

**ASPH/CDC Project**  
**Examining Community Partnerships for Prevention Research**  
Conference Call #5  
Monday, April 21, 2003 – 10am-12:00pm Pacific  
Call Notes

Partner Organizations & Primary Representatives\*:

1. CDC Prevention Research Centers National Community Committee  
**Ella Greene-Moton and Yvonne Lewis, Co-Chairs**
2. Community-Based Public Health Caucus of the American Public Health Association  
**Adele Amodeo and Renee Bayer**
3. Community-Campus Partnerships for Health at the University of Washington School of Public Health and Community Medicine  
**Sarena Seifer, Stacy Holmes and Annika Robbins**
4. Community Health Scholars Program  
**Michael Reese and Diane Calleson**
5. Detroit Community-Academic Urban Research Center  
**Barbara Israel and Robert McGranaghan**
6. Harlem Health Promotion Center  
**Richard Mack, Jr. and Curtis Harris**
7. New York Urban Research Center  
**Sarah Sisco and Sandro Galea**
8. Seattle Partners for Healthy Communities—Urban Research Center  
**Kirsten Senturia and Alison Eisinger**
9. Yale-Griffin Prevention Research Center  
**Kari Hartwig and Margot Zaharek**

CDC Technical Advisor on this project – **Lynda Anderson**  
CDC Staff Liaison on this project – **Sharrice White**  
Consultant: **Chris Paterson**

\* The majority of the partner organizations above will have individuals participating on this project who will not necessarily be joining the calls, but who will be an integral part of the project work and dissemination & feedback. Additional partnership representatives can and will be named throughout this project.

---

**Representatives on this call:** Margot Zaharek, Sandro Galea, Sarah Sisco, Lynda Anderson, Kari Hartwig, Sharrice White, Robert McGranaghan, Barbara Israel, Adele Amodeo, Chris Paterson, Alison Eisinger, Diane Calleson, Yvonne Lewis, Michael Reese, Ella Greene-Moton, Curtis Harris

**Notes:** Please send any additions, questions, or corrections to these notes to Annika at: [annikalr@u.washington.edu](mailto:annikalr@u.washington.edu)

---

**Acronyms:**

APHA = American Public Health Association  
CCPH = Community-Campus Partnerships for Health  
CBPR= Community-Based Participatory Research  
CDC = Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
IRB = Institutional Review Board  
NCC= National Community Committee  
PRC = Prevention Research Center

**Goals for the call:**

- Share announcements/updates
- Review decisions and next steps discussed at in-person meeting
- Discuss rough draft of synthesis report
- Discuss framework

### **Topic 1: Announcements/Updates on project and other events**

Robert is working on the Urban Research Center's continued funding possibilities; Lynda will be temporarily located in another office, and will send her alternative phone number, while hers is under construction; Sharrice and Diane will be attending the CCPH conference April 26-29; Barbara is working on the Asthma Center renewal; Sarena is following up on the Seattle CBPR conference that CCPH helped to plan; Diane is teaching a CBPR course this summer; Adele has reported on an interview with Lester Breslow that she will mail to all project partners.

Updates on the project include Harlem Health Promotion Center is doing a report on work done on community advisory boards across the nation and will forward the completed report to the partners as soon as possible. Alison received feedback from an advisory board member with specific things that need additional elaboration after receiving the initial draft document from CCPH.

### **Topic 2: Next Progress Report is due April 30, 2003**

**Action:** CCPH will submit the progress report and send a copy to the group via email.

### **Topic 3: Decisions/Next Steps following the In-Person Meeting that took place in Detroit on March 17-18, 2003 -- Review and discuss rough draft synthesis report and conceptual framework**

- In-Person meeting provided opportunity to synthesize outcomes/factors/barriers across all partners' experiences/research (Guiding Questions 1-3) to inform plans for Year 2.
- Next In-Person meeting (New York, June 17-18, 2003) will provide opportunity for partners to plan capacity-building activities for Year 2.
- CCPH will draft report that references partner summaries. Group will review during May 22 conference call and finalize soon thereafter. We may need an additional conference call in June to complete this task.
- All partners will send out final draft report to constituencies in summer with review guidance for feedback/comments due in early fall.
- Partners will meet for in-person meeting in New York to make plans for Year 2. Due to timing, feedback from constituents will be mainly incorporated after in-person meeting (feedback will assist partners in making recommendations in final report that go above and beyond Year 2 activities.)

