

ASPH/CDC Project
Examining Community Partnerships for Prevention Research
Conference Call #2
Monday, December 2, 2002 – 10am-12:00pm pacific time
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
Al Richmond, Toby Citrin, 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
Lee Bone and Diane Calleson
5. Detroit Community-Academic Urban Research Center
Barbara Israel and Robert McGranaghan
6. Harlem Health Promotion Center
Gabriel Stover and others TBD
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**

* 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: **Ella Greene-Moton, Yvonne Lewis, Renee Bayer, Sarena Seifer, Stacy Holmes, Diane Calleson, Barbara Israel, Robert McGranaghan, Gabriel Stover, Sarah Sisco, Alison Eisinger, Kari Hartwig, Lynda Anderson, Sharrice White.**

Notes: Please send any additions, questions, or corrections to these notes to Stacy at:
SLHOLMES@u.washington.edu

Acronyms:

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

Goals for the call:

- Discuss issues held over from last call: dissemination, authorship, budgets, and evaluation
- Confirm IRB status on the part of each partner
- Review and finalize the summary report components required from each partner
- Answer any burning questions...

Topic 1: Introductory letter and dissemination of project description to key stakeholders

- Call participants reviewed a draft letter from Sarena and Stacy which introduces this project to the PRC directors. Although the directors have heard about this project via a presentation by Ella and Yvonne at the APHA meeting, a formal introductory letter will provide additional information.
- The group agreed that the letter should come from Sarena but list all partners with contact names in the body of the letter.
- The letter will be edited to clarify that the PRC directors will be receiving a copy of the draft strategic plan for their review and comment (the draft did not make that explicit).
- The final text of the letter will be customized for other stakeholders by each partner. For example, the Community Health Scholars folks could use the letter to let their funder and colleagues know about this project.
- The group agreed that a similar project introduction posted on a website would be useful. Sarena offered to have the information posted on the CCPH website with links to each partner organization.

ACTION

CCPH will send out the letter to the PRC directors and will provide an electronic version of the letter to the group to be sent to other stakeholders. CCPH will also send the letter to Carolyn Beeker of the Urban Research Centers program office at the CDC.

All group members will use the core text of the introductory letter and send out letters as appropriate to introduce this project.

CCPH will post the information about this project on the CCPH website with links to partner organizations

Topic 2: IRB Update

- All partners have investigated their IRB requirements as they relate to this project. No additional IRB requirements have been presented so far.
- Ella, Yvonne, and Lynda have come up with a way that NCC can at least answer the first guiding question without collecting new data, and thus avoiding a long IRB process. The NCC will be able to utilize program evaluation information from the CDC's Project DEFINE (a participatory evaluation and mapping process).

ACTION

Sarena is in the process of applying for exemption through the University of Washington's IRB.

Lynda/Sharrice will work with NCC to make sure that all IRB related issues are resolved.

Topic 3: Review of Report Outline

- The group reviewed the updated report outline and discussed which sections should be changed in order to accommodate each partner's unique circumstances (updated draft being sent out with these notes).
- One major question was whether or not we want one report per partner or one report per each past project being used to answer the guiding questions. A concern is that an 8-page synthesis of findings across five different projects might not capture the unique findings from some individual projects. The solution that the group seemed to agree on was to allow each of us to go beyond the 8-page maximum but still require as much synthesis across multiple projects as possible. In addition, each of us will be sensitive to the number of pages that the whole group will have to read.
- Another issue is the description of each project that each partner will be drawing from. Section 1 allows space for each partner organization to introduce themselves (URC, NCC, CCPH, etc) while Section 2 describes the projects that will help answer the guiding questions. The suggestion was made that each project description also include the goals and objectives of the past project.
- **DEADLINE:** the deadline for each partner's summary will be March 3rd – two weeks before the in-person meeting.

ACTION

Stacy will revise the report outline based on this conversation and send out to the group with these notes.

Topic 4: Corporate/Group Authorship

- Group continued to discuss the concept of “corporate authorship” and “working group” authorship which identifies a group’s title/corporation name as the official author and then offers the individual members names as part of the report text/footnotes.
- The following information was provided to the group as part of the emailed agenda for this call:

For our discussion of authorship, these definitions used by Johns Hopkins University's Center for Clinical Trials may be helpful - we began discussing corporate authorship on the last conference call. I [Sarena] have an email into Donna Higgins, who was suggested as someone to contact who is familiar with corporate authorship. (Citation: <http://iws1.jhsph.edu/Research/Centers/CCT/gppps/Pub.pdf>) "modified corporate author citation n - 1. A form of corporate author citation in which the names of the individuals responsible for writing the work on behalf of the corporate entity appear in a footnote to the title page or in the credits or acknowledgments section of the work. 2. A citation in a bibliography or reference list in which individual names appear in relation to a corporate work." "modified corporate authorship n - A form of authorship in which the masthead attribution is to a corporate entity (eg, the XYZ Research Group), but where authors are listed elsewhere in the work (in the credits or acknowledgments section or in a footnote to the title page)."

