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>> KATHLEEN MURPHY: I'm here with Lisa Lachance MPA, PhD candidate. They are a managing director of solutions for kids in pain and also president of Wisdom2Action limited. Those URLs if you're curious are kidsinpain.ca. And Wisdom2Action. They're a doctoral candidate at the university focusing on collaboration between mental health services and the youth serving nonprofit sector to improve youth mental health. Their PhD will add to other degrees to public administration and international development studies. Lisa's professional experience includes time working for the Canadian international development agency, CIDA and a stint as director of policy at the Nova Scotia department of finance. We have a very broad background to benefit from today. We really appreciate it.

Lisa's presentation today is about the power of engagement, community-based organizations and knowledge mobilization. Ms. Lachance, are you ready to start?

>> LISA LACHANCE: I am, thank you. Great. Thanks so much for the introduction, and I honestly think Jon's presentation couldn't be more perfect in terms of setting out some of the thinking around our work at Wisdom2Action. I hope people will see some of the themes as we go through the presentation come to light.

>> LISA LACHANCE: So, I'm going to share the Wisdom2Action story with you today. I'm hoping that it will draw upon the conversations about engaging youth and communities and multi directional methods of knowledge translation that started with Jon's presentation.

So, I'll give you a sense of our original structure. So, we were funded and founded by the networks of centers of excellence which is a government of Canada funding organization. Through their knowledge utilization program in oh 2011. And over the first four years and in the renewal, we had funding of $2.8 Canadian over seven years. Our mandate is to support was to support the mental health and wellbeing of children and youth in challenging contexts. We took some time to think about what that means because obviously that's a pretty broad mandate and how could we make a difference and where do we need to focus and where are some of the knowledge needs many terms of supporting young people in particular marginalized young people in vulnerable communities. We developed our mission to focus on the youth serving sector. You see it there in front of you. Over time we built a network over 250 members from every pro Vince and territory in Canada. I saw in the chat we have a lot of Canadians online today. So that's great.

We also have dozens of international members as well. And we built ourselves as a cross sectoral and interdisciplinary network including researchers, community-based service providers, educators, healthcare professionals, and youth.

So, I just wanted to start to help ground our discussion and why we felt focusing on the youth serving sector with mental health was really important. So, this is a photo from an Inuit youth land and culture camp my son attended a couple years ago. This was the program tent where I always say all the magic happens. So, activities like making seal skin mitts, getting ready to go out to fish or snare as well as having presentations from service providers on sexual health, climate change, and food insecurity in the north. And this was clearly a transformative experience for my son and for the people that he was with.

So, here's a program that clearly contribute to individual as well as collective mental health. But yet, you know, it was not part of the mental health treatment plan that we had ongoing for him here in Halifax. While, of course, the mental health professionals we saw were pleased that this was happening, it wasn't planned for. It hadn't been identified as part of perhaps what he needed, and in terms of follow up, again, it was, you know politely acknowledged but not part of the ongoing treatment and planning. Yet we do have growing evidence around the value of land-based programming for indigenous young people. We know these types of programs had help young people build their wellbeing and resilience. We wanted to see how the community-based service providers who are doing this type of work can better connect with the mental health system.

So, this picture helps me ground in that type of perspective.

So, our knowledge approach so we had a look a number of the different kind of KT and KMB. It's Canadian term when I say knowledge mobilization, I'm mostly referring synonymously with knowledge translation. And we chose the action on services model for a couple reasons. One is seemed like it was one that was pretty easy or easier to explain to community service providers in terms of having three main components gathering the evidence, contextualizing the evidence and we could see how our work in the knowledge mobilization network would fit in those three categories. We started with a perspective that we valued the research. We also value the practice-based evidence. And wanting to strengthen the evidence-based practice through evaluation, evidence and engagement. We have use participatory youth engaged methods and really been grounded in principles of anti-oppression, equity, and positive youth development So looking at some of the barriers and facilitators to the community-based sector will perhaps explain how we built and developed our different projects. In terms of barriers, staff time and available resources are a huge barrier. As you know in the community-based sector people are responding to the needs of the clients that are coming in the door or connecting with them other ways. And at the same time funding is both limited for the actual programs and often has very little it offers very little capacity project or knowledge translation in itself is project based and doesn't add to operational capacity. Staff often don't have the capacity to access evidence. If they do, it's perhaps, first of all you can't access journals if you're not aligned with the university. And then being able to take the evidence that they might find and understand how it might fit in their own context or own organization is challenging. Evidence based practices are considered not relevant they focus on one issue; they're not based on a particular context. They don't necessarily have the ability to be tested in different contexts and the lack of learning networks. All of this is interrelated. If you don't have funding that provides for the building of learning networks, then it's hard to establish them.

