

Exhibit 3. CBPR requests for applications and peer review

Recommendations for constructing requests for applications and designing the review process to enhance the potential for strong and responsive applications employing principles of community-based participatory research (CBPR).

Requests for Applications

Resources to Guide the Process

- Provide links and references describing the fundamental principles and rationale for CBPR
 - <http://lgreen.net/guidelines.html>
 - <http://www.sph.umich.edu/chsp/>
 - <http://www.ccpb.info/Others>
 - Israel Schulz, Parker, 1998*
 - Viswanathan, Ammerman, Eng, forthcoming[†]
- Provide links and references describing the proposal-writing process in language understandable by community partners. (sources for this?)
- List contact information for individuals in your agency who can answer questions and provide additional resources regarding CBPR

RFA Text and Budgetary Guidance

- Use language in the RFA text that is understandable by both academic and community partners.
- Structure the RFA to include a planning grant or partnership development period
Possible approaches:
 - Implement a 1 year planning grant to strengthen or facilitate the development of community partnerships and participatory proposal development
 - those receiving planning grants are not guaranteed a full grant
 - success in partnership development is a prerequisite for obtaining full funding
 - Include planning and partnership development time on the front end of longer term funding mechanism
- Provide review criteria that
 - Emphasize the importance of high-quality research design and measurement combined with adherence to the principles of CBPR
 - Include methodological flexibility – study design and measurement methods that retain the ability to draw unbiased conclusions from the research while accommodating practicality and ethical treatment of the community.
- Create budget guidelines that are flexible enough to accommodate:
 - community organizations as lead fiduciary agent
 - subcontracts to community-based organizations
 - hiring community-based research assistant staff and covering office expenses
 - participant and community participation incentives and reimbursement such as timely payment for study participation, food for community events
 - shared decisionmaking between the university and community agencies
 - the longer timelines required for CBPR

* Israel BA, Schulz AJ, Parker EA, et al. Review of community-based research: assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annu Rev Public Health* 1998; 19:173-202.

[†] Viswanathan M, Ammerman A, Eng E, et al., Community-Based Participatory Research: A Summary of the Evidence, RTI International-University of North Carolina Evidence-Based Practice Center, Contract No. 290-02-0016. Forthcoming.

*This exhibit is from the draft version of the CBPR report (Viswanathan M, Ammerman A, Eng E, Gartlehner G, Lohr KN, Griffith D, Rhodes S, Samuel-Hodge C, Mary S, Lux L, Webb L, Sutton SF, Swinson T, Jackman A, Whitener L. Community-Based Participatory Research: Assessing the Evidence, Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 99 [Prepared by RTI-University of North Carolina Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. 290-02-0016]. AHRQ Publication 04-E022-2. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. July 2004).

Exhibit 3. CBPR requests for applications and peer review (continued)

Peer Review

- **Assemble a review panel that includes**
 - academicians with expertise and experience in the content area
 - academicians with expertise and experience in CBPR and the content area
 - some role for community members with experience in CBPR and/or content area
- **Provide guidance and training to reviewers regarding CBPR principles and methodology**
 - for standing study sections, provide links for web-based materials between study section meetings
 - for special emphasis or ad hoc review committees, distribute information on CBPR principles and review criteria when proposals are mailed.
 - conduct a conference call with review panelists after receiving proposals to assure their understanding of CBPR and address related questions
 - talk at greater length; have an in-depth discussion with the Chair of the study section or review panel to assure that they understand CBPR principles
- **If review panels include academicians and community representatives:**
 - Hold a meeting immediately prior to beginning before the review meeting panel discussions to assure everyone understands their roles and is comfortable with their responsibilities
 - Involve community representatives in the review discussion but do not assign them as a primary or secondary reviewer
 - Require PIs to supply a “lay” version of the abstract as well as the conventional abstract
 - Request that primary reviewers take responsibility for soliciting useful feedback from the community representative
 - Require that the summary report include a section addressing comments from the community representative
- **Provide reviewers with guidelines and checklists** that combine conventional proposal review criteria along with criteria for assessing the application of CBPR methods
- **Encourage discussions** among the review panel members at the time of the review that weigh the relative strengths and weaknesses of conventional research approaches (such as randomized controlled trials) against modifications that are more responsive to community concerns (such as delayed intervention control)
- **Create scoring criteria** that evaluate:
 - Adherence to sound study design, measurement, and analysis principles
 - Adherence to the principles and best practices of CBPR
- **Provide feedback to applicants** addressing both research methodology and CBPR principles