

2023 KT Online Conference:

Rural Community Living Development (RCLD): Community-based participatory research with Rural Centers for Independent Living

and

Success and failure in disseminating a “publication snapshot”: Lessons learned from partnering with external organizations

Presenters:

Lillie Greiman, Rayna Sage, and Sequoia Commins
with
Krys Standley and Jeff Gutierrez

Sponsored by AIR’s Center on Knowledge Translation
Disability and Rehabilitation Research (KTDRR)

<https://ktdrr.org/conference2023/index.html>

Transcript for audio/video file on YouTube:

<https://youtu.be/2vtp-AMNsMI>

ASHLEY CLARK-PURNELL: So, for our panel, we have the Rural Community Living Development. And our first presentation is going to be on "Community-Based Participatory Research with Rural Centers for Independent Living." Our presenters for this panel are Lillie Greiman, Dr. Rayna Sage, and Ms. Sequoia Commins.

So Lillie is a project director at the Rural Institute for Inclusive Communities at the University of Montana, and Dr. Sage is a rural sociologist at the same university. Ms. Commins is an ILS site supervisor for Tri-County Independent Living, and has a passion for reaching underserved communities. So, with that being said, I am going to go ahead and hand it off to them, if you would come on camera and self-describe, please.

RAYNA SAGE: I'll go ahead and go first. Hi. Thanks, everybody, for coming, and this is Rayna Sage. And I am a white woman with dark, medium-length hair. And I'm in my office in Missoula, Montana.

LILLIE GREIMAN: And then I can go. So this is Lillie Greiman. I am also a white woman. I'm in my late thirties, wearing glasses, and I am presenting also from my office at the University of Montana.

SEQUOIA COMMINS: And this is Sequoia. I am a white-passing woman. And my pronouns are she/they. I have long auburn hair, I'm wearing a blue shirt, and I'm also presenting in my office, but in Crescent City, California.

LILLIE GREIMAN: And I think-- should-- I guess I'll get us going. Thank you, everyone, for joining us today for our presentation. And, right off the bat, I want to make sure that I do an acknowledgment that

this research has been funded by the National Institute on Disability, Independent Living, and Rehabilitation Research, like a lot of other research that has been presented today.

Oh, yeah, I can control the slides. I keep forgetting that. And we did this slide, I suppose, already-- a brief introduction. But-- I don't know-- I want to give us all an opportunity to share maybe a little bit more about ourselves and who we are and the work that we do.

So I'll get us going-- I'll start. Again, Lillie Greiman. I am a geographer by my academic background, but I am a lifelong Montanan and Montana resident, and really care and have a lot of family ties to rural communities throughout Montana. I also live with multiple chronic conditions, and I'm on my own disability journey. And so being here and being able to do this work is really wonderful and exciting for me.

SEQUOIA COMMINS: I guess I'll go next. So-- yeah-- also here again-- Sequoia Commins. And I have lived in Crescent City, California, which is the most northern-western part of California, for most of my life. It's a very rural community.

And growing up in that community and growing up as myself as someone with multiple disabilities, and my parents being people with multiple disabilities, gave me a very unique lived experience that's helped me a lot and has developed my passion for working with people and uplifting voices. And I'm so happy to be here today. Thank you so much.

RAYNA SAGE: And that leaves me. This is Rayna Sage. My pronouns are she/her. And I am academically trained in sociology, with a doctorate degree, but I grew up pretty poor in the Inland Northwest. My dad was a timber faller. And I've just always been passionate about rural equity and inclusion. And that's what has led me here. I also have my own personal and familial experiences with disability.

So I'm going to get us started, I think. Yeah. So I was just wanting to say that I'm really glad to hear folks in the earlier sessions talking so much about intersectionality. And-- because, in the United States and across the world, rural places have been both excluded from decision making and exploited for the benefit of urban centers. And, relatedly, most social justice movements, such as the disability rights and disability justice movements, have largely been centered in urban settings with urban-centric kinds of values.

So, when we think about involving rural people and disabled people in research, we have to really pay attention to the importance of factors that both disability-- to factors such as that "disability" and "rural" are both difficult to define and people come to the table talking about these with different values and different ideas and beliefs about what that means, and that they are both identities that are undervalued and under-resourced, and that this results in some shared and amplified experiences of marginalization and exclusion for these folks in these communities.

So one way to increase the odds-- I won't say that it will ensure, but to increase the odds of successfully addressing some of these issues faced by rural disabled people, is through community-based participatory research. And this strategy can help us-- as long as we're using a lens towards

acknowledging and addressing the past injustices and neglect that these folks have experienced from the academic institutions and research community, we can use these kinds of techniques to increase their voice and their power in the process.

And community-based participatory research functions along a spectrum of-- some projects are informed by community members with lived experience, some actually engage folks, and some are really participatory, with folks being co-researchers. And some are a combination of all, and also driven by the questions that happen in the field.

SEQUOIA COMMINS: So where I work-- it's for Center for Independent Living, which-- in the United States, that's-- Centers for Independent Living are community-based, cross-disability nonprofit organizations that are designed and operated by people with disabilities. So what that means is that we are mandated by law to have more than 51% of persons with disability or more on our staff so we continue to be a consumer-controlled organization.

And one of our driving forces is, we have the independent living philosophy, which I like to say in plain language as, the person who comes in-- the consumer, instead of a client-- the consumer is the person who drives their own ship. They're the captain of their own ship. And, as an Independent Living Center employee, I'm their first mate. I'm there to help them on their journey, whichever direction they want that journey to go.

So we provide five core services federally, and myself in California. We actually have two other core services that are funded through the State of California, but our five core services across the board are peer support, information and referral, individual and systems advocacy, independent living skills training, and transition, which can look like youth transitions into adulthood or transition and diversion out of institutional settings, commonly at our-- so that's most likely congregate settings or nursing homes.

Another thing that I'd like to point out is that, in a CIL, most or all of our services that we provide are all interconnected with the core services. So, even though we do have them parceled out, one belongs with all, if that makes sense. Today, there are more than 350 CILs serving hundreds of rural counties. CILs are a valuable member of the US Administration on Community Living's Aging and Disability Network, where we partner with senior social service or aging adult services.

LILLIE GREIMAN: And I'm going to try to go quick on this slide so we have time to talk about more interesting things. But this is Lillie, and I just want to share that the Research and Training Center on Disability in Rural Communities, where Rayna and I have a really long history of partnering and working with CILs, which has been really wonderful since the late '90s.

And it's really exciting to be able to come in and really benefit from those long-standing relationships and able to really do some of this on-the-ground, community-based work that we do. So I'm just going to do that quick, and I'm going to move on to the next slide to get into what we're doing.

RAYNA SAGE: Sorry. Great. On this-- this is Rayna again. On this slide is a logo of the program that we're going to be talking about that we developed with our CIL partners over the last four years to

address the need to support Centers for Independent Living staff in reaching rural communities that they serve.

