

# Community Outreach and Engagement (COE) Activities Across the Translational Research Continuum: References

The 2020–2021 Community Outreach and Engagement (COE) Activities Across the Translational Research Continuum supplement awardees completed projects that were grounded in community-based theoretical frameworks and/or informed by evidence-based interventions. This tip sheet is a selection of applied and conceptual references from the peer-reviewed literature and other resources that informed the funded NCI Cancer Centers' project development and implementation and is not meant to be a comprehensive summary of all COE-related references or NCI endorsement of specific articles.

## REFERENCES

**Applied:** Represents references that describe applied research

PUBLICATION	ARTICLE DESCRIPTION
Arroyo-Johnson, C., Allen, M. L., Colditz, G. A., Hurtado, G. A., Davey, C. S., Sanders Thompson, V. L., Drake, B. F., Svetaz, M. V., Rosas-Lee, M., & Goodman, M. S. (2015). A Tale of Two Community Networks Program Centers: Operationalizing and Assessing CBPR Principles and Evaluating Partnership Outcomes. <i>Progress in Community Health Partnerships</i> , 9 Suppl(Suppl), 61–69. <a href="https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26213405/">https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26213405/</a>	In this article, a case study on the development and application of community-based participatory research (CBPR) was conducted that compared project vs. program operationalization of principles. The study found significant differences in CBPR and community engagement operational definitions.

**PUBLICATION****ARTICLE DESCRIPTION**

Brownson, R. C., Fielding, J. E., & Green, L. W. (2018). Building Capacity for Evidence-Based Public Health: Reconciling the Pulls of Practice and the Push of Research. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 39, 27–53.  
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29166243/>

This article reviews the principles of evidence-based public health, advancing evidence-based approaches by emphasizing the importance of capacity building, approaches for capacity building, and areas of research and practice to focus on in the future.

Gaglio, B., Shoup, J. A., & Glasgow, R. E. (2013). The RE-AIM Framework: A Systematic Review of Use Over Time. *American Journal of Public Health*, 103(6), e38–e46.  
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23597377/>

This article discusses the synthesis of use, key issues, and application of the Reach, Effectiveness, Adoption, Implementation, and Maintenance (RE-AIM) framework across 71 articles with the exclusion of nonempirical articles, case studies, and commentaries.

George, S., Vassar, S. D., Norris, K., Coleman, B., Gonzalez, C., Ishimori, M., Morris, D., Mtume, N., Shapiro, M. F., Lucas-Wright, A., & Brown, A. F. (2019). Researcher Perspectives on Embedding Community Stakeholders in T1–T2 Research: A Potential New Model for Full-Spectrum Translational Research. *Journal of Clinical and Translational Science*, 3(2-3), 120–124.  
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31660235/>

In this article, a team of academics and community partners “conducted discussion groups with researchers to assess perspectives on...barriers/challenges to including community stakeholders in basic science[.]”

Joosten, Y. A., Israel, T. L., Williams, N. A., Boone, L. R., Schlundt, D. G., Mouton, C. P., Dittus, R. S., Bernard, G. R., & Wilkins, C. H. (2015). Community Engagement Studios: A Structured Approach to Obtaining Meaningful Input From Stakeholders to Inform Research. *Academic Medicine*, 90(12), 1646–1650.  
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26107879/>

This article describes the testing and “development of the Community Engagement Studio (CE Studio). This structured program facilitates project-specific input from community and patient stakeholders to enhance research design, implementation, and dissemination. Developers used a team approach to recruit and train stakeholders, prepare researchers to engage with stakeholders, and facilitate an in-person meeting with both.”

## PUBLICATION

## ARTICLE DESCRIPTION

King, D. K., Shoup, J. A., Raebel, M. A., Anderson, C. B., Wagner, N. M., Ritzwoller, D. P., & Bender, B. G. (2020). Planning for Implementation Success Using RE-AIM and CFIR Frameworks: A Qualitative Study. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 8, 59.  
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32195217/>

This study showed how RE-AIM and the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR) were used together to study the implementation planning process for an asthma care intervention, Breathewell, with the goal of increasing efficient delivery of resource-intensive asthma care services.

Kost, R. G., Leinberger-Jabari, A., Evering, T. H., Holt, P. R., Neville-Williams, M., Vasquez, K. S., Coller, B. S., & Tobin, J. N. (2017). Helping Basic Scientists Engage With Community Partners to Enrich and Accelerate Translational Research. *Academic Medicine*, 92(3), 374–379.  
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27119330/>

“The Rockefeller University Center for Clinical and Translational Science partnered with Clinical Directors Network, a practice-based research network (PBRN), to create a community-engaged research navigation (CEnR-Nav) program to foster research pairing basic science and community-driven scientific aims. The program is led by an academic navigator and a PBRN navigator.”

