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1. Introduction

Poverty reduction in Nunavut depends on building a common understanding of what poverty means, who experiences poverty and how, and how the government and communities see and respond to the challenges poverty poses. Community Knowledge for Poverty Action (CPKA) is a proposal for a pilot project that combines conventional monitoring practices with resources and support for grassroots inquiry offers an opportunity to build such a common understanding, while also meeting broader goals of local self-reliance and the marriage of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit and Euro-Canadian governance.

The proposed pilot project will weave together two types of knowledge-building processes that, together, incorporate the diverse types of expertise in communities (See Figure 1):

1. The use of systematic data collection and dialogue at the local level as a means to assess progress related to a standard set of indicators of poverty across communities, as identified in the Roundtable’s Theory of Change, for the purposes of evaluating the success of poverty-reduction efforts.
2. Community-based participatory research into an aspect of poverty that the community wants to learn more about for the purposes of taking local action.

This system would meet two sets of goals that are of central importance to the future of poverty reduction work in Nunavut:

1. Monitoring of GN initiatives to ensure their consistency with the Makimaniq Plan and the Five-Year Action Plan, and to evaluate their contribution to poverty reduction, is mandated under the Collaboration for Poverty Reduction Act. To this end, the Nunavut Anti-Poverty Secretariat has concluded that community-based monitoring of indicators will be necessary.
2. One of the key themes of the Makimaniq Plan and the Roundtable’s Theory of Change is that of collaboration and community participation. The gathering of the Roundtable in June, 2013 agreed to an understanding of poverty reduction that centers upon working together, and it was also a point of consensus that, since most of the poverty-reduction initiatives will be community-based and locally specific, the Roundtable needs to engage more with communities going forward.

The case for addressing these goals together through community-based research is simple. Both revolve around the importance of working towards a shared understanding of the complex dynamics of poverty in the territory. Both require strong, productive relationships between different stakeholders in the effort to reduce poverty.
And both depend on fostering the link between knowledge and action: creating common knowledge together as the basis for new interventions, and learning more about the knowledge communities already have and ensuring that it continues to play an important part in maintaining well-being. Community-based research has been proven to build shared understanding, foster creative and mutually beneficial relationships between diverse stakeholders, empower communities, and proactively turn research into action.

Poverty is complex: it is not an objective condition, nor is it a static one. Ongoing dialogue at the local level is essential to understanding how poverty is experienced and how the challenge is evolving over time. The shift towards local self-reliance that is part of the GN’s mission can and should be accompanied by a commensurate shift in how the knowledge that informs governance is developed. This project affirms the fact that communities are the real experts on poverty in the territory. In doing so, it is liable to lead to better and more holistic performance management for the Secretariat, and more powerful and pragmatic community-level action that has the support of a broader array of stakeholders from the get-go.

Basics

The pilot project would take place in 4-5 communities over the time span of the Nunavut Anti-Poverty Secretariat’s Five Year Poverty Reduction Action Plan. The process is outlined in greater detail in Section 5, and an example is provided in Appendix 1. Year 1 would be devoted to laying the groundwork for the project and ensuring adequate engagement – scoping, relationship-building, hiring a Coordinator, beginning to assemble working groups and preparing researcher training curriculum. Years 2-4 would be devoted to facilitating annual monitoring and research cycles in each of the pilot communities. In Year 5, indicator monitoring would continue, and the community research process would wind down so that the Coordinator could focus on evaluating its contribution to poverty reduction and considering whether and how it could be scaled up across the territory along with increased indicator monitoring.
Figure 1: Reducing poverty in Nunavut requires making the most of different types of expertise.

Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit
- Practices and wisdom passed down from one's community
- Often shared through cultural and spiritual traditions

Experiential Knowledge
- Lived experience: what people learn and know from dealing day-to-day with issues that impact their

Institutional Knowledge
- Published facts and data produced by "experts," often from outside a communitie, for institutions like the government

Inspired by DataCenter’s (2013) Research Justice Vision.
2. Community-Based Monitoring

The International Development Research Centre (IDRC) in Ottawa has supported the development and implementation of community-based poverty monitoring systems (CBMS) in Asia and Africa, and has published the definitive guide to CBMS implementation, *Fighting Poverty With Facts*. Their research is the starting point for the CKPA framework. This section will outline the conventional CBMS process as advanced by the IDRC, identify a number of areas which can be improved upon in Nunavut to better reflect the territory’s unique context, and begin to lay out a vision for how a community-based monitoring can be incorporated into the Secretariat’s poverty reduction work.

**Conventional CBMS**

The goal of conventional community-based monitoring systems is to address information gaps in planning by institutionalizing systematic data collection and validation at the local level. This type of initiative has predominantly been used in developing countries: for example, large-scale CBMS is in place in the Philippines and India. The principal aim of CBMS is to reduce poverty, and it has been proven to do just that in a range of communities around the developing world.¹

CBMS measures a core set of fourteen indicators across all communities within the system at recurring intervals. These indicators were chosen because they are easy to collect and process, the IDRC states. Community-specific indicators can also be added to this core set.² The measurement process stands out because it relies on a partnership between communities and the government, and builds the capacity of local-level governments to use statistics in planning, monitoring and evaluating actions. The IDRC states that CBMS is a tool that democratizes decision-making and empowers communities, although as I will argue below, this occurs to varying degrees depending upon the system, and the standard model would need to be augmented to ensure that these benefits came about in Nunavut.

The IDRC has identified eight steps to implementing a community-based poverty monitoring system:

1. Advocacy and organization
2. Data collection and field editing
3. Data encoding and digitization
4. Processing and mapping
5. Data validation and community consultation

---

¹ See pages 25-65 of *Fighting Poverty With Facts* for detailed CBMS success stories.
² The IDRC does not detail the process by which community-specific indicators would be established. The examples of community-specific indicators it does give are not actually specific to individual communities, but reflect regional priorities, and it is not clear whether they were added as a result of community pressure or a decision within government.
6. Database management
7. Plan formulation
8. Dissemination, implementation and monitoring

These steps can be applied inexpensively and frequently, and the system as a whole is easy to sustain and is easily conducted by trained members of local communities. The community is engaged primarily in steps 2-5. Beginning in step 2, community “enumerators” collect the data according to the surveys developed by the sponsoring authority. In steps 3 and 4, trained community members encode and process the data. In step 5, the local government presents the results in a community forum with the stated purpose of ensuring the accuracy of the data and obtaining input on explanations for the findings. Steps 6 through 8 are largely conducted by and within the civil service at various scales of government.

Over time, the data gathered through community monitoring of indicators forms a valuable longitudinal database of information that shows which aspects of poverty reduction efforts are working, for whom, and how. This data is more up-to-date and in-depth across a range of communities than that which governments at a higher scale would be able to gather themselves.

