Unit 6: Disseminating the Results of CBPR

Robert McGranaghan and Jen Kauper-Brown

Successful CBPR partnerships go beyond establishing an authentic partnership and conducting research. They disseminate results back to the community and other constituencies, and work to apply the results through changes in practice and policy. This unit provides a basic introduction to principles and practices of disseminating the results of CBPR.

Learning Objectives

• Learn strategies for disseminating the results of CBPR to multiple target audiences
• Consider examples of policies and procedures that may be applied to your partnership
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Successful CBPR partnerships go beyond establishing an authentic partnership and conducting research. Once the CBPR partnership is functioning, the project has been implemented, and the data has been successfully collected and analyzed, the partnership must disseminate the results back to the community and other constituencies, and work together with a diverse group of stakeholders to apply the results through changes in practice and/or policy. Without dissemination and application, results of a CBPR partnership have little value to community partners. Successful CBPR partnerships have the following characteristics with respect to disseminating and applying their research findings:

**Involve all partners in the dissemination of information about the partnership and project findings in forms that all partners can understand and use.** This dissemination includes multiple audiences (e.g., community members, policy makers, local health professionals) and multiple formats (e.g., radio, newspapers, presentations at professional meetings, handbooks, policy position papers, scientific journal articles), with all partners involved as co-authors and co-presenters as their interests and circumstances allow. This entails a commitment to raising and allocating resources for these purposes, including, for example, offering honoraria and child care for community members who would otherwise be unable to participate. It is also important to find a balance between time spent developing products that report results back to the community and time spent writing articles for publication in peer-reviewed journals.

While publishing the results of CBPR in peer-reviewed academic journals can bring attention and greater prestige to the work of the partnership and is essential to faculty promotion and/or tenure, it is not the primary outcome or vehicle for dissemination sought by community partners. The field of CBPR is growing and increasingly viewed as a legitimate form of scholarship within the academic community. There are literally dozens of peer-reviewed publications of high-quality CBPR, many that allow or encourage authorship or co-authorship by community partners. See Unit 6 Resources for recent theme issues of journals on CBPR and a list of journals that regularly publish CBPR.

**Establish and follow procedures for dissemination, including authorship and credit.** CBPR partnerships need to establish and follow dissemination policies and procedures that address, for example, decisions about what messages are communicated, who will be involved, in what ways, and using what medium. Multiple partners need to be involved as co-authors of publications and co-presenters at meetings. Priority dissemination outlets need to include not only academic journal articles, but also the popular press, local community newsletters, radio, and TV stations that target audiences matching (or overlapping) those impacted by the research, as well as those who participated in the research. It is important to recognize that not all partners will be equally interested or skilled in writing journal articles or presenting at conferences, and not all partners will have equal ability to participate due to time, fiscal and organizational constraints. However, this should not preclude institutional partners from inviting community partners to take part in these activities, as sharing knowledge among partners builds capacity, and strengthens the overall partnership.

It is important to communicate with partners early on in the relationship, and develop written policies concerning how data will be disseminated and how credit will be given. Although it may seem unnecessary to address these questions in the beginning phases of a project, it is important that partnerships create such a policy early on. Once the data has been analyzed, individual partners may feel that they have liberty to disseminate results (through the media, academic journals, community members, etc.) with their group’s particular spin and credits. Such actions have the potential to undermine the partnership altogether.

**Disseminate and translate research findings for policy change.** Partnerships need to disseminate and translate research findings to educate policymakers about the policy implications of their work. Some of the strategies for accomplishing this can include: developing ongoing relationships with policymakers and their staff, developing a policy agenda for the partnership, and creating and disseminating policy briefs that reflect the key issues, findings and recommendations for action. It may be necessary for all partners to participate in training activities related to the policymaking process on how to create policy briefs and how to advocate for policy and systems change.

**Disseminate partnership “lessons learned” to benefit new and emerging CBPR partnerships.** Partnerships should share the wisdom they have developed through shared experiences over time, and less obvious but no less powerful, beliefs about what hinders or encourages partnerships. As with all research, there is a publication...
bias towards reporting positive results and few rewards in the world of funding or academe for those whose reports include the proverbial “dirty laundry”. However, we must find appropriate avenues for sharing this information. At the same time, it is critical that partnerships consider the impact of the findings on the community and the community’s policy objectives.

