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Executive Summary

The Penn Community Scholars Program (Penn CSP) is a training program for community organizations offering skill development in community-academic research partnerships. The Penn CSP not only arms scholars with the tools necessary to expand their research capacity, but with personal connections to work alongside and along with academic institutions and funders throughout the region. Its’ rigorous curriculum (see program summary, page 5) aims to increase knowledge, attitudes and beliefs around the meaning of and the need for community-academic partnerships, and walks participants through the research process, building research skills that lead to a culminating pitch presentation (see sample pitches Appendix B).

To date, the Penn CSP has built capacity among 52 individuals from 40 organizations that serve largely minority, low-income communities in Philadelphia. At baseline, organizations come into the program with varying levels of research expertise and infrastructure. Process and impact outcomes are assessed throughout the program, and following the program to measure program satisfaction; changes in knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and self-efficacy; behavior change; and the organizations’ intent and practice of conducting research.

The following evaluation includes data primarily from cohorts 3 (2017/18) and 4 (2018/19); limited data is available for cohort 5 (2019/20) as this program was suspended in March 2020 due to COVID-19. During this time period, the Penn CSP received institutional support from the Office of the Provost at the University of Pennsylvania.

This report highlights the findings of these evaluations (see impact, page 7). Across all cohorts, participants noted strong program satisfaction, and increased knowledge, self-efficacy and positive attitudes and beliefs towards conducting research. Highlights from the evaluation include:

- 119% increase in positive attitudes toward the importance of research.
- 81% increase in participant desire to partner with an academic.
- 78% increase in participant confidence in ability to identify a problem in the community.
- 69% increase in participant trust in the research process.
- 49% increase in participant confidence in developing program goals and objectives

At an organizational level, 14 organizations have partnered outside of the Penn CSP with academics in a wide range of activities, including but not limited to: partnering on grant proposals and research activities; helping recruit study participants; and helping conduct outreach and dissemination. With additional resources, there is tremendous opportunity to build upon this network, leveraging the success of the Penn CSP, and partnering scholars with more academics, particularly those located at Penn.

Some of the richest impact evaluation can be seen by the semi-structured interviews and case testimonials presented in the report (see impact, page 9). Overall, participants are highly satisfied with the program, and several have benefitted from long term impact (1-3 years post-program) in various ways including increased community-academic partnerships, and new funding opportunities based on the skills learned and utilized after the program.
About the Penn Community Scholars Program

**Overview**
The Penn Community Scholars Program (CSP) is a training program for community organizations offering skill development in community-academic research partnerships. Designed with the intent to train community organization leaders to expand their individual and organizational level of research capacity, the Penn CSP hosts 10-12 educational sessions per year and culminates with a final symposium event at which scholars are able to present a pitch articulating their proposed research project and how they plan to accomplish their goals. The Penn CSP not only arms scholars with the tools necessary to expand their research capacity, but with personal connections to work alongside and along with academic institutions and funders throughout the region.

**History**
The Penn CSP was co-founded by Nicole Thomas (Director, Urban Health Lab), Sara Solomon (Director, Penn Injury Science Center) and Dr. Lucy Wolf Tuton, with a vision to establish a more robust infrastructure to: support community engagement; build community capacity to serve as research partners; and promote the development of equitable partnerships to address critically important health, social, behavioral, and environmental research and policy initiatives between diverse Philadelphia communities and the University of Pennsylvania. Currently, the Penn CSP is housed in the Penn Injury Science Center (PISC) with primary funding from the Office of the Vice Provost for Research at the University of Pennsylvania. To date, we have successfully mentored 5 cohorts of community-based organizations, with a total of 52 participants from 40 organizations.

**Program Goals**

- **Enhance** community capacity to develop, implement, and evaluate programs
- **Improve** community capacity to form and sustain research partnerships
- **Foster** dialogue and opportunity for collaboration between existing Penn and community initiatives
- **Serve** as a networking resource for Penn researchers and community-based organizations

"The Penn Community Scholars program is a wonderful opportunity for small community-based organizations to get the support we need to capture the attention and interest of institutions that often seem out of reach. With the help of the community scholars team, you will leave more confident in your ability to ask the right research questions, frame your problem in compelling ways, and more adequately value the contributions of your organization in the research process."

