# Work Assignment 2

*Remember to save a personal copy of this completed work assignment for future reference.*

**Activity: Landscape Analysis**

As you learned in Modules 2 and 3, a critical step in the development of a comprehensive stakeholder engagement plan is the determination of broad goals and specific objectives for both your research and stakeholder engagement programs. Findings from formative research can help inform these engagement objectives, because outcomes from this initial research can help researchers identify what internal and external factors will either help or hinder the trial.

In this assignment, you will work with your team to complete a rapid scan of your center’s research readiness as well as some of the existing support structures. You will then use your responses to identify what you ultimately want to accomplish as a result of stakeholder engagement at your own IAVI center.

# Step 1: Your Research Agenda

* Begin by completing Sections 1.1 of the GPP Blueprint, and record your responses in the answer sheet below. You may want to print this assignment out and use it as a discussion guide in order to elicit input from other team members.
* If you have answered some of these questions before, in a previous GPP Blueprint exercise, make some brief notes about key points for consideration and instead focus on questions that are most relevant for your context and those that you have not yet considered in your planning and analysis.

|  |
| --- |
| SECTION 1.1**Trial-site inventory** |
| 1)List the trial/s you wish to develop a stakeholder engagement plan for and note any details from the trial protocol that are relevant to stakeholder engagement (e.g., the number of participants, target population, trial objectives, and trial endpoints). \* Consider copying sections from the protocol to save time! |

# Step 2: Rapid Scan

* Complete Sections 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4 of the GPP Blueprint, and record your responses in the answer sheets below.
* For this exercise, it important to collaborate with other members of your research team and consider a diversity of perspectives.

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION 1.2****Research readiness** |
|

|  |
| --- |
| **TRIAL SITE/RESEARCH TEAM** |
| 1) How experienced is the research team in conducting clinical trials? | Not at all | Moderately | Extensively |
| 2) How many HIV-related trials have been conducted at the site in the past 5 years? | 0 | **1–3** | 3< |
| 3) How many HIV networks or funding groups conduct trials at the site? List them below. | 0 | **1–3** | 3< |
|  |
|  |
| - |
| - |
| 4) How experienced is the research team in working with stakeholders?  | Not at all | Moderately | Extensively |
| 5) Has the research team been involved with stakeholder engagement efforts during previous trials? | NO | YES |
| 6) Have community stakeholders responded favourably to past engagement efforts? | NO | YES |
| 7) Have previous trials been successful in engaging a diverse range of stakeholders (e.g., with a variety of perspectives, backgrounds, experience, skills)?  | NO | YES |
| 8) How experienced is the research team in working with the population targeted for participation in the trial? | Minimally | Moderately | Extensively |
| 9) How many trials involving the target population has the site conducted in the past 5 years? | 0 | 1–3 | 3< |
| 10) How often do members of the target population come to the site for non-trial services (e.g., events, information, education, health care)? | Never | Occasionally | Often |

 |
|

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMUNITY ADVISORY BOARD (CAB OR OTHER SUCH GROUP)** |
| 1) How experienced is the CAB in clinical research? | Not at all | Moderately | Extensively |
| 2) Has the CAB been involved in previous trials? | Never | Occasionally | Often |
| 3) How knowledgeable are CAB members about the clinical research process? | Not at all | Moderately | Extensively |
| 4) How knowledgeable are CAB members about HIV prevention?  | Not at all | Moderately | Extensively |
| 5) How knowledgeable are CAB members about HIV prevention research?  | Not at all | Moderately | Extensively |
| 6) How knowledgeable are CAB members about the science involved in the proposed research?  | Not at all | Moderately | Extensively |
| 7) How well does the current CAB composition reflect the community population? | Not at all | Moderately | Extensively |
| 8) Have members of the CAB expressed negative views of the target population in the past? | Not at all | Moderately | Extensively |

 |
|

|  |
| --- |
| **Community and other stakeholders** |
| 1) How familiar is the local community with clinical research? | Not at all | Moderately | Extensively |
| 2) How well informed are members of the community about the clinical trial process?  | Not at all | Moderately | Extensively |
| 3) How well informed are members of the community about participant rights during a trial?  | Not at all | Moderately | Extensively |
| 4) How knowledgeable are members of the community about HIV? | Not at all | Moderately | Extensively |
| 5) How knowledgeable are members of the community about how HIV is transmitted? | Not at all | Moderately | Extensively |
| 6) How knowledgeable are members of the community about how HIV might be prevented? | Not at all | Moderately | Extensively |
| 7) How knowledgeable are members of the community about HIV prevention research? | Not at all | Moderately | Extensively |
| 8) Are members of the community aware of how they can access HIV prevention options?  | Not at all | Moderately | Extensively |
| 9) Are members of the community aware of the latest prevention options available in their area?  | Not at all | Moderately | Extensively |
| 10) What percentage of the community has had risk-reduction counseling or is aware that it is available?  | >25% | 25%>50% | 50%>75% | 75%>100% |

