CNNC Fellows Program
Guidance for Engaging Immigrant and Refugee Communities
(Google Form)

Instructions: Please consult this guidance prior if you are interested in contacting the CNNC with requests to facilitate the conduct of research or engagement projects which solicit the input of immigrant and refugee communities.

Note: Incomplete answers in any section do not necessarily preclude approval or participation. Project requests will be evaluated on a case-by-basis by the CNNC and the concerned communities, which will make suggestions about how to incorporate all relevant components.
This rubric does not aim to duplicate the efforts of institutional IRBs or Community Advisory Councils with regard to research practices. The aim here is to suggest and encourage best practices for reciprocity and power-sharing between researchers and communities. These questions are not meant solely for vetting, but to encourage reflection about best practices for ethical engagement with immigrant and refugee communities.
As a living document, this rubric is a starting point that may evolve in conversation with communities. This document has been viewed by: researchers, CNNC staff and practitioners, who were given an opportunity to provide feedback and input. (CM: How often and when is the rubric evaluated and updated? The P and P subcommittee could continue to monitor this.)

Application:
1. This guidance is a publicly available document (to be published in *New American Migration: Journal of Research, Practice, and Application*) for practitioners and researchers considering or proposing research or other engagement projects with immigrant and refugee communities.
2. Entities involved may come from different perspectives and experience levels including consultants, trainers, workshop participants, students, faculty, service learning, and funders/grantors who are doing surveys/research for foundational goals (e.g. research, community engagement, evaluation, and other activities).
3. When CNNC is consulted about engaging with research / engagement projects, this rubric will be used to evaluate proposals to determine whether or not CNNC will participate in any capacity, ensuring that projects are conducted in an ethical manner that responds to and advances community-identified goals.

Context: Many communities are accustomed to the drive-by volunteer or researcher who appears among them for a short time to fulfill a course requirement, conduct a study or other obligation, and then abruptly departs without attention to reciprocity. Repetitions of this dynamic erode trust with those affiliated, working, or researching with these communities. It is incumbent on scholars and researchers to clearly articulate their investment capacity, intentions, and responsibilities to the community. This would entail ethically communicating mutual expectations, timelines, including entry and exit strategies, to avoid perpetuating the harm of extractive approaches.
CNNC staff are not gatekeepers of these communities, but rather service providers who work with, alongside, and for immigrant and refugee communities. Service provider relationships create a power dynamic that is not to be exploited. An introduction by CNNC to communities of interest to researchers or practitioners is not an unconditional endorsement of a project. Community members ultimately have the autonomy to choose if, when, and under what circumstances they engage in research/engagement.

This document has been viewed by: researchers, CNNC staff and practitioners, and the Montagnard Community Advisory Council, who were given an opportunity to provide feedback and input.

Decision-Making Process:

1. CNNC/Fellows Research and Evaluation Subcommittee members will read the submitted rubric.
   a. R and E Subcommittee members will provide feedback on the submitted rubric with suggested changes.
   b. Thereafter we will facilitate an introduction to the CNNC staff member or Fellow whose program works with the particular community.
   c. If the CNNC staff member or Fellow wants to move forward and seek community vetting, CNNC can facilitate introductions.
   d. The CNNC and the CNNC Fellows R and E Subcommittee members do not play a gatekeeping role, but serve to suggest best practices. (DA: CNNC is obligated to make evaluations / decisions. CM: why avoid the language of gatekeeping - how will CNNC staff frame their role? SM: is it a referral role? Facilitative role? DA: This is a challenging place while the CNNC doesn't want to avoid decision-makers, acknowledge the decision. R and E Subcommittee will evaluate the applications. If this committee doesn't have the capacity/expertise, bring in a community or other consultant.)
2. The community has the ultimate decision about participation, engagement, and conditions of engagement (compensation, capacity building, etc.) as well as the duration, continuation, cycle of the project (ongoing consent vs. one-time consent).
   a. Check-in process/changes to project once the project is underway
   b. Plan for check-ins should be between the community partner and the researcher. CNNC can support if asked.

