Members
- 5. Implementation Measures for Clinicians
- 6. Implementation Measures for Researchers

These tables only include measures and items that have demonstrated validity; in other words, it measures accurately what it is supposed to be measuring. These measures also have reliability or similar items measure in a consistent fashion. Further, where possible, we have chosen measures

that have been shown to be valid and reliable with Māori samples (e.g., most implementation measures haven't been used with Māori). Finally, we have also included some measures that are normed which allows you to compare the scores in your study to those of another study. Most measures are not normed across populations as that requires rigorous testing across multiple studies. If you use a normed scale, you want to use it in its full form. If you are using another validated measure, ideally you want to use it in its full form although it can be altered and you can re-establish validity and reliability through your own statistical analysis. It is possible to include other measures in evaluation that may better fit your needs. When selecting measures, consider whether there is evidence of validity, reliability and normed scoring provided. Validity includes factorial, construct, concurrent and divergent validity. Reliability is usually assessed by test-retest or Cronbach's alpha.

To apply the evaluation measures, there are several key statistical comparisons to be made to help determine impact of the intervention. The first is to administer the measure before an intervention and then again after the intervention. The difference between pre- and post-test scores should be in the expected direction (e.g., increased exercise or decreased blood pressure). The second is to compare a group who received the intervention and a group that didn't receive the intervention. The group that received the intervention should have score that are higher (or lower) than the group that didn't receive the intervention.

9

 Table 1. Outcomes Measures for Patients/Community Members

Construct	Scales	Validated with Māori	Normed	Number of Items	Source
Tinana	Medical outcomes	Υ	Y	Varies	Varies
Tinana, Hinengaro	Health service utilisation	Y	Y	8	NZ Health Survey; <u>http://www.health.govt.nz/publication/content-guide-</u> 2015-16-new-zealand-health-survey
Tinana, hinengaro	Quality of Life: Medical Outcome Study	Y	Y	5	 Wu, A. W. (1999). MOS-HIV health survey user's manual. Self-published. Available: http://chipts.cch.ucla.edu/assessment/pdf/assessments/MOS- HIV%20Users%20Manual%20%20Draft.pdf
Wairua	Spirituality	Y	N	3	Te Kupenga, Māori Social Survey: <u>http://www.stats.govt.nz/survey-</u> <u>participants/a-z-of-our-surveys/te-kupenga-2013-questionnaire.aspx</u> (alternative also provided)
Whānau	Social support	Y	N	4	Unger JB, McAvay G, Bruce ML, et al. Variation in the impact of social network characteristics on physical functioning in elderly persons: MacArthur Studies of Successful Aging. Journals of Gerontology Series B- Psychological Sciences & Social Sciences 1999;54(5):S245-51 (alternative also provided)
Mauriora	Cultural connection	Y	N	12	Dyall, L., Kēpa, M., Teh, R., Mules, R., Moyes, S., Wham, C., et al. (2014). Cultural and social factors and quality of life of Māori in advanced age. Te puawaitanga o nga tapuwae kia ora tonu—Life and living in advanced age: a cohort study in New Zealand (LiLACS NZ). <i>NZ Medical Journal, 127,</i> 62-79
Toiora	Healthy lifestyle— exercise, nutrition	Y	N	7, 12	1. Exercise: NZ Health Survey; <u>http://www.health.govt.nz/publication/content-guide-2015-16-</u> <u>new-zealand-health-survey</u>

Pikinga Waiora					
					 Nutrition: NZ Adult Nutrition Survey 2008/09 <u>https://www.health.govt.nz/system/files/documents/publications_questionnaire.pdf</u>
Waiora	Access to community/personal garden	N	N	3	Created for this study
Te oranga	Social determinants: Deprivation, economic wellbeing, food security	Y, Y, Y	Y, N, N	8, 3, 8	 NZiDEP: Salmond, C., Crampton, P., King, P., Waldegrave, C. (200 update 2014). NZiDep: An index of socioeconomic deprivation for individuals Economic wellbeing: Te Kupenga, Māori Social Survey: <u>http://www.stats.govt.nz/survey-participants/a-z-of-our- surveys/te-kupenga-2013-questionnaire.aspx</u> Food Security: <u>https://www.health.govt.nz/system/files/documents/publicatic ans_questionnaire.pdf</u>
Te oranga	Trust in others and institutions	Y	N	7	Te Kupenga, Māori Social Survey: <u>http://www.stats.govt.nz/survey-</u> participants/a-z-of-our-surveys/te-kupenga-2013-questionnaire.aspx
Demographics	Age, gender, ethnicity, address, income	Y	N	5	Created for this study

MEDICAL OUTCOMES

Choose from list below that fit study

BMI, HbA1C, Blood pressure, waist circumference, cardio-vascular risk assessment, medications (prescribed vs. take), Rongoa, smoking, prescription of nicotine replacement therapy

HEALTH SERVICE UTILISATION

Reformatted from NZ Health Survey; <u>http://www.health.govt.nz/publication/content-guide-2015-</u> <u>16-new-zealand-health-survey</u>

Do you have a GP clinic or medical centre that you usually go to when you are	Yes	No
feeling unwell, unless or are injured?		
In the past 12 months, have you seen a GP, or been visited by a GP, about	Yes	No
your own health (physical or mental)?		
In the past 12 months, was there a time when you had a medical problem but	Yes	No
did not visit a GP because of cost?		
In the past 12 months, was there a time when you had a medical problem but	Yes	No
did not visit a GP because you had no transport to get there?		
In the past 12 months, was there a time when you got a prescription for	Yes	No
yourself but did not collect one or more prescription items from the pharmacy		
or chemist because of cost?		
In the last 12 months, have you yourself used a service at, or been admitted	Yes	No
to, a <u>public</u> hospital as a patient? This could have been for a physical or a		
mental health condition.		
In the past 12 months, how many times did you go to an after hours or A & E		
medical centre about your own health?		
In the past 12 months, how many times did you go to an emergency		
department at a public hospital about your own health?		

