



**Internal Use Only**

## **ACIAL AND ETHNIC HEALTH DISPARITIES: Schools and Graduate Programs of Public Health Respond as Engaged Institutions**

*A Capacity-Building Initiative Sponsored by the WK Kellogg Foundation*

# **NOTES**

### **Technical Assistance Sessions January 18-19, 2007**

**Roy P. Drachman Hall  
1295 N. Martin Ave., Bldg. 202A • Tucson, AZ 84724**

Engaged Institution Consultants: Neil Henderson & Sherrill Gelmon

#### **January 18, 2007**

**8:30-  
10:00am  
Room A326**

#### **MEET WITH FULL COMMITTEE**

**Session Liaison:** Jill Guernsey de Zapien and Douglas Taren

**Recorder :** Sonia Medina

**Goal:** The goal of this session is to meet entire committee and get a sense of who we are and our expectations of the two days.

#### **NOTES**

**Present:** Doug Taren, G. Marie Swanson, Brenda Manuelito, Maia Ingram, Iman Hakim, Carol Huddleston, Joyce Hospodar, Cecilia Rosales, Lisa Staten, Noram Gray, Cathryn Coe, Joel Meister, Jean McClelland, Chris Tisch, Jill de Zapien, Neil Henderson and Sherrill

**Welcome:** G. Marie Swanson welcomed the consultants, Neil Henderson and Sherrill Gelmon. Both consultants gave a brief background on their professional careers.

Sherril Gelmon works is from Portland State University. The program she works with is a collaboration between three institutions, covering a 90 miles radius. Dr. Sherril has worked extensively with CCPH.

Neil Henderson works at the University of Oklahoma and has a medical anthropology background. Some of the issues he works with are aging and care, and dementing diseases across various populations. Dr. Henderson has concentrated more on the American Indian population and others.

Jill de Zapien noted that the group had a lot of discussion on why we wanted to be a part of the Initiative. We are proud as an institution, yet one of the concerns is that very often when we talk about health disparities and community engagement we talk to each

other instead of communicating within the University as an institution. The idea for the TA is to stimulate dialogue and discussion on the identified issues.

Hopes and Dreams: Each participant gave a brief summary on their hopes and dreams for the College.

Jennie Mullins – “We are floundering as a college” in terms of vision regarding health disparities. We need to look at ways that we can support each other better, need to be realistic about resource and how much we can do.

Brenda Manuelito – Interested on issues of diversity. Diversity is growing with students and faculty. It is important to work well in the areas of teaching, research and community engagement. We also need to look at Retention and Recruitment. We also need to look at approaches and perspectives regarding health disparities and at the context of traditional university setting and how we work with the community.

Maia Ingram – Hope that all these ideas and discussions can be channeled together. We need to know how to develop academic programs and keep collaborating with the community. How do we respond to requests from the community? We need to capacitate other from their organizations.

Iman Hakim – As Division Director she works with Faculty through the P and T so that they don’t stumble. It has been hard to work with faculty and it will be more difficult with Junior Faculty. In regards to students, we need to know how to bridge translational research into the community.

Carol Huddleston – Has good relationship with MEZCOPH. The community in Douglas appreciated the College with the diabetes work that has taken place. She is here to learn from everyone.

Joyce Hospodar – Congress has focused on saving rural hospitals. She has worked on hospital marketing and strategic planning and is new to public health. She wants to learn how to serve better in the communities that she has worked with by having infrastructure and stability of rural hospitals.

Cecilia Rosales – Her main interest is mentoring. In terms of the academic portion of it, mentoring is challenging since she has a practitioner perspective.

Lisa Staten – She wants to see what other people are doing, everyone within the college is spread very thin. For those who have tenure, how can we do things better structurally so we can do things better with partners, there is no extra time. What are some goals so we can move toward for a better structure. Also, we need to make P and T guidelines friendlier to community engagement. Doesn’t feel that community engagement is taken into consideration in the guidelines. Also need to look at how we need to improve in mentoring.

Norma Gray – She has a good opportunity to work with Native groups. However, she is not able to publish any findings since she needs permission from the tribes. There are

