

Title: The NGAGE Model Developed at the Rush Alzheimer’s Disease Research Center: An Approach to Community Engagement and Inclusion in Dementia Research with Diverse Community-Dwelling Older Adults.

Authors: Crystal M. Glover, PhD^{*1,2,3}, Julie A. Schneider, MD^{1,3}, David A. Bennett, MD^{1,3}, Lisa L. Barnes, PhD^{1, 2, 3}, David X. Marquez^{1, 4}, Neelum T. Aggarwal^{1,5}, Sue Leurgans^{1,3}, Karen L. Graham, PhD¹, Susan Frick, MSW¹, Raj C. Shah^{1, 6}

*Corresponding author at: Rush Alzheimer’s Disease Center, Rush University Medical Center, 1750 West Harrison Street, Suite 1000, Chicago, Illinois 60612 United States of America. Tel: +1 312-563-1077 Fax: +1 312-942-4154 Email Address: Crystal_Glover@rush.edu Twitter: @CGster

¹Rush Alzheimer’s Disease Center, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois, 60612

²Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois, 60612

³Department of Neurological Sciences, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois 60612

⁴Department of Kinesiology and Nutrition, Institute for Health Research and Policy, The University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60612

⁵Department of Neurology, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois 60612

⁶Department of Family Medicine, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois 60612

Word Count of Main Text: (Including Abstract, Text, and References)

Number of References:

Number of Data Elements: Tables, Figures, Total Data Elements

Acknowledgements: We thank all community members who have attended and supported activities and events hosted by and affiliated with the Rush Alzheimer’s Disease Research Center. We thank all communities across the Chicago metropolitan area that have welcomed the Rush Alzheimer’s Disease Research Center. Last but not least, we thank all staff at the Rush Alzheimer’s Disease Center, especially those affiliated with the Outreach, Recruitment, and Engagement Core, past and present, for their dedication and tireless efforts over the years, including Traci Colvin, Israel Hernandez, Yadira Montoya, Judy Phillips, Jamie Plenge, Kyra Reynolds, and Tarisha Washington. A very special mention to Barbara Eubeler, Carol Farran, and Pamela Smith who were pivotal in developing and forming a solid foundation of ORE Core efforts.

Author Contributions: CMG and RCS contributed to the conception and design of the research study; CMG and RCS drafted the work; CMG, DAB, LLB, DXM, NTA, SL, KLG, SW, and RCS revised the work critically for important intellectual content; CMG, DAB, LLB, DXM, NTA, SL, KLG, SW, and RCS provided approval for publication of the content; CMG and RCS agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Funding: This work was supported by grants from the National Institute on Aging [grant numbers: P30AG072975 and P30AG010161 to JAS; R01AG022018 to LLB; R01AG17917 to DAB], the Illinois Department of Public Health, and the National Center for the Advancement of Translational Science [UL1TR002389]. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH.

Declaration of Any Conflict of Interest: The authors report no conflicts with any product mentioned or concept discussed in this article.

Institutional Review Board:

ABSTRACT

Background: One of the biggest challenges in the field of Alzheimer’s disease and related dementias (ADRD) is the severe inequitable inclusion of Black and Latino adults in clinical research studies. Despite consistent and persistent efforts, rates of participation among diverse older adults remain critically low.

Objective: The purpose of this paper is to set forth The NGAGE Model, one developed at the Rush Alzheimer’s Disease Research Center (Rush ADRC) to facilitate community engagement and research participation among diverse older adults.

Methods: The NGAGE Model consists of five steps that are conceptually distinct but overlapping in practice: 1) Networking, 2) Give first, 3) Advocate for research, 4) Give back, and 5) Evaluate. We define and describe each step. For steps 1 through 4, we calculated the number of events, number of attendees for each event, and percentages of attendees by racial and ethnic categorizations annually from July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2023, resulting in data for 12 distinct years, as provided in annual progress reports to the National Institute on Aging. For Step 5, we counted the number of persons and computed percentages of people by racial and ethnic groups who consented to our Data and Specimen Repository and enrolled in a research study.

Results: Over 12 years, the Rush ADRC conducted 5,362 events with 265,794 attendees. Give First activities represented the NGAGE step with both the highest number of events (n=2,247) and the most attendees (n=124,403). Among Black adults, the highest attendee percentage existed for Advocate for Research events (47%), while the highest for Latinos occurred for Give First activities (26%). Furthermore, 2,135 persons consented to the Data and Specimen Repository and 5,905 enrolled in a research study across 12 years. Higher percentages of both Black (37%) and Latino (10%) adults enrolled in research studies compared to the Repository with 21% and 7%, respectively.

Conclusions: The NGAGE Model facilitated community engagement and research inclusion among Black and Latino adults, particularly via Give First and Advocate for Research activities. We discuss the impacts of study milestones, staff resources, and the COVID-19 pandemic on The NGAGE Model activities and outcomes.

Keywords: Older Adults; Community Engagement; Recruitment Science; Cognitive Aging; Health Equity.

27 Introduction

28 One of the biggest challenges in the field of aging is the severe inequitable inclusion of Black and Latino
29 adults in clinical research focused on Alzheimer’s disease (AD) and related dementias (ADRD). [1-7]
30 Insufficient representation of Black and Latino adults exists across the research spectrum, from outreach and
31 engagement activities to participation in both observational studies and clinical trials. Simultaneously, older
32 Black and Latino adults face a disproportionate risk of developing ADRD, with estimates ranging from 1.5 to 2
33 times higher risk compared to their non-Latino White counterparts.[8-12] Furthermore, ADRD devastates not
34 only Black and Latino adults living with dementia but their entire families and communities who comprise
35 formal and informal care networks, with dire consequences of ADRD impacting every facet of life, including
36 current and future financial, physical, and psychological outcomes.[13-15] As such, the resounding under-
37 representation and under-inclusion of Black and Latino adults in ADRD research severely impedes the field’s
38 advancement. [2,16,17] More specifically, the field lacks necessary data from Black and Latino adults to
39 understand aging experiences and ADRD trajectories in diverse communities and, thus, how to address the
40 disparate burden of ADRD within these populations. The absence of such data severely limits the development
41 and implementation of effective community engagement approaches and necessary informational materials
42 regarding common topics related to aging and ADRD (e.g., managing comorbidities and phases of AD); and
43 undermines the safety and applicability of strategies and therapeutics to diagnose, mitigate, and treat ADRD.
44 Overall, Black and Latino adults cannot fully benefit from scientific advances and existing knowledge
45 associated with ADRD research as findings are non-generalizable, inapplicable, or unavailable to these
46 populations. It is paramount that a sweeping and marked shift must occur in the field regarding the inclusion of
47 Black and Latino adults in ADRD clinical research.

48 Researchers have continuously put forth efforts to remedy the under-representation and under-inclusion
49 of Black and Latino adults in ADRD research. Unfortunately, these efforts have yielded less than optimal
50 participation levels among diverse adults.^{19,21-27} Well-documented barriers to research participation have
51 persisted at the individual-, study-, and structural levels, including distrust of the medical system and research
52 due to past and current mistreatment, caregiving responsibilities, cultural perceptions regarding ADRD, lack of

53 familial support for research participation, a dearth of diverse researchers, linguistic incompatibility between
54 study resources and communities, and inadequate transportation. [18-23]

55 Conversely, community engagement has facilitated, in part, existent research participation by Black and
56 Latino adults. Researchers focused on welcoming Black and Latino adults into ADRD research have
57 tenaciously developed community-based approaches to collaborate with diverse communities to increase
58 research participation. [3,5,6,18,24-28]The foundation of effective community engagement consists of
59 researchers establishing and maintaining trusting and mutually beneficial relationships with community leaders
60 and members. These researcher-community relationships result in the bidirectional transmission of knowledge,
61 the development and use of information and programming that is both scientifically relevant and of use to
62 community-based audiences, current research participants as study ambassadors and collaborators, and
63 institutional support of local community-based services and resources. [29-32] However, a recent systematic
64 review regarding recruitment and retention with diverse older adults in ADRD research notes that related
65 strategies vary widely by research site and largely lack a clear evaluation plan. [3] Furthermore, current
66 recruitment and retention efforts specifically geared toward diverse older adults do not pertain to longitudinal
67 studies focused on ADRD. [3]

