Generating Equity-Oriented Partnerships: A Framework for Reflection and Practice

Leah Anne Teeters and A. Susan Jurow

Abstract

Research that links action across multiple scales of practice is particularly relevant for organizing consequential social change. The aim of this article is to present an evaluation framework to support community-based researchers in generating methods of engagement that can expand opportunities for non-dominant community members across scales of practice. Drawing on a five-year community-engaged research project, this article presents a framework outlining five dimensions of a community-engaged research trajectory: (1) establishing partnerships; (2) developing trust; (3) working with diverse linguistic practices; (4) planning for different forms of action; and (5) outcomes and dissemination. This is developed as a formative evaluation tool intended to be used throughout the research collaboration to inform the iterative process of learning collaborations and design work.

Introduction

An enduring concern for researchers working with communities regards developing research designs and practical tools that are relevant to community members while also contributing to theory. In doing this complex work, researchers and practitioners can develop collaborative methodologies that value community practices and move beyond paradigms oriented toward fixing or replacing community-based ways of knowing and being (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011). These collaborations can lead to powerful forms of knowledge production and social transformation (e.g., Bang, Medin, Washinawatok, & Chapman, 2010; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Wang & Jackson, 2005). There is also a risk, however, that they can undermine community knowledge and practices, reproducing inequities (Camacho, 2004; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2000; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008; Zavala, 2013). Given these hazards, we need to attend to the highly contextualized—geographically, culturally, historically, and institutionally—nature of social change and how this affects practices of community engagement, collective action, and learning.

University researchers and community members must negotiate competing pressures such as academic pressures to publish, community organizations' grant and funding cycles, and community needs for action-oriented results and timely deliverables. Despite rigorous theoretical grounding, these collaborations often fail or do not realize their full potential when local knowledge and values are not integrated into the endeavors (Lissenden, Maley, & Mehta, 2015). In other words, good intentions and academic theories are insufficient to produce productive partnerships (Easterly & Easterly, 2006).

As researchers and community members engage in collaborative work aimed at addressing historically entrenched community-based challenges and informing widespread systemic change, there follows a pressing need to develop methodological tools that can work toward ensuring that the emerging research practices promote equity. Mehta & Mehta (2011) identify the main challenges involved in doing this type of work as designing, implementing, and evaluating change grounded in activity systems as opposed to interventions imposed from outside of the activity system; taking projects to scale; engaging marginalized stakeholders in the collaboration; and managing systems of power and privilege so as to ensure equity. We developed our framework as a response to these challenges and to offer a practical tool—a community-engaged framework—that can support researchers in orienting their work around equity.

What equity means to different participants in community-engaged research varies. Equity is historically situated, culturally shaped, and always politicized. There is no predetermined endpoint for equity; rather, it is a fluid and shifting aim. Given that perspective, community-engaged partnerships that strive for equity need to be responsive and alert to the dynamics of equity and inequity when they emerge. Our view on equity is founded upon a commitment to the organization of greater opportunities for people from non-dominant

backgrounds to determine their own social futures. Importantly, work for greater equity is not only about gaining access to current structures of power, it also involves transforming those structures to facilitate more liberatory and just goals (Philip & Azevedo, 2017). We thus refer to the process of pursuing greater equity as equity-oriented work, acknowledging that this work is ongoing.

To support researchers to design collaborations that are oriented toward greater equity, we share insights that we have gained from a five-year community-engaged research project that emerged from our collaboration with a local non-profit focused on food justice. Our research collaboration has been oriented around the design of a methodological approach that emphasizes working toward solutions for problems that are significant to the conduct of community members' everyday lives. Our methods incorporate the iterative documentation, design, and refinement of learning found in Bang, Medin, Washinawatok, and Chapman, 2010. Building on our systematic analyses of diverse qualitative data sources generated as part of this project, we have developed an evaluation framework that we hope can be used reflectively to orient community-engaged research partnerships toward equity.

Developing a Grounded Empirical Evaluation Framework

The framework presented in this article was generated through analysis of empirical data sources from a long-term community-engaged research project called Learning in the Food Movement (Teeters & Jurow, 2018; Teeters, Jurow, & Shea, 2016). In this project, we partnered with a local non-profit organization that employed community health workers, called promotoras, to work with community members to improve access to nutritious food and healthcare resources. With the promotoras and the non-profit founders, we engaged in ethnographic (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007) and design research (The Design-Based Research Collective, 2003) to understand and enhance their community development efforts and to develop tools, such as workshops and a software application, aimed at enhancing the non-profit's professional practices.