But obviously there are some core facilitators. One is a deep understanding of the youth. I should probably add their context and community and a passion and dedication of doing better and to improving of the mental health of wellbeing of young people.

So, I'll talk through a bit about how we approach these three categories that we use guided by the Paris framework. The first is gathering evidence. So, we produced a knowledge a number of knowledge synthesis reports. While this is a fairly common KT tool for a lot of researchers, I think the way in which we developed these was quite unique. First of all, the questions were actually generated by our networks. So, we did the first three through a Delphi process and the then next four built from that. These were questions coming from service community providers and youth and researchers who were part of our network.

Each knowledge synthesis report was developed by a researcher by a community-based service provider and by a young person as well. In our network we worked hard to connect with young people who were multiple service users who had lived experience of the types of services, so maybe not the typical youth that might be engaged and certainly not typical young people who might become research assistants that sort of thing.

So together we provided staff support for those three usually three authors to develop the report. And when I first joined the network, actually the first three were done. They were all over 100 pages and from being involved in a lot of nonprofit organizations and also from working in government, you know, I looked to this and thought, no one's going to read this. This is so important information, but 100 pages is not what government policy folks tend to read and not what community service providers are able to read. So we developed summary documents and also developed policy checklists so people could literally pick up the policy checklist which ran two pages for each report and trust that it was based on good solid evidence and be able to guide their thinking about programming and structure based on those checklists we almost met with service providers four times in the development of them. So, we met to confirm the questions. We met with initial findings. We presented the draft report to the group, and then finally we did talk about their KT needs. We also did youth workshops with every report to test the findings that were coming forward and developed a number of videos.

So, we really tried to take, you know, a basic sort of knowledge synthesis approach and then really add to it. I should say too in our knowledge synthesis we looked at research evidence but also program evidence. So, we did do a lot of searching into the research as well.

We had a number of knowledge mobilization innovation grants. Firstly, the project that developed these included staff, researchers, and also youth who helped developed the criteria that reflected the W 2A principles such as youth engagement. These were designed to be small grants. These were about $7,000 Canadian to support the projects that either was an organization to share promising practice or for researchers who had obviously really done already the research but had something they wanted to share or deepen their community connection.

And then we also want in all that we were learning about how to do community-based knowledge mobilization we really wanted to make sure that we were also engaging graduate students in our work. So, we wanted to make sure that the next generation of researchers was learning along with us about how to do community-based knowledge mobilization. In this case we added an honorary to support graduate students in evaluation. I don't have time to go through all the projects we funded. We funded about 15. And I would say that drawing on some of Jon's presentation, so there were a number of videos that were made. We support a project in (?) a researcher who did a lot of work around sort of cultural learning being passed from elders to young people. One of the things they wanted was to develop some books so that's particularly something elders would have photos of their time together for their own use.

So, we did some of that work. We worked with mind your mind they developed a workshop of youth to affect our knowledge synthesis reports and they all produced scenes looking at technology and mental health. And the graduate student who did the evaluation and presented the evaluation in graphic novel format. So that just gives you a flavor of some of the things that organizations did and really I think one of the other things that struck me was that that little that microgrant, it was a very micro, microgrant actually seemed to provide for some transformative change for organizations and for researchers. It was sort of just enough to really provide support for something new.

