

ASPH/CDC Project
Examining Community Partnerships for Prevention Research
Conference Call #8
Friday, September 26, 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
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, Jen Kauper-Brown 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**

* 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: Lynda Anderson, Renee Bayer, Diane Calleson, Sandro Galea, Ella Greene-Moton, Jen Kauper-Brown, Yvonne Lewis, Sarena Seifer, Kirsten Senturia, Sharrice White, Margot Zaharek

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

Acronyms:

APHA = American Public Health Association
CBPR = Community-Based Participatory Research
CCPH = Community-Campus Partnerships for Health
CDC = Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
IRB = Institutional Review Board
IOM=Institute of Medicine
IWG = Interagency Working Group on CBPR
NCC= National Community Committee
NIH = National Institutes of Health
PRC = Prevention Research Center
URC = Urban Research Center

Goals for the call:

- Share announcements/updates
- Discuss the CDC Futures Initiative and the possibility of a submission from this group

- Discuss ideas around peer reviewers for federal grants
- Identify and discuss CBPR training and curricular resources

Topic 1: Overview and Introductions, Updates and Announcements

The make-up of the two working groups were reviewed (these have been since amended to reflect changes which occurred during the call).

Training Curriculum Work Group:

- Renee Bayer
- Diane Calleson
- Kari Hartwig
- Yvonne Lewis
- Robert McGranaghan
- Gary Tang
- Sharrice White

Policy Work Group:

- Adele Amodeo
- Lynda Anderson
- Sandro Galea
- Ella Greene-Moton
- Richard Mack, Jr.
- Sarah Sisco

The report from the first year has been given to an editor to review. An update on the report's progress will be given before the next conference call.

Action: Annika will email participants to schedule conference calls for each of the work groups. **Sarena** will distribute copies of the slides Ella will use for the project presentation at the APHA conference (Monday, Nov. 17th at 4:30 PM). **Lynda** has a request for citations on community-institutional relationships that she will e-mail to the listserv. If participants have information, they are requested to respond by October 31st.

Topic 2: CDC Futures Initiative

As a part of their organizational strategic planning process, the CDC is seeking input and feedback about how they are doing well, how they can enhance their effectiveness, what they can do to strengthen their relationships and forge new partnerships. The Initiative is further described at www.cdc.gov/futures

The group agreed that it is important to submit a letter which conveys the recommendations from the first-year report. The letter will include a brief history of the project, an acknowledgement of the usefulness and success of CDC's engagement in this project, and five of the first year's report recommendations that most clearly fit with the CDC. The following additional suggestions were made:

- Partners are encouraged to submit additional feedback as individuals or as representatives of other groups including the NCC and APHA CBPR Caucus. Sarena and Kirsten suggested that if partners do this, to consider discussing the importance of URC funding.
- A "modified Delphi" process might work well for gathering feedback from project partners and prioritizing the recommendations and points we emphasize to CDC.

Action: All Partners will review the first year report recommendations and send input to Sarena and Jen. **Sarena and Jen** will develop a "modified Delphi" process, draft the background piece and compile the input sent in by the partners for final review and sign off.

Topic 3: Peer Reviewers for Federal Grants

Sarena provided a short history of how this issue arose. In March 2002, CCPH was asked to submit a list of potential peer reviewers with CBPR experience for CDC's extramural prevention research grant program (Larry Green and Shawna Mercer). The list included individuals who have distinguished themselves on a national level as experts from an academic or community perspective on community-

based participatory research. Each is a member of the National Advisory Committee of the W.K. Kellogg Community Health Scholars Post-Doctoral Program and/or the Steering Committee of the Community-Based Public Health Caucus of the American Public Health Association and/or the board of Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Since that time, interest has also been shown by the CDC's Public Health Practice Program Office, peer review sections of the NIH, and the federal Interagency Working Group. The group discussed the role that this group can play in developing and disseminating this list and further encouraging community participation as peer reviewers for federal grants. The following suggestions were made:

- It is important to consider training for non-academic and academic peer reviewers about what it means to participate in this process.
- Training and information for funders is needed about what it means to include community members as peer reviewers.
- The group should consider the issue of compensation for community members
- Participants discussed the advantages for community members who participate as peer reviewers (e.g. education, connections for future funding, deeper understanding of what funders are looking for and how to pitch).
- For peer reviewer biosketches, it is necessary to ensure that non-academic experiences are presented in a way that resonates with those choosing peer reviewers.
- This group's efforts should be coordinated with those of Larry Green and Shawna Mercer.

Action: The Policy Work Group will continue discussion and work on this issue.

Topic 4: CBPR training and curricular resources

In preparation for the work of the Training Curriculum Work Group, the participants spent some time brainstorming and identifying existing training and curricular resources that should be considered. Participants suggested that the work group to have a two-step process. First, identify the gap in resources that currently exists that this project can fill and second, use this narrower topic area to establish the appropriate topics, audiences, and formats. The following additional suggestions were made:

- Existing resources which may be included and/or inform the training developed by the work group: CHSP video about CBPR; undoing racism trainings in Flint, work of CCPH fellows Darius Tandon and Cassandra Ritas; CBPR methodology book by Geni Eng and Barbara Israel in progress; CBPR classes (including one at UNC by Geni Eng and Diane Calleson); and work from the center in Toronto (series of workshops for community partners including CBPR 101 and funding/grant writing).
- While there are many resources related to partnerships, there is not much focused on partnership specifically around CBPR.
- Based on the earlier discussion, some participants suggested that training/orientation for peer reviewers and for funders about how to incorporate community members may be a good focused topic. The group was cautioned that because this project is to not only support existing partnerships but to also build capacity for other institutions too, that Basic 101 training should not be forgotten.
- The work group should consider input from potential training audiences in helping to define/refine training and curricular products. The group should also work in conjunction with the IWG.

Action: The Training Curriculum Work Group will continue discussion and work on this issue. **Sarena** will send a link to the listserv with information about the projects of CCPH Fellows Darius Tandon and Cassandra Ritas.

Topic 5: Reflection on process, additional follow-up and/or unanswered questions

There were no comments.

Action: Jen will send out a follow-up email reflection.

NEXT CALLS/MEETINGS:

October, 2003

Eastern/ Pacific

Dial In: 1-888-644-9029; Passcode is 25658

Must say leader's name: Ms. Sharrice White