	<p>issues related to research. How do we continue relationships with the community groups. How can we work together and expand capability of meeting the needs of the communities we work with.</p> <p>Kathryn Coe – We need to look at the good things the University does. We need the College to prepare a white paper about community engagement. Another issue is interdisciplinary and team building. We are also stretched very thin.</p> <p>Joel Meister – We need to revise the P and T guidelines. We looked at various models and one thing we wanted to avoid is to set up separate tracks, and tried to build in community engaged scholarship but has not done much about the culture. He sees three main items of equal value for the P and T guidelines, 1) research; 2) teaching; and 3) service.</p> <p>There is a disconnection between theory and practice, “talking and walking.” Engaging in a project is not the same as engaging a community. As scholars, we should be engaged in the community as a whole and not just as a group. There is a lot to be done. “Real time” is different than “academic time.” We need to figure out how to “game the system.”</p> <p>Jean McClelland – How do we fit skills and history to respond to the community? Her hope is to contribute by the end of the two days.</p> <p>Chris Tisch – We attract Peace Core volunteers and the community based research is what most of the students feel they like the most from the College. Her hope is that community engagement is not a challenge for our students. Her hope is that most of the students say that their experience here has helped with the community engagement perspective.</p>
<p><b>10:00am-12:00pm</b> <b>Room A326</b></p>	<p><b>MENTURING? MENTERING? OR MENTORING? WHAT IS IT? LETS TALK ABOUT CAREER DEVELOPMENT FOR JUNIOR FACULTY AND ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS.</b></p> <p><b>Session Liaison:</b> Lisa Staten, Cecilia Rosales, Brenda Manuelito</p> <p><b>Recorder:</b> Kerstin Reinschmidt</p> <p><b>Goal:</b> The goal of this session is to facilitate dialogue with our junior faculty first regarding their mentoring needs and then provide examples of mentoring programs that are useful to those who are engaging communities and involved in community based participatory research</p> <p><b>NOTES</b> Second dialogue will be to have dialogue with our academic professionals to discuss ways of building stronger relationships with our faculty and to envision a long term career as an academic professional in our college.</p> <p>Lisa Staten (LS) opened the session and asked those who did not attend the previous session to introduce themselves.</p>

The College's Mentoring Program Planning Committee was mentioned and Lynda Bergsma (LB) commented that she had attended one meeting but then never heard about this committee again.

Kerstin M. Reinschmidt (KMR) who is co-chair to this committee was asked to give an update. She summarized the history and the current status of the committee. In short, it was spear-headed by the A/APs back in 2003 when discussions about the need for mentoring began in this group. These discussions were followed by a needs assessment and an A/AP retreat in 2004. An A/AP Mentoring Subcommittee then solicited the official support from Dean Swanson to work on a college-wide mentoring system. Subcommittee members recruited faculty through the divisions and staff as committee members for the college-wide Mentoring Program Planning Committee. This new Committee continued its research into existing mentoring systems and also conducted a survey with the different groups at the College to identify overlapping mentoring needs. Some of those overlapping needs were found in grant writing and management. Unfortunately, some committee members kept stressing differences between the mentoring needs of staff, faculty and A/APs. Due to lack of commitment, the committee eventually faded out. By the end of January, the Dean will receive a short report on the committee's work accomplishments and the recommendation that, at this point, it would probably be more realistic for each group (faculty, A/APs, staff, students) to establish their own mentoring system which at a later point in time might be combined into one.

Doug Taren (DT) explained that the faculty has a system where every junior faculty members has a senior mentor. This system basically is for promotion purposes, not career development. He pointed out that what Nicole Yuan (NY) had said earlier about having mentors all over the U.S. reflected what mentoring really is: personal relationships. He stressed that mentoring needed to be defined and wondered how we as a College would create a community where mentoring existed.

Norma Grey (NG) agreed with DT and posed the question of how to share skills and work and figure out how to work as group in a true 'community-based' way.

Kathryn Coe (CK) commented that they used to have booklets on how to teach, for example, and that was something A/APs could use. She also pointed out that mentors also needed training.

Sherril B. Gelmon (SBG) pointed out the need to know how to find a mentor or mentee, and how to find a job description for each role.

Maia Ingram (MI) wondered whether mentoring really should be a formalized system, it seemed to her to be more natural in an informal form.

Cecilia Rosales (CR) reminded the group that first we would need to know what mentoring is.

LS points out that the College only has a limited pool of associate and full professors.

SBG suggested that maybe the College's rule of who could be a mentor could be

changed.

DT supported the idea of informal mentorship. It would probably be best, because one would need to get along well as mentor and mentee. Anything else would be couching.

Howard Eng (HE) pointed out that the faculty system was a written policy. This was more of a formal system on paper, but some faculty had no one in their area to be a mentor. HE stressed that those who are successful in academia have more than one mentor, and a mentor could also be a community member. It would be good to have multiple mentors for the different areas of activities.

SBG summarized what she was hearing: there seemed to be a College rule that did not fit the reality.

LS was struck by the talk about an official mentoring system when there did not seem to be a difference to the division director who would help her with promotion.

SBG said the division director had to help, while the mentor would want to help

Jean McClelland (JMcC) pointed out the need to document the mentoring that was done. Some individuals might also have mentoring relationships with other departments. Those connections needed to be formalized so that collaborations would be visible. Mentoring should be reflected in the APR.

Joe-Neil Henderson (JNH) explained that mentoring was both formal and informal, both structured and unstructured. A form could be created to foster more informal network. There was power to the informal component, as long as it was recognized.

LB said that she was a supervisor to XYZ, but that she also thought of her as a mentor and a colleague, and an equal. This was kind of what LS said before: What's the difference between a supervisor and a mentor?

