UAB CCTS Regional Community Engagement Consortium Meeting - Minutes

August 3, 2017
10 AM - 3 PM
Tuskegee University – Tuskegee, University

Agenda

• **Introductions:** 6 partner institutions (UA, UAB, USA, UMMC, Tulane, Tuskegee) represented in person and via WebEx;
  1. Mercedes Morales Alaman - UA
  2. Meena Nabavi – UAB
  3. Marjorie Lee White – UAB
  4. Max Michael - UAB
  5. Shauntice Allen – UAB
  6. Kim Littlefield - USA
  7. Shannon Shelly- Tremblay – USA
  8. Clayton Yates – Tuskegee
  9. Lecarde Webb – Tuskegee
  10. Honghe Wong – Tuskegee
  11. Jason White - Tuskegee

  **WebEx –**
  12. Keelia O’Mally - Tulane
  13. Catherine Haywood- Tulane
  14. Carolyn Johnson- Tulane
  15. Lonnie Hannon - Tuskegee
  16. Tammy Dempsey - UMMC

• **Welcome from Dr. Clayton Yates to Tuskegee University.**
• **Welcome from Dr. Max Michael.** This meeting was proposed at the CCTS Internal Advisory Board meeting in Mobile. Community engagement work has not completely been integrated into the work of the CCTS. Dr. Michael stressed the importance of knowing the needs of the community and those focus areas relating back to the research done through CCTS. Dr. Michael highlighted the key points of the meeting which included:
  a. Discussion/Future of PURE
  b. The use of simulation in community engagement
  c. Framing components of the renewal application, including what a Regional Community Engagement Consortium should look like, and how to engage and create an entity that is functional for all institutions. 6 years ago the goal was to develop trust between the community and the university. For the renewal application, how would this be measured? Trust? Relationships? Etc? Renewal application is due May 2018; writing to begin February 2018 (6 pages).
  d. Discussion regarding how a RCEC would show value added to other components of the CCTS.
• **Dr. Littlefield and Meena gave an update on PURE – Phase 2.** USA has agreed to rebudget funding to move forward with PURE – Phase 2. USA in the process of developing a position description to hire a person to assist in the data collection/entry. Position would be a temporary position, for someone with a high school degree with some form of community engagement experience. USA is budgeting 3 hours per community organization interview. Goal is to have the person hired by end of September. Dr. Littlefield raised the issue of IRB approval and needing a protocol and consent form for work done. Outcomes from the interviews would provide measurements for the renewal application.

The group suggested creating multiple simulations to test functionality of the PURE platform. This will be done by the end of August. The template that UAB has used for interviews will be shared with all institutions as well.

The discussion moved to profiling faculty (charged by Elsevier) vs Profiling of community members (no charge). The concern was that information is being missed due to papers, Alt Metrics, etc not being automatically populated by Elsevier. Meena agreed to look into this with Elsevier (test member: Leevones Fisher, M.Ed. (Dubois)).

Before the next meeting in November, UMMC and Tulane agreed to have 10 profiles populated in PURE. UA would report late. Tuskegee agreed to have 4-5 profiles completed.

**Shannon Shelley - Tremblay suggested framing out a methodological paper, and incorporating a bioethics perspective (Yates).**

Questions for Elsevier: (For Meena)
1. Are documents (meeting minutes, annual reports) being mined for data? If so, where can we see those connections?
2. Does the algorithm work for community member or just faculty members? Does it mine community information?
3. Financial consideration for community partners (we want access to press releases, etc). Will community profiles be charged the same amount as a faculty member?
4. When is the refresh done? 3-7 days? When do the linkages show up?

Next Steps re PURE:
1. Framing Publication and Methodology
2. Track outcomes from Phase 1?
3. Track collaborations from Phase 2?
4. What would be beneficial to the community partner?
5. Ask community organizations how PURE be of value to them.
6.

• **Dr. Shauntice Allen led the discussion about what a Regional CEI would look like.** Dr. Allen started with an overview of the previous CEIs in Birmingham.
  o The first CEI was in 2014. It was not a research driven conference, but an opportunity for academia and communities to talk about structural issues, etc. The fee to attend was $20.
CEI was much larger in 2015, and was moved to Birmingham Convention Center. The poster session started that year – networking connections were made. There was no fee to attend, but there were a significant number of registrants who did not attend.

