

This checklist was crafted by Katie Johnston-Goodstar and Jenna Sethi in collaboration with session attendees at the 'What Went Wrong': Reflecting and Learning from Community-Engaged Research conference on 7/12/2014. It is not an exhaustive checklist but if helpful, please share as you like.

But Do *I* Want to Work With *You*? Checklist:

- What is the philosophical orientation or standpoint of all involved?
 - You (community partners and researchers) have your own way of knowing
 - What is it?
 - Communities have their own ways of knowing
 - What is it?
 - What orientation is best situated to answer the questions at hand
 - Positivist? Interpretive? Critical? Indigenous? Multiple?
- Does the researcher already have a research question?
 - Will the community be assessed in damaging ways (deficit-oriented questions)
 - What is the focal level of the questions (attention to social context, individual or social level of analysis)
 - Are we in agreement on what the research question is? If not, is there flexibility?
- Does the researcher already have funding?
 - Where does the funding come from and how does funding impact the research?
 - i.e. is the research question set etc.?
 - How much of the funding will actually go to the community partner?
 - Will the community be assessed in damaging ways (i.e. “financially high risk”) and will work be required before payment?
 - Can funding be obtained outside the University? If so, how? Is this desirable?
- Who will own the data?
 - Do the community partner and university have equal access to the data?
 - Where will the data be housed? Who controls access?
 - What if there are different interpretations of the data? What is the process for disagreements?
- What is the publication/dissemination process?
 - What does dissemination look like? Who is it produced for?
 - Does the dissemination match the knowledge paradigm?
 - Is it print-centric? Is this the way this knowledge is shared/should be shared?
- What *does* “mutually beneficial?” look like?
 - Who benefits and how?
 - Financial benefits?
 - Impacts on policy/practice/social conditions?
 - Reputation/prestige/social benefits?
 - Should the question be.... are we “mutually vulnerable?”

This checklist was crafted by Katie Johnston-Goodstar and Jenna Sethi in collaboration with session attendees at the 'What Went Wrong': Reflecting and Learning from Community-Engaged Research conference on 7/12/2014. It is not an exhaustive checklist but if helpful, please share as you like.

- What accountability processes are set up?
 - Whose ethics (IRB/review boards) is the research accountable to?
 - Whose worldview? Animal justice? Earth justice?
 - How is success defined?
 - Who has the power to decide?

- How do I tell people 'no' without harming potential for future collaborations?
 - I think we have conflicting orientations/goals for research i.e. let's consider future work, I don't think we're a good fit 'for now,' let's keep talking...
 - Are you (researcher) willing to work for free so we can "try you out?"
 - What does our organization need to do to be proactive in seeking collaborations that fit us and our questions?

- Is research the activity we *should* be doing?

Resources (just a few starters):

- Data Center: Research for Justice - www.datacenter.org
- Highlander Research and Education Center - <http://highlandercenter.org/>
- The Revolution Will not be Funded: Beyond the Non-Profit Industrial Complex, edited by Incite! Women of Color Against Violence
- Kwayask itôtamowin: Indigenous Research Ethics - http://iphrc.ca/assets/Documents/IPHRC_ACADRE_Ethics_Report_final.pdf
- The Public Science Project: Participatory Action, Research & Design for a Just World - <http://publicscienceproject.org/>
- Decolonizing Methodologies by Linda Tuhiwai Smith
- Revolutionizing Education: Youth Participatory Action Research in Motion by Julio Cammarota and Michelle Fine
- Guishard, M. (2009). The false paths, the endless labors, the turns now this way and now that: Participatory action research, mutual vulnerability, and the politics of inquiry. *The Urban Review*, 41(1), 85-105.