**Example 6.1.1: Policies and Procedures for Dissemination**

**Detroit Community-Academic Urban Research Center (URC) Procedures for Dissemination-Related Activities**
*Adopted by the Detroit URC Board on August 30, 2000*

This document lists the guidelines and procedures that the Detroit URC Board has agreed upon for conducting dissemination-related activities related to the overall URC. Whenever appropriate, guidelines are also provided for how the Board will coordinate with the Steering Committees of specific URC-affiliated projects when they conduct their own dissemination activities. In addition, comprehensive, up-to-date lists are included of all URC-related presentations and poster sessions and articles published, submitted, and/or in preparation and doctoral dissertations completed.

The following standardized acknowledgement of the Detroit Community-Academic Urban Research Center (URC) will be used for all publications, presentations, and other dissemination-related activities:

“The Detroit Community-Academic Urban Research Center (URC) was established in 1995 as part of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s (CDC) ‘Urban Research Centers Initiative.’ The Detroit URC develops, implements, and evaluates interdisciplinary, collaborative, CBPR and intervention projects that aim to improve health and quality of life for residents of the southwest and eastside Detroit. The Detroit URC involves collaboration among the University of Michigan School of Public Health, Detroit Health Department, six community-based organizations in Detroit (Butzel Family Center, Community Health and Social Services Center - CHASS, Friends of Parkside, Kettering/Butzel Health Initiative, Latino Family Services, and Warren/Conner Development Coalition), Henry Ford Health System and the CDC.”

**Dissemination Activities and Procedures**

1. Develop guidelines for deciding who will attend and participate as presenters at conferences, seminars and workshops, and be a representative of the URC on advisory boards, and working groups focusing on the work of the URC Board.

**Criteria for who will attend, participate and/or be a representative:**

- To the extent feasible, there should always be at least one university and one Detroit community partner co-presenting;
- Board members who have the most expertise on the given topic will have first priority to be a co-presenter;
- Priority will also be given to those Board members who have been most involved with the particular topic to be addressed in the presentation;
- A rotating system for selecting participants will be used when more than one person meets the criteria for
attending conferences;

• Flexibility will be maintained in choosing participants for conferences based on the needs of the presentation;

• As a courtesy, and for evaluation purposes, URC-affiliated partners will inform the URC Board (and/or the URC Project Manager) when they have been invited to present at or participate in a conference, seminar, or workshop and/or represent the URC on an advisory board or working group.

Procedures and process:

• Community partners should be involved as much as possible in making presentations – particularly in areas where they’ll have more opportunity for capacity building;

• Selected co-presenters must be actively involved in the planning of the presentation;

• When time allows, the criteria for deciding who should be a co-presenter will be brought to the Board for discussion and a decision;

• When time doesn’t allow, the lead person for the presentation will first check with the proposed co-presenter(s) and if they agree to participate, will then send an email to the Board with recommendations for who should participate, along with a deadline for responding to the request;

• To the extent possible, and especially when the purpose and importance of the presentation seems to necessitate it, co-presenters will have the opportunity to practice "dry runs" of their presentations; and

• If someone who has agreed to participate is unable to do so, the decision for a replacement will be made by the lead person in conjunction with the Board.

2. Develop guidelines for deciding on authorship of academic and popular press publications about the work of the URC Board.

Criteria for authorship:

• To the extent feasible, there should always be at least one university and one Detroit community partner as co-authors;

• Board members who have the most expertise on the topic will have first priority to be a co-author;

• The number of co-authors will depend on the requirements of the publication. If the publication’s guidelines limit the number of authors, a rotating system will be used for selecting co-authors; and

• Priority will also be given to those Board members who have been most involved with the particular topic that will be addressed in the article.

Procedures and process:

• Selected co-authors must be actively involved in the development of the article;

• When time allows, the selection of who should be a co-author will be brought to the Board for discussion and a decision;

• When time doesn’t allow, the lead person for the article will first check with the proposed co-author(s) and if they agree to participate, will then send an email to the Board with recommendations for who should participate, along with a deadline for responding to the request;

• Regardless of the co-authors, all URC Board partner organizations will be acknowledged in every article; and

• If someone who has agreed to be a co-author is unable to do so, the decision for a replacement will be made by the lead author in conjunction with the Board.

3. Develop guidelines regarding communication about URC Board-related activities and findings to the media and at public meetings.

Procedures:
• Whenever a Board member is contacted by the media regarding URC Board activities, he or she will refer the contact to the URC Project Manager who will direct the media to the appropriate URC partner;

• Whenever an article or press release is given to the media regarding URC Board activities, the article or press release will be provided to the URC Project Manager who will share it with the Board; and

• Whenever making a presentation, URC-affiliated projects will acknowledge that the project is part of the URC.

