

Podcast Interview Transcript

Maryann Mason, Darby Morhardt, Ben Rucker, Monique Reed, Gina Curry, Jen Brown, Bill Haley, and Elmer Freeman

In each volume of the *Journal*, the editors select one article for our Beyond the Manuscript post-study interview with the authors. Beyond the Manuscript provides the authors the opportunity to tell listeners what they would want to know about the project beyond what went into the final manuscript. The associate editors who handled the articles conduct our Beyond the Manuscript interviews. This edition of Beyond the Manuscript features Maryann Mason, Darby Morhardt, Ben Rucker, Monique Reed, Gina Curry, Jen Brown and Bill Haley, authors of “I Know What CBPR Is, Now What Do I do? . . .” Community Perspectives on CBPR Capacity Building, and special issue Guest Editor Elmer Freeman.

Elmer Freeman:

Hello. My name is Elmer Freeman, and I recently served as one of the group of associate editors for a special issue of the journal, *Progress in Community Health Partnerships*. On behalf of the guest editors, let me say we are really excited about the theme of the issue, which is “Maximizing Community Contributions, Benefits, and Outcomes in Clinical and Translational Research.” I’m also excited about the collection of articles that emanate from organizational leaders and members of the communities engaged in clinical public health and community engaged research through the NIH Clinical and Translational Science Awards program, fondly referred to as the CTSA.

One of the articles assigned to me for review, entitled, “I Know What CBPR Is. Now What Do I do?” Community perspectives on CBPR and capacity-building” was selected for this special podcast to absolutely take us beyond the manuscript. We are fortunate today to have joining us our first author, Dr. Maryann Mason, assistant research professor at Feinberg School of Medicine at Northwestern University, along with several of her coauthors, which include community partner organizations and individuals, as well as other researchers from Northwestern University. Could each of you briefly introduce yourself to our audience and also tell us about your role in the project?

Maryann Mason:

This is Maryann Mason. I was the lead author on the manuscript working with the team, which included community organization representatives and academic members.

Darby Morhardt:

I’m Darby Morhardt. I’m with the Cognitive Neurology and Alzheimer’s Disease Center at Northwestern. I am a faculty member of the ARCC Steering Committee and a member of the evaluation workgroup.

Ben Rucker:

My name is Ben Rucker. I am the interim executive director at the Chinese Mutual Aid Association. I am the community co-chair of the ARCC Steering Committee and a coauthor.

- Monique Reed: Hi. I'm Monique Reed. I am a member of the Health Advisory Board at the Westside Health Authority, and we are a Steering Committee member for ARCC.
- Gina Curry: Hi. I am Gina Curry. I am the community-campus coordinator, part of the ARCC staff at Northwestern University.
- Jen Brown: I'm Jen Brown. I'm director of ARCC, which is the Alliance for Research in Chicagoland Communities.
- Bill Healey: I'm Bill Healey. I'm the faculty member in the Department of Physical Therapy and Human Movement Science at Northwestern University and the academic co-chair of ARCC.
- Elmer Freeman: Dr. Mason, I turn to you to ask you to introduce us to the Northwestern University Alliance for Research in Chicagoland Communities as the impetus for the manuscript that you and your colleagues submitted.
- Maryann Mason: I'm going to turn that over to Jen Brown who is the director of ARCC to speak on that.
- Jen Brown: I'm Jen Brown, director of the Alliance for Research in Chicagoland Communities. We're based at Northwestern University. We're part of the Center for Community Health, and we sit inside the Institute for Public Health and Medicine, and also we bridge community engagement services with Northwestern University's Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute. ARCC started in 2008. We were one of the first institutional infrastructure pieces at the university that actually was focused on community academic collaboration. We have a mission to promote and support community-engaged research collaborations between Northwestern University and community and faith-based organizations throughout the Chicagoland area.
- Everything we do is guided by a steering committee. I'm happy to say that some of our members are on the line today to talk. It's made up of 11 community and faith-based organizations, Chicago Department of Public Health, Chicago Public Schools, and then seven community-engaged faculty members here at Northwestern from a variety of disciplines. In general, to accomplish our mission, we have been focusing on five different areas that will probably come up during the call. But just briefly, the first one is participatory governance, which of course includes having a very active steering committee, partnership building, capacity building, fiscal support, and then also working on institutional support.
- As I mentioned, we began over five years ago so things have certainly changed in terms of what we have needed to do related to capacity building from when we were first building awareness of this approach to research, of this approach to bidirectional engagement and what kind of capacity building, both for academic partners or public agency partners, to where we are now with some awareness having been built in partnerships and of what kind of capacity is necessary to really take care of the small plants that are growing from the seeds. I look forward to hearing more about that throughout the call.
- Elmer Freeman: I have to say that the title of your manuscript immediately attracted me. My first question is actually about attribution. Who owns it? The statement: "I know what CBPR is. Now what do I do?" If it's not an individual, if it's a sentiment of the steering committee members or community members, I'd like to hear that as well.

