ISLAMIC COUNCIL OF VICTORIA

ICV Guidelines for Muslim Community-University Research Partnerships

Purpose

The principles and practices described here are intended to educate, inform and facilitate respectful, collaborative and beneficial research relationships between the Victorian Muslim Community and the wider university research community. It is also a statement of principles to guide these relationships towards an ideal. It is not a formal policy.

As the peak community organisation for over 200,000 Muslim Victorians, the ICV has been a 'community-partner' or 'participant' in many Muslim-focused research projects over its 42-year history.

Since 2001, the quantity of research focusing on Muslims worldwide has increased exponentially while driven by methodologies used extensively with security, counter-terrorism (CT), countering violent extremism (CVE), violent extremism (VE) and social cohesion studies. Since 2001, Muslim communities have gained considerable experience as research subjects, participants and community partners. Those experiences have informed ICV's understanding of the role of research in our community.

While developed for the ICV's own partnerships, this document may serve as a general resource for researchers and Muslim community organisations considering a research partnership. Community members wishing to understand their role as Muslim research participants may also find it useful.

Increasingly, Victorian Muslims seek more meaningful influence on the design of research, shared-decision-making and better training in the research process

Contents

Background

A research partnership between the University and the Community is ideally part of a larger collaboration that includes the interests of each partner and spans a wide range of activities. The University and the Community recognize that they often embody different cultures and missions. Nonetheless, the University and Community realise that combining their unique resources and perspectives can further the goals of both parties.

The ICV recognises that researchers making research requests have good intentions, but also that Muslim research is a growth industry and the pressure to apply for funded research has increased in frequency and media profile. Muslim research experts and researchers therefore have great sway over the 'Muslim narratives' in public policy and the broader media coverage. This is affecting the self-perception and health and well-being of Muslim communities.

They doubt the cultural appropriateness and rigor of 'Muslim research' and feel excluded from its benefits.

Muslim community experiences as research participants and partners suggest that the quantity of research into Muslims is not translating into an improvement in community well-being as measured in non-CVE community policies. They doubt the cultural appropriateness and rigor of 'Muslim research' and feel excluded from its benefits. The increase in research proposals and requests to the ICV to endorse research has also increased with the quality of applications often uneven. Community concern is focused on a perception that the ICV, and Muslims generally, are there to endorse all research regardless of the quality or benefits flowing back into the community.

Increasingly, Muslims seek more meaningful influence on the design of research, shared-decision making and better training in the research process. From a community perspective, these guidelines suggest processes to increase the knowledge and experience of both partners in consultation with researchers and best practice overseas.

Definitions

Many of the terms used in these guidelines have wide and commonly accepted meanings. A few have differing meanings for community, researchers and policy makers. We therefore clarify some terms below.

Muslim Community: for this paper, the term is applied to one or more of the following:

a) Australian citizens and permanent residents of Muslim faith currently residing in the state of Victoria, Australia.

b) Other residents such as non-permanent visa holders and refugees of Muslim faith currently residing in the state of Victoria, Australia.

c) All Muslim community organisations of any culture or ethnicity currently residing in the state of Victoria, Australia whether ICV or non-ICV members.

d) Non-Muslim family members, friends, and co-workers within Muslim community organisations in the state of Victoria, Australia.

Community-Based Research: Research that draws upon the Community's (however variously defined above) resources in terms of subjects, data, staff, material or other support.

Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR): This refers to a specific model of community-based research in which the researcher and individuals and/or entities in the Community create a partnership that identifies questions of mutual interest, conducts studies that reflect mutual input and derive outcomes that provide mutual benefit (Israel, Schulz, Parker, & Becker 1998).

Community Partner: Individuals and/or entities within the Community who may fairly represent their interests, needs and/or concerns because they are both

knowledgeable about and empowered to represent that Community. Community in these guidelines refers to ICVs Muslim membership and communities.

Islamophobia: A 2004 HREOC report defined the term Islamophobia as "the fear of Muslims" and our communities consider this term apt to describe the widespread fear and prejudice directed towards Muslims in Victoria, nationally and indeed internationally.

Community Policy: The ICV refers to 'community policy' where it seeks to make clear that its policy and advocacy work is representative of consultations that are based on identified community needs and experiences. They are not issues defined through individual state or national policies, strategies, statements or other documents that have not consulted with the Muslim community organisations and its members.

Muslim Research: This refers to all research conducted by Muslim or non-Muslim university, government or non-government or philanthropic organisations positioning the Muslim community as central to the completion of the research question. Many CVE and social cohesion research projects targeting higher Muslim participation rates do not use the word 'Muslim' in the research question or title. As will be discussed, community organisations and leaders often contribute to this confusion themselves.

Ethical Principles: A comparison of definitions for Respect, Beneficence, Justice and Research Merit & Integrity follows on pages 3,5 & 6.

Consulting researchers

The ICV consulted leading researchers working with Victorian and international Muslim communities with a focus on South East Asia. We became aware from our consultations that communities and researchers had much to contribute to ICV's guidelines. Several of the researchers consulted commented that Australian research processes with Muslim communities was 'lagging behind' the rest of the world. This feedback led to the ICV looking at some overseas models for this document.

While not individually identified, the seven leading researchers from four national universities have collective experience of receiving federal and state government funding for Muslim research. Their experiences range from three decades to very recent. Several have high media profiles commentating on Muslim research in Australian and international media.

The ICV consulted with Australia's leading researchers working with Victorian and international Muslim communities…

The ICV maintain regular consultations with its community members through forums, roundtables, anecdotal experiences, surveys within research projects, and through hosting and participation at events. This regular consultation helps the ICV to provide advice to state and federal governments while explaining government policies to the community. It is not only the Victorian peak organisation for Muslims, but has a 42-year history as a national thought-leader on complex Muslim social, religious and political issues.

Muslim community experiences of ethical research principles

Muslim communities and researchers agree that Australian university ethics are important. It is in the community-research relationship that these principles can sometimes be lost. It can be useful to review key principles from Australian research ethic codes and statements so community members and researchers can more easily refer to them in negotiations.

