

NRCDDV-National Resource Center on Domestic Violence (USNRCD1805A)

NRCDDV-National Resource Center on Domestic Violence Webinar
Live Captioning by Ai-Media

SPEAKER:

(Speaks Spanish)

During the presentation, if you have any questions for our panelists, please share it in the chat. I will make sure to pass them to them.

Hello, Anne, Cassie, Jan. Welcome. Hi, Deborah. Welcome. Yes. Terry, you have a question about being muted? You should be muted.

IVONNE ORTIZ:

Well, let's get ready to start. That afternoon, everybody. I am Ivonne Ortiz, I am the director of training and technical assistance for the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence.

I want to thank you for joining our session today. Our session is entitled "Strengthening Our Evidence Toolkit, -- Transformative Research and Evaluation Strategies to Centre Survivors and Advance Social Justice."

(Speaks Spanish)

We are going to be recording this session, and also, as I mentioned, please feel free to share your questions, comments, in our chat. (Speaks Spanish)

Before we start, I am going to open the space for our interpreters. So that they can give some instructions.

SPEAKER:

Hello, can you hear me? (Speaks Spanish) So, this is Ryan Garcia, with my co-interpreter. We are here with (Name). (Speaks Spanish)

You can see on your screen, right now, the instructions for accessing interpreting. Into Spanish. If you would like to listen in Spanish, you can see the instructions for accessing, on your computer, on the left-hand side. Or you can access it from your phone, on the right-hand side of the screen. (Speaks Spanish)

Thank you so much, (Speaks Spanish)

IVONNE ORTIZ:

Before we start, I want to also introduce our presenters for today. We have my colleague, Doctor Carrie Lippy. She joined us in 2020. She brings with her a wide range of experience in the gender-based violence field. From support groups, and LGBTQ grassroots agencies, to conducting research into violence prevention at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Welcome, Carrie.

Also, we have Dr. Susan Ghanbarpour. She is an independent researcher, and evaluator. Focusing on community led and participatory methodologies. Doctor Ghanbarpour has expertise in culturally responsive and equitable evaluation. As well as qualitative and mixed method research, and is co-author of the community-based participatory research, toolkit for domestic violence researchers.

She uses a strength-based approach to building partners capacities to cultivate evaluation of thinking, and adopt evidence-based practices. I want to also welcome, Selima Jumarali. She is a graduate student in the clinical community psychology PhD program at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County.

Her research focuses on the mental health and well-being of LGBTQ people of colour, community-based participatory research methods, and the needs and experiences of survivors of intimate partner violence.

She earned her degree in psychology from the University of Miami, and her MA from New York University. Thank you so much, to our panelists for joining us. This is really hard, for a Latina to say all of those big words. After 3:00 PM, I just want to say that. (Laughs) So, thank you to all of you.

Please, I think Carrie, you will be the first one. Let me pass the slide. There we go. Thank you, and welcome.

CARRIE LIPPY:

Thank you, I think, Selima, you were going to start us off. If that feels good?

SELIMA JUMARALI:

Sure, yes. Hi everyone, this is Selima speaking, I go by she/her pronouns. I am calling from a land colonial he known as Baltimore, Maryland. On behalf of the presenters, and not the organization's nor the funders hosting this event, I would like to acknowledge the violence and resistance occurring around the world, particularly the occupation, ethnic cleansing, dispossession, apartheid, and violence occurring in Palestine. Palestinian activists have called for a global day of action, asking us to speak out publicly supporting Palestine, and to contact our representatives, to end the 3.8 billion taxpayers dollars that fund these human rights abuses. I will put links in the chat to encourage you to take action. As well as a link to Jewish Voice for Peace, and organization from which you can learn more, and learn how to get involved. Now, we will get started for the day.

CARRIE LIPPY:

Great, thank you so much, Selima. I will quickly introduce myself, and give Susan a chance to do so as well. I am Carrie Lippy, I use she/her or they/them pronouns. I am the Co-Director of the National LGBTQ Institute on IPV intimate partner violence. We are a program of the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence, and we work in partnership with the National coalition of antiviolence programs, in New York City. That is a mouthful.

I am joining from occupied Duwamish land, also known as Seattle, Washington. I am a white, Genderqueer person, with short brown hair. And what you can't tell, a black-and-white striped shirt, with a mustard cardigan over it. Susan, I will pass it to you to introduce yourself.

SUSAN GHANBARPOUR:

Thank you. Hi, everyone. I am Susan Ghanbarpour. I am in Independent Researcher and Evaluator. I worked for many years with the Asian-Pacific Institute on gender-based violence.

The picture can't be displayed.

NRC DV-National Resource Center on Domestic Violence (USNRCD1805A)

And I am coming from (Name) land, also known as San Francisco, here in California. There are already friends in the chat, I love it.

I am so pleased and delighted to be with you all today. I think, Carrie, are you going to? Sorry, I forgot my pronouns, my pronouns are she/her, I am a ciswoman, I am like to skinned, and I am wearing a black top, which are the only kinds of coloured tops I own. OK, so I think that was everything. I will hand it off to carry.

CARRIE LIPPY:

(Laughs) Perfect, thanks Susan. Great, I am quickly going to go through our goals for today. Which are threefold. We want to explore with you all, what research justice is, and the undermining values for conducting Survivor centred research and evaluation that advances social change.

We want to examine principles and values of trauma-informed, Language Justice, and participatory research and evaluation.

And then, three, be able to learn together some concrete strategies for expanding gender-based violence research, and evaluation to be more survivor-centred, trauma-informed, and participatory.

So, to start off. It would be helpful to hear a little bit about the research you are all already doing. To shed some light on that research, it would be great if you could share in the chat box, how you think the survivors would describe the research or evaluation – you can go back, we will stay there. How you would describe survivors the research or evaluation your agency does.

If you could put a few words in the chat, for how you think survivors would describe the research or evaluation your agency does? (Laughs) Maggie says, gift card opportunity. Not impressed. Another survey, LOL, not enough, we do surveys but they are long and nerdy -- wordy.

