

Faith Communities as Health Partners: Examples from the Field

Annie Hardison-Moody, Willona M. Stallings

Faith communities have a critical role to play in improving the health and well-being of North Carolinians. Research indicates that faith communities are ideal venues for health promotion, because they are connected to hard-to-reach populations, large numbers of people attend services each week, and faith communities have existing resources that can be used to support these initiatives [1]. These resources include volunteers, available space and land, strong networks for social support, and leadership structures that can support healthy behaviors. Faith-based organizations thus have a unique opportunity to improve the health and well-being of the communities they serve. We describe 2 faith-based health promotion interventions in North Carolina.

The North Carolina Council of Churches—a statewide ecumenical organization representing 18 denominations, 6,200 congregations, and 1.5 million individuals—is working to improve the health of clergy and congregants through its faith-based health initiative, Partners in Health and Wholeness. The mission of the initiative is both to promote health as a practice of faith, illustrating the spiritual significance of leading healthy lifestyles, and to improve the health of clergy and congregants through increased physical activity, healthy eating, and prevention or cessation of tobacco use.

Since 2010, the Council has recognized more than 100 congregations across 36 different counties for their health-related efforts. These congregations, located in both rural and urban areas, are made up of more than 35,000 individuals of different socioeconomic levels, races, ethnicities, and genders. They are demonstrating their commitment to health as a practice of their faith by serving healthier church meals, adopting formal church policies related to healthy eating and physical activity, addressing health as a faith issue from the pulpit, maintaining tobacco-free buildings, planting community gardens, hosting youth events that encourage healthy lifestyles, providing healthy snacks and beverages to children and youth, and more.

The work of Partners in Health and Wholeness would not be possible without the endorsement of key denominational leaders and other clergy as well as the support of community health partners, such as local health departments and North Carolina Cooperative Extension, which provide free or low-cost resources to congregations. Using sustained funding from the Blue Cross and Blue Shield of North Carolina Foundation, and partnering with American Red Cross Health and Safety Services of North Carolina, and Blue Cross and Blue Shield of North Carolina, the Council of Churches will begin offering the following opportunities in late summer and early fall of 2012: mini-grants for congregations that have been certified by Partners in Health and Wholeness; a Faith and Health Leadership Council for clergy; and free training in cardiopulmonary resuscitation and the use of automated external defibrillators for selected congregations across the state.

Faithful Families Eating Smart and Moving More (Faithful Families) was developed in 2007, after a statewide stakeholder meeting initiated by the North Carolina Division of Public Health and North Carolina Cooperative Extension. Out of this meeting, 2 principles emerged: That faith-based health promotion work in North Carolina should focus on communities with limited resources, and that any program developed should be accessible and open to individuals belonging to any faith tradition. Working with an advisory committee made up of members of multiple faith traditions and people at various levels of leadership (community-based, state-level, etc), Faithful Families developed a 9-lesson curriculum, adapted in part from the North Carolina Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program's successful Families Eating Smart and Moving More curriculum. It includes dialogue starters to help participants connect their health to their faith. Created for use with low-income families, the Faithful Families curriculum also includes a planning guide for creating and implementing new policies (eg, deciding to incorporate physical activity into all events or to serve water and fruits

11. Rosenbaum E. Racial/ethnic differences in asthma prevalence: the role of housing and neighborhood environments. *J Health Soc Behav.* 2008;49(2):131-145.
12. Homer C, Simpson LA. Childhood obesity: what's health care policy got to do with it? *Health Aff (Millwood).* 2007;26(2):441-444.
13. Urquieta de Hernandez B, Sorenson J, Sanchez P, et al. Por nuestros ojos: understanding social determinants of health through the eyes of youth. Poster presented at: 15th Annual Conference of the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health; April 18-21, 2012; Houston, Texas.
14. Swinburn B, Egger G, Raza F. Dissecting obesogenic environments: the development and application of a framework for identifying and prioritizing environmental interventions for obesity. *Prev Med.* 1999;29(6 Pt 1):563-570.
15. Huang TT, Glass TA. Transforming research strategies for understanding and preventing obesity. *JAMA.* 2008;300(15):1811-1813.
16. Sharkey JR, Johnson CM, Dean WR, Horel SA. Association between proximity to and coverage of traditional fast-food restaurants and non-traditional fast-food outlets and fast-food consumption among rural adults. *Int J Health Geogr.* 2011;10:37.
17. Longacre MR, Drake KM, MacKenzie TA, et al. Fast-food environments and family fast-food intake in nonmetropolitan areas. *Am J Prev Med.* 2012;42(6):579-587.
18. An R, Sturm R. School and residential neighborhood food environment and diet among California youth. *Am J Prev Med.* 2012;42(2):129-135.
19. Christakis NA, Fowler JH. Social contagion theory: examining dynamic social networks and human behavior [published online ahead of print, June 18, 2012]. *Stat Med.* doi:10.1002/sim.5408.
20. Font JC, Fabbri D, Gil J. Decomposing cross-country differences in levels of obesity and overweight: does the social environment matter? *Soc Sci Med.* 2010;70(8):1185-1193.

and vegetables at events) and making environmental changes (eg, planting community gardens, mapping out walking routes).