We worked with several-- 15 to 30 centers so far on this grant, as well as the Association for Programs in Rural Independent Living, APRIL. And then this is housed in the Research and Training Center on Disability in Rural Communities.

So, again, this started in 2019. And we have used a collaborative approach with all of our partners to develop this Rural Outreach Curriculum and Peer Support Network-- is where we are at in this process in our-- we're in our fifth year of funding-- to identify what works and supports rural Centers for Independent Living and the consumers and communities that they work in.

So they-- the first-- so the-- here we go. Get my notes. So, to describe the process as succinctly as I can, for an entire year, we met weekly with seven Center for Independent Living staff skilled in rural outreach to decide on what kind of tools and systems that was needed to improve CIL rural outreach. Once our partners decided it should be some kind of curriculum or toolkit, we went into the work of defining and refining these topics through this iterative process we call participatory curriculum development.

And this resulted in an online outreach training that has five sections that support staff in how to get started, how to take action, and actually engage with folks you don't know in rural communities, how to keep the relationships going, and how to organize rural meetings. And it just has a lot of really great, rich material that was defined by and vetted by our partners.

And they are-- and really specific to rural places and people who may have experienced marginalization, exclusion, and exploitation, both at the individual and at the community level. And so what we found through this very iterative process is that, while the resource is amazing, it's not enough to create some kind of self-study. And, therefore, our partners helped us modify it to be used within a peer model-- peer support model, which is super well suited for independent living.

And so, in the second and third year, some of the original partners and new partners tested out the materials, setting rural outreach goals, engaging in peer support, and continued to provide us with feedback to further improve the curriculum. And, this last year, we were able to begin evaluating these efforts again using participatory methods.

[VIDEO PLAYBACK]

- This is a community event that we actually hosted at my office--

[END PLAYBACK]

LILLIE GREIMAN: Did I do that? Oh. [CHUCKLES] Oh. So this is Lillie again, and I wanted to talk about one of the participatory evaluations that we conducted with our partners. So we used a process called photovoice. And, actually, I am also going to look at some notes.

And photovoice is a process where you ask participants-- and, in this case, it was our original, our OG team of partners who helped us develop the curriculum-- about-- to take a series of photos that really represented the rural work that they do and what it means to provide rural independent living services.

And so, in the photovoice process, it involves asking our partners to take a series of photos that represent rural outreach to them, and then using their exact language and descriptions for the photos to communicate the meaning of rural independent living. We did this first. We had everyone take photos, and then we all got together collectively, looked at those photos, discussed them, and identified photos that were really meaningful, and then analyzed those to think about, well, what does rural independent living mean to you?

And what came out of it, then, is we were able to put it into what's called a story map. And I'll put the link. There's the link on the screen here, but I will put it in the chat also so that folks can check it out and see it. And it's a story map that highlights the results of our photovoice evaluation.

And something I think I wanted to highlight, and that's this audio clip here, is that the map was a really great way-- this tool, story mapping, was a great way to highlight not only the photos, but also integrate our partners' voices, in their own voices, describing why these photos matter and what rural independent living means to them. So, Ashley, now I think we can play the clip.

[VIDEO PLAYBACK]

- I was in charge of the fire pit, and we roasted marshmallows and those kinds of things. This is a community event that we-- this is a community--

[END PLAYBACK]

LILLIE GREIMAN: Oh, no.

ASHLEY CLARK-PURNELL: Sorry about that. Let's see. [CHUCKLES]

LILLIE GREIMAN: That's OK. We can just move on from it if that's-- for time's sake.

SEQUOIA COMMINS: And this is Sequoia here, and I was one of the participants for the photovoice evaluation and story map. And I have to--

[VIDEO PLAYBACK]

- --event that we actually hosted at my office. I was in charge of the fire pit, and we roasted marshmallows and those kinds of things. I just liked this one because it's bringing people from around the community together again in a way that they can just have a relaxed time.

[END PLAYBACK]

SEQUOIA COMMINS: So this is Sequoia here. And, as a participant of the story-- the photovoice evaluation and story map-- something that I found really inspiring and empowering is that all of these wonderful CILs from around the country-- we came together in sometimes-- in a rural area, as Rayna talked about, the marginalization-- you feel isolation. You feel like these problems are unique to your setting sometimes, especially if this is just the community you've lived in most of your life. [CHUCKLES] And you feel like an island.

And, after being able to connect to this peer mentor network, and especially seeing the actual data of our qualitative narrative of what's happening in our-- what rural outreach is to us-- if you click on the photovoice evaluation, you'll see that Lillie and Rayna did a wonderful job in picking out common themes in what we were discussing. And that really empowered me. And I didn't-- and the fact that this is actually something that is not unique.

While we have our different flavors and our different rural communities, I know that if-- I can talk to someone across the country about an issue that I'm having, a challenge, a barrier, a loss of what to do next, and they've probably been in a similar situation before. And it immediately increased my confidence and my network, which was fantastic for me as a participant.

LILLIE GREIMAN: I feel like you set us up so perfectly for this slide. It's about your network.

SEQUOIA COMMINS: [LAUGHS]

LILLIE GREIMAN: Yes. Maybe that was planned-- no.

SEQUOIA COMMINS: I was trying. [LAUGHS]

LILLIE GREIMAN: So-- and I should have noted that this project was hugely impacted by COVID. We had originally planned to be in community, going to 15 to 20 communities and learning what people are doing on the ground, and then taking that information and creating something from that. And what happened was we got funded, and COVID hit, so that that was no longer a possibility.

So we had to pivot on this project all the time. So one of the things we pivoted was-- because we couldn't be in community, and we had this great network of folks and a lot of travel money in our grant, we brought the folks that-- the new and the original folks that helped us develop the curriculum to Missoula, Montana for a two-day meeting.

And one of the participatory processes that we engaged in-- and this is a photo of the entire team in the room that we engaged in this process-- is ripple effects mapping. And this is an evaluation tool that can help groups and communities identify both expected and unexpected outcomes of engaging in a process or a program.

And so, in the picture, there's a group of, I think, about 15 to 20 folks standing in front of a piece of white paper that has a bunch of writing on it. And they are all posing and smiling at the computer, or at the

camera. And what this process-- what you do during this process is you have somebody facilitating, where you start with, OK, what happened when you joined this program? What was the next thing?

And then-- and how do we evaluate-- how do we evaluate how that-- and then, during the same time, someone is taking notes in a software called Xmind. And it's just a word cloud-- not a-- mapping-- a concept mapping software that you can use. And you can make all of these little branches, and it creates this whole big map, which is what's in the image in the corner. And we then took all of that information, and we're still in the process of identifying themes.

