

Title: Researcher Perspectives on Embedding Community Stakeholders In T1-T2 Research: A Potential New Model for Full-Spectrum Translational Research

Presenting Author: Sheba George, UCLA/Charles Drew University, Academic Partner (shebageorge@ucla.edu)

Additional authors in alphabetical order:

Rachelle Bross, Harbor-UCLA Medical Center/LA BioMed, Academic Partner (RBross@labiomed.org)

D'Ann Morris, UCLA, Academic Partner (DMMorris@mednet.ucla.edu)

Norma Mtume, Community Member, Community Member (nsmtume@sbcglobal.net)

Keith Norris, UCLA, Academic Partner (knorris@ucla.edu)

Ibrahima Sankare, UCLA, Academic Partner (ISankare@mednet.ucla.edu)

Teresa Seeman, UCLA, Academic Partner (TSeeman@mednet.ucla.edu)

Stefanie Vassar, UCLA, Academic Partner (SVassar@ucla.edu)

Pluscedia Williams, Charles Drew University, Community Member (pluscedia.williams@gmail.com)

Anna Lucas-Wright, UCLA/Charles Drew University, Community Member (wrightaziza@aol.com)

Sonya Young Aadam, California Black Women's Health Project, Community Member (sonya.cabwhp@gmail.com)

Arleen Brown, UCLA, Academic Partner (ABrown@mednet.ucla.edu)

Background & Objective: Effective community engagement in T3-T4 research is widespread, however, similar stakeholder involvement is missing in T1-T2 research. Recent IOM recommendations for CTSA's include having "active and substantive community stakeholder participation in priority setting and decision making across all phases of research (T1-T4)". As part of an effort to implement a pilot program to embed community stakeholders in T1-T2 research projects, a UCLA CTSI team (co- led by community stakeholders) conducted discussion groups with researchers to assess their perspectives on this potentially innovative and synergistic opportunity.

Methods: We conducted five discussion groups with 19 basic researchers (focused on T1 or T2 research) representing four research institutions. Topics included 1) barriers/challenges to including community stakeholders in basic science, 2) skills/training required for stakeholders and researchers, 3) potential benefits of these activities.

Results: 1. Barriers identified included a) high levels of technicality/jargon in research settings, b) finding community stakeholders with motivation/time for participation and c) challenges of relationship building to establish trust/open communication. 2. Skills/training needed for community stakeholders included basic understanding of science and lab-specific knowledge whereas researchers needed skills to communicate research concepts/relevance in lay language. 3. Participation benefits for researchers included addressing needs of surrounding ("real-life") communities and parlaying enhanced ability to explain research in lay language to policy makers and funders.

Conclusion: Engaging community stakeholders in basic science research was perceived as challenging but with exciting potential to incorporate "real-life" community health priorities into basic research resulting in a new model for full-spectrum translational research.