- Maryann Mason: That statement actually comes out of our data analysis. It's really a representative sort of conglomeration of the different themes that appeared in our interview data throughout the project. So it's not one person saying it, but kind of the actual theme and feel that emerged during the analysis.
- Elmer Freeman: So can you tell me what the people stated, or what they meant? Were there any expansions on just the statement or give me some ideas and statements that were grouped into this theme?
- Maryann Mason: This actually relates to one of the barriers we identified through our analysis where the people we spoke to and collected data from indicated that they had a very solid, general idea of what CBPR was and the principles behind it, the equity and the co-learning and the sharing and all decision-making. But that's what they really lacked and were thirsty for, if you will, the details of how to implement a project that embodied those goals and principles. So that statement really reflects the idea that I think ARCC has done a great job of bringing everybody up to speed around the ideas and principles of CBPR. One of our next and ongoing challenges is how to make the implementation of those principles and ideals in research partnerships work and how to model that for those who are emerging in that area.
- Elmer Freeman: As you know, CBPR is a very specific approach to conducting research, it's been identified as having greater credibility and acceptance in working with communities of color, underserved populations and the like. You actually provided background that stated it's particularly relevant for research that's focused on health disparities. I'm based in Boston, the land of the R01s, and we speak more about the principles of CBPR as opposed to the model itself. If you will engage in research, clinical trials, whether it's clinical research or public health interventions research, I think it's more about the principle and how they are applied than actually the approach itself. I'm glad to hear the response to that question.
- So with that being said, I would like for you to focus a bit—on the ARCC itself. As a partnership, what is its participatory governance model? Describe the representation, relationships, infrastructure, power dynamics that exist at the steering committee or between the university and the communities.
- Darby Morhardt: I want to start out by just making a statement that ARCC really represents or sets an example, as I've been thinking about this, an example for all of the CBO, the community-based organizations, and the academics at the table for how they can work in community because it really is a mirror or a parallel process, if you will, of what that partnership really should look like in conducting research in the community. Everyone is an equal member at the table. This is not about Northwestern coming in to the community with an agenda, and it's about engaging with the community in as equitable level as possible. Our steering committee has changed over time based on our needs and input from both the community-based organizations and ARCC staff and faculty. It initially began, as Jen said, in 2008 with primarily community-based organizations and then more academic partners were added.

Darby Morhardt:

In fact, I was faculty member that was added in the second wave when Jen approached me after hearing about my work with the limited English proficiency older adult community. I really was engaged in CBPR but I really wasn't using that language, but it is the values that I bring to my work and research as a social worker. So I was thrilled when I was invited to apply for a faculty position on the steering committee. As Jen has indicated, we have seven faculty members and 11 community-based organizations at this time.

We also developed a leadership structure for the steering committee. It was initially led by ARCC staff and then evolved into community and academic co-chairs. We have both community and academic co-chairs on this call today with Ben and Bill. Those members are voted upon by the entire group.

We also defined our example of participatory governance. It means that we include and have included over the years input from a broader group of stakeholders, not just those on the steering committee. There are other faculty doing community-based participatory research, not only at Northwestern, but within the larger Chicagoland community, and then also, other community-based organizations who are interested in working in this area. We have held three town hall forums where everyone is brought together to learn more about how to conduct CBPR in their academic and community settings. That's also been the seed for the development of additional partnerships.

Elmer Freeman:

Does anybody have anything they want to add, particularly from the community perspective?

Ben Rucker:

I would concur with everything that Darby said. From a community perspective, I do feel like an equal at the table and feel our voice is heard and given equal weight.