In consultation with researchers it became clear that Australia lacks information to translate these values into our community-university partnerships. Community-university partnership guidelines for Muslim community organisations in Australia are scarce. The ICV looked overseas and found a best practice

example to frame this document. To appreciate this best practice example, the ICV describe Muslim community experiences with Australia's current Code.

The Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research and Australia's National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research 2007

> **It can be helpful to review key principles from Australian research ethic codes and statements so that community members and researchers can easily refer to them...**

At the general level, most Australian researchers are guided by the *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research* (the Code) which guides institutions and researchers in responsible research practices and promotes research integrity. With community-university partnerships, we found that Australia's *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research 2007* (NSECHR) (Updated May 2015) influences the approach of many Australians researchers who propose partnerships with the ICV.

Developed by the National Health and Medical Research Council and the Australian Research Council and the Australian Vice -Chancellors' Committee, the NSECHR's founding principles are "respect for human beings, research merit and integrity, justice, and beneficence". While the ICV fully support both the Code and the NSECHR, the Muslim community experience of research has not reflected these values. Some researchers have conducted excellent projects with the ICV, with positive feedback, while others have not delivered on the language of key values according to community feedback.

The review of the Code and the NSECHR below offer an opportunity to reflect on ways to improve this process.

Muslim community experiences of Australia's NSECHR.

The NSECHR explains that these principles are not 'mechanical' and require deliberation, good judgement and will be different in each context. The ICV provides the following comment on how the NSECHR is currently working with the Muslim community.

NSECHR Value 1: In section 1.4 on the value of Justice, the NSECHR asks that Australian researchers ensure that: i) 'the process of recruiting participants is fair' (1.4.b); 'there is no unfair burden of participation in research on particular groups' (1.4.c); 'there is fair distribution of the benefits of participation in research' (1.4.d); 'there is no exploitation of participants in the conduct of research' (1.4.e); and 'there is fair access to the benefits of research'. Section 1.5 concludes that for research to reflect justice, "Research outcomes should be made accessible to research participants in a way that is timely and clear".

Community Experience: Justice matters to Muslim communities. The over-consultation of our communities to meet increasing demands for Muslim research is putting an unfair burden on the ICV and its member communities. People seek genuine outcomes from their participation in research. The low community awareness around existing data on Muslims could be addressed if researchers invested more time and resources into creating accessible resources that communities can understand. At present the onus is on Muslim volunteer organisations to simplify and disseminate complex findings to the community which is not sustainable.

Universities hold full intellectual copyright (IP) in Muslim research which often does not contribute to community policy. Unintentionally, this is affecting the recruitment of participants and how they feel. A perceived injustice in the process is leading to disengagement and a lack of diverse representation in the data. Some sections of

Muslim communities – especially youth - are feeling exploited and retreating from the process altogether. This does not help to close the gap on Muslim data which lags behind other diverse communities.

An appreciation for the unfunded time and resources that community organisations and volunteers spend to support researchers must be evident in all community-university partnerships with the ICV.

NSECHR Value 2: In section 1.10 on the value of Respect the NSECHR explains that, 'Respect also requires having due regard for the welfare, beliefs, perceptions, customs and cultural heritage, both individual and collective, of those involved in research.' It reminds researchers that, 'Where participants are unable to make their own decisions or have diminished capacity to do so, respect for them involves empowering them where possible and providing for their protection as necessary. (1.13)'

Community Experience: Community feedback to the ICV has shown that research participants find some researchers lack an understanding of the diversity of Muslim community, culture and history.
The ICV finds that an over-abundance of CVE, social cohesion, terrorism, Islamophobia and youth radicalisation-related research is framing the community's public and institutional identity through this narrative. At the same time, there are large data gaps in family violence, sexual health, drugs and alcohol, housing, employment and training, financial hardship, health, mental health and prison incarceration rates.

Youth in particular have told the ICV that the current representation of themselves in research, policy and the media has not had due regard for their welfare, beliefs, perceptions, customs and cultural heritage, both as individuals and as a community. Research projects do not currently fund capacity-building initiatives for the staff or organisations to understand the process. This reduces their meaningful participation to just 'being Muslim'. ICV and participants do not

contribute to the research question, or are asked if the research will contribute to community policies that have identified a pathway to advocate for improved conditions. They want to be empowered by the research, to contribute and understand the data and how it will be used. This is keenly felt by Muslim participants who divulge private and traumatic stories.

Research projects do not currently fund capacity-building initiatives for the staff or organisations to understand the process.

The ICV, like the majority of Muslim community organisations, is low funded and relies on its own volunteers and those of its members. When affordable, policy work is sometimes outsourced for specific documents such as these guidelines. 2017 ICV-Victoria University research identified that mosques in particular had extremely low capacity in policy and research.

NSECHR Value 3: The ICV found that the NSECHR understanding of 'Harm, discomfort and inconvenience' under Section 2: Themes in 'Research Ethics: Risk and Benefit, Consent' does not adequately appreciate the link between the harm that Muslim communities may experience as a result of over-consultation, or the repetition of a contested Muslim narrative such as those linked to Muslim youth radicalisation narratives.

The NSECHR explain that, 'psychological harms: including feelings of worthlessness, distress, guilt, anger or fear related, for example, to disclosure of sensitive or embarrassing information…' may lead to a 'devaluation of personal worth: including being humiliated, manipulated or in other ways treated disrespectfully or unjustly'. Social harm can also include, "…damage to social networks or relationships with others; discrimination in access to benefits, services, employment or insurance; [and] social stigmatisation."

Community Experience: Research which focuses on Muslims through the lens of law enforcement, counter-terrorism, criminology or radicalisation also reinforces those narrative which support Islamophobia. This is seen by the ICV as psychologically harmful. In a large youth forum held in 2016, Muslim youth were clear that their mental health was deteriorating from the over-abundance of public policies, media reports and research 'evidence' focusing on a negative future. Their representation in reports and research made them feel devalued.

