

Summary of Review Comments

Most frequent concerns and comments on those nominations that did not receive the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health Award (2003 cycle)

The Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH) Award recognizes community-campus partnerships that others can aspire to - a partnership that embodies the CCPH principles, uses multiple partnership strategies, involves a full range of partners and achieves significant health outcomes that go beyond a process or a single event. Submissions went through a thorough internal and external objective review process and selection was based on the intent, eligibility, and selection criteria described in 2003 Call for Nominations. Submissions were also reviewed for adherence to guidelines, page limits, and formatting instructions.

Most frequent concerns and comments

- **Not enough detail on governance structures and/or power balance among partners** – some submissions indicated the existence of a partnership governance structure and power sharing but did not give sufficient detail to determine how decisions are made and how power is balanced. Although reviewers understand that nominees are limited in space, partnership structures and issues of power between academia and communities are key topics related to the selection criteria and the CCPH Principles of Partnership.
- **Not enough detail on the “community” side of the community-campus partnership** – some submissions either chose not to include community representatives as part of their list of partnership representatives and/or did not include information about how community representatives contributed to or participated in the partnership’s structure and activities.
- **Narrow definition of “partnership” when compared to selection criteria and other submissions** – some submissions described excellent community-based activities such as outreach programs and experiential clinical rotations, but failed to demonstrate the existence of a community-campus *partnership* that reflects the intent and criteria of the CCPH Award.
- **Lack of results or outcomes** – some submissions failed to provide enough detail on the outcomes of their partnership activities. Although partnership “processes” are clearly an important topic for this award, some submissions emphasized a list of activities while failing to describe how the partnership activities are evaluated and how they contribute to significant outcomes.
- **Description of programs instead of answering essay questions** – some submissions gave an extensive overview of their programs but failed to directly answer the essay questions. After reading several submissions and comparing submissions against each other, reviewers can find it frustrating and confusing to “dig” for the answers to the essay questions.

In summary, the final decisions were based on a variety of factors, and reasonable people could disagree regarding the choices. The majority of submissions described important, meaningful, and deserving work. We thank all nominees for taking the time to create and submit the nomination package and for allowing us to consider your partnership for the CCPH Award.