**Improving on conventional CBM systems**

While CBM has led to a higher degree of empowered participation and resulted in poverty reduction in developing countries, a number of shortcomings common among pre-existing systems can be improved upon and made more appropriate for poverty reduction in Nunavut through the CKPA framework.

**Data diversity**

Decisions about what information will be collected by the community are sometimes made within governing institutions at the equivalent of the territorial or federal level, with limited or no community input. In cases where indicators are determined in part by local actors, the extent to which this determination is undertaken by local authorities or the broader community itself varies. Although CKPA involves asking communities to monitor a standard set of local indicators, these indicators are Nunavut-specific (see next paragraph), arise from the collaborative and community-driven Roundtable process, and reflect community priorities first and foremost. Within the CKPA framework, communities have the final say over which indicators they will monitor, and the option to add indicators to the monitoring component of the process. Finally, through the research component of the CKPA process, communities are given

---

3 The IDRC emphasizes the importance of developing community-specific indicators, and this is indeed one of the strengths of the CBM system in theory. This does not always seem to be borne out in practice, however; in many cases, this is due to standardized monitoring and evaluation requirements stipulated by international agencies such as the World Bank or the UN. For example, some CBM systems only measure progress towards the UN’s Millennium Development Goals.
the resources and support to gather a variety of other data, including but not limited to indicator-style measurements.

**Methodological diversity**

CBMS tends to rely primarily on surveys for data collection; focus groups are occasionally involved, but the emphasis is rarely on qualitative and/or social knowledge. While surveys will play an important role in CKPA, this framework opens up more space for community-determined strategies of qualitative inquiry, particularly via community-based research projects, and encourages broader use of stakeholder focus groups and interviews. This is particularly important in the context of Nunavut, where the Inuit oral culture is a source of a great deal of knowledge. Making more space for qualitative and group-based inquiry also reflects the importance of collaboration and community participation in poverty reduction work. Finally, the Community Researchers themselves gain much more from facilitating focus groups and conducting interviews than they would from just administering surveys; it is through these more interactive and personal methods of inquiry that relationships, networks and leadership skills are really developed.

**Carrying out the research**

The range of community members involved in CBMS as designed by the IDRC is limited, and there is little emphasis on developing relationships between different actors who play a role in reducing poverty. As mentioned above, community members are involved in steps 2-5 of the process set out by the IDRC. However, probing their description of the process a little further, areas of potential improvement emerge. First, the only stakeholders involved in developing the methodology and tools for data-gathering are the provincial and local governments. In the CKPA framework, community members with lived experience of poverty, as well as a range of local stakeholders from both in- and outside government are involved in determining the methodology and data-gathering tools. Secondly, the IDRC does not specify who in the community might act as the “enumerators” who collect and process the data, and in most case studies it seems as though the enumerators are primarily those who already work for local governments in some capacity. In the CKPA framework, data is collected by community members who would not otherwise have the opportunity to be involved in this type of project, with the goal of democratizing the research process and offering leadership and skill development opportunities to the most vulnerable. Thirdly, in the IDRC’s model, the local and provincial governments are the only stakeholders involved in analyzing the findings and developing conclusions to share with the community. In the CKPA framework, Community Researchers and the range of stakeholders involved in the Working Group collaborate to analyze the data and come up with preliminary conclusions, which are then discussed and revised through a broader community dialogue.
Using the research

The data and findings tend to be used primarily by government bodies at various scales, and the decisions about interventions or policy changes based on the data tend to be made within the walls of these institutions. As a result, the “action” that results from the monitoring tends to be taken “from above” and by those who conventionally have power to intervene. Additionally, since it’s focused primarily on refining local government planning, the IDRC’s model devotes little attention to how civil society actors can collaborate to use the research to take local action. CKPA is geared towards producing knowledge that can be used by a more diverse audience, and is designed to promote community-level action by a range of actors at different scales, including but not limited to the GN and municipal governments. Furthermore, CKPA focuses more strongly than other CBM systems on forming relationships between those with the capacity to take action on a specific issue, based on the understanding that collaboration (rather than unilateral GN action) is key to reducing poverty in Nunavut.

Community-Based Monitoring in Nunavut

As outlined above, there are a number of ways to adapt and improve the standard CBMS model to make it more relevant and effective in Nunavut. The most significant improvement would be to deepen community involvement at the beginning and end of the process: at the stage of determining what knowledge to gather, and at the stage of determining what to do with this knowledge. Insufficient community leadership and involvement at each stage of the inquiry process often undermines social research in the North, and it is argued here that following the CBMS process as stipulated by the IDRC would not go far enough in challenging this status quo.

CKPA modifies the CBMS process in two principal ways in order to overcome this insufficiency. The first, discussed in this section, is by increasing community and stakeholder involvement at all stages of the monitoring process. The second, discussed in the next chapter, is by pairing monitoring work with a participatory, action-oriented research project of the community’s choosing.

Who monitors?

CKPA proposes that Community Researchers (see Section XYZ), who have lived experience of poverty and who do not occupy positions of power in the community, carry out the bulk of the monitoring work. Supporting the research team is a Working Group composed of a diverse range of community stakeholders from in- and outside the government.

What is monitored?

In the monitoring component of CKPA, it is expected that the Secretariat will have a list of indicators they would like each of the participating communities to monitor. What sets this apart from conventional CBMS is that these indicators stem directly from the collaborative Roundtable process and reflect community priorities, rather than those of the federal or territorial government or another high-level funder. Furthermore, each community has the choice of whether to agree to monitor these
indicators, and can negotiate with the Secretariat to add or remove indicators where necessary. Lastly, the community-based research project ensures that the community has the resources to delve deeper into an issue of particular concern, and build an understanding of it over time in a way that suits their priorities for action.

**How is monitoring conducted?**

While the indicators identified by the Secretariat for community-based monitoring require the use of survey, they also offer more opportunities for focus groups and the incorporation of qualitative knowledge than conventional CBMS. Communities will also have the resources to add a range of methods to both the monitoring and research components of CKPA if they deem that this would provide a better sense of poverty in their community.

For example, in the Performance Management Framework, indicators 4.3.1 (“number and type of early childhood development programs available by community”) and 4.3.2 (“number and type of parenting support programs available by community”) are identified for community-based monitoring, using the “count and list” method. If early childhood development and parental support were particularly important for the community, and the Community Researchers and Working Group identified that holding a focus group would better reflect the community’s progress towards the Theory of Change’s short-term outcome of increased access to early childhood development services, they would have the training and resources to be able to facilitate this focus group, and the assurance that the findings from this group would be taken into account by the Secretariat in its overall poverty monitoring efforts.