QUALITY OF LIFE: Medical Outcomes Study general health perceptions

In general, how would you rate	Excellent	Very	Good	Fair	Poor
your health?		Good			
I am somewhat ill.	Definitely	Mostly	Not sure	Mostly	Definitely
	true	true		false	false
I am as health as anybody I know.	Definitely	Mostly	Not sure	Mostly	Definitely
	true	true		false	false
My health is excellent.	Definitely	Mostly	Not sure	Mostly	Definitely
	true	true		false	false
I have been feeling bad lately	Definitely	Mostly	Not sure	Mostly	Definitely
	true	true		false	false

Please note that an alternative version are the SF-12 and SF-36. SF-12 and SF-36 are available and either require a license from Optum (http://campaign.optum.com/optum-outcomes/what-we-do/health-surveys.html) or can be used for free from RAND

(https://www.rand.org/health/surveys_tools/mos.html) depending on the version used. Also, the MOS is available in a longer form with more dimensions (see reference above or the RAND website for more details).

SPIRITUALITY

1. How important is spirituality in your life? Very important, quite important, somewhat important, a little important, not at all important

2. How important is religion in your life? Very important, quite important, somewhat important, a little important, not at all important

3. How often do you attend religious worship services? At least once a week, at least once a fortnight, at least once a month, several times a year, at least once a year, less than once a year, never

An alternative measures, but not validated with Māori is Daaleman, T. P. & Frey, B. B. (2004). The Spirituality Index of Well-Being: A new instrument for health-related quality of life research. Annals of Family Medicine, 2, 499-503. 2 subscales—only life scheme is included (strongly agree to strongly disagree 1-5)

- 1. I haven't found my life's purpose yet.
- 2. I don't' know who I am, where I came from, or where I am going.
- 3. I have a lack of purpose in my life.
- 4. In this world, I don't know where I fit in.
- 5. I am far from understanding the meaning of life.
- 6. There is a great void in my life at this time.

SOCIAL SUPPORT

Unger JB, McAvay G, Bruce ML, et al. Variation in the impact of social network characteristics on physical functioning in elderly persons: MacArthur Studies of Successful Aging. Journals of Gerontology Series B-Psychological Sciences & Social Sciences 1999;54(5):S245-51l Original is yes/no scale

1. When you need extra help, can you count on anyone to help with daily tasks like grocery shopping, cooking, house cleaning, telephoning, giving you a ride? (always, most of the time, sometimes, never, I don't need help)

2. Could you have used more help with daily tasks than you received? (always, most of the time, sometimes, never)

3. Can you count on anyone to provide you with emotional support? (always, most of the time, sometimes, never, I don't need emotional support)

4. Could you have used more emotional support than you received? (always, most of the time, sometimes, never)

Another option for social support:

2 subscales on social support and social undermining

Oetzel, J. G., Wilcox, B., Archiopoli, A., Avila, M., Hell, C., Hill, R., & Muhammad, M. (2014). Social support and social undermining as correlates of health-related quality of life in people living with HIV/AIDS. *Journal of Health Communication, 19,* 660-675.

8. The following statements are about your relationships with your family and friends. Please circle the number under the answer that best matches your feeling about each statement.	Strongly <u>Dis</u> agree	<u>Dis</u> agree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. I can talk to my friends or relatives about my worries.	1	2	3	4	5

99					
b. Most people who are important to me know that I'm diabetic/pre-diabetic.	1	2	3	4	5
c. My friends or relatives often let me down when I'm counting on them.	1	2	3	4	5
d. My friends or relatives understand the way I feel about things.	1	2	3	4	5
e. There is someone I know who would lend me a car or drive me.	1	2	3	4	5
f. My friends or relatives often get on my nerves.	1	2	3	4	5
g. I can relax and be myself around my friends or relatives.	1	2	3	4	5
h. My friends or relatives argue with me often.	1	2	3	4	5
i. My friends or relatives drink or use drugs too much.	1	2	3	4	5
j. My friends or relatives really appreciate me.	1	2	3	4	5
k. My friends or relatives make too many demands on me.	1	2	3	4	5
I. There's someone I know who would lend me money if I needed it in an emergency.	1	2	3	4	5
m. I feel isolated from others.	1	2	3	4	5
 n. There's someone I know who will attend social activities with me. 	1	2	3	4	5
o. My friends or relatives criticize me often.	1	2	3	4	5
p. I often avoid family gatherings.	1	2	3	4	5
q. My friends or relatives really care about me.	1	2	3	4	5
r. When I do go to family gatherings, I'm likely to leave early.	1	2	3	4	5
s. There's someone I know whom I could count on to check in on me regularly.	1	2	3	4	5
 t. I can rely on my friends or relatives for help if I have a serious problem. 	1	2	3	4	5

CULTURAL CONNECTION

Dyall L, Kerse N, Hayman K, Keeling S. Pinnacle of Life- Māori living to Advanced Age. New Zealand Medical Journal 2011;124(1331):75-86; Dyall, L., Kēpa, M., Teh, R., Mules, R., Moyes, S., Wham, C., et al. (2014). Cultural and social factors and quality of life of Māori in advanced age. Te puawaitanga o nga tapuwae kia ora tonu—Life and living in advanced age: a cohort study in New Zealand (LiLACS NZ). *NZ Medical Journal, 127,* 62-79).

