Health in the Hubs Phase II:

Bridging Research (Book Smarts) with Neighbourhood Wisdom (Street Smarts) in a Campus-Community Partnership with Students, Residents, and Faculty Ruta Valaitis, RN PhD
Olive Wahoush, RN PhD
Nancy Murray, RN PhD (Candidate)
CHNC
May 15th 2012
Toronto, ON

Phase 2: Street Smarts →Books Smarts



Guided by faculty and community consultants



Community

Students



Support

Hamilton Community Foundation Grant to evaluate this phase II

- Over \$19,000 in funding from HCF's Community Health and Education Research (CHER) fund awarded for Phase 2 evaluation
- School of Nursing supported Local Planning Teams (LPTs) for contributions to student learning
 - LPTs supported community resident consultant honourariums to attend student classes at Perkins Centre and in community

Goals of Phase II



We will learn how:

- communities make effective use of research information in a community-based development and implementation project;
- universities can construct effective partnerships with communities; and
- community experience informs academic research and education.

Community resident consultants:

- Hired from each Local Planning Team (LPT) funded by the McMaster School of Nursing
- Developed information gathering strategies
- Adjusted language for Phase I survey
- Brought considerable knowledge about their neighbourhoods and strong networks to facilitate gathering of opinion
- Demonstrated commitment beyond paid role



D	\sim	Inc
П	U	ICS

- Students
 - > Explore research and best practices
 - > Target dissemination to academic and community audiences
- · Community Consultants
 - > Provide input on their neighbourhood context, clarify the issue and advise on dissemination
- Faculty
 - > Facilitate relationships, partnership, and learning



PHASE II Street Smarts⇔Books Smarts

- · Course development
 - Nursing-led course development: Partnering with Hamilton Neighourhoods for Health
- Interdisciplinary groups of students (n=12)
 - variety of disciplines enrolled (Social Work, Nursing, Psychology, Biochemistry, Sociology, BHSc, etc.)
- Local Planning Team (LPTs) committed to work with faculty and students and to identify consultant from LPT
- Three Groups School of Nursing faculty, community developer, community resident consultants and groups of 4 students partnered with each Local Planning Team (LPT)
- Students gathered research to support action on Phase I priority health issues

Full citation of paper; open acress link if available	Agrey, P. K. IX. (2011). Vancouver's restorative and (RestArt) anti-graffin project. An exploration and evaluation of the general and specific benefits and challenges. Manacrist submitted for publication, Department of Crimmology, Sman Fraier University, Burnaby, British Columbia.			Assignment: Literature reviews	
Year of publication	2011			conducted	
Location/country where study was conducted	Vancouver, Canada			conducted	
Type of paper (e.g. review, primary study, report, best practice document)	Promary research: Investigation			Examples of extractions of data from relevant papers	
Description of target population	Developers, coordinators, and facilitators of the <u>RestAct</u> Program				
Sample size where relevant	Tpeople				
Description of intervention	ffree semi-structured; developers, coordinat	waitative interviews of seven of Bast			
	investigate the backgr			ssues in determining causal effect. were sourced through referrals, which could lead to b	
Represents	program and theoretic conducted in persons a lifer through e-mail. Through e-mail. Earth of the conduction of can help them steps and the conduction of a finishment of the conduction of the existence of the conduction of the conduction of the conduction of the conduction of the conduction of the conduction of the conduction of the existence of the conduction of the existence of the conduction of the existence of the conduction of the conduction of the conduction of the existence of the conduction of the conduction of the conduction of the existence of the conduction of the conduction of the conduction of the existence of the conduction of the conduction of the conduction of the existence of the conduction of the conduction of the conduction of the existence of the conduction of the conduction of the conduction of the existence of the conduction of the conduction of the conduction of the existence of the conduction of the conduction of the conduction of the existence of the conduction of the conducti	Critical appeals at of research methods (type of research methodology used, comment on appropriatives of type, rigor of the research]	results. Also, some participants were not resibility, which could a the results. There was a small sample is a challong the level of a vision to kelprounds of the participants gave a broader level of a vision to kelprounds of the participants value to the participants value to program, but the researcher found otherwise. Subjects were annown the maintenance and honesty. The researcher relied on the participant value and value founds and within analled in crossed from the Third analysis of the value approach and written were not introviewed. The qualitative interview approach allowed for elaboration and many different topics to be approach was necessary in whiching the efficacy of the program.		
		Limitations	This study is limited in its application to South Sherman, as it would be difficult to find mentors and set up a referral system for participants, funding would be required, which means that there must be a theori framework and governing body established, which would take time.		
		Relevance to South Sherman Neighbourhood context	Although this program would require funding and involvement of an mentors on a semi-permanent basis, it is likely not of the best appro- available, as it targets graffiti perpetrators at the root. A similar rest justice program would take longer to implement, and would have to integrated into the justice system. However, it would fully included youth perpetrators in the community and help the channeling of ore energy ("the need to be heard") into constructive community build.		

