



Principles to Guide Research with Tribal Communities: The Tribal HPOG 2.0 Evaluation in Action

Michael Meit, MA, MPH, Carol Hafford, PhD, Catharine Fromknecht, BS, Noelle Miesfeld, MPH, Tori Nadel, BA, Emily Phillips, MPH

This practice brief is the second in a series of practice briefs being developed by the Tribal Health Profession Opportunity Grants (HPOG) 2.0 evaluation team. The briefs will be used to disseminate important lessons learned and findings from the Evaluation of the Tribal HPOG 2.0 Program, which is being funded by the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation within the Administration for Children and Families. The Tribal HPOG 2.0 program supports demonstration projects that provide eligible individuals with the opportunity to obtain education and training for occupations in the healthcare field that pay well and are expected to either experience labor shortages or be in high demand. The purpose of this practice brief is to summarize how the findings from the literature review and the values of the Roadmap for Collaborative and Effective Evaluation in Tribal Communities were applied to inform the Tribal HPOG 2.0 evaluation approach.

The Health Profession Opportunity Grants (HPOG) Program is administered by Administration for Children and Families (ACF), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.¹ In 2010, ACF awarded the first round of HPOG grants (referred to hereafter as HPOG 1.0) to 32 organizations, including five tribal organizations. In September 2015, ACF awarded a second round of HPOG grants (referred to hereafter as HPOG 2.0) to 32 organizations, again including five tribal organizations. The HPOG Program supports demonstration projects that provide eligible individuals with the opportunity to obtain education and training for occupations in the healthcare field that pay well and are expected to either experience labor shortages or be in high demand.

¹ HPOG was established by the Affordable Care Act in 2010 and extended by the Protecting Access to Medicare Act in 2014.

HPOG was authorized as a demonstration program. Accordingly, for both HPOG 1.0 and HPOG 2.0, ACF's Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation (OPRE) is using a multi-pronged evaluation strategy to assess the success of the HPOG Program, including a comprehensive implementation and outcome evaluation of the five Tribal HPOG 2.0 grantees. NORC at University of Chicago (NORC) led the Tribal HPOG 1.0 evaluation and is conducting the Tribal HPOG 2.0 evaluation in partnership with Abt Associates. Information about the Tribal HPOG 2.0 Program and the Tribal HPOG 2.0 evaluation design can be found in a separate Tribal HPOG 2.0 practice brief, *An Introduction to the Tribal Health Profession Opportunity Grants (HPOG) 2.0 Program and Evaluation*², and the *Tribal HPOG 2.0 Evaluation Plan*.³

² *An Introduction to the Tribal Health Profession Opportunity Grants (HPOG) 2.0 Program and Evaluation*. (2017, Forthcoming). Administration for Children and Families.

³ *Tribal HPOG 2.0 Evaluation Plan*. (2017, Forthcoming). Administration for Children and Families.

Key lessons learned from the Tribal HPOG 1.0 evaluation, including the importance of grantee engagement, building relationships, and understanding community and cultural context, informed the development of the Tribal HPOG 2.0 evaluation approach and design. Given these lessons learned, the Tribal HPOG 2.0 evaluation team initiated three key knowledge development activities: 1) gathering feedback from the grantees and other stakeholders on the evaluation approach and design; 2) consulting with experts that serve on the Tribal HPOG 2.0 Technical Work Group (TWG); and 3) conducting a brief review of the literature related to research in American Indian and Alaska Native (AI/AN) communities.

Also informing this work is the *Roadmap for Collaborative and Effective Evaluation in Tribal Communities*. In 2013, ACF's Children's Bureau formed the Child Welfare Research and Evaluation Tribal Workgroup, convening representatives from Tribal child welfare programs, evaluators, university researchers, technical assistance providers, and federal program partners to address challenges related to tribal child welfare and evaluation. This workgroup developed the *Roadmap* as a tool to "create a shared vision for the future of Tribal child welfare evaluation and provide a common language for Tribal communities and evaluators as they improve evaluation practice." While the workgroup focused on evaluation of Tribal child welfare programs, the principles and approaches apply broadly to research in AI/AN communities. The *Roadmap* describes seven core values that were identified by the workgroup to serve as a guide for researchers to "maintain cultural integrity in conducting evaluations." These seven values include: indigenous ways of knowing, respect for tribal sovereignty, strengths focus, cultural and scientific rigor, community engagement, ethical practices, and knowledge sharing.⁴

This brief describes how the knowledge development activities and the seven values of the *Roadmap* inform the Tribal HPOG 2.0 evaluation approach and design. In particular, understanding the history of research in AI/AN communities underscores the importance of community engagement and supports the values and approaches identified in the *Roadmap*. Researchers, program administrators, federal staff, and grantee staff can apply literature-informed strategies described in this brief to evaluations that include AI/AN communities, bringing the seven values of the *Roadmap* into practice.