SBG asked whether anyone had a definition.

KC replied that mentoring was used in two ways, one in which it was about caring, while the other definition was the academic one referring to particular knowledge that would get people through the system. KC also reminded attendees that KMR said earlier that there was no follow-through with the mentoring committee. This would be the rubber band effect, where individuals were so busy that they would not really care for a formal system.

Jill G. de Zapien (JGdZ) pointed out that mentoring was important for newcomers to the College who usually have a culture clash with all the new responsibilities. There was a need for some kind of system and some kind of network.

SBG wondered what would happen if a mentor gave advice but the mentee would not follow through. She gave an example from her experience where she had advised a mentee to dress differently from the students to be respected by them. SBG found that

saying things like that would put her in an uncomfortable position.

NG responded that this would go back to hierarchical relationships. If they mentee wouldn't like the advise given, he/she could go to someone else.

KC explained that there was an authoritative mentoring (a pecking order), and a nurturing kind of mentoring. The latter type is what we should be striving for.

KMR had two comments. First, the current discussion was quite interesting to her, because both A/APs and the Mentoring Program Planning Committee had already had similar discussions about definitions, how to find a mentor, formal vs informal, etc. Second, from all the work for the mentoring committees, she had learned that a mentoring system or program is a very complicated thing. It has a structure, still needs to be flexible. There are short-term and long-term mentoring relationships, as well as one-on-one and group setting mentoring. It seemed that successful systems had a mentoring coordinator. One of her personal favorite systems was the one at Wisconsin which is accessible on the web. The mentoring examples on the web also include definitions of mentoring, guiding principles, mentoring contracts, etc. Websites also point out the importance of the mentee to seek a mentoring relationship. If a mentoring system was to be created at this College, it would require real commitment from those involved, as well as a lot of work.

Brenda K Manuelito (BKM) made the point that there was a cultural difference in the college. While the faculty had a system, the APs did not and thus the latter would feel like second class citizens. This was why we needed to establish a college-wide system. There were some APs who had become assistant professors. Importantly, there are also people of color who are APs.

CR asked SBG about any examples of existing systems.

SBG replied that she didn't really like any system out there, and that existing mentoring systems were very individual. But it was important what was just said, namely that the mentee needed to approach the mentor for the mentorship. It was also important that the mentor would agree. I would be very helpful if the mentee specified what the mentoring was needed for. SBG also pointed out that the VA had a national mentoring program and anyone who wanted to progress at the VA, needed to be part of it. But of course, as the VA is a government organization, mentoring at the VA was very structured.

JNH shared that in his experience, mentoring was very individualistic and informal and thus he didn't have a good example of a formal system either. But since KMR said that what she heard in this discussion was like a rerun, we maybe should be talking about why the mentoring system didn't happen.

SBG stressed that she takes mentoring very seriously as a social obligation. She thought it might be important to talk about our own positive experiences. She felt that mentoring was important to her as a young woman growing up in the 60s when there were not many female role models. Maybe – and that might be what the A/APs experienced – people who are not in power positions are not in the place to create

something new. SBG learned the importance of multiple mentors, i.e. individuals who could help her in her career development. Now that she was senior, she wanted to give back. SBG hoped that mentoring could be institutionalized for A/APs at this College.

DT said that a lot of mentoring for promotion came from the division directors and might be good for faculty. He thought that for A/APs, jobs were not so much depending on production but on work content. A/APs might need mentoring on how to work better in their jobs. Unlike faculty, their job positions are written for specific jobs.

JGdZ disagreed with DT's statement to a certain extent since she supervises A/APs and has been working with them towards "promotion" as a supervisor. A/APs however, struggle with where they are going and this is what is extremely difficult.

MI pointed out that the faculty mentoring sounded like the one for students where you tell the person where to go and how to get there. Thus, we had a coaching system. Now the College needed to figure out where to go with mentoring. While it was required to have a coach, MI wondered whether it should it be required to have a mentor.

CR said that she was struck by the comments KMR had made earlier about the lack of commitment, and also by KC's comment that faculty had not time. CR thought that it was not that the faculty did not want to be part of the mentoring, but that they were too busy.

Nicole Yuan (NY) made the suggestion that while faculty was too busy to be individual mentors, maybe group mentoring would be an option. She wondered how the College could offer a group format mentoring, for example, in grant management or syllabus writing. She thought that something in that nature would be good to have.

SBG summarized that for faculty, the College would need rule-based guidelines and an advisor for P&T purposes. For things that were applicable to all, there could be College-wide mentoring session or brown bags, for example, on grant writing, teaching, balancing different work responsibilities as well as academic and personal life, etc.

LB pointed out that the group had not talked about "professional development." The College did not have any structure for professional development. There were no sessions on teaching, advising, etc. There was no chance of getting together to talk about such issues. There was a need for more opportunities.