But what we know so far is that engaging in this peer mentoring program mainly increased what we call human capital through building new skills, knowledge, and confidence, and also social capital through new relationships that have led to a number of other types of assets or capital, such as cultural capital when improving-- and the emphasis and value of rural outreach in organizations and in the disability community.

SEQUOIA COMMINS: And this--

SEQUOIA COMMINS: That's OK. So this is Sequoia. And some of the things that I also would like to talk about as a participant was, I agree that, definitely, the human capital was huge. Just a simple example is that, even though I do not work with youth, as a site supervisor, I do the onboarding for our CIL.

And I was able to connect to this great, great person on the other side of-- I'm on the left side of the photo, and he's on the right side of the photo. His name is Chris. And he gave me such a huge insight on how to assist other people at my CIL that we were able to take a huge pivot at our CIL and increase the service delivery and the quality of our services available for the youth department, just as a small example.

LILLIE GREIMAN: And this is Lillie. And I'll say that, yeah, this tool is really amazing. And maybe we can put the link to some more resources. And we have a-- I think folks will have access to these slides after, and we have some references at the end, in terms of really being able to understand these downstream effects of what you do.

And it was really, really amazing to be able to collect this information and then visualize it in a way that really shows that, yeah, one conversation can actually lead to a whole lot. And it's hard. We don't always-- we struggle sometimes to capture that.

And this is a really wonderful tool that allows you to capture that information and visualize it and then reinforce that confidence-- like, look, this work that we're doing is really making a difference. And there's something so powerful in being able to do that.

Oh-- getting very click happy, I think, with-- so we have here our last slide, which is just some brainstorming and thinking about some takeaways and lessons learned from this process. And I think

we've been sharing that. Sequoia just shared a little bit, and we can have a little bit more on that, but really thinking about, what were some of the hot tips that we learned, and, really, that it was these partner-driven elements-- that we-- I love the ship analogy so much, Sequoia.

And so I'm just-- I'm going to steal it now. And, thinking about that, I think navigating that a little bit with us is like-- the research team is always tricky because it's like we-- but I think it was important for us to let go of the idea that it was our ship or that we were navigating-- or maybe navigating that hierarchy a little, where we're all rowing together-- kind of a situation.

And I think that could be hard because we're navigating grant expectations and deliverables. But I feel like we were able to just, through the commitment to flexibility and understanding, really figure out what worked and what we needed to do.

SEQUOIA COMMINS: Yeah. So this is Sequoia. And, as a participant, what I'd like to bring-- what brings me to mind with that is that, even though you do have those grant requirements, I loved the fact that you and Rayna were curious. You were curious, and then that led to increased creativity.

So give yourself a pat on the back for that, because you're having people, like I said, from all over the country. I'm on the West Coast. You have a lot of people from the East Coast and Middle America and-- so we're coming from all over. And we're also-- I'd like to say-- is that this team was built-- was made of people who-- yes, we all worked at Independent Living Centers.

But we're at different parts of the organizational hierarchy. We're in different departments, which was absolutely a plus. It was a boon to the amount of feedback, networking, and, again, creativity that came out of this research.

So, as I'm saying with my own ripple effects, as someone who was able to do this community participatory-based research-- the ripple effects that came back to my community, besides the personal value that I took from it, and professional value, the ripple effects that came back to my community was-- I was able to have backbone, research, and evidence for the ideas and strategies that I had created, and created with the people in the peer mentor network.

So, as someone who's new coming into the Independent Living Center realm, I need to have those things in my toolkit to-- it's helped me-- the people who I've discussed things with have helped me realize I need to ask for funding, and this is how you do it. This is how you reach a certain demographic. This is how you do a community listening session-- a socialization.

In a previous slide, we had talked about Hank's version of the story map, which involves a picture of doing marshmallows on a street. And now I've done two street events, and they've been wildly successful, and it's been a great tool. It's also created a lot of discussion and feedback in my own CIL because I am-- technically, I'm a satellite office.

So there also is other cultural things to jump within my own CIL. And, definitely, being a part of this-- the ripple effects of all of these wonderful minds in one room working together on a common goal has just blossomed and expanded what we do as a CIL here. And I just want to say thank you so much on that.

RAYNA SAGE: Everything that just was said is amazing. And I also just want to note that we are community-based researchers. And we like to err on the side of transparency. And so, on this slide, you can see some of our commentary to ourselves because we didn't quite catch that.

But good news is, if you've read down to the bottom about Krys having some new resources about defining community-based work-- and I don't think that's what she's going to talk about, but she's going to be presenting next. And so I think that's all we really have.

LILLIE GREIMAN: That's what I-- yeah, I'll chime in as well-- this is Lillie-- in saying, yeah, that I think that, probably, the most important thing about doing some of this work is being comfortable in making mistakes and knowing that you're going to do something silly or wrong or embarrassing, like editing-- like reviewing your presentation 40 times and only catching something right before you present. And I think that there's some real value to learn from that. And doing on-the-field, in-the-community work is never clear cut. [CHUCKLES]

SEQUOIA COMMINS: No. No, it is not. And, if anybody goes to the story voice, that was one of my contributions-- was that, when you're doing presentations or you're going in the field, your plan A is probably not going to work. And so you need to have a plan B and C. And that has saved me so many times. [CHUCKLES]

RAYNA SAGE: I think that's our time.

LILLIE GREIMAN: I think so. I think we're right there. And just some questions-- so Lillie again-- to leave with you-- is there one thing that you would like to try in your work and share in the chat? And maybe, in the Q&A, we can talk about that. And, again, there are some references that hopefully will be out into the world at some point.

ASHLEY CLARK-PURNELL: Oh, wonderful. Thank you for that wonderful presentation. It was so great to hear about how you were able to form that partnership and all the lessons that you've learned and takeaways. And I'm pretty sure our attendees would love to hear more about what that experience was like and hear your honest answers as you illustrated on this slide.

So we're going to move on to our next presentation. And this is going to be on the "Success and Failure in Disseminating a 'Publication Snapshot.'" And so our presenters for this discussion are Jeff Gutierrez and Krys Standley.

So they both work for the Research and Training Center on Disability in Rural Communities, or RTC:Rural. And their bios have been posted in the chat. But, Krys and Jeff, if you would come on camera and do a brief intro and self-description for us-- you can go ahead and get started.

KRYS STANDLEY: Thank you, Ashley. Hi, everyone. I'm glad you could join us today for this presentation, titled "Success and Failure in Disseminating a 'Publication Snapshot'-- Lessons Learned from Partnering with External Organizations." My name is Krys Standley. I'm a white person in my 40s with long ash-blonde hair, and wearing a cream-colored cardigan sweater and a navy blue shirt.