⁴ Tribal Evaluation Workgroup. *A Roadmap for Collaborative and Effective Evaluation in Tribal Communities*. Children's Bureau, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. September 2013.

FINDINGS FROM THE LITERATURE REVIEW

The tribal evaluation team conducted a brief review of the literature to identify what is known about research and evaluation in AI/AN communities and provide information about appropriate methods for conducting research and evaluating education and training programs in AI/AN communities. Key findings related to the history of research in AI/AN communities and promising approaches to research in AI/AN communities are summarized below. Additional findings and methods can be found in the report, *Informing the Tribal Health Profession Opportunity Grants (HPOG) 2.0 Evaluation Design: A Brief Review of the Literature*.⁵

Historical Context. In order to understand the present-day experiences of AI/AN communities, especially in regards to conducting research with the federal government, it is important to acknowledge the ways in which federal policies and practices, such as forced relocation and boarding schools, changed the lives of AI/AN people and threatened their cultural identity.⁶ In addition, AI/AN populations have experienced some of the most severe health disparities in the United States. It is through this historical lens that researchers should understand the potential for distrust and hesitancy to participate in research activities among some AI/AN communities. Ultimately, as succinctly described by Kelley et al. (2013), "Indigenous groups' mistrust of research is based on a history that failed to honor Native American people, traditions, cultures, and communities."⁷

Published in 1979, The Belmont Report established guidelines for conducting research involving human subjects.⁸ The three main principles it outlines for planning and reviewing research are respect for persons, beneficence, and justice. The Belmont Report sets standards with which all research on human subjects must comply, but according to Sahota (2009), it does not provide complete protection for AI/AN communities.⁹ The Belmont Report is centered on the protection of individuals, but AI/AN community advocates believe that

⁵ *Informing the Tribal Health Profession Opportunity Grants (HPOG) 2.0 Evaluation Design: A Brief Review of the Literature*. (2017, Forthcoming). Administration for Children and Families.

⁶ Allyson Kelley et al. "Research Ethics and Indigenous Communities." *American Journal of Public Health* 103, no. 12 (2013): 2146-2152.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ Puneet Chawla Sahota. "Research Regulation in American Indian/Alaska Native Communities: Policy and Practice Considerations." (2009).

⁹ *Ibid.*

those protections should also extend to groups.¹⁰ Some researchers believe that, as a group, AI/ANs historically have not had adequate representation in the planning and review of research studies in which they have participated.¹¹

There have been many research efforts to better understand the social, economic, and health disparities of AI/AN populations, but these efforts have traditionally been conducted by university-based researchers with little or no input from the community.¹² Concerns raised by the lack of AI/AN involvement in research include lack of community-based research questions, culturally inappropriate research designs, and lack of a shared responsibility for data dissemination and interpretation of results. Some of the historical instances of abuse are well documented. A well-known, and often cited, example is the dissemination of findings using inflammatory language by non-native researchers who conducted a survey of alcohol use in an Inupiat community of Barrow, Alaska in 1979, which severely stigmatized the community and led to social and economic repercussions.¹³ This and similar events raised important questions among the research and AI/AN communities regarding the need to use transcultural research methods and involve the community in the interpretation of findings.¹⁴

Promising Approaches. Research organizations, tribes and tribal-affiliated organizations, and the federal government continue to work together to advance the dialogue around and develop strategies and practices for conducting research in AI/AN communities. The social science research community, including federal government, now largely embraces community-based participatory research (CBPR), but there is still more progress to be made in conducting truly collaborative research with AI/AN communities.¹⁵