After the fact. Not again. Someone says, "why are you asking me these stupid BS questions?" My agency does not particularly, definitely survey, says Olivia. Sporadic, research fatigue. Lots of mention of surveys. This is great, thank you all so much.

Carol Lena says, "who is going to see this?" Great, there are a lot of questions around privacy, utility, exhaustion. Just getting it done. You know... It feels very perfunctory for a lot of folks, it sounds like. Re-traumatizing. The research is explained and -- in documents that clients sign. Let's see... To be clear, either not again, or what is that?

Looking for the Goldilocks moments of over surveying, or not at all. Great, this is really helpful. I think this kind of sheds some helpful light on the fact that, you can go to the next slide. Thank you.

You know, when we talk and ask survivors, and this is actually coming from Susan's research, that she did with domestic violence advocates, about their experiences. With research. These are the kinds of things that come up. They feel related to what you are all describing.

The picture can't be displayed.

NRCDV-National Resource Center on Domestic Violence (USNRCD1805A)

The biggest, most consistent response was, "run!". Which is featured here in our conversation bubble. Also things like, puts us in a box. Survivors and advocates talk about it being a negative process, it being led, or feeling very white, and male. And also being drive-by research, where there is not real investment, it is not creating real change. It is just people gathering data, and leaving quickly.

So, we hear these responses pretty often, when we ask community members how they feel about research. Their reaction is pretty overwhelmingly negative. This in large part reflects a whole host of things, some of which are harmful traditional research practices. That includes things like a history of exploitation, and extraction of data from communities.

It includes the way that research has been used to stigmatize, or reinforce negative stereotypes about marginalized communities. Even outside researchers asking the wrong questions, in the wrong ways. All while claiming to be "objective and accurate". So, for many of you, as we have already illustrated, and especially for folks that are working in communities of colour, or queer and trans communities, immigrant communities, and communities with folks with disabilities, this probably all feels familiar.

The potential harm, the re-traumatizing nature of research, it can be harmful, for survivors and for those folks that we are working with.

So, let's think about the flip side. Let's think about research that not only does not harm, or exploit, but research that actually feels and does good. I would like you to write in the chat, about research you have been involved in that made you feel warm and fuzzy.

They are not typical words that we associate with research, and this is going to be research that you were involved in as a participant, or a researcher. And, what about that research made you feel that way?

Again, take a minute to put this in the chat. (Laughs) There is not a lot coming in. (Laughs) Here we go... Research that is centred on marginalized voices. Great. Yes. You might be the only one... We are pulling categorize data on specific abuse incidents. What is happening there. Kendra says when I heard my contribution reflected. Nancy explains they can't recall a time they felt warm or fuzzy. Research that gives me space to talk or reflect as an immigrant and also have follow-up with the report.

Great. Gretchen says language justice principles and flexibilities in how the research is done in the timeline. CVR principles generally at work.

I wonder if you got an advance notice of this webinar content. You have seen our slides.

Carolina says immigration attitudes and opinions across straight. -- States. When it is research that I actually conducted for black women and girls by black women and girls it centred intersection already. These are great.

I thought there would be a complete absence of examples but this is exactly what we are talking about.

The picture can't be displayed.

NRCDV-National Resource Center on Domestic Violence (USNRCD1805A)

You can go to the next slide.

So, this is why we are here today, to talk more about how to do this kind of research that instills joy, centres survivors and particularly as folks mention here centres marginalized survivors. And advances social justice. A lot of the characteristics that folks describe and we will be talking more about, Susan and Selima will talk more about. Just to explain as well in this image, I am hoping we can move from conducting research that harms and exploits survivors illustrated by this picture of my dog Nate looking very sceptical on the left on side that ultimately engages participants illustrated by Maeve looking very excited.

My dog feels precious as well.

Research justice is a framework that can help guide us as we make this pivot towards research that makes us feel warm and fuzzy. Research justice is a framework that comes from the data centre which is POC lead independent research organization for social justice movements. Unfortunately it closed its doors in 2016 but their work is shared by a number of different community-based organizations. Their website still has lots of amazing resources on it. You can still access a lot of those resources which are phenomenal.

Research justice focuses on the issue of who defines and controls knowledge production? Ultimately this is about shifting power, resources and decision-making to communities so that research is driven and defined and controlled by communities. It is about expanding what sources of knowledge are deemed credible and what is deemed evidence. It is also about an explicit focus on systems of power and oppression and how these systems affect the research process, the relationships within a project and some people's ability to participate at all. It pushes for greater equity, power-sharing and transparency within the research partnerships. Folks actually again mention this idea of transparency and one of the many things that I personally love about research justice is that it encompasses and complements other research approaches and frameworks. Some of these we will cover today. These will include things like community based participatory research, participatory action research, feminist approaches to research and racial justice including language justice, intersectionality and culture responsive research. You can go to the next slide.

We will spend some time now and putting this into practice. These represent three broad areas for folks to focus on to pivot the research towards equity survivor centred approach. The first is about inclusive notions of evidence and inclusive... Often when folks empower talk about evidence, they are really referring to particular kinds of research evidence. Things like randomized controlled trials and other research with so many internal controls that can be hard to see how they apply to the real world. There are several different evidence frameworks that push back on this narrow definition of evidence.

One of the frameworks actually comes from the centres for disease control and prevention of all places. They situate research evidence as one of multiple forms of evidence. They are referred to it as best available research evidence as shown in the green circle. Alongside this research evidence, they say folks should be recognizing experiential evidence. This is in the purple circle. It is based on people's insight, understanding and skills accumulated over time. Then in the blue

The picture can't be displayed.

NRC DV-National Resource Center on Domestic Violence (USNRCD1805A)

circle, they also recognize contextual evidence. This is knowledge about a particular context or community.