Bill Healey:

The other part of the steering committee that one of the structural piece is workgroups. It's fortunate that Ben, myself, Darby, and Maryann were all part of an evaluation workgroup, which in my mind has opened up all sorts of opportunities to evaluate the success of ARCC to look at dissemination and to participate in this podcast and the manuscript that was submitted. So I think in addition to the steering committee responsibilities, the workgroups also provide additional responsibilities for me as an academic and for the community to participate.

Elmer Freeman:

You said the evaluation workgroup. Are there any others?

Bill Healey:

Yes. There's an institutional change workgroup, and Jen—let's see. I think it's institutional—

Jen Brown:

We've had some of them come and go too. We've had a communications workgroup. We've had a workgroup that particularly focuses on issues related to membership. Another piece of the steering committee is we've been around for five years but also nobody has left the steering committee. All members want to keep their positions, so the steering committee recently talked about and brokered a process for we're going to be over a period of time transitioning on some new members and transitioning some members who have been on for a long time into a different type of involvement. Groups that will focus on the more ad hoc issues that come up.

One thing I wanted to add about the steering committee is that—and some people, just to clarify if it didn't come up before—the steering committee doesn't provide guidance to a specific research project. It's providing guidance and direction and vision for the kind of

Jen Brown:

infrastructure activities that we provide to over 30 different groups, the kind of support we provide to a broader group of partnerships, many partnerships. So it's not focusing on issues related to methodology of this or dissemination idea for this. It really requires the members to take off the hat of what am I doing in my specific own scholarship, community-engaged scholarship, and how do I think about what ARCC could do to serve academics like me or academics not like me that have a different approach or communities that I don't currently serve in or represent? How do I have a broader perspective? That really calls for the members and they over and over again do this to be very reflective and to step back.

It's interesting, Elmer, what you brought up earlier because we, just a few steering committee meetings ago, had a conversation about what's the difference between the terms like CBPR, community-based participatory research, community-engaged research versus talking about principles? How can we get people to no matter what they call it really be focused on what they do, because you could say you're doing CBPR but not be encompassing that? So it's a place that because people have been involved for years and have been able to step back and have this type of reflection, they can have some of these deeper philosophical what are the boundaries of the current field and where are we pushing it in the future to go?

Elmer Freeman:

Actually, that's a good segue to a question that I had relative to the workgroup. In my experience with the CTSA, it's always been focused on building capacity within the communities to do and engage in research partnerships of this nature. Never have I heard about a workgroup looking at institutional change. Can you talk a little bit about that?

Jen Brown:

The types of things that that group has focused on. One is it's been looking at how do we build awareness and support of institutional leadership here within Northwestern University but also more broadly within the city? How do our public agencies consider community academic partnerships in terms of their own policies or city or county policies or state policies that get passed? But the group has focused on things like ARCC has developed and now twice awarded a community-engaged research partnership award, which has been given by our associate dean for research at the medical school to just raise awareness and acknowledge partnership work.

Also, that committee has focused on things like ensuring that community and engaged academic partners are involved in faculty interviews for faculty that are coming that may be doing engaged research. ARCC now has a standing opportunity that any faculty that's brought in they have to have an interview with ARCC, both community and academic partners. We can provide our input into that faculty-hiring process. The group has also helped the steering committee to submit letters when the medical school and the entire university have done strategic planning processes, things like that. It has also worked with the Institutional Review Board to develop and implement human subject certification training that's more cultural and community relevant. Those are the types of things that that group has been involved with.

And recently, the group has talked about changing its name to Institutional Support versus Institutional Change so that we can be kind of embracing the positive and also rewarding changes that happen and not focused just on things have to change. What are the ways that the institution is supporting this work or can support this work?

Gina Curry:

I wanted to chime in on that. Another really great thing that the institutional change workgroup worked on is we developed a video that our department director took around to other colleagues throughout the university. Because that's another thing that the institutional change workgroup worked on, is to have these bigger heads of the departments to come to our steering committee meetings and meet with us periodically because before then that had never been done. Because they sometimes need to see things, we can send reports and they can see data and things on paper. But sometimes they need to come and sit with community members in a community venue, community organization outside of the walls of the university to understand and get a grasp on the different things that we're doing and the impact that we're making within the communities.

One of the things that came out of that was developing this great video because the director at that time said, you know, this can't be captured on paper. This is something that people need to see. The video was a great marketing tool that helped others to understand, people that are not familiar with CBPR and community engagement to understand better the kind of work that we're doing.