And I'm a project director with the Research and Training Center on Disability in Rural Communities, which is part of the Rural Institute at the University of Montana. I work with Lillie and Rayna from the previous presentation. Thanks for the shout-out. [CHUCKLES]

This topic is a different one than the community-based work, but we're excited to share, and there's some commonalities in this being a candid presentation of some of our experiences. Also relevant to this presentation, I'm a Certified Health Education Specialist and a Nationally Board-Certified Health & Wellness Coach. And I'm going to pass it on to Jeff to introduce himself.

JEFF GUTIERREZ: Hi, everyone. I'm Jeff Gutierrez. And I'm a white-presenting man in his mid-40s with brown hair and salt and pepper beard. And I'm wearing dark blue glasses and a charcoal gray shirt. And I've got "Rural Institute-- University of Montana" behind me as my backdrop. I'm happy to be here.

KRYS STANDLEY: Awesome. This is Krys again. Before we get into the details, I'm just going to bring us back to the title of this presentation, "Success and Failure in Disseminating a 'Publication Snapshot.'" So, as the title indicates, this presentation is a candid synopsis of a couple of different attempts we made at disseminating a snapshot of research findings. Some parts of this learning process were honestly a bit painful and a real letdown after putting a fair amount of energy into creating a product.

Fortunately, however, some parts were really gratifying. And, in combination, we learned some very valuable lessons. We hope that, by sharing these experiences, you can learn vicariously from them, and that your own efforts to collaborate with outside organizations to disseminate information will be on the more gratifying end of the spectrum.

I should acknowledge that the contents of this presentation were developed, like many other presentations during this conference, under a grant from the National Institute on Disability, Independent Living, and Rehabilitation Research, which is a center within the Administration for Community Living of the Department of Health and Human Services, and that the contents of this presentation do not necessarily reflect the policies of these institutions. So you should not assume endorsement by the federal government. And, with that, I am going to turn it over to Jeff, who will introduce you to this project.

JEFF GUTIERREZ: Thank you, Krys. Yeah, this is Jeff again. And I'm going to start with a little bit of background for how the project got started. Some of our team wanted to explore the resources that are available to us here at University of Montana. And we found an opportunity when Studio 1 at Mansfield Library announced that they were providing tours and orientations for UM staff.

There seemed to be some underutilized resources at the university, and we wanted to explore them for future planning. We don't have the time or the expertise to produce our own podcast series, but we do

have faculty members that already do. And so we were fooling around with the idea of serving as guest speakers to learn about what it would realistically entail to do so.

And that leads us to our motivation for this. We're very interested in expanding our KT dissemination products to include animations, videos, and podcasts. So we spent an hour with Studio 1 staff, and they provided us an overview of all of their equipment. And we discussed the potential issue-- potential uses, pardon me.

So Studio 1 is an audio and video production studio for people to record podcasts, lectures, live streams, a variety of formats at no cost. The picture here is One Button Studio, and that's their lightboard and audio setup, which would be perfect for a lot of voice work. And this picture is from the Mansfield Library Studio 1 website, to give that credit. We didn't actually end up utilizing the equipment for the project, but we hope to in the future.

One of the key things for us is, this is a new process for us. Our team has only created a handful of videos before this. So we wanted to explore the possibilities of what we could do, given the right circumstances.

We're a fairly small staff, but we try to look ahead to find opportunities to expand our products. And part of our motivation for developing this video is that we see the value in packaging our research in a way that's commonly used, easily viewed, and, most importantly, easily understood.

So we wanted to create a video, but we also wanted to develop a process for creating recognizable animation, in addition to our production of fact sheets and research reports. And, by "recognizable," I mean some level of consistency between the videos, both for the purpose of developing our internal process and to have a somewhat unified look in our video library.

The timing worked out pretty well for the KT team. Krysa had recently published a paper on health coaching for people with disabilities, and was very interested in trying out new techniques for packaging and dissemination. We wanted to share our research, of course. But we also wanted to provide information to a specific group of people, one that might not always consider how to effectively do their job with people with disabilities.

So that's why our target audience of health coaches interested in new research applicable to the field was important for us to get on the radar. We wanted to pique health coaches' interest in working with people with disabilities, or find those with a disability connection who might be interested in utilizing the curriculum.

The research topic presented an interesting and very valuable KT opportunity for us. Since the target audience was very specific, it allowed us to explore tailoring our message to a smaller, more defined group. And even more unique is, the target audience was outside the world of disability research and independent living in which most of our work takes place.

Past videos we've created have been for more general audiences, so this was a very good exercise for us to think critically about to whom we're speaking and how to best present information. Future videos could have a variety of target audiences, but the video format and the process of tailoring to an audience will be similar.

In terms of health coaches as the target audience, it was a different experience for me because, more often than not, I'm seeking to minimize jargon or find different ways to explain technical language. But, in the case of this video, we wanted to be sure to use accurate languages for health coaches so the message resonated with them. This does beg the question that, if we wanted to share the information with additional groups, would we need another video and another script? And we haven't dealt with that yet. [CHUCKLES]

The format that we decided on was what we called a Publication Snapshot video. And part of that was a goal of replicability. This is a format that we thought would be a useful tool for a variety of research moving forward. And, while this video was fairly narrowly targeted, we can use the process universally with a wide range of audiences, and it provides a high level of flexibility for us to tailor as needed.

We also thought that the connotation of calling them a "snapshot" might have the potential to encourage busy people to view the videos, knowing that they won't take up too much time. And, also, in the world of rapid dissemination of information, it reflects that it represents one publication, at one moment in time, and recognizing how quickly things change.

In terms of the process of creating the video, it took place when we all had the time and the bandwidth to take on the project, but also when all of us were out of the office for part of the production period. But this is the nature of our work, and it gave us a realistic picture of what would go into coordinating the creation of similar videos.

The entire process took about six weeks, which we felt was a win considering how much time all of us were out of the office during that period. And some of the time was spent figuring out our process. So we anticipate that we'll be able to be more efficient in the future.

The KT and communications teams met four times to discuss the key points of the paper and how to communicate them. And this was a really helpful interactive process that allowed all of us to include our perspectives for how to communicate the information concisely, while honoring the results of the research.

So we created and revised a script, and then shared the script and our image ideas with our graphic designer, Wasam, who created the video and made a couple of little changes. And then we posted it to a blog on our website. Before we started, we vetted a variety of different animation types to decide what look we wanted. And we ended up all appreciating the line drawings, and decided to continue exploring that format.

The video is a little over two minutes. It's two minutes and 14 seconds. So it's a little bit longer than we always want. And it took Wasam about 12 hours to complete. We anticipate that, in the future, it's going to

be a shorter process. But, since there was an opportunity to reach health coaches, we targeted the information to them, rather than the general public, and I think it resulted in a little bit of a longer video.

I ended up voicing the video, and Wissam added the audio to the animation. And it's a continued discussion about who should provide that animation-- how much inflection and enthusiasm, whether to have background music, and if it would be better for a researcher or a KT staff. We haven't made any specific decisions on this. And it'll probably just be a case-by-case basis moving forward. Overall, we feel that the process worked pretty well because we all communicated our schedules and we managed the project with minimal hiccups.