Our research allowed us to consider how participatory research can be empowering and when it can further marginalize populations that have historically been excluded from research and policymaking. Learning in the Food Movement brought together professors and graduate students in the University's School of Education and the Institute for Technology Development, community partners at the non-profit, local community members, and city officials. This diverse group of collaborators was a design feature aimed to facilitate learning and change across scales of practice (e.g., the individual, neighborhood, city, and larger region).

The evaluation framework we present emerged from the documentation of our process and analysis of our research approach and outcomes (Charmaz, 2006). Our research collaboration involved ethnographic data collection conducted over five years, including semi-structured interviews with participants, focus groups with promotoras, participant observation, and the writing of field notes in residents' homes and backyards, at the organization's office, in city meetings, and at community events. By design, we focused on problems that mattered greatly to the organization and community. Examples of some of our co-designed interventions include professional development workshops for promotoras, mediated conversations aimed at problem solving between the non-profit directors and the promotoras, and teatro (theater) as a means to instigate social reflection and change (Boal, 1997) focused on addressing organizational tensions, the design of a tablet-based application to streamline the promotoras' data collection, and workshops aimed at enhancing the promotoras' capacities for using new technologies for data analysis.

A Framework for Generating Equity-Oriented Research Partnerships

We developed an evaluation framework (see Appendix A) to support researchers and community members in generating methods of engagement that could further equity. This tool was designed for use throughout the research collaboration to inform the iterative process of learning collaborations and design work.

The framework has five dimensions representing a fairly common community-engaged research trajectory. The dimensions are (1) establishing partnerships; (2) developing trust; (3) working with language differences; (4) planning for action; and (5) outcomes and sustainability. We identified these domains based on a review of the literature on community engagement in non-dominant communities (Boyer, 1996; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011; Stoecker, 2013), interviews and focus groups with community-engaged researchers, and our own empirical research. This review process directed us to dimensions of community-engaged research with which

researchers and community members struggle to navigate relationships of power and privilege. With regard to each of these dimensions, we discuss activities in which researchers and community members can engage to develop a more equitable design and research process. We refer to these collaborative activities as "strategies for collaboration." Using the suggested strategies as points for reflection, community members and researchers can identify indicators of success, barriers faced, and innovations implemented.

Establishing Partnerships

Under which circumstances and with whom university researchers should engage in partnerships is a subject of rich debate (see for example Camacho, 2004, Zavala, 2013). Moving away from historical distinctions of researcher and researched, community-engaged researchers aim to generate partnerships that are mutually beneficial and address problems grounded in the community. Some argue that one has to be of the community to do research with the community, while others argue that this emic approach cannot produce objective insights (Erickson, 1997; Headland, Pike, & Harris, 1990). Others question the very notion of objectivity altogether (Harding, 1993). Although we recognize these tensions, we suggest that discussions should move beyond questions of membership and objectivity to questions of compatibility determined by the potential for the partnerships to establish new forms of valued social organization.

The framework we propose suggests that to assess compatibility and to initiate partnerships, university researchers should engage in ethnographic work. Ethnographic research can help researchers understand the social and historical organization of community work. This research entails engaging in participant observation, analysis of artifacts, and interviews with members of the community. Before stakeholders come together to discuss the partnership's aims and research questions, ethnographic research can help researchers (and sometimes community members themselves) appreciate a community's history, social organization, value structures, and work flows. For example, in the Learning in the Food Movement project, we observed and interviewed stakeholders, organizations, political leaders, and activists involved in the local food movement (Jurow, Teeters, Shea, & Van Steenis, 2016). This broad context gave us a way to situate the work of our partner organization and understand the ways in which this organization was a compatible partner. We were able to determine that compatibility because the non-profit shared a similar focus on equity and a desire to design a social change process that leveraged community members' cultural repertoires.