- 2017/18 Scholar, African Family Health Organization
Educational Content

The Penn CSP covers 10-12 sessions across 2 academic semesters, with education goals of:

• Understanding the meaning of and the need for community-academic partnerships
• Understanding the research process
• Research skill development
  • Conducting community needs assessment
  • Identifying community problems
  • Developing and refining research questions
  • Drafting logic models and memorandums of understanding
  • Partnering with academics
  • Navigating the IRB
• Developing and presenting a professional pitch
• Participating in a culminating symposium: “The Intersection of Community, Academia, and Grantmaking”

“The PCS Program allowed us to bring the voices of our communities and our organization to a larger platform. It allowed us to share space with other incredible individuals/organizations who are on the ground, day in and day out, fighting and advocating for safer, healthier communities. It was a beautiful experience to be part of.”

-2018/19 Scholar, Prevention Point Philadelphia

Program Highlights

• Guest lecturers include Penn Faculty such as:
  • Roy Rosin (Chief Innovation Officer, Penn Center for Healthcare Innovation)
  • Frances Barg (Professor of Family Medicine and Community Health at the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania)
  • Douglas Wiebe (Professor of Biostatistics and Epidemiology, Director of the Penn Injury Science Center, School of Medicine)
  • Joan Gluch (Associate Dean, Division Chief of Community Oral Health, Penn Dental Medicine)
  • Mark Neuman (Associate Professor, Anesthesiology and Critical Care)
  • Stephen Kimmel (Department Chair, Center for Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics)
  • Victoria Cargill (National Institutes of Health)
• Intensive coaching sessions performed individually with each scholar to prepare for the pitch presentation
• Group collaboration and networking across community organizations
• Culminating symposium featuring panelists across local, regional and national philanthropy and attracting over 125 participants.
Evaluation

Our evaluation plan is designed to assess outcomes at both the participant and the community level. They are illustrated in Table 1 and further described in detail below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Evaluation Strategy</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Satisfaction</td>
<td>Session Evaluation Survey</td>
<td>Post session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in knowledge, attitudes and beliefs, self-efficacy</td>
<td>Individual Assessment Survey</td>
<td>Pre- and Post-Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Change</td>
<td>Semi-structured qualitative interview and focus group</td>
<td>Post program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Theoretical base: Theory of Planned Behavior / Reasoned Action)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in Research Infrastructure</td>
<td>Organizational Assessment Administrative CDRD Data Review Post-CSP Survey Case Testimonials</td>
<td>Post Program 1 and 2 years Post Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Session Evaluation Survey: After each individual session throughout the course of the learning year, scholars are asked to submit a brief, 10-question evaluation. These track whether or not the program sessions met set goals and evaluate program satisfaction. Items within this evaluation include:

- What worked and did not work about the session
- If session objectives were met
- Likes/dislikes about the session and facilitators
- Plans to apply what was learned

Individual Assessment Survey: In order to measure changes in knowledge, attitudes and beliefs, self-efficacy, behavior, and program satisfaction, an individual assessment is administered to participants at the start and end of the entire program. Both surveys ask participants to indicate their levels of knowledge, confidence, and attitudes toward facets of community-based participatory research, as well as their overall satisfaction of the program. Program efficacy is measured by comparing changes from the pre and post surveys. The average difference from before and after the program from each participant is averaged from each category and presented as the average percent change by category.

Semi-structured Interview: Eleven participants in the 2017-2018 cohort completed a qualitative semi-structured interview 1-month post-program. Key focus points included a comprehensive overview of participants’ understanding of community-based work, their capacity to do research, and the associated facilitators and barriers. The analysis also explored ideas of trust in community work and research, and consolidated feedback about the strengths and challenges of the Penn CSP, the perceived benefit and impact of Penn CSP, and participants’ attitude towards community-academic partnerships. Lastly, the analysis provides recommendations for the Penn CSP moving forward.

Focus Group: In the summer of 2018, a focus group was conducted with 12 alumni (Cohorts 1-3) of the program to gather ideas to further engage Scholars as the program was completed. The group also assessed whether or not they were using skills learned in the program. Results were used internally to plan engagement activities and improve the program. The intent is to do more focus groups though with limited resources we have only been able to complete one.

