Sustainability in the context of CBPR partnerships is not just about funding. This unit asks you to consider the multiple meanings of “sustainability” and the factors that contribute to it. It highlights the importance of ongoing evaluation to continuously improve the partnership, and challenges you to consider a variety of possible scenarios that could affect your partnership and its future.

Learning Objectives

• Examine the multiple meanings of “sustainability” to CBPR partnerships
• Identify the role of a participatory, formative evaluation in improving and sustaining the partnership
• Examine factors that can help and hinder sustainability and choose which are most important to your partnership
• Develop criteria for determining which efforts to continue
• Learn effective strategies for weathering change
• Understand that partnerships evolve and in some cases need to dissolve
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Unit 7 Section 7.1: Using Partnership Evaluation for Managing, Planning and Strategizing

In order to ensure that the principles and operating procedures adopted by the partnership are being followed, and that an effective partnership is being established and maintained, partnerships need to conduct an ongoing participatory and formative evaluation of the partnership process.

Such an evaluation involves partners in the design and conduct of the evaluation (e.g., determining questions to be asked, how data is collected), and provides ongoing feedback of the results to the partners in ways that are understandable and useful (e.g., written reports, verbal presentations). All partners need to be involved in the interpretation of the findings and applying them to make changes in the partnership process, as appropriate. It is important to use process evaluation to monitor the health of the partnership. Process evaluation can be done relatively simply and inexpensively. It does not require a full or part time evaluator. For example, facilitated reflective discussions can be incorporated into regular board meeting agendas, periodic online surveys can gather anonymous information from partners and graduate students or consultants can be engaged to conduct annual face-to-face interviews with partners. Even with an informal process, the information gathered can provide valuable insight into the direction of the partnership. For example, an informal evaluation process might entail having the chair of the partnership board interview partners between meetings to assess their satisfaction with the partnership.

Evaluations that identify strengths and areas for growth and improvement will help partnerships make changes that increase their chance for success. Evaluation findings should be presented at least annually to the partnership board (or other governing and advisory bodies) to determine whether changes need to occur within the partnership. The board should allocate time to discuss the value of the evaluations and what response if any is needed. Evaluation findings can be used to reflect and critique the partnership process and relationships.

As partnerships and their membership progress over time, it is especially important to document decisions and their rationale. Documentation helps partnerships to create a mutual understanding, and also serve as a record of the decisions made by the partnership, should conflicts arise in the future regarding a particular issue or decision.

Example 7.1.1: Using Evaluation and Indicators of Success

Our partnership has monitored our impact through the evaluation of the Broome Team, the Prevention Research Center, and the individual projects and programs that have been implemented. We have used instruments such as closed-ended questionnaires, monthly reports by each organization, surveys, focus groups, field notes and in-depth interviews. In the early years of our partnership, one evaluator from the University of Michigan was assigned to complete our evaluation. This evaluator used a participatory evaluation model to determine indicators of success. Subsequent evaluators have built on this process, and it is now a collaborative effort where we collectively define our indicators of success:

- One of our indicators of success is the integration of our windshield tours into the residency training programs at local hospital systems in our County.
- Another indicator of success is the development of an Office of Community-Based Public Health at the University with dedicated staff, whose mission is to connect community and health department partners to faculty and students. A school-wide community-based public health (CBPH) committee was also established to provide policy direction and oversight for the School's CBPH efforts. Our community and institutional partners are supervisors, teachers, and mentors to graduate students inside and outside of the classroom, and they are also involved regularly as classroom presenters.
- We must also point to the longevity of our partnership as an indicator of success. It is our sustainability even after funding has ended and the recognition that we will stay at the table even though we have had differences of opinion that allows us to continue addressing our community's problems. Jokingly, one partner said, "you only get out of this by death." There is some truth in this joke because a successful partnership requires this level of commitment, a commitment described by one of our founding members as one that goes beyond the 9-5 workday.
- We also know that we have been successful because of the increase in the number of community-based organizations that have become engaged in various projects as a result of our team's influence. More community-based organizations now have involvement on steering committees throughout the community at large.
- We also attribute the proliferation of organizations committed to community-based public health to our work
Example 7.1.2: Using Evaluation for Program Planning

As a result of this formative component of the Detroit Community-Academic Urban Research Center (URC) evaluation, results were presented to the Board in a manner that allowed members to redirect or refocus activities on several occasions. For example, results from the evaluation revealed that many Board members had grown uncomfortable with the URC's stated focus on "maternal and infant health" in its original goals and objectives. The majority of members perceived the actual emphasis of the group to be broader. These results were presented back to Board members, who in turn had a lengthy discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of a more expanded focus for URC interventions. Subsequently, the group decided to change its official focus to "family and community health."

