

The CBR Review Process at the Ontario HIV Treatment Network



**SARENA SEIFER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
COMMUNITY-CAMPUS
PARTNERSHIPS FOR HEALTH**

CHAIR, OHTN CBR REVIEW COMMITTEE

Outline



1. OHTN CBR Capacity Building Fund Guidelines
2. OHTN CBR Review Process
3. Common Pitfalls to Avoid
4. Tips for Strengthening Proposals
5. Helpful Resources

CBR Capacity Building Fund Guidelines



The CBR Capacity Building Fund provides a mechanism for **Community-Based HIV/AIDS Organizations (CBAOs)** to request support for activities that will ultimately enhance their capacity to conduct CBR

CBR Capacity Building Fund Objectives



- Enhance capacity of CBAOs & people living with HIV/AIDS (PLWA) to participate in the CBR process
- Support CBAOs & PLWA to actively engage in developing & implementing CBR activities that will assist the CBAO to: develop new programs/services, modify/justify need for existing program/service, develop policies, assess specific population needs, generate data for research proposal
- Increase opportunities for partnership development with researchers, policy/decision makers, PLWA, other CBAOs
- Encourage effective knowledge translation and exchange (dissemination) activities

CBR Capacity Building Funding



- Requests for CBR Capacity Building Funds may be for a maximum of \$ 25,000
- Principal applicants may receive funding for only 1 project per fiscal year, except in exceptional circumstances where no other funding opportunities are available and where the proposed research is of an urgent nature

CBR Review Committee Functions



- To maintain mission/integrity of the OHTN in its activities
- Review & score applications
- Make recommendations on policies & procedures
- Ensure program is responsive to current/emerging trends
- Review final reports from funded research teams
- Refrain from reviewing applications that pose a conflict
- Act as ambassadors

CBR Review Committee Members



- **Robert Lorway**, Medical anthropologist, Centre for Global Public Health, Department of Community Health Sciences, University of Manitoba.
- **Kim McKay-McNabb**, Coordinator, National First Nations Environmental Contaminants Program
- **Treena Orchard**, Medical anthropologist, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Western Ontario
- **Angel Parks**, Coordinator, Positive Youth Outreach program of the AIDS Committee of Toronto
- **Jake Pyne**, Researcher, Trans PULSE project investigating the impact of discrimination on HIV vulnerability for trans people in ON & social work student
- **Jonathan Salsberg**, Associate director and research manager, Participatory Research at McGill University
- **Adinne Schwartz**, Sexual health promoter, Toronto Public Health
- **Sarena Seifer**, Executive director, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health
- **Douglass St. Christian**, Cultural anthropologist, University of Western Ontario

Highlights of CBR Review Process



- Each application reviewed on own merits, not in comparison to others
- Each application reviewed by 4 reviewers; at least 2 community-based
- Each reviewer prepares written review & overall score of 0-5 (3.5 and above is in the fundable range; 4.5 and above is outstanding)
- Assigned reviewers present & discuss their reviews with other reviewers and everyone provides an overall score
- Extensive notes taken during review discussion, combined with excerpts of the written reviews as feedback to all applicants
- Scores & summary of reviewer comments go to OHTN board for action

CBR Review Criteria



- Adherence to CBR principles
- Strengths & weaknesses of the project objectives, partnerships, capacity building potential, activities, and impact
- Relevance of project objectives to objectives of CBR Capacity Building Fund, HIV community & OHTN Strategic Plan
- Feasibility of activities as described: Achievable in the stated time frame? Does team possess necessary skills to fulfil them?
- Ethics – Are potential ethical risks (e.g. physical, psychological, social, legal) for human subjects (e.g. study participants, affected communities) addressed & mechanisms in place to minimize these? Any potential ethical issues that require further attention?

Common Pitfalls to Avoid: General



- Instructions not followed
- Inconsistencies between proposal narrative and budget
- Acronyms used and not explained; too much jargon
- Numbers in budget don't add up
- Multiple spelling mistakes
- Tiny type used, hardly any white space
- Data sources cited are old
- Argument for project's significance and relevance in the particular community or setting are based on national data
- Method/approach too vague to determine if appropriate or feasible
- Letters of support repeat language, are inconsistent with proposal
- Appendices repeat info in proposal or circumvent page limits

Common Pitfalls to Avoid: CBR



- Community described only by needs, not strengths and assets
- No sound rationale provided for partnership and participants
- Little/no evidence of meaningful participation of PLWA
- Attention paid to research methods but not methods of building/sustaining community partnerships and community participation
- No attention paid to barriers to community participation (e.g., childcare, transportation, interpretation services) – or they are mentioned in narrative but not adequately addressed in budget
- Includes community board, but no detail about board recruitment, role, composition, staff support, etc.
- No evidence of community capacity building (e.g., creating jobs, developing leaders, sustaining programs)
- Project design so specific & detailed, no room for participatory process

Common Pitfalls to Avoid: CBR



- Assumption that ethics review is not required or needed
- Not easy to discern how funding is being divided among partners (e.g., show what % is going to CBAO, institutions, consultants)

Ways to Strengthen CBR Proposals



- Use clear, concise, simple language
- Be creative (e.g., use stories, quotes, photos to help make your case)
- Ask trusted colleagues not involved in the proposal to review drafts and be brutally honest
- Have a detail-oriented reader proof proposal narrative and budget
- Debrief on any and all reviewer comments
- Volunteer to be a proposal reviewer to be a better proposal writer

Helpful Resources



Guidelines for Participatory Research

<http://www.lwgreen.net/guidelines.html>

Developing and Sustaining Community-Based Participatory Research Partnerships: A Skill-Building Curriculum

<http://www.cbprcurriculum.info>

Sample Terms of Reference Contract

http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/MOU6.pdf

CCPH's CBPR Resources Page – includes link to CBPR Listserv

<http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/commbas.html>

Wellesley Institute's CBR Workshop Materials

http://www.wellesleyinstitute.com/new_notable/cbr-workshop-materials-now-available