- 1. Do you live in the same area as your hapu /extended family / where you come from? (yes, no)
- 2. How important is your hapu to your wellbeing? (not at all, a little, moderately, very, extremely)
- 3. How important is your iwi to your wellbeing? (not at all, a little, moderately, very, extremely)
- 4. How well do you understand your tikanga? (not at all, a little, moderately, completely)
- 5. How much has colonisation affected the way you live your life today? (not at all, a little, moderately, very, extremely)

6. Do you have a specific role in a) your family/whanau/hapu, b) your local community/neighbourhood, c) your tribal/marae activities and d) other Maori organisations in wider society? (yes, no)

- 7. How satisfied are you with the role(s)? (not at all, a little, moderately, very, extremely)
- 8. How important is your family/whanau to wellbeing? (not at all, a little, moderately, very, extremely)

Cultural questions drawn from the te hoa nuku roa scale (Stevenson B, To He Nuku Roa. Te Hoe Nuku Roa: a measure of Maori cultural identity. Palmerston North: Te Pitahi a Toi, School of Maori studies, Massey University, 1996.)

- 1. How often over the last 12 months have you been to a Marae? (< yearly, once, a few times, more than once a month)
- 2. In general, would you say that your contacts are with: mainly Māori, some Maori few Māori, no Māori?
- 3. Could you have a conversation about a lot of everyday things in Māori? (yes, no)
- 4. Where do you speak Māori/other language? response menus including; On the marae, in my community, at home, in meetings or at work, other.

HEALTHY LIFESTYLE

Exercise (NZ Health Survey; <u>http://www.health.govt.nz/publication/content-guide-2015-16-new-</u> zealand-health-survey)

During the last 7 days, on how many days did you <u>walk at a brisk pace</u> – a brisk pace is a pace at which you are breathing harder than normal? This includes walking at work, walking to travel from place to place, and any other walking that you did solely for recreation, sport, exercise or leisure.

Think <u>only</u> about walking done for at least 10 minutes at a time.

____ days per week (range 0-7) [if A3.06=0 go to moderate activity A3.08]

- .K Don't know [go to A3.08]
- .R Refused [go to A3.08]

A3.07 How much time did you typically spend walking at a brisk pace on each of those days?

_____ hours (range 0-24) _____ minutes (0-60)

- .K Don't know
- .R Refused
- A3.08 During the last 7 days, on how many days did you do <u>moderate</u> physical activities? 'Moderate' activities make you breathe harder than normal, but only a little – like carrying light loads, bicycling at a regular pace, or other activities like those on Showcard page XX. Do not include walking of any kind. Think only about those physical activities done for at least 10 minutes at a time.

_____ days per week (range 0-7) [if A3.08=0 go to vigorous activity A3.10]

- .K Don't know [go to A3.10]
- .R Refused [go to A3.10]
A3.09 How much time did you typically spend on <u>each</u> of those days doing moderate physical activities?

____ hours (range 0-24) _____ minutes (0-60)

- .K Don't know
- .R Refused

He Pikinga Waiora

A3.10 During the last 7 days, on how many days did you do <u>vigorous</u> physical activities? 'Vigorous' activities make you breathe a lot harder than normal ('huff and puff') – like heavy lifting, digging, aerobics, fast bicycling, or other activities like those shown on Showcard page XX. Think only about those physical activities done for at least 10 minutes at a time.

_____ days per week (range 0-7) [if A3.10=0 go to all activities A3.12]

.K Don't know [go to A3.12]

.R Refused [go to A3.12]

A3.11 How much time did you typically spend on <u>each</u> of those days doing vigorous physical activities?

_____ hours (range 0-24) _____ minutes (0-60)

.K Don't know

- .R Refused
- A3.12 Thinking about all your activities over the last 7 days (including brisk walking), on how many days did you engage in:
 - at least 30 minutes of moderate activity (including brisk walking) that made you breathe a little harder than normal, OR
 - at least 15 minutes of vigorous activity that made you breathe a lot harder than normal ('huff and puff')?

____ days per week (range 0-7)

- .K Don't know
- .R Refused

Nutrition

Dietary questions (C1) :

https://www.health.govt.nz/system/files/documents/publications/ans_questionnaire.pdf;

Note: The survey is very long and only select items are included. You can focus on certain items to include in the survey

c.07 How often do you remove excess fat from meat (before eating it)?

- a. never b. rarely c. sometimes
- d. regularly
- e. always
- f. don't know

c.08 How often do you remove the skin from chicken (before eating it)?

a. never

He Pikinga Waiora

- b. rarely
- c. sometimes
- d. regularly
- e. always
- f. don't know

c.09 How often do you eat processed meat products? Processed meat includes ham, bacon, sausages, luncheon, canned corned beef, pastrami, and salami?

- a. Never
- b. Less than once per week
- c. 1-2 times per week
- d. 3-4 times per week
- e. 5-6 times per week
- f. 7 or more times per week
- g. Don't know

c.10 How often do you eat fresh or frozen fish or shellfish? Do not include battered/friend or canned fish or shellfish?

- a. Never
- b. Less than once per week
- c. 1-2 times per week
- d. 3-4 times per week
- e. 5-6 times per week
- f. 7 or more times per week
- g. Don't know

c.11. How often do you eat battered or fried foods (e.g., fish and chips)?

- a. Never
- b. Less than once per week
- c. 1-2 times per week
- d. 3-4 times per week
- e. 5-6 times per week
- f. 7 or more times per week
- g. Don't know
- c.13 On <u>average</u>, how many <u>servings</u> of fruit do you eat per day? Please include all fresh, frozen, canned and stewed fruit. Do <u>not</u> include fruit juice or dried fruit. A <u>'serving'</u> = 1 medium piece <u>or</u> 2 small pieces of fruit <u>or</u> ½ cup of stewed fruit. For example, 1 apple + 2 small apricots = 2 servings.
 - 1 I don't eat fruit
 - 2 Less than 1 per day
 - 3 1 serving per day
 - 4 2 servings per day
 - 5 3 servings per day
 - 6 4 or more servings per day
 - .K Don't know
- c.14 On <u>average</u>, how many <u>servings</u> of vegetables do you eat per day? Please include all fresh,

frozen and canned vegetables. Do <u>not</u> include vegetable juices. A <u>'serving'</u> = 1 medium potato/kumara <u>or</u> ½ cup cooked vegetables <u>or</u> 1 cup of salad vegetables. For example, 2 medium potatoes + ½ cup of peas = 3 servings.