As another example, an issue that arose in the early evaluation results from the in-depth interviews was a possible difference in opinion between academic and nonacademic Board members regarding the types of research in which the URC might be involved. Some of the academic Board members expressed visions of a variety of research endeavors, including research further describing the extent to which specific health problems or their correlates and causes exist in URC communities. The majority of nonacademic Board members, however, clearly stated their belief that the only type of research the URC should be conducting is intervention research. Descriptive or epidemiologic studies were perceived as "research for the sake of research," activities that they felt take away from communities without giving anything in return. Evaluation results regarding this issue were presented back to the Board and some very frank discussions ensued. Subsequently, Board members reached an understanding that the primary work of the URC should be intervention research, or research that provides and evaluates a community-based program.

**Unit 7 Section 7.2: Planning for Sustainability**

It is important that your partnership think about and plan for sustainability from its inception and not just something that you wait to think about when a project is nearing completion or funding is almost gone. At least a year before your partnership's work plan or current funding ends, you may want to create a plan for a more deliberate and formal process. It can also be useful to form a group or committee to work specifically on this issue. This group can make recommendations to the larger partnership and/or board.

Many people think about sustainability of a partnership as continuing the entire effort with a similar level of funding. However, this is not the only scenario that should be considered. It is important for partners to consider what is really necessary to support the continuation of the partnership, to see whether seeking a similar level of funding is warranted. This should be done before additional funding is sought. For more information on developing a plan for sustainable long-term funding plan, see Unit 5, Section 5.5.

The Center for Civic Partnerships, in its Sustainability Toolkit, has outlined 10 steps to sustainability:

- Create a shared understanding of sustainability
- Position your effort to increase your sustainability odds
- Create a plan to work through the process
- Look at the current picture and pending items
- Develop criteria to help determine what to continue
- Decide what to continue and prioritize
- Create options for maintaining your priority efforts (including funding issues)
- Develop a sustainability plan
- Implement your sustainability plan

Copyright Public Health Institute 2001. Sustainability Toolkit materials reprinted with the permission of the Public Health Institute

**Exercise 7.2.1: What Does Sustainability Mean to Your Partnership?**

It is important for a partnership to come to a common understanding of what sustainability means for the partnership and what criteria will be used to decide what and if the partnership or its components should be sustained.

In small groups, discuss these questions about the meaning of sustainability (20 minutes):

- Does it mean a continuing relationship and discussion among CBPR partners and organizations?
- Does it mean continuing a program or intervention from a CBPR partnership or project?
- Does it mean changes in a policy or system that addresses a root cause of the issue examined by a CBPR partnership or project?
- Does it mean an increase in community capacity to conduct their own research?
- Does it mean the sustaining of outcomes achieved by a CBPR project or intervention?
- Does it mean sustained funding over a specified period?
Factors influencing sustainability

There are a number of factors that influence the likelihood that you will be able to sustain your CBPR partnership, projects and/or outcomes. The exercises below are intended to prompt your thinking around these factors and determine which are most relevant to your partnership.

Exercise 7.2.2: How Sustainable Is Your Partnership?

This exercise is designed to be completed individually, then in groups of 2 people and then in a large group.

Below is a list of factors that can contribute to the sustainability of a CBPR partnership. Reflect on how your partnership is doing in each of these areas. Mark areas in which the partnership has done well with a star and mark areas you need to work on with an “X”. Have another person in the partnership (preferably with another organization/institution) complete this exercise, and compare results. Discuss how and where your viewpoints converged, and where they differed. Ask each pair to report back on their similarities and differences. Ask the partners to reflect on what they heard and identify the top priority areas they feel need to be addressed for the partnership to be sustainable.