68 The Rush Alzheimer's Disease Research Center (Rush ADRC) has largely focused its community
69 engagement efforts to facilitate research participation by older Black, Latino, and other minoritized populations
70 traditionally under-included in ADRD research. Funded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) since 1994,
71 the Rush ADRC's robust research portfolio mostly consists of longitudinal cohort studies focused on cognitive
72 aging, including studies that request biospecimens and postmortem brain tissue. Initially, the Rush ADRC's
73 Outreach, Recruitment, and Engagement (ORE) Core provided tactical support for study recruitment and related
74 activities. Largely through its ORE Core and support from the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute
75 (PCORI), the Rush ADRC subsequently began to foster enduring bi-directional relationships with community
76 organizations, leaders, and members to address barriers to and facilitate increased research participation among
77 prominent populations of older adults across the Chicago metropolitan area, including older Black and Latino
78 adults. Hallmarks of the Rush ADRC's approach to community engagement included community-based

79 research activities - from recruitment events to study visits - and the creation and dissemination of evidence-
80 based, scientific- and community-relevant, and linguistically congruent education materials.

81 In 2010, the Rush ADRC's ORE Core re-examined its activities and recognized that their efforts formed
82 the foundation of a more sustainable approach - one that is both systematic and pragmatic - to community
83 engagement and facilitation of equitable research participation among diverse older adults. Fundamentally, the
84 ORE Core approached community engagement by first networking with organizations that actively support
85 diverse older adults and addressing needs identified by diverse community leaders and members then
86 advocating for research participation. In 2011, the ORE Core formally characterized its approach to community
87 engagement as the NGAGE Model, a community-based, participant-centered, information-focused model (See
88 Figure 1).^{31,32} The NGAGE Model consists of five conceptually distinctive and sequential but overlapping steps:
89 1) Network, 2) Give first, 3) Advocate for research, 4) Give back, and 5) Evaluate. The purpose of this paper is
90 to describe the NGAGE Model and resultant research participation in Rush ADRC and other NIH-supported
91 studies among diverse older adults, specifically older Black and Latino adults. We developed and evaluated the
92 process of the NGAGE Model to examine its utility as an example of effective community engagement and
93 subsequent recruitment and retention as well as to advance recruitment science in ADRD research. As such, the
94 NGAGE Model may inform and bolster national research efforts to facilitate representative and inclusive
95 ADRD studies to develop and improve informational materials, treatment and risk reduction methods, and other
96 intervention strategies and therapeutics to foster equity in aging and dementia.

97 **Methods**

98 **Participants**

99 The Rush ADRC focuses its efforts on community-dwelling, non-demented older adults from diverse
100 backgrounds and who are traditionally under-included in ADRD research, particularly older Black and Latino
101 adults. The Rush ADRC's ORE Core aims to engage with diverse communities across the Chicago metropolitan
102 area, with its efforts guided by the NGAGE Model. Activities related to the ORE Core were approved by an
103 Institutional Review Board (Protocol Number L91020181-AM59) at The Rush University Medical Center. Data

are publicly available, de-identified, and aggregated from required annual progress reports to NIH for the Rush ADRC.

Activities Associated with Each Step of the NGAGE Model

The first step of the NGAGE Model involves networking with leaders of community organizations and other prominent community members. Networking interactions provide insight on how to best engage with communities and “give first” (second step) to meet community-specified needs using services supported by the Rush ADRC. Community engagement leads to the third step or advocating for research. Here, ORE Core events center on providing information to community members regarding the role and value of research participation and encourage volunteering for Rush ADRC and other NIH-supported research and related initiatives.

Cumulative knowledge from the Rush ADRC as well as from NIH, the Alzheimer’ Association, and other reputable scientific entities is “given back” (fourth step) to community members - regardless of consenting or not consenting to research or related participation. The Rush ADRC and its ORE Core evaluates (fifth step), in part, by examining the number of older adults who enroll in the Rush ADRC Data and Specimen Repository and those who join Rush ADRC studies and other NIH-supported initiatives. See Table 1.

Step One: Network

The first step of the NGAGE Model involves networking between Rush ADRC ORE Core staff and community leaders and prominent members located within and serving diverse communities. Staff initially identify leaders and prominent members and become consistently active in various organizations and groups within diverse communities, including regular attendance at meetings, faith-based services, health fairs, and as board members. Staff also engage in one-on-one meetings with leaders and other prominent members to further existing community-based health-related efforts. ORE Core staff learn about ongoing community efforts, and, in turn, community organizations, leaders, and members gain information about the Rush ADRC, its commitment to equity in aging, and related research efforts. At this step, the overarching goal is for the Rush ADRC ORE Core to establish relationships with local leaders and members to understand the needs and interests of diverse communities. Engagement occurs at an acceptable pace to community leaders and members, as we realize that early mistakes may jeopardize sustainable relationships.^{14,41}

130 *Step Two: Give First*

131 Over time, networking can foster the development of consistent, long-term relationships between the
132 Rush ADRC ORE Core and community leaders and members that are mutually beneficial and bi-directionally
133 trusting. Through these relationships, the ORE Core offers “give first” activities. These events include
134 presentations on health-related topics that are important while aging (e.g., the relationship between
135 cardiovascular and brain health, diet and physical activity, and disaster relief and preparation) at community-
136 based locations (e.g., park districts, libraries, and faith-based organizations); sponsorship and other resource
137 support of community-based activities; encouragement of memory evaluation; and conducting age-friendly
138 physical activity classes. Typically, Give First programming, including presentation topics and locations, is
139 suggested by community leaders and members. As such, community members may also request to receive
140 information about adjacent topics in aging, such as Long COVID and Parkinson’s disease. Here, we partner
141 with Rush colleagues and those from nearby institutions to provide programming of interest to community
142 members. We also pivoted Give First activities from scholarship to service during the COVID-19 pandemic, an
143 unprecedented time, where community members requested Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) and Rush
144 ADRC staff and other collaborators made or purchased PPE materials to provide across diverse communities.
145 All events and activities are publicized using word-of-mouth, flyers, and social media platforms (i.e., Facebook
146 and X – formally know as Twitter). Through Give First activities, the ORE Core consistently nurtures
147 community-centered relationships, in part, by matching expressed community needs with informatinal events as
148 well as support for community-initiated activities. Notably, Give First events may not directly tie to Rush
149 ADRC and other NIH-supported studies.

150 *Step Three: Advocate for Research*

151 Upon establishing bidirectional and trusting relationships between the Rush ADRC and community
152 organizations, leaders, and members - as indicated by consistent incorporation of Rush ADRC ORE Core staff
153 in organization and group activities, we seek counsel from community leaders and members regarding the
154 appropriate and allowable time, if any, to introduce opportunities for research participation. If permitted, the
155 ORE Core outlines the general purpose and value of research, the need for and process of participation,

156 anticipated outcome(s) of research and its participation, and possible implications of study findings. Then, we
157 follow up with presentations and announcements regarding specific Rush ADRC research studies and other
158 NIH-supported initiatives. The ORE Core aims for all presentations and correspondences regarding research
159 opportunities to be culturally relevant and linguistically compatible with community audiences. After each
160 presentation, attendees are asked to complete a form indicating their interest in research participation (i.e., yes, I
161 am interested in learning more about research opportunities; maybe, I am interested in learning more about
162 research opportunities; and no, I am not interested in learning more about research opportunities). If an attendee
163 indicates yes or maybe, ORE Core staff contacts the person with further information. If an attendee indicates no,
164 then we do not contact the person again at all. We encourage all attendees to share research opportunities with
165 their social networks as well as advertise research opportunities via flyers, local radio stations, and social media
166 platforms.