As sovereign nations, many tribes have established guidelines and regulations for human subjects research to protect their members and to engage in the research process with outside researchers. Some promising

approaches for conducting research in AI/AN communities include: (1) honoring tribal sovereignty and culture (e.g., obtaining Tribal resolutions/approvals and engaging in respectful and informed dialogue), (2) working with research review boards, and (3) using CBPR approaches as the basis for study design and implementation.¹⁶ Examples of CBPR strategies include engaging with the community in all components of the project, being flexible during the research process, using culturally appropriate data collection methods, and establishing appropriate outcome measures.¹⁷

The three most common processes for research review in AI/AN communities are federally registered institutional review boards (IRBs), tribal ethics review panels, and the enforcement of research specific codes within tribal laws. Review and approval processes are specific to each tribe and vary depending on available resources and research priorities. Through the process of learning about tribal research policies, researchers may have the opportunity to establish trust with the community with which they are working by demonstrating respect for tribal research partners, cultural beliefs, tribal institutions, and tribal sovereignty.^{18,19} Seeking approval from IRBs managed by and for AI/AN communities is one way to ensure that human subjects that are from or live in AI/AN communities are culturally represented and protected in cross-cultural studies. Other types of review include tribal research review boards, tribal council reviews, and community-based reviews such as cultural committees or elders.²⁰ Tribal organizations, meaning those working on behalf of AI/AN communities but not directly affiliated with a tribe, can be effective partners for researchers, especially non-native researchers. For example, one role of tribal organizations could be to regularly convene leaders of multiple tribes in a region to discuss opportunities for collaboration and capacity building. In addition, these organizations may also have service agreements with local universities to support tribes who engage in research activities, either with them or with other entities or

¹⁰ Rosalina James et al. "Exploring pathways to trust: a tribal perspective on data sharing." *Genetics in Medicine* 16, no. 11 (2014): 820-826.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Edward F. Foulks. "Misalliances in the Barrow Alcohol Study." *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research* 2, no. 3 (1989): 7-17.

¹⁴ James H. Shore. "Transcultural Research Run Amok or Arctic Hysteria." *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research* 2, no. 3 (1989): 46-50.

¹⁵ Allyson Kelley et al. "Research Ethics and Indigenous Communities." *American Journal of Public Health* 103, no. 12 (2013): 2146-2152.

¹⁶ Puneet Chawla Sahota. "Research Regulation in American Indian/Alaska Native Communities: Policy and Practice Considerations." (2009).

¹⁷ Jill Anne Chouinard, and J. Bradley Cousins. "A Review and Synthesis of Current Research on Cross-Cultural Evaluation." *American Journal of Evaluation* 30, no. 4 (2009): 457-494.

¹⁸ John G. Oetzel, et al. "Enhancing Stewardship of Community-Engaged Research Through Governance." *Journal Information* 105, no. 6 (2015).

¹⁹ NCAI Policy Research Center and MSU Center for Native Health Partnerships. (2012). *'Walk softly and listen carefully': Building research relationships with tribal communities*. Washington, DC, and Bozeman, MT: Authors.

²⁰ Allyson Kelley et al. "Research Ethics and Indigenous Communities." *American Journal of Public Health* 103, no. 12 (2013): 2146-2152.

institutions.²¹ The findings from the Tribal HPOG 2.0 literature review, *Informing the Tribal Health Profession Opportunity Grants (HPOG) 2.0 Evaluation Design: A Brief Review of the Literature*, provide more information on tribally-informed approaches for research with AI/AN communities.

APPLICATION OF THE ROADMAP FOR COLLABORATIVE AND EFFECTIVE EVALUATION IN TRIBAL COMMUNITIES

Given this historical context and the importance of community engagement when conducting research in AI/AN communities, the Tribal HPOG 2.0 evaluation design is guided by the seven values outlined in the *Roadmap*. The tribal evaluation team is committed to putting these values into practice in order to sustain a respectful partnership with the AI/AN communities and a mutually beneficial and collaborative learning experience. The seven values and their practical application to the Tribal HPOG 2.0 evaluation are described below.

Indigenous Ways of Knowing. Traditional ways of communication and shared understanding grounded in cultural practice, such as revering the wisdom of elders, respecting community voices, and using oral tradition, storytelling, and narrative, are the foundation for collecting information and disseminating findings. These traditions have been an important part of how native communities stay connected to their culture and history and pass down knowledge through generations.

