


Co-Production Readiness Tool

How to Use

- Ask a team member or community stakeholder to observe a typical team meeting to take note of behaviors they observe
- Invite observers with diverse points of view (or invite all participating to conduct the evaluation) to ensure the assessment reflects divergent experiences
- Check all boxes that apply

This tool measures a team's readiness for co-production and can help an Improvement Team assess readiness to engage with family and community partners in improvement work. It provides a list of things to look for when observing a team meeting. Once the team is engaged in the work, this tool can also be used by the partner (e.g. parent/family/community partner) the team is working with as a way for the partner to assess the team.

 30 minutes

HOW TO ASSESS YOUR RESULTS

Once you have completed the assessment, below is a way to gauge where your team falls on the scale. Please note that the ranges below apply to all categories within the Positive and Watch Point buckets. If you are not yet engaged in all aspects of the work, please keep this in mind and take note of your score accordingly.

WHERE YOUR TEAM RANKS

Positives

16: You're checking all of the boxes and doing the right work — keep it up!

8 - 15: You've got the formula down and are well on your way to co-producing effectively and efficiently. Keep an eye out for what you can improve upon going forward.

0 - 7: You have some work to do but don't fret — now that you're aware of this, you can make positive changes accordingly.

Watch List

0: In this case, not checking all of the boxes is a good thing! Your team is running effective, co-productive meetings — keep it up!

1 - 6: It's only natural that some of these watch points will creep into your meeting structure from time to time. Now that you are aware and attuned to some of these issues, work to improve on them.

7 - 17: It's time to regroup as a team and explore ways to improve your team's meeting structure. Below are some suggestions on steps you can take moving forward.

- *Reach out to others doing this work (individually or at QTIPS) to discuss and garner best practices to improve meeting engagements.*
- *Talk with your improvement lead to discuss strategies for improving your team's meeting style.*
- *Brainstorm with your team (and partners, when applicable) on ways to make improvements moving forward.*

Positives

Check all boxes that apply.

Style of Meeting

- Welcomes discussion
- All team members are focused on meeting and attentive

Communication During Meeting

- Listens a lot, staying engaged
- Direct and respectful communications
- Answers questions clearly, takes the time to explain all concepts

Meeting Logistics

- Clear meeting structure that has been communicated in advance
- All members (including patients/families, when applicable) of team included during agenda creation and meeting planning

Project Details (when and if discussing a community project)

- Flexible, willing to discuss possible adaptations based on need
- Plans to provide education or seeks to build capacity of community partner
- Community ownership of data; data and results shared with community
- Wants to work with community over time (this is not a one-off project)
- Budget is flexible and/or includes community support
- Openly shares project details
- Results shared in a timely, community friendly manner (website, social media, community newsletter)

Watch Points

Check all boxes that apply.

Style of Meeting

- Meetings are free-flowing; no introductions, agendas, or recaps
- Clear power dynamics at play
- Runs through agenda without including room for others to add/change
- Focus on self or team's goals
- Team members are clearly unengaged or "multitasking" during meeting
Limited or hurried discussion

Communication During Meeting

- Talks fast
- Little listening
- Using jargon and abbreviations
- Questions or differing opinions not welcomed

Meeting Logistics

- Meeting logistics do not accommodate all participants' needs
- Agenda not shared in advance for input

Project Details (when and if discussing a community project)

- Shares few details about the project
- Peer review publication is the priority; authorship is not shared
- One-time project
- Does not have team buy-in for community inclusion in the work
- Budget is fixed with little to no room to include community partner