167 *Step Four: Give Back*

168 The Rush ADRC ORE Core aims to Give Back to research participants and the broader communities
169 where they reside and represent through the dissemination of Rush ADRC research findings and related
170 developments produced by the Rush ADRC and NIH, other NIH-funded studies, the Alzheimer's Association,
171 AARP, and other reputable health-related National and State entities. The ORE Core disseminates information
172 via, in part, an annual newsletter for research participants; smaller coffee gatherings; quarterly topic-focused
173 and annual study-specific print communications; and social media platforms. We also collaborate with the NIH-
174 supported Alzheimer's and related Dementias Education And Referral (ADEAR) Center and the Alzheimer's
175 Disease Outreach, Recruitment, and Engagement (ADORE) Repository to nationally disseminate informational
176 and study-related materials developed at the Rush ADRC. Give Back activities also include an annual health
177 and back-to-school fair and celebrating cultural holidays. The overall goal of Give Back activities is to support
178 community capacity related to health and aging among diverse groups of people as well as to show appreciation
179 for research participants and diverse communities.

180 *Step Five: Evaluate*

181 The Rush ADRC ORE Core leverages the ADRC’s Data Management and Statistical Cores to record
182 and track the impact of NGAGE efforts for required tables in our annual NIH progress reports. We note the
183 number and demographic characteristics of persons who: 1) consent and enter into the Rush ADRC Data and
184 Specimen Repository from communities (i.e., not via the affiliated Memory Clinic); and 2) consent to and enroll
185 in research studies at the Rush ADRC and other NIH-supported initiatives. We postulate that consent and
186 enrollment into the Data and Specimen Repository and Rush ADRC and NIH-supported research studies denote
187 linkages between NGAGE Model efforts and subsequent research participation.

188 **Analyses**

189 We began systematically collecting data in 2011 regarding the NGAGE Model. For this analysis, we
190 focus on data collected from July 1, 2011 (the formal implementation of the NGAGE model) to June 30, 2023
191 (the end of the fiscal year with complete data), with data broken into one-year increments (e.g., July 1, 2021-
192 June 30, 2022), for a total of 12 years of NGAGE data. Data collected included the name of the activity or
193 event; its corresponding NGAGE Model step (e.g., Networking); the estimated number of attendees; the
194 percentage of attendees who belonged to the following racial categorizations: White, Black/African American,
195 American Indian/Native American, Asian American and Pacific Islander, and multiracial; and the percentage of
196 attendees of Latino ethnicity. Due to relatively small numbers, we collapsed the percentages for American
197 Indian/Native American, Asian American and Pacific Islander, and multiracial categorizations into a combined
198 racial category labeled as “Additional Groups.” For the full reporting timeframe of July 1, 2011 to June 30,
199 2023, we provide: 1) the number of activities and events; 2) the estimated number of attendees; 3) percentages
200 of White, Black, and Additional Group racial categorizations of attendees; and 4) percentage of attendees of
201 Latino ethnicity. We report these data across all NGAGE steps and for each step, cumulatively and by each
202 reporting year.

203 For the Evaluate step, we aimed to understand linkages between Rush ADRC ORE Core efforts and
204 research participation. In 2011, we began formally tracking the number and racial and ethnic identifications of
205 individuals who: 1) consented to join the Rush ADRC Data and Specimen Repository; and 2) decided to
206 participate in research studies at the Rush ADRC and other NIH-supported initiatives. For the Evaluate step, we

report the number of persons who consented to the Data and Specimen Repository and enrolled in Rush ADRC research studies and other NIH-supported initiatives as well as racial and ethnic categorizations of participants for the full reporting timeframe and for each year.

Results

The ORE Core supports three longitudinal cohort studies at the Rush ADRC – The Religious Orders Study (ROS), The African American Clinical Core (AA Core), and the Latino Core (LATC). ROS began in 1994 and consists of clergypersons predominately self-identified as older White adults. Since 2010, the AA Core solely includes older adults who self-identify as Black or African American. The Latino Core began in 2015 and is solely comprised of older adults who identify as Hispanic or Latino. The growth and expansion of these Rush ADRC cohort studies continue each year and require adaptations of NGAGE model activities, particularly associated with the COVID-19 pandemic and its aftermath. Furthermore, over time, the Rush ADRC provides infrastructure and resources for an increasing number of other NIH-supported initiatives and investigators. The NGAGE Model continues to inform engagement, recruitment, and retention across these diverse communities and various study needs and contexts.

Step One: Networking

Number of Events

Networking comprises the first step of the NGAGE Model, where the Rush ADRC identifies and initiates contact with community-based organizations, community-serving leaders, and other prominent members of a community. Networking requires an understanding of the needs and activities of diverse communities across Chicagoland, and new and existing organizations and leaders. Across the timeframes, we observe expected fluctuations with the acceleration of Networking activities during the first three years. Notably, one of the largest spikes in Networking occurred in Year 3, roughly two years prior to the formalization of a cohort (i.e., LATC) exclusively comprised of older Latinos in 2015. Another increase in Networking activities took place in Year 9, right before a predicted decrease due to COVID-19. See Table 2.

Number of Attendees by Racial and Ethnic Categorization

232 Among attendees, the number of Black adults remained consistently high during Years 1 through 3 and
233 again in Years 10 and 11. For Years 1 through 3, Rush ADRC staff worked to maintain and grow participation
234 in AA Core. In Years 10 and 11, Rush ADRC staff worked to identify new community-based collaborators to
235 serve older Black adults and communities where they reside and represent in novel and necessary ways
236 considering the COVID-19 pandemic. Conversely, a low number of Latino attendees persisted during Years 1
237 through 3. However, the number of Latino attendees steeply increased for Years 4 through 7, which
238 corresponded with a heavy ORE Core focus on the assembly of LATC. Latino participation in Networking
239 events steeply decreased during Years 8 through 11. See Table 3.

240 **Step Two: Give First**

241 *Number of Events*

242 Give First fosters a foundation for mutually beneficial, trusting, and lasting relationships between the
243 Rush ADRC and various community organizations, leaders, and members. Give First activities include
244 sponsoring an event such as financial support or food or providing an informational activity or lecture on topics
245 of interest (e.g., heart health, physical activity, and diet). The pattern of Give Back activities during the
246 reporting period resembles Networking events. For example, Give Back events steadily increased during the
247 first four years of tracking, especially with preparation for recruitment into LATC. However, the number of
248 Give First occurrences dipped, peaked once more, then decreased during the COVID-19 pandemic. See Table 2.

249 *Number of Attendees by Racial and Ethnic Categorization*

250 Attendance by Black adults remained elevated during Years 1 through 4 and peaked again in Year 11.
251 Give First participation among Black adults follows a similar pattern as for Networking events. This suggests
252 that Networking events were quickly followed by an ability to engage in Give First activities especially focused
253 on Black adults. The number of Latino attendees at Give First events steadily increased from Year 1, peaking in
254 Year 6. Subsequently, numbers for Latino attendees fluctuate and dwindle but remain robust. This pattern
255 corresponds with efforts to establish LATC. See Table 3.

256 **Step Three: Advocate for Research**

257 *Number of Events*

258 Once relationships are established between the Rush ADRC and community organizations, leaders, and
259 members, researchers begin to Advocate for Research. Like Network and Give First, we tracked high numbers
260 of Advocate for Research activities in Years 1 through 3. These increases may be related to recruiting for two
261 established longitudinal cohort studies exclusively focused on older Black adults, including AA Core as well as
262 the Minority Aging Research Study (MARS; PI: Dr. Lisa L. Barnes) – among communities where the Rush
263 ADRC has long-standing relationships prior to formally tracking NGAGE efforts. Notably, Advocate for
264 Research activities experienced a peak or higher point in Year 5, which coincided with the official start of
265 LATC. Numbers of Advocate for Research events remained high and stable during Years 6 through 9 but
266 steeply dropped during the COVID-19 pandemic, with numbers for Advocate for Research being the lowest of
267 all NGAGE steps during the pandemic. See Table 2.