> ## Respect for community goes beyond honouring the rights of individuals to include considering the effects of the research on the Community itself

They said that they experienced discrimination in the workplace, high rates of unemployment, and stigmatisation when reports and research repeatedly asked them to consider themselves a security risk or a disadvantaged individual with low aspirational prospects.

The disclosure of sensitive or embarrassing information (or data) weighs on the minds of Muslim community participants. Although researchers offer sincere efforts to maintain confidentiality, some universities advise their researchers to offer realistic confidentiality wavers that inform participants what the term 'unless required by law' means. The ICV raise this issue because Muslim research participants are deeply concerned with physical, electronic and other surveillance they believe all Muslims are under as a result of Islamophobia's influence on public policy and the media. The ICV discuss this in detail in its submission to the Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, Inquiry into the status of the human right to freedom of religion or belief (ICV 2017)

The ICV also refer readers to the Australia National University's (ANU) online page *Key ethical concerns: Informed consent* in the References for more information; and to the Australasian Human Research Ethics Consultancy Services (AHRECS) Research Ethics Monthly Review article *'Except as required by law': Australian researchers' legal rights and obligations regarding participant confidentiality* (AHRECS, 2017).

New guidelines for culturally competent Muslim community-university research partnerships

In Australia the Muslim community could not find a culturally appropriate model to bridge the principles in Australian research ethics codes and statements with practice in Muslim research. The researchers we consulted also did not refer to specific guidelines that address the Muslim community experiences highlighted in this section and were very supportive of the community putting forward clearer expectations.

From a community perspective, the ICV found the experiences of improving community-university research partnerships in universities outside Australia very valuable. The ICV sought permission from the Yale Centre for Clinical Investigation (YCCI) and the Community Alliance for Research and Engagement to apply insights from their guidelines for community-university partnerships.

The Yale Model: The YCCI's *Principles and Guidelines for Community-University Research Partnerships* (Sadler L S, et al, JHU Press, 2012) differs from the Australian model in its definition of ethics in that it omits "research merit and integrity" from its core principles, as did the influential 'Belmont Report' (NCPHSBBR, 1979) that focused on: Respect for Persons, Beneficence and Justice. The Belmont Report initiated widespread use of ethics principals for research in universities which is taken for granted today.

A secondary reason for the ICV supporting the omission of this principles is that, of the community experience described above, an all too frequent response from researchers when the ICV has requested greater input into research has been their need to maintain their research integrity and quality. The ICV see this argument as specific to research that does not integrate community agency into their process.

The ICV further determined that while we have capacity to evaluate how Yale's three principles affect Muslim community research partners, research merit and integrity is a peer-based value which the ICV can only calculate under advisement from experts or personal opinion.

While Australia's NSECHR explains that its four principles are not 'mechanical' and require deliberation, good judgement and will be different in each context, the ICV firmly believe that this judgement requires clear guidelines for both partners.

The Yale model has been chosen for its use of Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) processes; and the ICV is inclined to support CBPR-based research partnerships.

The ICV guidelines below were adapted from Yale's guidelines using their interpretation of the three principles described above.

Respect includes individuals and communities.

a. Respect for persons includes honouring the rights of all potential research subjects and taking measures to protect vulnerable individuals in the community who may be potential research subjects.

b. Respect for community goes beyond honouring the rights of individuals to include considering the effects of the research on the Community itself - for example, by considering the effect of the research results on a community's self-perception or beliefs, on perceptions outside the community, or on social service delivery within the community.

Beneficence means that research will be designed to minimize harm or the potential for harm and to maximize benefits to the individual and/or the community.

Justice focuses on the equitable selection of subjects and sharing of results with the community

Integrating these ethical principles into the research process to create a respectful, beneficial and sustainable Muslim Community-University Partnership requires a mutual commitment to implement useful strategies.

These should include the following:

5 key strategies:

1. Train Research Partners: It is essential to train University and Community partners in the research endeavour, so that each develops an understanding and appreciation of the requirements of designing and conducting research, as well as the contributions of each partner to the endeavour. It is important to the success of this training that it be a joint process and that both partners periodically evaluate its effectiveness

2. Share Decision-Making: Members of both the University and Community should participate in the planning, review and approval of community-based research.

3. Share Benefits: Given the legitimate contributions of both the University and the community partners, the rewards derived from research should be shared in a way that reflect the needs and contributions of each member of the research partnership.

4. Create an Ethical Framework: A set of operating principles must be agreed upon early to define the ethical conduct of the research partnership.

5. Promote Diversity: Recognizing that the community is diverse in multiple aspects, mechanisms should be identified to ensure that community involvement is as broadly representative as possible. The University also is recognized as representing a diverse community.

(1) Train research partners

It is essential to train both partners in the research endeavour, so that each develops an understanding of the requirements and the contributions of each partner to the conduct of research. Training also promotes acceptance and advocacy for the priorities of community research by both community and university partners and empowers the community to pursue research opportunities. Training takes many forms including formal training materials as well as informal interactions between research partners. These educational interactions should strive to meet the goals outlined below.

Training for All Partners

a. Educate all researchers regarding the principles and the importance of community-university research partnerships, so that no matter where they may subsequently work, they will continue to use and disseminate these principles whenever opportunities for Community-University partnerships arise.

b. Identify key values and other components of each partner's culture and ensure that each research partner understands and respects the differing perspectives and priorities of the other. All researchers should be informed that this process for developing understanding and respect is a necessary step whenever one is engaging in research with new partners.

c. Create mentoring partnerships by identifying interested Academic and community members which help the latter to develop basic research skills and acquire experience by participating in actual studies while also providing the former with the opportunity to learn about community values and resources.

