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Outline of Today’s Session

1. Overview of the call for papers & products
2. PCPH submission & review process
3. CES4H submission & review process
4. Questions, discussion & consultation
Why we’re doing this

Our goal is to highlight the perspectives & voices of community partners of Clinical and Translational Science Awardees (CTSA) & other academic research institutions in the full spectrum of clinical and translational research conducted with the intention of improving the health of communities….

...by publishing peer-reviewed papers & products!
Our priorities

- Understanding accomplishments, best practices and challenges that *community partners* have experienced with CTSAs and other research institutions.

- *Community perspectives* in clinical & translational research, including participatory approaches with a wide range of communities (e.g., clinicians, priority populations)

- *Community authored and co-authored* papers & products that clearly reflect community perspectives on community-engaged research and evaluation.

- Submissions that reflect *collaborations* across multiple communities, multiple CTSAs & community-engaged practice-based research networks.
High priority topics

- Developing sustainable, collaborative community-academic partnerships and measures of success in different types of community-engaged research and evaluation.
- Developing applied resources (e.g., toolkits, manuals, curricula) for community-engaged evaluation and research that recognizes community context and heterogeneity.
- Defining domains and content of “best practices” for community-academic partnerships that conduct research and evaluation and that inform and advocate for policy.
- Identifying shared language and values between communities & academy that contribute to implementation and dissemination of research and evaluation.
High priority topics

- Describing how to promote community perspectives and document and address community benefits, needs, risks, and other ethical issues associated with community-engaged research and evaluation.
- Exploring the context of community engagement within the research and/or evaluation process, including the roles played by social, behavioral, community, and organizational dynamics.
Key dates & deadlines

- **April 18-21, 2012**: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health 15th anniversary conference in Houston, TX
  
  
  - Sat Apr 21 8:30-10: PCHP workshop with Darius Tandon
  - Sat Apr 21 10:30-12: CES4Health workshop with Cathy Jordan

- **August 8, 2012**: Deadline for submissions in response to this themed call for papers & products

- **October 2013**: Anticipated publication of PCHP issue; CES4H products will be published as they are accepted, with promotional push of the set in October, 2013
Progress in Community Health Partnerships (PCHP)

- Only peer reviewed journal solely devoted to publishing community-based participatory research (CBPR)
- MEDLINE indexed
- Published quarterly by Johns Hopkins University Press
PCHP: Guidelines for Submission

- All submissions conducted through Manuscript Central

http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/pchp

- All submissions will go through the normal peer-review process used by PCHP
Types of PCHP Articles

1. **Original Research**—findings from a CBPR study; interested in array of research designs and methods

2. **Work in progress/Lessons Learned**—lessons learned from the process of developing, implementing, evaluating, and disseminating participatory research or evaluation projects

3. **Theory and Methods**—theoretical, methodological, and/or analytic techniques and approaches useful in the conduct of research involving community health partnerships

4. **Policy and Practice**—translation of research into policy and practice at multiple levels
5. **Education and Training**—descriptions and/or evaluations of training and education involving community health partnerships, including workshops, classes, seminars, webcasts, or other learning methods.

6. **Practical Tools**—tools and resources that facilitate the work of community health partnerships.

7. **Community Perspective**—descriptions of the perspectives' of community stakeholders involved in CBPR project.

8. **Systematic Reviews**—systematic review of aspects of CBPR using evidence-based methods.
How to Submit Manuscripts to PCHP

- Online submission via Manuscript Central
- Title, abstract, keywords
- Main text of manuscript; word count varies by section
- Indicate roles of each author
- Community/Policy brief for all Original Research articles
- Suggest at least two possible external reviewers
- Indicate submitting to special issue on perspectives/voices of community partners
PCHP Review Process

1. Initial screening by Managing Editor to determine appropriateness for PCHP
2. Manuscript assigned to guest editor
3. Guest Editor and Managing Editor seek academic and community reviewers
PCHP Review Process

- All articles peer-reviewed by academic and community reviewers

- Editorial Team comprised of academic and community partners; weekly meetings to discuss manuscripts

- Special issue guest editors will join Editorial Team to discuss manuscripts
PCHP Review Process

- Peer reviewers asked to return review within 21 days
- Guest Editor presents manuscript to Editorial Board; reviewer comments discussed as well as Guest Editor comments
- Recommendation is made: accept, minor revision, major revision, or reject
- Emphasis on detailed decision letters to assist authors in resubmission
- Revised manuscripts due within 30 days; revised manuscripts handled by Guest Editor
Five point scales to assess:
- Originality
- Relevance to community health partnerships
- Quality of methods, including design and analysis
- Quality of organization and writing style
- Appropriateness of conclusions
- Potential impact or usefulness

Narrative section to assess:
- Strengths and weaknesses of manuscript
- Involvement of partners in work
- What can be done to improve quality and organization of writing
Tips for Navigating Peer Review Process

- Priority given to articles that:
  - Have high public health significance
  - Describe work done with understudied populations
  - Provide NEW insights into the process of conducting CBPR