268 *Number of Attendees by Racial and Ethnic Categorization*

269 Black adults consistently attended Advocate for Research events, especially during Years 2 through 4
270 and again in Years 7 and 8. Notably, high attendance in Years 2 through 4 maps onto trends for Networking and
271 Give First events. This may indicate that Rush ADRC staff were able to conduct Advocate for Research events
272 sequentially and in a proximal time period as Networking and Give First activities. However, the number of
273 Black adults who attended these events significantly dropped in Year 11. This decrease in Advocate for
274 Research attendance among Black adults likely signals the Rush ADRC's pivot to other NGAGE steps during
275 the COVID-19 pandemic with less focus on showcasing and offering study participation, particularly to this
276 population. See Table 3.

277 Compared to Networking and Give First events, participation in Advocate for Research events by Latino
278 attendees began more slowly during Years 1 through 6, likely due to efforts to identify, establish, and maintain
279 community relationships prior to explicit LATC study recruitment. Peaks for Advocate for Research events
280 with Latino attendees existed in Years 6 and again in Year 10. Such peak years not only correspond with the
281 beginning of LATC enrollment but also with more staff resources. See Table 3.

282 **Step Four: Give Back**

283 *Number of Events*

284 Give Back events focus on informing research participants and communities in which they reside and
285 represent regarding study findings and recent developments at the Rush ADRC, NIH, and other reputable
286 scientific and health-related organizations. Research participants and related communities should not hear what
287 is being learned from their data via news or other outlets but rather from researchers and related staff. Like
288 previous NGAGE steps, we recorded high numbers of Give Back activities during Years 1 through 3. These
289 increased numbers may be attributed to research findings stemming from the established AA Core and MARS
290 cohort studies, where sustaining research participation and dissemination of findings were paramount based
291 upon study durations. In Years 4 through 7, Give Back occurrences steadily decreased as the Rush ADRC
292 focused more on Networking, Giving First, and Advocating for Research. However, we note an uptick in Give
293 Back activities during the pandemic when it was, arguably, of utmost importance to raise awareness around
294 rapid research developments as well as sustain research participation. See Table 2.

295 *Number of Attendees by Racial and Ethnic Categorization*

296 Among Black adults, overall attendance was lowest for Give Back events. It is unclear why the
297 proportion of Black attendees was lower compared to participation in other NGAGE Model steps. Perhaps
298 higher numbers of Black participants in Networking, Give First, and Advocate for Research events support
299 lower numbers for Give Back activities. For Latino adults, attendance at Give Back activities remained steady
300 across the reporting time period, with higher levels of participation in Years 6 through 8. This general pattern
301 exists in the context of LATC simultaneously aiming to recruit and sustain participation among older Latinos;
302 hence, concurrent peak numbers of Latino attendees in Give First, Advocate for Research, and Give Back
303 activities. See Table 3.

304 **Step 5: Evaluate**

305 For evaluating our NGAGE efforts, we obtained counts and percentages for persons who enrolled in the
306 Rush ADRC Data and Specimen Repository and individuals who joined research studies at the Rush ADRC and
307 those supported by NIH. Overall, more people joined research studies compared to those who enrolled in the
308 Data and Specimen Repository, with individuals at least four times more likely to take part in research studies
309 compared to enrolling in the Repository during Years 7 through 11. For the full reporting period, White adults

310 comprised 58% of all participants who enrolled in Rush ADRC and other NIH-supported studies, with 37%
311 Black adults and 10% Latinos. For Years 1 through 4, the pathway to research participation diverged for Black
312 adults compared to Latino adults. Black adults joined research studies at higher percentages than Data and
313 Specimen Repository enrollment. Conversely, Latino adults enrolled in the Data and Specimen Repository at
314 higher percentages than research study participation. This pattern did reverse in Year 5, with Black adults
315 enrolling in the Data and Specimen Repository at a higher percentage and Latinos joining research studies in
316 higher numbers. Furthermore, Data and Specimen Repository enrollment and research participation followed a
317 slightly different pattern in Years 8 through 10. During this timeframe, both Black and Latino adults joined
318 research studies at higher percentages than enrolling in the Data and Specimen Repository. See Table 4.

319 **Discussion**

320 The purpose of this study was to describe and demonstrate the utility of the NGAGE Model, an
321 approach developed at the Rush ADRC to equitably engage, include, and sustain participation in clinical ADRC
322 research with diverse older adults. The NGAGE Model consists of five steps that are conceptually separate but
323 practically interconnected – Network, Give first, Advocate for research, Give back, and Evaluate. We set forth
324 12 years of data, from July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2023, associated with each step of the NGAGE Model. To
325 contextualize results across all NGAGE steps, we first provide a general pattern of events and attendees across
326 the full reporting timeframe. For the first three years, we saw a steady increase in events followed by a decrease
327 in such activities. Notably, we restructured the Rush ADRC’s ORE Core in 2015, distributing roles throughout
328 the Rush ADRC, followed by the addition of a new ORE co-Leader and the loss of a key staff member in 2016.
329 We note increases in the number of events during the reporting periods between 2017 and 2019, with an all-
330 time high across the NGAGE Model activities. We believe that the addition of new ORE and other Rush ADRC
331 staff members and a focus on building LATC contributed to the increase in events during the 2017 through
332 2019 timeframes. In 2020, we experienced an expected decrease in events due to the beginning of the COVID-
333 19 pandemic. The number of activities stabilized in 2021 forward. The maintenance of events post-2020/after
334 the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic included a necessary and quick pivot to connecting with new
335 organizations, leaders, and members to serve diverse older adults, including research participants.

In addition to data patterns related to NGAGE Model events and activities, we recorded numbers of attendees as well as race and ethnic categorizations of those attendees. Across NGAGE Model Steps 1 through 4, White adults comprised the majority of attendees, with slightly more than 55% being White adults, compared to Black adults (~38%) and Latinos (~22%). This pattern also demonstrates that at least 40% of all attendees across all events associated with Steps 1 through 4 for the total reporting period belonged to Black, Latino, and Additional racial and ethnic groups. Hence, the NGAGE Model may represent one that promotes and fosters the inclusion of diverse older adults in events and activities associated with research and related opportunities across more than a decade.

To evaluate NGAGE efforts at the Rush ADRC, we obtained counts and percentages for persons who enrolled in the Data and Specimen Repository and individuals who joined ADRC research studies and other NIH-supported initiatives. Overall, more people joined research studies compared to those who enrolled in the Repository. For the full reporting period, White adults comprised more than 50% of all research participants, with more than 30% being Black adults and 10% being Latinos. Notably, during the first 5 years of the timeframe, Black adults were more likely to join research studies while older Latinos were more likely to join the Repository. This pattern reversed in the sixth year; however, afterward, both Black and Latino adults largely joined research studies at higher percentages than enrolling in the Repository. These patterns may speak to the broader Rush ADRC context where the first half of the timeframe focused on an established AA Core, while LATC was under development with study enrollment formally occurring near the second half of the timeframe. Furthermore, in 2015, the Rush ADRC explicitly and completely de-emphasized clinic-based entry into the Repository due to predominant enrollment of non-Latino White older adults, staffing resources, and clinic priorities. The Rush ADRC simultaneously began to exclusively focus on increasing community-based engagement, recruitment, and retention to ensure research and related activities with older adults from racially and ethnically diverse backgrounds, especially older Black and Latino adults. Hence, these structural changes at the Rush ADRC likely contributed to direct enrollment in affiliated studies at the Rush ADRC, with a lower number of persons enrolling into the Repository. It is also possible that older adults are more interested in joining an active research study compared to a Repository, a possibly passive research activity. Nevertheless,

362 the NGAGE Model was able to facilitate research participation among older Black and Latino adults during the
363 reporting timeframe.

364 Previous literature has established the critical role of several factors in the decision to take part in
365 research and related activities. [3,5,7,28,33-43] Barriers to research participation exist at the individual level,
366 with studies being inaccessible to a person due to a lack of transportation, existent responsibilities such as
367 caregiving, and linguistic incompatibility. These individual-level factors are inextricably tied to local and
368 structural factors. For example, local transportation – such as insufficient or unsafe roads, sidewalks, or public
369 transportation – is directly tied to local policy, prioritization, and investment. Academic structures, both
370 historic and current practices, also contribute to barriers to research participation, including studies taking place
371 at an institution of higher learning or medical center, mistreatment of Black, Latino, and other members of
372 minoritized communities, lack of remuneration, and not sharing knowledge gained from research that may
373 benefit communities. [3,5,10,28,40,41,44,45] Conversely, prior research has set forth two central facilitators of
374 accessible and inclusive research – trustworthy researchers and related practices, and community-engaged
375 research. [3,5,10,28,40,41,44,45] The field of ADRD increasingly recognizes and leverages approaches to
376 clinical research that engage, are informed by, and based within communities traditionally inequitably included
377 in studies. As such, it is necessary to collect and report data, especially longitudinally, associated with the reach
378 and utility of such approaches.