Training for University Partners

a. Educate researchers about issues of significant interest to the community to identify and facilitate studies of value to the community.

b. Inform researchers about potential community partners whose work overlaps with the area of their studies to facilitate the establishment of working relationships.

c. Inform university researchers about potential sources of data within the Community that could be used to support the development and/or the conduct of research studies.

d. Educate University researchers about how to design research projects to reflect community conditions, capacity and constraints so as to enhance the quality of the studies.

e. Educate all partners about the principles and the importance of community-university research partnerships.

Training for Muslim Community Partners

> ...the Community should be involved in the research approval process sufficiently early to allow meaningful influence on a study's design

a. Create opportunities for community members to receive training in the various aspects of the research process.

b. Inform the community about potential academic partners whose work overlaps with their interests or organizational missions to facilitate the establishment of working relationships.

c. Inform the community about sources of data and other evidence-based information that would be of value to the community.

d. Educate the community in the grant writing process to better enable community partners to respond to funding opportunities in a timely and competitive fashion.

e. Familiarize the community with the process of identifying potential sources of funding for research projects and capacity building.

(2) Share decision-making

For the community and its various constituencies to have confidence that research is not only appropriate but also beneficial, the community should be involved in the research approval process sufficiently early to allow meaningful influence on a study's design where appropriate to improve benefits and reduce risks. How this sharing in the approval process will be implemented may vary from community to community.

a. The engagement of the Community in the approval process should be enhanced through one or more mechanisms:
    *   strengthening the role of the community membership through a sense of ownership of the research
    *   creating a community Advisory Board
    *   requiring a specific and detailed letter of support and understanding of roles and responsibilities from planned community partners

b. In addition to enhancing community participation in the approval of specific studies, a mechanism such as a Community Advisory Board should be created to provide ongoing community input into the larger research agenda and the University-Community partnership.

(3) Share benefits

The potential benefits accrued through participation in research are many and vary according to the participant or the community at large. Within the academic setting, salary support, reputation, tenure, and increased chances for further funding are but a few of the individual benefits, while the University garners prestige, funding for its research mission, and an enhanced ability to recruit other faculty and to attract additional resources.

Community partners can similarly benefit through database development, program evaluation, and acquisition of data that will support additional projects, programs or grants, the creation of community education materials, staff training/mentoring - all of which can provide both programmatic support and build capacity for independent research.

A true partnership requires that the University and the Community recognize and appreciate each other's diversity

Opportunities for benefit to the research partners and the populations recruited into the study should be built into each research project to the fullest extent feasible

a. University and community partners should develop a plan for dissemination of research findings within the Community.

b. University researchers should help to educate the community to recognize which contributions to the research endeavour represent legitimate costs in the eyes of funding agencies so that Community partners have realistic expectations when negotiating a budget for a given study.

c. University researchers should recognize and design studies with respect for the essential missions of most of their potential community partners which are patient care and/or client services, not research.

d. University researchers should work collaboratively with each partner to identify and maximize collateral benefits that might reasonably accrue to the community partner during the conduct of the planned research.

e. When necessary, the University should facilitate access to key resources such as skilled youth workers or family violence case workers, who can work with

community organisations and groups to enable them to participate in University studies.

(4) Create an ethical framework

Each partner has certain responsibilities. Among the most important of these is that each should recognize the other's needs and empower the other to assert its unique rights within the relationship. We recommend that as part of the development and implementation of any research project, community and university partners sign agreements that specify agreed values from these guidelines, including disclosing any known or anticipated risks and benefits to the individual/institutional partners.

Roles of the University in the Partnership

a) The University should be familiar with the important issues facing the community that would be appropriate for a research study, and should familiarize themselves with the potential partners in the community who might be in a position to collaborate in research projects and/or to represent its interests.

b) The University should ensure that potential community partners are educated about the process of research development, approval, implementation, analysis, and dissemination and the time lines over which each of these occurs so that they can participate meaningfully in each step.

c) The University should ensure that potential Community partners are capable of thoroughly assessing the potential risks and benefits of their participation in research studies and determining whether their participation meets the standards of a true partnership. Where potential community partners lack a formal review mechanism, a model process should be developed in cooperation with the Community for such use.

d) University Researchers should ensure that the individuals within the community groups or agencies with whom they are negotiating fully understand the purpose and the implications of the proposed research and the research partnership so as to make informed decisions about their participation.

e) University Researchers should have and provide proof of liability coverage for any negligent acts arising from activities

Community partners should, to the greatest extent possible, look beyond their own immediate needs and take steps to maximize the benefit of the research partnership to the larger community

performed in the course of the research partnership in amounts and scope adequate to provide coverage for negligent injury to participants, subjects or Community partners arising from the research.

f) University researchers should involve community partners in the planning of studies as early as possible so that they can contribute to each step of the research process.

g) University researchers should involve Community partners as early as possible in discussions about the potential uses of all data to be collected, including a dissemination plan for the sharing of the research findings with the wider community, and should develop a process for handling findings that may reflect negatively and thus cause harm to one or both partners.

h) University researchers should involve community partners during planning for funding of the study, acknowledging and budgeting for activities commonly funded in research grants that are performed by the community organisations or groups during the course of the study.

i) University Researchers should be willing in the early stages of planning the research to (a) add research questions to data collection instruments that are important to the community organisation or group and are relevant to the study and (b) include the findings from these additional questions in their data analyses.

j) University Researchers should appropriately acknowledge the contributions of community partners and their key staff in any publications and presentations resulting from or related to the research and should, whenever possible, encourage participation by interested staff of the community partner in the preparation of those publications and presentations; staff should be named as authors when their contributions are at the level expected of a trained researcher.