Elmer Freeman:

I now want to turn to the community-based organization representatives and actually talk about the Partnership for Empowering research by Chicago Communities about Health (PERCH). In my understanding, this was an externally funded initiative that lasted about 18 months that provided resources to participating community-based organizations. Can you all describe the benefits of the approach to your organization?

Ben Rucker:

There were two phases to that, which came under two proposals that we wrote and received awards for from the Chicago Community Trust. Under the first phase, and that was right after I started in 2008, the benefit to me personally as well as to our community and our agency have been manifold. I have developed my own personal capacity in so many ways regarding community-engaged research. Our agency has gone from basically just being excited about being asked to participate in a study by the Urban Institute or someone else with a recognizable name to being more aware about what we should be looking for and that we actually need to be gatekeepers for our community and representing our community and asking how our community is going to benefit from participating in a research project.

Even beyond that, approaching through ARCC, another wonderful aspect of ARCC is that it's a matchmaking service or a brokerage house where if you have a specific research need or problem that you would like to do a research project on, you can go to them and ask if they have a relationship or they know someone who knows someone who might be interested in solving that problem too from the academic side. So we benefited in more ways than I could even describe in the time that we have, but it's been great.

Elmer Freeman:

Monique, do you want to add anything?

Monique Reed:

We had a different type of benefit from our partnership. Historically at Westside Health Authority, we didn't readily engage in research because many investigators that we saw coming to the community, we felt—and it may not have been so—they were coming to the community as research subjects and not as equal participants from our initial conversations with them.

Monique Reed:

Our founder, Jacqueline Reed, has strong beliefs in the mission of Westside Health Authority organization, which the mission is to build the capacity of citizens on the west side of Chicago. So community as subject participants didn't really meet with our mission.

So when we did engage, we did so in early 2000. We found researchers who were utilizing tenets of CBPR before we knew CBPR to be popular. So the PERCH and ARCC relationships helped us to find a community of people, likeminded people that helped us to identify a language and also tools that we hadn't thought of like memorandums of understanding. So it helped us to kind of frame how we knew we wanted to engage in research in this area of CBPR.

Elmer Freeman:

Great.

Gina Curry:

As Ben alluded to earlier, there were two parts of the PERCH, and the second part engaged six community-based organizations that were outside of the ARCC steering committee. Some of the things that they've indicated that they benefited from were like, for example, one of the groups they hired a research assistant to focus primarily on research, which they had never done before until they participated in the PERCH cohort.

Also, they have a coalition of 12 additional community-based organizations that they share information with them. So then, from that one community organization, now they've reached out to their network of 12 additional community-based organizations, and they share the tools and the templates; things like research inquiry, screening tools, and different research policies. So that one organization branched off to their 12 people in their coalition, so that's 12 additional organizations that have a lot of the same information and a lot of the information obtained through the different workshops that were provided and the peer mentoring that went on with this PERCH 2 project.

And they were very reflective around this idea of making sure that more than just one person or one department of an organization knew about community engagement and CBPR but to weave it throughout the organization and having a portion of their all-staff meetings to talk about CBPR and the project. So it's not just one person's assignment, but that it's every department in the organization knew something and had something relevant with the CBPR or the community-engaged research that they were doing and just expanded it throughout the organization in that way.

Jen Brown:

Thanks, Gina, for sharing that. I just want to add one additional unintended consequence that came out of that project of working to really build the network of community and faith-based organizations in Chicago that have this strong capacity. Another goal of the project funded through the Trust was to build the community of organizations that could be a network for each other. Elmer, just like you're a part of that network at the national level, can we provide that here in Chicago? Once those six organizations participated, we didn't want it to be like that program is done; the funding is over; it's done. We tried to keep in contact, invite them to all our events, but also at a quarterly basis to come and meet with the full steering committee.

Jen Brown:

Now that the steering committee is bringing on members, actually three out of the six community organizations that participated in this second phase of the PERCH project have submitted letters of interest or have been invited to and have then submitted letters of interest to join the steering committee. So it's an exciting way of strengthening those relationships.

Elmer Freeman:

Since you referred to my being active on a national level, let me throw out something that's come and emanating from not the formal research we've done but the feedback we get from our national community partner forums. One of which is that everything that's out there in the literature makes CBPR, community-engaged research, whatever you choose to call it, sound really easy.