379 We follow a long line of esteemed researchers who aimed to develop, apply, and examine community-
380 based approaches in service of equity in ADRD clinical research. Upon this scientific foundation, the Rush
381 ADRC conceptualized and implemented the NGAGE Model for the previous 12 years, complete with requisite
382 data. The NGAGE Model exclusively utilized community-based and, increasingly, community-informed
383 approaches regarding engagement, recruitment, and retention in clinical research studies, particularly focused
384 on Black, Latino, and other communities underrepresented and underincluded in ADRD research. Data patterns
385 indicate the ability of the NGAGE Model to guide outreach and engagement activities with diverse community
386 organizations, leaders, and other prominent members. These relationships fostered the bidirectional trust and
387 consistency needed to advocate for research affiliated with the Rush ADRC. Activities that focused on giving

388 back to not only participants but also broader communities, in part, sustained research participation. Many older
389 Black and Latino adults decided to take part in active research studies instead of signing into the data
390 repository. While the NGAGE model represents a non-linear and iterative process, data patterns persisted
391 through changes due to staffing resources, leadership, and the COVID-19 pandemic; thus, speaking to the
392 durability of the NGAGE Model. Through consistent and concerted activities and events, the NGAGE Model
393 provides a strong, pragmatic, and generalizable structure – rather than abstract or a simplified set of tactics –
394 that may be usable and adaptable in many diverse academic contexts and communities. The NGAGE Model
395 provides evidence-based support toward equitable engagement and inclusion with diverse older adults in
396 clinical ADRD research. The NGAGE Model extends the field of ADRD clinical research by adding to the
397 translational science of recruitment with diverse older adults. With this field-wide change, there will be net
398 positive movement in required representation and inclusion in ADRD clinical research studies.

399 We should note that the NGAGE Model did not include the assembly and dedication of an advisory
400 board, neither community nor participant. We decided to eschew asking community members and participants
401 to directly assist with and focus on our research agenda but rather going to diverse communities and offering
402 (hoping) to be a valuable service for them and supporting their decision-making regarding research. The
403 NGAGE Model shows the possibility to facilitate diverse research participation in the absence of such advisory
404 boards. As the use of advisory boards within ADRCs and other ADRD-focused institutions continues to grow, it
405 is important to not lose sight of research and related efforts consistently exist within diverse communities. It
406 remains paramount to standardize and evaluate the role, effectiveness, and experience of advisory boards from
407 individual and community perspectives.

408 The current study does include limitations. First, more women took part in NGAGE model activities and
409 events compared to men. We continue to develop NGAGE activities that may be more inclusive of men,
410 particularly by planning to host men-only events and activities where men frequent such as barbershops.
411 Second, while we used NIA Progress Report data for the Rush ADRC, designation of race and ethnic categories
412 for some attendees at NGAGE Model events and activities were assessed by Rush ADRC event organizers and
413 staff. These data were not collected from all individual attendees as this would require that people consent to

414 enrolling into the Rush ADRC Data Repository so that we may save their Interest Form Data. Lastly, NGAGE
415 Model events and activities took place within and surrounding the Chicago metropolitan area, with scant
416 understanding of how this Model may work in other areas. Researchers in other geographic areas can adapt,
417 implement, and track outcomes related to the NGAGE Model based on their research purposes. These
418 researchers must also bolster the impact of the NGAGE Model in their work by assessing and centering the
419 interests and needs of communities that they aim to serve through research. Cumulatively, the NGAGE Model
420 represents a pragmatic model for community-based engagement, recruitment, and retention in service of
421 equitable and inclusive ADRD clinical research with diverse older adults.

References

1. Levkoff, S., & Sanchez, H. (2003). Lessons learned about minority recruitment and retention from the Centers on Minority Aging and Health Promotion. *The Gerontologist*, 43(1), 18-26.
2. Matthews, K. A., Xu, W., Gaglioti, A. H., Holt, J. B., Croft, J. B., Mack, D., & McGuire, L. C. (2019). Racial and ethnic estimates of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias in the United States (2015–2060) in adults aged ≥ 65 years. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*, 15(1), 17-24.
3. Nápoles, A. M., & Chadiha, L. A. (2011). Advancing the science of recruitment and retention of ethnically diverse populations. *The Gerontologist*, 51(suppl_1), S142-S146.
4. Alzheimer's Association. Alzheimer's Disease Facts and Figures. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*. 2015; 11(3): 332+.
5. Gilmore-Bykovskiy, A. L., Jin, Y., Gleason, C., Flowers-Benton, S., Block, L. M., Dilworth-Anderson, P., ... & Zuelsdorff, M. (2019). Recruitment and retention of underrepresented populations in Alzheimer's disease research: A systematic review. *Alzheimer's & Dementia: Translational Research & Clinical Interventions*, 5, 751-770.
6. Rabinowitz YG, Gallagher-Thompson D. Recruitment and retention of ethnic minority elders into clinical research. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2010;24:S35-S41.
7. Reed PS, Foley KL, Hatch J, Mutran EJ. Recruitment of older African Americans for survey research: a process evaluation of the community and church-based strategy in the Durham Elders Project. *Gerontologist*. 2003;43:52-61.
8. Curry L, Jackson J. The science of including older ethnic and racial group participants in health-related research. *Gerontologist*. 2003;43:15-17.
9. Valle, R. Culturally attuned recruitment, retention, and adherence in Alzheimer disease and associated disorders: a best practices working model. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2005;19:261-266.
10. Gluck, M. A., Shaw, A., & Hill, D. (2018). Recruiting Older African Americans to Brain Health and Aging Research Through Community Engagement. *Generations*, 42(2), 78-82.

- 447 11. Graham, L. A., Ngwa, J., Ntekim, O., Ogunlana, O., Wolday, S., Johnson, S., ... & Obisesan, T. O.
448 (2018). Best strategies to recruit and enroll elderly Blacks into clinical and biomedical research. *Clinical*
449 *interventions in aging*, 13, 43.
- 450 12. Weiner, M. W., Nosheny, R., Camacho, M., Truran-Sacrey, D., Mackin, R. S., Flenniken, D., ... &
451 Veitch, D. (2018). The Brain Health Registry: An internet-based platform for recruitment, assessment,
452 and longitudinal monitoring of participants for neuroscience studies. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*, 14(8),
453 1063-1076.
- 454 13. Mayeda, E. R., Glymour, M. M., Quesenberry, C. P., & Whitmer, R. A. (2016). Inequalities in dementia
455 incidence between six racial and ethnic groups over 14 years. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*, 12(3), 216-224.
- 456 14. Schnieders T, Danner DD, McGuire C, Reynolds F, Abner E. Incentives and barriers to research
457 participation and brain donation among African Americans. *Am J Alzheimers Dis Other Demen*.
458 2013;28:485-490.
- 459 15. Welsh KA, Ballard E, Nash F, et al. Issues affecting minority participation in research studies of
460 Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disorders*. 1994;8(Suppl 4):38-48.
- 461 16. Ayalon L. Re-examining ethnic differences in concerns, knowledge, and beliefs about Alzheimer's
462 disease: results from a national sample. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2013;28(12):1288-95.
- 463 17. Valle, R. Culturally attuned recruitment, retention, and adherence in Alzheimer disease and associated
464 disorders: a best practices working model. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2005;19:261-266.
- 465 18. Dilworth-Anderson P, Cohen MD. Beyond diversity to inclusion: recruitment and retention of diverse
466 groups in Alzheimer research. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2010;24:S14-S18.
- 467 19. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. National plan to address Alzheimer's Disease 2015
468 Update. 2015. <http://aspe.hhs.gov/national-plan-address-alzheimer%E2%80%99s-disease-2015-update>.
469 Accessed October 18, 2015.
- 470 20. U.S Department of Health and Human Services. Alzheimer's Disease Research Summit 2015.
471 <https://www.nia.nih.gov/about/events/2014/alzheimers-disease-research-summit-2015>. Accessed
472 October 18, 2015.