Kwan, B. M., McGinnes, H. L., Ory, M. G., Estabrooks, P. A., Waxmonsky, J. A., & Glasgow, R. E. (2019). RE-AIM in the Real World: Use of the RE-AIM Framework for Program Planning and Evaluation in Clinical and Community Settings. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 7, 345.  
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31824911/>

In this article, 17 programs were analyzed to determine how the RE-AIM framework is used in the “real world,” and how the RE-AIM framework is “used for planning and evaluating health-related programs in clinical and community settings.”

Main, D. S., Felzien, M. C., Magid, D. J., Calonge, B. N., O’Brien, R. A., Kempe, A., & Nearing, K. (2012). A Community Translational Research Pilot Grants Program to Facilitate Community-Academic Partnerships: Lessons From Colorado’s Clinical Translational Science Awards. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action*, 6(3), 381–387.  
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22982851/>

This article describes how an academic institution engaged its community in research by offering pilot grant funding to invest in community-based translational research on health disparities.

**PUBLICATION****ARTICLE DESCRIPTION**

Partridge, E. E., Hardy, C. M., Baskin, M. L., Fouad, M., Willis, L., James, G., & Wynn, T. (2015). Shifting Community-Based Participatory Infrastructure From Education/Outreach to Research: Challenges and Solutions. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action*, 9(S), 33–39.

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26213402/>

This article describes a model for overcoming the challenges the Deep South Network for Cancer Control (DSNCC) faced when its request for application (RFA) required a controlled research intervention. This requirement was a shift from the education/outreach program that it conducted for 10 years, and was initially problematic.

Schapira, L., & Schutt, R. (2010). Training Community Health Workers About Cancer Clinical Trials. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, 13(5), 891–898.

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21181445/>

This article discusses “a [four-hour] training program about cancer clinical trials [that] was developed through a needs assessment and in collaboration with community health workers, who served as consultants and a larger advisory board [composed] of community health workers, educators, and clinical trialists.” The Schapira-Schutt clinical trials training module advocates for research in medicine.

Watson, K. S., Henderson, V., Murray, M., Murphy, A. B., Levi, J. B., McDowell, T., Holloway-Beth, A., Gogana, P., Dixon, M. A., Moore, L., Hall, I., Kimbrough, A., Molina, Y., & Winn, R. A. (2019). Engaging African American Men as Citizen Scientists to Validate a Prostate Cancer Biomarker: Work-in-Progress. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action*, 13(5), 103–112.

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31378740/>

This article highlights the “social networks/assets of stakeholders, [citizen scientist] curriculum development/implementation, and recruitment of healthy controls for [Prostate Health Index (PHI)] validation.”

---

**Conceptual:** Represents references that describe theoretical frameworks

PUBLICATION	ARTICLE DESCRIPTION
<p>Aarons, G. A., Hurlburt, M., &amp; Horwitz, S. M. (2011). Advancing a Conceptual Model of Evidence-Based Practice Implementation in Public Service Sectors. <i>Administration and Policy in Mental Health</i>, 38(1), 4–23. <a href="https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21197565/">https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21197565/</a></p>	<p>This paper proposed “a multi-level, four-phase model of the implementation process (i.e., Exploration, Adoption/Preparation, Implementation, Sustainment), derived from extant literature, and [applied] it to public sector services. [The authors] highlight features of the model likely to be particularly important in each phase, while considering the outer and inner contexts (i.e., levels) of public sector service systems.” Exploration, Preparation, Implementation, Sustainment (EPIS) Framework (<a href="https://episframework.com/">https://episframework.com/</a>)</p>
<p>Ahmed, S. M., &amp; Palermo, A.-G. S. (2010). Community Engagement in Research: Frameworks for Education and Peer Review. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 100(8), 1380–1387. <a href="https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20558798/">https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20558798/</a></p>	<p>This article describes a community engagement framework and the potential outcomes of its use. The framework was developed by the National Institutes of Health Director’s Council of Public Representatives.</p>
<p>Balazs, C. L., &amp; Morello-Frosch, R. (2013). The Three R’s: How Community-Based Participatory Research Strengthens the Rigor, Relevance, and Reach of Science. <i>Environmental Justice</i>, 6(1), 9–16. <a href="https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24260590/">https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24260590/</a></p>	<p>“This commentary focuses on under-emphasized aspects of [community-based participatory research (CBPR).] Using two case studies of environmental health CBPR research—the Northern California Household Exposure Study and the San Joaquin Valley Drinking Water Study—[this article posits] that CBPR helps improve the “3 R’s” of science—rigor, relevance, and reach—and in so doing benefits the scientific enterprise itself.”</p>
<p>Bonney, R., Phillips, T. B., Ballard, H. L., &amp; Enck, J. W. (2015). Can Citizen Science Enhance Public Understanding of Science? <i>Public Understanding of Science</i>, 25(1), 2–16. <a href="https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26445860/">https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26445860/</a></p>	<p>This article describes the level of effort and resources needed in citizen science projects.</p>