The data centre again, the beloved datacentre provides a similar and more community-based framework around this idea of multiple forms of evidence. It includes that mainstream knowledge that they define as published fact and data produced by researchers that are outside of the community. Then, they also recognize experiential knowledge which is in the purple circle. This is again it lives day-to-day experience, the things that we know and have learned from living and dealing with issues that impact our lives. Then, in that blue circle is cultural and spiritual knowledge. They define this as cultural practices and wisdom passed down through communities through shared cultural and spiritual traditions. Hopefully the emphasis of both frameworks is to recognize that research evidence is only one type of evidence. There are other ways of knowing through your experiences, your deep knowledge of your culture and community. These should also be considered evidence and should be considered at least on par with research evidence.

Another way to think about inclusive definitions of evidence: it is to think about the type of evidence that is considered legitimate or credible. Often times when they talk about evidence they are talking about statistics and graphs and other types of evidence based on quantitative data illustrated here by the calculator icon. Quantitative data is usually numbers based and often collected via surveys. I am not going to lie, I love quantitative data as well, I love making graphs. It is the only form of visual art I can do. I am absurdly proud of how nice I can make them look. But quantitative data is not the only kind of data. It is not the most appropriate kind of data in lots of different circumstances. Qualitative data is another equally valid form of data. It is displayed here next to two speech bubbles. Since it often involves collection strategies like interviews and focus groups. Other ways of capturing people's stories in greater nuances and in depth. Sometimes folks can dismiss qualitative data and see it as collecting anecdotes. However qualitative data can be just as rigorous and systematic as quantitative data. It can shed a very different light on what is being studied.

SPEAKER:

Someone asked in the chat if they will have access to the slides in case we missed writing something down. I wanted to say that yes slides will be available in webinar resources after the webinar and they are also being recorded and we will put a link in the chat. Apologies for interrupting.

DR CARRIE LIPPY:

I appreciate that thinking.

These narrow definitions of evidence and questionable notions of credibility of academia being the only credible source of knowledge can sometimes result in community-based agencies believing that what they are doing is not real research. Or they are not building real evidence. However, I am here to tell you otherwise. Community-based agencies are collecting data all the time. Often it is just a matter of recognizing it as research and making small tweaks to make it systematic.

The picture can't be displayed.

NRCDV-National Resource Center on Domestic Violence (USNRCD1805A)

So, the most obvious kind of research that community-based agencies are already doing is when we collect surveys at the end of class or at a training or at the end of an event. As shown in the first box on the left.

Often this is done because our funders require it. We reluctantly correct -- collect this data and get a small amount of data to get back to funders so we can continue our funding as a result of that.

Many of you have recognized that this is some kind of research though ultimately the utility it up of it might be questionable. You can tweak the questions you are asking to be able to answer questions that your organization has about its programming, effects on participants or whether it is meeting the needs of communities, etc. You could collect the data as shown in the second box and enter it into a database and summarize it. That means you to the third box and you can use that information and data for different kinds of evaluations. For example, if you are asking about what worked well or what to change about the class for next time, you could be conducting process or implementation evaluation essentially. If you're asking about what participants learned or what they might change because of the class, you could consider that an outcome evaluation. As shown by the picture of my Dog Jackson at the bottom you could transform everyday actions that your organization takes like in the picture of Jackson with glasses showing research over his head.

Another example of what you are already doing, in terms of research, is debriefing with cofacilitators after delivering a class or training. This is probably something we all do after giving a presentation or training. We actually haven't talked about it yet but I am hoping my co-presenters and I will debrief after this webinar to talk about how it went. However, as the same picture of my dog illustrates, this action can be considered data and be transformed into research.

By writing notes of what you discuss during your debrief, and being able to... I think that went back... One more... Thank you.

If you are able to write notes of your conversation, summarize what worked and didn't work, what you have done is done at process or implementing an evaluation. So, you are ultimately evaluating how the thing went and then making changes based on that. This is very straightforward and most people are already doing this. We don't always consider this evidence or research.

Then, the final one is one that might not come to mind when you think about data and research. That is when you are developing a new program. If you are working with community members to develop a new program, and this can be or a new curriculum, a new class... If you track the process of developing that program or curriculum development, it can be its own form of research. It is called developmental evaluation which is the process by which we develop a new program. The way that you do that is you can just track meeting attendance, you track decision-making process and you write down meeting notes and you are basically tracking the decision-making process by which this new program is developed. So, for all of these, these are types of research that folks are already doing so it is just a matter of making small tweaks to have it be considered a larger part of research and evaluation. I feel like I am babbling at this point so I will

stop here and pass it over to my colleague Susan Ghanbarpour.

SUSAN GHANBARPOUR:

Thanks, Carrie. Next slide, please. So, hello everyone, this is Susan. You are not babbling, Carrie, I appreciate the shout out to qualitative, because I am a mixed methods researcher. For the next 20 minutes or so, I will be talking about trauma-informed and healing centred approaches of practices in research and evaluation.

In the second piece, we will focus on Language Justice. Let's go to the next slide.

So, when you think about what shapes a lot of how research and evaluation is conducted, that is often connected to mainstream research ethics. Unfortunately, a lot of those ethical principles were developed essentially as a reaction to horrendous human rights abuses.

Particularly against marginalized, and racialized communities. And often years, or decades after the abuses actually occurred. So think of Nuremberg, and many other examples. So, the questions that I would like us to think about are, how can we be more proactive rather than reactive, to prevent harm in our research and evaluation practices.

How do we respond more quickly to address harm as soon as possible? How do we work with BIPOC and other marginalized communities, knowing this history of targeted abuse and exploitation? And, can we move beyond the do no harm approach?

To create meaningful and positive experiences for both researchers, and participants?

Spoiler alert, there will be a lot of dogs in this presentation. So, this is an image of Jackson, a golden brown dog wearing a sky blue harness, who has a gentle, supportive paw around Mabel, a smaller black and white dog. I would describe this approach as a "do no harm".

A trauma-informed approach, and I will assume here that many of us are familiar with trauma-informed approaches, because of our field. I apologize for not going into more detail. Essentially, when you are working with survivors in a research and evaluation context, you want to be able to understand and, to a certain extent, anticipate the traumas they may have experienced.