During this process of ethnographic investigation, a central aim should be to generate relationships that enable all parties to envision contributing to and benefiting from the partnership. It is critical to include the perspectives of multiple and diverse stakeholders so as to appreciate the different meanings of the practices being studied and/or transformed. From this point, partners should critically consider how proposed activities and questions can support new pathways along which people, practices, and tools can travel, as well as new dispositions toward equity-oriented action.

Developing Trust

Community-engaged research brings together people from different social positions, generating working relationships that are often asymmetrical in terms of access to financial, intellectual, and health resources. It is therefore imperative that these collaborations are premised on trusting relationships. Building on our prior research, we draw attention to the power of relationships de confianza (of trust) as a way of facilitating equity-oriented partnerships grounded in mutual trust (Teeters & Jurow, 2018). Relationships de confianza describe particular kinds of relations between partners, relations that prioritize empathy, action, and commitment to each other. They provide a valuable foundation for generating collaborative visions for greater justice.

Establishing relationships de confianza requires the development of mutual trust, respect, and commitment. Mutual trust involves putting human connections before a research agenda. In our work with promotoras, we centered interpersonal relationships not for strategic reasons, but for reasons of understanding, politicized caring, and solidarity (Vakil, de Royston, Nasir, & Kirshner, 2016). Although we employed traditional methods of data collection such as interviews, co-design sessions, workshops, document analysis, collaborative meetings, and participant observations, much of the time that we spent together was off the record. We engaged as participants, collaborators, and friends, frequently putting away our audio recorders and notepads so as to hear, and share, the more vulnerable stories that constitute our realities. Developing this genuine sense of trust and vulnerability is essential to the design of culturally appropriate research (Foley & Valenzuela, 2005).

Our regular meetings naturally flowed into our personal lives, and together, we commiserated over the loss of family members, health challenges, and personal/professional concerns. In these times, we engaged as friends and colleagues, recognizing that many of these stories were not intended for research purposes. As Tuck and Yang (2014) write, "there may be language, experiences, and wisdoms better left alone by social science" (p. 233).

Establishing mutual respect involves developing standards of collaboration where the aims are grounded in the needs, desires, and visions of the participants. Upon establishing shared goals of the collaboration, researchers and participants can develop work protocols that outline the aims, parameters, and distribution of tasks. The distribution of tasks should be done so as to not overburden any one person while making sure that all perspectives are adequately represented. Moreover, division of tasks should explicitly take into account and leverage participants' diverse and unique forms of expertise. Developing relationships de confianza involves both mutual engagement in shared tasks as well as strategically dividing labor along areas of interest, expertise, and availability of time. This attention to the division of labor and to the knowledge that is privileged helps to "guard against power imbalances" (Henrick, Cobb, Penuel, Jackson, & Clark, 2017, p. 6).

Moreover, we suggest that establishing relationships de confianza necessitates a commitment, which refers not only to engaged listening, but also to following through with action. Action can take multiple forms. The imperative element is that the nature of the action and its impact be agreed upon by all participants. When negotiating the terms of the action, it is helpful to consider the ways that different forms of capital can be leveraged by different stakeholders. For example, the researchers could leverage the networks via the university to access financial and intellectual resources, as well as social groups by which to expand participants' networks. Community practitioners could leverage their knowledge of the local community, including things such as local skills, social networks, and cultural values and customs.

Working with Language Differences

Language differences are often viewed as barriers to engaging in partnerships across groups from different cultural, racial, and national backgrounds. Although we acknowledge the importance of linguistic competence, we also recognize that if fluency were requisite for partnership for all community members and university members, community-engaged research would often not be conducted among groups with diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. In 2015, the United States census reported over 350 languages that were actively spoken within the United States (U.S. Census, 2015). This great diversity of languages should not mean that we should restrict our partnerships to communities speaking the most common languages spoken in the U.S.—reported to be English, Spanish, and Chinese (U.S. Census, 2015), but rather, that we should develop strategies for leveraging linguistic diversity as a resource and maintain standards of integrity for translation and verification of meaning.

When we refer to language, we also recognize that linguistic diversity encompasses variance due to factors such as dialect (national and regional variations of the same language) and domain (field specific technical terminologies and formal/informal codes) (Arrazattee, Lima, & Lundy, 2013). Translation, therefore, may be appropriate within a monolingual group. For example, there may be a need to explain field specific (e.g. medical, technology) jargon to a lay population. Or to explain cultural relations within a community to an academic audience. Translation, in this sense, refers to the creation of a shared and inclusive understanding amongst all participants.

