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ABSTRACT

An interdisciplinary team from Chapin Hall, funded by an internal Impact Area Fund, proposed to summarize strategies for and challenges to systems planning partnerships with Black and Brown communities. These partnerships aimed at building community decisional power, investment, and agency. In this report, which is a companion to five equity bulletins and a toolkit, we describe the approach and methods we used to develop the strategies and identify supporting resources. Our team developed a hybrid information retrieval approach that included systematic searching and iterative refinements. The research team conducted comprehensive search strategies and executed searches in multiple bibliographic databases. Using prespecified screening criteria, the team systematically reviewed over 700 records for eligibility. From the scholarly literature, we identified 35 empirical reports of community partnerships for systems planning and services in the U.S. Two researchers independently coded the content of the empirical reports and, with input from the team and Chapin Hall policy staff, identified key themes. In addition, we assembled a list of more than 20 individuals identified as Subject Matter Experts, who we invited to share insights on system partnerships with Black and Brown communities. We hosted two semi-structured discussions with 10 Subject Matter Experts and culled the salient themes and experience-driven perspectives from the discussion transcripts. Finally, we scanned grey literature sources for descriptions of prior and ongoing efforts to partner with Black and Brown communities and families. From a collection of 35 real-world cases, we selected six for in-depth examination. We extracted, coded, and organized content related to strategies, lessons, and challenges. We also identified cross-cutting and distinct findings across the three sources—scholarly, firsthand, and real world. We articulated five strategic and actionable recommendations: disrupt system mindsets and habits, invest in community, reimagine community engagement, transform systems with community in the lead, and embed community leadership and adapt over time.
BACKGROUND

Social service systems continue to focus on crisis responses to the challenges facing Black children and families. One way to address these challenges is to forge trusting relationships between systems and the communities they serve, wherein the communities are viewed as equitable and indispensable partners. As researchers, policy strategists, and implementation specialists to public-serving systems, we need to be knowledgeable and ready to advocate for shifts in decisional and fiscal power from systems to the communities and their representatives at the appropriate time and under the right circumstances.

The most effective and sustainable community-centered solutions are likely to be those that can draw from a diverse set of strategies and leverage the lessons learned from prior successes and failures. With Chapin Hall organizational support, in the form of an Impact Area Fund award, and a keen focus on the devastating impacts of persistent racial inequities in child welfare and other public serving systems, we set out to conduct a comprehensive scan of the scholarly literature, a candid exploration of the experiences and perspectives of thought leaders, and a targeted search of evaluations and demonstrations within the public domain.

From these sources, we extracted and coded information on strategies, challenges, and lessons. We then analyzed this information to outline practical and actionable recommendations for supporting efforts to transform how systems work with and for Black and Brown communities. From these analyses, we developed five equity bulletins which highlight strategies for system transformation through community leadership:

- Disrupt system mindsets and habits (VanMeeter et al., 2022a)
- Invest in communities (VanMeeter et al., 2022b)
- Reimagine community engagement (VanMeeter et al., 2022c)
- Transform systems with community in the lead (VanMeeter et al., 2022d)
- Embed community leadership and adapt over time (VanMeeter et al., 2022e)

We also compiled a list of resources culled from the field which we assembled in an accessible toolkit for championing community leadership in system transformation.

This document serves as a companion to the equity bulletins and toolkit, providing a transparent accounting of the methods we used to examine the different approaches, successes, and failures of planning partnerships with Black and Brown communities.
METHODS

The purpose of this work was to identify strategies for Chapin Hall staff to support equity-driven work with public systems and to offer guidance for embedding race equity in their policies and practices. Over several formative conversations within our team and with Chapin Hall colleagues, we drafted an explicit aims statement and vision for the outcome of the work: Summarize strategies for, and challenges to, planning partnerships with Black and Brown communities that effectively build their decision-making power and capacity to shape systems and services for the benefit of children and families. To manage the scope of work and deliver findings quickly, we conferred with Chapin Hall colleagues and examined the benefits of various methods and approaches. We submitted our project aims and methods to the Crown School-Chapin Hall Institutional Review Board (IRB), which issued a nonresearch determination (IRB21-0578).