Especially to avoid triggering, or re-traumatizing. So, we know about trauma associated with gender-based violence, sexual violence, but are you also thinking about historical or collective trauma? Racism, or bigotry? The trouble trauma associated with migration?

As well as, we spoke about earlier, people's past history with research and evaluation. Especially if they are from marginalized communities.

Another piece to consider is, are you thoughtfully constructing your data collection instruments? Of course, we want to avoid things like double-barreled questions, and so on. But also thinking about, are you including questions that are too complicated, difficult, or sensitive to unpack? In an inappropriate format, like a survey, where someone may not have the resources or support to process that in the moment.

The picture can't be displayed.

NRCDDV-National Resource Center on Domestic Violence (USNRCD1805A)

Are you using terms that the community recognizes for itself? For example, not using stigmatizing, incorrect, or painful terms. And, are your questions short and to the point? So you are not asking about painful details unnecessarily. Especially if you already have that information.

We do not want people repeating their painful stories over, and over again. Something we do not always think about, is what do you do for your own team? Do you have supports in place for facilitators? Self-care, and debriefing? Do you have that for your team members can back often, I do work with community-based researchers who will sometimes have painful experiences, in common with the participants that they are working with.

So, think again about team debriefs, team member pair ups, ways to avoid isolation.

IVONNE ORTIZ:

Before we go to the next light, we have a few questions. "What are the pros and cons of organizations working with external researchers, such as independent consultants and academic researchers?"

SUSAN GHANBARPOUR:

You know, I wonder if we can keep that question for Selima. Selima, how do you feel about that? I feel like your slides speak to that more.

SELIMA JUMARALI:

Yes, sure. This is Selima. We can address that a little later in the presentation. Thank you.

IVONNE ORTIZ:

Perfect. We have a question from Debra, let's see if we can answer this one. "Do you think that providing a summary of research the onto the narrow sources, is welcome, how ready are these organizations to both accept and reflect?"

SUSAN GHANBARPOUR:

Yes, that is another one that I am thinking... I am sorry, Selima, I am punting everything to you. Hold on, everyone, we have a whole section on participatory methodology. (Laughs)

I think we will address this, and also, if it does not, then let's resurface these questions. So can we hold them for now?

IVONNE ORTIZ:

Yes, I have them.

SUSAN GHANBARPOUR:

OK, shall we move on? Thank you so much, I cannot track the chat, I get overwhelmed. That is my own self-care, for myself. This image is of Jackson and Mabel, peacefully snuggling, which I think is a great way to model creating a safe container in which survivors feel comfortable, sharing their experiences.

The picture can't be displayed.

NRCDV-National Resource Center on Domestic Violence (USNRCD1805A)

There are a lot of ways to do that. We could emphasize the consent process. Which we are all aware of, in the sense that, participants can share whatever pieces of their story that they feel comfortable with. Or, stop sharing, at any moment.

I think it is also important to mention that they will still receive the full incentive, or remuneration. I talked to community members who have told me that they have been told, "well, you can stop, but you will not receive the incentive." Which I think is actually coercive. I think about creating spaciousness, within the context of the data collection activity.

So, think about question wording, and timing. Make sure you leave enough time for closure. I think we try to cram in a lot of things within our time constraints. But that puts pressure on participants, and on ourselves.

And if it is a group, like a focus group setting, going over ground rules and agreements. Also, just be prepared. Because, in case there is a trauma response, or re-triggering, have referrals ready.

It is really important not just to rely on the national hotlines, but to have culturally appropriate local services and support. When we do it in person, sometimes we have support staff on site. It is great. There are things you can do, like a grounding exercise. Let's move to the next slide. This is a poll.

So, I will wait a moment for the poll to come up, but I will also read it. Just asking if you all are familiar with the term "healing-centred"? If you could choose, yes, no, maybe, or not sure. Let's wait a moment for those results to come up.

CARRIE LIPPY:

While we are waiting, this is Carrie, I do not know if the tech team can support in bringing up Susan's video, so we can see Susan while she is presenting?

SUSAN GHANBARPOUR:

I my video on, maybe I was not pinned.

IVONNE ORTIZ:

This is Yvonne, I was able to see her. Maybe adjusting your view, and for all of our friends a joint -- joining us, maybe try to adjust your view.

SUSAN GHANBARPOUR:

Great, and I am sorry, I cannot see the poll results. Did we get results?

IVONNE ORTIZ:

Yes, I think some people are still voting. But, we have 38% said "yes", 34% "no", and 28% "I am not sure".

SUSAN GHANBARPOUR:

OK, I am so glad I asked. A real mix of reactions. Again, we do not have time to talk about healing centred approaches in depth, but I want to refer you to Doctor Sean (?) who described a

healing centred row approach as describing what has happened to you, and using those descriptions of agents of creation of their own well-being, rather than victims of traumatic events. It is an asset centred approach, and aimed at holistic well-being.

I will leave that there for a moment, and we can share resources later. But it is a shift from a deficit focused trauma approach, almost like, "what is the worst thing that ever happened to you?" To a sharing space, healing centred approach, which is more about looking at the totality of a person's experiences, including strengths, and joys. That conversation is happening now, especially in the education and youth development fields. But, it is beginning to emerge in our field as well, and I think that is a really great shift for us.

Let's go to the next slide. So, this is Mabel, craning her neck up and joyfully looking Jackson in the face. Which helps us explore the question of, how we are not only avoiding doing harm, but are we also creating a positive experience for participants and our team?

Which is again, trying to get more at the healing centred approach. I do not think we often think about, beyond sort of... Being neutral, or not creating harm. But, if we can think about small things, just like participants care and comfort, things like providing culturally appropriate food. And other things, like art materials, or toys. These are all things we have provided at our research activities.

Include cultural and healing practices, if you can. Provide meaningful incentives, often ones that are thought of by the community, themselves. Community members themselves. Simple things, like showing gratitude, following up on what you promise to do.