- 1 I don't eat vegetables
- 2 Less than 1 per day
- 3 1 serving per day
- 4 2 servings per day
- 5 3 servings per day
- 6 4 or more servings per day
- .K Don't know

c.22 How often do you eat fast food or takeaways from places like McDonalds,etc. Think about breakfast, lunch, dinner and snacks. Do you include times when you have only purchased a drink/beverage.

- a. Never
- b. Less than once per week
- c. 1-2 times per week
- d. 3-4 times per week
- e. 5-6 times per week
- f. 7 or more times per week
- g. Don't know

c.23 How often do you drink fruit juices and drinks. Do not include diet or diabetic varieties.

- a. Never
- b. Less than once per week
- c. 1-2 times per week
- d. 3-4 times per week
- e. 5-6 times per week
- f. 7 or more times per week
- g. Don't know

c.24 How often do you drink soft drinks or energy drinks? Do not include diet varieties.

- a. Never
- b. Less than once per week
- c. 1-2 times per week
- d. 3-4 times per week
- e. 5-6 times per week
- f. 7 or more times per week
- g. Don't know

c.25. How often do you eat lollies, sweets, chocolate, and confectionary?

- a. Never
- b. Less than once per week
- c. 1-2 times per week
- d. 3-4 times per week
- e. 5-6 times per week
- f. 7 or more times per week
- g. Don't know

(item created by the research team)

How often do you check the food labels for nutritional information?



- b. Less than once per week
- c. 1-2 times per week
- d. 3-4 times per week
- e. 5-6 times per week
- f. 7 or more times per week
- g. Don't know

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

- 1. Do you have access to fresh fruits and vegetables? If yes, where?
 - a. Community garden
 - b. Your own garden
 - c. Collected in the forest or other public spaces
 - d. Grocery store
 - e. Other
- 2. What percentage of fruit and vegetables do you grow or collect on your own?
- 3. Rate the quality of the neighbourhood you live in: Poor Fair Good Very good Excellent

SOCIAL DETERMINANTS

Address and then identify deprivation index per NZDep or IMD

NZiDep Salmond, C., Crampton, P., King, P., Waldegrave, C. (2007, update 2014). NZiDep: An index of socioeconomic deprivation for individuals.

The following few questions are designed to identify people who have had special financial needs in the last 12 months. Although these questions may not apply directly to you, for completeness we need to ask them of everyone. (Yes/No)

- 1. In the last 12 months have you personally been forced to buy cheaper food so that you could pay for other things you needed.
- 2. (If you are not 65 or older, full-time caregivers or full-time homemakers) In the last 12 months have you been out of paid work at any time for more than one month?
- 3. In the 12 months ending today did you yourself receive payments from any of these three benefits: Jobseeker support, sole parent support, or supported living payment?
- 4. In the last 12 months have you personally put up with feeling cold to save heating costs.
- 5. In the last 12 months have you personally made use of special food grants or food banks because you did not have enough money for food?
- 6. In the last 12 months have you personally continued wearing shoes with holes because you could not afford replacements?
- 7. In the last 12 months have you personally gone without fresh fruit and vegetables often so that you could pay for other things you needed?
- 8. In the last 12 months have you personally received help in the form of clothes or money from a community organisation (like the Salvation Army)?

From Te Kupenga <u>http://www.stats.govt.nz/survey-participants/a-z-of-our-surveys/te-kupenga-2013-questionnaire.aspx</u>

1. I would like you to think about how well your total household income meets your everyday needs for such things as housing, food, clothing, medicine, and other

necessities. Would you say you have not enough money, only just enough money, enough, more than enough money?

- 2. In the last 12 months, have you not paid electric, water bill on time because of a shortage of money? (not at all, once, more than once)
- 3. Imagine that you come across an item in a shop you'd really like to have. It costs \$300. It is not an essential item for housing, food, clothing or other necessities. It's an extra. If this happened in the next month, how limited would you be in buying this item? (not at all limited, a little limited, quite limited, very limited, couldn't buy it)Income and do they get all benefits entitled to; measure??

Food Security (C3):

https://www.health.govt.nz/system/files/documents/publications/ans_questionnaire.pdf

I now want to ask you some questions about particular foods you choose, and the buying of food or gifting of food. We are interested in whether you feel you always have sufficient resources to have the food you need for yourself and the people you live with. We are not concerned with your budget, or how you spend money, but we are more interested in finding out about how people get the food that they need for their household to eat and share.

CFS1.01 First of all, we know that some people can't afford to eat properly and we are interested in whether you think your household has enough money to eat properly. It's what you think eating properly is – not what I think or anyone else thinks.

We can afford to eat properly.

- 1 Always
- 2 Sometimes
- 3 Never
- .K Don't know
- .R Refused

CFS1.02 We are interested in whether you run out of basics, like bread, potatoes, etc because you do not have enough money. We are NOT referring to treats or special foods.

Food runs out in our household due to lack of money. How often has this been true for your household over the past year?

- 1 Often
- 2 Sometimes
- 3 Never
- .K Don't know
- .R Refused

CFS1.03 Now we are interested in whether a lack of money leads you to sometimes have smaller meals than you would like or whether a lack of money means there isn't enough food for seconds or you sometimes skip meals?

We eat less because of lack of money. How often has this been true for your household over the past year?

- 1 Often
- 2 Sometimes
- 3 Never
- .K Don't know
- .R Refused

CFS1.04 Now we are going to talk about the variety of foods you eat. By variety, we mean the number of different kinds of food you have.

The variety of foods we are able to eat is limited by a lack of money. How often has this been true for your household over the past year?

- 1 Often
- 2 Sometimes
- 3 Never
- .K Don't know
- .R Refused

CFS1.05 Some people rely on support and assistance from others for supplying their regular food and we are interested in finding out how many people fall into this group.