 |

|  |
| --- |
| SECTION 1.3**Existing support** |
| 1. Has the CAB been supportive of stakeholder engagement in past trials? What was the nature of its involvement? In what areas did CAB members take initiative? Were their efforts effective?
 |
| 1. What are the CAB’s strengths? What are its weaknesses?
 |
| 1. Is the CAB’s membership appropriately representative of the potential trial population? If not, which group/s are over- and underrepresented? If there is under representation, do the majority of members have understanding, demonstrated through their work, leadership or conversations with site staff, about the potential scientific and social issues of the potential trial population?
 |
| 1. List any stakeholders (individuals or organizations, groups, etc.) who have been engaged by the research team in related trials in the recent (previous five years) past.
 |
| 1. List the stakeholder advisory mechanisms (e.g., focus groups, interviews, suggestion boxes) you have used in the past. Note which were effective, which weren’t, and why.
 |
| 1. List any factors that have impeded stakeholder engagement in the past (e.g., budgetary shortfalls, insufficient staffing, lack of experience, lack of coordination among groups).
 |
| 1. Does the trial site have a secure funding stream at present for a robust and ongoing stakeholder engagement program?
 |

|  |
| --- |
| SECTION 1.4**Sociocultural landscape**  |
| 1)List attitudes, beliefs, or socio-behavioural factors in **the local community** (the population around the trial site) that could interfere with recruitment or trial conduct (e.g., social stigma, religious and traditional beliefs or practices, gender discrimination, misconceptions about research, mistrust of research and researchers).  |
| 2) List attitudes, beliefs, or sociobehavioral factors among **the potential trial population** that could interfere with recruitment or trial conduct (see examples above). |
| 3)Has HIV prevention research received balanced coverage in the local and national media? Has the coverage been positive or negative? Are there aspects of the media coverage (past or ongoing) that might interfere with recruitment or trial conduct (e.g., adherence once the trial is in process)?  |
| 4)List local organizations (e.g., CBOs, advocacy groups) that might have a stake in or influence—whether positive or negative—over the proposed trial. Are they likely to support the research? Might they oppose it and present obstacles? How significant an impact might they have? |

# Step 3: Barrier Analysis

Briefly review your answers above and note the key issues or processes that may have a negative impact on your research in the box below.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

# Step 4: Stakeholder Engagement Goal and Objectives

* Reflect on the barriers that are impacting your research that could be addressed through stakeholder engagement (e.g., “research team lacks experience working with target population”, “an influential community leader has reservations about the proposed research”, or “a specific aspect of the trial protocol could be seen to conflict with national HIV prevention practices”).
* Use this information and analysis as a basis to develop at least one overarching goal and two strategic objectives for your stakeholder engagement program or strengthen the goal and objectives from your previous community engagement plan, by applying the SMART criteria in Lesson 2. Record your responses in the field below.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

# Step 5: Stakeholder Identification and Prioritization

* Review your list of past stakeholders from other trials, refresh your list of potential key stakeholders for your upcoming trial and 2015 community engagement workplan in the table below. You can list the stakeholders as individuals or by group, organization, etc. Limit your answers in the second column to areas relevant to the research or the community (e.g., advocacy at high levels of government; influential voice in national media; extensive experience in technical aspects of trial-related procedures).
* Lastly, prioritize your list of stakeholders, assigning each a number (1 through 4) based on where they fall in the priority grid shown on the next page. Indicate each stakeholder’s priority level in the table above.

| Key Stakeholders |
| --- |
| Stakeholder | Area of expertise/ influence ( | Support or oppose the research | Partner in previous trial? (Y/N) | Potential engagement activity | Priority level |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Quadrant 2: INVOLVE**

Highly influential stakeholders should be kept engaged and informed, even if they’re only moderately invested—and even if they’re opposed to the trial.

Aim to increase their level of interest and gain their support.

**Quadrant 1: PARTNER**

Partner with highly influential stakeholders who possess valuable knowledge, skills, and resources and stand to benefit from the research.

Focus the most effort these stakeholders, consulting with them on decision making through all stages of the trial.

**Quadrant 4: CONSIDER**

Stakeholders who have low influence and low investment in the research should be informed and engaged only when necessary.

Reserve more significant efforts for higher-priority stakeholders.

**Quadrant 3: INFORM**

Keep stakeholders with significant investment in the trial but low influence informed and engaged as necessary.

Also consider assisting marginalized stakeholders so that they may become more influential.
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