These are always to turn a research experience into a more positive, and even joyful experience. Again, thinking about facilitators and teams, self-care. I also wanted to mention that, sometimes for survivors, particularly ones who are isolated, when you have something like a focus group.

It is not uncommon for folks to ask to keep meeting, even after the focus group is over. As a way for them to continue to connect with each other. Not in a focus group setting, but in a support group, or even a social group setting.

It is good to lay aside some funds, in case there is a way you can support something like that.

We also ask questions about mobility, how they might like to participate in the future, and community, in research and beyond research. Let's go to the last slide. This is an image of Mabel, who is wearing bright green booties, and not liking them. And has her eyes closed in a wince. Which is a face I think of when we think about when we create harm despite our best efforts.

If this does happen, I think we are all familiar with the different sort of information procedures, especially on consent forms, that tells participants exactly who they can contact.

I think we also sometimes neglect the training of staff, to make sure they are ready to handle those contacts when they come in. Also thinking about, how do we address that harm as soon

The picture can't be displayed.

NRC DV-National Resource Center on Domestic Violence (USNRCD1805A)

as possible? And involve the person who was harmed, in the process of thinking what they might feel might be a fair resolution, or way to move forward.

Bringing in some learnings from restorative justice, for example. And then, I think it is important to acknowledge what could be happening to the community, outside of your project.

This was certainly the case with several of my research projects after the 2016 election. Boy, right in the middle of that, the communities that I was working with had a very... Strong reaction.

And feeling of harm, of targeting. So, are your community partners and research partners able to bring that up with you? Are there clear lines of communication, and comfort for them to be able to do that? Have you built in flexibility to your timeline and budget, so you can be responsive? And are there any other resources you have to offer, beyond the research project?

So, let's go to the next section, which is about Language Justice. I want to pause for just a second, to see if any other questions or comments came up in the chat?

IVONNE ORTIZ:

Yes there are a couple more questions. One is: how does drive-by work in particular related to research design.

SUSAN GHANBARPOUR:

That was a comment in the session I was leaving, the drive-by work was really referring to external refer -- research is who swooped into a program and take the information and data in an extractive way and leave never to be heard from again.

Hopefully, that is not how you will be doing your participatory research design but we will get more into that. Anything else?

IVONNE ORTIZ:

There is another one, I don't remember if I shared it, from Deborah. Reframing the collection of data as a need driven by funders rather than can be a form of capacity building among teams and agencies.

SUSAN GHANBARPOUR:

Yes, absolutely. We have a whole section on it. I don't want us to be to behind and I want to get lots of time for the next section because most questions are directed at her. I will move on if that is OK.

IVONNE ORTIZ:

Yes that is perfect.

SUSAN GHANBARPOUR:

This is another poll and I wanted to ask if you are familiar with the term Linguicism. I will give you a few moments to think about your responses. Yes, no, not sure.

The picture can't be displayed.

NRCDV-National Resource Center on Domestic Violence (USNRCD1805A)

IVONNE ORTIZ:

I will read these to you in case you can't see them: we have yes... Not sure is 16%.

SUSAN GHANBARPOUR:

I will spend a little more time covering this content since folks are not really familiar with it.

Linguicism is a term coined by (name). It mirrors other forms of oppression's that we are already familiar with. Such as racism, sexism, able-ism. In this case it is discrimination specifically based on language difference. You will notice that the highlighted words in this definition refer to an unequal division of power along the lines of language.

If we go to the next slide, this is selection of headlines. I won't read them all but what I will say is that these illustrate that language oppression often intersects with other forms of oppression based on identity. Particularly race, religion, immigration status, disability and those intersections can compound experiences of marginalized Asian. And oppression.

While these headlines, I pulled them from a couple of years ago, they are both in keeping with ultra current sentiment. I am thinking for example of the stop AAP I hate movement which has surfaced so much of the violence directed at a API folks particularly when they are speaking language other than English. It goes back to deeper parts of US history... Including Xenophobic patterns. We have the suppression of the Hawaiian language for over 80 years, boarding schools where native children were severely punished for speaking their languages. Enslaved folks who were forbidden from speaking African languages because white slave owners feared they would be able to plan uprisings. We have a long history of Linguicism in our country and let's move to the next slide.

Again, this is some reflection that you can do in the chat box. Those headlines talked about in a more general way how folks may be targeted or experienced violence and oppression based on language. This is now... If you can think of an example and write it in the chat box. How do you think that the schism might affect survivors of vendor-based and sexual violence?

I will wait and see if some thoughts emerge. It can be short, you don't have to give a long response.

Carolina says it could intensify the trauma.

Translating documents with no cultural concept, context.

It impacts access to services. An abusive partner might have more power or speak the languages locally better. Agencies and service providers don't have appropriate options so people can understand them leading to further isolation. Not providing interpretation and translation while collecting surveys. And we have many more and I know we are short on time so I apologize that I won't read them all out.

I think in general we talk a lot about how it damages connection to culture, diminishes or eliminates accessibility to both services and to being able to connect. Yes, a lot of just sign here situations.

Let's talk about, again, how do we address this and what is a framework that will help us

The picture can't be displayed.

NRC DV-National Resource Center on Domestic Violence (USNRCD1805A)

address it.

How do we fight Linguicism? One way is to use language justice approaches. Language justice is an evolving field so the definitions are also evolving so I have given a couple from some leaders in the language justice movement. This focuses on rights and authenticity.

This focuses on power, oppression and resistance and democratic participation.

If we go to the next one, I think we are running short on time so I would love to hear how you all practice and think about how we can practice language justice so feel free to include those in the chat box. I am also going to highlight a few, especially for folks for whom this is a new concept.

Let's go to the next slide... These slides are just going through very familiar stages of research and evaluation. If we talk about planning and design stage there are a few different ideas here. I want to focus on the idea of budgeting time and resources.

This is an image that shows a group of five Asian, Latin X and indigenous women wearing headsets. It is not just about interpreters and translators but budgeting for equipment but time. This was a trilingual space which meant that we didn't think about this, but even though we had simultaneous like UN style interpretation, we still had to wait for interpretation from Spanish to English and then to ASL because the ASL interpreter did not speak Spanish. That is a unicorn interpreter if they know Spanish and English.

