

The Mid e t Latino Health Re ea ch, T aining, and Polic e Cente (the Latino Health Re ea ch Cente), a unit of the Jane Addam Colle ge of Social Wo k at the Uni e it of Illinoi at Chicago, a fo nded in 1993 fo the p po e of engaging in o tcome e ea ch, t aining, and polic e change in the a ea of health di pa itie . The Latino Health Re ea ch Cente ha follo ed comm nit pa ticipato a ction e ea ch (PAR) app oache ince it inception. In 1999, the Cente ecei ed f nding f om the Racial and Ethnic App oache to Comm nit Health (REACH) 2010 p o gam of the Cente fo Di ea e Cont ol and P e ention (CDC) to ed ce diabete di pa itie . REACH 2010 i a t o-pha e demon tation p oject that call fo coalition b ilding aimed at comm nit mobili ation to ed ce health di pa itie . REACH 2010 eek to add e health di pa itie elated to ca dio a c la di ea e; cance , pa tic la l b ea t and ce ical cance ; diabete ; HIV/AIDS; child and ad lt accination ; and infant mo talit .

The REACH 2010 Pha e I Initiati e called fo (a) a lead agenc /pa tne a the cent al coo dinating o gani ation; (b) pa tne hip ith a local o tate health depa tment; and (c) pa tne hip ith an academic in tit tion. D ing the 12-month Pha e I pe iod, the e pa tne , o king ith comm nit e ident and local o gani ation , e e e xpected to e tabl h a coalition fo the p po e of cond ctng a comp ehen i e comm nit a e ment that o ld e lt in an action plan to be implemented d ing Pha e II.

While p epa ing the CDC REACH 2010 g ant application, the Latino Health Re ea ch Cente in ited indi id al , comm nit o gani ation , and local health and h man e ice p o ide to a e ie of to n meeting to a e hich health di pa itie and hich comm nitie had the g eate t need fo a m ltip onged e ea ch and action app oach. Afte e e al meeting , comm nit leade e commended a t ateg that incl ded fo ming a coalition of Af ican Ame ican and Latino o gani ation in Chicago' aciall di e e So thea t Side. The ationale fo an Af ican Ame ican and Latino coalition a ba ed on an nde tanding that the e a e mo e imila itie than diffe ence bet een Latino and Af ican Ame ican in the U.S. and on the So thea t Side: the e a e the la ge t mino it g o p ; both g o p a e cha acte i ed b lo le el of ed cation and income and high le el of po e t ; and both g o p a e affected b di pa itie in health and acce to health ca e. Membe of both g o p tend to ha e a t on g en e of famil , comm nit , and eligio it / pi it alit , and man membe of both g o p e home emedie and o e -the-co nte medication to

t eat mptom of illne e . The apid g o th of the Latino pop lation, the ide p ead gent ification of Chicago' neighbo hood , and the demolition of p blic ho ing ha e fo ced the e g o p to li e in the ame comm nitie . A econda goal of the p oject a to b ing the e g o p togethe a o nd common i e like diabete . If cce f l in meeting the e goal , the coalition o ld ha e de eloped a model of imp o ing ace elation hip fo othe comm nitie to follo nation ide.

The comm nit leade e commended ta geting the So thea t Side of Chicago beca e the a ea e xpe ience hat Do g Gill efe to a a con e gence of di adantage¹ lo ocioeconomic tat ,² di in e tment ,² and doc mented health di pa itie .³

Chicago' So thea t Side incl de i x comm nit a ea (CA): So th Sho e (CA43), So th Chicago (CA46), Cal met Height (CA48), So th Dee ing (CA51), Ea t Side (CA52), and Hege i ch (CA55). Hi to icall , the e CA e e collecti el called the Cal - met A ea Steel Belt of the Mid e t beca e the majo o ce of emplo ment e e teel mill , ail oad ca t p od ction facilitie , and the a to moti e ind t . D ing the 1970 , the teel ind t declined almo t to e x tinction. B the 1980 , e e e nemplo ment and di p lacement e e appa ent th o gho t the egion.² The Chicago So thea t comm nit a ea ha e ne e eco e ed f om thi de a tation.