Tailored Dissemination of Results HEALTH IN THE HUBS: A Student Perspective When the state of the state of

Phase 2 Evaluation Research Questions

SWOT ANALYSIS

1. What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) Analysis of the Street Smarts←→Book Smarts initiative?



Phase 2 Evaluation Research Questions

2. ENGAGEMENT

What are partners' perceptions:

- > their personal perception,
- > community planning team's,
- University's, and
- ➤ other partners' engagement in the Street Smarts ↔ Book Smarts initiative?



Phase 2 Evaluation Research Questions

3. IMPACT

What do partners perceive to be the **impact** of this participatory, evidence-informed community development and implementation partnership initiative?



Methods



Focus Groups

- Students
- Local Planning team (LPT) members and community consultants
- Faculty

Partnership Self Assessment Tool

- Synergy
- Financial support
- Leadership
- Decision-making
- Satisfaction
- Benefits versus drawbacks

Data Collected

Dec. 2011- Jan. 2012

- Focus group participants
 - ➤9 Students (75%)
 - ▶4 Faculty (100%)
 - ▶18 Community members (56%)







Qualitative Data

SWOT PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Strengths



- Learning approaches used
 - ➤ Engagement **IN** and **WITH** the community
 - ➤ Non-traditional learning
 - ➤ Mutual learning occurred
 - ➤ Experiential learning
 - ➤ Authentic learning (real life)
- **Dissemination strategies** themselves (Pipeline walk, personalized messages to neighbours, quality of presentations, and ability to engage community in dissemination)

Strengths



- Quality of the research regarding community issues
- Positive qualities of students (youthfulness; diversity of backgrounds; fresh new and creative ideas)
- Multifaceted approach to problem-solving and movement towards solutions

Strengths



- Values and positive attitudes of all players (commitment, willingness to learn from each other, and valuing of contributions of everyone)
- Skills expertise and experience of <u>all</u> in 'teacher role' (community consultants, faculty, community developer, community members)

One student explained it this way

...the biggest surprise was the process of it all. The fact that we got to step out of the university bubble and have class downtown and work with the community and be invited to all their meetings. I think they were really accepting and they were really warm for embracing us and the whole process of it all ... That's not what you usually expect to receive from most of your other projects at the university. **The partnership of it all**.

Weaknesses



- More orientation regarding community project and course expectations needed for all players
 - ➤ Student's understanding of roles and expectations were vague
 - Community unclear about students' role in community
 - > Students needed more guidance and feedback throughout from community members
- Communication challenges between community and students and among community members

Weaknesses



- Time related challenges
 - > 3 months too short for community development project (takes long time to get a good understanding)
 - ➤ Limited time for students with faculty
 - ➤ Scheduling meetings for course and community meetings problematic
- Challenge for students to develop meaningful relationship with communities
 - ➤ Takes time; lack of exposure

Weaknesses



- Lack of human and fiscal resources to move community issues forward
 - ➤ Effort from community lacking at times
 - ➤ Lack of consistent funding for community
 - Costs for advertising/ communications with community

Action – Whose job is it?



A community member explained

It's not really fair to the students. They come up with all these ideas, they put all this work into it and then we just let it hang there for years to come. I think we need to act on it as a community group and start taking our own... taking it into our own hands to put some action and put some of those ideas to work

Valuing community experience



A student shared the following \dots

One of the things I really valued and enjoyed about this course was that it gave us the ability to step outside the McMaster University and it gave us an opportunity to connect with the greater Hamilton community. I found that so many of the people I know who go to McMaster, they go to school as just kind of one place that they stop at for four years. They stay in the Westdale McMaster bubble ... So, I found it was a really great opportunity for us, as students, to kind of give back to the community, to the city that's helped us... helping to facilitate our future lives, careers and ... and our education. So, I found that was a great opportunity.