Data collection and analysis is often uncomfortable for us. Also having the analysis in the original language.

This shows an assemblage of our materials including photos of objects and various races, genders and ages. Cut out colourful hearts and pipe cleaners shaped into people forms. We provided the our materials and asked the community teams use visual images either found or created rather than text to describe their project and then we asked them to present on their creations with simultaneous interpretation and notetaking.

This is important at the analysis stage, it shows a woman wearing an interpretation headset in colourful pieces of paper taped to a window that have writing in English and Spanish on them. It requires forethought on preparation. We asked the participants to respond to some questions before and we had the responses translated in all the languages in the room. Everybody got to see the same data at the same time and as they look to this data gallery, they then debriefed in groups afterwards where there was interpretation. Let's move on to the next stage: dissemination.

It is obviously important that all products are in the community languages as well as using communities preferred formats.

If we move to the next slide, this image is an example of a graphic recording in Spanish which has colourful pictures and icons accompanying the text. We hired a bilingual English, Spanish graphic recorder so she could create these graphic recordings in the language in which

participants were speaking. Then they were later translated and disseminated to everyone. What was unanticipated about this was that they were on really large, white paperboard and the community teams loved these graphic recording so much they asked if they could keep them at the end and they several of them hung them in their offices. I don't know about you but it is rare that people want to hang up data collection devices I am using.

I think it is important to think about what really resonates with participants.

The last date I want to talk about his learning and integration. Something we don't often talk about. It is very important in creating a language justice space. This is the idea of incorporating continuing feedback and learning throughout the project particularly for participants and your language justice partners like interpreters and translators. If you look at the next slide which is my final in this series, I am going to ask you to guess... This is an image of a wall coloured with colourful stickies with writing on them in English and Spanish. I want you to guess what is wrong with this picture? In our language justice context. What do you think the feedback that we got was from our interpreters who were doing the translation for this? As we had something like 20 participants go up and simultaneously right all of these post-its.

Yes, Amy it is very text centric. And who can possibly translate all of this and... English text is larger than Spanish and Spanish was crammed in the corner. We didn't think about it and it is a classic activity for researchers and evaluators and yet it didn't really occur to us before hand until we got feedback in the moment. That is it for this section and I'm sure you have many more ideas and questions. I want to hold questions now until the end because I really want to make sure that Selima Jumarali has enough time who is our next presenter, she will talk about maximizing participation which you are all intensely interested in from your questions.

SELIMA JUMARALI:

Thank you, this is Selena. I know that Susan intended to do this, so I will do it on her behalf. That our goal was to have this also model the Language Justice principles that Susan was describing.

Which would include having a multilingual chat. And chats that are translated, so that there is not conversation happening in the dominant language that is not accessible to people who may not speak that language, a.k.a., English.

So, just want to name that, we are trying to read out some of the things. So that they are translated, life. But in terms of a recommendation, that is something we would love for you to take, and do better than we were able to do today. (Laughs)

So, now moving on to talking about participatory methods, and approaches.

So, participatory research.

, Thank you. I apologize that I do not have a lot of polls and interaction, I was a little worried about time.

So, please write in the chat if you have knowledge about participatory research, if it is new to you, please share that as well. Participatory research is an approach to research in which researchers and community members share power, resources, and decision-making at every

The picture can't be displayed.

NRCDDV-National Resource Center on Domestic Violence (USNRCD1805A)

level of the research process.

I see a few people saying that they have some familiarity. But at least one person says in the chat, it is new to them. Next slide, please. I would like to invite a brave soul, of any language, if you can unmute, and share, how have survivors been included in the research and evaluation work that you do?

So, I will mute myself, and if one person could share, I would love to hear from you.

SPEAKER:

Please raise your hand, and I can unmute you. Caitlin, it looks like you have your hand raised? Would you like to share?

SPEAKER:

It looks like she muted herself. Any other brave souls out there?

SELIMA JUMARALI:

Alright, this is Selima. No worries, I do not want to pressure folks. You all can put it in the chat instead, if that is more comfortable. In terms of, how survivors have been included...

SPEAKER:

(Speaks Spanish)

SELIMA JUMARALI:

(Speaks Spanish)

SPEAKER:

(Speaks Spanish)

SPEAKER:

(Speaks Spanish)

SELIMA JUMARALI:

This is Selima, thank you so much for sharing that. Absolutely. So, I want us to consider that survivors are often engaged in research and evaluation, as participants. Where they are completing many surveys, as you all noted. But, I imagine that they have been included in other parts of your processes as well.

So, I invite us to note, that survivors can be engaged in different stages, and two different levels. So, next slide, please.

Generally, I pictured the research and evaluation process and the stages of conceptualization, and implementation. So, in conceptualization, we establish the research question, and determine the study design. And, in implementation, we collect and analyse data, and disseminate the findings.

So, in the traditional research and evaluation process, all of these steps are led by researchers.

The picture can't be displayed.

NRC DV-National Resource Center on Domestic Violence (USNRCD1805A)

And as the person who recently spoke mentioned, in participatory research, ideally we are bringing intention at the outset of the establishment of the research question, and design, to avoid superficial engagement that is not in the true spirit of participatory research principles. And values.

Having survivors collaborate, and partner at the outset of a study, allows us to leverage those strengths meaningfully, and holistically. Versus just at a later stage, that might enhance recruitment.

Now, many of us may be in the midst of conducting studies and evaluation, so I want us to consider how we can employ these different elements, in various aspects and stages of a study. While aspiring to a more holistic engagement in the future.

So, authors listed at the bottom of the page, developed what is called the participation continuum. This is an adaptation of it, I encourage you to check out their article. They assert that participation falls on a continuum, whereby as you move to the right side of the arrow pictured, there is increased participation from community partners, and increased power sharing between researchers and community partners. Traditional research falls on the lower end of the continuum, which is on the left side of the arrow. Whereby, community members are participants that are contributing as consultants, in ways that are directed by researchers.