- 473 21. Vincent GK and VA Velkoff. The Next Four Decades, The Older Population in the United States: 2010
474 to 2050, Current Population Reports, P25-1138. 2010. U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC.
- 475 22. http://www.aoa.acl.gov/Aging_Statistics/Minority_Aging/Facts-on-Black-Elderly-plain_format.aspx
476 Accessed October 14, 2015.
- 477 23. http://www.aoa.acl.gov/Aging_Statistics/Minority_Aging/Facts-on-API-Elderly2008-plain_format.aspx.
478 Accessed October 18, 2015.
- 479 24. http://www.aoa.acl.gov/Aging_Statistics/Minority_Aging/Facts-on-AINA-Elderly2008-plain_format.aspx. Accessed October 18, 2015.
- 480
- 481 25. http://www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging_statistics/minority_aging/Facts-on-Hispanic-Elderly.aspx. Accessed
482 Accessed October 18, 2015.
- 483 26. http://www.aoa.acl.gov/Aging_Statistics/Census_Population/Population/2009/index.aspx. Accessed
484 October 18, 2015.
- 485 27. Alzheimer's Association. Alzheimer's Disease Facts and Figures. Alzheimer's & Dementia. 2015;
486 11(3): 332+.
- 487 28. Ayalon L. Re-examining ethnic differences in concerns, knowledge, and beliefs about Alzheimer's
488 disease: results from a national sample. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2013;28(12):1288-95.
- 489 29. Paskett ED, Reeves KW, McLaughlin JM, et al. Recruitment of minority and underserved populations
490 in the United States: The Centers for Population Health & Health Disparities Experience. *Contemp
491 Clin Trials*. 2008;29:847-861. Epub 2008 Jul 31.
- 492 30. Valle R, Caregiving across cultures: working with dementing illness and ethnically diverse populations.
493 1998, Washington: Taylor and Francis.
- 494 31. Levkoff S, Sanchez H. Lessons learned about minority recruitment and retention from the Centers on
495 Minority Aging and Health Promotion. *Gerontologist*. 2003;43:18-26.
- 496 32. McNeilly M, Musick M, Efland JR, et al. Minority populations and psychophysiologic research:
497 challenges in trust building and recruitment. *J Ment Health Aging*. 2000;6:91-102.

- 498 33. Levkoff SE, Levy BR, Weitzman PF. The matching model of recruitment. *J Ment Health Aging*.
499 2000;6:29-38.
- 500 34. Gadegbeku CA, Stillman PK, Huffman MD, et al. Factors associated with enrollment of African
501 Americans into a clinical trial: results from the African American Study of Kidney Disease and
502 Hypertension. *Contemp Clin Trials*. 2008;29:837-842.
- 503 35. Trauth JM, Jernigan JC, Siminoff LA, et al. Factors affecting older African American women's
504 decisions to join the PLCO Cancer Screening Trial. *J Clin Oncol*. 2005;23:8730-8738.
- 505 36. Gorelick PB, Richardson D, Hudson E, et al. Establishing a community network for recruitment of
506 African Americans into a clinical trial. The African-American antiplatelet stroke prevention study
507 (AAASPS) experience. *J Natl Med Assoc*. 1996;88:701-704.
- 508 37. Bonner GJ, Miles TP. Participation of African Americans in clinical research. *Neuroepidemiology*.
509 1997;16:281-284.
- 510 38. Gallagher-Thompson D, Solano N, Coon D, Arean P. Recruitment and retention of latino dementia
511 family caregivers in intervention research: issues to face, lessons to learn. *Gerontologist*, 2003;43:45-
512 51.
- 513 39. Vesey GA. A successful strategy for recruitment and retention of Black elders in applied research, in
514 African American Research Perspectives, R.J. Taylor, et al., Editors. 2002, Michigan Center for Urban
515 African American Aging Research: Ann Arbor. p. 40-56.
- 516 40. Sinclair S, Hayes-Reams P, Myers HF, et al. Recruiting African-Americans for health studies: lessons
517 from the Drew-RAND Center on Health and Aging. *J Ment Health Aging*, 2000;6:39-51.
- 518 41. Ford ME, Havstad SL, Davis SD. A randomized trial of recruitment methods for older African
519 American men in the Prostate, Lung, Colorectal and Ovarian (PLCO) Cancer Screening Trial. *Clin*
520 *Trials*. 2004;1:343-351.
- 521 42. Reed PS, Foley KL, Hatch J, Mutran EJ. Recruitment of older African Americans for survey research: a
522 process evaluation of the community and church-based strategy in the Durham Elders Project.
523 *Gerontologist*. 2003;43:52-61.

- 524 43. Welsh KA, Ballard E, Nash F, et al. Issues affecting minority participation in research studies of
525 Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disorders*. 1994;8(Suppl 4):38-48.
- 526 44. Schnieders T, Danner DD, McGuire C, Reynolds F, Abner E. Incentives and barriers to research
527 participation and brain donation among African Americans. *Am J Alzheimers Dis Other Demen*.
528 2013;28:485-490.
- 529 45. Ejiogu N, Norbeck JH, Mason MA, Cromwell BC, Zonderman AB, Evans MK. Recruitment and
530 retention strategies for minority or poor clinical research participants: lessons from the Healthy Aging
531 in Neighborhoods of Diversity across the Life Span study. *Gerontologist*. 2011;51Suppl1:S33-S45.
- 532 46. Mendez-Luck CA, Trejo L, Miranda J, Jimenez E, Quiter ES, Mangione CM. Recruitment strategies
533 and costs associated with community-based research in a Mexican-origin population. *Gerontologist*.
534 2011;51Suppl1:S94-S95.
- 535 47. Rexroth DF, Friedland RP. Lessons learned regarding recruitment to the National African American
536 Alzheimer Disease Health Literacy Program. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2010;24:S54-S57.
- 537 48. Areán PA, et al. Recruitment and retention of older minorities in mental health services research. *The*
538 *Gerontologist*, 2003. 43(1): 36-44.
- 539 49. Rabinowitz YG, Gallagher-Thompson D. Recruitment and retention of ethnic minority elders into
540 clinical research. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2010;24:S35-S41.
- 541 50. Valle, R. Culturally attuned recruitment, retention, and adherence in Alzheimer disease and associated
542 disorders: a best practices working model. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2005;19:261-266.
- 543 51. Dilworth-Anderson P, Cohen MD. Beyond diversity to inclusion: recruitment and retention of diverse
544 groups in Alzheimer research. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2010;24:S14-S18.
- 545 52. Ballard EL, Gwyther LP, Edmonds HL. Challenges and opportunities: recruitment and retention of
546 African Americans for Alzheimer disease research: lessons learned. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*.
547 2010;24:S19-S23.

