KAARE (Knowledge-Audience-Action-Reciprocity-Evaluation)

KAARE is a reflection and planning exercise for strategically communicating research. This tool presents a "simplified amalgam" of intersecting, generalized concepts drawn from *knowledge brokering, -mobilization*, *-translation*, *-exchange, -dissemination, -utilization, -transfer, implementation science/practice*, and *science communication*. Placing Knowledge, Audience, Action, Reciprocity, and Evaluation in a 5x5 stepwise grid, KAARE provides 25 questions/prompts to clarify strategic objectives and priorities.

↓ Knowledge	↓ Actions	↓ Audiences	↓ Reciprocity	↓Evaluation
Knowledge Questions →				
What new knowledge has been generated or demonstrated? What do we know or understand now that we did not know before?	What specific action(s) might be taken? How concretely can we describe them? What could this knowledge mean "in practice"?	Whose lives and decisions might be impacted by this knowledge? Who can build upon it? How specific or broad is this audience?	What follow-up questions might be inspired, implied or prompted by this knowledge? How would the audience inquire further?	What is the robustness of our knowledge or research findings? What are the ethical ramifications of utilizing or implementing it?
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Action Questions →				
What is the justification for why this knowledge can or should prompt action now? What makes the action relevant?	What might be objectively and manifestly different in the world because of this action?	How can we describe how this knowledge should be put into action without inferring an information deficit on the part of the audience?	How will the experiences of people who act upon this knowledge inform future research? How will the research be mutually beneficial?	How will we evaluate the impact, consequences, or implications of the actions based on this knowledge?
6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
Audience Questions →				
How does this audience articulate their greatest needs? What are their perceived gaps between their actual and ideal? What real reasons do they have for investing in change?	What incentivizes or disincentivizes the priorities and behaviours of people who can take this action? Where does this action or change in behaviour fall in their priority matrix?	How does this audience define the nature of truth? What people or institutions do they most trust? How do they conceive of "us" and "we"? How do they measure social status?	How will we invite the "audience" to become our collaborators? What internal processes or structures impede their integration and involvement in research?	How will we know our strategies to engage and collaborate with this audience are effective, equitable, and do not cause harm or sow seeds of distrust?
11.	12.	13.	14.	15.
Reciprocity Questions →				
What are the potential ways that the information we are putting out into the world might produce or generate new knowledge, questions, or perspectives?	What system feedback responses (reinforcing or self-correcting) do we anticipate in response to these actions? How do these assumptions inform our communication?	Who is excluded in our conception of this ecosystem of individuals and groups? How can we segment and pluralize our conception of "the audience"?	What does "authentic involvement" mean for our collaborators and knowledge users? What are their nascent fears or hesitations to invest in future research endeavours? How would we know?	How will we know that our strategy to share this research has achieved its objectives? What outcomes does this audience define as "successes" or "failures"?
16.	17.	18.	19.	20.
Evaluation Questions →				
How will we systematically seek to identify blind spots in our current knowledge–the "unknown unknowns"?	How can behaviour change (actions taken and system feedback) be measured—quantitatively and qualitatively?	What evaluation questions or data points are most important and valuable for our collaborators and knowledge users?	How will we take what we learn to plan future research projects differently moving forward? What is our continuous improvement model?	Counterfactual or "premortem" exercise: this entire effort to engage potential knowledge users failed miserably; what happened?
21.	22.	23.	24.	25.