Organizational Assessment: Before and after participation in the Community Scholars program, individuals fill out an evaluation survey on behalf of their organization to assess the organization’s aptitude for the research process. This is completed both before a scholar begins the program, and then again 1 and 2 years after they have completed the scholars program.

Post-CSP Survey: We conduct a survey annually with Scholars 1 and 2 years after they have completed the scholars program. The survey assesses continued evidence of research infrastructure, research activities, and community-academic partnerships.

Administrative CDRD Data Review: In order to get the most up-to-date information regarding community-academic partnerships, we reviewed administrative data from Community Driven Research Day (CDRD). CDRD is a city-wide program that encourages collaboration between researchers and community-based organizations (CBOs)/community groups that have research questions they are interested in answering. This one-day event is jointly sponsored by the following institutions: Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia, Drexel University, Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine, Temple University, Thomas Jefferson University, and the University of Pennsylvania. CDRD tracks community-
academic partnerships over-time. This data complements our tracking of community-academic partnerships from our organizational assessment, post-Penn CSP survey, and informal data gathering via individual conversations.

**Case Testimonials:** Finally, we collect testimonials via email and telephonic correspondence from Community Scholars that we have developed relationships on an ongoing basis.

**Impact**

The following displays evaluation impact primarily from cohorts 3 and 4, 2017-2019. Cohorts 1 and 2 are not included in the current funding cycle and were more formative, pilot years. Cohort 5 was suspended in March 2020 due to COVID-19. Of note, Scholars who completed programming up to March 2020 will be invited to pitch their ideas and graduate from the program in Spring 2021, and we will receive post-program data at that time.

**Participation**

The Penn CSP has helped strengthen the research skills and knowledge of 52 individuals representing 40 different community organizations (Table 2). Overall, organizations have varied by mission and communities served (Appendix A). The majority of organizations serve minority populations living at or below the poverty level across various racial and ethnic groups representative of Philadelphia.

As shown in Appendix B, pitch presentations / organizational focus also has varied. Beginning in Cohort 4 at least half of the organizations focused broadly on an area in injury science, including but not limited to the opioid crisis, suicide, domestic violence, and elderly falls. This shift in content focus was due to the shift of the program to the Injury Science Center.

**Changes in Knowledge, Self-Efficacy, Attitudes and Intentions to Conduct Research**

**Changes in Knowledge:** Figure 1 displays changes in knowledge from Cohorts 2 and 4 from pre- to post-program. For each cohort, knowledge increased from pre- to post-program assessment in every topic area. The largest increases were seen in conducting needs assessments (48% increase), formulating research questions (45% increase), asset mapping (35% increase), and navigating the IRB (34% increase).

**Change in Self-Efficacy/Confidence:** Figure 2 shows changes in self-efficacy by skill and topic area. Questions examined
how confident each participant was in their abilities to conduct community-based participatory research (CBPR), including taking the lead in the research process, partnering with academics, developing goals, and creating a pitch to present their programs and organization.

As illustrated we saw the largest increase in participant self-report scores of confidence levels in the domains of identifying a problem in the community (78% increase), developing goals and objectives (49% increase), partnering with an academic (47% increase), and developing a pitch (45% increase).

**Change in Attitudes and Intentions**: One goal of the program was to build trust among organizations to participate in research and partner with academics, recognizing a history tainted by academic researchers not having the community members’ best interest in mind. In addition, community members and organization leaders may often think of researchers as unapproachable and/or consider the research process as too complex.

As illustrated in Figure 3, based on analysis of our most recent two cohorts, 2017-2018 and 2018-2019, we saw the largest increase in participant self-report scores of changes in attitudes in the domains of the importance of research (119% increase), the desire to partner with an academic (81% increase), and trust in the research process (69% increase).