We rely on others to provide food and/or money for food, for our household, when we don't have enough money. How often has this been true for your household over the past year?

- 1 Often
- 2 Sometimes
- 3 Never
- .K Don't know

CFS1.06 Also, some people have to rely on other sources of help such as food grants or food banks.

We make use of special food grants or food banks when we do not have enough money for food. How often has this been true for your household over the past year?

- 1 Often
- 2 Sometimes
- 3 Never
- .K Don't know
- .R Refused

CFS1.07 We know that some people get quite stressed and worried about providing enough food even though they don't actually go without food.

I feel stressed because of not having enough money for food. How often has this been true for your household over the past year?

- 1 Often
- 2 Sometimes
- 3 Never
- .K Don't know
- .R Refused

CFS1.08 We recognise that for some people food and sharing with others is important, to the point that they don't have enough food for themselves. In this question we are only interested in social situations that are gatherings within, or outside, the household. As a result people may find themselves stressed/whakamā (embarrassed) about their koha (gift) when providing food for others.

I feel stressed because I can't provide the food I want for social occasions. How often has this been true for your household over the past year?

- 1 Often
- 2 Sometimes
- 3 Never
- .K Don't know
- .R Refused

TRUST IN OTHERS AND INSTITUTIONS

Where zero is people can never be trusted and ten is people can always be trusted, how much of the time do you think most people in New Zealand can be trusted?

Where zero is the public institution can never be trusted, and ten is the public institution can always be trusted, how much do you trust______ to treat people fairly?

- a. Health system
- b. Education system
- c. System of government
- d. Police
- e. Courts
- f. Media

DEMOGRAPHICS

Age, gender, ethnicity, address, income

Table 2: Outcome Measures for Clinicians

Construct	Scales	Validated with Māori	Normed	Number of Items	Source
Te oranga, Waiora	Health system	Y	N	5	
Ngā manukura	Community Leadership	N	N	10	Oetzel, J. G., Zhou, C., Duran, B., Pearson, C., Magarati, M., Lucero, J., Wallerstein, N., & Villegas, M. (2015). Establishing the psychometric properties of constructs in a community- based participatory research conceptual model. <i>American</i> <i>Journal of Health Promotion</i> , 29, e188-e202.

HEALTH SYSTEM DATA

Data collected from the clinic: Number of enrolments, number of pre-diabetes/diabetes patients, % of patients screened with referrals to programme/pharmacology, % of patients completing the programme/pharmacology, patient monitoring of HbA1C/renal disease, patient admissions for diabetes conditions, whether patient progress is monitored for different ethnic groups (i.e., gaps in best practice treatment along)

COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP

How much did your project have leadership in the following areas: 1 (strongly disagree)-5(strongly agree)

- 1. Taking responsibility for moving the project forward
- 2. Encouraging active participation of academic and community partners in the decisionmaking
- 3. Communicating the goals of the project
- 4. Working to develop a common language
- 5. Fostering respect between partners
- 6. Creating an environment where differences of opinion can be voiced
- 7. Resolving conflict among partners
- 8. Helping the partners be creative and look at things differently
- 9. Recruiting diverse people and organizations into the project
- 10. Providing orientation to new partners as they join the project

Table 3. Outcome Measures for Researchers

Construct	Scales	Validated with Māori	Normed	Number of Items	Source
Te oranga, Waiora	Health equity assessment tool (HEAT)	Y	N	10	Signal, L., Martin, J., Cram, F., and Robson, B. <i>The Health Equity Assessment Tool: A user's guide.</i>
Waiora	Community health environmental scan survey (CHESS)	N	N	51	Wong, F., Stevens, D., O'Connor-Duffany, Siegal, K., & Gao, Y. (2011). Community health environment scan survey (CHESS): A novel tool that captures the impact of the built environment on lifestyle factors. Global Health Action, 4: 5276.
Ngā manukura	Distal community outcomes	N	N	5	Oetzel, J. G., Zhou, C., Duran, B., Pearson, C., Magarati, M., Lucero, J., Wallerstein, N., & Villegas, M. (2015). Establishing the psychometric properties of constructs in a community-based participatory research conceptual model. <i>American</i> <i>Journal of Health Promotion</i> , <i>29</i> , e188-e202.

HEALTH EQUITY ASSESSMENT TOOL

- 1. What inequalities exist in relation to the health issues under consideration?
- 2. Who is most advantaged and how?
- 3. How did the inequalities occur? What are the mechanisms by which the inequalities were created, maintained or increased?
- 4. Where/how will you intervene to tackle this issue?
- 5. How will you improve Māori health outcome and reduce health inequalities experienced by Maori?
- 6. How could this intervention affect health inequalities?
- 7. Who will benefit most?
- 8. What might the unintended consequences be?
- 9. What will you do to make sure the intervention does reduce inequalities?
- 10. How will you know if inequalities have been reduced?

CHESS: COMMUNITY HEALTH ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN SURVEY

For full scale see: Wong, F., Stevens, D., O'Connor-Duffany, Siegal, K., & Gao, Y. (2011). Community health environment scan survey (CHESS): A novel tool that captures the impact of the built environment on lifestyle factors. Global Health Action, 4: 5276.