Roles of the Muslim Community in the Partnership

a. Potential community partners, in anticipation of committing to participate in the research process, should ensure that they are educated in the various steps of a study's development, approval, implementation, analysis, and dissemination of findings as well as the time lines over which each of these steps occurs by availing themselves of individual and/or organizational training opportunities.

b. Potential community partners, in anticipation of committing to participate in the research process, should establish a process of internal review and approval to ensure that any proposed studies are appropriate for the Community Partners' involvement and will not impair their ability to meet their organizations' missions. When community partner's lack resources for internal reviews, joint post-research reviews must state how to overcome this impediment.

c. Potential community partners, in anticipation of committing to participate in the research process, must establish an

infrastructure to ensure that they will meet all ethical and regulatory standards, including Australian Human Subject Protection standards and policies, and must agree to undergo relevant training equivalent to that required of their University collaborators.

d. Community partners must accept the authority and requirements of Australian research ethics codes if they plan to participate.

e. Community partners must adhere to the same Conflict of Interest standards that are required of their University collaborators.

f. Community partners should review and comment on drafts of any research participant information sheets and data collection forms prior to their use to ensure that the final forms are acceptable to the Community participants from a social, cultural, linguistic and literacy viewpoint.

g. Community partners should, to the greatest extent possible, look beyond their own immediate needs and take steps to maximize the benefit of the research partnership to their community.

(5) Promote diversity

A true partnership requires that the University and the community recognize and appreciate each other's diversity, and understand the importance of this diversity to the long term success of the partnership. To realise the goal of true community engagement, therefore, a community-university partnership should:

Community partners must accept the authority and requirements of Australian research ethics codes if they plan to participate.

a. Develop a thorough baseline knowledge of the community - its history, its demographics, its resources, its

weaknesses, and the relationships that exist within it.

b. Assess the community's needs and identify priority issues by a process that seeks the broadest possible representation and strives to reach the greatest possible consensus. Needs and issues identified in this manner should be shared with interested members of the University so that they may be included in other University research agendas.

c. Identify potential partners and determine their capacities to collaborate in various studies. All reasonable efforts should be made to offer opportunities equitably so that as many partners as possible participate in as many studies as possible given their abilities and interest to meaningfully contribute to them. Ensure that beneficiaries of the research reflect the diversity of the community as broadly as possible.

This concludes the recommended strategies for the ICV Guidelines for Muslim Community-University Research Partnerships.

For further information, please contact Mr Nail Aykan, Executive Director, The Islamic Council of Australia (ICV) Phone: [+613] 9328 2067 or Email: nail.aykan@icv.org.au

References

Australian National University (ANU) Key ethical concerns: Informed consent. Accessed 15/08/2017: <https://services.anu.edu.au/research-support/ethics-integrity/key-ethical-concerns>.

Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission 2004, *Isma - Listen: National consultation on eliminating prejudice against Arab and Muslim Australians.* Croydon Park, NSW, HREOC.

Iner, Derya [ed] & Charles Sturt University, *Islamophobia in Australia Report 2014-2016.*

Islamic Council of Victoria, 2017, *The ICV Submission to the Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, Inquiry into the status of the human right to freedom of religion or belief*.

Israel, B.A., Schulz, A.J., Parker, E.A., & Becker, A.B. 1998. 'Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health' in *Annual Review of Public Health,* 19, pp 173-202.

Mayan M J, Daum C H, 'Worth the Risk? Muddled Relationships in Community0Based Participatory Research" in *Qualitative Health Research* 2016, Vol 26(1) 69-76, SAGE.

National Health and Medical Research Council, & the Australian Research Council and Universities Australia, *The Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research* (the Code). Accessed 10/08/2017: < https://www.nhmrc.gov.au/guidelines-publications/r39>.

National Health and Medical Research Council Australian Research Council Australian Vice - Chancellors' Committee, *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research 2007* (Updated May 2015). Accessed 10/08/2017: https://www.nhmrc.gov.au/book/national-statement-ethical-conduct-human-research.

Peucker, Mario, *The civic potential of Muslim community organisations for promoting social cohesion in Victoria*, Victoria University, Melbourne, 2017.

Lois S. Sadler, Jean Larson, Susan Bouregy, Donna LaPaglia, Laurie Bridger, Catherine McCaslin, Sara Rockwell, 'Community–University Partnerships in *Community-Based Research' in Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action,* Volume 6, Issue 4, Winter 2012, pp. 463-469. Accessed 05/07/2017: http://muse.jhu.edu/article/491651.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Federal Register 1979 April, 18;44(76):23192-7. *Protection of human subjects: Belmont Report—ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects of research.*

Australasian Human Research Ethics Consultancy Services Pty Ltd (AHRECS), 'Except as required by law': Australian researchers' legal rights and obligation regarding participant confidentiality in *Research Ethics Monthly*, posted 3 February 2017. Accessed 15/08/2017: <https://www.ahrecs.com/human-research-ethics/except-required-law-australian-researchers-legal-rights-obligations-regarding-participant-confidentiality>.

Appendix 1: Community Consultation Insights of Australian Researchers, August 2017

ICV Guidelines for Muslim Community-University Research Partnerships

Purpose of consultation

The ICV consulted with seven leading Australian and international Muslim researchers who represent the current established cohort of researchers, research developers, chairs and directors of research centres specialising in Islamic communities, social cohesion and CVE and CT. There were four men and three women researchers, with two of Muslim faith, and three with Muslim research experience dating back to 9/11.

Each had previously or currently been funded by state or federal agencies responsible for funding CVE, CT or social cohesion. Several had significant experience with media commentary on Muslim research. The ICV shared the identities of the other researchers with each other to establish the level of expertise. They noted that each researcher's experience in Muslim research was not comparable to each other.

The ICV recognise that the researchers consulted possess unique skills and experience in Muslim research and thank them for the time given to share their opinions. The ICV summarise their insights below.

...over the last ten years or so there has been more attention paid to the Muslim community, and their issues, and youth issues especially, as global [security] concerns have increased

Insights on funding

- All the researchers had prior or current funding experience from the Australian federal and state governments.
- Some described receiving large Australian Research Council (ARC) grants.
- One person said that many grants did not require researchers to have solid contact and access to the Muslim community.
- All the researchers were currently in paid employment within university offering access to internal research funds.