Design and Implementation Factors
Effort’s resources (e.g., staff, money, time)

- Create a project that comes from the community vs. one that was imposed by a funder.
- Make sure your efforts are effective and/or are viewed as effective.
- Engage in public relations to keep your activities/issues highly visible.
- Try to secure more long-term funding for new projects to give you more time to evaluate them and secure continued funding.
- Build upon established activities.
- Choose an effort that is based on a demonstrated need in the community.
- Initiate a project that is aligned with your priorities and also helps other organizations fulfill their mission.
- Plan for financial sustainability.
- Obtain enough resources to generate an initial success.
- Include a training component so that you can train others – you create a constituency of supporters and groom new leaders to take over later.
- Build the capacity of the community – this helps create volunteers, trainers and advocates and can help leverage new funds.
- Maintain continuity in staff, community members, and political leaders.
- Include policy change to get more cost-effective, long-term outcomes.
- Have alternative approaches for sustainability – be flexible.
- Have a separate group/committee focused on sustainability so that others can focus on the collaborative’s
desired outcomes.

- Make evaluation a priority.

**Organizational Setting Factors**

*Structures and processes related to organization of effort*

- Work to create a strong institution (stable organization, projects are aligned with goals, strong leadership).
- Integrate the work effort within existing systems.
- Make sure the activity fits within the organization’s mission and activities.
- Develop and nurture a well-positioned advocate/program champion.
- Gain endorsement, support and/or commitment from the top of the organization.
- Build alliances with other groups that have a similar mission.
- Make your issue part of someone else’s agenda, plan or operations (e.g., business community, government, agencies).
- Give awards/ recognition to key individuals and organizations to make their commitment to the partnership more public.

**Environmental Factors**

*Broader contextual factors in political, economic, and social environment*

- Look out for competing problems that might be a barrier to sustainability (e.g., downturn in the economy).
- Focus on our community’s assets (vs. needs).
- Involve residents in decision-making so the activities are relevant and they have a long-term commitment to the effort.
- Be flexible; look for windows of opportunity (e.g., new federal/state initiatives, new elected officials).
- Try to obtain core funding from within the community (ask, “who are the people with financial resources in our community who have an interest in seeing the community improve?”)
- Build relationships with funders (philanthropies, corporations, individual donors, etc.).
- Encourage funders to increase the proportion of funds dedicated to prevention (vs. treatment, incarceration, etc.).

*Center for Civic Partnerships. Sustainability Toolkit: 10 Steps for Maintaining your Community Improvements. Copyright Public Health Institute 2001. Sustainability Toolkit materials reprinted with the permission of the Public Health Institute*

---

**Exercise 7.2.3: Facilitating Factors for Sustaining CBPR Partnerships**

Below is a list of facilitating factors for sustaining CBPR partnerships. Post this list on a blackboard or flip chart paper hanging on easels or a wall. Give each participant 10 stickers and ask them to distribute stickers next to those facilitating factors they feel are most important to the partnership. Instruct them to distribute the 10 stickers in any way they wish (i.e., all 10 stickers on one item, one sticker on each of 10 items, etc.). Debrief with the full group to review the 3-5 factors rated by participants as being the
List of facilitating factors for partnership sustainability:

- Funding and Other Resources for Partnership Infrastructure
- Funding and Other Resources for the Community
- Excellent Project Manager
- Tangible Benefits to Members of the Partnership
- Having the Right People and Organizations Involved
- Organizational Representation
- Strong Staff Team
- Shared Experiences and History
- Good Communication
- Strong Long-term Commitment
- Individual Relationships Between/Among Partners
- Mutual Respect and Support
- Shared Understanding or Shared Purpose
- Established Core Principles
- Continuous Planning Process
- Ability to Evolve
- Having a Specific Focus
- Having a National Reputation
- Being About an Approach (CBPR), Not Just a Project
- Excellent New Partners
- Trust
- Performing Internal Evaluations
- Learning from Past Mistakes and Successes
- Flexibility
- Humor
- Concrete Projects and Interventions
- Achievement of Targeted Goals
Unit 7 Section 7.3: Determining Which Efforts to Continue

Before deciding what programs, interventions or activities to continue or discontinue, it is important to have a clear picture of the work your partnership is currently engaged in as well as any future commitments and obligations. Your partnership may want to establish criteria for deciding whether or not to continue an activity. It is important that your partnership comes up with criteria that partners agree are important and relevant. When designing and using the criteria, the following tips may be helpful:

• Do not select more than 3-5 criteria or the process may be too cumbersome.
• Choose response options that are as simple as possible while still giving meaningful information (e.g. yes/no/unknown; 1-5).
• Recognize that data may need to be gathered to inform the analysis.
• Recognize that this may be a very difficult process. The partnership may not want to admit that something hasn’t “worked” or that discontinuing an activity may have negative repercussions (e.g., staff layoffs).
• Recognize that there are many factors that may influence a final decision. However, using a set of criteria to analyze your options will ensure a more informed and transparent decision.

