Step 1 – WORKBOOK

Reviewing the Local Context

Reviewing the intervention with implementation in mind

The framework assumes that the intervention has already been designed, or selected for implementation. However, we know that within a local context there are a range of adaptations that may need to be made to ensure there is equal access and outcomes. To help think through the implications of the local context the first step is to review the design with equitable implementation in mind. For the purposes of this framework we would encourage you to apply the He Pikinga Waiora tool to consider the various design aspects of the intervention.

# Introduction

In this first step it is important to review (or design) the intended service from the perspective of what is known to improve equity[[1]](#footnote-1). To help in the process the following task looks at the critical design principles that research has identified as key for improving equity.

## Objective

To review the intervention to ensure it can achieve equitable intervention and equal outcomes for the local context that the intervention will be implemented in.

## Step-by-Step Instructions

1. For each of the design principles, use the table provided to rate the planned intervention from High to Negative.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **High** | **Medium** | **Low** | **Negative** |
| Community Voice | The community is involved in defining the problem and developing the solution | The community is involved in either defining the problem or developing the solution | The community has only been informed but has no direct involvement in the definition of the problem or solution development | The intervention is being implemented in the face of significant community opposition |
|  | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No |
| Reflectivity | There are explicit strategies to review the impact of the intervention over time and make adjustments as a result | There is some consideration about the need to review process and outcome measures. How to act on these are unclear. | There are no strategies to review the service as it is being designed and implemented | The is unintentional bias in the intervention design |
|  | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No |
| Structural transformation and resource | The intervention design is intended to significant structural transformation, and the intervention has sustainable resources | The intervention has sustainable funding, but there is a limited focus on structural transformation | The intervention receives minimal resources and is only sustainable over a short term | There are less resources or lower quality resources available as a result of the intervention compared with no intervention. |
|  | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No |
| Community engagement | There is strong community leadership. Decision making is shared and strong partnership is identified throughout the intervention. | Communication is two-way and there is co-operation to implement the intervention with a partnership becoming apparent. | The intervention team has ultimate control over the intervention and communication, which flows one-way to the community. | The intervention is placed in the community with no consultation with the community. |
|  | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No |
| Integrated knowledge translation | The intervention includes a process of mutual learning across stakeholders. The information is tailored to the needs of different knowledge users | The is medium level support for knowledge translation across stakeholders | The intervention has minimal or no support for implementing knowledge translation | The knowledge users have major concerns which they are not able to discuss with the intervention team. |
|  | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No |
| Systems perspective | The intervention design includes the following: 1. Multiple causes; 2. Broad focus/multiple solutions; and 3. Multiple perspectives/world views, values of multiple stakeholders | The intervention design includes 2 of the 3 factors in the high category | The intervention design includes 1 or none of the 3 factors in the high category | The intervention has a negative impact due to a lack of consideration of multiple perspectives necessary to support implementation. |
|  | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No |
| System relationships | The intervention demonstrates a strong understanding of the complex relationships between variables including feedback loops, time delays, and multi-level effects | There is a moderate understanding of the complex relationships between variables including feedback loops, time delays, and multi-level effects. | There is limited understanding of the complex relationships between variables including feedback loops, time delays, and multi-level effects. | The intervention has a potential negative impact dues to a lack of consideration of system relationships important for implementation |
|  | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No |
| System levels | The intervention targets changes at the macro, meso, and micro levels, and provides sufficient rationale and context for each level. | The intervention targets changes at 2 levels with some rationale and context for each level. | The intervention targets changes at 2 levels or less without providing rational or context. | The intervention has a potential negative impact due to a lack of consideration of the change in different levels needed to support implementation |
|  | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No |

1. For domains that have been rated as negative or low list the approaches you will use to improve this domain.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **High/Medium already** | **Actions to improve** |
| Community voice | Y/N | 1.  2 |
| Reflexivity | Y/N | 1.  2. |
| Structural transformation | Y/N | 1.  2. |
| Community engagement | Y/N | 1.  2 |
| Integrated knowledge translation | Y/N | 1.  2. |
| Systems perspective | Y/N | 1.  2. |
| System relationships | Y/N | 1.  2. |
| System levels | Y/N | 1.  2. |
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