There is a misperception that the higher education sector is flowing with funds. It is very low. Researchers do not use money for themselves

- In recent years grants for research in CVE has begun to focus on 'community-led' government programs and government-funded CVE and social cohesion research.
- All but one person agreed that funds for Muslim research had grown substantially over the past decade and that competition for funding was intense. A typical comment was, 'So much funding money I agree, and very competitive.'
- One commented that if a department has a group of regular or favoured researchers, then this can lead to a lack of diversity in methodology that prioritises the funder's criteria.
- One person felt that perceptions of universities benefiting from increased funding was unfair. They said: 'contrary to that perception [for over funding], and therefore it is a misperception, is that there isn't a lot of money, and it's very hard to get. There is a misperception that the higher education sector is flowing with funds. It is very low. Researchers do not use money for themselves.'

The cultural and faith competence of researchers

- Each researcher had a different relationship to the Muslim community.
- Muslim researchers of Muslim faith had mixed feelings about accepting government funding and were aware that they held dual roles as researchers and community leaders. As one person commented: 'Feeling compromised at times sure, if you're a Muslim researcher, people are suspicious if you work with government on anything, so I don't pay attention to that, I just do what I think needs to be done'.
- The group believed that there was a higher level of understanding of the diversity of Muslim communities by those that worked regularly with communities than new researchers who had little or no cultural competency. Someone explained, 'Researchers personalise their process and want to understand Muslims from a basic level leading to a lack of rigour in assessment at the stage of ARC or at the partnership agreement stage.'

Don't hide behind academic language

- A lack of cultural competence could lead to an over-reliance on expert language which affects how Muslims are recruited and described. The general comment was, "Don't hide behind academic language.' They added that, 'the diversity of the cohort challenges the methodology to be inclusive'.
- One person said 'the very fact of co-design is a mark of success' in Muslim research but it is rarely evaluated.
- It was accepted that terrorism and violent extremism was a factor in most of the Muslim research grants and that these topics 'framed' the Muslim community. Despite this, many shared the opinion of one person who said: 'Don't focus on

violent extremism, its' youth engagement and support and other issues. Muslims are just like anybody else."

- Another person explained: 'There is no such thing as the Muslim community. It's a series of communities, or contact with a variety of individuals across the spectrum in Australia, in South-East Asia and beyond'. This led one researcher to focus more on 'Islamic-thought social movements and Muslim societies'.

> **There is no such thing as the Muslim community. It's a series of communities, or contact with a variety of individuals across the spectrum in Australia and South-East Asia and beyond**

- Some saw the importance of focusing on community, rather than on individuals, and that this separated them from the lens of law enforcement.
- There was a split on the issue of community self-victimisation even among Muslim researchers. When communities felt that it was always 'someone else's problem' or that 'they are treating us this way', researchers were put in a difficult position to be either advocates or factual researchers. They felt this dilemma was not well understood by communities.
- Over half of the researchers felt that the, 'general literacy of researchers about Muslims is not high' and wanted to see improved standards.
- The common theme among the researchers was one of support for Muslim communities. They said, 'My guiding principle on relationships between researchers and the community is mutual respect. Always two-way so the good benefits flow in both directions and we

can work together on issues that we both care about'.

- While not articulated by all researchers, there was a sense that community could also better support researchers. A typical comment was, 'Some community organisations don't have much respect for researchers. If nobody is respecting each other, why bother, we need mutual respect.'
- Sometimes when community organisations used the word 'policy' it confused collaboration. Researchers are often uncomfortable with policy-led research and interpret the word 'policy' to mean government agendas. When the ICV explained that its 'community policies' came from community consultations and feedback from the 'ground up', they supported Muslim organisations asking for less CVE-research and more community policy data such as family violence, health, education, housing and employment.

Effects of over-consultation of Muslims communities

- There was mixed awareness that Muslim participants are contributing to many projects at once and that a lack of interest in collaboration may stem from over-consultation and a strain on their resources.
- All the researchers shared the sense that 'over the last ten years or so there has been more attention paid to the Muslim community and their issues, and youth issues especially, as global [security] concerns have increased'.
- Muslim over-research was not a new phenomenon in Australia. A person noted that, 'Like indigenous peoples, Muslims are currently researched to death and they don't get to see the material and what it is doing for them and they get frustrated with that.'

- Again researchers of Muslim faith were put in a tough professional situation at times. One explanation was, 'Yes unfortunately, in research, including my own, Muslims are the problem, it problematizes them. As a Muslim I do have an issue with that. I am aware that [Muslim research] will reinforce negative stereotypes about what it means to be a Muslim.

- One researcher though that being non-Muslim in the context of over-consultation could sometimes be an asset. They said, 'I'm not a Muslim, which I think gives me an edge, because I asked dumb questions. Then people think about those basic questions they won't ask if they're Muslim.'

- Everyone agreed that only focusing on violent extremism was disadvantaging the Muslim community. A typical sentiment was, 'I have 110 % support for recognising that Muslim communities are not a single issue community and never have been. If you fund matters that really matter to people, such as employment, you often walk away after consultations, with the idea that if everybody had a job we would be much better off.'

- Most researchers understood that the cultural competency of Australian researchers affected how a problem was positioned in the research question, the methodology, and how this affected the funding. They said, "Muslims have become more research literate over the years, literate of the agenda and distrustful of researchers, so I often have Muslim organisations call me for academic referees. Do you know this person? Can I trust them?'

- One person thought that the growth in 'casual' Muslim research with low cultural competency and integrity was hurting Muslim research and the community. They explained that the same questions are repeated to inform new researchers with low cultural competence and knowledge of the Muslim community or Islam. It

becomes a personal effort of the researcher to understand, so all research

85-90% terrorism topics in Muslim studies shows a fetishization perhaps

keeps starting from a same basic level and doesn't advance.'

- Over-consultation periods occur at specific times of the year when government grants make Muslim research more attractive. A typical comment was, 'Some academics are rushing their research proposals, with little background work, trying to make their proposals written to attract grants.'

- The over-consultation of Muslims was leading to declines in numbers and diversity in research which was affecting quality. Researchers did not shy away from this trend. They said there was a 'need to consult the fringe as surveys are not accurate'.