Once we reached a consensus on the language and scope of the work, as stated by the project aim, we began outlining the approach. Early on, we agreed that the work would be grounded in a replicable and comprehensive process of literature and information retrieval and selection. We conducted systematic and comprehensive search strategies, semi-structured group discussions, structured memos, coding of article content, and qualitative synthesis. We used three primary sources of data to inform our review and analysis: scholarly literature, Subject Matter Experts, and “real-world” cases. In this section, we describe our approach to searching, selection, and synthesis for each source.

Scholarly Literature

To identify primary studies for inclusion in this review, we developed search strategies and executed searches in multiple databases, including PsycINFO, PubMed, Web of Science, and Scopus (see Appendix A). We developed screening criteria to examine each record for relevance to project aims. We used a web-based screening tool, Rayyan (Ouzzani et al., 2016), to review each record at the abstract and title level. Records not excluded by two independent reviewers were promoted for a second level of screening using the record full text. Each record was reviewed by a minimum of two individuals; conflicts were resolved through team discussion. We used Endnote reference management software (Bramer et al., 2016) to document the search retrievals, screening disposition, and articles retained for qualitative analysis. We excluded reports only focused on participatory action research methods, intervention and service provision not informed by a community partnership, nonpublic or for-profit sectors, and studies for which system or policy change was not an intended outcome. We operationalized these criteria as a form (see Appendix B) that we used to review literature abstracts and full text. We used a modified grounded theory approach to thematic synthesis of qualitative literature (Glaser & Strauss, 2017; Thomas & Harden, 2008). We analyzed the information from the included papers, using open coding conducted independently by two researchers and then reconciled for common, overlapping, and related concepts (see Appendix C). These open codes were combined with a set of a priori codes related to research aims to create a
codebook. We then coded all included literature using this codebook in NVivo (QSR International Pty Ltd, 2020) qualitative coding software.

**Subject Matter Experts**

We queried members of our research team, Chapin Hall colleagues, and external partners to compile a candidate list of individuals who were deeply committed to systems change and were engaged in prior or ongoing efforts to center the strengths and needs of Black and Brown families and communities in system change efforts. Chapin Hall staff identified lead funders engaged in the work and individuals who were closely involved in projects where community engagement and empowerment were central to the work.

We compiled an extensive list of experts comprised of referrals from our team and colleagues and from our search for exemplary efforts of partnerships with Black and Brown communities. We hosted two structured conversations with Subject Matter Experts. We prepared brief summaries of the objectives and scope of our work and drafted prompting questions which we distributed in advance of the meetings to encourage balanced participation. We documented the discussions and verified out notes using the recordings and transcripts generated by the virtual conferencing service. We summarized both common and unique opinions and perspectives.

**Case Studies**

The final source of information for this review came from “real world” cases (i.e., “case studies”; see Briere et al., 2018). We conducted a broad scan of cases based on team knowledge. With input from our team, Chapin Hall staff, and Subject Matter Experts, we selected case studies to enrich our understanding of community partnerships and highlight real examples of successes and failures from prior work aimed at engaging community in systems change. We used the following criteria to select cases:

1. Depth of community partnership
2. Partnership with one or more predominantly Black or Brown communities in system or service development, planning, or change (or a combination of these)
3. System, service, or policy relevance to Chapin Hall’s focus on children and families
4. Documentation of strategies, challenges, and lessons learned

In addition, we attempted to select cases that were geographically representative and captured various levels of focus (such as system, state, national). For each selected case study, we collected a set of publications (such as funder reports, organizational briefs, and evaluations) that documented successes and challenges over time. The team used an analytic memo process, informed by iterative thematic inquiry (Morgan & Nica, 2020) and document analysis methods (Bowen, 2009), to describe the background, strategies, equity approaches, impacts, and lessons learned from each case.
RESULTS