**How is action taken?**

By involving community members of all types, as well as stakeholders representing a range of different institutions and organizations, CKPA ensures that actions are planned and taken collaboratively and based on relationships that transcend conventional institutional working patterns.
3. Community-Based Research

Research is the methodical, coordinated process of investigating and learning for a particular purpose; it is not reserved as a skill for a privileged few. People use forms of research every day to improve their lives, and through this have built expertise in the problems they face and the solutions they need. What keeps this expertise from bringing about change is a lack of resources, coordination, and legitimacy. In political decision-making, legitimacy tends to be conferred to specific types of Euro-Canadian, technocratic knowledge about an issue – “Institutional Knowledge” in Figure 1. This can lead to problematic conclusions and actions, especially when it comes to marginalized groups such as those experiencing poverty. To reduce poverty in Nunavut, the process of learning about the issue needs to be based on a better balance between institutional, experiential and cultural knowledge, all of which offer ways to make sense of the past and plan for the future. Actions need to be based in the various ways that people understand and make decisions about their own situations.

Community-based research achieves the following goals:
- Synthesis between the collection and use of knowledge (research and action)
- Breaks down the “wall” between researcher and researched
- Restructures power relations in the research process
- Honors the knowledge and strengths within Nunavut’s communities

All aspects of the research involve people from the community, and the research is grounded by the lived experiences of the researchers. The community, through the Researchers, defines the research question and methodology, and is involved in all stages of the project's progress, including conducting the research, participating in data analysis, developing policy and service recommendations and participating in knowledge-sharing. This project has been designed to include a Working Group of community leaders that supports the research process, and the hope is that their involvement in determining the path of the research leads to productive collaboration and clear pathways for the research to lead to local action.

Community-based research is action-oriented. The focus is not “what is the problem,” but “how do we respond.” The need is not just for “more data,” but for the understanding and relationships necessary to act. By involving all relevant stakeholders and those impacted by poverty in all stages the inquiry process, the research process itself builds the relationships and common understanding necessary to take lasting action. Furthermore, by including those who will use the research in the knowledge-building process, CKPA ensures that the research suits their needs and goals, and in doing so, can lead to “workable” conclusions.
Incorporating Community-based Research into Monitoring

Community-based research is a way to make the monitoring process more equitable, and ensure that communities and individuals benefit as much from the work as the Secretariat does. Since community-based research processes tend to follow a very similar set of steps to monitoring – recruiting researchers and supportive partners, identifying important areas where knowledge creation would have an impact, collecting relevant information, engaging in collaborative dialogues with this information, and making informed contributions to social change efforts – there is an opportunity to link a monitoring system with a more participatory research project to achieve a more holistic knowledge-gathering process for all stakeholders involved.
4. Roles

This section elaborates upon the roles of the key actors in the proposed CKPA process. These may well evolve over time, but the basic structure outlined below is recommended for the length of the pilot project. Continuity of involvement should be considered a priority, however it’s likely that each community will experience some degree of turnover. This will be a test of the system’s supportive structure and the ability of communities to continue to move forward together.

Project Coordinator

The Project Coordinator will be a position within the Nunavut Anti-Poverty Secretariat. Broadly, the Coordinator will be responsible for initiating and overseeing the CBPMS process in participating communities. The Secretariat should ensure that the Coordinator has sources of support that he or she can turn to for guidance at different stages of the process; for example, if the Coordinator has limited experience leading training sessions, the Secretariat should ensure that they have a connection to someone with experience in adult education in Nunavut that they can turn to for advice.

Aside from specific duties in each stage of the CBPMS process outlined in Section XYZ, the Coordinator has a number of overarching responsibilities:

• Acting as the primary liaison between the Secretariat and Community Researchers and Working Groups
• Developing tools and resources for Community Researchers and Working Groups as community needs evolve
• Ensuring outreach, advocacy and publicity
• Conducting “archival” work to ensure “institutional memory,” including:
  o An internal log, “journaling” the development of the project
  o Ensuring the organized storage of notes, findings, progress reports, etc.
  o Keeping resources and tools up-to-date
  o Gathering (and circulating) new resources or research from other jurisdictions that may be of use to different actors and stakeholders.
• Maintaining the pace of the project
• Upholding the balance between the communities’ and the Secretariat’s priorities
• Budgeting

Experience as a facilitator would be valuable.
Working Group

A Working Group of approximately four to six people will support the Community. Working Group members will be community leaders who have experience with poverty reduction work. These leaders may be experienced service providers within government or with non-profit organizations, elders, young adults, etc. Refer to Section XYZ for more information on the composition of Working Groups, as well as the possibility of using existing groups in the community to fulfill this purpose.

The Working Group’s primary purpose is ensuring that monitoring and research leads to local action, rather than existing in a vacuum. Through participation alone, Working Group members should be forming valuable relationships between the CBPMS and their respective organizations and constituencies. Group membership is also an opportunity for new relationships between these organizations and constituencies to develop.

The Working Groups’ specific responsibilities include:
• Acting as an informed local resource to the Community Researchers and the Coordinator
• Building relationships to turn research into action
• Assisting where applicable with Researcher training and skill development
• Assisting with community engagement and stakeholder involvement
• Acting as a source of support and encouragement for the Community Researchers
• Using the project and findings to bring about change in the community

Community Researchers

Depending on the size of each community, 2-4 community members with lived experience of poverty will be recruited to act as Community Researchers. Community Researchers will be deeply involved at all stages of the monitoring and research process, and will act as key representatives of the interests of the community at large and, specifically, those struggling with poverty.

Community Researchers should be willing to devote a total of between two to four weeks of their time each year to the project. In the first year, this will include about one week’s worth of training workshops. Community Researchers will be paid honoraria for their research and training time – if researchers are recipients of Income Assistance, it may be possible to organize a “top up” to this payment.

Researchers’ specific responsibilities include:
• Participating in designing the research agenda, methodology and tools
• Participating in training
• Data-gathering (conducting surveys and interviews, facilitating focus groups)
• Data analysis (tabulating survey results, analyzing interview and focus group notes)
• Presenting findings and facilitating community dialogues
• Preparing research for dissemination
• Community advocacy
• Participation in reflection exercises, providing input on the future of the research and the development of tools and resources

Benefits to researchers include:
• Access to training
• Opportunity to develop new knowledge and skills
• Leadership opportunities
• Greater awareness of issues being researched
• Work experience and potential employment opportunities
• Income
• Self-confidence
• New relationships and networks

Nunavut Anti-Poverty Secretariat
The Nunavut Anti-Poverty Secretariat will be the “home institution” of the CBPMS. It will have to initiate the CBPMS; hire, pay and provide office space and supplies to the Project Coordinator; set the budget and arrange funding for the CBPMS.