- With cuts to higher education, researchers feel compelled to apply for Muslim research funds whenever funds are available. One person who has refused promotion to focus on community-led research sees over-consultation as a systemic problem. They commented that: 'Workloads and budget cuts push us into education [which is] maintaining research active roles but which minimise community service. Many struggle with this. This adds pressure to publish and get grants at the same time as teaching. It leads to not being as effective or as collaborative with community service.'

- A researcher put the current Muslim research situation into perspective by saying, '85-90% terrorism topics in Muslim studies shows a fetishization perhaps. This is similar to research in the prison system. Those programs do not work'.

Research influence on media and public policy

- A common theme was summed up by one person who said, 'A lot of the research we do does find itself into public policy but it's difficult to trace'.

- People said that government policy does intersect with research. One person explained, 'in most cases researchers don't even know where it ends up in policy terms. Sometimes government can commission work from us, let's take it out of the CVE area, they come to ask for, say, domestic violence, and we go and do the work and then the government changes or the bureaucrats change and suddenly it's hard to trace.'

- A typical concerned comment was, 'I am wary that some researchers should be policy led. Some research should lead policy too. If we're only reactive, we are not doing our job, we have a leading role, that's why we do what we do. Even with community policy work and needs, as long as it is responsive to ICV policy needs, but also to come to you as researchers, and you think it's important to you.'

- The media caused mixed reactions from researchers. They agreed that it was possible that, 'The media representation influences the research; it creates the "Muslim problem"' and that 'Universities are commercially minded, so the media narrative plays a large role in their research'.

- One senior academic thought that journalists didn't have time to keep up with the diversity of Muslim research and to isolate and report on exceptions to the CVE narrative. They said, 'I don't think the media is interested unless it is directly connected to some issue. In the last 15 years journalists have become familiar in some of these issues, better than before. Because of the range of issues, popular discourse, media reporting also reflects that, but still one cannot deny that

significant parts of the media may want to report in a particular way and that's how things are, so it's up to the key leaders, scholars to be very closely involved in these discourses to make a difference. But expecting accuracy of reporting on what Muslims do *then it's not going to happen.'*

- One person acknowledged that researchers are 'more than observers, you influence them and influence the data'.

Australian Muslim research in a global context

- The CVE narrative in Muslim research was viewed by all researchers as a global phenomenon and not isolated to Australia. They saw similar issues in the UK, Europe, the US and, to some degree, in parts of South-East Asia, although most considered Australia to be behind in research innovation and quality. Most shared the opinion that, 'Australia does not do as much as we could. There is heaps of research in the world. We are behind and not doing as much or [as much of] quality'.

> ...the greatest problem in CVE is that people in the field travel overseas, see programs, and then take a program and transpose it to Australia without thinking if it can be built for here.

- Some saw the popularity of Muslim research as affecting the quality of data and community trust, and that overseas they had learnt this lesson. A researcher working mostly overseas explained, 'People working better are working abroad. People in Australia are recent converts to CVE in research. It's slow to progress'.

- Another person observed that there was more 'lip service to community led

programs at conference strategies' but that the community-university collaboration aspects were still weak.

- Keeping up with international work was considered to be important but it also had hazards. One person said, 'In Australia we are not tapping in with overseas learnings to map out our own projects. We're quite slow in community-led strategies', but another person said, 'the greatest problem in CVE is that people in the field travel overseas, see programs, and then take a program and transpose it to Australia without thinking if it can be built for here.'

- Another researcher voiced concern about using overseas models. They commented: 'Australian researchers are dealing with Australian situations, so how can we compare? The question of, are they directly comparable to the rest of the world, isn't always appropriate. Many issues are specific to local circumstances. The level of quality depends on the quality of resources. Australia is a small country [in terms] of a Muslim population, so making comparison with the US is not a fair comparison.'

Ownership and access to the research data?

- Some saw the accessible dissemination of research findings to the community as the weakest link.

- Another person said, 'Yes, there is quality out there, but whether it is being used or not is a different story. The amount being done in university is enormous, PhD thesis, it's out there. [But] we can question how much of that research is accessible to policy makers, if the interest is significant, or how it's impacting government. It's data overload.'

- One researcher suggested that communities should have access to anonymous aggregated data that is not used in the final publication for community funding applications.

- There was consensus in the statement: 'A lot of work has been published, perhaps too much. The issue is that it doesn't get out there'.

- Researchers all realised that intellectual property (IP) ownership by universities was an issue of concern to communities. Exceptions needed to be approved by each university ethics committee and built into the community-university partnership from the start.

Yes, there is quality out there, but whether it is being used or not is a different story. The amount being done in university is enormous

- One person saw sharing of information and IP as 'capacity-building' and noted that while the Australian Government was willing to invest in capacity building in their foreign aid budgets, with Muslim research this was absent.

- When discussing IP, one of the researchers said, 'It's a question of the governance of who can share data and who it can be shared with. Currently it is totally controlled by university ethics guidelines, national guidelines, and you have to build it in if ICV want access to aggregated data'.

- Half of the researchers expressed genuine concern about how shared IP might work. They said, 'It's a complex element, there are ways to have access to data that don't involve joint intellectual property, which rely on a legal definition. The criteria for joint IP is: what is your role in creating new knowledge or know how, or in other words, if part of a project is working on the design of the project, or its analysis, then yes IP becomes an issue'.

Suggestions for improving community-university partnerships

- There was a sense that all the researchers agreed with the opinion of one person who said simply, 'Make reasonable attempts to engage with diverse Muslims'.

- Being strategic in locating the areas where communities contribute the most IP and where they have least resources needs was important to one researcher. They reflected: '"My sense is that with research projects in partnership [there is more] interaction at the project phase but not beyond, and less collaboration and communication between community partners after this point'. They discussed a best practice project they did where heavy collaboration occurred in the early project phase and called this "face validity" where the research and survey questions could be altered or deleted by the participants themselves.

