APPENDIX E: SUMMARY OF INTERNATIONAL SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Indigenous Health Service and Program Evaluation
SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

What will we cover?
Systematic review update
Exemplar papers
Principles identified
- protocols and approaches
Pitfalls
Discussion and questions
Next steps

Research Question
What are the best methods for evaluation of Indigenous health services and programs?

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

**INCLUSION**
- Published after 1970
- English language
- Focus on Aboriginal/Indigenous populations (aboriginal, indigenous, native, native
  American, Maori, Marind, Inuit, Alaskan Native, Australian, African
  American, Samoan, Hawaiian, New Zealand, Guatemalan, Mayan, Indian
  peoples, Maori people, Inuit people, Alaskan Native people, Guatemalan
  people, Samoan people, Hawaiian people, New Zealand people, Guatemalan
  people, Alaskan Native people, Guatemalan people, Samoan people, Hawaiian
  people, New Zealand people)
- Quantitative/qualitative design
- Evaluates health-related outcomes
- Sample size
- Longitudinal/long-term
- Interventions that target Indigenous populations
- Outcome measures of health-related indicators
- Quantitative/qualitative design

**EXCLUSION**
- Published 1970 and earlier
- Non-English language
- Studies that do not focus on Indigenous populations
- Studies that do not measure health-related outcomes
- Studies that do not include Indigenous populations
- Studies that do not use quantitative/qualitative design
- Studies that do not include outcome measures of health-related indicators
- Studies that do not use quantitative/qualitative design

Quality appraisal
1. Rate the relevance of the method and measures
   (i.e., to local community values, knowledge, skills, beliefs)
2. Rate the rigour of the evaluation methods, design, implementation, analysis, and reporting
   (answer using appropriate disciplinary lens = i.e., rate qualitative using qualitative criteria, quantitative using quantitative criteria)
3. Rate the strength of the evidence
   (i.e., Adequate power and statistical significance for quantitative, convincing major themes that have been triangulated for qualitative, etc)
Exemplars


Exemplars...


Evaluation principles

Derived from Exemplars

- Community self-determination
- Sovereignty/governance of evaluation
- Foundational integration of Indigenous community knowledge and practice
- Design
- Data collection tools
- Local community leadership
- Participation in evaluation
- Linked to intervention implementation
- Responsiveness flexibility to community context, needs and the environment
- Reciprocity / shared learnings
- Respect for local protocols / culture
- Value of relationships and trust

Community self-determination

Sovereignty/governance of evaluation

- Code of Ethics

- Community Advisory Board

- Community-based participatory process evaluation; and community-driven approach ensured the OCAP principles were met with appropriate and sensitive evaluation methodology, ownership of evaluation process, protocols and products resting with the community.


Foundational integration of Indigenous community knowledge & practice

**DESIGN**

- For example, data collection instruments incorporated the Whare Tapa Wha which means four-sided house. This describes the four dimensions of health that encompass the whole person:
  1. te taha wha (body)
  2. te taha whenua (mind, emotions)
  3. te taha wairua (spiritual) and
  4. te taha wha (extended family)

- Language and pilot testing instruments, etc
Responsiveness /flexibility

- Responsive and flexible to the community context, needs and the environment
- Community members had major influences throughout the life of Kahnawake Schools Diabetes Prevention Project (KSDPP)
- Elders requested the project to focus on children
- Intervention should place equal emphasis on the school and community intervention components, and promote learning through oral traditions

Reciprocity / shared learnings

- Reciprocity / shared learnings – across all stakeholders

Respect for local protocols / culture

- Ensuring evaluation is undertaken in a ‘good way’ and captures relevant program and policy information. E.g. not just capturing pre and post-knowledge change in a health behaviour change program.

Value of relationships and trust

- Value of relationships and trust

Pitfalls

- Extreme methodology or theories – e.g. only qualitative methods work in indigenous contexts
- Evaluator/researchers don’t locate themselves
- Not identifying, acknowledging and clarifying different stakeholders perspectives
- Funding contingent – e.g. justifying money
- Over integrating evaluation – e.g. limited detachment/independence.
- Limited community capacity

Exemplar matrix: Traffic light report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A random evaluation of a community based addiction program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A random evaluation of a community based addiction program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A random evaluation of a community based addiction program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A random evaluation of a community based addiction program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A random evaluation of a community based addiction program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A random evaluation of a community based addiction program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A random evaluation of a community based addiction program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A random evaluation of a community based addiction program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A random evaluation of a community based addiction program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. A random evaluation of a community based addiction program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion and questions