Our search for literature retrieved 722 records. Using the eligibility criteria described in the methods, we identified 156 potentially relevant publications based upon information available in the title and abstract. We retained 41 publications, of which 35 were empirical and were selected for qualitative coding (Bateman et al., 2017; Brown & Stalker, 2020; Capers, 2018; Devia et al., 2017; Dupre et al., 2016; Eng & Parker, 1994; Ferre et al., 2010; Geiger, 2002; Grumbach et al., 2017; Holden et al., 2011; Israel et al., 2005; James et al., 2008; Jenkins et al., 2004; Kreger et al., 2011; Lachance, Kowalski-Dobson, et al., 2018; Lachance, Quinn, et al., 2018a, 2018b; Lee & Navarro, 2018; Lorthridge et al., 2012; Mannes et al., 2005; Mendel et al., 2021; Nguyen-Truong et al., 2018; Nissen & Curry-Stevens, 2012; Pierre et al., 2020; Purnell et al., 2018; Quinn et al., 2018; Reid et al., 2019; Rice et al., 2016; Sands et al., 2018; Sands et al., 2016; Simmons et al., 2008; Sinha & Kasdan, 2013; Watson-Thompson et al., 2020; Wynn et al., 2011; Wysen, 2021). These reports, published between 1994 and 2021, described 33 unique partnerships (see Appendix D). Two team members independently coded 1,663 segments of text from the 35 empirical reports to seven main categories: challenges and barriers, impacts, lessons learned, context, key concepts, partnership structure, and strategy. The distribution of coding is summarized in Figure 1. Notably, key concepts of social capital, institutional resistance to change, and policy change were coded in fewer than half of the publications.

Figure 1. Distribution of Coding Assignments Among Empirical Publications (n = 35)

We extended invitations to 22 individuals (Subject Matter Experts) to join group dialogues on Black and Brown community leadership in system change, facilitated by the research team. Almost half of those invited (10, or 45.5%) agreed to participate. Participants included researchers, community activists, sponsor organizations, and leaders of past and present change efforts. The Subject Matter Expert discussions focused on the state of the field (for example, expert experiences, recent progress,
priorities, and gaps); tools and resources (for example, most used, useful, actionable); and opportunities (for example, new insights, promising approaches). Transcripts of the two discussion sessions are available from the authors upon request. Trauma-informed approach was a topic the Subject Matter Experts discussed but it was not represented in the literature and case studies that we identified. However, we know that it is crucial for systems to recognize and respond to traumatic stress and experiences of adversity. We identified 35 examples of community-centered, equity-focused efforts (case studies) within the U.S. using web searches, outreach, and reviews of publication reference lists. We vetted the selection of case studies with colleagues to identify those that were representative, deeply informative, and useful for addressing current challenges and opportunities. For each of these efforts, we collected a comprehensive set of publications documenting the effort over time (see Appendix E). These frequently were in the format of funder reports, organizational briefs, and evaluations.

Upon assembling and analyzing the information from the three sources, we set out to summarize and prioritize key knowledge and observations. This process was facilitated through several conversations within the team and with Chapin Hall colleagues. To synthesize across sources and bring structure to the extracted and coded information, we created six questions related to partnership with Black and Brown communities for policy and systems change (see Appendix F). For each question, team members reviewed relevant coded text and synthesized key themes. We then added complementary or novel insights from case studies and Subject Matter Expert conversations to these lists of themes. From these themes, five strategic and actionable foci emerged: disrupt system mindsets and habits, invest in community, reimagine community engagement, transform systems with community in the lead, and embed community leadership and adapt over time.

Figure 2: Community Leadership Strategies
1. **Disrupt system mindsets and habits**: Systems engage in unlearning and adopt and sustain a race equity framework, shifting from seeing families as problems to be fixed toward seeing families and their communities as the key to thriving children.

2. **Invest in community**: Community members grow their individual agency and capacity for collective action, supported by institutional investments in connectedness, learning, leadership, and existing community strengths.

3. **Reimagine community engagement**: Community tables are more than a way for systems to check a box. They are purposefully built and governed to shift decision-making power and maintain it in the hands of the community.

4. **Transform systems with community in the lead**: Communities drive and scale systems-level change through codesign, braided supports, and resources commensurate with aims flow directly to communities rather than through intermediaries.

5. **Embed community leadership**: Change efforts are sustained through long-term funding streams, power-sharing infrastructure, and adaptations driven by a culture of continuous reflection.

