Revolutionalizing GPP in Research

A Case of GPP Community Score Card in Zambia

Date: 11/09/2024

VIRTUAL MEETING

Background of GPP Community Score Card

- Between 2013 and 2018 the PopART study, a randomized study evaluating the impact of a package of HIV prevention interventions on HIV incidence at the community level, was conducted in South Africa and Zambia.

- During the preparatory stage, Zambart organized a stakeholders meeting to introduce the study.

- During the meeting CSO's from the PLHIV Constituency demanded to have a role to play in the study.

- This gave birth to the Community Partnership Platform; a group of CSO's that came together to play a role of community advisory mechanism side by side with the Community Advisory Board (CAB)

- This structure had sits on various levels of the study.

- In order to hold each other accountable, the GPP Community Score Card was introduced.

Rationale of the GPP Score Card

- Prior to the PopART study, community engagement was spearheaded by the Community Advisory Boards.

- However, there engagement with communities was a by the way thing without any accountability mechanism in place.

- The results from community engagement was never measured, tracked or documented.

- It was felt that community engagement in research was not structured and orgnized.

- The visibility of Community actors in community engagment was missing.

- This created a weak community feedback loop before, during and after the research

- All these factors isolated research sites from the community.

Objectives of the GPP Community Score Card

- To increase community engagement and participation in research processes

- To enahnce accountability mechanisms in community engagament in the research processes

- To facilitate structured and organized community engagement in research processes

- To strengthen community feedback loop in research processes

- To create community ownership and visibility of reseaarch

Methodology

❖Focus group discussions with different popuation groups and advocates to identify gaops and successes in community engagement before, during and after clinical trials

❖Identify common themes on issues identified

❖Use the themes to come up with indicators for tracking over a period of time

❖The indicators identified were used to develop a GPP Community Score Card.

❖Administer the GPP Community Score Card on a quaterly basis

❖Hold interface meetings with the site staff to discuss the results of the GPP Community Score Card

❖Develop action plans to address/resolve the issues/gaps identified by the Score Card.

❖Repeat the process on a quarterly basis and discuss progress in the execution of the action plan.

Results

❖Increased community participation in the research processes.

❖Improved relationship between the community and the research site.

❖Community engagement efffort measured and tracked.

❖Community engagement is done in an organized and structured manner.

❖Visibility of CAB activities enhanced at community level

❖Increased Community appreciation of research work

❖Reduction in community myths about research activities

Challenges

❖Lack of information on trials being conducted in their respective areas/districts

❖Limited research literacy among community representatives robbes the process of adequate input during focus group discussions.

❖The process is new in research conduct and participants may not fully understand the rationale

❖Relationship building may take time

Recommendations

❖Improve community awareness of trials being implemented in any district/area

❖Invest in research literacy among community actors.

❖Encourage research sites to adopt the GPP Community Score Card as a way of measuring community engagment efforts

Conclusion

❖ GPP Community Score Card makes community engagment organized and structured.

❖ Helps track and measure GPP efforts in clinical trials

❖ Helps hold actors in research conduct accountable

❖ Impoves community participation in research conduct.