



CDC PREVENTION RESEARCH CENTERS'

PARTNERSHIP TRUST TOOL

USERS MANUAL





The contents of these materials have not been formally disseminated by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and should not be construed to represent any agency determination or policy.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. PURPOSE OF THIS MANUAL 1**
- II. BACKGROUND OF THE PARTNERSHIP TRUST TOOL (PTT) 1**
 - A. The Prevention Research Centers (PRC) Program..... 1
 - B. How the PTT Was Developed 1
 - C. Overview of the PTT 2
- III. STEPS TO COMPLETING THE PTT 2**
- IV. FILLING THE ROLES 3**
- V. FOR COORDINATORS 4**
 - A. Description of the PTT Survey 4
 - B. Distributing the PTT Survey 4
 - C. Collecting the Completed PTT Surveys..... 4
- VI. FOR FACILITATORS 5**
 - A. Preparing Data Summaries for Discussion 5
 - B. Materials Needed for In-person Discussion 10
 - C. Note Taker..... 10
- VII. PTT FACILITATED DISCUSSION GUIDE 10**
 - A. Inquiry 10
 - B. Imagining 10
 - C. Innovation 11
 - D. Implementation..... 11
- VIII. POST-DISCUSSION FOLLOW-UP..... 11**

APPENDICES

- A. Partnership Trust Tool Survey
- B. Facilitated Discussion Guide
- C. Sample Invitation Letter
- D. Data Summary Excel Spreadsheets
- E. Appreciative Inquiry Diagram
- F. Sample Summary Table



I. PURPOSE OF THIS MANUAL

The purpose of this manual is to provide its intended users with instructions to implement the Partnership Trust Tool (PTT). It describes the functions of the PTT and instructions to assist the coordinator and facilitator. It covers all the steps required to complete the PTT, administer the PTT survey, compile and analyze survey data, as well as facilitate discussion prompted by the PTT.

This manual is intended for two primary users. The first user is the coordinator who will help engage partner participation and arrange logistics for the survey administration and in-person, half-day meeting. This person will also ensure that the facilitator receives all needed information to implement the PTT effectively. The second user is the facilitator who will be responsible for entering and synthesizing survey responses and for facilitating the group discussion. As the discussion facilitator, this person is responsible for eliciting participation from group discussion attendees, and moving discussion along to ensure that the entire discussion guide is implemented in the allotted timeframe.

It is important to note that more than one person may assume the role of facilitator or coordinator. The person(s) responsible for coordinating or facilitating the PTT process must take the time to become very familiar with this manual, specifically the facilitator instructions and the discussion guide.

II. BACKGROUND OF THE PARTNERSHIP TRUST TOOL

A. THE PREVENTION RESEARCH CENTERS (PRC) PROGRAM

The Prevention Research Centers (PRCs) Program is a network of academic researchers, public health agencies, and community members that conducts applied public health research in disease prevention and control. Authorized by Congress in 1984, the PRCs are funded and managed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to

- Conduct health promotion and disease prevention research.
- Have research teams that represent a variety of disciplines.
- Conduct research with underserved communities.
- Collaborate with partners to plan, implement, and disseminate research.
- Establish and maintain relationships with partners and communities.
- Conduct training for researchers, students, partners, and community members.
- Evaluate center-level activities.

B. HOW THE PTT AS DEVELOPED

Early research with PRC partners revealed that trust among partners is a critical indicator of how well PRCs build relationships with their communities and other partners, and is considered an important factor in maximizing (or limiting) the success and function of the PRCs.

The PRC Program office at CDC sought to gain a greater understanding of the attributes and behaviors associated with establishing and maintaining trust within the context of PRC



partnerships. By examining trust in greater depth through extensive literature reviews and focus groups with PRC partners (health department, academic, and community representatives of the PRCs), we learned that the following are considered essential components of trust:

- Accessibility
- Dependability
- Good/clear communication
- Mutual benefit
- Openness
- Providing accurate information
- Relationship building
- Responsibility
- Sharing of power/responsibilities
- Supportiveness
- Truthfulness
- Valuing differences

The PTT was designed to spark reflection and dialogue around these various components of trust, highlighting those considered most relevant to the participating partners.