Summary of key areas of assessment and questions:

- 1. Store assessment: What kind of store is this? What does this store mostly sell? Does this store sell fresh fruit and/or vegetables? Does this store sell tobacco products? Is there a "no sale to minor" sign? Are there healthy food options at the register?
- 2. Restaurant scan: The food service is....; Are there any smoke-free or no-smoking signs visible? Are there any people smoking inside? Is there nutritional information posted on the menu/menu board?
- 3. Street vendors: Number of other street vendors in view; What foods are available at this stall?
- 4. Recreational facilities: Type of facility; hours of operation, Is the facility in use? Is the facility less than .5km from public transportation? Is there a food vendor on premises? What foods are available at this vendor? Does it have indoor facilities? Is this open to the public year round? Is this facility free to the public? What type of facilities are available? Is the facility designated as smoke-free? Is part of the facility smoke free with restricted smoking areas indoors? Are there any smoke-free or no-smoking signs visible? Are there any people smoking inside? If there are people smoking, are they in the restricted area?
- 5. Parks/gardens: Type of facility; Hours/days of operation; Is the park/garden in use? Is the facility less than .5km from public transportation? Does the park have exercise equipment for public to use that is free? Does the park have space or grassy area large enough for physical activity? Is there a food vendor on premises? What foods are available at this vendor?
- 6. Vending machines: Where is the vending machine located? Which options are available in this vending machine? Are healthy options identified as healthy?
- 7. Information environment: What do you see? For which risk factors? Is the message positive or negative? What kind of message/advertisement/point of decision prompt/regulation? Is a brand mentioned?
- 8. Streets: Cycle path/trail, bike lanes, Side walk, Safety, Lack of pollution, Trees along sidewalk, Neighbourhood is generally free from litter

DISTAL COMMUNITY OUTCOMES

Community Transformation

How much did your project: 1 (strongly disagree)-5(strongly agree)

- 1. Result in policy or practice changes
- 2. Improve the overall health status of individuals in the community
- 3. Result in acquisition of additional financial support
- 4. Improve the overall environment in the community

Community health improvement

1. Overall, how much did or will your research project (insert name) improve the health of the community? 1 (not at all)- 5 (a lot)

Construct	Scales	Validated with Māori	Normed	Number of Items	Source
Toiora	Perception of innovation adoption	N	N	13	Created for this study although influenced from Pankratz, MD, Hallfors, D, & Cho H. (2002). Measuring the

Table 4. Implementation Measures for Patients/Community Members

						perceptions of innovation
D						adoption: The diffusion of a
						federal drug prevention
						policy. Health Education
						Research, 17, 3, 315-326.
						Alternative option is a 30-item
						scale: Atkinson, NL. (2007).
						Developing a questionnaire to
						measure perceived attributes
						of eHealth innovations.
						American Journal of Health
						Behavior, 31, 612-621.
	Te mana	Readiness to	N	Ν	14	Shea, C. M., Jacobs, S. R.,
	whakahaere	change:				Esserman, D. A., Bruce, K., &
		Change				Weiner, B. J. (2014).
		commitment,				Organizational readiness for
		change				implementing change: a
		efficacy and				psychometric assessment of a
		change				new measure. Implement Sci,
		valence				9(7), 1-15.

PERCEPTION OF INNOVATION ADOPTION

He Pikinga Waiora

- *Relative advantage*—the degree to which an innovation is perceived as better than the idea it supersedes. The higher the perceived relative advantage, the more likely the innovation will be adopted.
 - 1. The whānau-based lifestyle intervention programme is better than a diet.
 - 2. The whānau-based lifestyle intervention programme is more effective for making healthy lifestyle choices than other programmes I've used in the past. (or if you haven't done anything else, better than nothing)
 - 3. The whānau-based lifestyle intervention programme has benefits compared to what we have been currently been doing.
- Compatibility—the degree to which an innovation is perceived as consistent with the existing values, past experiences and needs of potential adopters. If the innovation is perceived as an extreme change, then it will not be compatible with past experiences and is less likely to be adopted.
 - 1. The whānau-based lifestyle intervention programme is consistent with my personal beliefs and values.
 - 2. The whānau-based lifestyle intervention programme is useful.
 - 3. The whānau-based lifestyle intervention programme is credible.
- *Complexity*—the degree to which an innovation is perceived as relatively difficult to understand and use. Innovations that are perceived as complex are less likely to be adopted.
 - 1. The whānau-based lifestyle intervention programme is easy to use.
 - 2. The whānau-based lifestyle intervention programme is clear.
 - 3. The whānau-based lifestyle intervention programme content is relevant.
- *Observability*—the degree to which the results of an innovation are visible to others. If the observed effects are perceived to be small or non-existent, then the likelihood of adoption is reduced.
 - 1. The whānau-based lifestyle intervention programme has benefits that are obvious.
 - 2. The evidence of the whānau-based lifestyle intervention programme is readily available.

Trialability—the degree to which an innovation may be experimented with on a limited basis. This may include trying out parts of a program or having the opportunity to watch others using a new program. Trialability is positively related to the likelihood of adoption.

- 1. The whānau-based lifestyle intervention programme can be tried out without requiring extensive involvement.
- 2. The whānau-based lifestyle intervention programme can be adapted or modified to suit my needs.

READINESS TO CHANGE

(Strongly agree to strongly disagree)

Change Commitment

- 1. We are committed to implementing this change.
- 2. We are determined to implement this change.
- 3. We are motivated to implement this change.
- 4. We will do whatever it takes to implement this change.
- 5. We want to implement this change.

Change Efficacy

- 1. We can manage the politics of implementing this change.
- 2. We can support people as they adjust to this change.
- 3. We can coordinate tasks so that implementation goes smoothly.
- 4. We can handle the challenges that might arise in implementing this change.
- 5. We can keep track of progress in implementing this change.

Change Valence

- 1. We feel this change is compatible with our values.
- 2. We believe this change will benefit our community.
- 3. We believe this change will make things better.
- 4. We feel that implementing this change is a good idea.