**PUBLICATION****ARTICLE DESCRIPTION**

Brown, T., & Wyatt, J. (2010). Design Thinking for Social Innovation. *Development Outreach*, 12(1), 29–43.

[https://doi.org/10.1596/1020-797x\\_12\\_1\\_29](https://doi.org/10.1596/1020-797x_12_1_29)

This book describes how industry-trained designers can help create tools for outreach.

Butterfoss, F., & Kegler, M. (2002). Toward a Comprehensive Understanding of Community Coalitions: Moving From Practice to Theory. In R. J. DiClemente, R. A. Crosby, & M. C. Kegler (Eds.), *Emerging Theories in Health Promotion Practice and Research: Strategies for Improving Public Health* (pp. 194-227). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

This book chapter describes community coalition action theory.

Butterfoss, F. D., & Kegler, M. C. (2012). A Coalition Model for Community Action. In *Community Organizing and Community Building for Health and Welfare*, 16(3), 309–328. <https://muse.jhu.edu/book/16464>

This book chapter describes an in-depth community coalition model.

Colditz, G., Wolin, K. Y., & Gehlert, S. (2012). Applying What We Know to Accelerate Cancer Prevention. *Science Translational Medicine*, 4(127). <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22461645/>

The authors discuss ways to implement “improved infrastructure that will better incentivize and support transdisciplinary, multilevel research and successful intervention.”

Collier, E., & Danis, M. (2017). Participation of Citizen Scientists in Clinical Research and Access to Research Ethics Consultation. *The American Journal of Bioethics: AJOB*, 17(4), 70–72. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28328379/>

This article discusses the role of citizen scientists in clinical research.

Damschroder, L. J., Aron, D. C., Keith, R. E., Kirsh, S. R., Alexander, J. A., & Lowery, J. C. (2009). Fostering Implementation of Health Services Research Findings Into Practice: A Consolidated Framework for Advancing Implementation Science. *Implementation Science*, 4(1). <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19664226/>

This article describes “the Consolidated Framework For Implementation Research (CFIR) that offers an overarching typology to promote implementation theory development and verification about what works where and why across multiple contexts.”

## PUBLICATION

## ARTICLE DESCRIPTION

Diclemente, R., Crosby, R., & Kegler, M. (n.d.). Emerging Theories In Health Promotion Practice and Research Strategies for Improving Public Health. <https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Emerging+Theories+in+Health+Promotion+Practice+and+Research%3A+Strategies+for+Improving+Public+Health-p-9780787966164>

Chapter 7 includes a discussion of the Community Coalition Action Theory (CCAT) model.

Glasgow, R. E., Vogt, T. M., & Boles, S. M. (1999). Evaluating the Public Health Impact of Health Promotion Interventions: the RE-AIM Framework. *American Journal of Public Health*, 89(9), 1322–1327. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10474547/>

This article discusses the framework for public health intervention evaluation that assesses five dimensions that occur at multiple levels: reach, efficacy, adoption, implementation, and maintenance.

Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., & Becker, A. B. (1998). Review of Community-Based Research: Assessing Partnership Approaches to Improve Public Health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 19(1), 173–202. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9611617/>

“ This review provides a synthesis of key principles of community-based research, examines its place within the context of different scientific paradigms, discusses rationales for its use, and explores major challenges and facilitating factors and their implications for conducting effective community-based research aimed at improving the public’s health.”

Leeman, J., Calancie, L., Hartman, M. A., Escoffery, C. T., Herrmann, A. K., Tague, L. E., Moore, A. A., Wilson, K. M., Schreiner, M., & Samuel-Hodge, C. (2015). What Strategies Are Used to Build Practitioners’ Capacity to Implement Community-Based Interventions and Are They Effective?: A Systematic Review. *Implementation Science*, 10, 80. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26018220/>

In this article, systematic review of empirical studies of capacity-building interventions was meant to contribute to further development of the Evidence-Based System of Innovation Support (EBSIS). The review worked to identify the range of strategies used, structure variations, and effectiveness of increasing practitioners’ use of evidence-based prevention interventions.