The Secretariat will use the indicator-specific data collected by Community Researchers in its monitoring efforts. Based on its Theory of Change, it will decide which indicators will be marked for community-based monitoring, and work with the Coordinator to introduce new indicators to the data-collection tools as and when appropriate.

As the administrative body supporting the Poverty Reduction Roundtable, the Secretariat will also ensure that the results of the CBPMS – indicators and community projects – are incorporated into Roundtables.

The Secretariat’s specific responsibilities include:
• Staffing and funding the Project Coordinator position
• Agreeing on a budget with the Project Coordinator
• Funding the project in each of the five pilot communities
• Incorporating community data into overall poverty reduction monitoring and evaluation work
• Incorporating CKPA findings and lessons into policy work where applicable
• Incorporating community research into Roundtable meetings where applicable
• Advocacy and outreach
5. Process

*The steps below proceed with the assumption that the Secretariat has appointed a Project Coordinator. A brief description of this role is included in Section 4.*

1. Establish Local Working Group

A Working Group composed of community leaders provides the supporting structure for the research process. The first responsibility of the Project Coordinator, with the help of Secretariat staff and their connections, will be establishing each local Working Group and securing its membership. This will be done primarily through outreach to individuals who are recognized leaders in their communities. In seeking members, priority should be given to those who have participated in the Roundtable in the past and are familiar with its structure and goals. That said, this is not a set-in-stone precondition; many important community members may not have had the opportunity or resources to participate. Working Group members should be representative of the community's priorities, willing to share responsibility for change with community members, and motivated to turn research into action.

The Working Group may include:
- Experienced members of the hamlet or territorial government
- Representatives from health and social service organizations
- Representatives from local Inuit organizations
- Community leaders
- Elders

It may be possible for an existing group or committee in the community to serve this purpose, such as a Wellness Committee or the Community Economic Development Committee, where these exist. However, if an existing group is used, the Coordinator should ensure that they represent a range of perspectives, interests and experiences. Changing and/or building relationships between relevant stakeholders is a key part of the CKPA process, and the Coordinator should be confident that using an existing group will be conducive to this.

During their first gathering, the Group should agree on the principles that will guide their work. A set of core principles, either as prompts or foundation for agreement, might be provided by the Coordinator, or borrowed from another community. The Working Group in each community should be encouraged to shape these principles to the local context.
2. Recruit Community Researchers

With the assistance of Working Group members, the Coordinator should arrange for a call to be put out in the community - over the radio, at local establishments and through local service providers - for people willing to be involved in the project as Community Researchers. Working Group members should also be encouraged to reach out to particular individuals who they think would make good candidates. All effort should be made to recruit researchers who have lived experience of poverty. Community Researchers should be able to speak both Inuktitut (or Inuinnaqtun where appropriate) and English, and to involve young adults (age 16 and up) and Elders.

The selection process for Community Researchers should be agreed upon with the Working Group in advance of the recruitment process. In general, however, if there’s a surplus of eligible candidates, Working Group members should interview all those interested in applying. Consideration should also be given to the amount of energy that Community Researchers can realistically devote to the project, how each candidate would benefit from the opportunities it affords those who participate, the different sets of lived experiences that each candidate would bring to the process, and whether the team is representative of the community. While ideally not exceeding five, the number of Community Researchers per community does not need to be fixed, and the Working Group and Coordinator should proceed with a team that they believe represents a diversity of experiences, capacities and which they believe will be committed to participating for the three years of the pilot project.

3. Reach Consensus on Research Plan

Once they have been brought on board, the Community Researchers and the Working Group should meet for an introduction to the monitoring process and the community-based research. From there, they need to forge a consensus on an area of inquiry – for example, homelessness or youth opportunities. If at all possible, the Coordinator should be on hand to lead these meetings. Research projects can feel like daunting tasks, but with proper planning and facilitation, they can be done well even by the smallest community groups.

Since the CBPMS is designed to produce knowledge that will be of use to both the Roundtable and to the communities, two sets of agreements need to be established. First, the Secretariat (represented by the Project Coordinator) will need to reach an agreement with the Working Group and Community Researchers in each community about what will be monitored, and how. Secondly, communities (represented by Community Researchers and Working Groups) will have to reach an agreement on the research agenda they would like to take over the course of the pilot project.
The community’s research agenda will need to include:

- A statement of objectives
- A research question
- A list of data needs
- A list of the methods and tools to gather the data
- An explanation of who the audience for the research is
- An explanation of the changes they hope the research will bring about in the community.

**Building Agreement on Monitoring Poverty Reduction**

Together with the Working Group and the Community, the Project Coordinator should facilitate a discussion about the Roundtable’s Theory of Change, how change is measured across the set of indicators outlined in the Performance Management Framework, and the specific indicators of change that the Secretariat hopes to measure through community-based monitoring. The Coordinator should propose the set of indicators that the Secretariat would like the community to monitor, and the group should discuss these to ensure there is a shared understanding about the purpose of monitoring them and reach an agreement to carry out the monitoring.

Once agreement has been reached on what will be measured, the group should come to a common understanding of the tools and methods that will be used. As above, the Secretariat should propose a method for gathering the data for each indicator (survey, focus group, etc.) and, where necessary, give some background on these methods and explain why the Secretariat has chosen them. The group should discuss the proposal, clarify any areas of uncertainty and reach an agreement to carry forward with these methods to monitor the Secretariat’s indicators.

**Community-based Research**

After reaching a consensus on the monitoring component, as outlined above, the Coordinator should facilitate a series of discussions with the Working Group and Community Researchers about the community-specific research agenda that they would like to pursue in their communities with the resources available through this program.

The group should begin by discussing the principles and goals of community-based research. Following this, it might be a good idea for the group to do an exercise along the lines of ‘We are the Experts!’\(^4\) or ‘Tour of the Knowledge Factory’\(^5\) to ensure that the group reaches a common understanding of the power relationships involved in knowledge production in Nunavut and fact that while community knowledge can stand at a disadvantage in terms of influencing policy, communities can control the means of knowledge production and exercise the right to know and the right to be heard.

Next, the group should work towards finalizing an area of inquiry. The *Makimaniq Plan* and the Roundtable’s *Theory of Change* might be good starting points,

---

\(^4\) DataCenter, *An Introduction to Research Justice*, page 14

\(^5\) DataCenter, *An Introduction to Research Justice*, page 10 and 21-24
as they identify key themes and priority areas for poverty reduction work. Existing community documents like Wellness Plans may also be helpful resources at this stage, as these tend to identify priority actions. When thinking about research agendas, participants should be encouraged to consider how the information and knowledge gathered can be applied to bring about change in the community.

### Finding a research question

All the themes of The Makimaniq Plan suggest specific issues communities may choose to direct their respective research efforts towards:

- **Healing and Wellbeing**
  - e.g., “How do addictions affect our community, what actions are being taken, and how can we ensure that they have the support to develop?”