So it was a good exercise in team communication and project management which, again, was part of our motivation and gave us a clearer picture of what goes into the creation of a video and how to best collaborate to get the most out of each stage of the process. So we have a few thoughts on how we want to improve both the process and the product, but we'll get into that later in the presentation.

Overall, the creation was pretty smooth and rewarding, and gives us realistic opportunities to improve the efficiency of our process and the quality of our product. We'll detail what went wrong here in a little bit. But, first, we would like to share the video. Ashley, if you would, please.

[VIDEO PLAYBACK]

[MUSIC PLAYING]

- Publication Snapshot-- Health Coaching for People with Disabilities. People with disabilities have limited access to health promotion services, and report poorer health than their peers without disabilities. With this in mind, we created a health coaching intervention for people with disabilities. This intervention, called Health My Way, combined one-on-one coaching with a curriculum from our Healthy Community Living program.

We wondered, can this intervention help people with disabilities, improve their health-related quality of life, and change their health behavior? So we pilot tested Health My Way. We surveyed and interviewed people who completed the program. They reported fewer poor health days per month and more physical activity.

We found that coaches helped participants by providing social support, tailoring the curriculum to fit participants, and setting goals participants were excited about. This indicates that health coaching may be an effective approach for improving healthy behaviors and quality of life for people with disabilities. Rural Institute for Inclusive Communities, www.ruralinstitute.org, University of Montana.

[END PLAYBACK]

KRYS STANDLEY: This is Krys again. So there you have the end product that we created. Our first effort at disseminating this product began with identifying an organization to partner with. As the slide mentions,

I'm a Board-Certified Health & Wellness Coach, and so I had some connections within the coaching community. I knew about a digital campaign to highlight health coaching research.

This campaign was hosted by a private organization that had created a platform for health coaches to connect with health care companies that hire coaches. And the organization's digital campaign involved sharing weekly social media posts about a new peer-reviewed study on the effectiveness of health coaching. They shared these posts to LinkedIn and on their organization's website.

This seemed like an ideal outlet to reach our target audience with timely, thoughtful research that could contribute to the field. So I reached out to the person who coordinates these postings. She was enthusiastic about sharing a video summary, alongside her own written summary of our work and its relevance to the field of health coaching.

We tailored the video, like Jeff had mentioned, to the target audience of health coaches. The video provided a concise overview of the study's findings and its relevance for health coaching practice. We also provided a link in the text description on the video's YouTube page to a blog post on our website that included the research paper. We hope that the video would spark interest so that, if coaches wanted to learn more, they could go to our website to do so.

And we were excited about promoting disability research to health coaches. As you're likely aware, improving health outcomes for people with disabilities can be challenging, and advancing the discussion within the field is an important start. So everything seemed to be coming together to launch our first Publication Snapshot video. Everything about the process seemed to be good, and then we saw what they posted.

So this slide shows an image that is a screenshot of their LinkedIn post. Don't worry about trying to read this extremely tiny print. But what do you see in this post? A bunch of words. Our research was buried in a long and rambling post. And you might be asking, where is the video? We had the same question. There wasn't even a link to the video in the post at all. Instead, in a comment under the post, there was a hyperlink-- the web address for the video.

So, as you might be guessing, our initial feelings were disappointment and frustration. After putting in the work to create this video that we thought was really good, the end result was a total flop. To make matters worse, the post listed our organization's name incorrectly, and I had to ask the person we had worked with to correct it.

So, because they barely mentioned the video, it felt like we created free content for this organization to promote itself, rather than it being the mutually beneficial partnership that we had understood and hoped that it would be. And, unsurprisingly, we did not see increased readership or web traffic as a result of this posting. Overall, this collaboration did not feel like the productive, rewarding partnership we had hoped for.

So, after that unsuccessful dissemination, our team gathered to debrief about the experience. This slide says that we used a plus/delta framework. Basically, what that means is just that we identified what went

well-- those are the plus parts of the debrief-- and what we would have liked to changed if there were something like this that we were doing again in the future. And, while there were certainly some lessons learned, the experience left a bad taste in our mouths. However, we recognize the need to look at the complete picture of creation, collaboration, and dissemination.

Fortunately, we got another shot at using the video to disseminate this snapshot of research findings. We found another potential outlet, which was the National Board for Health & Wellness Coaching. This organization has a social media presence on Facebook.

And, although their Facebook posts are generally about topics that are other than research, I reached out to the account administrator for that page to share a summary of our research and our video and to ask if they would be interested in sharing that information. So, fortunately, the account administrator replied with an enthusiastic response.

Here's what the National Board for Health & Wellness Coaching offered. They offered to share a video on their Facebook, Instagram, and LinkedIn pages. They offered to share the paper, the video, and our organization's website with the chair of their Commission on Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility and with the chair of their Research Commission.

Additionally, they offered to share this content on their internal website, which connects over 4,000 health coaches. And they offered to share the research paper and the video that the paper was based on with a Mayo Clinic physician who was working to update the Compendium of Health and Wellness Coaching Literature. And they also welcomed our future sharing around anything else that may be of interest to the health coaching community.

Basically, we got the full treatment for dissemination that we had hoped for with the first outlet. This collaboration drastically improved the reach of our video, and it set us up with a game plan for future dissemination of research on this topic. Since this is a newer approach for disseminating research findings, looking for future possibilities was the goal, and this partnership was a step in the right direction.

To highlight the differences, our first partnership buried our content in a way that de-emphasized us and our work. And, in contrast, our second partnership showcased us and our work. I don't have an image on this slide for this, but the social media post from the second partnership used a large image of the opening screen of our video, which was paired with a succinct paragraph that named us, the researchers who were involved in the project, and described the work that we do at the Rural Institute. Yeah. So that was great. [CHUCKLES]

So, overall, we consider this to have been a positive learning experience. Through partnering with these two outside organizations, we learned several important lessons. The first is that we need to build in a process to vet the deliverable before it's published, and we need to budget sufficient time to do so.

Both of the organizations that we worked with were extremely quick to disseminate information once we provided it to them. They both disseminated this information through their channels less than 24 hours after receiving it from us. In the case of the National Board for Health & Wellness Coaching, this turned

out well, as their dissemination highlighted our work in a way that reflected favorably on us and what we produced. But, in the case of the private organization, their dissemination was tremendously disappointing.

However, we did not-- oh-- we noted that the idea of vetting posts of the external organizations could be tricky because pre-approving the posts could encumber the dissemination process. And, also, that partnering with organizations, they might assume that they have autonomy in how they post once we give them the information, unless it's stated otherwise. But, all in all, this highlights the value of learning which outlets do a good job of dissemination and fostering connections with them.