Since 2007, Faithful Families has been implemented in more than 45 faith communities across North Carolina, in predominantly low-income and minority communities [2, 3]. Self-reported data from 941 adults in participating faith communities shows that 70.5% of participants are African-American, 62.6% qualify as low-income under the federal poverty guidelines, and 71.6% are overweight or obese.

In addition to providing 9 weekly classes to more than 560 participants, Faithful Families has led communities of faith to make more than 170 policy and environmental changes. A majority of the faith communities that participate in the program have implemented multiple policy changes; the most common is a decision to serve water and healthy options like fruits and vegetables at all meetings and events. More than four out of five participants (83%) in the Faithful Families classes have reported a change in one or more nutrition behaviors [2].

Working with faith communities is an emerging and promising public health strategy. This type of multilevel, community-based approach has been effective in helping members of faith communities become advocates for policy and environmental changes that promote healthy eating and physical activity [4, 5]. Through programs like Partners in Health and Wholeness and Faithful Families Eating Smart and Moving More, faith communities are making North Carolina a better place to live, work, play, and pray. For more information, visit <http://www.healthandwholeness.org> and <http://www.eatsmartmovemorenc.com/FaithfulFamilies/FaithfulFamilies.html>. NCMJ

Annie Hardison-Moody, PhD project manager/Faithful Families coordinator, Voices into Action: The Families Food and Health Project, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina.
Willona M. Stallings, MPH program coordinator, Partners in Health and Wholeness Initiative, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to Dr. Carolyn Dunn, Cathy Thomas, Lorelei Jones, and George Reed for their review of this article. The authors would like to express their appreciation for the support of Representative Becky Carney, an official Strive to Revive partner. Her experiences helped to create the foundation for this project and secure funding for this important work in faith communities.

Potential conflicts of interest. A.H.M. and W.M.S. have no relevant conflicts of interest.

References

1. Campbell MK, Hudson MA, Resnicow K, Blakeney N, Paxton A, Baskin M. Church-based health promotion interventions: evidence and lessons learned. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2007;28:213-234.
2. Hardison-Moody A, Dunn C, Hall D, Jones L, Newkirk J, Thomas C. (2011) Multi-level partnerships support a comprehensive faith-based health promotion program. *J Extension*. 2011;49(6). <http://www.joe.org/joe/2011december/iw5.php>. Accessed July 18, 2012.
3. Hardison-Moody A, Dunn C, Hall D, Jones L, Newkirk J, Thomas C. Faithful families eating smart and moving more: the role of volunteer lay leaders in the implementation of a faith-based health promotion program. *Int J Volunteer Admin*. 2011;28(2).
4. Kaplan SA, Ruddock C, Golub M, et al. Stirring up the mud: using a community-based participatory approach to address health disparities through a faith-based initiative. *J Health Care Poor Underserved*. 2009;20(4):1111-1123.
5. Ammerman A, Corbie-Smith G, St. George DM, Washington C, Weathers B, Jackson-Christian B. Research expectations among African American church leaders in the PRAISE! project: a randomized trial guided by community-based participatory research. *Am J Public Health*. 2003;93(10):1720-1727.

Electronically published October 12, 2012.

Address correspondence to Dr. Annie Hardison-Moody, Department of 4-H and Family and Consumer Sciences, North Carolina State University, Campus Box 7606, Raleigh, North Carolina 27695 (annie_hardison-moody@ncsu.edu).

N C Med J. 2012;73(5):387-388. ©2012 by the North Carolina Institute of Medicine and The Duke Endowment. All rights reserved. 0029-2559/2012/73520

21. Israel BA, Eng E, Schulz AJ, Parker EA (eds). *Methods in Community-Based Participatory Research for Health*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2005.
22. Phillips RL, Jr., Kinman EL, Schnitzer PG, Lindbloom EJ, Ewigman B. Using geographic information systems to understand health care

access. *Arch Fam Med*. 2000;9(10):971-978.

23. Tapp H, Dulin M. The science of primary health care improvement: potential and use of community-based participatory research by practice-based research networks for translation of research into practice. *Exp Biol Med* (Maywood). 2010;235(3):290-299.