SGB wondered whether there were mentoring opportunities on the other side of campus (which was answered in the affirmative). She had seen it before that new schools had little contact with the main campus. SGB suggested as a high agenda item that the College tap into existing resources across campus.

JGdeZ said that there had also been a desperate cry from A/APs who work in communities to have mentors.

SGB thought that maybe it would be a bit goofy, but also fun, to have a mixer where people could learn about each other and what they had to offer.

	<p>Carol Huddleston (CH) said that she thought what was needed was a support group, a space where people felt comfortable. She also affirmed that we would find individuals in the community who had a whole lot to offer.</p> <p>HE suggested putting mentoring into context. Especially for those working in the community, it would protect the relationship with the community. If someone would poison the community, it would affect everyone else in the College. HE continued seeing mentoring as a plus.</p> <p>The meeting was adjourned.</p>
<p><b>12:00-3:00pm</b></p> <p>12:00-12:50pm Room A326 <i>(lunch provided)</i></p> <p>1:00-3:00pm Room A120</p>	<p><b>“VOICES FROM THE COMMUNITY,” A GREAT OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMUNITY PARTNERS TO DISCUSS NEEDS, MEZCOPH’S SUCCESSES AND CHALLENGES.</b></p> <p><b>Session Liaison:</b> Jennie Mullins, Kathryn Coe, Jo Jean Elenes, Joyce Hospodar</p> <p><b>Recorder:</b> Joyce Hospodar</p> <p><b>Goal:</b> The goal is to discuss with our community partners the strengths and challenges to our past partnerships and envision an ideal partnerships and the steps towards building it.</p> <p><b>NOTES</b></p> <p><b>What was gained by the community via the project/partnership? What was gained by the College?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research projects advance the field of public health</li> <li>• Internships/other exchanges of personnel address project needs</li> <li>• Ability to share resources</li> <li>• Research agreement(s) with Arizona tribes under way</li> <li>• Support helps to meet tribal needs via students, technical assistance, and grants</li> <li>• Opportunities for Native American interns to work in Indian Country</li> <li>• Tenacity and compassion provided state-wide</li> <li>• Development of interagency service agreements using “creative” financing</li> <li>• Trust of individuals/project focus/ and developing relationships</li> </ul> <p><b>What were the challenges/barriers during the project?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Missions of College and practice partners are not aligned; further, goal of proposed project needs to be agreed upon</li> <li>• Funding restrictions/mandates required – What value will be left in the community?</li> <li>• Projects are time limited</li> <li>• Partners and College are, at times, on different time lines. i.e., the academic calendar is not in sync with state/federal grant calendar</li> <li>• Geographic distances from College to partners</li> <li>• Potential abuse of power and privilege as it relates especially to Native American tribes; mistrust exists between Native Americans and Universities</li> </ul>

- Other commitments/competing demands of College
- Lack of time to build sustainable partnerships
- Data collection concerns as it relates to tribal sovereignty; must understand that data collected is owned by tribes not universities
- Many communities are tired of being “measured”
- Academic world misses the people who are behind the numbers/statistics
- Lack of awareness that communities/tribes do differ; tribes, especially are sovereign and each have their own culture/traditions
- Too focused on publications

### **Recommendations**

- Organize/sponsor Faculty/Academic Professionals “boot camp” in communities to observe, learn and become immersed in the “life of the real world”
- For local partners, have people shadow others in organization
- Increase cross communications to better appreciate each other; understand what motivates an organization and identify what one can give to the relationship
- Understand each others’ barriers, history, culture, experience, resources
- Promote mutual respect – How can we give/take to meet each others’ needs?
- Develop a set of criteria for sustainable partnerships
- Establish a long term view for outcomes
- Share promising practices in partnerships
- Create realistic vision/timelines; include the federal government in this discussion because they are even farther removed on what is most realistic
- Increase funding for College by doing more outreach to other institutions within the University
- Develop a database/search engine on public health projects occurring within the State
- Develop a proactive approach to increase tribal nation engagement (policies, principles, MOUs, MUAs, etc.
- Become community driven
- Develop effective models for other to replicate
- Create a shared vision and outcome
- Host seminars/brown bag events on site and/or distance education in state and local health departments; propose to share costs/identify presenters
- Provide more training for Public Health professionals especially focused on data
- Share information through sponsorship of webcasts (note: local/state agencies want more training opportunities)
- Build more organizational capacity/infrastructure to improve the quality of services
- Explore possibilities for the expansion of services focusing on “electronic” options
- Create better “link” to college – identifying the “go to” person(s) who can identify who is doing what, where, and with whom
- Initiate the “ultimate connections” approach via the development of an external stakeholder directory
- Increase the sharing of “best practices” and expertise through a more formalized

