



# GIPA Homefire: Participatory Data Analysis During COVID

**Authors:** Charlene France, Michael Parsons, Brittany Skov, Randy Jackson, Renée Masching, William Gooding, Marni Amirault, Trevor Stratton, Tracy Prentice, Tara La Rose, Doris Peltier, Charlotte Loppie, Don Turner, Michael Orsini, Danita Wahpoosewyan, Rene Boucher, Jack Haight, Peetanacoot Nenakawekapo, Kerrigan Johnson, and Priscilla Bilsborough.

---

## Background:

GIPA = Greater Involvement of People Living with AIDS/HIV.  
IPHA = Indigenous Peoples living with HIV/AIDS.

IPHA involvement is integral in the response to HIV and AIDS within First Nation, Inuit, and Métis populations in Canada. Current models of GIPA do not include culture, and therefore don't fit well to supporting growing leadership with Indigenous Peoples in Canada. The project goals were to 'Indigenize' the GIPA principles, and look at the positive health benefits, as well as negative health impacts of IPHA leadership. We also asked about leadership needs to better support our IPHA leaders.

# Methodologies

---

The GIPA Homefire project applies a multi-pronged, mixed-method approach emphasizing Indigenous ways of knowing, decolonizing research methodologies, Two Eyed Seeing, and principles of community-based research, by bringing together IPHAs, academics, and community researchers.

## Quantitative:

- Online survey.
- Culturally specific needs for support in leadership.
- Impact on health and well-being.

## Qualitative:

- One-on-one follow-up interviews.
- In-depth data about impact on health, mentoring, and supports.

## Critical Analysis:

- One-on-one interviews with AIDS Service Organizations and clinics.
- Identifying organization policies of enacting GIPA.

Indigenous Culture and Ceremony played an **important** role in the success of this project. Finding ways to continue these practices virtually has been arduous, challenging us to find new ways to adapt and move forward.



# Virtual Participatory Data Analysis

Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, our original plan was to meet in-person, over the course of a few days to conduct our participatory data analysis. To adapt and move forward, we had to conduct our participatory analysis through Zoom, over the span of roughly a year.

We finished our data collection in January 2021, and created qualitative and quantitative teams, that met monthly, to start coding our qualitative data and begin the process of analyzing our quantitative data. Unfortunately, we found most of our team members were **not available to engage in our virtual meetings**.

Challenges with conducting a virtual participatory analysis:

- Zoom fatigue.
- Team participation and scheduling.
- Keeping on track.

**Culture and Ceremony** holds a prominent space in the hearts and minds of team members! This needs to be considered moving forward!

To re-engage with our team, we held a **multi-pipe Ceremony**, where nearly our entire team showed up. This was an important opportunity to connect with each other at a time when we were all isolated. Being in a relationship and Ceremony together, while not discussing the project 'work' specifically.



# Virtual Participatory Data Analysis

---

After the virtual Ceremony, we thought our team members were re-engaged, however, team members did not show up in these numbers again. The **Ceremony helped to bring together all our energy and affirm the value of the project.**

Alongside the team members who were in meetings, we collaboratively coded the qualitative interviews on the software *Dedoose*, and ended up with 16 codes to analyze through participatory analysis. Once the data was coded, we read through the quotes pulled from each theme, and held 3-hour weekly meetings for five weeks. These meetings were also not well attended individually, however many team members attended at least once.

Reflecting on oral cultural tradition and storytelling, we decided to invite team members who had not been in meetings to engage more informally one-on-one. These analysis meetings were held on Zoom and rendered extremely rich code analysis by shifting from writing to talking about what the codes might mean. These meetings were fruitful, although they were very resource intensive, as they required substantial time to prepare, and summarize discussions afterwards.

Shifting to a culturally-informed analysis strategy led to greater engagement with team members by entrenching Indigenous ways of doing – talking vs. writing – accommodating schedules and reducing Zoom galleries.



# Thank-You

A big thank you to:

- The IPHA Caucus for pushing for this research project.
- CAAN staff and team members for writing and re-writing the proposals.
- CIHR for funding GIPA Homefire.
  - Award #1511183
- All our research participants for generating the quantitative data and participating in the qualitative interviews.
- And team members for ongoing participation in the project.

Author Contacts:

[charlenef@caan.ca](mailto:charlenef@caan.ca) or  
[michaelp@caan.ca](mailto:michaelp@caan.ca)



**University  
of Victoria**