The second lesson that we learned is that it's valuable to think critically about the interests of the disseminating organization-- to consider whose interests they have most in mind. For instance, we noted in retrospect that, as a private, meaning for-profit organization, that first organization is likely to have its own self-interest in mind. It's the business model.

And, in contrast, the National Board for Health & Wellness Coaching is a non-profit organization, and it has an interest in promoting the discipline of health coaching on a broad level. So that's an important piece that we will keep in mind for future reference, and that you might want to keep in mind as well.

Lastly, we learned that, when doing a collaboration, we need to name the desired benefit for our organization, and then evaluate whether or not we received that benefit to know if we get something out of that partnership. So all of these lessons learned are good reminders to us to be attentive stewards of our time and our partnerships. We had some hesitation and some red flags about the initial outlet that we worked with. And we should have done our due diligence to ensure that the final product delivered what we thought it would.

But, because we are still learning, we know that this will be an area of improvement in the future. That's not to say we will get everything we want all of the time, but at least we can define what a successful use of our time means to us. And then, overall, we think we will want-- we know we will want to be more careful to look beyond merely considering publishing as a win.

Instead, we plan to carefully consider if the publication will reach those who need it most. And that's the ultimate goal and purpose of this work. And, with that, I'm going to pass it back to Jeff to wrap up with some lessons learned in terms of our internal processes.

JEFF GUTIERREZ: Thank you, Krys. Yeah, in terms of our internal-- this is Jeff again. In terms of our internal process and product, we're definitely still learning. We felt that it was great for our first full go-around. One of the biggest things is that we need to shorten the videos. One minute is the standard, and would suit our purposes well enough. We recognize that. It's just going to be a matter of intentionally shortening our message, while not diluting it.

Secondly, we need to carefully consider the benefits of tailoring for a limited group versus expanding the audience. And this is just going to be an ongoing conversation for each product's KT efforts. There are

benefits and drawbacks for each. So different versions of videos or how we tailor them is going to be an ongoing conversation.

And, lastly, our website is not ideal for video sharing. Being at the university, we have, let's say, limited control over some things involving the website, and a lot of the functionality wasn't there. So we're going to be more careful about that.

And, lastly, not listed on here-- accessibility, I feel, always has room for improvement. We would like to pay more attention to how we're pacing the captions on spoken words and text on the screen to help ensure that they match up so our message is clear. The accuracy of the text, the size of the text, and a more consistent number of words within caption content are also priorities moving forward, and always making sure that we have representative images of disability or ongoing priorities and concerns.

So, overall, it was a good learning experience. But we tend to be our biggest critics-- [CHUCKLES]-- and that's probably showing. And here is our contact information. You can find the RTC:Rural at the URL above, and then each of our individual email addresses below. And that's the end of our presentation, Ashley.

ASHLEY CLARK-PURNELL: Thank you, Jeff, and thank you, Krys. I think the lessons learned were very valuable from your presentation because I believe a lot of attendees have experience-- [CHUCKLES]-- trying to vet their deliverables, making sure that it's hitting the target audience, and just navigating the accessibility piece. I'm with you on that.

So it was great to hear from you. And, if you do end up coming up with processes for vetting your deliverables and everything that you talked about, it'd be great if you could share that information with us. So, with that, I'm going to pass it off to Kathleen. And I invite all of our presenters back on camera for our Q&A session.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: Perfect. Thank you, Ashley. For those of you who might be just joining our show this afternoon, I'm Kathleen Murphy. I'm the Director of the Center on Knowledge Translation for Disability and Rehabilitation Research. I'm a white woman with shoulder-length blonde hair, wearing a navy blue scoop-neck dress with a houndstooth-checked jacket over it. And I wear blue plastic reading glasses. Sorry about my-- hang on one second here. Let's just take care of this.

So, once again, another fantastic session. We did have some questions in the chat. And, also, as all of those who registered know, we do ask if registrants have questions. So we've pulled some from those that seem pertinent, or that you all could perhaps address.

So one of them-- there's always-- the Center on Knowledge Translation does a survey of all grantees about what are their top training and technical assistance needs. And we've done it-- I don't know-- over 10 years. And, every single year, the top training need is, how do you measure your knowledge translation?

So along-- in that spirit, Krys and Jeff, when you made the video, what were ways that you were hoping to be able to measure its success? What were you thinking like-- if it-- I know you said it failed, but, if it hadn't, what would that success look like, and how would you have known that it was successful?

JEFF GUTIERREZ: This is Jeff. To start, number of views on the video, number of downloads on the paper-- they were both connected, so start with the most basic metrics. Who's looking? Who's reading? That simple.

And then, from there-- a secondary ancillary, but every bit as important-- I would hope that health coaches would reach out to Krys with questions with interest. So, really, that would be the greatest indicator of a successful product, is if it reached those people that we intended it to, and then reconnected them with us.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: So that ties right in with what Jess put in the chat-- excellent. Right to the point, this innovation worked because Krys heard from some health coaches. So that is very interesting, too, because it really is an indicator of a very active reception of the video, whereas we all know the-- it's hard to get to measure that, whereas sometimes we are left only with more passive indicators of use, like downloads or the analytics that Google Analytics or our website can provide.

So there was someone who messaged me privately who was wondering, since you did have to mount the video on different platforms, did you find that, just based on those basic downloads or hits, like what Bonnie is putting with likes, views, reading-- did they differ per platform?

KRYS STANDLEY: I can say that those numbers differed by the organization, the partnering organization, where there were-- even just the list of the ways that the second organization, the National Board of Health & Wellness Coaching-- what they did with the information-- the fact that they shared it with this person-- this doctor who's putting together a Compendium of Health and Wellness Coaching currently-- just this exhaustive list.

And this invitation-- I think, in a way, the invitation to share future research with them is the most promising outcome of all of them, just to have this established partnership, because we're doing ongoing research on this topic. And now we know right where to go, and they have a sense of who we are and what we're about. And that's a pretty good outcome.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: Absolutely. Yeah. So is that-- I'm assuming from the presentation that you never did hear from health coaches, which maybe was your original goal. But you were able-- the journey with this video morphed into, perhaps, a different audience.

KRYS STANDLEY: I can speak to that a little bit. I think Jeff and I might have slightly different orientations to what the goal of the video was. In my mind, just sharing the information and having people view it was what I was looking for. It's how the social media world works.

You put out this short video, and people see it, and then they've got that little nugget of information that they didn't have before. And they're probably not likely, in today's world of being bombarded with all this

information, to reach out every time they find something interesting. But just the fact that they've seen it and heard that information is a win in my mind.