We advocate for an asset-based view of language diversity. Embracing language differences can allow for people to express themselves in a variety of forms, to use words that may capture ideas that do not exist in other languages, and to be intentional about the words they do use. Developing strategies for working with language differences—to see linguistic variation as an asset rather than as a deficit—is a key part of building equitable partnerships across diverse groups. Language is constructed through social processes and bound with culture (Vygotsky, 1986). In this sense, language is "constitutive of thought and meaning, where meanings shape reality and are inscribed according to changing cultural and social situations" (Venuti, 2000, p. 6). The inclusion of diverse languages necessarily implies a diversity of epistemologies. When designing for practices and tools intended to become consequential across scales of practice, including diverse linguistic groups, an asset-based approach helps ensure that the designs can move across social, temporal, and geographical scales and become meaningfully incorporated into social practices and structures.

When partnerships bring together participants from diverse linguistic backgrounds, partnerships should employ practices of translation. Yet, translation, in of itself, is laden with power dynamics (Lui, 1999; Niranjana, 1992). Unidirectional translations risk misinterpretations and distortion of meaning as the original words are presented in the second language. This situation can often result in the dominance of one epistemology at the expense of another. One way to mitigate this issue is by employing two-way translations, where the original passage or statement is translated into the second language, and then the translation is translated back into the original language to verify accuracy, meaning, and understanding (Mignolo & Schiwy, 2003). This approach is important in both written language as well as spoken language.

Though translation is an important consideration in multi-dialectal research partnerships, we do not suggest that language be privileged as the only method of communication. Linguistic differences provide partnerships with a valuable opportunity to expand repertoires of communication. Multi-modal expression, such as artistic representations, digital representation, diagramming, and the use of representational models can encourage participants to think deeply and critically about problems of practice, values, and imagined futures than could be done via words alone (Brazg, Bekemeier, Spigner, & Huebner, 2010; Conrad & Kendal, 2009).

For example, in our collaboration with the promotoras, when we were initially learning about how the promotoras viewed their work, we provided them with colored clay. After a written reflection of their work, they then made a clay representation of how they related to their work. In Figure 1, a promotora (lay Hispanic/Latino trained in health care) represented her work by depicting a tree sprouting two new trees. She explained that like the tree, a promotora has to first establish roots in the community. From these roots, she then spreads her work, cultivating new practices.

This visual representation supported the promotora's verbal explanation of her relationship with her professional practices. Creating clay sculptures provided promotoras multiple ways to express their sentiments. The clay representations varied significantly among participants, allowing everyone to see the different perspectives that existed within the group. This form of sharing knowledge helped to minimize the risk that epistemologies are translated solely through the perspective of the translator.

Figure 1. Spreading Roots Symbolic of Promotoras' Work

Engaging in role play and non-verbal action can similarly facilitate reflection and communication. For example, acting out real and imagined experiences can serve as a form of play that can reveal points of re-organization and new forms of participation (Hornsby-Miner, 2007). Within role play and simulations, drawing attention to body language and expression can reveal important points of misunderstanding, discomfort, frustration, or accordance that may extend beyond the interpretation of words (see Boal, 1997). Moving beyond a reliance on verbal communication can facilitate the imagination of new dynamics, surfacing new possibilities, and potentially disrupting unproductive patterns of engagement.

Planning for Action

The notion of planning for action elicits important questions regarding the very nature of action. What counts as action? Could the planning for action be the action in and of itself? Could the process of engaged listening be the action? Who defines action and how is it counted as consequential? We aim to break apart notions of action, suggesting that seemingly inconsequential ways of participating, such as engaged listening, could be enough to open up new ways of participating. At the same time, more traditional modes of action, such as organizing a group of people to engage in a shared task or to design a tool, may also count as valuable action. Our intent is to encourage expansive notions of what action is and in the process, to encourage university researchers to think about ways to engage in meaningful and empowering strategies of collaboration.

Regardless of the nature of action, decisions around partnership activities and engagements should be made from a corpus of information,

including details regarding participants' values, forms of expertise, desired outcomes, and current work systems. This information can be used to identify focal outcomes and methods by which to achieve these outcomes. The methods employed should leverage participants' backgrounds and forms of expertise, strategically synthesizing them with new tools that extend in desired directions.