So, then we also thought so then how do you contextualize the knowledge? For example, in the knowledge synthesis report, that's great. We did lots and lots of things and probably lots of different formats, but then how do you really share it in community and share it in a way that people get to test some of the ideas? They get to think about what's being put forward and then connect with others and sort of integrate into practice ideas. So, I'll tell you a bit about how we've done that.

And then mainly we did this through a series of knowledge community knowledge sharing events which are also called Wisdom2Action events. We called the events Wisdom2Action before we called ourselves Wisdom2Action. And that name was chosen purposely with the idea that everyone has wisdom to share. Again, our aim with these events with as to develop cross sectoral interdisciplinary youth engaged spaces.

We did that in a number of ways. We always had a participatory planning team that helped us develop the purpose for the event and guide in terms of everything from where is the best location to have this event in this community to really helping us with a snowball invitation approach to make sure we were really reaching into community. And I think that was really important for community service providers in particular because they were hearing from their pierce that maybe what was happening was a little bit different than the average conference. If they were thinking about the pressures on their own time and resources, they would, you know, maybe be able to see if this event might make sense for them.

And in terms of different types of learning, so most of the days are spent in small group discussions, and we moved people through sort of a series of discussions that help provide a lot of information. So, we often replace, for instance, a typical panel discussion with the world cafe sort of style. And instead of a concurrent session approach, we used something called open space where actually people build that part of the agenda together in the room. And offer to host conversations on questions they may have or projects they may want to share or project questions they have.

So, I'm going to run through a couple more slides and then show you a video because I think to get a sense of what these look like is to see some videos. So, I'll go through the next slide.

So, for February of 2018 we hosted an event in Vancouver Canada called Embrace Life. This was focused on youth led suicide prevention. To back up we had a youth advisory council and we had a number of members who were working in suicide prevention. They were interested in finding a way in our network to do some work around that issue. There's a lot of work happening in suicide prevention and we spent time looking at what our added value and that's where with our commitment to youth engagement felt like looking at how youth are engaged in this issue would be consistent and not happening in other spaces again, we had a participatory planning team that included youth, service providers, healthcare professionals, government officials, researchers, we did a literature review that looked at the research evidence and we spent a lot of time deep diving into the gray literature and we looked at 50 programs that were youth led or youth engaged suicide prevention. It was gathering the knowledge. If I can go to the next slide, and then we had our community knowledge sharing event.

So, the group you see pictured there is most of our youth team. Wisdom2Action model was developing a youth team that leads the design of the day and then we offer training and support for the youth team to host the event. So, this is a really diverse group. As you can see, high school graduate and undergraduate students, some service providers, young people who had started programs in this area while they were students or were living in their community. They have a lot of experience in indigenous communities. We had First Nations in Inuit youth who were part of this team. They have a lot of experience with mental health or surviving suicide or connected through their community. So, we're a national group. Canada's a big country, as you know. We were connecting online prior to the event to do the design and start capacity building.

We spent the day together before the event started as a youth planning day. Interestingly they developed we had metal support and elders at the event. They did their own support model as well as what they wanted to roll out.

Then to Embrace Life. I'll run through the slide and we can watch the video. So, we because we had done that knowledge literature review. We had talked to a lot of our participants prior to the event. So, we really went in with some ideas of key themes of what works in terms of youth lead suicide prevention. At the event and following the event we developed a prototype for a youth engaged suicide prevention model for rural, remote First Nations community. I would say we worked together collaboratively for a couple funding applications. We're not quite there yet. But I think to think about how we can take what we're learning and facilitate the uptake into community, developing a project model and trying to support communities to find funding seemed to be a really important step.

(Video Playing)

>> So, this the youth host.

(Music)

(Video captioned)

>> We gathered two days on the territory of the coast people and we were gainful to do that on these territories and to have first nation communities and indigenous youth come all across Canada. We had front line support workers. We have people from the ministry I have education. It's been really amazing. It's awesome to see the collaborative effort from everyone from diverse backgrounds and communities. The objectives to were to share practices in suicide prevention. We connected and felt support and built relationship with each other. We did this through activities like open space where the participators get to choose what they want to talk about and anyone can join the conversation and fishbowl where you get to observe a conversation in a big circle and listen and feel heard. Cafe that were predetermined questions. It's having a conversation about those questions and presentations from all kinds of organizations. We had jack.org and we had the Red Cross giving a presentation. Michael talked about his experience as a children's author with indigenous topics and also the youth association who danced and sang and played music for us.