	<p>structure; currently do not know how relationships have been formed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must compromise when coming to the table; what are the important issues, what can be shared, and where to draw the boundaries? No one side should have total domination – share in the identifying the proposed outcome.</li> <li>• Ensure community is involved with any approach!</li> </ul>
<p><b>3:00-4:00pm</b> <b>Room A326</b></p>	<p><b>BROADER MEETING WITH OTHER ASSOCIATE DEANS IN UNIVERSITY—<u>Luis Moll and Deborah Young</u></b></p> <p><b>Session Liaison:</b> Jill Guernsey de Zapien and Doug Taren</p> <p><b>Recorder:</b> Sonia Medina</p> <p><b>Goal:</b> The goal is to generate ideas of building a stronger cross college infrastructure to be responsive to our communities’ needs. This meeting included Luis Moll, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Deborah Young the Associate Director for Cooperative Extension.</p> <p>Luis Moll provided an overview of the many programs and opportunities for building a collaborative response to communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wildcat (math and science Charter) school,</li> <li>• the Language, Research and Culture area that includes community based initiatives, policy discussions and participatory action research.-- public dialogue forums that they are organizing in the community that are multi-agency and multi-institutional. Next one in April is focusing on obesity</li> <li>• The college of Education is very interested in the issues of racial and ethnic health disparities</li> </ul> <p>Deborah Young provided an overview of the Cooperative Extension Program under the umbrella of their Healthy Lifestyles Program that are existing collaborations with Public Health:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The most extensive collaboration is through our Special Action Group Model and our CHAPS (Community Health Advancement Partnership).</li> </ul> <p>In the discussion it became clear that Extension through its 4H work provides a great opportunity for collaboration—over 350,000 kids in the state are in 4H(over 50% minority population). The College of Education through its Parent Academy, Gear Up—Early outreach (3000 families) and their public forums are also ripe for collaboration.</p> <p><b>Action Item:</b> Jill agreed to try to pull together a broader group of COPH folks to meet with Extension and Education to discuss some additional opportunities for collaboration including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Obesity forum</li> <li>• Student placements</li> <li>• Joint doctoral projects</li> <li>• Classes incorporating community based learning</li> <li>• Best practices</li> </ul>

<b>January 19, 2007</b>	
<b>8:30-9:30am Room A326</b>	<p><b>DEBRIEFING FROM PREVIOUS DAY</b></p> <p><b>Goal:</b> The goal of this session is to provide a brief discussion of the previous days activities.</p>
<b>10:00-11:00am Room A312 (Dean's Conf. Rm.)</b>	<p><b>MEET WITH P AND T COMMITTEE</b></p> <p><b>Session Liaison:</b> Joel Meister</p> <p><b>Recorder:</b> Doug Taren</p> <p><b>Goal:</b> The goal of this session is to facilitate a discussion with the P and T committee regarding the issues that arise when evaluating faculty who are heavily involved in community work and community engaged scholarship, as well as to provide the group with any models, suggestions, etc. for this evaluation.</p> <p>Meeting with Promotion and Tenure Committee</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We should review Boyer model of Scholarship of Engagement</li> <li>2. Pervasive theme needs to be that scholarship is scholarship</li> <li>3. What is missing within P&amp;T is not that community engagement is valued, but how does one present this information within a P&amp;T packet and show its scholarship.</li> <li>4. P&amp;T committee may want to change the type of paperwork that is required for the college that will be better for evaluating participation in scholarly activities and other areas of academics.</li> <li>5. Portland State University requires that faculty members are interviewed by the P&amp;T committee to provide the faculty member an opportunity to explain details about their dossier.</li> <li>6. No matter what happens with engagement, faculty members have to show productivity.</li> <li>7. One aspect of productivity will be to show how scholarly work is disseminated. We need to weigh dissemination and the various forms of dissemination differently now than in the past given that many different avenues are now available.</li> <li>8. Determining workload with regard to community engagement is important to use as a factor with measuring productivity.</li> <li>9. We need better advising of faculty on how to put together packets. Examples of dossiers should be made available.</li> <li>10. We need to find better ways to mentor, coach and educate faculty members.</li> <li>11. P&amp;T guidelines are available for all faculty members and the P&amp;T committee. They need to be reviewed and implemented.</li> <li>12. Dr. Gelmon's presentation will have a lot of the details that relate to P&amp;T.</li> </ol> <p>COPH Faculty Present: Ron Watson, Loriann Klein, Jill Gurnsey de Zapien, Joel Meister, Wayne Peate, Elena Martinez, Marie Swanson, Zhao Chen, Lisa Staten, Douglas Taren</p>

11:15am-  
12:30pm  
(lunch  
provided)  
Room A120

**COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNITY ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP. WHAT IS IT? WHY DOES IT MATTER? WHAT IS THE CONNECTION TO HEALTH DISPARITIES?**

**Session Liaison:** Maia Ingram, Norma Gray, Nicky Teufel-Shone

**Recorder:** Brenda Manuelito

**Goal:** The goal of this session is to provide a comprehensive overview of the intersection between community engagement and the elimination of health disparities as well as the kinds of “scholarship” that can make a difference.