Rubric

Considerations	Notes (to be filled out by person submitting proposal / request)	N/A
I. Project Preparation and Planning		
What inspired or prompted you to focus on this specific community / population? Was it externally driven academic or program interest , or a request from within the community?		
What is the purpose of the research? What do you hope to accomplish or contribute, big picture?		
Have you engaged in discussions / relationship building with any members/leaders of the community? Please mention briefly. If not, what steps will you take to learn about the community/ prepare yourself for working with the community? Please mention briefly.		

Have you had discussions with other researchers and CNNC Fellows who have experience with the community? Please mention briefly.		
Whom have you consulted who has prior experience with the community / population? Before engaging with the community/population consider learning from another researcher or practitioner or CNNC Fellow who has experience.		
Have you discussed and mutually decided upon research questions, methods, data collection strategies, protection and security of sources/ informants / participants (as needed), dissemination plans, capacity building plans,entry and exit plans etc. with the community?		

II. *Project Implementation*		
Are you from the community? Do you have team members from the community? If not, Have you completed any training or study in cultural humility/cultural safety as related to community engagement and research? Do you have a plan in place to incorporate these elements? Name course/certificate/location of training. Many who teach/work with these topics have not had "formal" instruction in cultural humility yet are deeply involved in praxis/ongoing learning around this topic. If this describes you, please indicate briefly. If you have a plan, please include a copy.		
Where are you in the application process with an Institutional Review Board and/or Community Advisory Board? Are you willing to apply for review by a Community Advisory Board within the community you wish to engage with, in addition to a University IRB?		
Do you have plans for the following: - The protocol should specify the date / time/ occasion during which researchers first enter and ultimately leave the community. - There should be an announced timeline (beginning, middle, end) - Include check-in meetings with community members. - Exit plans should include plans for and indicators of community capacity building.		

How will you incorporate and observe Covid-19 safety procedures? Please also see Section IV on Equity and Accessibility		

III. Incentives and Benefits to Stakeholders		
Who is funding the research? What stake do they have? What are their interests, expectations about how it will be used? Have you discussed desired incentives and benefits with the community?		
What will be the incentives and benefits that come back to the community of focus for this project? These should be substantial. Consider time, effort, and personal disclosure that may be asked of participants. Examples of incentives: gift cards or other financial compensation for participants, etc. Examples of benefits: technical reports for community dissemination, graphics-based info for lower literacy communities, social media presentations, funding for community efforts, supplies for community schools, student training, community awareness, co-authorship of reports and papers, mentoring community organizations to seek funding, facilitating introductions between the community organization and other entities such as local, county, or state officials, etc.		
Will CNNC staff or program sites play a substantial role in the project? If so, what will be the incentives and benefits that come back to CNNC? Examples of incentives: funding for staff time, events for the community, supplies for the Centers and program participants, etc. Examples of benefits: copy of finished research summary, presentation, products or deliverables, framework for future programming, training and assistance with follow-up advocacy, if any, etc.		

IV. Equity and Accessibility		
How do you plan to accommodate language access / linguistic differences: plan for effective translation, interpretation? Is this project English centric or are cultural concepts accurately conveyed through quality		

adapted materials and how interactions are conducted (setting, body language, attire, etc.)		
Which examples, visuals, descriptions, and other references will you use to compensate for and complement linguistic differences?		
Which kinds of screening tools will you use, and how will they be tailored for accessibility to the community / population (including people who do not read or write in any language and people with disabilities)? How might you develop screening tools and research instruments in partnership with the community?		
Which types of additional labor will your project require from individuals, including employees and volunteers of different organizations? Many things may take much longer and require unanticipated effort by community partners.		
How do you plan to discuss and act on the following with the community involved in this project: - Community perception of research - Ideas of privacy and consent - Plan for seeking/obtaining consent - Anonymity vs. confidentiality Community has ultimate decision making authority regarding the duration, continuation, cycle of the project (ongoing consent vs. one-time consent). You are expected to seek consent during various stages of your project.		
How will you know whether participants feel safe and confident criticizing you and/or the project?		
How will you center participants'/beneficiaries' voices and feedback in evaluating the project? What was their subjective experience?		
How will you deal with a situation where the participants felt ambivalent about results but it benefited them in some observable concrete way?		
Disagreements can sometimes arise. Do you have a plan/process to address/manage such situations in a way that is equitable for all?		
V. Dissemination		