So my question is that you note in your manuscript that the team's discussion or points of agreement/disagreement around the emerging theme of "partnership and equality" was initially identified as a subtheme embedded in a larger theme of "lack of specifics for doing CBPR". Then the after noting by the community partners, Monique and Ben, that they felt it was an independent theme in the research and as Maryann and Darby became convinced, they agreed to make it a standalone theme. Can you discuss the differences in your perspective and how you came to reconcile them?

Monique Reed:

Gina mentioned earlier that one of the community organizations went out and got a research assistant and now includes research as an activity during staff meetings. So that is a way to incorporate research into the organization. However, as a community-based organization, you still have the day-to-day activities of providing opportunities or services for the community that you're engaged in. So not only are you doing your day-to-day activities but now, in order to be an equal part of the research process where you can identify the research problem, interpret the problem, disseminate the information, in order to feel like an equal, you have to be able to speak their language, the scientific language that is provided in the literature or in literature reviews.

It's almost like learning a second language if you haven't been privy to that information before. So not only are you doing the initial, your day-to-days, but you're doing that. So that's just in itself, and identifying the funding or the resources to have people on your team that can help you to either interpret the information or to identify people that have the knowledge and the background to interpret that information. That's difficult. Coming to the meetings, the ARCC meetings, and when we say that we're going to be equal, we're equal, but that means that we're there, so we're not in the community we are engaged and on this project. So that's taking time away. You really have to decide: Is the cost of taking time away worth the benefit? So that's something that we really had to work through on all of our levels from our CEO to our managers. People have to buy into it. How is this really going to benefit me? And that's a process, but we felt and we feel that it's worth it.

Elmer Freeman:

Ben, do you have anything to add?

Ben Rucker:

I agree with what Monique said. But I will also say we grapple with the same questions from the very beginning. Over time, I personally have embraced it because as I feel, again, I've grown a lot personally with a new skill set. It's been useful in so many ways. I'll give you another example though. We received a seed grant project through ARCC in the first year. It was a proposal that had been written before I stepped into my role there, so it was written by my predecessor. We got that, and it yielded results. We did it on immigrant senior populations. Since then, data that we gleaned from just that seed grant study has helped us. We've incorporated that into grant proposals since that time that we've gotten awards for. Now, I can't attribute it 100 that that was what made the difference, but I know in other grant proposals, we've gotten feedback from, I think it was the Office of Refugee Resettlement. They'll give you the strengths and weaknesses on a proposal that you wrote after you write it, whether you receive it or not. That was cited as one of our strengths, was that we're doing research and using relevant data in our proposal.

So I know that is one very tangible benefit, but there are many others that I can't enumerate here. But that is a struggle because community-based organizations, like so many other sectors, we're really, really stretched. We're forced to do more and more with less and less. It's something you have to think about. You're always aware of that.

Elmer Freeman:

I'm going to turn to Maryann and Darby and ask the two of you. What was your perspective on this notion of partnership and equalities and how to do something when it comes to reconciling it?

Maryann Mason:

So this is an interesting evolution, at least I think for me personally, because I had gone into this thinking that each partner in an academic community partnership would have their skills and strengths and we would come together and complement one another, so it was okay if the academic held the analytic skill set mostly in a partnership. But through the dialogue with Monique, Ben and others, I began to see how that actually holds the partnership back when one partner has kind of all of the skill sets and the other partner has none of it. So I began to see how all of—even though we can complement each other, we still need the basic skills in our own separate entities or shops in order to function well as a partnership. In that way, I began to see some of the nuances of this.

Darby Morhardt:

I really agree with what Maryann has said here. I'd like to just speak from my experience with two partnership-building seed grants that I've received through ARCC. One was with the Korean-American community, and I'm hoping that we are able to work with the African-American community. What we did in our Korean-American community partnership-building grant is we built in research training as part of our monthly meetings with each other. Instead of me being the person that was actually doing the didactic work with the community and talking about how do you develop a research question, how do you design methodology, how do you do the analysis, we actually went to the Korean community who had relationships at a local nearby academic institution, two Korean-American professors of social work, went to them and learned together that methodology.

Darby Morhardt:

In addition, we also had sessions where the Korean community informed me and others in my center about cultural issues surrounding the conceptualization of dementia and cognitive impairment and aging in the Korean community. We are definitely very sensitive to the issues around sharing our knowledge with each other but doing it in a way that is as equitable as possible. I hope that's clear.

