

Research Team

Sexual and Gender Diversity: Vulnerability and Resilience

RESSOURCES FOR BUILDING AND MAINTAINING PARTNERSHIPS BETWEEN ACADEMIC RESEARCHERS AND COMMUNITIES

The preparation of this document was facilitated by a grant from the Institute of Gender and Health (IGH), Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR 2005-11-HOA-1988721) and by a grant from the Fonds Québécois de Recherche sur la Société et la Culture (FQRSC 111796) awarded to the research team SVR www.svr.uqam.ca

Table of Content

	Pages
Partnership Definition.....	3
Types of partnership	4
Assessing partnerships	6
Ressources for research with aboriginal communities	11

DEFINITION

“ [...] Partnership is defined here as "a process by which an organization associates itself with at least one other organization, as part of a customized and progressive relationship, who agree to pursue a common goal and compatible objectives, who decide to pool human, information, financial and material resources in order to achieve mutually beneficial results, in accordance with their respective mission, mandate and objectives, while remaining sovereign outside of the partnership” (Boisclair, 2005)²¹.
[Footnote] 21. Michel Boisclair (2005). Lecture notes.”

Cited in BOISCLAIR, Michel and Louis DALLAIRE (2008). “Introduction”, in Michel Boisclair and Louis Dallaire (dir.), *Les défis du partenariat dans les administrations publiques : un regard systémique – Théorie et pratique*, Québec, Presses de l’Université du Québec, accompanied by a CD-ROM, p. 11.

Types of Partnership

Copied from:

BOISCLAIR, Michel et Louis DALLAIRE (2008). Michel Boisclair et Louis Dallaire (dir.), *Les défis du partenariat dans les administrations publiques : un regard systémique – Théorie et pratique*, Québec, Presses de l'Université du Québec, accompanied by a CD-ROM.

	Mutual exchange of information	Consultation	Dialogue	Collaboration
Objectives	To gain information about a person, a group or a subject that is related to our mission, our orientations, our objectives or our future projects.	To ask for advice, an opinion; to question or listen; to ask for and discover the opinions of others; to obtain and provide information, prior to making a decision.	To pool ideas, priorities and ways of doing things, and to agree upon orientations, strategies and actions to be taken, thereby creating a synergy among the partners. This involves "doing things separately".	To pool resources and/or responsibilities in order to attain a goal, in which the contribution of each party, working as associates, is needed to achieve success. This involves "doing things together".
Why	To exchange information about our respective organizations. - Explore avenues for cooperation. - Evaluate risks. - Facilitate the provision of services for all parties. - Report any short-, medium- or long-term changes.	- To explore options, take note of any needs, determine interests. - To understand or flesh out a situation or a problem.	- To agree to work together; develop a rapport and a complementarity that will create a leverage for taking action.	- To make use of, interdependently, human, material and financial resources and efforts. - To make expertise a complement to actions.
Characteristics	- Information transfer: data, content, facts, results, etc.	- Seek out opinions, advice and information that are likely to assist the partners in their decision-making.	- Sharing of information, opinions, analyses and solutions. - Current or potential joint project. - Voluntary commitment, with the option of withdrawing.	- Joint project where each party is associated with the others. - Formal commitment, signed or not, specifying the agreed-upon mandates, responsibilities, resources and structures.
Method of governance	- None in particular, but the partners may decide otherwise.	- May be formal or informal, depending on the partners' needs; advisory committee or consultation table.	- May be formal or informal, depending on the needs of the organizations. Each party commits to taking action in view of the situation or problem, but may act individually.	- Generally formal. The partners agree on a mode of governance that encourages the implementation of the partnership.
Decision-making	- Providing information is not done for the purposes of decision-making.	- Depending on the type of consultation, the party that initiates the consultation has the power to make the decision independently, but appreciates input from others before making a decision, as does the party being consulted. In cases where a consultation takes place, partners are free to do what they want with the content of the exercise but it would be to their advantage to explain the motives that form the basis of their decision.	- The aim is consensus, but each party is free to make their own decisions.	- Based to the preferred mode of governance, decisions are made together and the partners commit to acting upon them in accordance with the agreed-upon modalities.
Commitment	- No formal commitment or follow-up. - Is limited to providing clear and accurate information in order to act within the respective missions and mandates of each party as much as possible.	- No commitment, but a concern for transparency and feedback in view of the situation or the problem that is the subject of the consultation.	- Moral commitment regarding decisions. - Each party is only liable for their own commitments.	- Formal commitment in which each party represents an essential link in achieving the targeted objective. - Each party must therefore meet their obligations and is accountable to the other parties in terms of its commitments and its impact on the other parties.
Interrelations	- In general, very weak organizational interrelations.	- Weak organizational interrelations.	- Limited organizational interrelations on any of the following aspects: human, information, material and financial.	- Strong organizational interrelations on any of the following aspects: human, information, material and financial.
Consequences of not respecting commitments	- Possible indirect impacts, e.g., if information is not clear, it may have an impact on the resulting decisions.	Possible indirect impacts, e.g., apathy from another party if it does not feel it is recognized in the result of the consultation.	- Definite impacts, particularly if the partners wish to take further steps. - Possible loss of credibility and influence in the community. - Furthermore, synergy can only be achieved if each party fulfils its commitments.	- Definite impacts. - Challenge the attainment of the targeted goal. - Risk of major impacts on the organization. - Loss of credibility for the partner that withdraws. - Loss in confidence among the other partners.