- Career direction influenced by course
- Opportunity to experience community development rather than from lectures or texts
- Opportunities related to students' research dissemination events
 - ➤ Brought out new community members
 - >Warm community acceptance and interest

Career impact



One student explained

I felt one of the benefits was the **networking process**, especially with residents and people who work for [name of organization]. It also **inspired to me to actually go out and not be afraid to look in to visit different organizations** and possibly **apply for jobs**... I've met people in the community and some of the other residents and things like that, where I've actually been able **to talk**, **to kind of inspired me to look in different areas** and kind of select areas down to epidemiology and agriculture. That was one of the good opportunities I find in directing my career into (area of work).

Threats



- Threat of making **limited progress** in the project
 - ➤ Lack of continuity of course
 - > Results not happening quickly enough
 - > Fear of disappointing community
- Sustainability concerns
 - > Need community members to be motivated to work in next steps
 - > Fear that expectations are too high for community
 - > Fear of piecemeal funding
 - > Lack of power from grass roots initiatives
- Lack of **recognition/ obscurity** of the project
 - ➤ Need to communicate to City government to ensure link to City plans

Chall	lenge	of sus	staina	bility
011011		0. 50.	,	~



One individual explained the challenge of sustainability this way

One of the challenges is by using students in a very impressive third year course we had some excellent work turned out by some motivated students who are now done their course and they're no longer involved in the project and they're moving on. So, all of the momentum, passion, moral impetus [...] that went into all of that work is now gone and needs to be rebuilt amongst people other than people who are already involved in the Health in the Hubs project.

It's about action



One faculty member explained

So, beyond the community consultants I think there was a heightened awareness of everyone who sits at those local planning teams that, you know, this is not about study, this is about action and we want some explicit instructions that are actually going to help us in our particular goal. Actually one individual said as much:

"We've been studied already. We know what the issues are. We know our neighbourhood. **Tell us what we can do to actually make some real changes"**

Impact / Outcomes



- Impact on Neighbourhoods
 - Too soon to say if intervention is making community a better place to live, work, and raise a family
 - Intervention moved neighbourhood projects forward
 - Increased valuing of community university relationships
 - Brought people together around community issues

Impact / Outcomes



- Impact on University
 - Consistent with McMaster University President's 'Forward with Integrity' message – including promoting community engagement
 - > School of Nursing Charter at the time of this evaluation had **not yet** shared with rest of university
 - > Students engaged beyond the walls of the university
 - > Community appreciating university reaching out

University Impact



A community member explains it this way

...but one thing that I really am touched by is that McMaster university is doing a really wonderful job of reaching out into the community and... and that the students are not in isolation and living in ivory castles. They've been able to see practicalities, 'cause what you learn at university or school, wherever, is not necessarily applicable to when you get into real life and so this becomes a really great learning experience for them. But I think for we as neighbours as well.

Future Work



- Further analysis to be completed by end of June 2012
- Presentations to be shared with:
 - ➤ Local Planning Teams
 - ➤ President's Taskforce on Community Engagement
 - **≻**Conferences
 - ➤ City of Hamilton Staff
 - ≻Etc...

Ongoing Work



- Development of health promotion activities in and around the Perkins Centre
- Crown Point: Building connections with Public Health to address community safety issues.
- McQuesten: Working on Community Kitchen and discussion in community about what aspects of Food Security they want to move forward on.
- South Sherman, Crown Point and McQuesten developing capacity for joint proposal writing.

It's about...



- Using a citizen-centric approach to working with neighbourhoods
- **Building community** university relationships based on strengths and assets
- Process of learning together
- Not about meeting a need but working alongside the community to identify and build on assets.
- **Not** reliant on volunteerism- citizens & university.

It's about...



- Who has ownership of the work?
 Accompanying the community on their journey
- Building networks
- Building capacity
- This work has legs and is **ongoing**; it has set a foundation and needs to be sustainable

Questions?



- Contact re Phase I
 - ➤ Dyanne Semogas <u>semogas@mcmaster.ca</u>
 - ➤ Steven Rolfe <u>rolfe@mcmaster.ca</u>
- Contact re Phase II
 - ➤ Ruta Valaitis <u>valaitis@mcmaster.ca</u>
 - ➤Olive Wahoush <u>wahousho@mcmaster.ca</u>
 - ➤ Nancy Murray <u>nmurray@mcmaster.ca</u>