



**Healthy Environments Partnership
(Detroit, Michigan)**

**CBPR Partnership Evaluation Tools:
In-Depth Interview Questionnaire & Conceptual Model**

The Healthy Environments Partnership (HEP) <http://www.hepdetroit.org/> is a project of the Detroit Community-Academic Urban Research Center <http://www.sph.umich.edu/urc>, with funding from NIEHS (1 R01 ES10936-05; 1 R01 ES014234-01) and NCMHHD (1 R24 MD001619-01). The partners that have been involved in HEP are: Brightmoor Community Center, Boulevard Harambee, Friends of Parkside, Detroit Department of Health and Wellness Promotion, Detroit Hispanic Development Corporation, Henry Ford Health System (AIM HI), Rebuilding Communities Incorporated, Southwest Solutions, Southwest Detroit Environmental Vision, University of Michigan Schools of Public Health, Nursing, Social Work, Architecture and Urban Planning, and the Institute for Social Research.

For more information on the *Healthy Environments Partnership* please contact:

Sheryl Shellman Weir, Project Manager
109 S. Observatory Rm. 2818
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109
Telephone: (734) 615-2695 Fax: (734) 647-6358
ssweir@umich.edu

Overview

The Healthy Environments Partnership (HEP) has been working since 2000 to examine and address relationships between environmental conditions and cardiovascular health in three ethnically-diverse Detroit communities. The community-based participatory research process (CBPR) used in HEP involves equitable engagement of representatives from community-based organizations, health service organizations, and academic institutions in all phases of the research and intervention process. The HEP Steering Committee, with representatives from each of the partner organizations, meets on a monthly basis to discuss, provide input, and finalize decisions regarding the Partnership's ongoing efforts to reduce the risks of cardiovascular disease in Detroit neighborhoods.

Assessing and documenting the extent to which a CBPR process is collaborative, participatory, and effective at achieving intermediate objectives can happen long before evaluating the partnership's impact on health and achievement of its ultimate goals. As part of the evaluation of the HEP partnership process, evaluation staff conducted in-depth interviews with 13 HEP Steering Committee members during the summer of 2006. The purpose of conducting these interviews was to assess the community-based participatory process within the HEP SC as well as to assess the impact of the participatory partnership on the individual partners, the partnership as a whole, and the work and results of the partnership. These interviews also provided the Steering Committee members an opportunity to share their perceptions of HEP's accomplishments and challenges to date and to suggest improvements for the Partnership.

Consistent with a CBPR approach, the evaluation was a formative, participatory, and iterative process. Steering Committee members were actively engaged in developing and approving the themes and questions for the evaluation (see Attachment A). The development of the evaluation questionnaire was also guided by a conceptual framework for assessing group dynamics as an aspect of effectiveness of CBPR partnerships (see Attachment B). After research approvals were obtained by the Steering Committee and the University of Michigan's Institutional Review Board, each Steering Committee member was interviewed by HEP evaluation staff. Evaluation staff reviewed the interview transcripts and responses were summarized by common themes and discussed openly with the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee then prioritized and acted on selected findings to improve partnership functioning.

References

For additional information about evaluation of CBPR partnerships and the conceptual framework used for assessing group dynamics as an aspect of effective CBPR partnerships see:

Israel, B.A., Lantz, P.M., McGranaghan, R., Kerr, D., & Guzman, R. (2005). Documentation and evaluation of CBPR partnerships: In-depth interviews and closed-ended questionnaires. In B.A. Israel, E. Eng, A.J. Schulz, & E.A. Parker (Eds.), *Methods in community-based participatory research for health* (pp. 255-277). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schulz, A. J., Israel, B.A., & Lantz, P. (2004). Assessing and strengthening characteristics of effective groups in community-based participatory research partnerships. In C. Gavin, M. Galinsky, & L.M. Gutierrez (Eds.), *Handbook of social work with groups* (pp.309-325). New York: Guildford Publications.

Attachment A: The Healthy Environments Partnership In-Depth Interview Guide (2006)

1. What is your vision for the HEP partnership?
2. In your opinion, what have been the major accomplishments of the HEP partnership since you joined the Steering Committee (SC)?
3. What factors would you say have facilitated HEP's accomplishments?
4. What have been the major barriers/challenges facing the HEP partnership?
5. Mutual trust is a fundamental characteristic of effective partnerships. To what extent does trust exist among members of the HEP SC?
6. Compared to other partnerships that you have been involved in, what do you find particularly unique or significant about the HEP partnership?
7. Please describe the extent to which the HEP partnership has synergy.
8. To what extent and how have new relationships formed among the partners of the HEP SC?
9. Representation of community members is a theme that has been discussed in past SC evaluations and meetings. What is your perception of a partnership that is representative of community constituents?
10. Many partners on the SC are affiliated with institutions or organizations. What does it mean for an individual on the SC to be "representative" of their organization?
11. What does your organization hope to accomplish by its affiliation with HEP?
12. How does your organization assure that community interests are represented in the work of the HEP partnership?
13. In what ways is the work of HEP benefiting the community?
14. How have you personally benefited from your membership in the HEP partnership?
15. To what extent is there equal buy-in and investment in the partnership among all SC members? Is everyone pulling their own weight?
16. To what extent is the HEP partnership positioned to meet the CBPR goals to promote reduction of cardiovascular disease in Detroit?
17. To what extent are there opportunities for members of the HEP SC to develop and demonstrate shared leadership?
18. In the event that core funding ends for the HEP partnership, what are your thoughts regarding sustaining the partnership?
19. We've touched upon group processes, representation within the partnership, partnership accomplishments and challenges, shared commitment and leadership, and future expectations. Is there anything else you'd like to share?

Attachment B: Conceptual Framework for Assessing Group Dynamics as an Aspect of Effectiveness of CBPR Partnerships

Schulz et al. (2004)