C. OVERVIEW OF THE PTT

The PTT is a two-part instrument designed to assist CDC’s PRCs define and develop their community–institutional working relationships. The tool includes the following:

1. An initial survey of 30–60 minutes (Appendix A) that asks partners about their experiences and expectations of partner behaviors related to 11 components of trust.
2. A facilitated discussion among the participating partners. The *Facilitated Discussion Guide* (Appendix B), which builds on participants’ quantitative and qualitative survey responses, was developed using the Appreciative Inquiry Model (e.g., Hammond, Sue Annis. 1998. *Thin Book of Appreciative Inquiry*. Thin Book Publishing: Bend, OR). (Resources and tools related to appreciative inquiry are available at <http://appreciativeinquiry.case.edu/>.)

Because the PTT is based on the Appreciative Inquiry Model, the survey and the guided discussion build on the strengths of a partnership by helping partners identify and examine what they have done or are doing well. The group then collectively examines ways to repeat their successes more frequently or to integrate the behaviors that led to success in other aspects of their work.

III. STEPS TO COMPLETING THE PTT

The table below should be used as a checklist as your PRC prepares for and completes the PTT. Use the right-hand column to specify who in your PRC will be responsible for each step.

TASKS	SUGGESTED RESPONSIBLE PERSON
Assemble list of e-mails/mailling addresses of potential participants.	<i>Identified coordinator</i>
Identify a facilitator for the PTT discussion.	<i>Identified coordinator</i>
Disseminate one-page invitation letter to potential participating partners and identify a feasible date and time for the in-person discussion (at least 2 weeks after the survey administration).	<i>Community liaison/community committee chair, PRC director or identified coordinator</i>



TASKS	SUGGESTED RESPONSIBLE PERSON
Resend one-page invitation letter along with the survey in an attachment. Be sure to include in the letter and on the last page of the survey, the return instructions and the date and time of the PTT in-person meeting.	<i>Identified coordinator</i>
Send survey reminder e-mails to nonrespondents.	<i>Identified coordinator</i>
Send meeting reminder to participants.	<i>Identified coordinator</i>
Enter PTT survey responses into Microsoft Excel spreadsheet (provided) or your own analysis software for summary analysis.	<i>Identified facilitator</i>
Summarize PTT survey responses in preparation for PTT discussion.	<i>Identified facilitator</i>

IV. FILLING THE ROLES

Coordinator—Any PRC that decides to use the PTT will need to designate a coordinator within their PRC. The coordinator will help engage partner participation and arrange logistics for the survey administration and in-person, half-day meeting.

Facilitator—Results from initial pilot tests of the PTT showed participants felt the PTT was best facilitated by an individual who is external to the PRC but who has a working knowledge of the PRC and its history. Useful facilitation skills include the ability to accurately synthesize information heard from the group discussion and report back to the group on the spot, elicit participation from group discussion attendees, and move discussions along to ensure that the entire discussion guide is implemented within the allotted timeframe.

The facilitator also must become very familiar with the PTT facilitator instruction materials and discussion guide.

Before implementing the PTT, the facilitator will need to understand a few things about the partnership with which they will be working. Questions to understand include the following:

- What is the primary work being conducted by the partnership? With what aspects of the research are these partners working together?
- How long have the partners worked together? Was there a relationship prior to the current project?
- Have the partners experienced discord in the past? How was that resolved? Does discontent remain?
- Moving beyond the individuals in the partnership, have there been historical challenges related to trust among those in the partner community (or organization) and in the university?

Partner Participants—The PTT was designed for participation from all types of partners—community, academic, and health department partners. When partner dynamics differ for various partner groups (e.g., health department vs. community partners), it may be useful to have participants indicate the partner group to which survey responses refer. Even if partners are



unable to attend the in-person meeting, it is important that everyone complete the survey so that everyone's impressions can be considered during the discussion.

