

The Community of Practice evaluation questionnaire (CoPeval)

This document presents the Community of Practice Evaluation Questionnaire (CoPeval), and summarizes the four working steps regarding its origin and development (Hamzeh et al., 2019). These steps are based on international standards in educational and psychological research concerning the origin and development of questionnaires (Hamzeh et al., 2018). The CoPeval questionnaire has been designed for coordinators, facilitators and members of Communities of Practice (CoP).

Step 1: Objectives and constructs

CoPeval is aimed to evaluate and improve CoP in partnership with their members, for example on an annual basis (formative evaluation). The two evaluated constructs are CoP processes and CoP outcomes.

Step 2: Origin of CoPeval

The CoPeval dimensions (concepts) and items (factors) are derived from several sources: (a) the conceptual framework most often cited in the CoP literature (framework proposed/revised by Wenger, a CoP pioneer); (b) insights from an external CoP expert; (c) the developers' CoP experiences; and (d) a review of the CoP methodological literature that identified 12 validated CoP-related questionnaires. None of which covered all of the dimensions and items pertinent to CoP evaluation.

Step 3: Initial Development of CoPeval

All of the items in the 12 identified questionnaires were pooled into one list. They were then categorized into CoP dimensions using a nominal Group method with three CoP experts. The items were further categorized into two groups: generic items (likely to be pertinent to any CoP in any context) and specific items (probably only pertinent to some CoPs or to some CoP contexts, e.g., CoPs in clinical settings). This resulted in the first version of the CoP evaluation questionnaire (CoPeval-v1).

Step 4: Relevance and clarity of the items

For each item of CoPeval-v1, the relevance and clarity were assessed via cognitive debriefings with members of the Nunavik Youth Mental Health CoP. This resulted in the second version of the questionnaire (CoPeval-v2), available below.

In conclusion, CoPeval-V2 is an innovative and unique questionnaire compared to existing CoP evaluation questionnaires for three reasons. It is complete, i.e., it covers the main dimensions and main known items (concepts and factors from 12 validated questionnaires). Its origin and development are clear (application of international standards). Its structure of generic and specific items is innovative. Future work will investigate the ecological content validity of CoPeval across several CoPs.

Acknowledgements

This methodological report and the CoPeval questionnaire are the result of an initiative led by the Method Development component of the Quebec-SPOR SUPPORT Unit, with the support and expertise of the Nunavik CoP in Youth Mental Health (Atautsikut), in response to a request for service from the CoP of Pharmacists in Family Medicine Groups.

References

- Hamzeh, J, Kaur N, Bush P, Hudon C, Schuster T, Vedel I, Hong QN & Pluye P (2018). *Questionnaire Origin and Development Appraisal (QODA) checklist*. *McGill Family Medicine Studies Online*, 13:e06.
- Hamzeh J, Johnson-Lafleur J, Ouellet C, Granikov V, Pluye P & Nadeau L (2019). *The Community of Practice evaluation questionnaire (CoPeval): Origin and development*. *McGill Family Medicine Studies Online*, 14:e01.

Community of Practice Evaluation Questionnaire (CoP-Eval-V2)©
Version 2019-08-19-19

Please contact us if you plan to use this version: pierre.pluye@mcgill.ca

PART 1: GENERIC ITEMS – potentially relevant for assessing any CoP

PART 2: CONTEXT ORIENTED ITEMS – pool of items that may be relevant in certain contexts such as CoV

For each item, the response options are:

- I strongly agree
- I agree
- I neither agree nor disagree (I don't know)
- I disagree
- I strongly disagree

PART 1: GENERIC ITEMS

JOINT ENTREPRISE

- 1 CoP members discuss the objectives of the CoP in a collaborative way
- 2 The CoP is developed according to the needs of its members
- 3 My points of view are respected in the CoP
- 4 CoP members help each other
- 5 I see the long-term value of the CoP for its members

MUTUAL ENGAGEMENT

- 6 I am satisfied with my participation in the CoP
- 7 I am motivated to participate in the CoP
- 8 I am comfortable with sharing my points of view with other CoP members
- 9 I feel that I am part of the CoP
- 10 I make time to attend CoP activities even though I have a lot of work
- 11 I have a role in making decisions concerning CoP activities

SHARED REPOSITORY (KNOWLEDGE SHARING)

- 12 I have some knowledge and experiences that I prefer not to share with CoP members
- 13 The CoP allows me to speak about my own experiences
- 14 CoP members have developed a shared understanding of how to interact in the CoP
- 15 CoP members can decide to keep part of their collective knowledge only accessible to themselves
- 16 Knowledge developed in the CoP can be turned into new ways of doing things

SOCIAL SUPPORT

- 17 My participation in the CoP reduces my isolation
- 18 The CoP atmosphere is pleasant
- 19 The CoP atmosphere allows for openness and creativity
- 20 CoP members make constructive comments
- 21 CoP members trust each other

TRAINING (CAPACITY BUILDING)

- 22 The CoP enables me to know more about other members' experiences and points of view
- 23 The CoP helps me to compare ways of doing things
- 24 In the CoP, I hear experiences and points of view that confirm I am doing the right thing
- 25 In the CoP, I learn something new for my practice or for myself
- 26 My participation in the CoP has improved my skills or my practice

PART 2. CONTEXT ORIENTED ITEMS

IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION

- 19 I have the time to participate in the CoP
- 20 Sufficient time is available for CoP activities
- 21 The connectedness among the CoP members has increased over time
- 22 There is a process to continuously document the work of the CoP
- 23 There is a process to evaluate the outcomes of the CoP
- 24 There is a process to propose improvements of the CoP

FACILITATION

- 1 I am satisfied with the organization of CoP meetings
- 2 I am satisfied with the way in which the CoP is facilitated
- 3 I am satisfied with the coordination of CoP online activities
- 4 I am satisfied with the way CoP members are encouraged to participate in CoP activities
- 5 All CoP members have the opportunity to contribute to the discussions
- 6 The CoP facilitator ensures that nobody takes over a discussion
- 7 I am satisfied with the way CoP members can connect with each other
- 8 I am satisfied with the way CoP activities are advertised
- 9 I am satisfied with the way opportunities participating in learning activities outside the CoP are communicated

EXTERNAL IMPACT

- 10 My participation in the CoP has increased my satisfaction at work or in doing other activities
- 11 Through being a member of the CoP, I make useful new contacts for my organization or for myself
- 12 I really see the advantages of participating in the CoP for my organization or for myself
- 13 I share some knowledge and skills learned in the CoP with people outside the CoP
- 14 Through being a member of the CoP, I am able to do certain activities more efficiently
- 15 The CoP makes a real contribution to the effectiveness of my organisation
- 16 The CoP contributes to developing new practices within my organisation
- 17 My organization advertises the knowledge created in the CoP
- 18 Some CoP knowledge can be used as a source of evidence to improve services or policies

VARIA (new items suggested by interviewees)

- 25 The CoP is allowing me to learn about Inuit and non-Inuit knowledge
- 26 The CoP improves relationships between inuits and non-inuits
- 27 Finally, I would recommend the CoP to someone else

*The CoPeval-v2© questionnaire is free of charge for any non-commercial use in education and research.
Intellectual property rights (copyrights # 7724312)*