We developed concise summaries of the findings and our recommended strategies culled from research and planning partnerships, capacity development efforts, and direct knowledge from those who have worked with systems to empower Black and Brown communities for the benefit of children and families. We solicited feedback from colleagues to decide how to organize, select, and communicate the findings. With our communications team, we developed five system transformation equity bulletins to provide practical and timely resources for internal and external audiences. In addition to the equity bulletins, we created a toolkit of resources to support the pragmatic process of community involvement in system change. We selected the toolkit resources from a collection of 50 documents relevant to community leadership in system change assembled from our team’s searches, recommendations from the Subject Matter Experts, and materials shared by our Chapin Hall colleagues. We chose 17 of these resources to highlight in the toolkit based on their completeness, ease of use, applicability to work in systems, and incorporation of a race equity lens. We omitted resources that exclusively addressed cultural competence or research methods to remain focused on strategies for policy and system change. For each, we indicated one or more of the five strategies represented by the resource, provided a link to the material, and identified the authoring organization. Notably, we did not identify tools to support the “Invest” strategy. Given that many past efforts identified investment in community as a key strategy, we highlight this as an important gap to fill in the practice literature.
SUMMARY

Our aim was to understand the successes and failures of prior efforts to build Black and Brown community leadership into public systems change. The breadth and wide-ranging implications of the materials made it necessary to carefully balance project aims with a comprehensive articulation of important lessons from past work. We adapted existing rigorous literature review methods, sought insights from experts, and scanned grey literature sources to elucidate key strategies and develop actionable tools and resources. Our team regularly revisited our project aims statement and discussed expected outcomes and impact of the work.

We collaboratively developed search strategies and executed them in multiple databases. We honed the retrievals using prespecified criteria. Our work included an analysis of case studies to provide real-world examples and demonstrate the evolution of community partnership efforts over time. Case studies were chosen based on how relevant they were to the aims of our work and whether the comprehensive documentation of the project was available. We also selected these cases to get perspectives from efforts that varied in terms of scale, location, funding source, and the systems involved.

Finally, we sought insights directly from individuals with a demonstrated commitment to partnerships with Black and Brown communities for systems-level change. We hosted two semi-structured conversations with Subject Matter Experts, who represented researchers, community activists, sponsor organizations, and leaders of historical and current change efforts. We analyzed source materials and transcripts qualitatively to identify cross-cutting themes and guiding principles to help Chapin Hall and our partners center communities in equity-focused systems-change efforts. We synthesized the findings from each of the information sources to identify strategies to engage authentically with communities, relinquish fiscal and decisional power, recognize community assets and individual agency, and dismantle long-standing structural barriers to resources and opportunities for Black and Brown families and communities.

Our reliance upon multiple sources of information and our integrative approach was critical to the rapid development of actionable strategies. The discussions with Subject Matter Experts were invaluable and contributed to the overall framing and priorities for coding and synthesis, including action, new approaches, and taking care to not repeat the past. Case studies, or real-world cases, offered the opportunity to draw on knowledge not represented in peer-reviewed publications. Several of these cases served as exemplars or resources, which our team included in a toolkit of resources for Chapin Hall.
This work was exploratory with the explicit aim of integrating perspectives drawn from scholarly, current, and past demonstrations, as well as from individuals who were deeply involved in efforts with communities of color to create system change. There is no consensus on a single best approach, but we offer a set of actionable strategies and practical tools that systems and their partners should consider when thinking about how to transform their relationships with the Black and Brown communities they serve. Though resource and time constraints precluded an exhaustive systematic review, we believe that our efforts to share findings throughout the project and invite perspectives of our close colleagues and others bolstered the quality and applicability of the work.
LIMITATIONS

This synthesis attempted to unify a vast collection of empirical, anecdotal, and practical information into a coherent framework for advancing our efforts to promote and sustain genuine partnerships with Black and Brown communities. Thus, we had to make decisions about what would and would not be included in the search and selection of information. In these decisions, we may have omitted relevant and important materials. Considering this, we chose to share our plans and activities with colleagues, in part to gather feedback on decisions around exclusion criteria and scope.

Our review did not examine community partnerships with specific non-Black communities of color, such as Indigenous, Latino/Latinx, Southeast Asian, Pacific Islander, and other minority racial and ethnic groups. Including reports and examples of partnerships with these groups would exceed the resources and time allocated to this project. Some of the collaboration efforts we included discussed strategies for partnering with minority racial and ethnic groups, generally, which we retained because the findings were clearly relevant to Black communities.