In terms of the discussion portion of the PTT, participation by a mix of older and new partners is highly encouraged. Because portions of the PTT survey and discussion refer to past experiences among partners, it is important that participants have a history of working within the partnership. However, it will also be useful to have newer partners present to share their examples and expectations. If there is no history (or a limited history) of working together, participants may find it useful to reflect on past experiences they have had within other similar partnerships.

V. FOR COORDINATORS

The PTT survey is the first of the two primary components of the PTT. This section describes the survey instrument, provides recommendations on how the survey should be distributed and to whom, and offers instructions for the return of surveys. A sample invitation letter for partners to participate in the PTT can be found in Appendix C.

A. DESCRIPTION OF THE PTT SURVEY

The first component of the PTT is a survey that takes 30–60 minutes to complete. The survey asks respondents to (1) select and rate components of trust they believe are critical to build and maintain trust in their partnership, (2) rate if the selected components are occurring in their partnership, (3) provide brief examples (stories) of times when each of the components they rated was exhibited in their partnership, and (4) give examples of what partners could do better to improve each component. Respondents' answers to the survey questions will help the facilitator prepare for the next step—the PTT facilitated discussion.

B. DISTRIBUTING THE PTT SURVEY

Surveys should be sent at least 4 weeks in advance of the selected discussion date to all partners invited to participate in the discussion. We recommend that the invitation letter be sent again along with the survey so participants will understand how the survey relates to the upcoming discussion.

To ensure all participants receive the survey in a timely fashion, we recommend the survey be sent both via e-mail and regular postal mail. Also, please be sure to include on the letter and on the last page of the survey instructions for participants to return the surveys, including when the surveys are due and who they should be returned to. Please encourage partners that are unable to attend the in-person meeting to complete and return their surveys as well.

C. COLLECTING THE COMPLETED PTT SURVEYS

Provide respondents at least 3 weeks to complete and return the surveys and allow at least 1 week for reviewing the data and preparing for the discussion. Including a self-addressed and stamped return envelope with the surveys sent will help participants return them quickly. For those sent via e-mail, be sure participants know they can complete and return them via e-mail by



using Microsoft Word. Reassure them that confidentiality will be maintained and that names will not be used during the discussion or in any summary of the data.

VI. FOR FACILITATORS

This section provides instructions for analyzing the survey results and for using those data to prepare for the in-person discussion. Once the surveys are received, the data need to be analyzed and prepped for the in-person discussion. The entry and analysis of the survey data will take time. Thus, it is important that you set aside adequate preparation time between receiving the survey and the meeting date.

A. PREPARING DATA SUMMARIES FOR DISCUSSION

Quantitative Responses

Entering and analyzing the participant responses can take some time. The survey has been provided to you in a Microsoft Word format that uses fields that can easily be transferred to Microsoft Excel. In case you are unfamiliar with that technique, you can download Excel spreadsheets with preset formulas (Appendix D: <http://webdev.nccd.cdc.gov/prc/about-prc-program/partnership-trust-tools.htm>) for you to calculate and summarize the survey data. When you enter data into the spreadsheets, appropriate totals and averages referenced in the steps below will automatically be calculated for you. Alternatively, you may wish to use your own software (e.g., SPSS) to calculate results.

- **Step 1.** For each respondent, enter the following information in the appropriate quantitative spreadsheet (see example on page 8 for Community Partner Quantitative Results):
 - The rating of importance assigned to each component (insert respondents' ratings, 1–7).
 - The rating of occurrence assigned to each component (insert respondents' ratings, 1–7).
 - The components of trust selected as a top three item for discussion on the last page of the survey (for each component and each respondent, enter 1 if selected as a top three pick, enter 0 if not selected as a top three pick).
- **Step 2.** For each respondent type, tabulate the total score for each of the ratings of importance and occurrence and the frequency of top 3 ratings. Also, for each respondent type, calculate the average ratings for importance and occurrence. Then total the frequencies and calculate the average ratings for all partners combined. In the Excel spreadsheets (Appendix D), these summary scores automatically are tabulated in the last two rows on the Academic Partners, Community Partners, and Other Partners quantitative results spreadsheets.
- **Step 3.** Be sure to write down if you find notable differences among these three groups in their summary reports with regard to ratings of importance or occurrence for each of the components. You will want to bring attention to these differences during the group



discussion, as they may impact which components of trust the entire group decides to discuss and develop action steps for.