So, yeah, it was just an amazing event to be part of.

>> LISA LACHANCE: Great. So, thanks for sharing that. I should say I couldn't remember if Dana talked about the facts these presentations were actually PechaKucha presentations. So, looking back to Jon's presentation earlier, that is a format that we have often used in events. And have found it to work really well. I will say as well we have sometimes sort of taken that format and worked a little bit with it. I sometimes worry when people take a facilitation approach and tried to adjust it or riff of it ask make sure you get to the outcomes you wanted.

But one of the things that we have heard from young people with anxiety is that PechaKucha can sometimes can be really difficult because of the pressure and the slides are changing. At the same time, it's always been interesting to work with researchers to develop them. So, if you go on our website on the events section, you'll see a lot of our events listed there.

We did one, an event called from trauma to resilience, that was building on a research project on preventing sexual violence with a particular focus on young men. So that really was one that was an event that grew from researchers. Community engagement but researchers nonetheless and then became a community event. So, working with researchers to develop PechaKuchas often sometimes there is some concern or even perhaps resistance in terms of trying to boil things down to the six minutes and 40 seconds and not to be using slides with words and that sort of thing. I would say consistently the feedback from researchers have been that they really enjoyed the format and they felt they were able to get everything across that they wanted to get across. They also get feedback at the event from folks who listen to their presentation and were able to reflect back what they had heard and said. So that is a format that we have used before.

And so, I should say that we've done lots and lots of evaluations. One of the things we do is support people to do investigations and organization to develop their evaluation skills. We have done a number of evaluations and we've done a lot of Wisdom2Action events evaluations. We do an immediate post event and one at the event. I should have included that we use often a very visual evaluation. I can send this along to the conference organizers to post in the resource center. And then sometimes we do the more traditional evaluation. Really what we want to know is, you know, thinking through how we measured knowledge translation impact. At this point immediate post event, do you feel are you reporting an increased knowledge or increased connections or new connections. Then we also people to reflect on the youth engagement component and the facilitation methods.

And then for our first few years we followed up with a six- and 12-month evaluation. There we really wanted to see did you take that new knowledge and make a change? Those new connections, did they result in a program or policy change? We looked for stories around service partnership and change. We regularly had organizations come to an event in their own community and not know about each other and realized they were serving the same groups of young people. And we're probably overlapping in some way shape or form. We've had organizations that learn about new frameworks they've adopted. There's been new academic partnerships, whether that's researchers and community-based organizations being able to partner together or we've also connected graduate students with more established researchers to form partnerships.

All right. And so that final if you recall I talked about the Paris model so gathering the evidence, contextualizing the evidence and how to facilitate the evidence.

I will say this piece is really important because, you know, often when people consult with us around knowledge mobilization or knowledge translation, they talk about great ideas like building a website or a tool kit. My concern always with things like that is, you know, in knowledge translation you can build it and you can put it on line and particularly in community service providers, they can download it and still the barriers remain in terms of time and resources and networks to actually use what you're offering.

And so, with that in mind, I offered the example of the KMb innovation and microgrants earlier. Through that what we started to realize too is that what people also needed was support and coaching or mentoring. So, we launched a knowledge mobilization and evaluation mentoring program that ran for three years from two 2016 to 2020. Our second round of funding we had a regional hub structure. So, we had folks from the center of excellence in child and youth metal. And the (French) in Montreal and then the research center join us as our regional hubs and they were able to bring a lot of experience in community coaching and mentorship like we wanted to so they were well experienced working with community organizations to help them implement a new practice or learn more about evaluation or about knowledge mobilization.