53. Bachman DL, Stuckey M, Ebeling M, et al. Establishment of a predominantly African-American cohort for the study of Alzheimer's disease: The South Carolina Alzheimer's disease clinical core. *Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord*. 2009;27:329-336. Epub 2009 Mar 10.
54. Williams MM, Scharff DP, Mathews KJ, et al. Barriers and facilitators of African American participation in Alzheimer disease biomarker research. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2010;24:S24-S29.
55. Curry L, Jackson J. The science of including older ethnic and racial group participants in health-related research. *Gerontologist*. 2003;43:15-17.
56. Fillenbaum GG, Huber MS, Beekly D, et al. The consortium to establish a registry for Alzheimer's Disease (CERAD). Part XIII. Obtaining autopsy in Alzheimer's disease. *Neurology*. 1996;46:142-145.
57. Schmitt FA, Wetherby MM, Wekstein DR, et al. Brain donation in normal aging: procedures, motivations, and donor characteristics from the Biologically Resilient Adults in Neurological Studies (BRAiNS) Project. *Gerontologist*. 2001;41:716-722.
58. Olsen SJ, Malvern KT, May BJ, et al. Partnership with an African American sorority to enhance participation in cancer genetics research. *Community Genet*. 2008;11:201-207.
59. Fritsch T, Adams KB, Redd D, et al. Use of live theater to increase minority participation in Alzheimer disease research. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2006;20:105-111.
60. McCallion P, Toseland RW, Lacey D, Banks S. Educating nursing assistants to communicate more effectively with nursing home residents with dementia. *Gerontologist*. 1999;39:546-558.
61. Stevens AB, Burgio LD, Bailey E, et al. Teaching and maintaining behavior management skills with nursing assistants in a nursing home. *Gerontologist*. 1998;38:379-384.
62. Pullen-Smith B, Carter-Edwards L, Leathers KH. Community health ambassadors: a model for engaging community leaders to promote better health in North Carolina. *J Public Health Management Pract*. 2008;14(Suppl);S73-S81.
63. Israel BA, Cummings KM, Dignan MB, et al. Evaluation of health education programs: current assessment and future directions. *Health Educ Q*. 1995; 22:364-389.

- 573 64. Connell CM, Kole SL, Benedict CJ, et al. Increasing coordination of the dementia service delivery
574 network: planning for the Community Outreach Education Program. *Gerontologist*. 1994;34:700-706.
- 575 65. Patton M. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. 3rd ed. 2002, Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- 576 66. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *HIV Surveillance Report*, 2015; vol. 27.
577 <http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/library/reports/hiv-surveillance.html>. Published November 2016. Accessed 06
578 May 2017.
- 579 67. Illinois Department of Public Health. 2014 Illinois HIV/AIDS Epidemiology Profile.
580 <http://www.dph.illinois.gov/sites/default/files/publications/1-27-16-OHP-HIVfactsheet-Overview.pdf>.
581 Accessed 06May2017.
- 582 68. Chicago Department of Public Health. *HIV/STI Surveillance Report*, 2015. Chicago, IL: City of
583 Chicago; December 2015.
- 584 69. Hessol NA, Schneider M, Greenblatt RM, Bacon M, Barranday Y, Holman S, Robison E, Williams C,
585 Cohen M, Weber K; Women's Interagency Human Immunodeficiency Virus Collaborative Study Group.
586 Retention of women enrolled in a prospective study of human immunodeficiency virus infection: impact
587 of race, unstable housing, and use of human immunodeficiency virus therapy. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2001
588 Sep 15;154(6):563-73.
- 589 70. Asare Bempong G, Ramamurthi HC, McCuller J, Williams JK, Harawa NT. Recruiting Black Men Who
590 Have Sex with Men and Women (BMSMW) in an Urban Setting for HIV Prevention Research. *J AIDS
591 Clin Res*. 2014 Dec 30;6(1). pii: 408.
- 592 71. Haley DF, Lucas J, Golin CE, Wang J, Hughes JP, Emel L, El-Sadr W, Frew PM, Justman J, Adimora
593 AA, Watson CC, Mannheimer S, Rompalo A, Soto-Torres L, Tims-Cook Z, Carter Y, Hodder SL;
594 HPTN 064 Study Team. Retention strategies and factors associated with missed visits among low
595 income women at increased risk of HIV acquisition in the US (HPTN 064). *AIDS Patient Care STDS*.
596 2014 Apr;28(4):206-17. doi: 10.1089/apc.2013.0366.
- 597 72. Magnus M, Franks J, Griffith S, Arnold MP, Goodman K, Wheeler DP; HPTN 061 Study Group.
598 Engaging, recruiting, and retaining black men who have sex with men in research studies: don't

- 599 underestimate the importance of staffing--lessons learned from HPTN 061, the BROTHERS study. *J*
600 *Public Health Manag Pract.* 2014 Nov-Dec;20(6):E1-9. doi: 10.1097/PHH.0000000000000025.
- 601 73. Painter TM, Ngalame PM, Lucas B, Lauby JL, Herbst JH. Strategies used by community-based
602 organizations to evaluate their locally developed HIV prevention interventions: Lessons learned from
603 the CDC's innovative interventions project. *AIDS Educ Prev.* 2010 Oct;22(5):387-401. doi:
604 10.1521/aeap.2010.22.5.387.
- 605 74. Fortune T, Wright E, Juzang I, Bull S. Recruitment, enrollment and retention of young black men for
606 HIV prevention research: experiences from The 411 for Safe Text project. *Contemp Clin Trials.* 2010
607 Mar;31(2):151-6. doi: 10.1016/j.cct.2009.12.004. Epub 2009 Dec 24.
- 608 75. Allman RM, Sawyer P, Crowther M, Strothers HS 3rd, Turner T, Fouad MN. Predictors of 4-year
609 retention among African American and white community-dwelling participants in the UAB study of
610 aging. *Gerontologist.* 2011 Jun;51 Suppl 1:S46-58. doi: 10.1093/geront/gnr024.
- 611 76. Ejiogu N, Norbeck JH, Mason MA, Cromwell BC, Zonderman AB, Evans MK. Recruitment and
612 retention strategies for minority or poor clinical research participants: lessons from the Healthy Aging in
613 Neighborhoods of Diversity across the Life Span study. *Gerontologist.* 2011 Jun;51 Suppl 1:S33-45. doi:
614 10.1093/geront/gnr027.
- 615 77. Dilworth-Anderson P, Williams SW. Recruitment and retention strategies for longitudinal African
616 American caregiving research: the Family Caregiving Project. *J Aging Health.* 2004 Nov;16(5
617 Suppl):137S-56S.
- 618 78. Levkoff S, Sanchez H. Lessons learned about minority recruitment and retention from the Centers on
619 Minority Aging and Health Promotion. *Gerontologist.* 2003 Feb;43(1):18-26.
- 620 79. Barnes LL, Shah RC, Aggarwal NT, Bennett DA, Schneider JA. The Minority Aging Research Study:
621 ongoing efforts to obtain brain donation in African Americans without dementia. *Curr Alzheimer Res.*
622 2012;9:734-745.
- 623 80. Viswanathan M, Ammerman A, Eng E, Gartlehner G, Lohr KN, Griffith D, Rhodes S, Samuel-Hodge C,
624 Maty S, Lux, L, Webb L, Sutton SF, Swinson T, Jackman A, Whitener L. Community-Based

- 625 Participatory Research: Assessing the Evidence. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 99
626 (Prepared by RTI–University of North Carolina Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No.
627 290-02-0016). AHRQ Publication 04-E022-2. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and
628 Quality. July 2004.
- 629 81. Staley K. Exploring impact: public involvement in NHS, public health and social care research.
630 Eastleigh, United Kingdom: INVOLVE; 2009.
- 631 82. MacQueen KM, McLellan E, Metzger DS, Kegeles S, Strauss RP, Scotti R, Blanchard L, Trotter RT.
632 What is community? An evidence-based definition for participatory public health. *Am J Public Health*.
633 2011;91:1929-1938.
- 634 83. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Principles of community engagement (1st ed) Atlanta (GA):
635 CDC/ATSDR Committee on Community Engagement; 1997.
- 636 84. Clinical and Translational Science Awards Consortium Community Engagement Key Function
637 Committee Task Force on the Principles of Community Engagement. Principles of Community
638 Engagement Second Edition (2011). NIH Publication No. 11-7782 Printed June 2011.
- 639 85. McCormack L, Sheridan S, Lewis M, Boudewyns V, Melvin CL, Kistler C, Lux LJ, Cullen K, Lohr KN.
- 640 86. Communication and Dissemination Strategies To Facilitate the Use of Health-Related Evidence.
641 Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 213. (Prepared by the RTI International–University of
642 North Carolina Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. 290-2007-10056-I.) AHRQ
643 Publication No. 13(14)-E003-EF. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality;
644 November 2013. www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/reports/final.cfm.
- 645 87. Bowen DJ, Sorenson G, Weiner BJ, et al. Dissemination research in cancer control: where are we and
646 where should we go? . *Cancer Causes Control*. 2009 Aug;20(4):473-85.
- 647 88. Grimshaw JM, Shirran L, Thomas R, et al. Changing provider behavior: an overview of systematic
648 reviews of interventions. *Med Care* 2001 Aug;39(8 Suppl 2):II2-45. PMID: 11583120.
- 649 89. Areán PA, et al. Recruitment and retention of older minorities in mental health services research. *The*
650 *Gerontologist*, 2003. 43(1): 36-44.