- **Education and Skills Development**
  - e.g., “How can we improve high school graduation rates?”

- **Food Security**
  - e.g., “What can we do together to ensure that access to country food does not decrease?”

- **Housing and Income Support**
  - e.g., “What does it mean to be homeless in our community, and how can we better support those experiencing homelessness?”

- **Community and Economic Development**
  - e.g., “How can we increase the economic opportunities of young people in our community?”

- **Collaboration and Community Participation**
  - e.g., “How does colonialism impact our community in the present and how can we move forward together?”

Once the area of inquiry has been determined, the group should try to identify specific research goals. Ideally, these would be articulated in one or two sentences stating the visible and measurable impact it is hoped that the research will achieve. Accompanying these goals should be a specific research question that guides the process (see Figure XYZ above). The group will also need to identify its audience as specifically as possible – this will probably include “the community,” but an effort should also be made to pinpoint specific policymakers, etc.

With all of that in mind, the group will need to determine which data will be most beneficial to advance their goals, and where that data can be found. Some data may already exist in public documents or at specific organizations – for example, a homeless shelter may keep records of how many beds are filled on a given night. Other data related to individual experiences, or the opinions of certain individuals or groups, may need to be created through research tools such as surveys or interviews. The tools used will depend on the group’s assessment of the data needed. The group will need to
design its own research tools. This is an opportunity for those involved to reaffirm their ownership over the research project, intimately understand its role in the overall effort to reduce poverty, and keep them invested in the process and the outcomes.

Once the research topic, questions, goals and methods have been identified, it might be a good idea to open up the dialogue to the community to discuss the proposed research strategy, and gain their feedback and support. Building broad buy-in from the outset will help ensure that the later phases are as productive as possible. After this meeting, the Community Researchers, Working Group and Coordinator can incorporate this feedback into a finalized research agenda. After sharing this agenda with the Secretariat for feedback, research training can commence.

Tools

A number of tools may be of assistance in determining the community-based research agenda. These include:

• ‘Asset-mapping’ (NTI, 2011, p.66)
• ‘Identifying the Issues in Your Community’ (NTI, 2011, p.77)
• ‘Create a Community Vision’ (NTI, 2011, p.69)
• ‘Understanding Participatory Research Methods’ workshop (DataCenter, 2013, pg. 44-46)
• ‘Creating Your Research Plan’ workshop (DataCenter, 2013, p. 47-50)
• *The Makimaniq Plan*
• The Roundtable for Poverty Reduction’s *Theory of Change*
• Pre-existing *Community Wellness Plan*
• *Socio-Economic Assessment & Monitoring* (NEDA, 2006)
• *Fighting Poverty With Facts* (IDRC, 2006)

Resources that will help with methodology and tool development include

• *Participatory Research Kit: Creating surveys* (DataCenter, 2004)
• *Participatory Research Kit: Conducting Interviews* (DataCenter, 2010)
• *Inclusion Research Handbook* (OWHN, 2009)
• *Introduction to Research Justice* (DataCenter, 2013)

4. Train Community Researchers

Community Researcher training should take place over a series of workshops facilitated by the Project Coordinator (where is this not possible, the Coordinator could arrange for a member of the Working Group, or another community member who might have the appropriate skillset, to deliver the training). Research training programs in other contexts have taken approximately 15 hours; the Coordinator should work with the Community Researchers to determine a schedule that suits everyone's busy lives.

The Coordinator will be responsible for providing the curriculum, based on the skills required to carry out the monitoring and any additional skills needed to round out
the methods identified in the community’s research agenda. Training should be interactive; activities facilitate sharing and creative problem solving, which is an important part of the entire process. Visual aids - such as flip charts - should be used to keep track of progress and help everyone retain information. Worksheets and resources that the Community Researchers can use as reference as the project develops may also come in handy - various organizations, from NTI to the Ontario Women’s Health Network have developed relevant tools, listed below, and the Coordinator may want to look to these examples in developing his/her own. At every opportunity, Community should be given the chance to practice the new skills they are developing. Role-playing exercises may be valuable in this regard.

Working Group members should be encouraged to sit in on training sessions if possible. They’re likely to be able to provide more constructive support if they’re familiar with the research methods and the Community Researchers attitudes towards and experiences with them. Working Group members may also want to lead additional community-specific workshops on the history of local poverty reduction work, the various stakeholders involved in poverty reduction work, etc.

Community Researchers should also have a short “refresher” workshop annually, as well as access (with the help of the Coordinator) to any tools, resources or materials that may assist them in their roles as their inquiry progresses.

Training should cover:

- Developing and administering surveys
- How to facilitate a focus group, and how to take notes to record the proceedings
- Preparing for and conducting an interview
- Conducting a literature review (if applicable)
- Quantitative and qualitative data analysis
- Research Ethics

**Tools**

In developing and facilitating the training program, the Coordinator may benefit from the following tools:

- ‘Challenges and Opportunities to Working Together’ (NTI, 2011, p. 69)
- ‘Organizing a Working Group Meeting’ (NTI, 2011, p.78)
- *Inclusion Research Handbook* (OWHN, 2009)
- ‘We are the Experts!’ (DataCenter, *Introduction to Research Justice*, p. 14-18)
- *Participatory Research Kit: Creating Surveys* (DataCenter, 2004)
- *Participatory Research Kit: Conducting Interviews* (DataCenter, 2010)
5. Data-Gathering

In this phase, the Community carries out the data-gathering methods agreed upon in Phase 3 and for which training was provided in Phase 4. This will likely involve surveys and focus groups to collect indicator-related data, as well as relevant methods for the community’s research project of choice. This phase will likely extend over a period of 2-3 weeks, depending on the number of Community Researchers, the size of the community, and the research methods undertaken.

This will be one of the most intense parts of the whole process, demanding lots of time and energy from the Community Researchers. One or more Working Group members should arrange to have periodic (even daily) check-ins with Community Researchers to discuss any issues that might be cropping up, and so that the group can gather to provide each other with support.

Surveys

Surveys are likely to comprise a part of the data-gathering phase. If this is the case, the Community Researchers and Working Group should arrange to publicize the fact that the survey will be conducted, over radio, public notices, and/or word of mouth. Surveys may be conducted at the household level, or if the goals of the research suggest otherwise (i.e. targeting a subset of the population like high school students), they may be conducted at specific locations around the community, such as a school or Wellness Centre.

Focus Groups

Community Researchers will have received training on how to conduct a focus group, including ways to secure participation. Advance planning will be necessary to notify the relevant people that these discussions are taking place. Working Group members and local service providers may also be of assistance in securing participation. The Working Group may be able to offer support scheduling these meetings and securing space and necessary supplies.