Other issues that came up during discussion:

1. Everyone needs to send in citations (if not already cited in original report) if they need to be moved into the body of the report that they correspond with.
2. Recommendations included in the report addressed multiple levels:
  - a. some focused on individual partnership level
  - b. some focused on partnership at the collective level (p. 28)
  - c. some focused on institutional (academic and public health) (p. 29)
  - d. some focused on individual community partnership level
  - e. some focused on individual partnership collective level
  - f. funding agency focused recommendations (p. 31)
3. Multiple points that were similar were summarized
4. The term "Community-institutional partnerships for prevention research" was used in the original request for applications. Many people used "CBPR" in reports. We need to decide which term to use and be consistent. Questions asked: if we use CBPR to describe everything, will people recognize their own work? Will the connection be made to people who are working in these partnerships? "Community-institutions" could mean institutions outside of academia, a broader term that CBPR is a part of. Regardless of which term is used an explanation needs to be included on terms used. The consensus of the group seemed to be to use the term "community-institutional partnership for prevention research" and define CBPR as a component.
5. Is it a partnership when the community is involved in an advisory position rather than a decision making one? The definition of "What is a partnership?" in beginning of draft report defines it as a decision making partner. Communities want an active role, not just an advisory position. Although, just because they are labeled "advisory" doesn't mean they don't take on an active role.

The terms need to be defined in report. Report needs to talk about the functionality of partnerships. Need to make it clear that the report is discussing the function, not the label.

6. Would the report benefit from tables, figures, or pictorial images that distinguishes when communities are involved as advisors vs. involved in an active role?
7. For CBPR to be successful must it lead to change in health in the community? We know that it can take decades to see the outcomes of partnerships. In addition, we need to keep in mind what's available in terms of resources to measure success. However, the ultimate outcome is to see changes in communities. We need to address these questions under any recommendations to increase the evidence base for CBPR. Also, how are we defining outcomes? Should be a discussion in the report somewhere.
8. Lynda offered to set up CDC bridge conference calls if subgroups of partners wanted to hold additional conference calls to discuss the report.

**Action:**

The next version of the draft report will include the sections missing from the rough draft report (i.e., cover letter with instructions on how to review the document, an executive summary, and brief descriptions of the project, partners, methodologies used)

**Topic 5: Conceptual Framework**

This framework sets up the premise that the stronger the partnership, the more successful the outcomes. This finding is implicit in the report. From the work at the In-Person meeting in Detroit:

- Can use framework for where Year 2 will focus work
- A connection will be included to incorporate the places that the causal relationships between the outcomes and the partnership should be evaluated.
- Group agreed that we should take out the reference to the PRC and add a description of a narrative of the framework in place of a brief paragraph to give background and description. This was agreed upon during the March meeting and can be included in the final report.
- Include a footnote that states "adapted from" and cite other frameworks used to create this one.

**Topic 6: June In-Person Meeting**

The group identified these topics for our next in-person meeting:

- Determine what our year 2 activities will be
- Determine who will be involved in year 2 activities
- Determine budget for year 2

**Topic 7: Agenda for Next Call**

The group identified these topics for our next conference call:

- Send comments before next call. Sarena and Stacy will incorporate comments, add more information to the report draft and send another version to the group prior to next call.
- Update on New York meeting & review of draft meeting agenda
- Final "draft" report will be discussed in New York and/or another conference call and then sent out for comments

**NEXT CALLS/MEETINGS:**

**May 22, 2003, 2pm-4pm Eastern/11am-1pm Pacific  
Dial in: TBA**

**June 17-18, 2003, Partner Representative Meeting 2  
New York City, New York**