Elmer Freeman:

So finally, I just want to say I served on the NIH Director's Council of Public Representatives for four years during the early implementation of the CTSA program and know that its essence was to promote greater engagement with communities and public participation in research and increase public confidence in science and actually accelerate translational research into policy and practice. The CTSA was central to Dr. Zerhouni's roadmap for NIH in which he stated, "Engaging the public is a national priority. It is not an option." Given this, how openly do you see community-based organizations, communities and others in terms of their capacity to engage in community-engaged research in an equitable way getting addressed in the CTSA program? I mean the overall program itself and not necessarily external funding and resources like that.

Jen Brown:

We've talked about this within the steering committee and with our broader partners at our local level in terms of our own CTSA here at Northwestern. I'll let Ben talk a little bit about that. But at the national level, we've also been involved in the Community Partners Integration Committee that's at the national level. We really feel that the National Consortium and the National Institutes of Health as the funder could provide clearer expectations or requirements of what each CTSA should be doing to support and involve community-based organizations. I know in the latest guidelines for submitting funding proposals, they left it a lot more open and didn't specifically have requirements. I think that they can use their position to include language about that and ideas about that or requirements about that that would really communicate that that's a value of theirs and that's something that's required in the language that you just shared from Dr. Zerhouni.

I also think that it's been really left up to the individual CTSA's, not that it shouldn't be our responsibility, but to dedicate support or funding to help community partners to allow them to have time and resources to be able to participate in things at the consortium level. Again, to really operationalize the support that NIH says they have of community partners being involved in that level, they could be providing funding for community partners to participate, to attend national meetings, things of that nature. I think that there's a lot that could be done at that national federal level, but we also see opportunities for change at the local level too.

One thing I'll mention, too, that we've done locally is in Chicago we have CTSA's at three of our institutions, at Northwestern but also at University of Illinois at Chicago and University of Chicago, which has a relationship with Rush University as well. So those are four major academic institutions in Chicago. We're pushed by our community partners. Actually, Dinah Ramirez of Healthy South Chicago, she was saying there's more support and encouragement of universities engaging community partners. She said, "We're getting all these requests and you guys are tripping all over each other. You got to get your act together."

- Jen Brown: So from encouragement from her and others, we worked on forming a consortium of the community-engagement programs across those institutions as well as some of our community partners to say that if our goal is to improve the health of the city and the area, we shouldn't be dividing up the city and saying, oh well, Northwestern will take the north side and U of C will take the south side and UIC will take the west side or whatever. But that we should be collaborating with each other as CTSA's on a local level to ensure that we're meeting the needs. If we can't meet them here at Northwestern, it makes total sense that we encourage and help our partners connect to academics at other institutions that might be able to help them.
- Monique Reed: I had a comment that I wanted to make. From our experience at WHA, we see the academic community-engaged research as a little bit of a dating game. We've experienced good dates and bad dates. But in the beginning, it seemed as though academic institutions were always asking us out. We feel that in order to really make this research process work, we want to be proactive and ask investigators out on this date. Because every relationship doesn't necessarily work, we found that we have good people and investigators like Maryann, Darby, and Bill who are on the call, and we've had good relationships, but not everyone sees that the way that community partners should be equal. They don't interpret it that way. They don't interpret equality that way. You stay in your lane and we'll stay in our lane, and together we'll make it work. But it doesn't always work in that fashion. So we do like the opportunity to be equal investigators and apply for funding as a lead investigator.
- Ben Rucker: At the institutional level or at our CTSA or at Northwestern CTSA, we worked really hard—ARCC worked hard. We basically court and tried to develop our relationships with the CTSA's director and with the associate director. An example of that is we are inviting the associate director for the first time to our next steering committee meeting. We asked for him to come to one of our steering committee meetings, but we worked very hard to establish and build relationships and let our needs be known.
- Elmer Freeman: All right, I want to wrap this up by thanking all of you for actually helping us to accomplish our objective, which was actually to take us beyond the manuscript and what is going to be coming out in the published article that you all generated but really get into some of the salient issues about these research partnerships, some of the challenges, and being as frank, open, and honest with your discussion as you could be. For that, I thank you on behalf of the group of associate editors, the journal itself, and look forward to working indirectly with all of you all in the future.