There were several limitations to our approach related to the context of this work. First, the budgetary expectation was that the work would be completed within one year. The Chapin Hall Impact Area Fund offers Chapin Hall staff an opportunity to explore new methods, approaches, and partnerships to advance knowledge of topics that align with the organization’s strategic priorities. The fund provides resources for a deep, but relatively short-term scholarly or experiential project. Second, although we knew that our aim must be grounded in a race equity lens and within the context of systems serving communities and families, we had few to no concrete definitions or parameters at the outset. Finally, our team, with a diverse set of skills and experiences, had to harmonize language and concepts to work effectively and efficiently, especially in the absence of explicit boundaries to the topic scope.

To address these challenges, our team met weekly and had deep discussions to address new information, evolving concepts, and historical context. We exercised a commitment to humility and revisited the project aims to remain flexible yet avoid straying too far from the project scope. Furthermore, the weekly meetings and an advance agenda allowed us to work in a coordinated manner to swiftly identify records from the scholarly literature, develop a set of screening criteria, and screen records with a high level of interrater agreement. We consulted with our Chapin Hall colleagues periodically to vet plans, progress, and preliminary findings. Finally, the strategies we offer are informed by past work, but they do not constitute evidence-based practices.

Future efforts should focus on developing benchmarks and measurable outcomes of successful community-system partnerships. Evolving strengths, local resources, and a community’s unique history are complex and are best addressed through a multistakeholder but community-centered lens. Nonetheless, we should remain committed to adopting best practices and contributing to the existing body of knowledge on community capacity and leadership to improve the health, opportunities, and well-being of Black and Brown individuals.
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## Appendix A: Literature Search Retrievals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Import</th>
<th>Search Type</th>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>Records Retrieved</th>
<th>Duplicates Discarded</th>
<th>Records Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>NLM</td>
<td>PubMed, PMC, MEDLINE</td>
<td>1/5/2021</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>Web of Science</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1/5/2021</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>SCOPUS</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1/5/2021</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>Web of Science</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1/6/2021</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>EBSCO</td>
<td>APA PsycINFO</td>
<td>1/8/2021</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Handsearch</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/5/2021</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Handsearch</td>
<td>Web of Science</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1/6/2021</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Handsearch</td>
<td>Google</td>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td>1/10/2021</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Handsearch</td>
<td>Google</td>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td>1/14/2021</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Handsearch</td>
<td>NLM</td>
<td>PubMed, PMC, MEDLINE</td>
<td>1/14/2021</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Handsearch</td>
<td>NLM</td>
<td>PubMed</td>
<td>1/14/2021</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Handsearch</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/19/2021</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Handsearch</td>
<td>NLM</td>
<td>PubMed</td>
<td>1/19/2021</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>Web of Science</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1/19/2021</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Handsearch</td>
<td>SCOPUS</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1/19/2021</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Handsearch</td>
<td>Google</td>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td>1/21/2021</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Handsearch</td>
<td>Google</td>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td>2/10/2021</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Handsearch</td>
<td>Google</td>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td>3/26/2021</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>919</strong></td>
<td><strong>197</strong></td>
<td><strong>722</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B: Scholarly Literature Screening Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Brief description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| X-1  | No community partnership | Exclude the publication if it does not discuss community partnership and/or building community capacity to shape systems and/or services.  
Community partnership includes, for example, involving community members in system, service, and policy planning processes. Capacity building can include, for example: asset mapping, approaches to building individual agency, coalition building, and community organizing. See X-3 and X-4 for related exclusion criteria on the system and/or service shaping focus.  
A discussion of this work should include descriptions of at least one of the following: forming a community partnership, shared decision-making processes, strategies for building community capacity to partner, and the challenges and lessons learned from the effort. |
| X-2  | Wrong population | Exclude the publication if it focuses exclusively on a population other than Black, Black mixed race, Latinx, or Latinx mixed race individuals, unless it is focused on communities of color in general.  
For example, we would exclude articles specifically focused on white communities, women as a group, or LGBTQ individuals as a group. In the latter two cases, articles could be included if the abstract indicates it discusses racial and ethnic minorities as a subgroup. |
| X-3  | Wrong sector | Exclude an article which does not discuss systems and/or services.  
"Systems and services" refer specifically to public systems and nonprofit services, including the state, federal, and institutional or organizational policies that shape these institutions. Some examples include social welfare policy, the juvenile justice system, the child welfare system, school districts' after school programming array, food assistance programs, and public health systems.  
Articles focused on for-profit businesses or informal groups should be excluded, unless these groups are discussed in the context of a cross-sector or coalitional partnership. |
| X-4  | Wrong impact | Exclude an article which does not discuss system and/or service planning, development, and/or change.  
"Planning" includes activities like asset mapping, needs assessment, identifying barriers to community partnership, and coalition building.  