To be respectful of indigenous ways of knowing, the tribal evaluation team engaged with each of the Tribal HPOG 2.0 grantees to gather feedback on the evaluation design. Specifically, the tribal evaluation team met with each tribal grantee in-person or by phone to share the research questions and ensure that they are grounded in local context and interest. Additionally, if appropriate in their community, the tribal evaluation team encouraged grantees to include tribal leaders and administrators in discussions about the evaluation. The Tribal HPOG 2.0 grantees also reviewed the data collection methods and protocols to ensure that information would be collected in a culturally respectful and sensitive manner. These discussions resulted in some changes to the protocols to ensure that questions asked of respondents are culturally-appropriate, clearly phrased, and not overly burdensome to answer. Additionally, grantees made suggestions about recruiting program participants for interviews and focus

groups (e.g., making sure that the invitation came from someone on the staff that was well-known to the student) as well as appropriate timing for conducting the focus groups to be mindful of student schedules and work and family obligations (e.g., evening or weekend times).

Another way that the evaluation design incorporates traditional ways of knowing is through sharing the final evaluation report with each grantee for them to review and offer comments about the interpretation of findings. While the final report presents an objective analysis of the program, there may be certain instances where stories or comments may be interpreted differently by the evaluation team than the grantee or community member. It is important to recognize that cultural differences may lead to different interpretations of the same data and to provide enough context to portray the findings from these multiple perspectives. The Tribal HPOG 2.0 grantees will also be involved in identifying ways to share the findings with their communities.

Respect for Tribal Sovereignty. Tribal nations have sovereignty, or ultimate authority, over the research that is conducted on their lands and with their members. Similar to the approach used for the Tribal HPOG 1.0 evaluation, the evaluation team consulted with the grantees early in the process to determine what approvals would be needed prior to conducting the evaluation with their communities. Together the tribal evaluation team and each of the Tribal HPOG 2.0 grantees developed and agreed to Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) to clearly define the roles and responsibilities of each entity and to outline the purpose and methods of the evaluation. As described in the MOUs, NORC will lead the evaluation and conduct annual site visits to each grantee; seek required tribal approvals for the evaluation; provide technical assistance around evaluation activities; build local capacity on using data and findings to inform program decisions and promote performance improvement; and share findings with the grantees.

As agreed upon in the MOUs, the tribal evaluation team sought approvals as required by each tribal organization, including IRB approvals and tribal resolutions. The tribal evaluation team sought approval from a number of tribal entities, including tribal Research Review Boards, IRBs at tribal colleges, and a regional Indian Health Service (IHS) IRB. For example, grantee staff at Turtle Mountain Community College (TMCC) referred the tribal evaluation team to the Tribal Nations Research Group (TNRG), which reviews all research conducted on the Turtle Mountain reservation and has reviewed and approved the study protocol for the Tribal HPOG 2.0 evaluation. Other tribal organizations that provided research approval in HPOG 2.0 include the IRB at the United Tribes Technical

²¹ Examples: Inter-Tribal Council of Arizona, Inc., Southern Plains Tribal Health Board (formerly known as Oklahoma City Area Inter-Tribal Health Board), and Great Plains Tribal Chairmen's Health Board.

College (UTTC), one of the partner institutions of Cankdeska Cikana Community College (CCCC), and the Great Plains regional IHS IRB, who reviewed the study protocol as part of the approval process for the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Health Board. Additionally, grantee staff at CCCC and the tribal evaluation team worked together to secure a resolution from the Spirit Lake Tribal Council in support of the HPOG 2.0 evaluation.

While the IRBs typically have information about their review process available online, early communication with the IRB administrators proved useful and established the basis for ongoing tribal review of the research. For example, the tribal evaluation team met with the TNRG administrator early in the evaluation to understand the process and the forms required for submission to the TNRG. The IRB administrator also shared the TNRG's preferences on the content and format for informed consent forms, which enabled the evaluation team to adapt the forms prior to submission. Through communication with the Great Plains IRB administrator to confirm the submission requirements, the team learned that they accept materials that have been previously prepared or submitted to another IRB instead of preparing separate submission forms, which simplified the submission process.

