partnerships. Their honest and frank feedback was essential to broaching sensitive topics related to partnership development, and to identify realistic and practical solutions. We also thank all members of the planning committee and our colleagues in the Community Engagement Program for their work on bringing together community and academic members for this retreat. This project was supported by grant number UL1TR002240 from the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS).

3372

Developing a REDCap Database to Understand Partnership Cultivation Efforts

Grisel M. Robles-Schrader[1], Gina Curry, Josefina Serrato, Jen Brown and Keith A Herzog
[1]Northwestern University

OBJECTIVES/SPECIFIC AIMS:.Outline the development and purpose of the partnership brokering database in REDCap. Provide an overview of the tool and how it works. Discuss how this tool facilitates partnership-brokering activities and discuss plans for future use METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap) is a secure, web-based application developed at Vanderbilt University to assist with systematic data management of small and medium sized projects. CCH utilized REDCap to build a custom data management warehouse entitled the Partnership Brokering Tool. Information compiled in various formats (handwritten notes, spreadsheets, etc.) over the past 10 years by CCH staff, was then systematically organized and entered into the Partnership Brokering Tool. The tool captures information such as individual contact information, organizational affiliation (academic, community, faith, government etc.), research interests (35 categories - asthma, diabetes, heart disease, etc.), communities of foci (children, elderly, LGBTQ, ethnicity, etc.), and target geographic community served (Chicago north, south, suburban, Illinois, etc.). RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Data was compiled on 451 community groups and organizations and 77 partners in academia thus far. Community organizations represent a range of community sectors including advocacy and policy groups, community-based, faith-based organizations, foundations, media, schools, etc. throughout the Chicagoland area. Data analysis activities are underway, however, results will also be shared regarding characteristics of the communities these organizations serve including:. Age range. Special populations (as defined by the CSTI grant). Underrepresented racial and ethnic communities. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: The Partnership Brokering Tool has provided a format for CCH to systematically gather information about the relationships staff have cultivated with community groups and organizations. Unlike an email management system, this REDCap project is highly useful in capturing the parameters of our partner pool, identifying partnership gaps, and matching individuals interested in collaborating with researchers or community organizations that have a particular skill set or research interest. The Partnership Brokering Tool has also facilitated stakeholder engagement dedicated to guiding the centers' overall goals, objectives, and programming. Finally, utilizing REDCap has streamlined efforts in reporting quantitative and qualitative data about these organizations. In the next phase of this project, CCH will utilize the database to assess the nature of the relationship between CCH and community groups and organizations.

3347

Developing Relevant Community Engagement Metrics to Evaluate Engagement Support and Outcomes

Grisel M. Robles-Schrader[1], Keith A Herzog and Josefina Serrato
[1]Northwestern University

OBJECTIVES/SPECIFIC AIMS: The goals in this project were two-fold:. Develop metrics that assessed community engagement support the center provides, and. Systematically document the fluid and time-intensive nature of providing community engaged research support, as well as key outcomes. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: The CCH utilized REDCap software in combination with Excel, to create and implement a data collection system to monitor and report on the full spectrum of engagement activities offered by the center. Center staff collaborated in identifying relevant metrics, developing the data collection instruments, and beta-testing instruments with real examples. This facilitated the integration of contextual factors (defined as factors such as the history, size, and diversity of the community, the organizational mission, the structure and size of the CE team, the number of years a university has been supporting community-engaged research work, etc.). Taking a collaborative approach in developing the center's evaluation plan offered the added benefit of facilitating staff/faculty buy-in, building staff capacity, and engaging the team in understanding concepts related to performance measurement versus management. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Key benefits of these engagement tracking systems include: consolidating data into a central location, standardizing tracking processes and critical definitions, and supporting more automated reporting systems (e.g., dashboards) that facilitate quality improvement and highlight success stories. Data were compiled and reported via on-line dashboard (REDCap and Tableau) to help center leadership and staff analyze:. Quality improvement issues (How quickly are we responding to a request for support? Are we providing resources that meet the needs of community partners? Academics? Community-academic partnerships?);. Qualitative process analysis (In what research phase are we typically receiving requests for support (e.g. proposal development phase, implementation phase, etc.)? What types of projects are applying for seed grants? After the seed grant ends, are the community-academic partnerships continuing to partner on research activities?);. Outcomes (Are new partnerships stemming from our support? Are supported research projects leading to new policies, practices, programs?). DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: There is a gap in the literature regarding meaningful, actionable, and feasible community engaged metrics that capture critical processes and outcomes. This project identified many more relevant metrics and demonstrates that it is worthwhile to take a collaborative, inclusive approach to identifying, tracking, and reporting on key process and outcome metrics in order to convey a more comprehensive picture of community engagement activities and to inform continuous improvement efforts. Community engagement centers across CTSIs offer a similar range of programs and services. At the same time, much of the community-engaged research literature describes metrics related to community-academic grant submissions, funds awarded, and peer-reviewed publications. Experts that work in the arena of providing community engagement support recognize that these metrics are sufficient in understanding the spectrum of engagement opportunities. Community engagement (CE) teams nationally can utilize these metrics in developing their evaluation infrastructure. At the national level, NCATS can utilize the metrics for CE common metrics related to these programs and services. Critical to this