Local o gani ation ha e a hi to of comm nit o gani ng a o nd ocial j tice i e and had p e i o e xpe ience in ing PAR in add e ing health conce n , e pe ciall in the a ea of HIV/AIDS, mate nal and child health, a thma, and b ea t cance . Ho e e , diabete cont ol and p e ention e e not p ominent on the local agenda. Ba ed on a ailable diabete - elated data^{4,5} and f the con ltation ith ke pa tne , it a dete mined that the e comm nitie co ld be mobili ed a o nd diabete and each a tate-of- eadine ,⁶ that i , engage in ta geted action to ed ce diabete - elated mo talit and complication , ith ancilla e ffo t pointed to a d inc ea ing ad lt accination fo in en a, fo hich people ith diabete a e at ele ated i k.⁷

In J l 1999, the fo nding membe of the Chicago So thea t Diabete Comm nit Action Coalition (CSEDCAC) b mitted a REACH 2010 Pha e I p o al. In addition to the Latino Health Re ea ch Cente , the p incipal pa tne e e the So th ide Health Con o ti m, a net o k of comm nit ho pital and p ima ca e facilitie (no kno n a the Healthca e Con o ti m of Illinoi); the Illinoi Diabete Cont ol P o gam of the Illinoi Depa tment of H man Se -

ice ; and *Centro Comunitario Juan Diego*, a local community organization that primarily serves recent immigrants. See Figure 1 for a list of coalition members.

A number of factors played into the decision to focus on diabetes: high diabetes mortality in the target community; high diabetes-related hospitalization rates, based on hospital discharge data; and high gestational diabetes rates.^{4,5} The present article describes (a) the PAR theoretical approach developed by the Latino Health Reach Center and practiced by CSEDCAC from its inception⁸; (b) elected leadership funding from REACH 2010 Phase I activities; and (c) current and planned coalition activities.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

PAR refers to a family of methodologies that can be used to pursue each objective (knowledge, understanding) with the meaningful involvement of community members (takeholders) and an ultimate focus on social action leading to improvement in social

condition.⁹ PAR approaches focus on building community capacity through training, which leads to consciousness-raising and a state of readiness for action. Community leaders and takeholders develop the knowledge and skill to take action aimed at changing community conditions and determine that a positive environment (context) exists to sustain behavior change over time.⁹ Examples of capacity building include facilitating the development of community infrastructure, coalition and providing training aimed at addressing community issues in understanding the social and political context of a problem and their potential solution.

Action research has links to and informed by a number of intellectual traditions, although it is not defined by any one of them. The seminal work of Kurt Lewin,¹⁰ Carland and Kemmi,¹¹ and Reason and Rowan¹² are all acknowledged. Action research has much in common, however, with a range of other traditions, including participatory research, action inquiry, action science, and community development. Its intellectual

Figure 1. CSEDCAC member organizations

| MEMBER | SECTOR |
|--|--|
| Advocate Trinity Hospital | Provider |
| African American Dietetics Association | Provider/professional organization |
| Black Nurses Association | Provider/professional organization |
| <i>Centro Comunitario Juan Diego</i> | Community-based organization |
| Chicago Family Health Center | Provider |
| Chicago Park District | Government/recreation |
| Guadalupe Senior Center | Community based organization |
| Healthcare Consortium of Illinois | Community-based organization |
| Healthy South Chicago | Community-based organization/consumers |
| Hispanic American Foundation for the Advise ment of Health | Provider/professional organization |

2. *A a... a e... e... ce... e... be... a... a... .*¹⁸ Without open communication and shared decision-making, trust and commitment among members will hinder and endanger completion of the work. Further, in a loose coalition, each member brings different strengths and full participation impairs the quality of decision.¹⁹ CSEDCAC accomplished this by developing a decision-making framework that all discussed and agreed upon among coalition members. The decision-making framework delineates ultimate responsibilities for decision related to membership, vision, goal, and objective; conflict resolution; coalition sustainability; and planning and evaluation.