Table 5: Implementation Measures for Clinicians

Construct	Scales	Validated	Normed	Number	Source
		with		of Items	
		Māori			
Toiora; Te mana whakahaere	Causal Factors of Implementation	N	N	27	Peters, M. A. J., Harmsen, M., Laurant, M. G. H., & Wensing, M. <i>Ruimte voor</i> <i>verandering? Knelpunten en</i> <i>mogelijkheden voor</i> <i>verandering in de</i> <i>patiëntenzorg</i> [Room for improvement? Barriers to and facilitators for improvement of patient care]. Nijmegen: Centre for Quality of Care Research (WOK), Radboud University Nijmegen Medical Centre, 2002.
Te mana whakahaere	Readiness to change: Change commitment, change efficacy and change valence	N	N	14	Shea, C. M., Jacobs, S. R., Esserman, D. A., Bruce, K., & Weiner, B. J. (2014). Organizational readiness for implementing change: a psychometric assessment of a new measure. Implement Sci, 9(7), 1-15.
Ngā manukura	Organisational Support	N	N	14	Duckers, MLA, Wagner, C., & Groenewegen, PP (2008). Developing and testing an instrument to measure the presence of conditions for successful implementation of quality improvement collaboratives. BMC Health Services Research, 8, 172.
Toiora	Perception of innovation adoption	N	N	13	Created for this study although influenced from Pankratz, MD, Hallfors, D, & Cho H. (2002). Measuring the perceptions of innovation adoption: The diffusion of a federal drug prevention policy. Health Education Research, 17, 3, 315-326. Alternative option is a 30- item scale: Atkinson, NL. (2007). Developing a questionnaire to measure perceived attributes of



CAUSAL FACTOR OF IMPLEMENTATION

(Strongly agree to strongly disagree)

Innovation

- 1. This innovation leaves enough room for me to make my own conclusions
- 2. This innovation leaves enough room to weigh the wishes of the patient
- 3. This innovation is a good starting point for my self-study
- 4. Working to the innovation is too time consuming
- 5. The innovation does not fit into my ways of working at my practice.
- 6. The lay-out of this innovation makes it handy to use.

Provider

- 7. I did not thoroughly read nor remember the innovation.
- 8. I wish to know more about the innovation before I decide to apply it.
- 9. I have problems changing my old routines.
- 10. I think parts of the innovation are incorrect.
- 11. I have a general resistance to working according to protocols.
- 12. Fellow doctors do not cooperate in applying the innovation.
- 13. Other doctors or assistants do not cooperate in applying the innovation.
- 14. Managers/directors do not cooperate in applying the innovation.
- 15. It is difficult to give preventive care because I am not trained in giving preventive care.
- 16. It is difficult to give preventive care because I have not been involved in setting up the preventive care.

Patient

- 17. Patients do not cooperate in applying the innovation.
- 18. It is difficult to give preventive care to patients with a different cultural background.
- 19. It is difficult to give preventive care to patients who seem healthy.
- 20. It is difficult to give preventive care to patients with low socio-economic status.
- 21. It is difficult to give preventive care to older patients (60+)
- 22. It is difficult to give preventive care to patients who rarely visit the practice.

Organizational/Structural

- 23. Working according to this innovation requires financial compensation.
- 24. It is difficult to give preventive care if there is not enough supportive staff.
- 25. It is difficult to give preventive care if the instruments needed are not available.
- 26. It is difficult to give preventive care because the timing of the preventive care is awkward.
- 27. It is difficult to give preventive care if the physical space is lacking.

READINESS TO CHANGE

(Strongly agree to strongly disagree) Change Commitment

- 1. We are committed to implementing this change.
- 2. We are determined to implement this change.
- 3. We are motivated to implement this change.
- 4. We will do whatever it takes to implement this change.
- 5. We want to implement this change.

Change Efficacy



- 1. We can manage the politics of implementing this change.
- 2. We can support people as they adjust to this change.
- 3. We can coordinate tasks so that implementation goes smoothly.
- 4. We can handle the challenges that might arise in implementing this change.
- 5. We can keep track of progress in implementing this change.

Change Valence

- 1. We feel this change is compatible with our values.
- 2. We believe this change will benefit our community.
- 3. We believe this change will make things better.
- 4. We feel that implementing this change is a good idea.

ORGANISATIONAL SUPPORT SCALE

(strongly agree to strongly disagree) Organisational Support

- 1. In the department where the project is implemented, we see that the project is important to the strategic management.
- 2. In the department where the project is implemented, we see that the strategic management support the project actively.
- 3. The hospital gives the support we need in the department to make the project a success.
- 4. The hospital does everything in its power to increase willingness to change.
- 5. The board pays attention to the activities of the project team.
- Team organisation
 - 6. There is good communication in the project team
 - 7. The division of tasks is perfectly clear in the project team
 - 8. Everyone is doing what he or she should do in the project team.
 - 9. The project team is responsible for progress of the project.
 - 10. The project team is in charge of project implementation.

External Change support

- 11. At collaborative meetings, I always gain valuable insights.
- 12. External change agents provide sufficient support and instruments.
- 13. External change agents raised high expectations about performance and improvement potential.
- 14. External change agents made clear from the beginning what the goal of the project is and the best way to achieve it.

PERCEPTION OF INNOVATION ADOPTION

See Table 4 for specific items

Table 6: Implementation Measures for Researchers

Constr uct	Scales	Validat ed with	Norm ed	Numb er of Items	Source
Ngā manuk ura	RE-AIM (reach, effectivenes s, adoption, implementa tion, maintenanc e)	N	N	14	<u>http://www.re-</u> <u>aim.hnfe.vt.edu/resources_and_tools/meas</u> <u>ures/index.html</u>
Ngā manuk ura	Adoption	N	Ν	4	Li, R et al. (2004). Organizational factors affecting the adoption of diabetes care management processes in physician organizations. Diabetes Care, 27, 2312
Ngā manuk ura	Cost	N	N	10	Drummond, MF, O'Brien, B, Stoddard, GL, Torrance, GW. (1997) Methods for the economic evaluation of health care programmes. Oxford: Oxford University Press. P. 305.
Ngā manuk ura	Fidelity	N	N	47	Monroe-DeVita, M. et al (2011). The TMACT : A new tool for measuring fidelity to assertive community treatment. Journal of American Psychiatric Nurses Association, 17, 17-29.

RE-AIM

There is a check list to guide this evaluation from the source.