**Prominent Themes from Qualitative Semi-Structured Interviews**

**Analysis of Semi-structured Interviews**: Overall, participants enjoyed participating in the Penn CSP. Scholars stated they benefited from the program by developing strong interpersonal and research skills, and expanding their knowledge about research methods. Participants felt they gained knowledge of research culture and ability to communicate with people in academic institutions to forge strong research partnerships. In addition, the Penn CSP served as a networking and coalition-building opportunity for representatives of diverse community organizations to interact. Several prominent themes emerged - a few are detailed below. A full report of all themes is available.
Community Engagement & Research: Many participants described research as beneficial for the community, with a few noting that research conducted by outside parties could be exploitative. For their own work and organizations, participants perceived research as a tool that could be utilized for grant applications, to improve their organization’s programs, or to strengthen connections with the community. Overall, participants spoke of community engagement as enhancing the research process as it revealed more issues and problems in the community that a researcher may not have been aware.

Research Ethics and Trust: Participants emphasized the need for ethical transparency in research objectives and practices, from obtaining informed consent to sharing data and results with the community. They noted power dynamics favored the researcher, and therefore discussed the importance of actively working to build rapport with the community.

“[Research] could give [community members] a better understanding of what they’re actually dealing with or what type of problems are in the communities as far as peoples’ health, education, crime, all that comes about in that research, they will see all that. Some people in the community feel totally trapped, don’t know which way to go” More information would help the community in the long term.”

Community-Academic Partnerships: Overall, participants stated they felt positively towards the prospect of community-academic partnerships to conduct research and community-based projects, citing great potential and mutual benefit, as well as access to crucial expertise, technical know-how, and funding. However, a few participants described reservations concerning mistrust, unfairness, and hidden agendas when engaging with an academic partner. Specifically, these participants referenced a historical legacy of exploitation of marginalized communities and past negative experiences working with academic medical institutions. Following their participation in CSP, those participants expressed new optimism about community-academic partnerships moving forward, provided responsibilities were clearly outlined and agendas were transparent.

“As long as [academic institutions are] straight up and open about what we doing and there’s no, what we would say, hidden agendas and everything that –there has to be clarity –as long as there’s clarity, I’m willing to work with anyone. I just need clarity.”

Feedback on Penn CSP Program: Participants broadly felt positively towards the level of attention and support they received from the internal CSP team. They noted the team’s open-door-policy and genuine interest in the scholars facilitated their success in the research project and pitch competition. The participants liked the open, discussion-based format of the classes. Participants endorsed the logistical features of the program, including time of sessions, location, and room selection. Participants found the comprehensive overview of conducting research, from planning and IRB approval to execution, valuable. Despite familiarity with data collection, participants cited struggling with the later steps of research, including data analysis, creating a deliverable, and managing relationships with funders.

“I think that the Community Scholars Program was really tremendously helpful in that way, to see how partnering with academic institutions at the community level can be really, really beneficial. It was like a crash course in a way; I would like to get more of a comprehensive knowledge base about that and about really how a proposal gets to a potential investigator or funder and then where it winds up in the timeline of that and those types of things.”
Organizational Level Outcomes: Community-Academic Partnerships

At the organizational level, we assessed changes in research infrastructure and increases in academic partnerships. The following results are cumulative from Cohorts 1 through 5. Note, we included Cohort 5 in this review, of whom completed five months of the program.

Overall, the majority (80%) of organizations are interested in partnering in research - as indicated in Appendix A, 32 of the 40 organizations. In addition, as shown in Figure 4, and based on available data, 15 organizations (38%) have formed community-academic partnerships on a continuum of activities, including: recruiting study participants, serving as data collection sites; helping conduct outreach and dissemination of study results; informing outreach procedures, and participating in research activities, including serving as a Co-investigator on a grant.

A large majority of community scholars expressed a desire to partner with an academic at Penn and have continued to communicate with the program administrators to express their interest. However, with limited infrastructure and resources, facilitating the formation of mutually beneficial partnerships has been challenging. This gap in infrastructure has led to a number of missed opportunities to connect these trained community members with Penn researchers and their seeking partnerships with researchers at other local academic institutions.