Interviews

If Community Researchers have identified the need to conduct interviews with specific individuals in the community (or outside the community, i.e. a GN employee in Iqaluit), Working Group members may be able to provide assistance in making these connections.
6. Analyze Research

Once the data gathering has been carried out, Community Researchers conduct an initial analysis. Data analysis involves inspecting and “cleaning up” the data with the goal of bringing useful information to light. For the quantitative information gathered, this will entail compiling, digitizing, and summarizing the results. For the qualitative information gathered through focus groups or interviews, Community Researchers will use their training to draw out common themes, suggested actions, and points of consensus.

The Working Group will then join the Community Researchers to go over the initial analysis of the community-specific data, and through discussion the entire team augment and build on their conclusions as necessary. Together, they will make an attempt at synthesizing the data into new knowledge – taking the information and turning it in to powerful messages that reflect the community’s experience and shine light on both the problems the group is trying to address and the solutions for which they are advocating. The Working Group will also verify the information collected for the purpose of the Secretariat’s Performance Management Framework.

As a part of this process, Community Researchers should identify policy and service recommendations that arise through the research or that they feel follow naturally from the findings. Identifying specific actions will help mobilize the community around them, and ensure that the project does not exist in a vacuum.

When the Community Researchers and Working Groups are satisfied with their analysis and synthesis of the findings, they will prepare to present them to the community. For the PMF-related indicators, this may consist of a putting together a simple presentation for discussion and validation, while for the community research project, a more involved and multi-faceted approach may be designed to ensure that the research helps the community works toward pragmatic, grassroots actions to reduce poverty.

7. Community Dialogue

The results of the monitoring and research components of the CBPMS will need to be brought to the community. This will create dialogue and momentum around the changes sought by the research, and poverty reduction efforts in general.

Poverty Reduction Indicators

The data gathered on the poverty reduction indicators will need to be validated by the community before being submitted to the Secretariat. The indicators should be presented in the context of the broader Theory of Change, and an explanation behind the methodology used to measure them should be given. For indicators where
previous measurements exist, changes over time should be presented, and for all indicators, upcoming initiatives or changes that may influence the data over the upcoming year should also be mentioned.

The meeting participants should be given the opportunity to discuss what these findings mean for the community – in terms of lessons, opportunities for action, etc. – and these thoughts should be recorded by Community Researchers or members of the Working Group and shared with the Secretariat along with the indicator data.

**Community-based Research**

Community Researchers should also share their analysis and synthesis of their findings with the community, as well as update them on any action (or plans for action) that may already have arisen from their work. The discussions of this research should be as interactive as possible – it’s important to be sure that the Community Researchers are serving the goals of the community and have broad support, and a democratic dialogue will contribute immensely to this. Participants should be encouraged to share their own analyses and syntheses, suggestions for actions or supplemental research, etc. If broad support from the community is secured, the research is much more likely to lead to action and accountability for that action.

**8. Data Sharing and Advocacy**

Communications staff at the GN or NTI may be able to assist with disseminating the knowledge to wider audiences via social media or other online tools.

**Poverty Reduction Indicators**

Once analyzed and validated by the community, all of the data pertaining to Performance Management Framework indicators will be passed on to the Secretariat for the evaluation of territorial poverty reduction work. The information gathered will be stored in a database maintained by the Secretariat. Communities and service providers working on issues related to poverty at different scales will be able access this valuable longitudinal data to support their ongoing efforts. The indicators will be used to show progress in various aspects of the Roundtable’s Theory of Change, and as such will also be used to prepare materials for Roundtable meetings and as the basis for discussions and dialogue between Roundtable members. For example, free GIS software could be used to map specific aspects of the data at the territorial scale.

The Secretariat and Roundtable member organizations will be able to rely on this data as they continue to carry out the valuable work they are doing, as well as advocate for new policies and initiatives with a richer foundation of knowledge and a better sense of what is having the most impact on people’s everyday lives.

**Community-based Research**

Since the research will be focused on change at the community level, the most important audience – the community and its leaders – will already have been involved
from the beginning, and the research will be familiar to them. For Working Group members and their home organizations in particular, planning or action based on the research may already be underway. The validation meetings and dialogues will hopefully have spurred broader local momentum around the focus issue.

After going through the Community Dialogue phase, Community Researchers and Working Groups will be encouraged to share updates on the progress they’ve made on their research projects with the Secretariat. Since the communities “own” their data, it’s ultimately their choice whether and how to share the progress, but it is hoped that the Coordinator can reach an agreement with them on a sharing timetable and format that is mutually beneficial. The Secretariat can be a valuable source of advice and connections for these community projects. Community Researchers will also be offered the opportunity to present their community’s findings at the next Roundtable meeting, and can collaborate with the Working Group and the Coordinator to find an effective and meaningful way of sharing this information.

Working Groups can also work with the Coordinator and the Secretariat to determine other stakeholders (for example, specific NTI or GN departments) with whom they would like to share their research, how, and to what end. The Coordinator should offer to help Working Groups develop a research-sharing strategy for key stakeholders working at the territorial scale, since these may not be located within the community in question.

At the culmination of the pilot project, Community Researchers and Working groups will be encouraged to document their successes and the lessons learned along the way. This does not need to be in the form of a formal report or plan; the Coordinator can work with Communities to determine the most effective way of gathering this information together in a way that can be shared broadly.

9. Learning and Reflection

It will be important for all involved to thoughtfully evaluate the outcomes of the CBPMS components and their impacts. After each annual process, Community Researchers and Working Groups should meet to discuss what went well during each phase, what could be improved upon in the future, and how the work is contributing to their desired outcomes. For example, if a policy change is the long-term goal, the first year of research may have shifted or consolidated public opinion, building fertile ground for organizing around policy reform. Or, if the data analysis revealed new community needs, goals might shift a bit to better reflect the community’s true priorities around the issue. Community Researchers should also consider more practical changes that may need to be made – budgets may have to shift, or additional training sessions and tools might be needed to move the project forward.

Consecutive rounds of monitoring will allow the Secretariat and Roundtable members to assess whether policies, programs and projects are yielding the intended results, and whether progress is being made towards outcomes specified in the Theory of Change. Reflection will ideally highlight ways in which indicators and/or
methodology may be modified going forward to better reflect local circumstances and needs. This may lead to changes at the territorial scale, and the development of alternative templates: in the Philippines, due to different sets of local needs, four different sets of household surveys were eventually developed for communities to choose from. The Secretariat may find this to be a valuable step when considering the expansion of the project after the pilot phase.
6. Timeline

Although the CKPA process could hypothetically span any amount of time, and repeat itself in successive cycles, this section lays out a five-year timeline for a pilot project that lines up with the time-span of the Secretariat’s poverty reduction action planning. Appendix 1 applies this timeline to a specific issue in the community of Gjoa Haven.