Évaluation du partenariat

Ce questionnaire est la propriété de Michel Boisclair

Michel_Boisclair@enap.ca

ASSESSING THE HEALTH OF YOUR PARTNERSHIPS

MICHEL BOISCLAIR

JUNE 10, 2008

QUESTIONNAIRE

ASSESSING THE HEALTH OF YOUR PARTNERSHIPS

For each of the following criteria, situate your current perception of the partnership in which your organization is involved by circling the number that you feel is most appropriate.

Scale:	4. Very satisfied 3. Satisfied 2. Somewhat satisfied 1. Dissatisfied	Scale
1.	The motives for establishing a partnership were clearly defined by the organization's key players.	1 2 3 4
2.	This partnership sufficiently promotes the interests of each partner and its implementation goes beyond the stage of intentions .	1 2 3 4
3.	The advantages and disadvantages of the partnership have been accurately assessed by the key players.	1 2 3 4
4.	There is an appropriate level of risk identification, assessment and management.	1 2 3 4
5.	The choice of partner or partners has been carefully evaluated.	1 2 3 4
6.	This partnership sufficiently takes into account factors regarding compatibility between the partners:	
6.1	Each partner's mission	1 2 3 4
6.2	Each partner's objectives	1 2 3 4
6.3	Each partner's policies	1 2 3 4
6.4	Each partner's organizational culture	1 2 3 4
6.5	Affinity among the partners	1 2 3 4
6.6	Commitment from each partner's key players	1 2 3 4
7.	This partnership sufficiently highlights the complementarities of each of the partners:	
7.1	The partnership draws upon the partners' strengths.	1 2 3 4
7.2	The partnership takes into account the partners' mutual needs.	1 2 3 4

8.	This partnership takes into account each partner's capacities :				
8.1	On a technical level	1	2	3	4
8.2	On a financial level	1	2	3	4
8.3	On an administrative level	1	2	3	4
8.4	In terms of the relative size of the partners' organizations	1	2	3	4
8.5	Regarding their available time	1	2	3	4
9.	The development of the partnership and its implementation were planned by the partners.	1	2	3	4
10.	The key players in the partnership are credible and have the flexibility that is needed for the development of an alliance and for its management (rapport).	1	2	3	4
11.	The partners have given themselves qualitative and quantitative indicators with regards to the partnership.	1	2	3	4
12.	The partners have implemented assessment and follow-up mechanisms with regards to:				
12.1	Their partnership relation	1	2	3	4
12.2	The development process of the partnership	1	2	3	4
12.3	The agreement (the contract)	1	2	3	4
12.4	The results obtained in the framework of their partnership	1	2	3	4
13.	The investments required for managing the development of the alliance take into account each partner's ability to invest.	1	2	3	4
14.	This partnership relies on a comprehensive document that is flexible enough to allow for the effective management of the alliance without hindering its development.	1	2	3	4
15.	This partnership was or is beneficial for each partner.	1	2	3	4
		<hr/>			
	TOTAL:				

INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

✓ **YOU'VE SCORED BETWEEN 28 AND 69**

???

You must seriously question the motives that led to the creation of the partnership. Your partnership is fragile and vulnerable.

✓ **YOU'VE SCORED BETWEEN 70 AND 79**

WARNING!

Your partnership is moving ahead, but it remains fragile. Try to identify areas that could serve as opportunities for the partners to work together.

✓ **YOU'VE SCORED BETWEEN 80 AND 89**

WELL DONE!

However, your partnership does show some weaknesses. Address them before moving forward with your alliance.

✓ **YOU'VE SCORED BETWEEN 90 AND 112**

EXCELLENT!

Your partnership is built on a solid foundation. Concentrate on maintaining and developing its strong points. Work on improving the weak points. Doing so will ensure that each partner benefits.

Resources for partnerships between academic researchers and aboriginal communities

- **Guidelines for Health Research Involving Aboriginal Communities**

http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/documents/ethics_aboriginal_guidelines_e.pdf

- **Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession (OCAP) or Self-Determination Applied to Research: A Critical Analysis of Contemporary First Nations Research and Some Options for First Nations Communities.** By Brian Schnarch, *Journal of Aboriginal Health*, January 2004

<http://www.nswp.org/pdf/SCHNARCH-OCAP.PDF>

http://www.linkup-connexion.ca/catalog/prodImages/042805095650_314.pdf