Strengths Focus. Historically, evaluations in AI/AN communities often focused on highlighting deficits instead of strengths. It is important that an evaluation consider the assets of the community in addition to the challenges. The Tribal HPOG 2.0 evaluation approach focuses on the HPOG Program's intent to promote self-sufficiency and career pathways for TANF recipients and other low-income individuals. This also means identifying cultural components and protective factors that support engagement, educational persistence, and employment outcomes, as well as recognizing barriers and constraints that individuals and communities may face. For example, a student's family obligations may present a barrier to completing coursework and pose competing priorities, but a strengths-based approach also emphasizes the positive impacts of strong family connections, such as serving as a role model and instilling the importance of education in younger generations.^{22,23,24} Evaluation findings that

²² Mark LM Blair, "Taking the Next Step: Promoting Native American Student Success in American Indian/Native American Studies Graduate Programs" [PhD diss., University of Arizona, 2015].

²³ Cheri Lynn Kicking Woman, "The Tribal College Movement: Ensuring that Native American Students Successfully Complete an Associate Degree and Persist to Earn a Four-Year Degree" [PhD diss., University of Montana, 2011].

highlight facilitators as well as challenges, or areas for improvement, provide a more comprehensive picture of the program and the community. The tribal evaluation team and the grantees developed the interview and focus group protocols with a strengths focus to ensure that the questions gather information about program, community, and participant strengths and how they can be leveraged to improve outcomes. For example, the inclusion of measures of success beyond educational and employment outcomes emphasizes other achievements that are meaningful to participants and grantees, such as increased confidence, life skills, and self-efficacy. Additionally, interview guides include specific questions about the effect that family responsibilities and commitments have on a student's decision to pursue an academic or training program and their ability to achieve their academic and employment goals. Similarly, interview guides for grantee implementation staff and grantee administrative staff also ask questions about the role of family in supporting students' aspirations for higher education, how the staff incorporate family members into the program to support students, and how program staff model extended family relationships to provide support.

Cultural and Scientific Rigor. Rigorous evaluation methods ensure that the findings from the evaluation are reliable and can answer the research questions. Often, rigorous methods imply experimental or quasi-experimental research designs. However, in conducting research with AI/AN communities, it is important to value the contribution of local culture and practices. As defined in the *Roadmap*, "rigorous evaluation in Tribal communities means that sound scientific methods need to be employed but that they must also be grounded in sound cultural methods."²⁵ The tribal evaluation team strived for cultural and scientific rigor in the methods being used for this evaluation. Combining qualitative and quantitative methods underscores the importance of telling the story of each community's experience, as well as reporting the quantifiable results from the performance measurement system and other administrative data sources. As noted earlier, active engagement with the Tribal HPOG 2.0 grantees and the TWG provided insights and feedback on the evaluation design and methods and enhanced the cultural and scientific rigor of the evaluation. TWG members have expertise in relevant areas, including research and evaluation in AI/AN communities, health workforce research, rural health, and program development and evaluation, and the Tribal HPOG 2.0

²⁴ Raphael M Guillory, and Mimi Wolverton. "It's about Family: Native American Student Persistence in Higher Education." *The Journal of Higher Education* 79, no. 1 (2008): 58-87.

²⁵ Tribal Evaluation Workgroup, 2013.

grantees provided feedback relevant to their community to ensure that the methods are culturally responsive. For example, grantee staff suggested that they assist with recruitment of program participants for focus groups and interviews, given their familiarity and relationship with the participants. As such, the tribal evaluation team will discuss the best and most culturally appropriate recruitment techniques with each grantee during site visit planning. Grantee staff also provided input on the outcomes to be measured by the evaluation, ensuring that the evaluation assessed measures of success meaningful to program participants and the tribal grantees beyond educational and employment outcomes (e.g., increased confidence, life skills, etc.).

Community Engagement. Community and grantee engagement are essential to a CBPR approach and therefore central to the design and implementation of the Tribal HPOG 2.0 evaluation. The tribal evaluation team sought to establish relationships with the Tribal HPOG 2.0 grantees from the start of the evaluation. For example, the tribal evaluation team held phone calls and in-person visits to build relationships with the new grantees and maintain relationships with returning grantees. Specifically, the continuity in staff at the returning grantee organizations and on the tribal evaluation team enabled the team to build on prior relationships with the three returning grantees. The initial phone calls and visits provided the evaluation team an opportunity to talk with staff and learn about their community and culture.²⁶ In addition to grantee engagement, the tribal evaluation team learned about and met with other community stakeholders, including HPOG program partners and local employers. Initial visits and conversations provided an opportunity for the tribal evaluation team to understand grantee and community research priorities and what they hoped to learn from the evaluation.