In our partnership with the promotoras, the non-profit leadership initially approached us with the idea that we could help them generate a curriculum to support and train new promotoras. We knew that to accomplish this task, we would first have to learn about the promotora model. We researched the historical use of the model, shadowed promotoras in their work, co-designed workshops aimed at articulating the model, conducted semi-structured focus groups and interviews with the promotoras, the non-profit co-founders, and community members, and engaged in participant observations. Through this inquiry process, we learned that the promotoras' work was dynamic. Therefore, a curriculum, in terms of a bounded, static tool, was not most useful. Instead, the promotoras needed a tool that could support them in accessing resources and documenting practices, while accounting for the emergent nature of their work. It is thus that our design of "a curriculum" took form in the design of a tablet-based software application that allowed the promotoras to gather, document, and analyze data on their own practices. This example shows how the collaborative activity was rooted in a community-engaged need and how its manifestation evolved through the process of ethnographic data collection and analysis. The result was a more meaningful and sustainable product.

Outcomes and Sustainability

Like action, we suggest an open-ended approach toward defining valued outcomes. Outcomes can be tangible (e.g. the design of new technology) or intangible (e.g. recognition of invisible work via engaged listening). Regardless of the nature of the outcomes, they should be agreed upon and benefit diverse stakeholders. If the outcomes are intangible or less concrete deliverables (such as new participant structures), it is important that the value and objective of the outcomes be mutually established and defined.

Two significant tensions of community-engaged research involve timelines of deliverables and actual products. Academic research involves long cycles of data collection, analysis, writing, peer review, and revision. This process can take years. In such cases, by the time the academic research cycle concludes, findings and published articles are no longer relevant to pressing problems of community work. Community members and organizations need more immediate feedback and reports that can fit into grant cycles and local press releases. Therefore, not only should the timeline be adjusted, but the deliverables should be differentiated, identifying valued outcomes for community members and organizations. These deliverables can support and even parallel the academic writing and representation process, but need to be developed on a timeline and in a format relevant to stakeholders (Franz, 2009, 2011).

In considering outcomes, we must also consider the sustainability of these outcomes. When designing for the sustainability of desired outcomes, it is important to consider how both the technical and the social infrastructure of the focal activity system are being supported. In our collaboration with the promotoras, one of our designed outcomes was the aforementioned software application. In this work, our tangible outcome was a tablet-based application to support the promotoras' data collection and analysis. However, an intangible outcome was increased agency for the promotoras to document and analyze their own professional practices and to gain greater facility with technology. To build the promotoras' agency alongside their technical capacity, we incorporated their expertise in community organizing and urban agriculture and wove this knowledge throughout the design of the tool. We were intentional about scaffolding the technology development so as to apprentice the promotoras into design, use, and maintenance of the product. This eventually resulted in the promotoras taking over the creation of new forms and taking on the responsibility of updating and maintaining the technology. Moreover, as we built the technology, we worked with the non-profit to ensure that organizational structures were in place to support the promotoras' expanding agency (Teeters, 2017). This example illustrates how outcomes can incorporate tangible tools (the tablet-based application) and intangible structure (enhanced participant agency). Moreover, we share this example with the aim of illustrating the importance of attending to technical and social infrastructure simultaneously to build the capacity that can result in sustainable change.

Conclusion: Moving Toward Equity

As community-engaged researchers, we need relevant and sensitive tools of accountability that can facilitate social change. The framework we have described in this paper is a step toward this goal. We believe this framework can support the development of more equitable social interactions with community partners. The aim of this framework is to support researchers in being intentional about design decisions so as to not replicate historical patterns of marginalization and oppression. There is a pressing need for community-engaged researchers to strive for greater transparency of goals, methods, and values. With this aim at the foreground, we conclude with a set of practical suggestions for moving forward with this framework as a guide for collective work toward equity:

Engage in broad ethnographic research to understand community values and practices. If we want to understand what is consequential to communities, it is necessary to spend time investigating people's views on what matters, when it matters, and for whom it matters. Conducting interviews and engaging in long-term observation in multiple settings, the basic tools of ethnography, can help us grasp how people construct meanings for themselves and others. These practices can allow researchers to see moments of tension in a community, which can then become the impetus for social transformation (Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, & Cain, 1998). Engaging in ongoing ethnographic research further supports empirical recognition that communities shift through time and this dynamic matters significantly for our definitions of equity.