Today we did build a tool kit, but we didn't leave it there. This is where the mentoring program came in. We wanted to help people learn how to use what was in the tool kit. We had an application process whereby community organizations could review the tool kit and identify where they wanted to increase their knowledge mobilization or evaluation capacity. And then we worked together over the course of a year. So, we had a one-year work plan we had 100 hours of mentoring for folks. And it was a really important process. We have evaluated that initiative. And people have reported, you know, really positive outcomes are it that.

That gets to some of the evaluation. I think these are really important learnings for thinking about doing community-based knowledge mobilization.

So, this was interesting because we chose the word mentoring as opposed to coaching because we felt it really reflected the co learning that we wanted to achieve. So, while it was an organizational mentoring program, we still saw relationships were super important, the relationships between the people in the mentoring relationship as well as the organizations.

We know that it was super important to have a strong understanding of context and also have a responsive and adaptive work planning approach. So, thinking about community-based organizations and some of the barriers and facilitators identified earlier, things change and priorities change, funding changes for community-based organizations, the needs of their clients are shaped by what people want to be working on. So, while we established those work plans, we found that we really had to be constantly reassessing them and updating them as the year went on.

Certainly, there was a temptation to sometimes almost a demand from our partners to sort of move from mentoring into doing or managing. So that was really important to be aware of that and to think about, you know, it was often a fine balance in terms of walking alongside organizations or knowing what piece of work was important to undertake.

And then I guess the other challenge was just staying connected. So, again, thinking about some of the barriers to knowledge mobilization for community service providers, you know, how can we best support organizations when they're providing critical services for young people and often facing, you know, client crisis, funding crises and how to stay best connect them.

And I just wanted to say I think I'm ending off my presentation talking a bit about our commitment to youth engagement and why we felt that was really important. So, we did all of our work from a youth engaged perspective. Young people were on our board. We had a youth advisory committee. As I talk through our various projects and programs, young people were involved every step of the way. I should say actually going back to the mentoring program, the number of our projects were on youth engagement and we had youth lead or support a number of those mentoring relationships as well.

So, especially since we were doing a lot of training and supporting organizations around youth engagement, we thought it was really important to do our own evaluation of our practice and so we undertook a participatory evaluation of our youth advisory function. And so, I think you can see there the quote that every engagement is where everyone including professionals feel they've engaged from the experience. Young people reported that they were interested in becoming involved with a knowledge mobilization network, for instance, because it gave them a chance to address sectoral level issues. It's a chance from going beyond service to service and doing advocacy to actually recommending changes at an assistance level.

Our youth advisors serve three different ways. One as, as you can see, collaborators and partners. They're often involved in lots of different projects in the youth serving sector and youth mental health sector. Most of them saw themselves as moving into the mental health sector as professionals. So, they saw themselves in that role. And they also continued to see themselves as youth. So, they were youth with mostly lived experience as the youth serving sector. So we reported that the benefits are mutual and they also reported that while they could understand their impact on the organization and they could see their impact in various different projects but what they needed to understand more was at a sectoral level. That's often a challenge when thinking about evaluating knowledge translation in general is keeping track of those bigger systems changes.

So, they developed a theory of change. So stronger youth advisors results in a stronger youth serving sector that improves youth wellbeing. The students I really loved this perspective and had seen over six years how that was being implemented.

So I think overall in terms of the network, I think we really saw that by taking an approach that valued the academic and practice based evidence, it really shook up some of that language that's often used in knowledge translation around there being knowledge producers which is thought of as researchers and knowledge users which is thought of as government, services, and, you know, people using programs or services. So, in this case youth themselves. And started to move people around. So, if we were thinking about what strengthened the practice-based evidence by using more evaluation, that could turn service users to service producers. By valuing the lived experience, that took them from youth to knowledge producers. When we welcomed researchers to our Wisdom2Action events and said that like most of the time we didn't do a lot of presentations, so like, please come, because of your interest and expertise in this area, but participating as equal partners in small group discussions. I think there's a lot of value in those shifting roles.

I think that we had an approach to knowledge mobilization that tried to account for the common internal external barriers of community-based organizations. We had an approach that was quite responsive in ourselves in terms of growing and developing our practice based on evaluation, based on what we saw happening elsewhere in the sector and really integrating youth voice in terms of our approach and our projects.