Figure 4: Community-Academic Partnerships post-CSP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description of Activities with Academic Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A & W Community Solutions | • Helped with recruitment for focus groups with PISC International Scholar, Dave Humphrey, on community violence in West Philadelphia.  
• Recently included as part of a hub-and-spoke community model on a NIH research application with PIs Douglas Wiebe and Ronald Collman.  
• Member of PISC Community Action Board; participates in monthly meetings to inform and collaborate on Injury Science community-engaged research and outreach.  
• Matched with PISC Scholar Ruth Abaya. |
| African Family Health Organization | • Matched with the Penn MPH program as a fieldwork site. |
| Blessings Inc. | • Matched with the Penn MPH program as a fieldwork site. |
| Jarell Christopher Seay Love and Laughter Foundation | • Served as a contracted community research site for a National Institute of Justice study on youth violence (PI: Wiebe).  
• Partnered with the Penn MPH program as a fieldwork site. |
| Lutheran Settlement House (case testimonial 1) | • Received two CDRD pilot funding awards serving as Co-Investigator with former Penn Faculty Melissa Dichter and SOM Faculty Ashlee Murray, and faculty from Jefferson University.  
• From pilot funding and pitch presentation, has received approximately $350,000 in additional funding from CHOP and private donors to support the initiative. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Collaborations and Funding Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mt. Zion Baptist Church                           | • Matched with the Dental School (Joan Gluch) for onsite dental services.  
  • Partnered with the SON on a project to build community health programming. |
| No More Secrets Mind Body Spirit Inc. (case testimonial 2) | • Received CDRD pilot funding serving as Co-Investigator with faculty from Jefferson University.  
  • Matched with Bridging the Gaps Program as a partnering organization. |
| Pennsylvania Horticultural Society                | • Applied for funding as Co-Investigator with Douglas Wiebe to the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (not funded).  
  • Longstanding academic partner with UHL on NIH funded greening project (PIs Charlie Branas and Eugenia South). |
| Prevention Point Philadelphia                     | • Recently included as part of a hub-and-spoke community model on a NIH research application with PIs Douglas Wiebe and Ronald Collman on addressing disparities in COVID-19 (not funded). |
| Promise Zone Research Connection                  | • Received CDRD pilot funding serving as Co-Investigator with faculty from Drexel University.  
  • Member of PISC Community Action Board; participates in monthly meetings to inform and collaborate on Injury Science community-engaged research and outreach. |
| Schuylkill Center for Environmental Education     | • Received substantial subsequent funding from pitch presentation in partnership with CHOP and Penn, Nature PHL (formerly called Nature RX). |
| Share Food Program                                | • Recently included as part of a hub-and-spoke community model on a NIH research application (not funded) addressing disparities in COVID-19. |
| Sisters R Us Circle of Survivors                  | • Received CDRD pilot funding serving as Co-Investigator with faculty from Jefferson University, and subsequent funding from Jefferson University, Office of the Provost. |
| Southwest CDC                                     | • Matched with MPH Student for capstone project. |
| West Philadelphia YMCA                            | • Received CDRD pilot funding as Co-Investigator with academic partner Rachel Meyers of the CHOP Violence Intervention Program (VIP).  
  • Recently included as part of a hub-and-spoke community model on a NIH research application (not funded) addressing disparities in COVID-19. |
Vashti and Marcella of the Lutheran Settlement House (LSH) were part of the first cohort of the Penn CSP in 2015/2016. LSH is a long-standing social service organization in Philadelphia dedicated to serving marginalized children, adults, and families through an integrated program of social, educational, and advocacy services.

When Vashti and Marcella started the program, their “STOP IPV” program was in its infancy. STOP IPV addresses intimate partner violence (IPV) and teen dating violence, while also considering the impact of child abuse and community violence on individuals and families. STOP IPV was created to institute routine IPV screening in hospital settings.

Upon starting the program, STOP IPV had gained little traction across multiple hospital settings. They were still in their pilot phase of the project, which made it ripe for the Penn CSP. Using pilot data and patient testimonials, Vashti and Marcella created a research question, logic model and comprehensive pitch that they presented at the Penn CSP culminating symposium.

As stated by Vashti and Marcella following the program, “As a community-based agency ...we have historically struggled to develop meaningful and truly collaborative relationships with research partners because we weren’t able to "speak the language" of academics and researchers. We are currently using our new research knowledge gained from the Community Scholars Training Program to pitch several research projects within various academic institutions in Philadelphia, including Temple and Penn. In fact, we used our pitch in a meeting with one of our hospital partners and were able to obtain direct funding in the exact amount we were seeking for the first time in nearly 10 years!”