If the partnership decides to continue an activity, it will be beneficial to consider the following questions about the justification for continuing it:

• What results have we achieved that justify continuing this effort?
• To whom is this effort important and do we have their commitment to finding resources for this effort?
• What cost effectiveness (or other financial justification) can we document for this effort?
• What resources are needed to continue this effort? What are possible sources of resources? What are strategies for future resource stability?

If the partnership determines that some or all activities will not be continued, it may be worth looking into other ways to continue them outside of the partnership. For example, by:

• Transferring the Effort to Others: The partnership might find an organization outside of the partnership to continue the activity. The disadvantage of transferring the effort this way is that it may not allow for capacity building of and ownership by the partners themselves.

• Institutionalize the Effort into a Partner Organization: The partnership supports or plans so that the activity is incorporated into existing community partner organizations or programs.

• Changing policies: Activities may be sustained through changes in rules, regulations, and laws.

If none of the potential strategies above pan out, is important to not just abandon the activity abruptly. Complete the necessary steps to close out the activity. This may include documenting what was done, completing the evaluation, writing the final report, and helping any staff or “clients” transition to other positions. Refer to Unit 7, Section 7.5 read more about things to consider if the partnership itself decides not to continue.

Example 7.3.1: Potential Criteria for Determining Which Efforts to Continue

Impact

• Has evaluation found this activity to be successful?
• Has there been an improvement in the way partners work together as a result of this effort?
• Has there been, or will there soon be, a measurable improvement in community health?
• Are there other ways these improvements can be achieved?
• Does this effort helps prevent problems in the community?
• Has this activity resulted in improvements in health-promoting policy?
• Is there evidence of increased community capacity to deal with the issues involved with this activity?
• Do the potential benefits (short term and long term) justify the cost of doing the work?
• What are the potential effects of not sustaining this activity?

**Resources needed**
• Is this activity filling a niche that is not being filled by another group within the community?
• Are there any other efforts in the community that complement or duplicate these activities?
• Has the partnership been able to leverage additional resources (money, services, donations, etc.) through this effort?
• Is it likely that we will be able to secure additional funding or resources to support this activity?
• Is this partnership the best group to continue doing this work?
• Do we have the capacity to continue this work?
• Are there individuals in this partnership willing to carry out the work?

**Broad community support**
• Does the community support the effort?
• Do key decision-makers support the effort?
• Are individuals within the community able to identify specific accomplishments/activities that we have conducted?
• What will the community reaction be to having something “taken away”?

**Still a need**
• Does this effort help meet a long-term community goal?
• Is the issue(s) addressed by this effort still a community need?
• Will discontinuing this activity have a negative impact on the community and/or population served?
• Is this issue/problem worth devoting our resources to, relative to other issues/problems in the community?

*Center for Civic Partnerships. Sustainability Toolkit: 10 Steps for Maintaining your Community Improvements. Copyright Public Health Institute 2001. Sustainability Toolkit materials reprinted with the permission of the Public Health Institute*
Unit 7 Section 7.4: Weathering the Change Process

Partnerships evolve and change over time. The policies, procedures, and infrastructure that is developed at the beginning of a partnership may need also need to change to reflect the partnership’s lessons learned, changing focus, new partners, etc. Periodic review and discussion of partnership principles and policies or the purpose and expectations of the partnership ensures consistency and checks the relevancy of a partnership. Sometimes the partnership is still relevant, but the goals and objectives of the partnership are not. Other times, this process of reviewing your relationship can help you determine if and when the partnership has run its course.