I really do think principles matter. So, you know, whether it's working on report or an event, being clear of what your organizational principles is super helpful. For us having a clear commitment, for instance, to youth engagement really shaped who we partnered with in how we did the work that we did and obviously the need to plan for and fund. In our case we were lucky to have funding that allowed us to do that. I think knowledge mobilization is really important because we could keep producing the same products. We could keep trying to reach the same stakeholders, but unless we know if it's working, we don't know if we're having an impact.

So, as I noted, we were funded by the Canadian government for our first few years of operation. Then as an organization, we actually incorporated as a social enterprise in February 2018. What that means is we do offer services for a fee to organizations that are able to provide that funding. But we also work with organizations who aren't able to access evaluations or other of evidence to support. This year we've been working with an organization called family SOS and supporting them in evaluation and curriculum development.

So those are our services. We remain committed to community impact. You can reach me at that email and our website has tons of information on it. Like I said, the events page, you can go there and look at some of our event reports on a range of issues in different communities as well as videos. We also do a YouTube channel. We'll have some examples of our PechaKucha presentations if you want to have a look at them. Thanks. Now we can turn to questions.

>> KATHLEEN MURPHY: Wonderful. Thank you so much, Lisa. And you can go ahead and turn on your video now. So, everyone can see you. We're going to be joined again by Jess Chaiken and Lauren Polvere. I don't see Lauren. Hang on. Okay. There you are. Okay. So, this is a tiny point of clarification, Lisa, and a boring way of discussion. But before I forget, is there a difference between a social surprise and what weld call in the US a nonprofit or other countries call civil society or community based organization. Is that something specific?

>> LISA LACHANCE: So, we there is a difference. So, we aren't incorporated as a nonprofit. So basically, there's different legislation in different parts of Canada, so continue the not exciting way to start the questioning period. You essentially incorporate as a business, but then have a commitment to, I guess, contributing to different areas of community development. In our case it's working with organizations who couldn't otherwise access those services.

>> KATHLEEN MURPHY: Okay. Thanks. I was just curious because it is interesting from the perspective of where is there going to be evidence pushed out or knowledge translation, knowledge mobilization activity happening. We tend to think it's like at organizations like national institutes for research or university-based centers but obviously there is an important role that other entities or medium such as yourselves can set up as individuals. And I did also just kind of a housekeeping point of clarification, we have a very efficient staff here at KTDRR who put together this conference, and as all the presenters know, we require that they submit things fairly early and life does happen. So, Lisa is no longer with kids in pain. That's a correction to my introduction of them.

Okay. So on to things that are a little juicier, Jess Chaiken, you mentioned well, you can talk about your own comment, right, about diverse participation.

>> JESSICA CHAIKEN: Sure. I noticed you certainly pointed out just how diverse your groups were that participated in all of these different events. How do you facilitate the conversations within those groups without letting sort of the dominant group center the conversation on themselves? How do you keep the voices from those underrepresented groups floating to the top of the conversation? You mentioned how some of the participants in their evaluation they reported they felt heard. And you saw that in the interactions. So how do you keep the conversations going without letting those of us who think know better take over the conversations?

>> LISA LACHANCE: So, I think it starts from really, from the get go. I mentioned that we always have a participatory planning team around our events in particular. I can start with that as an example. So, from the very beginning, we're inviting people to a conversation about project or an event and that includes the researchers, the government officials, the service providers, and the young people. And so that sort of creates the groundwork for a team of people who are involved in understand the principles behind the work and confirm the objectives. So, part of it's like confirming the purpose of the event or project. And then that kind of gets reflected out throughout how we communicate. In terms of events we always send out a welcome letter in advance that tries to start identifying sort of what people can expect because often people have referred to our approach as unconference, I don't think totally it is. We often don't send out event agendas for instance, so we need to prep people for what they're walking to and we talk about the youth team and that sort of thing.

Especially have youth teams lead the events that starts to center a diverse voice. So, an ideal event is often that I'm not doing a lot of active facilitation. I'm there. I can provide support. We've also developed a model. We often have youth who have a vast range of experience in engagement and facilitation who actually support the youth team. So, I'm even like one step further removed as sort of the adult in the room.