Now, four years later, STOP IPV is being instituted as a national model and is currently maintained at CHOP, Einstein Medical Center and Jefferson Frankford Hospital through LSH. With strong academic partnerships, they have evaluated the impact of the program and now serve as a replicable model for incorporating IPV education and screening into hospital settings.
Case Testimonial 2

**Name of Organization:** No More Secrets: Mind, Body, Spirit, Inc.

**Cohort Year:** 2018-2019

**Scholar:** Lynette Medley

Lynette Medley founded No More Secrets: Mind, Body, Spirit, Inc. in 2012 to provide a platform for people of all ages to engage in conversations and address challenges surrounding human sexual development and sexual awareness. Lynette’s work through No More Secrets MBS covers a widespread variety of topics and services: engaging community conversations about health and wellness, expanding religious ministries to include relationship needs, educating schools or collegiate sororities and fraternities on sexual health and violence, and hosting couples coaching, group sessions, and mentoring programs.

With a host of different interests and programs offered, Lynette came to the Penn CSP in the fall of 2018 unsure of exactly where she wanted to focus her research and advocacy talents. While completing the training, she decided to center her pitch on a topic often considered ‘taboo’ and entirely under-addressed as an issue: period poverty. Lynette noticed that period poverty – defined as a lack of access to sanitary products like pads and tampons and menstrual hygiene education – was affecting not only young women in foreign countries, but young women “right in our own backyards” in Philadelphia.

Lynette delivered a moving and powerful pitch on period poverty and was chosen unanimously as the winner of the 2019 Penn CSP Symposium. One panelist, after hearing Lynette’s presentation, aptly stated, “I think we are sitting in front of a rising star,” and Lynette has proven to be exactly that.

Since completing the program in May 2019, Lynette has moved quickly to become a leading figure in Philadelphia’s fight against period poverty and stigma. No More Secrets MBS currently collects menstrual products and monetary donations on an ongoing basis to deliver sanitary napkins, tampons, wipes, soap, and disposable underwear to families in need. She has assisted hundreds of families in Philadelphia by providing essential products in order for girls to feel comfortable and safe throughout their cycles, and aided in ensuring these young ladies need not miss essential days of attending school.

In addition to her work on the ground, Lynette has fiercely advocated for policy changes as well. On May 28th, 2019, Philadelphia Councilwoman Cherelle L. Parker presented Lynette with Resolution 190480, recognizing that date as Menstrual Hygiene Day and honoring No More Secrets MBS. She presented at the House Democratic Policy Committee Hearing on the topic of Comprehensive Sex Education at Thomas Jefferson University on October 17th, 2019. Lynette most recently rallied outside Capitol Hill with a group of men and women on October 19th, 2019 for the country’s first National Period Day.
Future Steps

Moving forward, the Penn CSP will continue programming virtually with a new cohort of 8 organizations, and will invite Cohort 5 to resume participation for the culminating symposium and graduation of the program.

We are actively seeking funding to build off of the success of the Penn CSP to create an infrastructure at Penn to facilitate authentic community-academic partnerships in an easy, meaningful, and productive way with the following aims:

**Aim 1: Expand the network of trained Community Scholars, to increase community capacity to partner in research with Penn investigators.** We will continue to build a cadre of community scientists through the Penn CSP. Our established curriculum is comprehensive and includes skill development, coaching, and a culminating symposium. This year, we have started to run sessions virtually with 8 organizations focused on social justice, health equity, and access.

**Aim 2: Develop an institutionalized model available to all schools and centers at the University of Pennsylvania that serves as a “go to” hub for equitable and sustainable bi-directional research partnerships.** Ultimately, we envision REACH will improve Penn’s ability to: respond to the increasing number of funding requests that require authentic community partnerships; improve relationships with community members; and expand the ability of Penn researchers and their collaborating community partners to promote health equity through high impact research.