Cultivate relationships of politicized care and committed action. Relationships are the basis for organizing equity-oriented social change (Teeters & Jurow, 2018). Seeing each other as people with dignity and agency in the face of oppressive structures is fundamental to progressive social action (Espinoza & Vossoughi, 2014). We can begin to cultivate relationships of politicized care, which involves recognizing that transformation of inequities is necessary to support humanizing relationships, by engaging in each other's worlds through ethnographic involvement. The next step, however, demands that we plan for action with our community partners that leverages their social and historical practices to develop sustainable and culturally relevant change. Doing this work together can demonstrate our commitments to each other and help us appreciate both the obstacles and motivations for social change.

Embrace linguistic and representational diversity as a way to gain deeper appreciation of partners' perspectives and values. Appreciating the humanity and agency of our community partners requires recognizing their multiple ways of making sense of their worlds. Talk and writing are often privileged as the primary ways that people interpret their experience. This view has roots in Western, male, and Eurocentric perspectives on valued knowledge, which obscures other ways of knowing, learning, and becoming (Medin & Bang, 2014). This perspective can obscure the variety of ways people communicate, collaborate, and generate new configurations for a better world. As researchers, we need to be intentional about which languages we use to do our work and what discourse practices we use to center some perspectives and marginalize others.

Practice critical reflection on goals and methods with humility and generosity. Doing equity-oriented work means that we are working toward a goal that is not predetermined or static across time and space. Moving in this way requires a disposition toward responsiveness and improvisation and this rests upon a strong sense of appreciating not knowing and not having all of the answers. In order to ensure that we are making progress toward greater equity, however, we must reflect critically on our actions and stay open to how we might need to change, step aside, and make room for others to step up.

We make these suggestions to facilitate the development of equity-oriented partnerships. We think that attending to these issues can advance our understanding of what equity means for diverse communities and how researchers could work with them to achieve greater justice. Simultaneous to doing this practical work, we also believe that research on our partnership practices will support more effective designs for equity. One research task involves writing design narratives that present stories of the evolution of equity-oriented partnerships. What were the initial goals that focused the partnership? How did these shift over time? Why? What new goals emerged? Systematically documenting the partnership's development could

support us in articulating the motivations and values behind our joint work. A second necessary area for investigation should focus on building an empirical basis of what works and what hinders equity- oriented partnerships. This situated knowledge of how equity-oriented partnerships function could then advance our collective capacity for creating consequential change. We hope that the framework we have presented in this article can facilitate this important and ongoing work.

References

Arrazattee, C., Lima, M., & Lundy, L. (2013). Do university communications about campus-community partnerships reflect core engagement principles? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 20*(1), 41–52.

Bang, M., Medin, D., Washinawatok, K., & Chapman, S. (2010). Innovations in culturally based science education through partnerships and community. In M.S. Khine & M.I. Saleh (Eds.), *New science of learning: Cognition, computers, and collaboration in education* (pp. 569–592). New York, NY: Springer.

Boal, A. (1997). The theatre of the oppressed. *UNESCO Courier*. Retrieved from https://www.questia.com/read/1G1-20099663/the-theatre-of-the-oppressed.

Boyer, E.L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach, 1(*1), 11–20.

Brazg, T., Bekemeier, B., Spigner, C., & Huebner, C.E. (2010). Our community in focus: The use of photovoice for youth-driven substance abuse assessment and health promotion. *Health Promotion Practice, 12*(4), 502–511.

Camacho, M.M. (2004). Power and privilege: Community service learning in Tijuana. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 10*(3), 31–42.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Grounded theory*. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of sociology*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Conrad, D., & Kendal, W. (2009). Making space for youth: iHuman youth society and arts-based participatory research with street-involved youth in Canada. In D. Kapoor and S. Jordan (Eds.), *Education, participatory action research, and social change: International perspectives* (pp. 251–264). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Easterly, W., & Easterly, W.R. (2006). *The white man's burden: Why the West's efforts to aid the rest have done so much ill and so little good.* New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Erickson, F. (1997). Some approaches to inquiry in school-community ethnography. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 8(*2), 58–69.