Year 1

To begin, the Secretariat would need to hire/appoint a Project Coordinator. This position is described in greater detail in Section 4, and the details provided could contribute to a job description for this person.

The first year of the project would be spent laying the groundwork for the research and monitoring processes. There are five main tasks for the first year, which are primarily carried out by the Project Coordinator with assistance from the Secretariat and, where appropriate, key contacts in pilot communities:

• Planning, scoping and forming key relationships
• Selecting participating communities
• Forming Working Groups and recruiting Community Researchers
• Preparing training curriculum and materials
• Finalizing the indicators that the Secretariat will propose to the communities for the monitoring component of the process

Years 2-4

Years 2-4 are devoted to successive rounds of monitoring and research, as illustrated in the diagram. Year 2 begins with intensive workshops to determine the community’s research agenda and agree on a monitoring plan, outlined in Step 3 of the process (page 15). In successive years, this process becomes less intensive, and mainly involves adjustments to the plan agreed upon in Year 2. In a similar vein, while researcher training will be time-consuming and intensive in Year 2, in Years 3 and 4, only shorter refresher sessions will be necessary.
**Year 5**

By the end of the three-year cycle, it is hoped that the Secretariat will have gained valuable, community-level longitudinal data on important indicators of poverty reduction, and that communities will have achieved their research goals. Whether the process continues or is modified is up to the Secretariat, and Year 5 has not been assigned a research cycle so that communities can focus their resources on implementing any actions they may have begun to undertake based on the CKPA process, and so that the Coordinator and Secretariat can focus on evaluating the process and determining next steps.

The Coordinator should use the fifth year to engage in a reflective dialogue with each of the participating communities’ Working Groups and Researchers about what the community gained from the process, what worked well, and how the program could be improved going forward. The Secretariat will also need to consider how and whether to continue monitoring and/or research – this may involve scaling up the CKPA approach, which would be resource intensive and which would depend on the benefits and lessons from the pilot process. Alternatively, it may involve extending a modified version to additional communities. By this point, the Secretariat will be in the process of developing its next five-year action plan, and the dialogue that goes into creating that document will be a valuable forum within which to address these questions.
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Appendix 1: Gjoa Haven Case Study

Overview

In 2014, the Mayor of Gjoa Haven formally submitted a letter to the Department of Family Services seeking resources for a “family violence and/or homeless shelter.” Two housing petitions accompanied this letter, one from the local housing association and one from community members. The dialogue between the community and the GN was complicated – the file was bounced around between different corners of the government, and it was uncertain what type of support the community was seeking (and what type of support was actually needed). The extent of homelessness in the community was also unclear, and it was difficult for the government to build a clear picture of what the issue was, in order to develop a plan to address it. This was the first time that the community had requested resources for emergency housing, and the GN had done very little work directly focused on homelessness in the community before.

This “file” is a good example of an instance where a project like Community Knowledge for Poverty Action can have an impact on poverty reduction in the territory. It offers a framework through which the Secretariat, representing the GN, NTI and the Roundtable, can collaborate with the community to build a common understanding of the challenges it’s facing and facilitate concrete actions at the community level.

Process

1. Establish a local working group

Knowing that homelessness is a priority issue in Gjoa Haven, the Coordinator would reach out to the Mayor and SAO, who were Poverty Reduction Division’s primary points of contact from when they first spoke with the community about emergency housing needs. Ideally, the SAO might agree to join the Working Group, and work with the Coordinator to recruit the rest of the Working Group. Other members might include a social worker from the GN, a teacher, a representative from the local housing association, an Elder, or another Hamlet employee who has previously participated in the Roundtable.

2. Recruit researchers

To recruit researchers, the Working Group would arrange for a call to be put out on the local radio station for individuals with lived experience of one or more aspects of poverty and an interest in helping take local action as a researcher. Additionally, announcements would be made at local service points. Working Group participants could also make sure to personally invite community members who they may have served or worked with in some capacity who they think might make a good addition to the research team and benefit from the experience. All interested would be invited to an information session, where the program would be outlined and the responsibilities
and benefits of being a researcher would be explained – payment, time requirements, skill development, community leadership, etc.

After this meeting, all interested members of the community would be invited to apply to be a Researcher. Applications would be submitted through a local service point like the Hamlet office. The Working Group would meet to discuss the applications, and, if necessary, arrange for interviews to narrow down the group to around 4-5 committed Researchers.

3. Reach Consensus on Research Plan

The Coordinator would need to travel to Gjoa Haven to facilitate this phase (and the next). Two agreements need to be established during this phase: on the monitoring process, and on the community-based research agenda.

The Coordinator’s first task in the community would be to bring the Working Group and Researchers together for a preliminary meeting. At the meeting, the Coordinator, Working Group and Researchers would all be given the opportunity to introduce themselves and share their expectations and initial concerns about CKPA. The Coordinator would proceed to introduce the CKPA framework and its two components: community-based poverty monitoring, and the community-based research project.

A subsequent meeting would need to be dedicated to building agreement on monitoring poverty. This would involve facilitating a discussion about: the Roundtable’s Theory of Change and how change is measured through the Performance Management Framework; the CBM model as developed by the IDRC; and the rationale for using CBM in the context of Nunavut. The Coordinator would introduce the indicators that the Secretariat would like to monitor in the community, and open them up for discussion with a view to reaching agreement on a final set of community-specific and -monitored indicators that would feed in to the PMF. The Coordinator would then have to reach an agreement with the group on the tools that would be used to measure these indicators.

Once the Working Group and Researchers are all on the same page about that part of the CKPA process, the group would move on to build their community-based research agenda. First, this would involve discussing the principles and goals of community-based research, and how it fits in to the CKPA system and the work of the Roundtable. Next, the group would go through some exercises that explore community knowledge and how it can be used to take action on poverty. Then, with a common understanding of the fundamentals of the project in place, the group would try to reach a consensus on the area of inquiry they would like to focus their efforts on, as well as a research agenda, as outlined in the Process section of the CKPA proposal. In this case, the community has already clearly articulated a priority area where they would like to see action in their community: homelessness. This would likely make reaching consensus a little easier to navigate for all involved.
Outline: Sample Research Agenda

Statement of objectives: The Gjoa Haven CKPA team intends to investigate homelessness in the community and explore appropriate interventions with the goal of building a strategy to reduce homelessness in the community that is informed by a common understanding and a will to act shared by all relevant stakeholders.

Research question: What is the extent and experience of homelessness in Gjoa Haven, and how can we better support those with urgent housing needs?