- Degree of community involvement influences the priority given to manuscripts
  - This will be particularly true with special issue submissions

- Submissions from community organizations are strongly encouraged, but need to comment on partnership with academic researchers
Tips for Navigating Peer Review Process

- Community Perspective articles can take various shapes and forms
  - Not bound to “traditional” academic format for presenting research findings
  - Emphasis on finding creative and innovative ways to highlight perspectives of community partners
Challenges of Disseminating Innovative CES Products

Innovative products of CES – documentaries, manuals, curricula, websites, toolkits, policy briefs, training videos, assessment instruments (not a manuscript)

- Lack of dissemination mechanisms to broaden community impact
- Lack of peer reviewed publication outlets
- Format of peer reviewed journals not conducive to innovative CES products
- Traditional peer review process may not find value in CES products
- Traditions of the reward structure for faculty promotion and tenure – academic partners less likely to invest time in innovative products
Launched in 2009 as a component of Community-Campus Partnerships for Health’s Faculty for the Engaged Campus Initiative, supported in part by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education of the US Department of Education
Purpose of CES4Health

- Mechanism for peer review & online publication of products of community-engaged scholarship in forms other than journal manuscripts

- Intended to both increase impact of these products in communities & increase likelihood they will count in faculty promotion & tenure review
Minimum Submission Criteria

- **The CE in CES4Health - Community engaged**

- **The S is CES4Health - The project that resulted in the product was approached in a scholarly way – builds upon or is grounded in previous practice or evidence**

- **The Health in CES4Health – Defined very broadly**
Types of Products

• The product itself can be in any format that can be disseminated – document/pdf, slides, website, video. We haven’t had an example of this, but it could also be a desktop or pda application. The product can be uploaded or it can reside on a website and the reviewers, and users if it is published, can be directed to the website. In some cases the product can be in hard copy form though it is certainly more convenient for editors/reviewers and users to access it online.

• Types of product – manual, curriculum, syllabus, guide, report, presentation, assessment instrument or tool, brief, toolkit (document or web-based), website, documentary, training video, case study, exercise, simulation, photovoice etc. 1 product. Multiple pieces need to go to web

• Free or near free – if user needs to contact author for product, author can recoup shipping and handling and very modest development costs. CES4H is not for commercial ventures
A helpful distinction

- The results of CES are often disseminated through diverse products that are accessible and useful to community members and policy makers, such as resource guides, toolkits, policy briefs, educational videos and photovoice exhibits.

- CES also often leads to the development of tools that can assist others in implementing or adapting the project in their communities, such as assessment instruments, instructional manuals and partnership agreements.
Examples of 34 Products Published to Date

- Community Based Participatory Research with Indigenous People (educational video)
- Partners in Research: Curricula to Prepare Community and Faculty for CBPR Partnerships
- Engaging the Underserved: Personal Accounts of Communities on Mental Health Needs for Prevention & Early Intervention Strategies (report)
- Toolkit to Establish & Sustain Year-Long Walking in Rural Communities
- Overtown Cookbook (evidence-based & taste-tested culturally diverse healthy recipes)
- Mapping Memories (digital stories of refugee youth & curriculum resources for engaging youth)
Submission Process

- Products in English considered year-round (those in response to this call due by Aug 8)

- Submission = *product* (downloadable, linkable) and 12 question *application*

- Application questions probe rigor & engagement/community benefit issues
  - Keywords: topics, type of resource, resource format
  - Product aims, development, quality, intended audience, significance
  - The project that resulted in the product – scholarly approach, rigor
  - Degree of & quality of engaged approach
  - Reflection on strengths & limitation
  - Assurances regarding copyright & privacy
CES4Health Application Process

• Application question examples:

  ○ 5. Please describe how your product or the project that resulted in the product builds on a relevant field, discipline or prior work. You may cite the literature and provide a bibliography in the next question if appropriate.

  ○ 7. Please describe the project or body of work from which the submitted product developed. Describe the ways that community and academic/institutional expertise contributed to the project. Pay particular attention to demonstrating the quality or rigor of the work.

  ○ 8. Please describe the process of developing the product, including the ways that community and academic/institutional expertise were integrated in the development of this product.

  ○ 12. Please describe ways that the project resulting in the product involved collaboration that embodied principles of mutual respect, shared work and shared credit. If different, describe ways that the product itself involved collaboration that embodied principles of mutual respect, shared work and shared credit.
How to Submit to CES4Health

- Application is first completed in WORD. Cut and paste to online application.
- Upload product or provide link
- Submit
CES4Health Review Process

- Mirrors typical journals
- Screened by Editor for minimal criteria of *engaged activity* and *health-related* (broadly speaking)
- Screened by Editor for copyright or privacy problems
  - May result in delay in review. Communicate with author.
CES4Health Review Process

- Assigned to Associate Editor who assigns 2 academic and 2 community reviewers based on aligned interest/expertise
- Reviewers complete one hour training with Editor.
- Reviewers have 1 month to complete review.
- Goal for total turnaround time – 3 months
- Decision – A, AR, R. Constructive summary
CES4Health Review Criteria