There are a number of activities that can be done to address how changes in the membership of a partnership may create a need for change. These include:

- Using internal evaluation processes to assess status of membership composition
- Working with the evolution of the membership to create a stronger partnership
- Developing criteria for new members that address gaps and build on strengths
- Anticipate changes in dynamics (“shared history” of older members vs. perspectives of “newcomers”)

Below are examples of how two partnerships successfully weathered the change process:

**Example 7.4.1: The Partnership Lifecycle**

The Broome Team was the first structure in Michigan organized in response to the call for proposals from the WK Kellogg Foundation Community-Based Public Health Initiative. The Kellogg funding ended after five years, but the Broome Team continued to meet without funding. During this time, Community-Based Organization Partners (CBOP), an alliance of our community-based organization partners, was organized. We continued to meet for almost two years with no funding until we applied to become a Prevention Research Center to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). At this point, we invited the Greater Flint Health Coalition to our partnership recognizing a weakness in our previous model which did not include representation from health care providers, employers, unions, and policymakers. Thus we became the Prevention Research Center Community Board, but the Broome Team continues to meet quarterly and has taken on a more philosophic role. For example, when the PRC Community Board identified that members were using multiple definitions of “community” and that this was creating conflict in our discussions, the job of proposing a definition was delegated to the Broome Team.

*Excerpted from Flint PRC proposal*

**Exercise 7.4.2: Weathering Change – Reaction and Prioritization Scenario**

You are the chair of a community and academic partnership (CAP) in a major city. After five years of building a shared vision, establishing the structure, and managing a stream of steady national funding to engage in
health promotion and disease prevention activities for your identified community, you have been informed that your CBPR partnership funding has been cut. You, the researchers, and the partnership members had anticipated a reduction in funds, but were not prepared for a full cut. Six months from now, the CAP will not have financial support.

You will have your monthly CAP meeting next week. Given your precarious funding status, what are your immediate priorities? During the time you have for this activity, fill in the boxes in the chart below with 1-3 short term and 1-3 long term goals for each concern. This exercise will help you figure out what to do at the next meeting. First, to establish short term goals, and second, to establish the groundwork for goals over the long term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Short-Term/Meeting Goals</th>
<th>Long-Term/Next 6 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale/ membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current and future projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting/ place of meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of Short and Long-Term Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Short-Term/Meeting Goals</th>
<th>Long-Term/Next 6 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future funding</td>
<td>1. Convene a sub-committee</td>
<td>1. Advocate with current funder for more $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Meet with PI (or fiscal conduit) to ensure staff support</td>
<td>2. Start searches for smaller, doable initiatives that build on current projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale/</td>
<td>1. Address morale up front</td>
<td>1. Revisit structure of CAP (i.e.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>2. Encourage attendance</td>
<td>mission/bylaws/membership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Organize members to</td>
<td>2. Revisit identity and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>advocate for more</td>
<td>community presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Current and  | 1. Secure staff support  | 1. Prioritize what is doable/|
| future projects|                        | desirable (consider how a  |
|               | 2. Assess/inventory     | project can best be        |
|               | projects                 | packaged for a possible    |
|               | 3. Secure board         | “end” product)            |
|               | commitment to projects  |                            |

| Setting/place | 1. Enlist commitment on  | 1. Continue to enlist        |
| of meetings   | part of host             | commitment on part of host   |
|               |                          |                            |

| Community    | 1. Share statement/      | 1. Present the news; inform |
| relations    | announcement via         | public of current status    |
|              | community meetings and   |                            |
|              | academic networks        |                            |

**Exercise 7.4.3: Weathering Change – Temporary Funding Scenario**

You are the chair of a community and academic partnership (CAP) in a major city. After five years of building a shared vision, establishing the structure, and managing a stream of steady national funding, the partnership approached the end of a funding cycle with little prospect of maintaining a relationship with the funder. Since the news about the cessation of funding, board members have questioned why funding for the partnership was not renewed and why the success of their CBPR approach appeared to be unrewarded. Further investigation into future initiatives of the funder did not seek innovative partnerships to improve health disparities, nor did they encourage a social justice approach.

The board became proactive in voicing their discontent with the future initiative of the funder. They challenged the funder’s mission and focal audience at a CAP meeting during a funder site visit, which occurred after the announcement of no funding. CAP members also initiated a letter writing campaign to the funder’s central office.