**Aim 3: Implement and evaluate the acceptability and fidelity in the model proposed in Aim 2.** We will pilot implementation of REACH in year 2, and evaluate and improve upon it using implementation science methods for full implementation in year 3. We will measure impact through the number of new faculty-community engagements, new proposals submitted with community partners, as well as through interviews with both faculty and collaborating community members.
Appendix A: List of Organizations*
(*indicates interest in partnering with Penn researcher)

### 2015-2019 (Cohorts 1-4)
- A & W Community Solutions*
- African Family Health Organization*
- Al Bustan Seeds of Culture
- Alzheimer’s Association - Delaware Valley Chapter*
- American Heart Association*
- Asociación Puertorriqueños en Marcha (APM)*
- ARTZ Philadelphia*
- Belmont Alliance Civic Association*
- Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia
- Blessings Inc.*
- Coalition of African Communities*
- Delaware Valley Fairness Project
- Five Loaves & Two Fish Unlimited - Hero, Inc.*
- Habitat’s Home Repair (Habitat for Humanity)*
- Intercultural Family Services
- Jarell Christopher Seay Love and Laughter Foundation*
- Lutheran Settlement House*
- Mt. Zion Baptist Church*
- Nationalities Service Center*
- No More Secrets Mind Body Spirit Inc.*
- Oromo Community Organization of Pennsylvania
- Pennsylvania Horticultural Society*
- Philadelphia Department of Behavioral Health and Intellectual Disability Services*
- Prevention Point Philadelphia*
- Promise Zone Research Connection*
- Sayre Health Center*
- Schuykill Center for Environmental Education*
- Sisters R Us Circle of Survivors*
- Southwest Community Development Corporation*
- theVillage

### 2019/20 (Cohort 5)*
- American Foundation for Suicide Prevention Philadelphia
- Minding Your Mind*
- Muslims for Humanity (M4H) Community Development Corporation*
- Philadelphia Anti-Drug / Anti-Violence Network (PAAN)*
- West Philadelphia YMCA*
- Multicultural Community Family Services*
- Share Food Program*
- Pennsylvania Harm Reduction Coalition
- Menergy LLC*
- Monumental Baptist Church Community Development Corporation*

*This cohort stopped programming in March 2020 due to COVID-19. Those who completed the program up to that date will be invited to make their final presentations and graduate from the program in April 2021.
## Appendix B: Pitch Presentations

### 2017-2018 Cohort 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pitch Presentation Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask the Doc Program: Increasing Engagement, Access and Positive Health Outcomes for Sayre High School Students</td>
<td>Sayre Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreasing Infant/Toddler Irritant Dermatitis</td>
<td>Belmont Alliance Civic Association / Promise Zone Research Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Philadelphia’s First</td>
<td>Promise Zone Research Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Project: A Community Surveillance System to Increase Public Safety and Safety Perception in West Philadelphia</td>
<td>A &amp; W Community Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educating, Empowering and Equipping Philly Youth to Graduate College Debt-free through a Student-Led Catering Business</td>
<td>Five Loaves and Two Fish Unlimited – Hero, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Barriers, Creating Awareness and Accessing Social Services for the Oromo Community in Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Oromo Community Organization of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribing Healthy Housing: Addressing Unsafe and Unhealthy Housing Conditions through Integrated Partnerships between the Health and Housing Repair Sectors</td>
<td>Coalition of African Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gap in the System of the Children Impacted by the Opioid Epidemic</td>
<td>Department of Behavioral Health and Intellectual Disability Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Promotoras as an Outreach/Education Tool for Alzheimer’s Disease Among the Latino Community</td>
<td>Alzheimer’s Association, Delaware Valley Chapter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2018-2019 Cohort 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pitch Presentation Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A New Approach: Rapid Warm Hand Off Response Team</td>
<td>Prevention Point Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment through Engagement: African Americans as Partners in Clinical Trials</td>
<td>Sisters R Us Circle of Survivors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire: Integrating Occupational Therapy and Case Management with Refugee and Immigrant Populations</td>
<td>Nationalities Service Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids-Choice Pantries: Tackling Food Insecurity to Improve Education</td>
<td>Delaware Valley Fairness Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter? Not in Southwest</td>
<td>Southwest CDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seay It Loud! Live, Be, and Stay Safe</td>
<td>The Jarell Christopher Seay Love and Laughter Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Literacy and Justice For All: Building a Better Tomorrow for Hunting Park Using Family Literacy</td>
<td>Lenfest Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>