Community needs a bit of breathing space to get into higher level issues

- Giving community partners access to aggregated/anonymous data after analysis has been done by the researcher, but not used in the final publication, would help to close the data gap in non-CVE research and strengthen community policies.

- Safe discussion opportunities where the challenging experiences of researchers could be raised. One researcher explained, 'I have had damaging experiences partnering with community organisations in the past, where they have simply used the partnership, say great, put on a new project officer for salary, then the person doesn't do the work'.

- Another person said they supported better communication. They said, 'If we want this genuine partnership then it's a two way

learning process [which is also] about our limits and funding is one of those limits. It is not flexible'.

- Researchers wanted the ICV to embrace larger multi-organisational projects where it was only one player amongst others within a multi-party enterprise.

As Muslim communities, we leaders should be thinking, creating institutions, to help and facilitate [improved research] …

- One observation noted that the community needed time and support to build capacity to respond to the sheer number of Muslim research projects. They said, 'Community needs a bit of breathing space to get into higher level issues.'

- Another area of confusion researchers saw was in clarity from community organisations. A person volunteered: 'I would like to change two schools of thought when talking with Muslim communities tackling VE at the community level. One is that the only way is to address it directly, call a spade a spade, be honest, say it straight, so don't pretend you're not doing CVE. Secondly, [Muslim organisations] tell us to forget about stuff directly as it will turn everyone off. They will be intimidated. So slowly, very indirectly.

  We'd like some opportunity for some genuine dialogue for each of those opportunities to understand where they stand. I prefer the direct approach, that cuts both ways, but on the other hand, those advocating for the indirect approach are partly reluctant to go fully with that issue. The lack of clarity from the Muslim community on this sits within these two schools of thought. Different approaches are great, but the nuances and diversities, they can be hard to understand.'

- Reflecting on their own work and that of new Muslim researchers, one person said, 'In the work of some South-East Asian projects, I found them more collaborative, a sense of friendships going back decades. [I learned that] sometimes, with advocacy, you can lose objectivity and credibility. Be self-aware about what you're doing. Critical thinking and proper friendships are important [to the research]'.

...sometimes, with advocacy, you can lose objectivity and credibility. Be self-aware about what you're doing. Critical thinking and proper friendships are important...

- Researchers of Muslim faith said, 'As Muslim communities, we leaders should be thinking, creating institutions, to help and facilitate [improved research], to think about the next generation of thinkers, scholars, researchers and the like. [Communities] have a feeling that someone else will do the job'.

- One suggestion was to 'invest in smaller pre-project consultation with communities' as long as this did not result in further over-consultation. This was described as a 'post-design but pre-administration process which could work.'

- Researchers supported adapting to the ICV's community consultations and helping them to document them to give back to ICV and the community and to share this IP.

- All strongly voiced support for the ICV's efforts to build staff competence in contributing to, and evaluating, research data in collaboration with universities.

The ICV recognise that shared decision-making and shared benefits requires new skills and recommends further reading on the article 'Worth the Risk? Muddled Relationships in Community-Based Participatory Research (Mayan & Daum, SAGE, 2016).

For further information, please contact Mr Nail Aykan, Executive Director, The Islamic Council of Australia (ICV) Phone: [+613] 9328 2067 or Email: nail.aykan@icv.org.au

Appendix 2: Research Checklist
ICV Guidelines for Muslim Community-University Research Partnerships

The following questions are not conditions for partnership, but will assist the ICV staff to understand your Muslim research proposal.

○ **What is your understanding of the history and purpose of the ICV?**

○ **Have you read and understood the ICV's Guidelines for Muslim Community-University Research Partnerships?**

○ **Describe your previous relationships with the Muslim community?**

○ **What is your understanding of the term Islamophobia?**

○ **Does your research include research partner training for yourself and ICV staff?**

○ **How will ICV staff and Muslim participants share in the decision-making in this project?**

○ **How will the ICV and Muslim participants benefit from this research?**

○ **What type and quantity of aggregated unpublished final data can the ICV access during and on completion of the research?**

○ **How and to whom will results, during and after the research, be disseminated to?**

○ **With the ICV's assistance, are you prepared to fund and conduct pre-project community consultations and to produce accessible documents or media?**

○ **Will the partnership include activities and documents with joint Intellectual Property (IP) with the ICV and your university?**

○ **Does your Muslim research contribute to studies in countering violent extremism (CVE) – including violent extremism (VE), social cohesion, community safety or criminology - or Non-CVE?**

○ **If your research is non-CVE, will your methodology be aligned with the methodologies accepted by researchers in those non-CVE disciplines?**

Acknowledgements

The ICV thank the seven leading Muslim researchers for their candour in sharing their expertise and personal experiences and for their sincere support in helping ICV to manage its capacity as a community partner with universities, governments and philanthropic organisations.

The ICV recognise and thank Yale Centre for Clinical Investigation (YCCI) and the Community Alliance for Research and Engagement for their permission to customise and adapt their community-university guidelines.

The ICV recognise and thank the ICV Board Members, staff, community members and non-ICV Muslim community organisations consulted for these guidelines.

The ICV's community-university partnerships guidelines and principles are not a formal community policy and are written as a 'grey literature' contribution to improve Muslim community-university research partnerships and cross-cultural and interfaith understanding. It informs the ICV's management decision on whether to endorse, proceed or fully participate as a community partner in Muslim community-university research partnerships with universities or in multiple-partnerships with governments, private or philanthropic organisations.

The guidelines may also assist the ICV member organisations and other Muslim community organisations in managing research issues. If quoting this document, please also acknowledge the YCCI model.

Copyright

This document is © Copyright to The Islamic Council of Australia (ICV) 2017

Contact

The Islamic Council of Australia (ICV)
Email: admin@icv.org.au
Phone: [+613] 9328 2067
Fax: [+613] 9329 1677

Mailing Address:
Islamic Council of Victoria
P.O. Box 14156
Melbourne VIC 8001