Do you plan a wide/r range of research products from your project, over and above academic presentations, journal articles, or books? Do you have plans for translational products and community information materials, sharing relevant findings in languages that community members can understand in venues that they can access?		
Do you plan to include key community members as co-authors on your research products? What will be the roles and expectations of authors?		
Suggestion from Christelle B: Will you share findings, reports, papers with appropriate community members prior to publication, to discuss whether it meets community guidelines and community safety?		
Do you have guidelines in place for how to navigate a community's right and decision to reorient / refocus a research agenda in the event of unforeseen disruptions or emergencies (e.g. pandemic)? The COVID-19 pandemic has left us with many lessons about community agency and rights to reorient focus areas and partnerships to address emergency issues. This has meant, unfortunately, disruptions to ongoing projects that were once agreed upon by community-academic research partnerships. Do you have a plan to reorient your research agenda in case of unforeseen disruptions?		

Collaborators: Christian Mathies; Kelsey White; S. Sudha, Leilani Roughton; Christelle Barakat; Sonalini Sapra; Diya Abdo; Mia Baxley; Cathryn Bennett; Dominique L'Divers; Naglaa Rashwan; Jennifer Yourkavich; Sharon Morrison; Elizabeth Saylor

Resources/Citations:
- 2019. "Public Health Rubric." American Academy of Pediatrics, Section on Epidemiology Public Health andEvidence (SOPHE), accessed July 20. https://www.aap.org/en-us/about-the-aap/Sections/Section-on-Epidemiology-Public-Health-and-Evidence/Pages/SOEPHE.aspx
- https://www.acme-journal.org/index.php/acme/article/view/784
- https://www.acme-journal.org/index.php/acme/article/view/784/643
- Various authors. "International Refugee Research: Evidence for Smart Policy." Virginia tech School of Public and International Affairs. 2018. https://spia.vt.edu/content/dam/spia_vt_edu/research/refugee/Refugee-Research-Issue-No-1-1.pdf

- Matheis, C. and Jamison, E. "Avoiding Policy Failure and Finding Common Ground for Refugee Reception, Resettlement, and Integration: A Prototype Rubric." 2018.
- Matheis, Christian. 2016. "Refuge and Refusal: Credibility Assessment, Status Determination and Making It Feasible for Refugees to Say 'No'." In *Migration Policy and Practice: Interventions and Solutions*, edited by Harald Bauder and Christian Matheis. New York: Palgrave.
- McConnell, Allan. 2015. "What is policy failure? A primer to help navigate the maze." *Public Policy and Administration* 30 (3-4):221-242.
- Onyx, J. (2008). University-Community Engagement: What does it mean?. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement, 1*, 90-106.
- Paynter, S. (2014). Tackling wicked problems through engaged scholarship. *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship, 7*(1), 48-59.
- Tuck, E. & Yang, K.W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 1*(1), 1-40.
- Santiago-Ortiz, A. (2020). Mapping Collaboration as Resistance to Neoliberalism: A Case Study of Participatory Action Research in Puerto Rico. *Tracce Urbane: Rivista Italiana Transdisciplinare di Studi Urbani, 8(*4), 270-289. DOI: 10.13133/2532-6562_4.8.17220.
- Santiago-Ortiz, A. (2019). From Critical to Decolonizing Service-Learning: Limits and Possibilities to Social Justice-Based Approaches to Community Service Learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 25*(1), 43-54.
- Weiner, John. 2005. Health Policy Analysis Checklist. http://ocw.jhsph.edu/courses/introhealthpolicy/PDFs/Bardach_Outline_IHP_7b.pdf: Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health.