So, I think all of that sort of helps to set the stage. We're not just saying we want youth engaged. We're walking the walk. And then I talked about the idea that we have these principles and that they really matter. Actually, within our events, each section, each sort of activity, whether it's an open circle or the world cafe or open space actually has its own principles. We get explicit and saying if you're doing a world cafe and there are five people each person should be speaking one fifth of the time and look at how you can make connections and integrate information is really important. So, I think that's how we do it. We really demonstrate out in all of our communications what we're trying to do. And then really try to make that comfortable in the room for everyone attending. It's actually a very reflective process in terms of the youth host teams and within our organization. Did we really feel that everyone felt like they were able to participate in what we were seeing and what would we do differently the next time? I could talk about this all day actually. So, I'll stop there.

>> KATHLEEN MURPHY: So, Jess, we're going to turn the tables a little bit on kind of pose a version of that question to you, right. Your job is to stay connected to all, you know, 300 odd grantees of our funding agency, NIDILRR. So, I'm sure there are, I think, probably KTDRR is one of them frequent fliers who are always like, me, me, I want to be in the newsletter. How do you stay connected to all the grantees who may not be so vocal.

>> JESSICA CHAIKEN: We do some stalks; we go to their publication output through indexes with tables of contents. We also have several touch points throughout the year where we're actually reaching out to the principals and their staff to remind them we're here and what we do and get update on their latest activities, get our hands-on actual publications. We also have points throughout the year where we produce materials where we go to the grantees and engage them. We're working on this topic. What are you doing in this area? We summarize the research they're doing. We go back to them and have them review the summaries and make sure they're accurate and engaging. Once the product is finished, give it back to them and they can distribute it to their own networks. There's a budge bunch of ways we try to stay engaged. The NAR Tech Conference is the best example of that. They're sitting across the table from other grantees and talking and exchanging ideas.

>> KATHLEEN MURPHY: I mean as much as we love our online conference, it's nice to have face to face interactions as well.

So, Lauren, I'm thinking about you and the people that you've been super engaged with, it's one thing to want to draw out the kind of shy or reticent person. It's another thing when the story that is important to hear is actually traumatic to tell. So how do you sort of deal with equity in the fostering conversation and that issue?

>> LAUREN POLVERE: That's a really good question. I would say that for something like that I think it's really important to think about setting the stage for that in any conversations that are going to be held just talking about content and what could be raised to give people a sense of what's comfortable to share what they want to share but ways they can exit components of that that might not be comfortable for them. Consistent with Lisa's presentation, another point in which you can engage youth is setting those kind of parameters and setting parameters around how you can discuss those issues because I think sometimes the messaging coming from young people themselves is more powerful than the message of the researcher setting the stage for those parameters. It's yet another point to see if we can have members of participatory planning team weighing in on that as well.

>> LISA LACHANCE: If I can hop on, we think about safety and how to support people. A few steps we take so I mentioned the letter that goes out. We also speak to this point very early on in the process about the fact that it's while we're talking about incredibly sensitive and difficult topics that the focus really is on services and research questions rather than having a therapeutic space. At the same time, we always work with elders of the local community. So usually First Nations and Inuit elders who help us open properly and doing the land acknowledgment but also stay for the day. We always have professional mental health support. So those folks’ sort of pop up at the beginning and let people know who they are who can do a debrief with people as well.

Part of attracting diverse participants is also kind of concerning space and location, we work hard to be community spaces that feel comfortable for people. We actively try to avoid universities and hotels, for instance. And so that helps. But we often look for a space that offers a quiet space. We'll have our big room where we're doing the moving and discussing and have at least one quiet space where people can sort of chill out. I think the other thing that we do is that there is often a lot of talking at a participatory conference but because we have a lot of visuals happening. We work with a graphic facilitator so people can also take their breaks or express themselves in ways other than speaking.

>> KATHLEEN MURPHY: Interesting. I've never really thought about that, the importance of other modes of expression although that's partly what today is all about.