- **Appropriateness** for CES4Health.info
- **Clear Goals** - the degree to which the authors state the purpose of the product, its intended audience/users and clear goals and objectives.
- **Adequate Preparation** - the degree to which the authors appropriately reference or build upon prior work in the area.
CES4Health Review Criteria

- **Methodological Rigor** - the degree to which the authors justify the appropriateness of methods chosen with respect to the goals, questions and context of the work

- **Significance** - the degree to which the product adds to existing knowledge and benefits communities

- **Effective Presentation** - the clarity of the presentation style, the accuracy of the product content, and the appropriateness of language and visual aides for diverse audiences
**CES4Health Review Criteria**

- **Reflective Critique** - the degree to which authors provide critical reflection about the work, informed by both academic/institutional and community feedback

- **Ethical Behavior** - the degree to which authors provide evidence for a collaborative approach characterized by mutual respect, shared work, and shared credit (and approval by an institutional review board and/or community-based review mechanism, if applicable)
CES4Health Reviewer Rating Form

- Review form includes quantitative ratings on 5 pt scale

6. Effective Presentation - the clarity of the presentation style, the accuracy of the product content, and the appropriateness of language and visual aides for diverse audiences. This question applies to the product. (Information is available in Product Application Question 10 and by reviewing the product)

6a. Rate the degree to which the author uses a suitable style, clear communication and effective organization to present the work.

6b. Rate the degree to which the language, format, or graphics contained in the product would be understood by a broad and diverse audience (avoidance of culture-specific language, jargon, unexplained acronyms, etc.).

6c. Rate the degree to which the product’s presentation format is appropriate for its stated aims.
10. Please use the space below to comment on the extent to which the product is likely to be useful to the intended audience/users and the extent to which it is likely to be used:

12. Please use the space below to comment on the strengths and limitations of the product and the product application. These comments will be your summary that can be shared with the author. If you checked “accept with revisions” please be specific about what revisions are needed.

Strengths
Limitations
Suggested revisions for product
Suggested revisions for product application
Tips for Successful Submission

• Ways to demonstrate qualities of partnership of reciprocity and shared credit:
  ○ List all partners as co-authors in appropriate authorship order
  ○ Acknowledgements section in the product
  ○ In questions on application that ask about background on the project or development of the product, or explicitly ask about how all partners were substantively involved, mention all by name and describe their roles.
Tips

- Provide *keywords* for the topic, relevance to certain populations, format of the product, methods used in the project, etc so reviewers can be assigned who will be most able to effectively review the product and provide helpful feedback and so that your product can be found easily by users searching by keyword.

- Take care to keep *product* and *project* distinct and note which questions are asking for info about the product vs the project. Confounding the two is the number 1 reason pitfall.
Tips

- Provide some detail in the questions about the *scholarly approach* to the work and the bibliography. Provide factual background on the topic, for instance, diabetes. What gap does your work fill? Did you use a particular methodology that you could provide some information about to demonstrate that you understand best practices in this method – CBPR, SL, photovoice. A few paragraphs is helpful. Doesn’t need to be a literature review but demonstrate that you know what came before you and provide references.
Tips

- Demonstrating *significance or impact* – sometimes data exists about how the *product* has been used and what people think, how effective it is, or what kind of impact it has made. Provide a summary of that data.

- Sometimes the product has not been put to a test yet, no data exists. But maybe there are emails in which people have commented on the product or told you how they are using it. Summarize that.

- Remember that this is about the *product*. Don’t talk about impact the *project* has had (for example, CBPR projects can make impact in communities when they include capacity building, social change or advocacy activities, etc.)
Tips

- **Strengths and limitations** – discuss both and comment on how all partners have had some contribution in identifying the S’s and L’s.
  - This is also just about the product.
- In describing the *qualities of the partnership*, provide examples of how the partnership embodied mutual respect, mutual benefit, reciprocity, shared decision making, shared credit, etc. Don’t just say that these things happened.
Common Pitfalls

- Be sure that you have dealt with any potential copyright or HIPPA issues and can confidently answer questions in the application that you have no non-original content or if you do that you have permission or it is open access/stock, etc.

- **DO THE APPLICATION IN WORD FIRST AND SAVE IT**

- Make sure you hit submit at the end and that you get a confirmation screen. If you don’t get a confirmation screen, you may see red alerts about required fields/questions have been left blank.
  - Contact assoc editor or me if you have a tech glitch and don’t get a confirmation screen.
Discussion
Questions
Consultation
Key dates & deadlines

- April 18-21, 2012: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health 15th anniversary conference in Houston, TX
  Register at http://bit.ly/uLxLPf
  - Sat Apr 21 8:30-10: PCHP workshop with Darius Tandon
  - Sat Apr 21 10:30-12: CES4Health workshop with Cathy Jordan

- August 8, 2012: Deadline for submissions in response to this themed call for papers & products

- October 2013: Anticipated publication of PCHP issue; CES4H products will be published as they are accepted