Research audience: Department of Family Services; Nunavut Housing Corp.; Hamlet government

Data needs, sources and tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Need</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Methods + Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness in the community</td>
<td>Households; Service providers</td>
<td>Survey; Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determinants of homelessness</td>
<td>Households; Service providers</td>
<td>Survey; Interviews; Focus Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency housing availability</td>
<td>Service providers; Public records</td>
<td>Interviews; Asset mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency housing needs</td>
<td>Households; Service providers</td>
<td>Survey; Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships necessary for change</td>
<td>Researchers; Working Group; Service providers</td>
<td>Influence mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas for intervention</td>
<td>Community; Service Providers</td>
<td>Focus Groups; Interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timeline: Year 1 focuses on research necessary for developing proposal for emergency shelter; Years 2-3 focus on research that builds understanding of community-level supports for the insecurely housed, and an exploration of strategies to reinforce these supports, as well as augment them with additional action.

Anticipated changes in the community: Increased and appropriate emergency housing options/strategies; open, productive and non-stigmatizing dialogue; closer collaboration between community, service providers and NHC in planning the future of housing in Gjoa Haven.

4. Train Researchers

Beginning with some of the resources recommended in the CKPA proposal, and based on the hypothetical research agenda above, the Coordinator could plan a training program that included: developing surveys; conducting interviews; facilitating focus groups; and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data. In addition to the standard training outlined in the Process section, training in Gjoa Haven could touch specifically on: the findings, lessons and limitations of previous homelessness research in the
territory; the housing spectrum and types of supportive and emergency shelter; different understandings of what it means to be homeless; the specific challenges of participatory research with homeless people.

5. Data-Gathering

Based on the hypothetical research agenda above, and the indicators designated for community-based monitoring in the Performance Management Framework (v.6), researchers would use surveys, focus groups, and interviews to complete the data collection for the monitoring and research components of CKPA. Potential interview candidates for the community’s research project include: Hamlet SAO; social workers; housing officers; elders; people experiencing homelessness; staff from GN Departments of Family Services and Health. Potential focus group sessions include: emergency shelter needs; community support strategies for housing crises; the challenges of being homeless in Gjoa Haven.

6. Analyze Research

Over the course of the analysis of community-based research findings, Researchers and the Working Group would ideally focus on: how the findings pertain to emergency shelter strategies and interventions; areas of consensus on effective ways to create change in the community; service provision gaps relative to homelessness; areas of community strength in dealing with housing issues.

7. Community Dialogue

Based on the research findings, as well as the opinions of Researchers, the Working Group and the Coordinator, a productive Community Dialogue might include the following:

- Development and/or discussion of emergency housing proposals
- Discussion of community strengths in dealing with housing issues, and additional supports for these efforts
- Areas of additional inquiry for the next year’s round of research

8. Data Sharing and Advocacy

Poverty Reduction indicators as agreed upon for the monitoring component of the process would be submitted to the Secretariat, along with any additional material the Researchers or Working Group deemed appropriate, as specified in the Process section of the CKPA proposal.

The findings of the community’s first year of research into emergency housing and homelessness may, for example, go in to the development of a proposal for funding for an emergency shelter in the community. Research in the following year may spur the development community-based support strategies for those who need assistance transitioning out of emergency housing. Depending on the formats in which the Researchers and Working Group agreed to assemble their findings, there may be ways to distribute them to relevant stakeholders at the local and territorial level. This may include the opportunity to present findings and progress at a Roundtable meeting.
Working Group members will be responsible for taking the findings to their respective organizations and constituencies and determining how best to act and have an impact in that regard. Working Group members would also ideally meet at regular intervals to update each other on the actions they are taking within their organizations/constituencies and develop relationships that may make these actions more impactful. They would also be encouraged to share these updates with the Secretariat, as well as seek guidance or connections.

9. Reflection and Evaluation

Each year, the Working Group and Researchers would meet at the end of the research cycle to discuss what went well, what could be improved upon next year, and how they might need to adjust their research agenda to accommodate newly-identified needs or priorities. They’d also identify and discuss lessons for/from other communities.

Prospective Timeline

Year 1: Preparation

- January – March: Secretariat selects pilot communities, including Gjoa Haven
- April – August: Coordinator builds relationships within the community, discusses project with relevant stakeholders, and assembles Working Group
- August – October: Coordinator and Working Group agree on a plan to recruit Researchers
- October – November: Researcher recruitment

Year 2: First Research Cycle

- January: Coordinator travels to Gjoa Haven for two weeks to facilitate the development of the monitoring plan and research agenda, and to lead researcher training
- February – March: Data-gathering (two weeks of full-time household surveys, plus additional time for interviews and focus groups)
- April – June: Data analysis
- July - August: Preparation for, and facilitation of community dialogue
- September - December: Data-sharing and advocacy
- November – December: Reflection and evaluation
- December: Monitoring results and research progress shared at Roundtable

Year 3: Second Research Cycle

- January: Research agenda and priorities adjusted based on previous year’s reflection, evaluation and progress/findings; Training refresher
- February – March: Data-gathering
- April – June: Data analysis
- July – August: Preparation for, and facilitation of community dialogue
- September - December: Data-sharing and advocacy
- November – December: Reflection and evaluation
• December: Monitoring results and research progress shared at Roundtable

Year 4: Third Research Cycle
• January: Research agenda and priorities adjusted based on previous year’s reflection, evaluation and progress/findings; Training refresher
• February – March: Data-gathering
• April – June: Data analysis
• July – August: Preparation for, and facilitation of community dialogue
• September - December: Data-sharing and advocacy
• November – December: Reflection and evaluation
• December: Monitoring results and research progress shared at Roundtable

Year 5
There is no research or monitoring cycle designated for the fifth year of the pilot project at the outset. This year is designated in the pilot project proposal as time for the Secretariat and communities to evaluate the CKPA approach and come to a decision about whether/how to scale it up or wind it down, based on their resources, priorities, and the progress made through monitoring and research.

If the Secretariat is confident that they want to continue with the CKPA model, the community can repeat the same annual cycle as years 2 through 4. If at this point Gjoa Haven had identified and implemented a solution to it’s emergency housing needs – for example, a family violence shelter was currently being built in the community – it may elect to build a new research agenda based on a different priority, for example high school graduation rates. If that were the case, however, indicators related to homelessness could still be monitored through the CKPA framework – homelessness would just not be subject to the same type of action-oriented inquiry as in previous years.

Hypothetical Results
Gjoa Haven identifies the need for a flexible emergency housing site that provides short-term supportive housing for women and children fleeing violence, as well as those in overcrowded situations who may be in need of respite stays. Additionally, the facility is open during the day as a drop-in center. Community dialogue around the issue has removed some of its’ stigma, and the drop-in center is able to offer weekly separate weekly support groups to women, men and youth who are having trouble with their living situation. Gjoa Haven’s in-depth research also helped the government reform the Tunngasuvvik policy to better suit community needs.