**Questions for discussion:**

1. What might the CAP Chair do to address the fiscal relationship with the funder?

2. What can the CAP Chair do to maintain operation of the CAP, possibly with little or no financial backing?
3. What might the CAP Chair suggest to obtain further funding?

**Exercise 7.4.4: Weathering Change – Loss of Funding Scenario**

You are the chair of a community and academic partnership (CAP) in a major city. After five years of building a shared vision, establishing the structure, and managing a stream of steady national funding, the partnership has completely dissolved.

The partnership is at a turning point. You have already led the partnership unsuccessfully in lobbying for additional support from the federal funder and have weathered through a short period of time with temporary funding. There is no funding to support core activities and you no longer have a community liaison or protected time of Investigators and Project Managers to support the partnership’s research activities. A decision on whether or not to continue to exist needs to be made.

You will have your monthly CAP meeting next week. How do you present the question to the CAP of whether or not your partnership should continue? How do you propose what the next action step should be for the CAP? How do you enroll/engage members in that next action step(s)?

Within your group, discuss and fill in some examples of the vision and strategy for each of the areas of concern listed in the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission, bylaws, principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function of CAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Examples of Visions and Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Sustain morale; encourage active participation by revisiting Mission/Bylaws/Principles</td>
<td>Enhance and diversify membership; publicize community relations; establish new identity/disseminate new name and purpose to collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission, bylaws, principles</td>
<td>Sustain community relations and dissemination</td>
<td>Establish ad hoc committee to redefine purpose and structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function of CAP</td>
<td>Identify different levels of involvement with partners to serve as</td>
<td>Intervention work group and subcommittee formation for current and future projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advisors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduit/Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is often an assumption that once formed, every partnership will continue. But in reality, there may be circumstances where it is appropriate for a partnership to dissolve. Sometimes relationships and partnerships end naturally, when the project is complete, or the purpose of the partnership has been fulfilled. However, not all partnerships have happy endings. Some end abruptly and can leave one or more of the partners dissatisfied or even angry. Knowing how and when to call it quits can be difficult and stressful for all partners involved.

When is it appropriate to dissolve a CBPR partnership?

- When there has been dishonesty, misuse or abuse within the partnership
- When all of the targeted goals have been achieved
- When there has been a gross violation of the partnership’s principles
- When there is inadequate resources to support the partnership

A high level of trust and positive relationships are central to successful CBPR partnerships. There may be some partnerships that decided to dissolve because the personalities and the working relationships simply did not work.

Sometimes a partnership may wish to continue to work together, but no funding is obtained. A partnership may dissolve temporarily but agree to come together again if a funding source is identified.

While a “formal” CBPR partnership may decide to dissolve, that does not mean that the relationships between partners must end or that programs or activities begun during the CBPR project must discontinue. These activities may be maintained by a partner organization or other organization.

Below are some questions that should be considered:

- How will you know whether it is time to dissolve or to continue the partnership?
- What are the benefits and drawbacks of ending the partnership?
- When (if ever) is it okay to end the partnership?
- Are there any resources available to fill the gaps and strengthen the weaknesses in the partnership?
- What are partners willing to sacrifice in order to maintain the partnership? What are partners not willing to sacrifice in order to maintain the partnership?
Unit 7 Citations


Unit 7 Recommended Resources


*Building Sustainable Non-Profits: The Waterloo Region Experience* (2004). Centre for Research and Education in Human Services & Social Planning Council of Cambridge and North Dumfries. This handbook highlights ways that non-profit organizations can improve their sustainability, including partnership building, leadership and governance, relevance/research, and organizational culture. It applies a CBPR approach or philosophy to all four. [http://www.crehs.on.ca/downloads/sustainability%20manual.pdf](http://www.crehs.on.ca/downloads/sustainability%20manual.pdf)

*Power of Proof: An Evaluation Primer* is an online resource that provides background information about evaluation as well as information on evaluation planning, writing evaluation objectives, collecting data, stages of evaluation, interpreting evaluation data, and reporting results. Designed for use by program personnel, rather than evaluation professionals, it can be used to guide program development and goal-setting, as well as evaluation. [http://www.ttac.org/power-of-proof/index.html](http://www.ttac.org/power-of-proof/index.html)