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Why measure success in long-standing CBPR Partnerships?

MEASUREMENT APPROACHES TO PARTNERSHIP SUCCESS
MAPS - Specific Aim No. 1

Clearly define CBPR partnership success and develop a tool (MAPS) to determine success in long-standing CBPR partnerships and intermediate and long-term contributing factors.
MAPS – Specific Aim No. 2

Test the psychometric qualities of the MAPS tool in a sample of long-standing CBPR partnerships existing 6 years, and longer.
MAPS - Specific Aim No. 3

Develop mechanisms to feedback and apply partnership evaluation findings, and widely disseminate the MAPS tool and feedback mechanism in a readily accessible and usable format.
MAPS is a project of the Detroit Community-Academic Urban Research Center (Detroit URC), and builds upon its work using a CBPR approach throughout all stages of the project.
Israel, Schulz, et al., Conceptual Framework for understanding & assessing success in long-standing CBPR partnerships

MAPS Scoping Review 2007-2017

MAPS Key Informant Interviews 2017

‘MAPS’ Measurement Item Pool

Research for Improved Health (RIH) Systematic Literature Review 2002-2008

Environmental Characteristics

- Structure
- Group Dynamics
- Partnership Programs and Interventions

Intermediate Outcomes of Effective Partnerships
e.g.
- Relationship between costs & benefits
- Shared ownership, commitment
- Ability to adapt, respond
- Synergy created

Long-Term Outcomes of Effective Partnerships
e.g.
- Sustainability
  - Longevity of partnerships
  - Continuation of work
  - Relationships ongoing
  - Capacity enhanced

Success of Long-Standing Partnerships
e.g.
- Long-term commitment to the partnership
- Health equity
- Deliverables from research (grants, papers, presentations)
- Tangible community and/or health benefits
- Policy and practice change

Source: Adapted from original model by Israel, Lantz, and Schulz (2001, 2003, 2005), drawing upon the work of Lasker & Weiss (2003); Sofaer (2000); and Wallerstein and colleagues (2008).
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- Long-term commitment to the partnership
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- Deliverables from research (grants, papers, presentations)
- Tangible community and/or health benefits
- Policy and practice change

Source: Adapted from original model by Israel, Lantz, and Schulz (2001, 2003, 2005), drawing upon the work of Lasker & Weiss (2003); Sofaer (2000); and Wallerstein and colleagues (2008).
Methods for Key Informant Interviews

- Semi-structured interview protocols were developed

- Questions were open-ended and organized by area of focus:
  - Defining Success
  - Success above and beyond outcomes
  - Costs & benefits of participation
  - Sustainability
  - Synergy
  - Equity in partnership
Methods for Key Informant Interviews

- Conducted Key Informant Interviews

- Pilot Testing (n=5)
  - 3 Community & 2 Academic Participants

- Expert Panel Member (n=16)
  - 8 Community & 8 Academic Expert Panelists
MAPS Community Expert Panelists: 

Key Informants

Alex Allen  
Executive Director  
Chandler Park Conservancy  
Detroit, Michigan

Linda Burhansstipanov  
Founder/President & Grants Director  
Native American Cancer Research Corporation  
Denver, Colorado

Elia Greene-Moton  
Administrator  
CBOP Community Ethics Review Board  
Flint, Michigan

Marita Jones  
Executive Director  
Healthy Native Communities Partnership, Inc.  
Shiprock, New Mexico

Angela Reyes  
Executive Director  
Detroit Hispanic Development Corporation  
Detroit, Michigan

Al Richmond  
Executive Director  
Community-Campus Partnerships for Health  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Zachary Rowe  
Executive Director  
Friends of Parkside  
Detroit, Michigan

Peggy Shepard  
Executive Director  
WEACT for Environmental Justice  
New York, New York
MAPS Academic Expert Panelists: Key Informants

**Elizabeth (Beth) Baker**
Professor, College for Public Health & Social Justice
St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri

**Cleopatra (Cleo) Caldwell**
Professor, School of Public Health
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

**Bonnie Duran**
Associate Professor, School of Social Work
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

**Eugenia (Geni) Eng**
Professor, School of Public Health
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

**Meredith (Merry) Minkler**
Professor Emerita, School of Public Health
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, California

**Amy Schulz**
Professor, School of Public Health
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

**Melissa Valerio**
Associate Professor, UT Health Science Center
UT Health School of Public Health San Antonio Regional Campus
San Antonio, Texas

**Nina Wallerstein**
Professor of Public Health
University of New Mexico School of Medicine
Albuquerque, New Mexico
Methods for Key Informant Interviews

Qualitative Data Management & Analysis (Ongoing)

- Used a process of in vivo line-by-line restatements and open coding based on a grounded theory approach
- Multiple coders worked to reach consensus on the codes
- Codebook developed through this process
- Used NVivo data management software
Success in long-standing CBPR partnerships:
Selected outcomes to-date from the key informant interviews
SUSTAINABILITY:

Tangible support for all partners extends beyond partnership.

"So maybe it's going back to that notion of social support that 'Is it perceived or received?' and I think that there's something about received support from within a partnership, within a relationship that is part of what happens with sustainability is that there's tangible assistance that continues to be offered."

-Academic Partner
"[The] kinds of engagement you need at the beginning of a partnership I think are much more intensive and face-to-face and time-consuming, and building relationships, really getting to know someone and getting to know the community, getting to know all those things. So, I think the costs do shift over time....there are certainly costs in terms of at the beginning, you're not publishing as much."

-Academic Partner

**RELATIONSHIP OF COSTS & BENEFITS OVER TIME:**

For the first few years the costs may exceed benefits.
EQUITY:

Partnership recognizes and tries to minimize power different.

"...equity is important...and I do think it's a recognition of power, and that power looks like different ways, and manifests itself along many different elements. It could be around race, gender, sexual orientation, all of that, but it recognizes those differences and it tries to kind of minimize what some of those differences are, right?"

-Community Partner
Why is this important?
Next Steps

• **Combine themes** from key informant interviews with findings from MAPS Scoping Review and Research for Improved Health (RIH) systematic review

• Conduct **Delphi Process** with Expert Panel to determine important concepts to measure with MAPS tool

• Develop **draft MAPS tool** and pilot test

• Administer **MAPS survey** to all partners in 55 long-standing CBPR partnerships

• Conduct **validity testing** using both classical and modern psychometric methods

• Disseminate **findings** to participating partnerships & more broadly
To learn more about the Measurement Approaches to Partnership Success (MAPS) project, please contact MAPS Project Manager Megan Jensen.

Megan Jensen, MPH  
E: mlaer@umich.edu  
T: +1 (734) 764-6029
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