- **Step 4.** Examine all components rated as a top three pick. For those rated as a top three component by a number of participants (e.g., three or more participants), look at whether they received high or low occurrence ratings.
- **Step 5.** Write these components on an easel pad page and/or handouts (to be prepared prior to and used during the group discussion), showing any major differences in ratings for community, academic, and health department or other partners. In addition to this, you may also wish to create a handout using Excel that illustrates the quantitative summary data in graph (i.e., plot) form.

*****Try to have a fairly equal number of “occurring” and “not occurring” components on which to focus the discussion.***

Qualitative Responses

We recommend that you take advantage of the copy and paste feature in your word processing program to input respondents’ open-ended (qualitative) responses into your database or spreadsheet (see example on page 9). These open-ended responses also may be exported into a Microsoft Word document if desired and you may consider sharing these data as a handout during the discussion.

For use during the Inquiry phase of discussion:

- **Step 6.** For each of the components in Step 4 identified as a top three pick *and* received *high* occurrence ratings, select some examples of the behaviors that *are* occurring (e.g., from responses to “give an example of a time when people were really being dependable”). Write these examples on the appropriate easel pad pages for use during the *Inquiry* phase of the discussion. Use a separate page for each component and list its examples beneath it.

For example, in the sample community partner data on page 8, the average rating for “mutual benefit” was above 5.0 for both important and occurring. Additionally, 4 of the 9 respondents selected it as one of their top three components for discussion. Select components with similar results to discuss during the Inquiry phase.

Follow this process for each of the different partner groups and be sure to note any major difference in ratings among partner groups.

During the discussion, after showing the list of components ranked highest for occurring, you then would lead participants through a discussion of each of the components, sharing the positive examples they provided in the survey and getting them to tell the stories about those examples or to provide additional examples.

For use during the Imagining phase of discussion:

- **Step 7.** For each of the components in Step 4 identified as a top three pick *and* received *low* occurrence ratings (e.g., 3.0 or below), select some examples of the behaviors that



participants said are desired (e.g., from responses to “what is an example of something your PRC partners could do to be more dependable?”). Write these examples on an easel pad page for use during the *Imagining* phase of the discussion. Use a separate page for each component and list examples beneath it.

In our example (on page 8), all of the components shown were selected as a top three component by 4 respondents, however none of the components have an occurrence rating of 3.0 or below. If this happens (and it may if participants rate everything fairly high), select those top three components for which people also gave examples of behaviors they *want to see* occur (e.g., from responses to “what is an example of something your PRC partners could do to be more dependable?”).

Jot down 4–5 of these components on one easel pad page along with any notes about major differences in ratings among the partner groups. These will be shared and discussed during the *Imagining* phase.

During the discussion, after showing the list of *lowest* ranked components, you then would lead participants through a discussion of each of the components, sharing the examples of desired behaviors they provided in the survey and discussing why they wish to see those things occur.



Community Partners Quantitative Results

	Dependable: Importance	Dependable: Occurrence	Dependable: Top 3 Component	Mutual Benefit: Importance	Mutual Benefit: Occurrence	Mutual Benefit: Top 3 Component	Good/Clear Communication: Importance	Good/Clear Communication: Occurrence	Good/Clear Communication: Top 3 Component	Accessible: Importance	Accessible: Occurrence	Accessible Top 3 Component	Open: Importance	Open: Occurrence	Open: Top 3 Component
Respondent 1	2	5	1	5	7	1	2	5	1	5	7	1	2	5	1
Respondent 2	4	6	0	5	5	0	4	6	0	5	5	0	4	6	0
Respondent 3	6	3	0	7	5	0	6	3	0	7	5	0	6	3	0
Respondent 4	2	6	0	7	5	1	2	6	0	3	5	1	2	6	0
Respondent 5	1	7	0	5	6	1	1	7	0	3	6	1	1	7	0
Respondent 6	5	5	1	5	4	1	5	5	1	4	4	1	5	5	1
Respondent 7	3	6	1	7	7	0	3	6	1	7	7	0	3	6	1
Respondent 8	6	4	1	4	6	0	6	4	1	2	6	0	6	4	1
Respondent 9	8	3	0	6	4	0	8	3	0	6	4	0	8	3	0
TOTAL FREQUENCY	37	45	4	51	49	4	37	45	4	42	49	4	37	45	4
AVERAGE SCORE	4.11	5.00		5.67	5.44		4.11	5.00		4.67	5.44		4.11	5.00	