I would like you to think about, how even in one study, we can move from the lower levels of participation, to the higher levels of participation. As we progress in the study. And at the end of one study, or an evaluation, we can have built the partnerships necessary to start a new project, from a fully participatory place.

Next slide, please. So, in the lower participatory engagement, and, researchers are the one controlling and owning the process and the product. They are directing community feedback, and sharing what they have determined to be appropriate aspects of the research process, as I have already mentioned, community members are subjects of the research next slide, please. In contrast, in higher levels of participatory engagement. There are equal and sustained partnerships. Where there is a shared power, decision-making, and ownership.

Where survivor and advocates expertise are valued, and there is opportunity for bidirectional learning, between researchers and community members, and the project reflects the goals, values, and strengths of the community. So, participatory research really calls us to move toward the higher end of the spectrum. Where there is increased mutual transparency, trust, and relationship building as well as shared ownership of process and products.

Our reflection question I would like to post to you all, is, how can you increase participatory engagement in your work? If you can put your ideas in the chat, I will take a moment to look out for those. Feel free to share any challenges that you have experienced in increasing participatory engagement in your work.

So, Cassie says, incentives. As in, it is difficult to find incentives to increase participatory engagement? Compensating people for the time they have put into the work. Yes. That is something that is definitely important, and for academic researchers, which this sort of connects

to a question someone was asking earlier, I think about pros and cons of external researchers working with organizations... The academic researchers have research inherently incentivized as part of their jobs.

Whereas, for community partners, there may not always be the compensation built in, for their time and labour. Other challenges include sintering Language Justice in the process, Kristin says, I think this also speaks to me for interrogating where organizations are, in the spectrum of community engagement to ownership.

The power dynamics matter so much, I agree. A challenge is finding, sharing findings with survivors, and just as importantly, interpreting recommendations and conclusions together with survivors. Absolutely. Funders expectations of how fast we go, and what questions we answer.

Certainly, that is a big challenge. So, folks are still sharing in the chat, I will read a couple more, and then move forward. So that we have time for a Q&A at the end. One outcome of my project, Melinda says, will hopefully be to share research findings with participants, and to offer up a resource guide book, for solutions proposed by other participants. That is wonderful.

So, you all are already putting in some of the practical recommendations that I hope to address in some of the future slides.

I will share some tips from our collective experience as presenters, and then hopefully we can address some more specific questions in the Q&A. So, on the lower end of participatory engagement, we can acquire feedback from community partners who serve the population of interest, or, from individual survivors, or groups of survivors.

As we have mentioned, this can happen through focus groups, forums, presentations, and that can be form any aspect of the research process. You can establish an advisory Board, and again that can be an individual survivors, or survivors who are part of one particular community, or organization. You can conduct cognitive interviews with survivors and advocates, to evaluate measures and procedures, particularly for cultural relevance, and for Language Justice, as someone mentioned earlier.

That translation is not just about words, but concepts, constructs, and cultural meaning. Next slide, please. I want us to note that in that lower level, researchers are still the ones holding the power and control. Which I hope is salient for us in the gender-based violence research field. Or just field.

To move closer to a higher level of participatory engagement, some tips include, engaging survivors to support with recruitment. Training them to contribute to data collection and analysis. Or, collaborating with survivors to establish recommendations in response to study findings.

You will note on the slide, that I have's item Adams and colleagues. They came up with expectations to change process, and there is a paper outlining where you have a study findings, and survivors can select the ones that are most salient. And establish what kind of recommendations and action projects should be done in response to those findings.

The picture can't be displayed.

NRC DV-National Resource Center on Domestic Violence (USNRCD1805A)

Next slide, please. Now, for the remainder of the time, I will be speaking, I am going to focus on how to increase our participatory engagement, to that higher level of the spectrum.

So, building relationships with survivors and community partners to collaboratively address an issue affecting the community. This requires prioritizing trust, with and among survivors and advocates along with researchers. We need to be prepared to share, transparently, all aspects of the study.

To receive feedback on any and all elements, including consent forms, mandatory reporting, and confidentiality procedures. Discussing our mutual expectations, capacities, interests, strengths and needs. Because, what survivors sometimes bring to the table may not be what researchers are entering in with. And as folks have noted in the chat, this can also contradict what funders are expecting from researchers. Particularly if funding was requested, or applied for before these relationships were developed. No problem, someone says that they have to leave, they have another meeting. Again, the recording will be available later. Thank you for letting us know, and thank you for joining. Also as researchers and evaluators who might be associated with institutions academic or otherwise, we are connected to resources and need to be creative around how we can leverage those resources to build the research capacities of survivors and advocates. To collaboratively identify what topics we work on and how.

From my experience developing an infrastructure for continuous feedback and relationship building is so critical.

It can include as simple as check ins at the start of every meeting that prioritize that humanity and lived experience of people the aunt just the work and labour.

It looks like collectively establishing group guidelines where we ask everyone in the room, researchers and community partners, what they need to be able to fully participate and contribute. How we will handle a conflict and how we would notice tension. Sharing facilitation meaning that researchers and evaluators aren't the only ones leading meetings that community partners are setting the agenda as well. Contributing their expertise, history, knowledge, information and contacts.

Another tip comes from one of our community partners is creating a feedback form. Groups move through different stages. There is the forming, storming, norming and I don't know who to site for that. In the beginning, relationships can go through a honeymoon stage and later on when conflict and tension arise it can be difficult to surface that if you hold less power in the group. Feedback forms allow for people to have time to reflect after a meeting or session and to share that information potentially anonymously so that feedback can be addressed for future meetings and sessions.

For the data collection and analysis process, we talked about as presenters, participants and researchers using in language concepts and codes particularly when doing qualitative analysis. Community activists have used retreats for collective sense making of data they have collected. Such as interviews with survivors. That survivors and advocates may have insights of those anticipated differences that can shape and create the lens that we take toward analysis.