JEFF GUTIERREZ: This is Jeff, and I definitely don't disagree. We wanted to get the information out, first and foremost. And, to backtrack a little bit, that same posting on YouTube-- we did see a marked increase on the second sharing. There were very few views initially. And then, once that second sharing opportunity-- that second partnership came up, we did even see that reflected in the basic analytics. So it was a win, but we're still always hoping for more.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: For sure. And I use "outcome"-- there's nothing wrong with a good dissemination outcome. If you can see that someone out there has touched it, that's not nothing either, correct. So-- sorry. I was going to-- there was something else I wanted to ask you, Krys. Let me look here at my notes here, because I'm listening and taking notes.

Oh, yeah, yeah. So you had this original relationship, and that's great that something else developed that-- probably going to be more helpful moving forward. But was there any debriefing with that first partner organization. Just to help our audience-- when things maybe don't go quite well, did you try to let them know or salvage, or was it-- how did that work, or were you just like, we're done?

KRYS STANDLEY: I think the latter, in this case. It was such a de-emphasization-- if I'm saying that right-- of our work, where it was just like a footnote in their self-promotion, that it just felt like it was not-- they knew what they were doing. We told them we were creating this video for them to share. We weren't creating it for any other purpose.

So I think it was just the lesson learned is-- a private organization like this might just have their own self-interest in mind, and-- yeah. I could have said where we were disappointed. I think they probably knew it.

Just the fact that they didn't even get our organization's name right and I had to ask them to correct that just shows the level of lack of attention to detail and lack of interest in promoting us, actually. So it just seemed like not, probably, worth the energy to share. But I don't know. You never know. It might have been good to do.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: So, yeah, audience, if you have similar experiences or ideas, go ahead and pop them in the chat, and we can bring that up in the discussion. So your example is very striking, given that you work at a Rural Institute.

And, tying this presentation back to some of what the first one was talking about, do you think-- usually, the researchers are the hegemonic ones-- the ones with power. And here's an instance where you actually got dissed. Do you think it had to do with coming from a Rural Institute or-- did you-- do you consider the power imbalance-- that there is a power imbalance, and you are the weaker side of that?

KRYS STANDLEY: Yeah, I-- I'm answering this. Anybody else can jump in if they want as well. Yeah, I think it may be-- it's a private sector/non-profit power imbalance, if anything, where they've just got profit and their own stakeholders as their target audience that they're angling toward. So I would personally just

be wary of working with a private organization in the future. I'd want to be really, really clear and have really good communication about how any partnership could benefit both parties.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: And, just with my "Center on KTDRR trying to help grantees" hat on, it's-- I don't know if we've ever done anything either about supporting grantees in really setting up written agreements-- memorandums of understanding, and so that-- you hate to be not trusting people, but maybe it's a version of good fences make good neighbors. I don't know. Something-- food for thought, so thanks for giving me that bee in my bonnet.

And I did just want to tie back this whole issue with power and morality, and bring in our first set of presenters. So have-- one-- and correct me if I'm wrong, because I am not from a rural area. I live in Austin, Texas, and I grew up in Rhode Island, which is, I think, the most-- or it used to be-- most densely populated state in the United States. So there definitely is, or has been, a stigma attached to some aspects of rural culture.

And I'm wondering about this question and if you think it's legitimate, or does it actually illustrate a stereotype? So the question is-- and you can just answer the question. [CHUCKLES] But our registrant said, "My intended audience is farmers; male, female youth; agro dealers; and rural households. Will this conference address any KT strategy for any of my intended audiences?" So would you say that-- absolutely. Yup. Farmers are an important part of our rural audience. Or is that someone-- or am I, by linking it to rurality, being stereotypical?

SEQUOIA COMMINS: I'm going to take this one. So this is Sequoia. And, as part of our makeup in Del Norte County, which is, like I said, the most northwestern county in California, we have two large farming sectors in our county.

And that might not be-- you're correct, Kathleen-- is that that might not be the case for every rural setting. We have a very rich dairy farm that makes some of the-- makes A2 Heritage milk. We have the Easter lily bulb capital of the world here. So we do have a rich farming community.

And, if that participant wanted to hear more about that, my suggestions would be to-- we have a rule that rural outreach curricula that Rayna and Lillie were talking about does discuss some strategies that would be helpful. I myself am working on that as well. And I've been taking training webinars through AgrAbility, which is a disability-based training site. But most-- it is centered around reaching farmworkers.

And so those would be my suggestions. I don't really find that as a stereotype, Kathleen, but it is definitely something that happens in rural communities, as you find there are many-- what I say in-- there are agricultural and environmental industries that you're going to find in rural communities because of the geographic space and location that you might not find in an urban setting.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: So there is something to that. Because I think another-- go ahead.

RAYNA SAGE: Oh, sorry, Kathleen. This is Rayna. And I just wanted to add to that-- people can be led to think of a stereotype of a family farm and a community that is built on numerous family farms, and these small productions.

But most of our agriculture now is very industrialized and corporatized. And so, when we think about folks that we might want to reach who are involved in farming, they are the farmworkers. They are the distributors. They're-- we're not necessarily talking about, most of the time, somebody who owns a small farm.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: Yeah, because so much farming in this country anyway is industrial now. And I am aware that a lot of the workforce actually is not white, necessarily. Marta Portocarrero was wondering what kind of outreach you're doing to Spanish-speaking populations, if at all-- that's been able to be incorporated into your scope or not.

SEQUOIA COMMINS: So I will take that, because, yes, the farmworkers that we have here, especially for the Easter lily bulb part, which is-- there are environmental impacts that come with that large scope, and it is also on Indigenous lands. So that's definitely an intersection that I'm very interested in making sure that our disability services are.

But there is a large population of Hispanic and Latinx individuals that will work these lily fields, and there's also a large Indigenous demographic as well. So wanting to be there to make sure that advocacy-- a line of advocacy and protections are there for the individuals who work these seasonal jobs, and having access to community resources, is a lot-- largely also, again, what AgrAbility is providing webinars about.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: That's an interesting point, too. Because we were talking earlier today about how the target audience, or the community, isn't static-- that people might age out of it or have more or less intensity of their identification with the community. And, if you're dealing with a seasonal labor force, they're literally moving in and out of the community. So that's interesting.

So are there any other-- and all of y'all can speak to this, because I know you all have expertise in rural areas. Are there other common blind spots that people have who are not familiar with rural communities when they approach them or try to reach out to them?

LILLIE GREIMAN: Well, I just want to speak-- I think that it's going to address the previous question-- this is Lillie-- and also this one, perhaps. and emphasizing, too, around the work that Rayna and Sequoia and I are part of is that-- the target audience for that research really was Centers for Independent Living. So they were the organizations that we were working with. And then, as a result of that, we have numerous centers who are doing that outreach, then, to a variety of different rural communities.

And some of those core strategies-- and then they are coming together to share what works well for them. So what works well with a migrant community in Idaho may or may not work well for a migrant community in northern California and elsewhere.