**NOTES**

**Introductions:**

Maia Ingram: Introduced Kellogg Initiative and purpose of today’s meeting

Sherill Gelmon: See powerpoint slides

Neil Henderson: See powerpoint slides; First he began telling a short story about a 1950s b/w television show called Twilight Zone.

**Questions and Responses:**

Denise Roe: As you know our college is struggling with this issue of P/T guidelines and recognition of CES for some time. I would like some more input on two issues: on the current notion for assessing local impact of CES and information about universities that are extending the tenure clock of those involved in CES.

Sherill Gelmon: I don’t know of any university that is extending the tenure clock and I would advise against it because it sets up a second track and makes CE scholars a set of second class citizens. You need a single way of evaluating scholarship in a college or institution. There are many different topics and methods but they must be judged in the same way. If you extend the tenure clock it could possibly lead to messy situations. This takes me to my soapbox of faculty development--if I am going to engage in CES what can I do to show the nature of the impact of my scholarship. This needs to be at the start of your discussion. I’m from the Chicago variety of doing it early and often. As I think about our work on assessment at Portland State University we submitted one-half-dozen peer reviewed data which talked a lot about our work with communities. We need to begin thinking about this at the beginning in a very different way. What are our products and dissemination plan? Locally, what is important—are we talking about a change in health status or how we build infrastructure or economic indicators or maybe we need to develop collaboration indicators. We need to change our model of what we are measuring. A number of insitutions are changing their criteria and approaches and working through new methods.

Neil Henderson: I don’t know of any models where the tenure close has been extended and I agree with Dr. Gelmon it has a potential to create a ripple effect. On the issue of local impact there is a genre of fieldwork that is designed to not only measure collaborations but whether the members within an agency or community work with you. We call them co-researchers and because of their level of engagement these people would be indicators of subtle change and could respond to questions about local impact.

Sheila Gelmon: How do we know our work makes a difference if you are starting a community-based collaboration? We decide we will have a collaboration and we start meeting regularly and we decide in six months and in one year this is what we will be

doing. Define your benchmarks to help with this as a means of assessment.

Mary Koss: I want to share two personal experiences that I connected with what he said: I have congenital hip dysplasia and I was in a wheelchair at the time I was 40 and I am so glad we have different treatments and it made me think about that when he was talking. Second, I once worked on a project where we went to seven different tribes across the country and we were looking at alcohol and violence problems and we wanted to understand the “environmental roots” rather than what has been learned from studying European origin people with alcohol problems. The boarding school experience was one of the things the community said we need to look at and when we did the data analysis we determined boarding schools have no predictive power. Then we look at it again and took an accounting of physical abuse and sexual abuse in childhood and after you look at those two things boarding schools had no impact but boarding schools did have an impact when you took those out. A whole lot of abuse is what went on in the big building.

Nicky Teufel-Shone: But I think about that concept of boarding schools which is a really good example about our perceptions going in that “dirty” the outcomes. The boarding school experience is still happening. At the Heard Museum for 2-3 years they ran an exhibit on boarding schools. The value is that you built up all these perceptions of what an awful institutions it was and all these outcomes and then at the end of the exhibit you watch a video and the kids who went to the Phoenix Indian School were taped saying “I got my skills here and it was a good experience where I got a good job. I think adults look at it in a mixed way and it raises a good question of when you go into this kind of research which deals with social justice questions. You have to be really receptive and conscious about how you are driving your research. People well tell you what you want to hear and that is a good example of how a CBPR approach, if done right, can help you get a balanced perspective on something.

Neil Henderson: The balanced perspective is essential also hearing the Other perspective.

Nicky Teufel-Shone: When we look at the issue of health disparities, the whole issue is where is the disparity and whose disparity is it? Your perspective may not address survival because you didn’t interview those who aren’t here.

Lynda Bergsma: This is for Sherill. Yesterday, you said at PSU you got P&T on this different and expanded concept of scholarship. With regard to the people who held the power to tenure you, did they already internalize this notion of scholarship or did you do something in the preparation of your dossier? Did you put some kind of context around presenting your scholarship?

Sherill Gelmon: Yes to both questions. I was the first person to come up for Full Professor four years after we initiated the process. You have to really state how your case is relevant and important and I would couch it in your institution’s mission which is “to serve the health of people in Arizona and the Southwest.” Did I get that right? Well, then, here is the work I do and how it contributes to that mission and here is how it is relevant and important to my institution and college. I am not working on some whacko area. It is incredibly important to show how you work is relevant to local institutions and has a community impact, for example, in the town of Tucson. I have been on our Dean’s advisory committee and I show how you can show your work that matters and how it is related to the institution. This goes back to faculty development.