So, I think all of what we're talking about it's pretty hard to know when we're doing it well, particularly if there's a lack of self-awareness on the part of the organizers. So that points to the importance of evaluation that Terry Donovan was bringing up earlier in the conference. Terry, do you want to elaborate a little bit on how your center tries to evaluate the knowledge translation you do whether or not you're specifically evaluating stakeholder engagement?

>> TERRY DONOVAN: Sure. I had mentioned in the chat we, like many places, do a considerable amount of training and often have the evaluation right after the training. We began to rales that's all well and good but is anybody using any of this at all after we invest all this time, effort, et cetera. More in the last six months or so we started doing follow up surveys at 3, 6, and 9 months asking participants we'll break the training into modules if possible manageable asking are you using this, are you not using it? Maybe a couple open ended questions, is there a reason you're not using it? I can't tell you much because our response rate is not great, so we need to work on that. But it is a piece we think we need to keep doing, upon although it can be a little unnerving when you hear back, no, I'm not using it.

But that's a piece we've started. So, both in the initial evaluation but after the fact. Some of that will begin helping us perhaps even tailoring the original training piece in ways I think it goes to a lot of the presentation here so far about how do we connect people to the information in ways that they really want to use it more than just giving it to them like a PowerPoint slide. So, there's some pieces from today others have talked about it that we can implement in the ways that we're.

>> LISA LACHANCE: If I might add too, when we do the follow up evaluations, we definitely see a decrease in the response rate like radically that's who has a story they want to share and accept that. Obviously, we do lots of incentives so offering travel funding to our next events, what have you to try to get people to fill out the evaluation survey and try to make them as painless as possible. I definitely get your point I have had when there's been an incentive people felt like sharing their response. I have had a couple people I don't know if I'm using it yet, but I want to enter the draw for the next event. I think if they want to come back, that's an okay outcome as well.

But mostly I sort of think getting 10% of the initial responses by the end of the year, those are usually some pretty good stories.

>> KATHLEEN MURPHY: Thanks, Lisa. You know, we try in this conference to have it be a real mix of, you know, fun, let's look at this innovative strategy and demonstrations but also how would you implement that, how do you evaluate it. But in addition to those more pragmatic concerns, we also try to think about theories of knowledge translation.

So, you did mention, Lisa, that you used the Paris model. I know Joann wrote out the acronym for what that is. And we had asked Lauren to think a little bit about how how she contextualizes knowledge through online and in person event and the peer support model is it similar or different?

>> LAUREN POLVERE: Sure. So, I actually saw a lot of points of similarity, Lisa, as you were sharing, information about your process and what you have been working on. I think the participatory planning teams is really something that resonated with me that's worked well in a lot of the projects I've been involved in really ensuring that there's strong stakeholder engagement, youth engagement right up front so that's something that's co constructed not just pushing knowledge out but to construct and codevelop information and codevelop a process as well

I was also thinking about applications to my work when you suggested a tool kit and how that was a mechanism of continuing this work and pointing that information to people who could use it and monitoring and evaluating that as well in order to really see what's working well, what people were finding resonated with them. I think that's something I've done as well that's been very helpful.

I think for me listening to your presentation and just seeing in the slides the size of the groups and everything, I think the level of stakeholder engagement that you did in facilitation with those groups that is really something to see that adds tremendous promise. What was occurring to me when you develop groups of that size coming together, it can be really challenging from a facilitation perspective in terms of how that comes together and how you do that efficiently but also that must have been a setting where you could really energize people about that work so the youth working with their communities, just really seeing what the uptake possibilities could look like and the fact that people in other communities are engaged in the same sort of thing. That's something I'll take with me in just thinking about bringing something to scale in that sort of a way. I was yours looking at the size of those meetings what you found kind of challenging from a facilitation perspective and also if you saw any youth leaders really emerging from that? Because another component I was thinking it sounds like you took pains to make sure that it was a youth created approach. I could also see potential in terms of kind of moving toward a youth led approach where youth leaders could emerge in that setting and bring the ball forward even more. I would am interested to hear how that transpired.