- Other examples of corporate/group authorship were discussed, including an article referenced in the American Journal of Public Health (AJPH), Feb 1995, p.183, Appendix B p.192. In this example, the author of the article is listed as a “research group” and a full page of “members” is listed in the appendix. Our group seemed to think this model would work well for our project since it would allow us to include the numerous individuals working on this project (including those individuals whose past findings we’re relying on) but who might not be represented on the calls.
- Our group is considering an “author name” of: The Community Partnerships for Prevention Research Group.

ACTION

Stacy/Sarena will draft up an authorship policy for the whole group to review.

All group members will start keeping track of all names and affiliations that would be included in the group members’ list as part of any appendix to our report, future articles, presentations, etc.

Topic 5: In-Person Meeting & Facilitator

- The first in-person will take place in Detroit, MI on March 17-18th. The hope is to have a mid- to late-morning start time on Monday, March 17th, have one group dinner that evening, and end early enough for people to fly home on Tuesday, March 18th. Partner reps coming from the west coast might need to arrive early and stay in Detroit on Sunday night, but most folks will only need a one-night stay.
- The group discussed ideas for having an outside facilitator so that all partners can participate equally. Our proposal budgeted \$2000 for a facilitator for each in-person meeting. Some group members encouraged CCPH/Sarena to find someone who she knows or would be willing to work closely with since CCPH will be the lead partner in working with any outside facilitator—with the caveat that the person have facilitation experience and community-based participatory research knowledge.
- The group made some suggestions of people: Mark Chesler, Sociologist at University of Michigan who is known to the Michigan folks; Monte Roulier, CCPH board member (unless conflict of interest prohibits); Mark Smiley, consultant used by CCPH in the past. Other suggestions are welcome.
- The group suggested that a draft of a job description for the facilitator also include background on this project, objectives for the in-person meeting and minimum qualifications/background for the facilitator.

ACTION

All group members will follow-up with any potential facilitators to find out if they are interested; available on the meeting dates; available for the budgeted amount; and qualified. Potential facilitator names and contact information can be passed on to **Sarena** (sarena@u.washington.edu) or **Stacy** (SLHOLMES@u.washington.edu).

Stacy/Sarena will draft a job description for the facilitator to be discussed on the next call.

Topic 6: Budget—Honoraria

- All partners will be receiving an equal amount of funding for their time on the project (not including travel expenses). The honoraria will be broken into two payments through an invoicing process. The first payment will happen after the partner summaries have been turned in (around the time of the 1st

in-person meeting) and the second/final payment for the year will happen around the time of the 2nd in-person meeting.

- The group discussed the pros/cons of having the honoraria be paid to an individual representative or to the organization. The decision is up to the partner organization, but CCPH will work with the University of Washington system to be able to pay the partnering organizations.

ACTION

Annika will work on establishing the invoicing process, obtaining required information from each partner, and will provide information to partners on the invoicing process via email or on the next call.

Topic 7: Questions regarding outcomes

- One question that came up from Barbara's group is where outcomes are located within our project and final report. Although our project is process focused (facilitators and barriers to successful research partnerships), we do not want to lose sight of the outcomes of community partnerships for prevention research. The suggestion was made that our report be framed broadly enough to recognize outcomes (e.g., how facilitating factors can lead to certain outcomes or how outcomes are integral to the definition of a successful partnership...).
- One suggestion was to make such a question part of the list of guiding questions. However, the group is leaning towards keeping our attention to this issue more informal for now so as not to change our original focus.

ACTION

All group members should consider results and outcomes as they reviewing past projects. Everyone should consider coming to the in-person meeting with 2-3 examples of outcomes/results of their community partnerships for prevention research that could be incorporated into the report.

Topic 8: Establishing a context and conceptual framework

- The group discussed the need to put our final report and recommendations into a conceptual framework. Although we are not doing a systematic literature review, we might be able to say "Here's this conceptual framework and here's the piece of it that our report speaks to."
- Some examples were mentioned that we should explore further as a group, including a framework presented in an upcoming publication by Roz Lasker and a workbook by Shoshanna Sofaer. More discussion and other framework examples can be discussed on future calls and at the in-person meeting.

ACTION

All group members might think about examples of conceptual frameworks for the group to discuss. **Sarena/Stacy** will collect examples mentioned on the call and elsewhere, and make sure this stays on the agenda as the project progresses

Topic 9: Reflection and evaluation of our group process

- The group discussed some of the different ways that we can reflect on and assess our group's process and progress on this project -- as referred to in the original proposal. Some people prefer to write their responses via email while some folks prefer to use designated time during the call and/or during the in-person meetings to reflect and comment on our progress.
- The group's reflections can be helpful to the group as well as becoming part of any progress reports in the future.

ACTION

Stacy will send out a post-call email as one way to collect feedback, commentary, and reflections. **Stacy/Sarena** will also build time into each agenda for this purpose and collect the information in the notes.

NEXT CALL: Tuesday, January 28, 2003 at 1-3pm Eastern/10-12pm Pacific