	<p>Nicky Teufel-Shone: Do you know of institutions who are including community members on P&amp;T committees or writing community letters of recommendations?</p> <p>Sherill Gelmon: At my own institution we accept letters of support from communities. Frankly, a really big part of community involvement involves several letters. It really documents what my contributions were and has external validation on my impact other than my peer reviews. I'm sure the CCPH (Campus Community Partnerships for Health) website has documentation on this regard in their CES report.</p> <p>Nicky Teufel-Shone: Was their guidance provided so that you didn't get letters that said you were a good person?</p> <p>Sherill Gelmon: I asked for individuals for specific letters and talked with them about different parts of the impact made. We talked it through but I did not write the letter. We talked about what the important parts of the letter should be.</p> <p>Jill DeZapien closed the meeting.</p>
<p><b>1:30pm-3:00pm</b> <b>Room A 120</b></p>	<p><b>STUDENT DISCUSSION: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND HEALTH DISPARITIES. WHAT ROLE DOES PUBLIC HEALTH PLAY?</b></p> <p><b>Session Liaison:</b> Nicky Teufel-Shone</p> <p><b>Recorder:</b> Erin</p> <p><b>Goal:</b> The goal of this session is to provide an opportunity for students to have a more in depth discussion on the “how to” of elimination of health disparities as public health professionals.</p> <p><b>NOTES</b></p> <p><b>Consultant #1: Neil Henderson (NH)</b></p> <p>Alzheimer’s support groups in 1980s attracting only majority population What was the reason for this?</p> <p><b><i>Began to look into communities:</i></b> U of South Florida-Tampa Communities of African Americans, Spanish speakers University not in the census tracts in which communities were clustered, so how did we get to the communities? Background homework (demographics, etc.), community assessments, identified community gatekeepers/guides, Spanish language media (one trilingual newspaper)</p> <p>1-We contacted people who worked in aging services funded by the county &amp; grew up in the area (stepping stones)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning about the community can take a good deal of time.</li> <li>• African American woman (culture broker) who worked for aging services connected NH with her minister → appointments with other local churches (NH gave talk on Alzheimer’s) → Alzheimer’s support group meeting in African American community, but nobody showed → rescheduled, but nobody showed → What did we do wrong?</li> <li>• Met with church missionary society to understand – invisible loyalty boundaries</li> </ul>

	<p>around each church – need to move support group meetings to a neutral location</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Used branch of public library with a meeting room (culturally neutral location), and everyone (i.e., members of different churches) showed for support group meetings</li> <li>• Also found that media testimonials effective way to attract newspaper readers to meetings</li> <li>• Other community organizations to tap into: fraternities/sororities (social/service clubs), local African American-owned businesses (communicated to employee groups) – word of mouth was crucial, minority-specific newspapers</li> </ul> <p><b>Consultant #2: Sherrill Gelmon</b></p> <p>Urban university – “Let knowledge serve the city” An issue defined in downtown Portland was homeless youth (ages 11-20)</p> <p>A community project might start with very little information. Youth may have been kicked out, left, orphaned, etc.</p> <p>Preliminary public health concerns about homeless youth population: drugs/alcohol, victimization, STIs, malnutrition, hygiene, violence, mental health</p> <p>Local service providers were trying to cater to this population and better coordinate their services. We were asked to look at alcohol/drug treatment &amp; behavioral health and how to address these issues from the perspective of the youth.</p> <p>How did we reach homeless youth? Had to go to them – hung out on the streets, irregular hours – younger graduate students worked with former homeless youth to do outreach</p> <p>Again, finding a respected guide was important. Certain foods and entertainment vouchers were enticements.</p> <p>What else to think about? Preparation (lots of information/how to get information the youth might want) Trust Ways to contact: information board, word of mouth Appearance: don’t intimidate, offend, annoy, etc.</p> <p>Theoretical lens Experiential lens Always multiple perspectives, complex process</p> <p>Improving/moving things along – community work is never finished/”solved”</p>
<p><b>3:00-4:00</b> <b>Room A326</b></p>	<p><b>WRAP UP WITH COMMITTEE</b></p> <p><b>Session Liaison:</b> Jill Guernsey de Zapien and Douglas Taren</p>

**Recorder:** Maia Ingram

**Goal:** The goal of this session is to provide an opportunity for some initial impressions of the visit as well as to gather any additional information needed for the development of observations and recommendations from the consultant team.

**NOTES**

Overall observations from the consultants

Sherrill: Thanked the group for our generosity. Is impressed by what we have been able to do in a very short time. We seem connected, engaged, and committed for a young college. Other institutions are just trying to figure out how to begin. However we already have a lot of community partnerships.

Issue heard repeatedly during the sessions is faculty/AP development to support the work that they are doing. She heard a lot of pleas for additional resources to provide some training such as writing grants, managing grants, being a PI, teaching. She would suggest putting energy into that in the future. Faculty need support for the tenure promotion process (no language for the AP track)

On the community session it was great to see so many people there and she imagines there are many more. It was what she expected to hear in terms of the college being wonderful but also that there are various issues. It was a reinforcing session in that there were not complaints, but there is always more that can be done.