Espinoza, M., & Vossoughi, S. (2014). Perceiving learning anew: Social interaction, dignity and educational rights. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*(3), 285–313.

Eyler, J., & Giles, D. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Foley, D., & Valenzuela, A. (2005). Critical ethnography: The politics of collaboration. In Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.) (p. 217). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Franz, N.K. (2009). A holistic model of engaged scholarship: Telling the story across higher education's missions. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 13*(4), 31–50.

Franz, N.K. (2011). Tips for constructing a promotion and tenure dossier that documents engaged scholarship endeavors. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 15*(3), 15–29.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (2007) *Ethnography: Principles in practice* (3rd edition). London, Routledge.

Harding, S. (1993). Rethinking standpoint epistemology: What is "strong objectivity?" In Alcoff, L. & Potter, E. (Eds.) (pp. 352–384). *Feminist epistemologies*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Headland, T.N., Pike, K.L., & Harris, M. (Eds). (1990). Emic and etic: The insider/outsider debate. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Henrick, E.C., Cobb, P., Penuel, W.R., Jackson, K., & Clark, T. (2017). *Assessing research-practice partnerships: Five dimensions of effectiveness*. New York, NY: William T. Grant Foundation.

Holland, D., Lachicotte, W.S., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hornsby-Miner, E. (2007). If I could hear my mother pray again: An ethnographic performance of black motherhood. *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies, 3*(3).

Jurow, A.S., Teeters, L., Shea, M., & Van Steenis, E. (2016). Extending the consequentiality of "invisible work." *Cognition and Instruction, 34*(3), 210–221.

Lissenden, J., Maley, S., & Mehta, K. (2015). An era of appropriate technology: Evolutions, oversights, and opportunities. *Journal of Humanitarian Engineering, 3*(1), 8–16.

Liu, L. (1999). *Tokens of exchange: The problem of translation in global circulations*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Medin, D.L., & Bang, M. (2014). *Who's asking? Native science, western science and science education*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Mehta, C., & Mehta, K. (2011). A design space and business strategy exploration tool for infrastructure-based ventures in developing communities. *International Journal for Service Learning in Engineering, Humanitarian Engineering and Social Entrepreneurship, 6*(2), 30–57.

Mignolo, W., & Schiwy, F. (2003). Double translation: Transculturation and the colonial difference, In T. Maranhao and B. Streck (Eds.), *Translation and ethnography: The anthropological challenge of intercultural understanding* (pp., 3–30). Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Niranjana, T. (1992). *Siting translation: History, post-structuralism, and the colonial context*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Philip, T., & Azevedo, F. (2017). Everyday science learning and equity: Mapping the contested terrain. *Science Education, 101*(4), 526–532.

Saltmarsh, J., & Hartley, M. (2011). Democratic engagement. In J. Saltmarsh and M. Hartley (Eds.), *"To serve a larger purpose": Engagement for the democracy and the transformation of higher education* (pp. 14–26). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Stoecker, R. (2013). *Research methods for community change: A project based approach*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publication.

Teeters, L. (2017). Developing social alongside technical infrastructure: A case study applying ICTD tenets to marginalized communities in the United States. *Journal of Community Informatics*, *13*(1), 193–209. Retrieved from http://ci-journal.org/index.php/ciej/article/view/1311.

Teeters, L., & Jurow, A.S. (2018). An ethnographic study of relationships de confianza and the organization of collective social action. *Ethnography and Education 13*(1), 84–99.

Teeters, L., Jurow, A.S., & Shea, M. (2016). The challenge and promise of community co-design. In V. Svihla and R. Reeve (Eds.), *Untold story: Design as scholarship in the learning sciences*. New York, NY: Routledge.

The Design-Based Research Collective (2003). Design-based research: An emerging paradigm for educational inquiry. *Educational Researcher, 32*(1), 5–8.

Tuck, E., and Yang, K.W. (2014). R-words: Refusing research. In D. Paris and M.T. Winn (Eds.), *Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry with youth and communities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Vakil, S., de Royston, M.M., Nasir, N.S., & Kirshner, B. (2016). Rethinking race and power in design-based research: Reflections from the field. *Cognition and Instruction, 34*(3), 194–209.