Participatory processes take place at monthly open meetings held in public places (most often the local library) and through meeting agenda and minutes, guest speakers, and training opportunities related to diabetes self-management. Anyone who attends the monthly meeting is invited to join a working committee (task force), formed to focus on specific community needs and tasks (e.g., focus group, telephone survey); to sign up for the mailing list; and to receive periodic e-mail updates and bilingual newsletters. New participants are invited to a coalition orientation session, which is held at the same time as the task force meeting. Diabetes screening, foot and foot examination for people with diabetes are also available during monthly coalition meetings. In addition, guest speakers are invited to address diabetes-related issues as a means of keeping the membership informed of up-to-date diabetes information.

3. *A e... a... h... d... c... ,... , ca ac... .*¹⁸ While the inherent structural inequalities between the ethnic minority and the majority will not be remedied in the context of an single participatory process, continued efforts at building the capacity of the community to meet its own needs lessen the operational impact of inequalities and allow, over time, for community members to take control and moderate their role in the process.

During CSEDCAC Phase I activities, community capacity building included training for community staff and concerned citizens on diabetes, coalition building, and each method.

LATINO HEALTH RESEARCH CENTER PAR MODEL

The PAR model developed by the Latino Health Research Center has been applied to a diverse set of health issues including environmental exposure, diabetes prevention and control, cancer prevention and control, and tobacco control⁸ and has been used

in the evaluation. Figure 3 summarizes the major steps in the participatory process and highlights some of the activities necessary to progress from step to step.

COMMUNITY DIALOGUE

Once the community leaders are elected, the Latino Health Research Center initiated a dialogue with local leaders to explain the REACH 2010 Initiative and explore their interest in becoming partners. The Southside Health Consortium facilitated this process and a instrumental in bringing key community leaders (1,180 region and center), lethT 0.0 the 1. Phase I activities a.35 LOGUa

tion et eat, held at the o t et of REACH 2010 Pha e
II acti itie .

Figure 4. Mission Statement, Central Goal, Objectives, and Principles of Collaboration of the Chicago Southeast Diabetes Community Action Coalition (CSEDCAC)

Mission Statement:

As per the 4231 FD0-0557, the Southeast Diabetes Community Action Coalition (CSEDCAC) is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization, and its mission is to reduce the burden of diabetes in the Chicago Southeast Side.

...pon o hip, high te e comm nit mobili ation
 a a tateg fo diabete cont ol and p e ention; (d)
 coalition-b ilding t ategie ; (e) applied e ea ch meth-
 od ; (f) acce ing p blicl a ailable data; (g) pe fo m-
 ing a comm nit - ide e o ce e ; and (h) action
 planning.

Data collection

Specific objective e e de eloped fo Phase I acti itie :

Identif ke ocial, medical, en i onmental, c l-
 t al, in tit tional, and beha io al facto that
 ma be a ociated ith acial/ethnic di pa itie
 in diabete i k, p e alence, and i alit of ca e
 among Latino and Af ican Ame ican and othe
 g o p in peo e comm nit a ea on Chicago’
 So thea t Side.

Identif effecti e t ategie fo diabete p e en-
 tion and cont ol th o gh comm nit acton plan-
 ning.

Hi panic/Latino (Table 1). Most respondents were female (69.9%). Respondents had a mean age of 44.5 years; non-Hi panic white respondents had the highest mean age (51.2 years), and the Hi panic/Latino group the lowest (38.3 years mean age). Respondents had a mean of 12.7 years of education; Hi panics had the lowest level of education (mean of 9.8 years).

The sample population appeared to be of low socioeconomic status based on the high unemployment rate (20.4%), which reached 42.6% among Hi panic/Latino; a high level of participation in government benefit programs (27.6%), particularly among non-Hi panic black (27.7%) and Hi panic/Latino respondents (33.3%); and consuming food in food banks (9.1%), which was particularly high among Hi panic/Latino respondents (13.0%).

Access to care. Access appeared to be problematic, particularly for Hi panic/Latino respondents, who reported a variety of financial and linguistic barriers. Approximately 21% of Hi panic/Latino respondents reported no health insurance; 23.9% reported linguistic barriers in communicating with their health care providers. When considered together, the two factors may explain the reported low effectiveness of selected preventive services, including regular physical exam, blood pressure testing, and cholesterol screening (Table 1).

