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Workshop Audience & Objectives

**Audience**
Non-academic researchers with basic knowledge of medical/scientific research, and those that have completed previous workshops in series.

**Objectives**
By the end of this session, participants will:

- Understand the principles of working with community in conducting research.
- Be introduced to differences in language used between researchers and academia, and best used language in community settings.
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1. Social or Scientific Value
2. Scientific Validity
3. Fair Participant Selection
4. Favorable Risk-Benefit Ratio
5. Independent Review
6. Informed Consent
7. Respect
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1. Social or Scientific Value

- Scientific or health decision-making value
- Developing community capacity
- Sustainability increases value to community and research
- Challenges when studies that have value for community are not considered valuable from the scientific or social perspective
2. Scientific Validity

- Research must be scientifically valid to be ethical.
- Community should have a role in deciding the design of a study because certain designs may not be acceptable, thus the study may not be done.
- Community input can increase validity of interpretations.
3. Fair Participant Selection

- Should be based primarily on scientific goals-focus on particular racial/ethnic groups or a particular community may be justified and fair when chosen for reasons of justice

- Hiring and training community members for outreach, recruitment, and data analysis can increase fairness and community capacity
4. Favorable Risk-Benefit Ratio

- Risks and potential benefits to community as a whole should be considered.
- Determining appropriate risks, benefits, and risk/benefit ratio in communities that lack access to healthcare services.
- Risk to individual participants must be justifiable by potential benefit to individual and/or by benefit of findings to society.
5. Independent Review

- Enhance public accountability and minimize influence of potential conflicts of interest

- Independent community reviews enhances transparency and accountability to community

- Community IRB: same functions as a University’s IRB
6. Informed Consent

- Respects research participants’ rights to make decisions that are consistent with their values, interests, and preferences.

- Community can help design innovative ways to enhance informed consent, help manage misinformation and rumors, and disseminate information to community.

- Challenge: If trust in community partners leads participants to pay less attention to risk to themselves.
7. Respect

- For potential and enrolled participants
- For community
- For research partners
- Trust and trustworthiness
- Joint development of guiding principles, agreements, and conflict resolution
- Community and research dissemination
- Recognition of both community and research biases, stereotypes, and politics
Community and Universities Have Different Languages
Academia Often Uses Jargon...

- This can lead to misunderstandings and marginalization of one partner or their staff and constituents
- Careful planning is the key
- Share documentation such as a website or annual report
- Avoid jargon or make sure it’s explicitly explained
Verbal Language

Don’t Use

- Them
- Those
- You people
- I understand
- We understand
- We feel that you

Do Use

- Community or residents
- Identify all parties
- I am aware
- We can relate to
- With common consent of all parties, it is the feeling that
Verbal Language

Don’t Use

- Your community
- I know what you mean
- I understand where you’re coming from
- My data

Do Use

- This community
- I can relate
- I can empathize with you
- Data collected in the community
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Sometimes what appears to be the end is really a new beginning.
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