

Results from a process and impact evaluation of the CBPR Partnership Academy: Lessons learned for developing community-academic partnerships for health and equity

Ricardo Guzman

CEO Emeritus, Community Health and Social Services Center, Inc.

Chris M. Coombe

University of Michigan School of Public Health

Barbara Israel, Alex J. Allen III, Barbara Brush, Edith Kieffer, Toby Lewis,
Gloria Palmisano, Zachary Rowe, Carol Gray

Annual Meeting of the American Public Health Association, Denver, CO

November 8, 2017

This program is funded by the National Institute of General Medical Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under Award #1R25GM111837-01. Related materials do not necessarily represent views of NIH. With acknowledgement to our colleagues in the Detroit Community-Academic Urban Research Center

Presenter Disclosure

- Ricardo Guzman
- Chris M. Coombe
- (1) The following personal financial relationships with commercial interests relevant to this presentation existed during the past 12 months:

No relationships to disclose.

Evaluation Purpose, Approach, & Methods

Enhance CBPR capacity, skills, and knowledge, in partnership with communities; and increase participation of researchers from under-represented groups in CBPR.

- **Participatory and Formative**
- **Process Evaluation**
- **Impact Evaluation**
- **Mixed Methods**



Multiple Data Collection Methods

Component

- Week-long Course
- Ongoing learning forums
- Mentoring
- Partnership grant & project
- Mid-year assessment

- Overall program impact

Methods

3 open-ended questions, Questionnaire (post)
Short surveys after each
Post; documentation
Post; documentation
Data feedback and discussion

Pre- and post-questionnaires (qualtrics)
Selfie-videos of advice to next cohort
Reflection activity at final forum
Documentation

Periodic feedback, interpretation, and application of results by all involved.

Week-Long Course: Key Qualitative Findings (3 cohorts)

Most valuable/beneficial:

- Gained a true understanding of CBPR from the knowledge, examples, and expertise of Detroit URC partnerships. Instructors modeled CBPR.
“A huge appreciation for the need to spend time on processes of a good, solid, equitable partnership as well as the research goals of a partnership.”
- Relationships strengthened, partners learned together in co-learning environment.
“...we got to know one another much better, learned together, strengthened our partnership, and were able to talk through our questions and ideas.”
- Detroit trip pulled everything together. linked classroom to what CBPR really looks like, its impact, and the ongoing role of community partners in their communities.
“It was the highlight of the week...The community partners are doing the work they are doing not because of the academic partners...but in concert with the academic partners, and that makes all the difference.”

Week-Long Course (cont.)

Least valuable/beneficial

- Too much presentation and sitting, would have liked more activities
- Not enough time to process so much information, go deeper
- Amount/level of research content didn't always match needs of both community and academic partners

Recommendations

- More time for small group discussion, to work on team projects, and networking
- Visit Detroit earlier in the week, spend more time with the community or hold sessions in Detroit



Course Content, Material, and Instruction

Please indicate your level of agreement about the overall course material and instruction:
Mean on scale of 1-5, Strongly disagree to Strongly agree

Question	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 3
Overall course content and structure was well-organized	4.0	4.7	4.8
Teaching and class learning materials were effective	3.7	4.6	4.6
Course instructors demonstrated expertise in the subject matter	4.7	4.8	4.9
Learning resources (binder, book, resource list) will be useful to me in the future	4.7	4.6	4.8
Interactive exercises and questions were at an appropriate level	3.5	4.2	4.7
Opportunities for partnerships to work together on specific tasks were valuable	NA	4.7	4.7



Madina Agénor, PhD, MPH
CBPR Partnership Academy Participant

Ongoing Learning Activities



	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Cohort 1</u>	<u>2</u>
Overall satisfaction with the session	4.1	4.6	
Facilitators fostered a co-learning environment	4.4	4.8	

Most valuable:

- Seeing how others are tackling similar situations and how they overcame or found solutions.
- Getting peer feedback that was thoughtful, constructive, AND supportive.
- I continue to be amazed at the thoughtfulness and preparation that goes into each step of the process. Thank you all for the amazing opportunity you are providing!

Challenge: Difficult to coordinate schedules across 24 people and 4 time zones; wanted a final in-person session of everyone.

- It would be helpful to have a second in-person gathering to engage all participants in shared problem solving and learning about each project.

Mentoring from Community & Academic Experts



“We greatly appreciated the support and guidance provided to us by our mentors. They showed great care in understanding the issue... and provided extremely valuable insight from their vast experience. We are so appreciative...”

Grant Proposal & Hands-on Development of a CBPR Partnership

- Our mentors' feedback was incredibly helpful and allowed for us to submit a stronger proposal. We really enjoyed the process of first receiving written feedback, and then having an opportunity for a lengthy discussion. We are grateful to our mentors for their time, skill, and interests in our work, and very much look forward to the year ahead!
- Through the partnership development project, I was able to really experience the day to day work that is necessary, and not always welcomed by all members of each of our institutions.



Post: How beneficial were the following program components in contributing to your overall CBPR Academy Experience?

% responding Very or Extremely Beneficial

Component	Cohort 1	Cohort 2 (prelim)
Week-long intensive course	89%	100%
Trip to Detroit	78%	100%
Writing the proposal	67%	82%
Getting feedback on the proposal	72%	100%
Receiving funding	72%	100%
Implementing the Proposal	67%	100%
Mentoring	72%	82%

Selected Process, Outcome, and Impact Findings from the Post- Survey

	Cohort 1	2	
■ Overall satisfaction	72%	91%	very or extremely satisfied
■ Met expectations	61%	91%	exceeded/greatly exceeded
“ “	28%	9%	matched expectations
■ Enhanced competence in developing a CBPR partnership	76%	91%	very or extremely enhanced
■ Use CBPR in future work	89%	91%	likely or very likely

Selected Accomplishments* reported at 3 months from end of year-long program

- 17 Grant proposals submitted
- 10 Proposals funded – range of \$5,000 - \$150,000
- 13 CBPR training/workshops conducted
- 12 Presented to academic audiences
- 15 Presented the partnership's work to community audiences
- 15 Incorporated CBPR into teaching
- 3 Articles submitted for publication



Impact: Enhancing CBPR Capacity

- All 48 completed the year-long program
- 68% from underrepresented racial and ethnic groups
- 81% of researchers are woman
- Funding received from CDC, NIH, national and local foundations, universities, a hospital foundation
 - “I was awarded \$800,000... to implement our health leadership project utilizing a CBPR approach. I know that really highlighting my participation in the CBPR Partnership Academy played a role in getting funded!” - Academic partner, 9 months post-academy

Continuing and Expanding CBPR Partnerships

“The process is alive and well and we look forward to continuing our partnership and working on additional projects.”

“Being part of this group has helped keep our partnership momentum going and has allowed us to think more creatively. It also has given us space to think more broadly about collective impact and the data/research we need to accomplish those broader goals.”

“Would have loved to have another weeklong training in Michigan at the end of the program to solidify training and think about next steps. Or if you had a reunion meeting for all cohorts.”

Lessons Learned

- Being together, in-person for the week-long course establishes a strong base.
- Engaging Community-Academic teams both as instructors and participants integrates CBPR and equity.
- Balance hands-on, applied learning with knowledge.
- Focus on relationship-building in all activities throughout the year.
- A highly diverse group brings an essential dimension.
- Need to balance *project* development and *partnership* development.
- Continuing beyond the year fosters a network of peers and co-learners committed to equity.





Enrique W. Neblett, Jr., PhD
CBPR Partnership Academy Participant



detroiturc.org