

**FIPSE Collaborative Sustainable Funding Workgroup
Teleconference Call #2: November 15, 2005 (9 – 10:30 AM PST)
Call Minutes**

Workgroup Members/Staff present: Lynn Lotas (Case Western), Suzanne Cashman (UMass), Sarena Seifer (CCPH), Kristine Wong (CCPH), Karen Yoder (IUPUI)

Workgroup Members/Staff not present: Steve Gabbe (Vanderbilt), Elizabeth King (Cincinnati), Janelle Krueger (Auburn), Sharon Shields (Vanderbilt), Tina Whalen (Cincinnati)

Recap of Call #1 (Lynn):

(1) The group decided to develop a repository of case studies (successfully funded grants, lessons learned). It was emphasized that the repository should not include just successful efforts; efforts that were *not* so successful are just as valuable. Lynn has sent out a 1-page document listing the questions that should be answered for each case in the repository. Liz King's HRSA-funded proposal was one case that was mentioned for inclusion in the repository.

(2) There was interest in developing a list of people (at a senior level) who would be willing to serve as mentors for others who are beginning their careers, and are interested in learning how to write competitive grants.

(3) There was interest in developing a list of funders that have interest in CES/CBPR projects, along with a list of any foundation staff with whom Collaborative members have developed relationships.

Call #2

Topic 1: Case Studies Repository

The group should continue to identify case studies that can be included in the repository. All agreed that "small" grants (less than \$30K) should be distinguished from "large" grants (i.e., >\$30K, or a federally funded research grant from NIH, HRSA, or CDC), as the approach towards writing these grants – along with the required preparation – is completely different.

It was suggested that the Case Studies should be specific in nature in that each case should list the sequence of steps that were taken to prepare the proposal. Another aspect that should be included is to specifically list the sequence of steps that should be taken to build one's program so that one can receive larger grants.

Topic 2: February 2006 Collaborative Meeting panel

The group felt that one way to build this repository would be through the February 2006 Collaborative meeting, where individuals willing to present their case study/experience on a panel about sustainable funding would give all the information needed to create a profile in the repository. This would be possible because all presentations will be audiotaped and transcribed. Another idea on how to solicit case studies was to assign each team to present a case study at the Feb. meeting.

Specific questions that panel members could address could be:

- (1) How to get started with funding a new project
- (2) Different types of funding
- (3) How to build a sustainable, institutionalized program over a period of years
- (4) Timing issues: how long it takes to develop a competitive proposal, and how to work with RFP deadlines that oftentimes do not give enough lead time to develop competitive proposals

Other areas to explore on the panel:

(1) Alternative funding pathways: for example, as a subcontractor through a community group instead of the university – in the case that the university will only allow one applicant out of the entire university to apply for a particular grant, rather than one per school or department.

(2) IRB issues: How to get approval from IRB

(3) A representative from a funding agency or foundation who can speak knowledgeably about the current funding landscape (most probably someone from the Nashville area, since our first priority is to put resources for travel and conference space towards Collaborative members)

(4) Evaluation component: How to build this into your proposal

A program at the UNC-Chapel Hill School of Dentistry was cited as a good example, and a possible panelist.

Topic 3: Mentoring

The group had mixed sentiment about whether the mentoring idea should be formalized or not. Some felt that it would be a good idea to ask senior-level individuals to mentor junior-level faculty by helping to review proposals, make comments on drafts, etc. Another idea was a “barter/swap” program, where people could create bios that listed their expertise, and people would help each other in exchange for another person’s help.

Others felt that a more formalized approach would not work because people would see it as an additional commitment, and thus shy away from signing up as a mentor. In addition, it would be more specific for someone just to send out an email to the Collaborative listserve with their specific area of need, and anyone with that kind of expertise could volunteer to help. Another person suggested that this kind of system already existed through CCPH's Consultant Network.

It was concluded that the Collaborative members would be asked via email which, if any, system would work better for them – or at least “plant the seeds” of this question in their heads as preparation for the Feb. meeting, where this could be discussed in greater depth.

Action: Lynn will post about this mentor idea on the listserve. CCPH volunteered to do a quick “digest” of all workgroup activities after each call cycle so that everyone is up to date on what each workgroup is working on; this will serve not only as a means of greater communication, but may also enable each group to piggyback on each other's efforts.

Topic 4: Communication with Funders

It was suggested that there could be a teleconference with a funder that could speak to their funding priorities, and demystify the application and review process.

Potential individuals:

- Michael Edwards at Ford Foundation was mentioned as someone who may be someone who could do this.
- Liz King's contact at HRSA was another person who would be appropriate, but people need to check in with her about it.
- Terri Wright at Kellogg was also cited as someone who could speak about how Kellogg evaluates the quality of partnerships as described in grant proposals; she will be speaking at a panel during the CCPH conference.
- Robert Wood Johnson is another foundation we want to talk with.
- David Maurasse (consultant to Casey Foundation on universities as community “anchors”)
- Carnegie Foundation

Action item: Between now and the next workgroup call, we will try to get one teleconference call scheduled with funders (to take place in January 2006). The group will talk over the next few weeks to coordinate who we're going to/have spoken with about this.

Topic 5: Multisite Project Possibilities

Are Collaborative members interested in pursuing multisite project funding?

As an example of a multisite project, Lynn described her work with Case Western students, who conduct service-learning and CBPR at two public schools – one predominantly African American and the other Latino.

CCPH is interested in developing another multisite collaborative, and was wondering if funders would be interested in this. One example brought up by Sarena was a program that could fund Collaborative members to take “sabbaticals” so that the recipient can pursue CBPR work, or write up their CBPR projects for publication. Recipients could be dubbed “fellows”, and grouped into a CBPR Fellows Program.

Closing Comments/Recap of this call:

It was emphasized that during these planning processes, we continue to think about what we want to accomplish in this workgroup, so that when we convene in February, we will have a productive meeting and make the best use of our time when we meet in person.

Call #2 Recap (Lynn):

During this call, we identified 3 strategies we want to pursue:

- (1) Build a case studies repository so that those beginning in the field can look to these as examples.
- (2) Build a culture of mentorship in the Collaborative. Have a discussion as to whether members prefer to have a more formalized system, or keep it at an informal level (email postings, etc.).
- (3) Start gathering information, as well as building relationships with, key funders who support CES.

We identified two ideas we wanted to explore:

- (1) Pursuing funding for a CBPR “sabbatical” (or CBPR Fellows program)
- (2) Pursuing a multisite project together

It was pointed out that the CBPR “sabbatical” project would also be a multisite project, as funding would be available for anyone in the Collaborative to pursue.

Action items:

- (1) Lynn will revise Essential Elements of Case Studies document. She'll also send this on to Liz so that Liz can complete the form based on her HRSA grant. (To date, Lynn has already done this).
- (2) Lynn will post to the listserve asking about people's preferences for a mentorship system
- (3) Sarena will post to the full Collaborative group and all working group listserves asking whether anyone would be interested in presenting on the Case Studies panel for the Feb. meeting.
- (4) Between now and the next workgroup call, we will try to get one teleconference call scheduled with funders (to take place in January 2006). The group will talk over the next few weeks to coordinate who we're going to/have spoken with about this.