Venuti, L. (2000). *Translation studies reader*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1986) *Language and thought*. Cambridge: MIT Press (originally published in 1936).

Wang, Y., & Jackson, G. (2005). Forms and components of civic involvement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 12*(3), 39–48.

Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2000). Community-centered service learning: Moving from doing for to doing with. *American Behavioral Scientist, 43*(5), 767–780.

Weerts, D.J., & Sandmann, L.R. (2008). Building a two-way street: Challenges and opportunities for community engagement at research universities. *Review of Higher Education, 32*(1), 73–106.

Zavala, M. (2013). What do we mean by decolonizing research strategies? Lessons from decolonizing, Indigenous research projects in New Zealand and Latin America. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 2*(1), 55–71.

About the Authors

Leigh Ann Teeters is a lecturer in the School of Education at the University of Colorado Boulder. Susan Jurow is an associate professor of educational psychology and learning sciences in the School of Education at the University of Colorado Boulder.

Appendix A: A Community-Engaged Framework: Generating Equity-Oriented Research Partnerships

Domain	**Establishing Partnerships** 1. Brokering relationships. 2. Identifying problems relevant to stakeholders. 3. Determining/negotiating roles		
Strategies of Collaboration	1. Brokering relationships: a) Ethnographic work is used to assess compatibility. b) Diverse stakeholders are considered in partnership. 2. Identifying problems relevant to stakeholders: a) Problems of practice are negotiated after ethnographic research. i. Researchers' perspectives from diverse stakeholders and represent those to decision-makers. ii. Research aims link practices across scales of practice. 3. Determining/negotiating roles: a) Researchers and participants negotiate roles and expectation prior to initiating research. b) The research roles and methods used are sensitive and appropriate to the various communities (literacy, language barriers, cultural sensitivities).		
Evaluation of each domain	**Indicators of Success**	**Barriers Faced**	**Innovation Implemented**

Domain	**Developing Trust** 1. Establishing mutual relationships. 2. Developing confidence		
Strategies of Collaboration	1. Establishing relationships of mutual benefit: a) Practitioner's forms of expertise are acknowledged and leveraged. b) The research/community team generates space for authentic and engaged listening. 2. Developing Confidence: a) Researchers engage in off the record listening. b) Researchers follow through with plans of action		
Evaluation of each domain	**Indicators of Success**	**Barriers Faced**	**Innovation Implemented**

Domain	**Working with Language Differences** 1. Translation (consider more than language). 2. Triangulation (multi-modal). 3. Inclusivity.		
Strategies of Collaboration	1. Translation: a) Two-way translations. b) Cultural, content, and technical elements accounted for. c) Boundary practices are created to broker cultures and content areas. 2. Multi-modalities: a) Multi-modal engagement is employed. b) Meaning checks are implemented. 3. Triangulation of meaning: a) Meaning is co-created. b) Understandings are checked for validity		
Evaluation of each domain	**Indicators of Success**	**Barriers Faced**	**Innovation Implemented**

Appendix A: (Continued)

Domain	**Planning for Action** 1. Ethnography. 2. Collaboration. 3. Activities to serve multiple purposes.		
Strategies of Collaboration	1. Ethnography: a) Designs are grounded in participants' historical practices and lived experiences. b) Participants' knowledges, values, and expertises are central to the design process. 2. Collaborative: a) Barriers to community participation are identified and addressed. b) The research design process includes community members in every stage. 3. Activities serve multiple purposes. a) Activities are embedded in existing activity system. b) Activities should draw on theories and research on learning practices and equity.		
Evaluation of each domain	**Indicators of Success**	**Barriers Faced**	**Innovation Implemented**

Domain	**Outcomes and Sustainability** 1. Opportunities for feedback. 2. Practices across scales. 3. Sustainability.		
Strategies of Collaboration	1. Opportunities for feedback: a) Include the community's perspective and contributions in the results of the research. b) Engage in iterative cycles of analyzing results with community members. 2. Practices across scales: a) Outcomes transform interactions across geographical space. b) Outcomes transform interactions across social groups. 3. Sustainability: a) Outcomes transform interactions across time. b) Participants adopt interventions and take responsibility for their continued implementation.		
Evaluation of each domain	**Indicators of Success**	**Barriers Faced**	**Innovation Implemented**