

Community-based Participatory Research: Practical Tips

Marshall H. Chin, MD, MPH
Associate Professor of Medicine
Director, RWJF Finding Answers:
Disparities Research for Change
The University of Chicago

Roadmap

- My brief story
- Definition of CBPR and resources
- Recommendations

Community-Based Participatory Research

- Community focus – often vulnerable or hard to reach populations
- Collaboration – community and academic partners
- Equal relationships
- Benefit of community
 - Ultimately interventions
 - Reduce disparities

Resources 1

- Israel BA, Schulz AJ, Parker EA, Becker AB. Review of community-based research: assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annu Rev Public Health* 1998; 19:173-202.
- Community-Campus Partnerships for Health
<http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/>

Resources 2

- www.ahrq.gov – CBPR: Assessing the Evidence
- New journal:
Progress in Community Health Partnerships:
Research, Education, and Action

Principles of CBPR 1 (Israel et al.)

- Recognizes community as a unit of identity
- Builds on strengths and resources within the community
- Facilitates collaborative partnerships in all phases of the research
- Integrates knowledge and action for mutual benefit of all partners

Principles of CBPR 2

- Promotes a co-learning and empowering process that attends to social inequalities
- Involves a cyclical and iterative process
- Addresses health from both positive and ecological perspectives
- Disseminates findings and knowledge gained to all parties

Recommendations 1

- Relationship building - longterm
- Trust – can't predict everything
- Honesty, transparency
- Get to know one another
 - Visit other's turf
 - Food/meals – breaking bread
 - Openness, trust beyond technical business relationship
 - Got to like one another

Recommendations 2

- Flexibility - working in the real world
 - Understand legitimate needs of all and be flexible to make it happen
 - Time constraints & mission of community partners
 - Academic needs of the researchers
 - Simple and practical are good

Recommendations 3

- Find out who's willing to play ball
 - Individuals, tough hx
 - Don't take rejection personally
- Forgive and forget
- Senior leadership support from the beginning
- Regular updates to senior management
- Enlarge the pie
 - Share the \$ - research and service grants

Recommendations 4

- Equal partnership – What does this mean?
 - Goals, needs, skills of partners
- Find out what people are good at and interested in
 - Don't force square peg in round hole
- CBPR as a continuum
- Humility – everyone make an effort to learn
 - Specific expertise but understand general issues of all

Recommendations 5

- Institutionalization
 - Ability to absorb hit of leaders leaving
 - Written rules vs. flexibility
 - Structure – when to lead, when to follow, when to facilitate

Recommendations 6

- Everyone at table but subcommittees particularly interested do work
 - Feasibility – get things going
- Make sure team has necessary expertise

Recommendations 7

- Pilot projects – crawl then run
 - Small successes nurture spirit
 - Debug process on manageable scale
 - Pilot data for larger grant
 - Study results
 - Proof of relationship
 - Proof of debugged process

Recommendations 8

- Latch on to existing infrastructure/projects
- Diversify portfolio

Recommendations 9

- Grantsmanship – Know your competitive advantage and pound on it
 - Population need
 - Minority populations, Rural/Urban, SES/Literacy
 - Existing model programs
 - Strengths of academic partners
- Open CBPR yet structured
- Time – meld with grant cycles - flexibility

Recommendations 10

- Everyone shares the credit – broadcast small and large successes
- Multiple forms of dissemination – community, listserves, websites, newspapers, newsletters, journals, community and academic presentations
- Side effects - Employ the community when possible

Recommendations 11

- **Funders / Agencies / Communities / Researchers - Promote a common vision vs. separate agendas**
 - Improve health care of communities and patients
 - Service versus research - role of rigorous evaluation
 - Funders promote collaborations: e.g. joint funding
 - Respect, transparency, feedback and input – But independence, no censorship
 - Successful partnerships = major impact

Bottom Line

- Fun
- Chance to do a lot of good
- Inherently rewarding work
- Tough balancing - tradeoffs
- Limited number of pre-existing model programs
- Seamless partnerships – Research – Translation – Service - Policy

RWJF Finding Answers: Disparities Research for Change

- \$6.5 million in grants over 3 years
- Interventions to reduce racial and ethnic disparities in health care
- Health care setting
- Cardiovascular, depression, diabetes
- www.solvingdisparities.org