There were not many associate deans attending that meeting, and it is interesting to think of multidisciplinary opportunities and how it can be useful for students. A real challenge is how to collaborate across the Speedway to the other campus.

P and T discussion was addressed somewhat by her plenary, however we have already made a lot of progress in creating the guidelines and now it is necessary to follow through on implementing them and changing the culture to support them.

We are well along in this work and have a much stronger foundation than other institutions and she will take back some of what she has learned, including the rubber band analogy.

Neil:

What has stood out for Neil is an overarching issue regarding the devaluing of CBPR and community engaged scholarship and how to change that. Has talked about the case of the multidisciplinary team to work with the VA hospital and the fact that the head of the hospital mandated participation of the doctors etc. in the process of going to meetings, etc. Over the course of a year, the process was repetitive of each discipline learning another's discipline and what they could do. And it became clear that this was a superior way to apply multiple expertise for the benefit of the patients.

By analogy the question is whether it is possible to improve interdisciplinary capacity on all proposals. Not necessarily for all people to do CBPR, but rather apply all these disciplines and that automatically the value of CES will go up through increased

approval of proposals and parallel increased recognition of CES. Perhaps it is a matter of shifting the terminology to interdisciplinary. There are models that can be used and applied.

Through this the mentoring process would be improved, improved knowledge at the P&T committee. Attempt to do that OK has resulted in more capacity and increased success with grants and the ultimate increased value for communities.

There is implicit here already some incipient teamwork and valuing, at least of everyone in this room. The question is whether we have thought of ourselves in that way? It sounds like there is already tons of interaction and perhaps that needs to be formalized.

He thanked the group for the opportunity to be here and pointed out that it was an evolving discussion.

Nicky:

Shifted discussion to student engagement in CBPR, and similar to the faculty, the student schedule makes it difficult for them to be part of this research. Typically they are ready to do it and try to do it in a semester during their internship. Her question is whether there is a way to involve students prior to the internship that allows students to be engaged that also allows them to continue with their academics? Students struggle with the same issue.

Sherrill:

Leaving the community interaction until the final internship seems silly, so finding ways to involve students prior seems obvious. Philosophy at Portland U is that whenever possible we build in support for students in every grant so they start to get experience in c-b projects early in their program. The distance of the sites are obviously difficult. Attending to opportunities is important.

Nicky: asked whether anyone had experience in co-teaching with a community member.

Sherrill: has known of examples, it has not worked well at Portland which has a quarter system.

Neil: there is one at the OK Choctaw Nation where there is a hospital site 3.5 hours from campus and the students spend 4 weeks there. There is the notion of the field school which can be remarkable economical once the relationship is established and there is longevity. Housing is usually the issue. We don't know if there are public health schools that do this.

Sherrill: AHECs have done this in Portland.

We did this here with funding from HRSA in Nogales.

Chris: Informed us that last night a group of students spoke to her about the fact that they were not required to have community engagement every semester. One person said that they had it in their undergrad? These were largely peace corps volunteers.

Neil: define community. It could be this college, AHSC, or some other group. The principles and the structure may be very similar.

Kathryn: has applied to NCI for money to do a methods camp. One is for American Indians on collecting qualitative data and another is for Latino communities to do alternative types of data collection.

Marie: reminded us of formal relationship with Dine college and suggested having students to go there for a semester or two and perhaps teach and also gain expertise.

Nicky: no one contacted her when she put out an opportunity last summer and she wonders if that is because it has not been well publicized, but no one was available to do this for two months. Probably needs to be publicized early.

Doug: reminds us of independent studies. I often tell my students that if there is something they want to do they can do identify someone to work with under the auspices of an independent study. Maybe we could come up with some models

Maia suggested that APs would be a great link for those community projects.

Jenny reminded us of the --- project and she has gotten no response to the opportunity.

Joel pointed out the faculty had no time. Norma suggested going to classes and talking directly to students.

Chris was concerned about the timeline involved in involving students and the IRB process.

Jill pointed out that we need to find new ways of communicating with each other b/c we are all doing so many things and email is clearly not sufficient in communicating what is going on, and she wonders if we need to have more personal interactions.

Doug: asked Neil how the school of public health engaged students in OK. There was some joking about the use of mailboxes.

Norma said the students need to meet those of us who are working in the university.

Neil had no particular suggestions for improvement. Special seminars run by students tend to be based on the enthusiasm of the particular student. But there are not any institutional structure.

Lisa pointed out that we do a great job in getting students out there in a two year program and that for the DrPH it needs to be more solid, but what we are doing now gives students a strong appreciation of it, and it is great that they are asking for more.

Jill emphasized the usefulness of having more students involved in projects, although it may not be possible to mandate it, perhaps strongly encourage.

	<p>Doug suggested that it is part of our responsibility to go to other faculty and try to engage them in community projects, i.e. an environmental project.</p>
--	---