

**ASPH/CDC Project**  
**Training Curriculum Work Group**  
Thursday, April 8, 2004 – 3:00-4:30pm Eastern  
Call Notes

**Representatives on this call:** Renee Bayer, Kari Hartwig, Jen Kauper-Brown, Yvonne Lewis, Robert McGranaghan, Gary Tang, Robb Travers

**Not present:** Diane Calleson, Sharrice White

**Notes:** Please send any additions, questions, or corrections to these notes to Jen at:  
jenbr@u.washington.edu

---

**Goals for the call:**

- Review and discuss curriculum draft
- Discuss upcoming presentations and pilot-testing opportunities
- Discuss timeline of assignments and plans for future calls

**Updates and Announcements**

- Because of other commitments, Diane Calleson will be reducing her role in the training curriculum work group. She will assist in the review of curriculum drafts but will not be writing any additional content.

**Topic 1:** Review and discuss curriculum draft

The work group members gave feedback and response to the curriculum as a whole. Comments included:

- Good work overall; the content is rich; very comprehensive; great start
- There is currently a lot of redundancy; there is a need for more strategic organizing to help with flow. Work needs to be done to ensure that the curriculum flows as one piece but can also be split into pieces that can stand alone.
- More work needs to be done on the activity pieces
- More content is needed covering the social justice rationale of CBPR
- More content is needed about the policy outcomes that CBPR can lead to. Several available resources were mentioned. (**Note:** Subsequent to the call, resources on this topic were sent to the work group listserv. These included: slides from a workshop being conducted by Robb and his colleagues, the product from CCPH fellow Cassandra Ritas, slides from a lecture by Dennis Raphael at the Wellesley Center)
- How can the curriculum be made more instrumental? For example, by adding more charts and ensuring that information is in an easy to absorb format before getting into details. Way too much text, we should be trying to make things more reader friendly.
- Examples representing additional partnerships are needed. There is currently heavy representation from MI and Toronto. Gary is interested in helping to identify examples and sample pieces (e.g. budgets which have a % of \$ going to support communities and advisory board structure which has a % of members who are community members). It was suggested that it would be helpful to present a side by side comparison between budgets for a standard research project vs. a CBPR project. A suggestion was made to put a call for examples/case studies out to the larger ASPH-CDC group requesting specific items/topics we are seeking.
- The voice is not consistent throughout the curriculum. Some pieces are currently directed towards only the academic partner. For example, it was suggested that a piece be added on “when community groups should partner with a researcher.” In preparing the next draft, authors should consider and ensure that the voice and content of the text speak to both community and institutional partners.
- It was noted that some pieces are written about a partnership like a URC while others are written at the level of an individual project.

Some specific parts of the curriculum were also discussed. Discussion included:

- In Unit 1 Section 4, CBPR is referred to as “less rigorous.” It is important not to convey that CBPR as a research approach is not less rigorous.

- There was an interesting discussion about the term cultural competency and how this concept is addressed.
- It was suggested that content be added to the curriculum exploring the “values of CBPR,” how partnerships can determine if partnership values fit with the CBPR approach, and if CBPR is an appropriate approach for the research question being asked.
- It was suggested that organizations with expertise and ability to provide technical assistance on curriculum topics be included in the resources sections.
- In Unit 2 Section 3, there is a discussion about addressing expectations of all partners but the roles listed only include PI, Co-investigator, and staff. It was noted that it is important to also consider and address the expectations of all partners not just salaried staff.

Several suggestions were made that authors should consider when preparing the next draft. These included:

- Work to make the content more appropriate for a curriculum (i.e. less text, more activities/examples)
- Ensure that the voice and content of the text speak to both community and institutional partners.
- Activities should be included throughout the units, not just at the end.

**Action: All Work group members will submit comments to the curriculum authors by April 21<sup>st</sup>. All authors will send the next draft of their pieces to Jen by May 7<sup>th</sup>.** Authors should flesh out any pieces still needing to be composed, incorporate comments from other work group members, and edit units so they do not read like a book. **Robb** and **Renee** will work together on the policy piece. **Kari** will work on the pieces in Unit 1 originally assigned to Diane. **Authors of Units 2 and 3** will work together to address overlap issues.

## **Topic 2: Discuss upcoming presentations and pilot-testing opportunities**

Updates were given on several upcoming presentations and opportunities.

- Robert and Yvonne will be leading an early riser session entitled "A Skill-Building Workshop on Community-Based Participatory Research Partnerships" at the SOPHE 2004 Mid-Year Conference, May 5-7 in Orlando, Florida
- Kari and Jen submitted an abstract on the curriculum to the Institute for Community Research's conference being held June 10-13, 2004 in Hartford, CT. The submission requested the opportunity to present multiple sessions so more pieces of the curriculum could be shared.
- Robert and Jen gave a brief summary on the call held with staff at the Border Health Promotion center. The Border Center is seeking representatives from each of the URCs to serve as faculty at the training.
- There is a possibility to pilot test all or part of the curriculum with Robb's partners in Toronto.
- It was noted that a request could be posted to the PRC listserv seeking individual PRCs which may be interested in being a pilot test site for the curriculum.
- The work group will spend some time on the next call discussing criteria for pilot testing sites.

## **Topic 3: Next Steps**

The next work group call will be scheduled for mid-late May.

Next full group call: A call has not been scheduled.