Community Partners Qualitative Results

	Dependable: Examples of Occurring Behaviors	Dependable: Examples of Desired Behaviors	Mutual Benefit: Examples of Occurring Behaviors	Mutual Benefit: Examples of Desired Behaviors	Good/Clear Communication: Examples of Occurring Behaviors	Good/Clear Communication: Examples of Desired Behaviors	Accessible: Examples of Occurring Behaviors	Accessible: Examples of Desired Behaviors	Open: Examples of Occurring Behaviors
Respondent 1									
Respondent 2									
Respondent 3									
Respondent 4									
Respondent 5									
Respondent 6									
Respondent 7									
Respondent 8									
Respondent 9									
Respondent 10									
Respondent 11									
Respondent 12									
Respondent 13									
Respondent 14									
Respondent 15									
Respondent 16									
Respondent 17									
Respondent 18									



B. MATERIALS NEEDED FOR IN-PERSON DISCUSSION

For the in-person discussion, you will need the following to facilitate the conversation among the partners:

- Easel pad and easel (with survey responses written on them, as specified previously).
- Handouts (illustrating quantitative and qualitative summary data) (*optional*).
- Different colored markers.
- Tape.
- Name tents.
- Adhesive dots (enough for three sets of two different colors per person for the prioritization exercise (see Innovation Phase/Action Planning section of the *Facilitated Discussion Guide*).
- Photocopies of the appreciative inquiry diagram (see Appendix E) for participants.
- Summarized results (for you to reference during the discussion if needed).

C. NOTE TAKER

For the in-person discussion, you will need to have a note taker to capture important points from the conversation among the partners. It will be the note taker's responsibility to clearly record key points of the discussion, the group consensus and decisions, and future action items. The facilitator should be able to use the notes to construct a plan or course of action for future meetings. The note taker role may be best filled by the community liaison or a person (not the facilitator) that is not engaged in the discussion.

VII. PTT FACILITATED DISCUSSION GUIDE

The PTT *Facilitated Discussion Guide* is the second component of the PTT. Using this guide, you lead participants through a 4½-hour discussion, incorporating their PTT survey responses and generating further discussion around the issues raised. The discussion guide leads participants through four phases.

A. INQUIRY

In the first phase, ***Inquiry***, participants review examples of positive partnership experiences noted on the surveys. During this phase you, as facilitator, will help participants identify themes that have led to their success in previous activities.

B. IMAGINING

In the second phase, ***Imagining***, you will lead participants in a discussion about their desires to attain greater partnership success. You can help begin this discussion by sharing responses from the survey of expectations partners felt were not being met as desired. Together, the group will identify behaviors they would like to see more of in their partnership.



C. INNOVATION

During the *Innovation* phase, you will help participants to come up with ideas for addressing the concerns articulated about the partnership and to narrow those ideas to a specific set they wish to focus on.

D. IMPLEMENTATION

In the fourth phase, *Implementation*, you will close out the discussion by guiding the group through developing an action plan to carry out the ideas raised, including identifying specific people responsible for ensuring various tasks are accomplished and broad timelines for doing so.

VIII. POST-DISCUSSION FOLLOW-UP

After the discussion has ended and the partners have returned to their activities, it will be helpful for you, as facilitator, to provide them with some material from the discussion to promote their continued progress. You can help them to remember the timetable and assignment of responsibility by providing a written summary of their final decisions from the Implementation phase. An example of a follow-up summary table is presented in Appendix F.

The group also may require some additional technical assistance to lead them through particular challenges raised during the discussion. You can let the group know that they may contact the PRC Program office at (770) 488-5395 if they would like ongoing assistance with particular partnership concerns.