But we're bringing folks together and sharing just some basic skills that I think are probably universal-- not-- I don't know if I want to say "universal," because I hate saying that, I guess. But there are strategies around building relationships and developing trust-- things that we've heard throughout and strategies for doing that-- that underlie almost all of what you're doing.

And so, when we're working with centers, we're really talking about that you need to be in the rural community. And I think, probably getting back to what you're saying, of the strategy that would be the most important, would be actually to be there, to form relationships in real life-- [CHUCKLES]-- to get to know people. And that can be, obviously, very challenging. But I would say that that's probably, in terms of-- across a lot of communities, is, be there. Be humble. Be aware that you'll make mistakes and learn from those. And be open to it.

SEQUOIA COMMINS: Thank you, Lillie, so much. I actually-- so yeah. I totally forgot to actually answer the question-- [CHUCKLES]-- about a concrete strategy that we are using. So, due to our capacity, we haven't been able to follow up on this lead yet. But due to the fact that I went-- so the-- for Northern California, the lily bulb fields are in Smith River, California. And so I targeted that because of the Indigenous and the farmworker demographic there, and the fact that it's geographically distant from our only incorporated city.

I decided to partner up with the Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation, which-- that is their lands. And I created a strategic partnership with them, which involved me having office hours there every month. And then I coordinated specifically of having those office hours at the same time that some of the food services were doing mobile outreach.

Then I created a strategic partnership with them, and they have a Spanish speaker with them. Unfortunately, I do not speak Spanish. And so I asked her, how are you-- how are you reaching these individuals?

So our next step is that we are going to be making a whole day of outreach. And we'll be hitting another-- a church site that is very popular in Smith River, California. So not only can people speak to the Spanish speaker about food and community resources, but then she'll be there to introduce me as a safe individual to talk to, and for interpretation services.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: It's so fascinating how so much of so many of these presentations goes back to relationships. So I'm still-- [CHUCKLES]-- on this stereotypical-- because there's other ways that it came up. Because not all of the-- well, I guess if we're talking about underserved communities, a lot of them are stigmatized, but-- you're welcome, Martha. She's thanking me for the answer to the question.

So another thing that came up in our registration that I think potentially ties, either to rural audiences or to stereotypes about them, is people wondering, how do I engage community members who are "anti-science"? So there is this sense of the coastal elites, and that's where very prestigious things happens-- the capital is in the coast, and that the rural areas in the middle get left out of those conversations and, at times, are resentful of that. So how-- given that you are rural, but you're also social scientists-- so how do you engage-- does that come up at all in your work, or how do you handle that if it does?

JEFF GUTIERREZ: This is Jeff. I'll start out with this one. In my experience, it comes down to meeting people where they are and not judging. When we worked on our Vaccine Hub project at the tail end of COVID, we were working with a wide variety of CILs as an advisor group, and things were discouraging. And then we posed the question to them, what would you consider a success in your vaccine outreach? [CHUCKLES]

And their response says a whole lot. It was to be able to have a conversation. It was that simple. Being able to talk about it was their goal. So we ended up putting together an exercise called Deep Conversations about how to practice non-judgmental conversation and connect with people. And that removes that elitism a lot of the time, just by meeting people where they are. And that's where the relationship starts.

RAYNA SAGE: And this is Rayna. I'll just add that, in our work, it's the-- well, one-- I was going to put it in the chat-- but no assumptions about who has the right answer. Like Lillie was saying earlier, we just really have to come with a lot of humility. And I haven't lived in a rural community. Missoula's not actually rural. Montana is seen as a very rural state, but we're not. And I haven't been in those communities, living there for a long time.

So you come with-- you can't assume you have the right answer. And, even though we do come from a public health perspective, and we might personally value everybody getting vaccinated, you have to meet them where they are and find folks who want to make their community better, whatever that looks like, and help-- and they can define what that means, and then we help.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: Yeah, yeah, yeah. I'm reminded-- I was at the What Works Global Summit in Ottawa a couple of weeks ago. And they had an Indigenous person come in to do the land acknowledgment and then a blessing.

And someone asked about trying to combine systematic review and research synthesis, real science-positive kinds of knowledge, with other kinds of knowledge. And what you're talking about is a really nice illustration of that-- of just being really open to what that other kind of knowledge might have to offer.

We are-- so I know Marta Alison is going to start very soon. But-- so, Marsha, I'm interested-- when we get to your presentation-- I'm going to let this run a little bit longer-- what you might have to say about this as well, because it's tricky.

So, on the one hand, yes, we want to be respectful. But we are also in an environment, particularly as we're-- we're talking here about putting things on social media. And KTDRR has a website, by the way-- I'll put the link in later-- which has-- we have a casebook, and some of this work has been highlighted in it.

And there is actual, active disinformation online. So I don't think anybody has the answer to that, but it can't always just be about accepting that. So I'm just going to go and see if anybody has any thoughts or reactions to that.

SEQUOIA COMMINS: I've got a thought. So this is Sequoia. And for-- it's fun-- it's fun because with the coastal elitism-- so, since I'm in California, we're on the coast. And Del Norte County is just like, we're going to be as anti-California as possible-- [LAUGHS]-- when it comes to stereotypes. So we do have a lot of what you're discussing. And I'm just one person.

This is just one approach. I'm only coming from my lived experience and my experience working in this community. But it's about-- when you're talking about the humility and not knowing that-- understanding that you don't-- might necessarily not have the whole correct answer-- making that other person-- and maybe I'm not talking about social media disinformation. Maybe I'm talking about a candid conversation that you can have with an individual.

When you start leading questions into critical thinking skills without putting it as-- where you're still putting that person at an equal power dynamic-- no power play here-- no power play in the conversation whatsoever-- like Jeff is talking about, meeting someone where they're at, and not necessarily saying, well, I think you're wrong because I have all of this evidence to support that you're wrong.

But going through-- and exactly what Rayna is saying of, but what are your outcomes that you want? Because here are your list of things that you can do. Here are your informed choices, which is a very Independent Living Center thing that we do. [CHUCKLES]

Here's your informed choices, and I'm not going to put a negative or a positive to any of these choices. But this is the reality of the situation, and which way are you going to go? And when you take out the, I guess, the ethos, pathos, logos of trying to persuade someone-- trying to be-- trying to have an end game of what they want-- when you get rid of the end, I find these conversations to be very reflective, introspective, and powerful on the individual.

And then they can lead and go have conversations of, this is actually something that I thought about. And that's just the information dissemination that we've had in Del Norte County. We've had public billboards about vaccinations and stuff like that, and they last maybe three months before they get tagged.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: Wow.

SEQUOIA COMMINS: Candid conversations are the way to go, in my opinion, in rural communities.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: Well, I am all for candid conversations, as the KTDRR staff know very well. [CHUCKLES] It's one of my skills. And, toward that, we are going to have to cut this off and candidly move over-- I'm going to hand the mic back to Ashley so we can start on our last session with Marsha Elison.