"Development" includes activities like program or policy design, structuring new administrative processes and/or funding, and creating new strategic plans.  
"Change" includes activities like continuous review and oversight, program, or policy restructuring, funding reallocation, revising strategic plans, and reshaping administrative structures. |
This means excluding the publication if it focuses on a direct service intervention and/or approach, with the following exceptions:
A) the intervention directly contributes to community input in planning, development, and/or change (for example, a nonprofit-organized youth leadership board which provides input on the out-of-school time service array) or B) the publication describes community involvement in the development of the intervention and/or approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Brief description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X-5</td>
<td>No critical frame</td>
<td>Exclude articles that do not discuss or engage with concepts from critical theory. Key concepts from critical theory include inequity, racial justice, marginalization, cultural humility, decolonization, systemic racism, white supremacy, and racialized violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-11</td>
<td>Duplicate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-12</td>
<td>Non-English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-13</td>
<td>Unable to obtain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-14</td>
<td>Conference Abstract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C: Coding of Empirical Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Files</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenges and barriers</td>
<td>For any discussion of the challenges and barriers faced in the process of involving community in system, service and/or policy change. These could include difficulties faced that aren’t resolved or resolvable. May be double coded with “Lessons learned.”</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional resistance to change</td>
<td>Use for barriers that emerge from within institutions, including government bodies, systems, and/or nonprofit organizations.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Use for information that is relevant to, but not directly descriptive of, the community partnership and system change process.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>For descriptions of the intended or unintended (ripple) effects of a partnership effort. This could be the system, service, and/or policy change; however, it might also have to do with changes in community dynamics, impacts on partner organizations, or even more distal outcomes.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key concept</td>
<td>Use for when the authors are defining or engaging with a concept which is central to our investigation. Code here if the concept does not fall under one of the sub-codes.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical race theory</td>
<td>For terms and discussions related to critical race theory. Includes concepts like racial justice/injustice, racial equity/inequity, white supremacy, anti-Blackness, antiracism, critical consciousness, etc.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>For terms and discussions related to social capital. This could include individual or community social capital, including ideas like community connectedness, self-efficacy, collective action, collective impact, etc.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons learned</td>
<td>Reflections on what could or should be done differently in future partnership and system change efforts. May be double coded with “Challenges and barriers.”</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making process</td>
<td>Use for descriptions of how the groups and individuals involved make decisions about things like setting priorities, allocating resources, coordinating activities, evaluating progress, etc.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power dynamics</td>
<td>Use for discussion of how power and positionality impact partnerships, and how these are embedded in partnership structure. This could include things like trust, positionality,</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Files</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tokenism, or power sharing.</td>
<td>May be double coded with “Roles and responsibilities” and “Reflexivity and feedback.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource management</td>
<td>Use for descriptions of how resources (people hours, space, and funding) are mobilized through the partnership. May be double coded with “Decision-making process.”</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>Use for descriptions of what obligations individuals and groups involved in a partnership take on. This can include officially agreed-upon obligations, or responsibilities that individuals take on informally. May be double coded with “Power dynamics.”</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>Use for discussion of the methods and strategies that partners used across the lifetime of the effort to achieve stated goals. Code here if the activity or process does not clearly fall under one of the sub-codes.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Description of how partnership activities and strategies change over time, in response to changing contextual factors or strategic direction.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Description of any efforts aimed at improving the ability of community members or groups to get involved in system and/or service change efforts.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>For descriptions of how community becomes involved in a system and/or service change process as a partner and/or leader. This could include community-based organizations, grassroots groups, or individual community members.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge building</td>
<td>For descriptions of how partners collected information to inform systems, service, or policy change efforts. This could include description of strengths or needs assessments, evaluation, participatory action research, or other methodological approaches. May be double coded with “Reflexivity and feedback.”</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy change</td>
<td>For descriptions of the strategies partners used to advocate for and achieve change to public policy. This could mean getting a new policy passed, changing an existing policy, or affecting policy implementation.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexivity and feedback</td>
<td>For description of activities that involve reflection or self-reflection on the part of individual partners, organizations, or the partnership as a whole. This could include collecting feedback through evaluation processes. May be double</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Files</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems change</td>
<td>For descriptions of the strategies partners used to advocate for and achieve public systems change. This could include systems like child welfare, education, public housing, public health, etc. It could also include changes to a service array, or a systems' approach to social services.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