4. Develop procedures regarding the relationship between URC Board and URC affiliated projects’ dissemination activities.

Procedures:

• URC-affiliated projects need to develop their own set of dissemination guidelines and procedures separate from the Board’s;

• For archival purposes, URC-affiliated projects will provide copies of their dissemination guidelines, articles, press releases and other printed materials to the URC Project Manager on at least an annual basis;

• URC Board and affiliated projects will provide copies of their dissemination guidelines, articles, press releases and other printed materials to the CDC as part of the annual report submitted by the Project Manager, and a list of those materials will be shared with the Board as part of the annual report;

• Annually, URC-affiliated projects will renew and update as needed their dissemination guidelines and ensure that they are being adhered to.

5. Develop a list of core publications regarding the work of the URC Board for dissemination through academic outlets.

Procedures:

Ideas for articles may be proposed to the Board for its review and approval along with an abstract. (See appendix 2 for an up-to-date list of Detroit URC-related publications, submitted articles, and articles in preparation.)

6. Develop a list of core publications regarding the work of the URC Board for dissemination through community newsletters, popular press, websites, and other media.

Procedures:

• Develop list of community newsletters, popular press, websites, and other media based on input from Board members and distribute the list to all URC partners;

• URC partners will inform the Project Manager whenever any specific media are approached by URC-affiliated projects to avoid duplication of effort.

List of potential community newsletters:

• Community Health Informer (KBHI newsletter)
• The Pipeline (Warren/Conner Development Coalition)
• Parkside’s New Day
• Mack Area News (U-SNAP-BAC newsletter)
• Morningside News
• Chandler Park Newsletter (Chandler Park Neighborhood Association)
• AWARE Newsletter
• Outer Drive Chandler Park
• El Central
• Latino Press

7. Develop strategies and procedures for educating organizational, local, state, and Federal level policy makers and funders on the benefits and results of CBPR in order to promote policies supportive of CBPR.

**Procedures:**

• Develop one-page summaries of relevant results from and policy implications related to URC-affiliated projects and Board activities;
• Develop list of key policy makers from organizational, local, state and offices to meet with regarding the benefits and results of CBPR;
• Develop list of key funders to meet with regarding the benefits and results of CBPR (e.g., Mott Foundation, W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Community Foundation of SE Michigan, Annie E. Casey Foundation, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation);
• Develop list of key policy-focused organizations and/or individuals with whom to meet regarding CBPR and who could assist the Detroit URC in communicating findings and policy implications related to URC-affiliated projects and Board activities;
• Prioritize list of policy-makers, funders, and policy-focused organizations and develop a plan for meeting with them;
• Attend and participate in meetings/seminars/conferences/workshops focusing on CBPR to communicate findings from and policy implications of URC-affiliated projects and Board-related activities.

8. Develop procedures for coordinating with the Dissemination and Training Core of the Michigan Prevention Research Center and other training-related activities.

**Procedures:**

• The URC Project Manager will ensure coordination and communication between the Michigan PRC and the Detroit URC, including URC-affiliated project staff and partners, regarding dissemination and training activities involving both Centers;
• The URC Project Manager will ensure coordination and communication between the Detroit URC, including URC-affiliated project staff and partners, and other training-related activities that arise (e.g., activities conducted by the Michigan Public Health Training Center).

9. Monitor the dissemination activities of the Detroit URC to ensure that the guidelines and procedures listed above are being followed.

**Procedures:**

Annually, the URC Board will review and update as needed the dissemination procedures and ensure that they are relevant and being adhered to.

---

**Example 6.1.2: Guidelines for Authorship**

The North Carolina Public Health Initiative Authorship Guidelines:

Guidelines that partnerships can use to guide the authorship process,
Unit 6 Recommended Resources

For a listing of journals that publish CBPR, visit http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/links.html#Journals


Israel BA, Eng E, Schultz AJ, Parker EA (Eds). (2005). *Methods in Community-Based Participatory Research for Health*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers. To receive a 15% discount, order through the CCPH website [link to www.ccph.info]. This book provides a comprehensive and thorough presentation of CBPR study designs, specific data collection and analysis methods, and innovative partnership structures and process methods. This book informs students, practitioners, researchers, and community members about methods and applications needed to conduct CBPR in the widest range of research areas—including social determinants of health, health disparities, health promotion, community interventions, disease management, health services, and environmental health.