Prevalence of diabetes. Based on the telephone survey, the prevalence of diabetes in the total target population (age ≥ 18 years) was estimated to be 16.3%. The self-reported prevalence was highest among non-Hi panic white respondents (22%), followed by non-Hi panic black (16.6%) and Hi panic/Latino (10.8%). The percentage of women who reported a history of gestational diabetes was 12.1%; the percentage was particularly high for Hi panic/Latina respondents, compared to those for non-Hi panic white (11%) and non-Hi panic black (10.7%) respondents.

Other cardiovascular risk factors. Non-Hi panic white respondents reported the highest prevalence of certain conditions, such as heart disease (14%) and high cholesterol (26%), while they reported the lowest prevalence of kidney disease, which was highest among Hi panics (9%) and non-Hi panic black respondents (3.7%). The prevalence of high blood pressure was highest among non-Hi panic black respondents (29.7%).

Data on a number of health indicators suggested that the entire South Side Chicago community, regardless of ethnicity, was at risk for diabetes. For example, more than half of the respondents reported one or more relatives with diabetes. An additional 12.3% reported a family history of diabetes (Data Table 7). The prevalence of diabetes was particularly high among Hi panics (13.0%).

Table 1. Selected health disparities indicators for telephone survey respondents

| <i>Self-reported characteristic</i> | <i>Self-reported race/ethnicity</i> | | | <i>Total (N=394)</i> |
|---|---|--|--|--------------------------|
| | <i>Non-Hispanic black (n=273)</i> | <i>Non-Hispanic white (n=52)</i> | <i>Hispanic/ Latino (n=69)</i> | |
| <i>Demographics</i> | | | | |
| <i>Sex</i> | | | | |
| Male | 31.1 | 30.8 | 24.6 | 30.1 |
| Female | 68.9 | 69.2 | 75.4 | 69.9 |
| <i>Age</i> | | | | |
| 18–44 | 51.3 | 36.6 | 72.5 | 53.7 |
| 45–64 | 30.9 | 34.6 | 18.8 | 29.0 |
| ≥65 | 17.8 | 28.8 | 8.7 | 17.3 |
| Mean age (years) | 44.7 | 51.2 | 38.3 | 44.5 |
| Mean years of education | 13.5 | 12.5 | 9.8 | 12.7 |
| <i>Socioeconomic status</i> | | | | |
| Percent unemployed | 15.1 | 19.2 | 42.6 | 20.4 |
| Percent participating in government benefit programs ^a | n | | | |

Table 2. Selected health disparities indicators for telephone survey respondents with self-reported diabetes