- 1. Reach (Individual Level): What percent of potentially eligible participants a) were excluded, b) took part and c) how representative were they?
- 2. Efficacy or Effectiveness (Individual Level) What impact did the intervention have on a) all participants who began the program; b) on process intermediate, and primary outcomes; and c) on both positive and negative (unintended), outcomes including quality of life?
- Adoption (Setting Level) What percent of settings and intervention agents within these settings (e.g., schools/educators, medical offices/physicians) a) were excluded, b) participated and c) how representative were they?
- 4. Implementation (Setting/agent Level) To what extent were the various intervention components delivered as intended (in the protocol), especially when conducted by different (nonresearch) staff members in applied settings?
- 5. Maintenance (Individual Level) What were the long-term effects (minimum of 6-12 months following intervention)? b) What was the attrition rate; were drop-outs representative; and how did attrition impact conclusions about effectiveness? Maintenance (Setting Level) a) To what extent were different intervention components continued or institutionalized? b) How was the original program modified?



Created an index of the number of different element adopted by the organization (out of 4): clinical practice guidelines, case management, physician feedback, diabetic patient registries

COST

10-item checklist on cost effectiveness

FIDELITY

47 item scale/checklist to what extent they follow the intervention guidelines. Needs to be tailored for specific study.

Back to Index

18.1 Other Resources

List URLs for other guides should people want more information (from Engage for Equity Website including the following)

https://www.ccphealth.org/cbpr-curriculum/ (requires membership though)

https://cpr.unm.edu/research-projects/cbpr-project/index.html Engage for Equity

He Pikinga Waiora Publications

Teng, A., Blakely, T., Scott, N., Jansen, R., Masters-Awatere, B., Krebs, J., & Oetzel, J. (in press). What protects against pre-diabetes progressing to diabetes? Observational study of integrated health and social data. Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice.

Beaton, A., Manuel, C., Tapsell, J., Foote, J. Oetzel, J, Hudson, M. (2019). He Pikinga Waiora: Supporting Māori health organisations to respond to pre-diabetes. International Journal for Equity in Health,18: 3.

Click here for PDF: https://rdcu.be/bfD8o

Oetzel, J. G. (2018). Addressing health inequities in cardiovascular health in indigenous communities: Implementation process matters as much as the intervention itself. International Journal of Cardiology, doi:10.1016/j.ijcard.2018.07.036

Oetzel, JG, Wihapi, R., Manuel, C. Rarere, M. (2018). An integrated approach to prevent chronic lifestyle diseases in Māori men. International Journal of Integrated Care, 18(S2), A73.

Oetzel, J.G., Scott, N., Hudson, M., Masters-Awatere, B., Rarere, M. Foote, J., Beaton, A., & Ehau, T. (2017). Implementation framework for chronic disease intervention effectiveness in Māori and other indigenous communities. Globalization and Health, 13: 69. DOI: 10.1186/s12992-017-0295-8

Oetzel, J.G., Scott, N., Hudson, M., Masters-Awatere, B., Rarere, M. Foote, J., Beaton, A., & Ehau, T. (2017). Implementation framework for chronic disease intervention effectiveness in Māori and other indigenous communities. Globalization and Health, 13: 69. DOI: 10.1186/s12992-017-0295-8

Beaton A, Manuel C, Tapsell J, Oetzel J, Hudson M, Scott N, Rarere, M. (2017). Identifying strategic opportunities for Māori community organisations to respond to pre-diabetes: Building a platform for integrated care to deliver change that matters to communities. International Journal of Integrated Care, 17(5), A166.

Oetzel, J.G., Scott, N., Hudson, M., Masters-Awatere, B., Rarere, M. Foote, J., Beaton, A., & Ehau, T. (2017). He Pikinga Waiora Implementation framework: A tool for chronic disease intervention effectiveness in Māori and other Indigenous communities. International Journal of Integrated Care, 18(S1), A68. There are a number of resources available, a small selection is provided here for guidance:

Journals covering research in the area, e.g. Implementation Science

Implementation Research in Health: A Practical Guide (Peters, D. et al 2013)

Implementation research: what it is and how to do it (Peters, D. et al 2013)

Writing implementation research grant proposals: ten key ingredients (Proctor, E. 2012)

Dissemination and Implementation Research in Health: Translating Science to Practice (Brownson, R. et al 2012)

<u>A guide to implementation research in the prevention and control of noncommunicable diseases</u> (World Health Organization 2016)

Implementation research toolkit (WHO/TDR 2014)

Nine steps for developing a scaling-up strategy (WHO 2010)

<u>RE-AIM Framework</u> (Glasgow et al)

He Pikinga Waiora

An introduction to implementation science for the non-specialist (Bauer, M. et al 2015)

Other Useful References and Links

For further reading you might consider some of the following resources. Also, a closely related approach to the HPW framework is community-based participatory research (CBPR). Many of the resources suggested in this site come from CBPR literature.

Wallerstein N, Oetzel, J, Duran, B, Belone, L, Tafoya, G, Rae, R. CBPR: What predicts outcomes? In: Minkler M, Wallerstein, N, editors. Community-based participary research for health: from process to outcomes, 2nd edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2008. p. 371-92.

Wallerstein, N., Duran, B., Oetzel, J.G., & Minkler, M. (2018). Community-based participatory research for health (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Israel BA, Eng, E., Schulz, A. J., & Parker, E., editors. Methods in community-based participatory research for health, 2nd edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2013.

Oetzel JG, Zhou C, Duran B, Pearson C, Magarati M, Lucero J, et al. Establishing the psychometric properties of constructs in a community-based participatory research conceptual model. Am J Health Promot. 2015; 29:e188-202.

Community-Campus Partnerships for Health: https://www.ccphealth.org/cbpr-curriculum/ Detroit Community-Academic Urban Research Center: https://www.detroiturc.org/resources.html Engage for Equity: <u>https://cpr.unm.edu/research-projects/cbpr-project/index.html</u>

Back to Index