coded with "Knowledge building" and "Power dynamics."
Appendix D: Projects and Cases Described in the Scholarly Literature

Brownsville Action Community for Health Equality (BACHE)

Building Assets Reducing Risks

Centers for Children’s Environmental Health and Disease Prevention Research (Children’s Centers)

Communities of Opportunity

Community Action to Fight Asthma (CAFA)

Community Organizing for Policy Change HB2134

Community Partners in Care (CPIC)

Food and Fitness


Lachance, L., Quinn, M., & Kowalski-Dobson, T. (2018a). The Food & Fitness Community Partnerships: Results from 9 years of local systems and policy changes to increase equitable opportunities for health. Health Promotion Practice, 19(Suppl 1), 92S–114S.


**Food and Fitness; Holyoke Food & Fitness Policy Council (HFFPC)**


**For the Sake of All**


**Healthy Places North Carolina**


**Healthy African American Families (HAAF)**


**HopeZone**


**Midsouth Transdisciplinary Collaborative Center (TCC) Academic Community Engagement (ACE)**


**North Bolivar County Health Council (NBCHC)**


**NYC Health Department Neighborhood Health Action Centers**

Partners for Improved Nutrition and Health


Philadelphia Community Efficacy Beliefs


Prevention Initiative Demonstration Project (PIDP)


REACH 2010 Charleston and Georgetown Diabetes Coalition


REACH; Smoking Cessation Coalition (SCC)


Reclaiming Futures


Right to the City Alliance

Sinha, A., & Kasdan, A. (2013). Inserting community perspective research into public housing policy discourse: The Right to the City Alliance's "We Call These Projects Home." *Cities, 35*, 327–334.

San Francisco Health Improvement Partnership (SFHIP)


Spreading Community Accelerators Through Learning and Evaluation (SCALE); Skid Row Women of Los Angeles; Healthy Livable Communities of Cattaraugus County


Texas Department of Family Protective Services Addressing Disproportionality Pilot

The Bronx Health REACH Coalition; Men on the Move


The Hartford Youth Project (HYP)


Together Helping to Reduce Youth Violence (THRYVE)

Appendix E: Case Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project or Initiative Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Child Legacy Campaign</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA</td>
<td>Child and family services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Healthy Communities Initiative</td>
<td>Multisite</td>
<td>Community development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COFI Parent Leadership Initiative</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Early childhood and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-Centered Community Change</td>
<td>Multisite</td>
<td>Child and family services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Connections</td>
<td>Multisite</td>
<td>Community development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Initiative Demonstration Project</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Child welfare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Black Child Legacy Campaign**


**Building Healthy Communities Initiative**


**Community Organizing and Family Issues (COFI)**


**Family-Centered Community Change**


**Prevention Initiative Demonstration Project**


Making Connections


Appendix F: Questions for Analysis

Strategies for partnership with Black and brown communities that builds their power

Q1: What kinds of outreach, capacity building, and engagement activities have been used to involve Black and brown communities in system and policy change?

Q2: How do organizational and interpersonal power dynamics impact community partnerships to effect policy and system change, and how do partnerships address this?

Shaping policy, systems, and services with community

Q3: How are communities involved in setting priorities and making decisions about the strategic direction of change initiatives?

Q4: What frameworks, resources, and contextual factors are seen as central to achieving policy and systems change, in efforts involving community partnership?

Challenges, barriers, and lessons learned

Q5: What kinds of challenges and barriers do community partnerships face to forming and maintaining partnerships, and when possible, how might these be overcome in the future?

Q6: What kinds of challenges and barriers do community partnerships face to creating change in policy, systems, and services, and how might these be overcome in the future?