## PUBLICATION

## ARTICLE DESCRIPTION

Leeman, J., Calancie, L., Kegler, M. C., Escoffery, C. T., Herrmann, A. K., Thatcher, E., Hartman, M. A., & Fernandez, M. E. (2017). Developing Theory to Guide Building Practitioners' Capacity to Implement Evidence-Based Interventions. *Health Education and Behavior*, 44(1), 59–69.  
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26500080/>

The authors “conducted a scoping study of frameworks and theories detailing variations in [evidence-based interventions (EBIs)] or practice contexts and how to tailor capacity-building to address those variations. Using an iterative process, [the authors] consolidated constructs and propositions across 24 frameworks and developed a beginning theory to describe salient variations in EBIs (complexity and uncertainty) and practice contexts (decision-making structure, general capacity to innovate, resource and values fit with EBI, and unity vs. polarization of stakeholder support).”

Luke, D. A., Calhoun, A., Robichaux, C. B., Elliott, M. B., & Moreland-Russell, S. (2014). The Program Sustainability Assessment Tool: A New Instrument for Public Health Programs. *Preventing Chronic Disease*, 11, 130184.  
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24456645/>

This article presents results of a measurement development study of the Program Sustainability Assessment Tool. This tool is a reliable instrument to assess the capacity for program sustainability of public health programs and more.

Minkler, M. (2012). *Community Organizing and Community Building for Health and Welfare*. In Project MUSE. Rutgers University Press.  
<https://muse.jhu.edu/book/16464>

This book describes approaches to community building and organizing (e.g., collaborating with communities on assessment, coalition building, media advocacy).

Reedy, J., Blanchard, J. W., Lund, J., Spicer, P. G., Byars, C., Peercy, M., Saunkeah, B., & Blacksher, E. (2020). Deliberations About Genomic Research and Biobanks With Citizens of the Chickasaw Nation. *Frontiers in Genetics*, 11, 466.  
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32477408/>

“A consortium involving a university and three American Indian/Alaska Native (AIAN) community partners is working to promote deliberation and dialogue in AIAN communities about the potential benefits and risks of genomic research for those communities.” This article describes “the deliberative method...and report[s] on the ideas discussed during the tribal citizens’ deliberations.”



**PUBLICATION****ARTICLE DESCRIPTION**

Ridpath, J. R., Wiese, C. J., & Greene, S. M. (2009). Looking at Research Consent Forms Through a Participant-Centered Lens: The PRISM Readability Toolkit. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 23(6), 371–375.  
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19601476/>

“The toolkit provides strategies for creating study materials that are readable and participant centered, focusing on consent forms but also addressing other participant materials. Based on plain language principles, this free resource includes a flexible menu of tools, such as an editing checklist, before-and-after examples, easy-to-read template language, and a list of alternative words.”

Salamone, J. M., Lucas, W., Brundage, S. B., Holloway, J. N., Stahl, S. M., Carbine, N. E., ... Shajahan-Haq, A. N. (2018). Promoting Scientist–Advocate Collaborations in Cancer Research: Why and How. *Cancer Research*.  
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30120210/>

This article discusses “the benefits of engaging advocates in cancer research, [underscoring] ways in which both the scientific and patient communities can facilitate this mutually beneficial collaboration, [and] how to establish and nurture successful scientist–advocate relationships throughout the research process.”

Shea, C. M., Young, T. L., Powell, B. J., Rohweder, C., Enga, Z. K., Scott, J. E., Carter-Edwards, L., & Corbie-Smith, G. (2017). Researcher Readiness for Participating in Community Engaged Dissemination and Implementation Research: A Conceptual Framework of Core Competencies. *Translational Behavioral Medicine*, 7(3), 393–404.  
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28341897/>

This article proposes “a conceptual framework that identifies detailed competencies for researchers participating in [community-engaged dissemination and implementation (CEDI)] and maps these competencies to domains. The framework is a necessary step toward developing a CEDI research readiness survey that measures a researcher’s attitudes, willingness, and self-reported ability for acquiring the knowledge and performing the behaviors necessary for effective community engagement.”

Tossas, K. Y., Watson, K. S., Colditz, G. A., Thomas, C. R., Stewart, J. H., & Winn, R. A. (2020). Advocating for a “Community to Bench Model” in the 21st Century. *EBioMedicine*, 53, 102688.  
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32114395/>

The article advocates for using the community-to-bench model.

Wilkins, C. H., & Alberti, P. M. (2019). Shifting Academic Health Centers From a Culture of Community Service to Community Engagement and Integration. *Academic Medicine*, 94(6), 763–767.  
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30893063/>

This article describes the “need for academic health centers (AHCs) to engage communities across their clinical, research, and education missions.”