| Self-reported characteristic | Self-reported race/ethnicity | | | Total (N=60) |
|---|------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | Non-Hispanic black (n=42) | Non-Hispanic white (n=11) | Hispanic/Latino (n=7) | |
| Demographics | | | | |
| Mean age (years) | 55.8 | 60.5 | 50.7 | 56.1 |
| Mean years of education | 12.9 | 12.2 | 9.3 | 12.4 |
| Socioeconomic status | | | | |
| Percent unable to work because of diabetes | 17.5 | 9.1 | 42.9 | 19.0 |
| Percent unemployed | 9.5 | 36.4 | 28.6 | 16.7 |
| Percent participating in government benefit programs ^a | 29.3 | 27.3 | 42.9 | 30.5 |
| Percent worried about not having enough food | 20.0 | 0 | 28.6 | 17.2 |
| Access to medical care | | | | |
| Percent without a regular source of health care | 4.8 | 0 | 0 | 3.3 |
| Percent needed medical care but did not get it within past year | 14.3 | 9.1 | 14.3 | 13.3 |
| Percent without health insurance | 11.9 | 9.1 | 42.9 | 15.0 |
| Percent with difficulty communicating with providers because of language barrier | — | — | 0 | 0 |
| Health status | | | | |
| Mean age when told they had diabetes | 44.9 | 47.8 | 38.4 | 44.6 |
| Individuals with self-reported diabetes as percent of telephone survey sample (N=394) | 16.3 | 22.0 | 10.8 | 16.1 |
| Perceived health | | | | |
| Percent excellent/very good/good | 48.7 | 73.0 | 42.9 | 52.6 |
| Percent fair | 34.1 | 9.1 | 42.9 | 30.5 |
| Percent poor | 17.1 | 18.2 | 14.3 | 16.9 |
| Self care/quality of care | | | | |
| Percent did not know their of type of diabetes | 17.5 | 9.1 | 42.9 | 19.0 |
| Mean number of HbAc1 within past year | 2.9 | 3.0 | 1.7 | 2.8 |
| Mean number of times health provider checked feet within past year | 3.8 | 3.4 | 1.5 | 3.6 |
| Percent had a dilated eye exam within past year | 85.0 | 90.9 | 71.4 | 84.5 |
| Percent ever received diabetes education classes | 47.5 | 63.6 | 57.1 | 51.7 |
| Percent saw a dietitian or nutritionist within past year | 32.5 | 27.3 | 42.9 | 32.8 |
| Percent had a flu shot within past year | 45.2 | 72.7 | 42.9 | 50.0 |
| Percent taking aspirin every day or every other day | 31.0 | 27.3 | 14.3 | 28.3 |
| Percent had physical exam within past year | 90.4 | 100.0 | 71.4 | 89.8 |
| Percent check feet daily | 87.5 | 81.8 | 100.0 | 87.9 |
| Percent check blood sugar daily | 42.5 | 54.5 | 28.6 | 43.1 |
| Diabetes risk factors | | | | |
| Percent with one or more family member with diabetes | 81.0 | 63.6 | 100.0 | 80.0 |
| Percent of women who gave birth to a baby weighing >9 pounds | 11.5 | 16.7 | 50.0 | 16.7 |
| Percent women who ever had gestational diabetes | 37.0 | 42.9 | 25.0 | 36.8 |
| Percent with one or more chronic conditions | 69.0 | 72.7 | 71.4 | 70.0 |
| Percent with hypertension | 64.3 | 40.0 | 57.1 | 59.3 |
| Lifestyle risk factors | | | | |
| Percent overweight (BMI >27) | 35.0 | 33.3 | 14.3 | 32.1 |
| Percent obese (BMI >30) | 32.5 | 33.3 | 71.4 | 37.5 |
| Mean times eating outside home weekly | 3.0 | 4.7 | 2.0 | 3.2 |
| Percent ate foods not prepared at home within past week | 69.0 | 81.8 | 71.4 | 71.7 |
| Percent smoked five or more packs of cigarettes in lifetime | 42.5 | 72.7 | 71.4 | 53.3 |

^aTANF, Medicaid, SSI, Social Security retirement or disability benefits, WIC, Food Stamps, public housing, and various meal programs.

an action plan adopted. The coalition decided to plan and conduct a commitment forum (one in English and one in Spanish) to present the preliminary findings and the draft action plan to the committee. From the forum, the action plan was finalized and the grant application for REACH 2010 Phase II was prepared. This action plan included a brief history of the coalition, its vision, mission, collective values, and principles; stated the coalition's broad overall goal and objectives; outlined major activities with performance measurable goal and objectives; suggested strategies for targeted action; set deadline; and determined resources needed to implement the plan.

Each activity and intervention has its own evaluation component. For instance, during the summer of 2002, the South Chicago Chamber of Commerce conducted a health eating awareness campaign in local grocery stores and restaurants; this campaign is being evaluated by measuring participation (e.g., number of grocery stores and restaurants that change stocking practices or menus to increase focus on health nutrition); a follow-up survey of participant is planned.

The data from the comprehensive community assessment are being used as baseline data; a telephone survey and focus group will be repeated later in Phase II. Hospitalization data will be compiled at a later point during Phase II. The coalition plan to use the SECAT data to measure progress.

CONCLUSION

Most efforts to prevent or control diabetes have focused on changing individual lifestyle practices. CSEDCAC has led a community-based PAR strategy

The author would like to acknowledge the hard work and commitment of the members of the Chicago Southeastern Diabetes Commitment Action Coalition, particularly the following people: Sothide Health Continuum (now the Health Care