Ultimately, community partners should be the ones setting the analytic frame. How should we interpret this information? How are we making sense of this? Recalling what was presented on earlier that there are different forms of evidence and different forms of naming making.

Lastly, in dissemination. Susan also touched upon this, that we need to critically examine dissemination processes. What information is shared? How is it shared? And to and by whom is it shared? We need to examine the power dynamics inherent in these dissemination processes. They carry a lot of power. What do funders ultimately find out about this topic? Addressing what someone shared earlier or ask, should we share more than what funders have assets for? I would say, that to a degree, of course it depends on specific project and context but generally, the two things I think are important are the frame of how we talk about these things so for example: when I did work with and academic researcher doing research on youth involved in the juvenile legal system, as foundational as language. Are we using terms like offenders and delinquents that are common in the academic literature and the layer to funders? Or are we simply reframing that kind of language and how we are presenting back our findings that these are youth, young people, these are youth involved or targeted by the legal system. I do think that sharing around those kinds of findings, is necessary in order to start raising awareness amongst funders and pushing them to consider how and why they should be funding more expensive work. This also ties to authorship and how people are credited and who leads the authorship. Whether it is writing and publication or image creation and presentations. And working in partnership with survivors and advocates to prioritize what information is shared. Is it being shared and culturally relevant and accessible ways that caters to the literacy levels of the community in context?

I would love to emphasize using design and technology for accessibility both in terms of language justice and in terms of disability justice. Sometimes findings have been released as video rather than our report. This does require consideration of resource allocation which can be more intensive particularly when funders and workplaces are emphasizing written products.

Some creative ideas that I think are worth noting include having a website where information is shared. Where community members can respond back to give feedback on the findings and to share actions that they are taking in response to the findings. I am thinking about different health surveys that have been done for LGBTQ youth and their creative ways in which even after the study was over, the findings were interacted with, action projects led to continued research and evaluation.

A last note, is to discuss safety and confidentiality. Even though in participatory engagement we want to ensure that we are sharing power and decision-making amongst researchers and community partners. There is also the concern that sometimes survivors do not want to be outed. Again engaging creativity in how to credit folks while also not necessarily outing them. We have discussed options like pseudonyms, incorporating people's affiliation with an advisory board rather than their personal job as a means of protection. Ultimately, drivers know what is best for them.

One other note I wanted to make before I forget, but I am already forgetting, is consensus decision-making. I didn't noted on the slide and I am happy to send a follow-up resource. You can Google that it is a form of decision-making that is different than democratic processes.

The picture can't be displayed.

NRC DV-National Resource Center on Domestic Violence (USNRCD1805A)

Democratic processes are majority rules. Depending on who is represented in the space and who is prioritized in the space it can represent in equitable power dynamics. A thumbs up can be used for support, a thumbs neutral means that I am not enthusiastic but I will not block the decision, or a thumbs down approach. That is even if one person is thumbs down to block a decision, then conversation must continue until compromise is reached. That is collective decision-making. It is just one model of sharing power.

So, I know that many of you are already invested in participatory engagement and it is new for others. I will say that there are some considerations to taking the next step and increasing participatory engagement. It includes what is the capacity of all the partners involved? Is there funding and compensation and are there opportunities and avenues to acquire that funding and compensation? To ensure equal compensation for labour distribution. What mechanisms allow for shared power and decision-making? Sometimes if we are part of a larger organization, we might share power with survivors and advocates but then there are folks above us who might trump or change what deliverables we produce which can still leave survivors feeling this empowered and over ridden. Skill building and sharing, we are not taught how to navigate conflict and how to facilitate meetings and develop relationships and trust. It is talked about but in terms of the practical elements, we have to be honest about our gaps and areas to build our own capacities in order to engage in this in a way that is authentic and sustainable. I will end on the next slide with sharing some questions like where can you increase participations and how are those most impacted being centred in the research process? If not, what shifts need to be made? How are resources and decision-making distributed? How can you transform power dynamics?

I will pass it back to Carrie to wrap us up. Thank you all so much.

DR CARRIE LIPPY:

Thank you so much. We are running low on time so I will go through this quickly. I will say that we have compiled some research and evaluation resources. They include resources that are available in English and Spanish including the National Latina network and the community toolbox. As well as research resources available in English only which is the CBPR toolkit, the introduction to research justice which we mentioned earlier, the DV evidence project and the CDC's understanding evidence framework that I presented earlier.

Also, some additional anguish justice resources that are available in English and Spanish include the Centre for participatory change, antenna and ones that are available only in English are the Highlander Centre. All of these links will be sent to you in the slides that will be sent later. You will have access to those.

I want to say quickly that this presentation was made possible through funding by the Administration on children youth and families. The views and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of our funding agencies.

And we have about two minutes for questions. I don't know if it makes sense to try to cover those quickly or if you have other things for us... That are needed for closing? Can you go to the next slide as well.

The picture can't be displayed.

NRCDV-National Resource Center on Domestic Violence (USNRCD1805A)

These, this is our contact information for us should you want to reach out.

IVONNE ORTIZ:

What I can suggest is that although we have all of your questions and we shared them with our presenters, you can also add your question to the survey that will be prompted at the end of this presentation. I am the one that gets all that feedback so I will be sure to send that information to the presenters. So we can keep in contact. As was mentioned before you will receive a copy of this presentation and the resources that were mentioned, the PowerPoint presentation, the recording of the webinar and thank you, thank you so much it was an amazing presentation. She will be putting that information in the chat. That is all the time that we have so thank you to carry, Susan, and Selima for a great presentation. It was great information. Thank you to our participants who were so engaged. I also want to thank and give thanks to our ASL interpreters, and our Spanish interpreters and our captioner's and all of the team that have made this webinar possible. Please follow us on social media and let's continue the conversation. Any last thoughts? Anything you want to share with our friends?

SPEAKER:

Thank you so much! Thank you for participating and being here today I really appreciate it.

IVONNE ORTIZ:

Thank you everybody.

Live Captioning by Ai-Media