



# An Assessment of Proposed Community Engagement Evaluation Tools

**Brendan Joyce; Cindy Blitz PhD**

Successful community engagement is a vital component of clinical and translational research, but there is a notable lack of effective tools to measure this success. The field has a great need for standard metrics in community engagement. This project sought to assess existing and proposed community engagement metrics and determine the most effective method to standardize the evaluation of community engagement success. A literature review was conducted on reported and proposed community engagement metrics. Papers were collected through PubMed using the search terms: (community OR patient OR stakeholder) AND (engagement) AND (measurement OR metrics OR evaluation). 15 articles were identified to meet the inclusion criteria. Metrics from the papers were compared by their effectiveness in producing data that are relevant, useful, and standardized. It was found that the most commonly used metrics provided insufficient information to truly assess the success of community engagement efforts. Many studies differed in their definition of community engagement and in their objectives in utilizing it. Researchers measured very different information from others, further increasing the difficulty of metric standardization. Some articles proposed evaluation frameworks that improved the quality of data gathered. However, these frameworks did not produce the needed standard measurements. RE-AIM, an evaluation framework frequently used in the Public Health field, shows promise in standardizing community engagement evaluation. This method has the potential to provide standardized data so that community engagement efforts can be better compared and the field more quickly advanced.

Community Engagement Evaluation Strategies	
<b>Weak</b>	<b>Common Metrics</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriated from traditional academic measures</li> <li>× Do not effectively evaluate engagement success</li> <li>× Data not standardized</li> </ul>
<b>Improved</b>	<b>Evaluation Frameworks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metrics used depend on research context</li> <li>✓ Effectively evaluate engagement success</li> <li>× Data not standardized</li> </ul>
<b>Strong</b>	<b>RE-AIM</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designed for public health intervention evaluation</li> <li>✓ Effectively evaluates engagement success</li> <li>✓ Data standardized</li> </ul>