As described in the *Roadmap*, community input should occur at all phases of the evaluation, from design to dissemination. As noted, the tribal evaluation team solicited feedback from grantee staff and their partners on the evaluation design during the development phase. The tribal evaluation team began this process by engaging with grantee staff to fully describe proposed components of the evaluation design and answer questions. Grantees opted not to participate in some components of the evaluation, depending on the priorities of their communities. For example, the Tribal HPOG 2.0 grantees were asked whether they had interest in participating in an impact evaluation. The tribal evaluation team explained the benefits and challenges of participation in the impact

evaluation so that grantees could make an informed decision. Ultimately, none of the Tribal HPOG 2.0 grantees decided to participate in the impact evaluation. Similarly, the tribal evaluation team worked with grantees to review the benefits of collecting participant social security numbers, which would enable the tribal evaluation team to link participant data to long-term employment and earnings data. Most Tribal HPOG 2.0 grantees identified potential uses for this data in their own work and opted to collect social security numbers; however, two Tribal HPOG 2.0 grantees declined to collect social security numbers for some or all of their participants given the practices within their community. Feedback on the overall approach, methods, and study protocols was also incorporated into the evaluation design.

In addition to the design and implementation of the evaluation, the tribal evaluation team will also seek community input on the interpretation and dissemination of findings. As part of the community engagement strategy, the tribal evaluation team will develop a dissemination plan that describes the products to be developed during the evaluation and outlines the approaches and strategies for sharing findings with multiple audiences. The grantees will be asked to provide input on the plan and provide guidance about appropriate venues for co-presentation and dissemination. Additionally, findings from the evaluation will be shared with grantees to advance the collaborative process of the evaluation and share knowledge. Grantees will also be asked to review products from the evaluation, including reports and briefs, to ensure they are accurate and grounded in cultural context.

Ethical Practices. For the Tribal HPOG 2.0 evaluation, ethical practice involves the transparency of the research process; acknowledgement of the history of problematic research in AI/AN communities; assurance of safeguards for privacy; respect for individual rights through informed consent and community rights through tribal approval; protection from harm; and tangible benefits to the community in the form of skills, capacity-developed, and/or knowledge generated. Taking all of these factors into account, the tribal evaluation team's commitment to ethical practice is codified through the review of the evaluation's procedures and protocols by NORC's IRB as well as all three tribal IRBs (the TNRG, the UTTC IRB, and the Great Plains Regional IHS IRB). Additionally, the U.S. Office of Management and Budget will review components of the evaluation design (e.g., data collection instruments, incentives, and privacy and security measures).

Further, the tribal evaluation team has developed a set of security policies and protocols for the evaluation to protect

²⁶ No data collection occurred during initial visits or phone calls.

study participants from injury or harm or breach of privacy. Physical security measures as well as data and network security measures are in place to ensure only authorized individuals access private data collected during the evaluation. Through administration of written or verbal informed consent, respondents will be informed about the purpose of the study; who is conducting it; risks and benefits of participation; how the data will be used; that participation is voluntary; and that respondents' privacy will be protected. To protect the privacy of respondents, the tribal evaluation team will not reference individuals when reporting findings. Similar care will be taken when reporting findings that pertain to small communities.

Knowledge Sharing. A key goal of the Tribal HPOG 2.0 evaluation is to foster reciprocity and bidirectional learning between the grantees and the evaluation team. The evaluation provides an opportunity for the tribal evaluation team to learn from the grantees and understand each tribal community's history, culture, norms, social and economic context, and perspective on evaluation and learning. In turn, the tribal evaluation team has an obligation to share its knowledge and skills with the tribal grantees. The tribal evaluation team has provided and will continue to provide technical assistance related to participating in the evaluation (e.g., implementing informed consent procedures for participant data collection, orienting new staff to the evaluation) and how data and findings can be used to promote local program performance management and improvement. The tribal evaluation team will identify opportunities for technical assistance based on the needs and interest of grantees, which will be discussed as part of every in-person visit. Throughout the project, the evaluation team will continue to look for opportunities for knowledge sharing that could enhance the evaluation, such as cultural sensitivity trainings for the evaluation team and opportunities for sharing resources or tools among grantees.