In 2016, the CEI was centered around Social Justice. It was a full day conference, with breakout sessions, poster session, as well as a post survey. Registration fee was implemented again this year.

The CEI in 2017 will be on October 6th at BJCC. The theme is “CHEER” for Civil Inclusion. Dr. Errol Crook from USA and Diane Bell McKoy (lunchtime speaker) will be keynote speakers. Registration is now open - $25.

Discussion moved to what a Regional CEI would look like. Slides from the meeting in Tuscaloosa were presented again to the group. Dr. Allen reminded group that community collaboration is a required component of the renewal application: “To engage communities around specific projects and to advance the science of community engaged research.”.

Diabetes was a topic area discussed at meeting in Tuscaloosa. The opioid epidemic was also suggested as a topic. What is it that the communities want? Dr. Michael presented the neighborhood leaders health survey that was conducted several years ago, and suggested that it may be useful to repeat and use UAB Survey Research Unit – to find what ARE the main issues facing communities.

For normal meeting, participants get in a car and go. How do we create opportunities for academics and community partners without them getting in a car? Live Stream CEI to 4 different sites: Mobile, Jackson, Nola, Tuskegee, as a way to expand and broaden the participation (not just listening and watching) with parallel breakout sessions. As a proof of concept, if this could be accomplished for Fall 2017, it would be strong for the R-13 application, as well as the renewal application. It was also suggested to add Speed Network Dating at each site – in person or virtually. It was also suggested to reach out to Auburn regarding the technology used for distance education.

In the future, the All of Us campaign might allow for an opportunity to get involved in the Alabama Genome project and to bring this topic to a CEI meeting.

- Dr. Marjorie Lee White led discussion about how simulation could be incorporated into Community Engagement.
  - She began with an overview of the Poverty Simulation (large space with 100 participants) vs. Social Determinants of Health Simulation (has been piloted 3 times).

Title of Simulation could be: “Engaged Research”. Participants would be divided into two groups:

I. Research Personnel – Mix of T1, T2, T3, T4 researchers. What is it that the group needs to practice to do? The goal of researchers is to get research off the ground, but there also needs to be community engagement. Researchers would have to simulate the mismatch – how things are in the community. In an awareness simulation, the experience could be switched so researchers are the communities. Add chance cards so researchers become the patient!

II. Community Groups - Goal is to have your issue be researched, and brought to the front. Community partners could help with real scenarios to utilize during simulations.

Next steps:
1. Flushing out details, gathering researchers and community members. Challenge will be getting the right individuals in the room. Between now and May 2018, convening groups to discuss what simulation would look like.

2. Dr. Marjorie Lee White will provide an estimate cost of time for Simulation Center to develop framework by February 2018.

- **Dr. Michael led discussion on Community Council Proposal.** Input from the community would be beneficial/critical to the group. It was suggested that community representation at the leadership level vs. creating a different council would be more beneficial. Community members would go through an orientation, and would be compensated for their time and effort. Dr. Allen suggested reaching out to Al Richmond about how to best engage community participation. It was agreed that community voices were missing in meetings. Dr. Michael recommended 2-3 community representatives from each institution.

- **Next Steps**
  1. Specific items related to PURE between now and First of November.
     a. Simulated Profiles
     b. Ask Elsevier questions
     c. Institutions gather information from partners
  2. CEI to be streamed at other universities with breakout capacities.
     a. One workshop session to understand what a community council would look like.
  3. SIM Model – Dr. Marjorie Lee White will develop a 1-pager to guide conversation.
     a. Seek grant funding for the build, CCTS funding for simulation.
     b. Health Survey could inform the build. (Use Survey Research Unit at UAB). Talk to Dr. Martha Arrieta (USA) about data that could be available. Dr. Michael to discuss sample size and cost with Survey Research Unit.
  4. CCTS Website
     a. Need profiles of those who are a part of group, as well as work being done at each of these institutions.
     b. Spotlighting projects on a rotating basis.
     c. Currently old information on website – info from 2015. Webmaster to do updates – we need to provide content.
     d. Highlight PURE.
     e. Brief synopsis of Meetings.
     f. Each consortium member to send 150 word Biography, what host institution specializes in professional headshot, and 1 photo of something happening in community by the end of August. (send to Meena).

- **Next meeting date – Early November (Location TBD)**
- **Adjourn – adjourned at 2:35pm.**