CONCLUSION

Knowledge of historical events—oppression, discrimination, trauma, and resilience—that have impacted AI/AN communities for generations provides important context for conducting research and further underscores the importance of having a collaborative and mutually-beneficial approach to evaluation. The evaluation team's approaches described here apply the values expressed in the *Roadmap* and take steps toward building a "new narrative" (a goal of the *Roadmap*) in conducting research and evaluation in AI/AN communities. Informed

by key knowledge development activities and guided by the *Roadmap*, the Tribal HPOG 2.0 evaluation design and data collection efforts are based on a CBPR approach. This approach includes a focus on the tribal grantees' individual and collective history with research and evaluation, tribal rights and governing of research conducted in their communities, and direct community involvement in the evaluation design and implementation. The Tribal HPOG 2.0 evaluation team has taken this approach with the goal of generating knowledge that is beneficial and which fosters learning and capacity building.

This report is in the public domain. Permission to reproduce is not necessary.

Submitted to:

Amelia Popham, Project Officer
Hilary Forster, Project Officer
Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Contract Number: HHSP233201500052C

Project Director:

Michael Meit, MA, MPH
NORC at the University of Chicago
4350 East West Highway, Suite 800
Bethesda, MD 20814

Acknowledgments:

We would like to acknowledge the Tribal HPOG grantees and the Tribal HPOG 2.0 Technical Work Group for their review and contributions to this practice brief.

Suggested citation:

Meit, Michael, et al. (2017). Principles to Guide Research with Tribal Communities: The Tribal HPOG 2.0 Evaluation in Action. OPRE Report #2017-61, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, the Administration for Children and Families, or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. This report and other reports sponsored by the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation are available at <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/index.html>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Blair, Mark LM. "Taking the Next Step: Promoting Native American Student Success in American Indian/Native American Studies Graduate Programs." PhD diss., University of Arizona, 2015.
- Chouinard, Jill Anne, and J. Bradley Cousins. "A Review and Synthesis of Current Research on Cross-Cultural Evaluation." *American Journal of Evaluation* 30, no. 4 (2009): 457-494. doi: 10.1177/1098214009349865
- Foulks, Edward F. "Misalliances in the Barrow Alcohol Study." *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research* 2, no. 3 (1989): 7-17. doi: 10.5820/aian.0203.1989.7
- Guillory, Raphael M., and Mimi Wolverton. "It's about Family: Native American Student Persistence in Higher Education." *The Journal of Higher Education* 79, no. 1 (2008): 58-87. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2008.0001
- James, Rosalina, Rebecca Tsosie, Puneet Sahota, Myra Parker, Denise Dillard, Ileen Sylvester, John Lewis et al. "Exploring pathways to trust: a tribal perspective on data sharing." *Genetics in Medicine* 16, no. 11 (2014): 820-826. doi:10.1038/gim.2014.47
- Kelley, Allyson, Annie Belcourt-Dittloff, Cheryl Belcourt, and Gordon Belcourt. "Research ethics and indigenous communities." *American Journal of Public Health* 103, no. 12 (2013): 2146-2152. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2013.301522
- Kicking Woman, Cheri Lynn. "The Tribal College Movement: Ensuring that Native American Students Successfully Complete an Associate Degree and Persist to Earn a Four-Year Degree." PhD diss., University of Montana, 2011.
- NCAI Policy Research Center and MSU Center for Native Health Partnerships. (2012). *'Walk softly and listen carefully': Building research relationships with tribal communities*. Washington, DC, and Bozeman, MT: Authors. Retrieved from http://www.ncai.org/attachments/PolicyPaper_SpMCHTcjxRRjMEjDnPmesENPzjHTwhOIOWxIWOIWdSrykJuQggG_NCAI-WalkSoftly.pdf
- Oetzel, John G., Malia Villegas, Heather Zenone, Emily R. White Hat, Nina Wallerstein, and Bonnie Duran. "Enhancing Stewardship of Community-Engaged Research Through Governance." *Journal Information* 105, no. 6 (2015). doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2014.302457
- Sahota, Puneet Chawla. "Research Regulation in American Indian/Alaska Native Communities: Policy and Practice considerations." (2009). Retrieved from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/Research%20Regulation%20in%20AI%20AN%20Communities%20-%20Policy%20and%20Practice.pdf
- Shore, James H. "Transcultural research run amok or Arctic hysteria." *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research* 2, no. 3 (1989): 46-50. doi: 10.5820/aian.0203.1989.46