- 651 90. Rabinowitz YG, Gallagher-Thompson D. Recruitment and retention of ethnic minority elders into
652 clinical research. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord.* 2010;24:S35-S41.
- 653 91. Sha B, Exner K, Kniuksta R, Fritsche J, Williams B, Aziz M, Lochowitz J, Purim-Shem-Tov Y. Use of
654 an electronic health record (EHR) best practice alert (BPA) in an urban emergency department (ED)
655 diagnosed acute and chronic HIV infection. *HIV Research for Prevention 2016: AIDS Vaccine,*
656 *Microbicide and ARV-based Prevention Science (HIVR4P), Chicago, USA October 17-21, 2016,*
657 *Abstract P15.01.*
- 658 92. Russell N, Igras S, Kuoh H, Pavin M, Wickerstrom J The active community engagement continuum.
659 ACQUIRE Project Working Paper 2008. Retrieved from [http://www.acquireproject.org/](http://www.acquireproject.org/fileadmin/user_upload/ACQUIRE/Publications/ACE-Working-Paper-final.pdf)
660 [fileadmin/user_upload/ACQUIRE/ Publications/ ACE-Working-Paper-final.pdf](http://www.acquireproject.org/fileadmin/user_upload/ACQUIRE/Publications/ACE-Working-Paper-final.pdf) on 07May2017.
- 661 93. Strauss RP, Sengupta S, Quinn SC, Goepfing J, Spaulding C, Kegeles SM, et al. The role of
662 community advisory boards: involving communities in the informed consent process. *Am J Public*
663 *Health.* 2001;91(12):1938–1943.
- 664 94. Patton MQ. *Qualitative evaluation and research methods.* Newbury Park (CA): Sage; 2002.
- 665 95. Rossi P, Lipsey M, Freeman H *Evaluation: a systemic approach (7th ed)* Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage;
666 2004.
- 667 96. [http://www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging_statistics/minority_aging/Facts-on-Black-Elderly-](http://www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging_statistics/minority_aging/Facts-on-Black-Elderly-plain_format.aspx)
668 [plain_format.aspx](http://www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging_statistics/minority_aging/Facts-on-Black-Elderly-plain_format.aspx). Accessed September 2, 2010.
- 669 97. http://www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging_statistics/minority_aging/Index.aspx. Accessed September 2, 2010.
- 670 98. http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en. Accessed September 2, 2010.
- 671 99. http://www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging_statistics/minority_aging/Facts-on-Hispanic-Elderly.aspx. Accessed
672 September 2, 2010.
- 673 100. Paskett ED, Reeves KW, McLaughlin JM, et al. Recruitment of minority and underserved
674 populations in the United States: The Centers for Population Health & Health Disparities Experience.
675 *Contemp Clin Trials.* 2008;29:847-861. Epub 2008 Jul 31.

6. Valle R, Caregiving across cultures: working with dementing illness and ethnically diverse populations. 1998, Washington: Taylor and Francis.
7. Levkoff S, Sanchez H. Lessons learned about minority recruitment and retention from the Centers on Minority Aging and Health Promotion. *Gerontologist*. 2003;43:18-26.
8. McNeilly M, Musick M, Efland JR, et al. Minority populations and psychophysiologic research: challenges in trust building and recruitment. *J Ment Health Aging*. 2000;6:91-102.
9. Levkoff SE, Levy BR, Weitzman PF. The matching model of recruitment. *J Ment Health Aging*. 2000;6:29-38.
10. Gadegbeku CA, Stillman PK, Huffman MD, et al. Factors associated with enrollment of African Americans into a clinical trial: results from the African American Study of Kidney Disease and Hypertension. *Contemp Clin Trials*. 2008;29:837-842.
11. Trauth JM, Jernigan JC, Siminoff LA, et al. Factors affecting older African American women's decisions to join the PLCO Cancer Screening Trial. *J Clin Oncol*. 2005;23:8730-8738.
12. Gorelick PB, Richardson D, Hudson E, et al. Establishing a community network for recruitment of African Americans into a clinical trial. The African-American antiplatelet stroke prevention study (AAASPS) experience. *J Natl Med Assoc*. 1996;88:701-704.
13. Bonner GJ, Miles TP. Participation of African Americans in clinical research. *Neuroepidemiology*. 1997;16:281-284.
14. Gallagher-Thompson D, Solano N, Coon D, Areal P. Recruitment and retention of latino dementia family caregivers in intervention research: issues to face, lessons to learn. *Gerontologist*, 2003;43:45-51.
15. Vesey GA. A successful strategy for recruitment and retention of Black elders in applied research, in *African American Research Perspectives*, R.J. Taylor, et al., Editors. 2002, Michigan Center for Urban African American Aging Research: Ann Arbor. p. 40-56.
16. Sinclair S, Hayes-Reams P, Myers HF, et al. Recruiting African-Americans for health studies: lessons from the Drew-RAND Center on Health and Aging. *J Ment Health Aging*, 2000;6:39-51.

- 701 17. Ford ME, Havstad SL, Davis SD. A randomized trial of recruitment methods for older African
702 American men in the Prostate, Lung, Colorectal and Ovarian (PLCO) Cancer Screening Trial. *Clin Trials*.
703 2004;1:343-351.
- 704 18. Reed PS, Foley KL, Hatch J, Mutran EJ. Recruitment of older African Americans for survey research: a
705 process evaluation of the community and church-based strategy in the Durham Elders Project. *Gerontologist*.
706 2003;43:52-61.
- 707 19. Welsh KA, Ballard E, Nash F, et al. Issues affecting minority participation in research studies of
708 Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disorders*. 1994;8(Suppl 4):38-48.
- 709 20. Rexroth DF, Friedland RP. Lessons learned regarding recruitment to the National African American
710 Alzheimer Disease Health Literacy Program. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2010;24:S54-S57.
- 711 21. Areán PA, et al. Recruitment and retention of older minorities in mental health services research. *The*
712 *Gerontologist*, 2003. 43(1): 36-44.
- 713 22. Rabinowitz YG, Gallagher-Thompson D. Recruitment and retention of ethnic minority elders into
714 clinical research. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2010;24:S35-S41.
- 715 23. www.re-aim.org. Accessed August 30, 2010.
- 716 24. Valle, R. Culturally attuned recruitment, retention, and adherence in Alzheimer disease and associated
717 disorders: a best practices working model. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2005;19:261-266.
- 718 25. Dilworth-Anderson P, Cohen MD. Beyond diversity to inclusion: recruitment and retention of diverse
719 groups in Alzheimer research. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2010;24:S14-S18.
- 720 26. Ballard EL, Gwyther LP, Edmonds HL. Challenges and opportunities: recruitment and retention of
721 African Americans for Alzheimer disease research: lessons learned. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*.
722 2010;24:S19-S23.
- 723 27. Bachman DL, Stuckey M, Ebeling M, et al. Establishment of a predominantly African-American cohort for
724 the study of Alzheimer's disease: The South Carolina Alzheimer's disease clinical core. *Dement Geriatr Cogn*
725 *Disord*. 2009;27:329-336. Epub 2009 Mar 10.

- 726 28. Williams MM, Scharff DP, Mathews KJ, et al. Barriers and facilitators of African American
727 participation in Alzheimer disease biomarker research. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord.* 2010;24:S24-S29.
- 728 29. Curry L, Jackson J. The science of including older ethnic and racial group participants in health-related
729 research. *Gerontologist.* 2003;43:15-17.
- 730 30. Fillenbaum GG, Huber MS, Beekly D, et al. The consortium to establish a registry for Alzheimer's
731 Disease (CERAD). Part XIII. Obtaining autopsy in Alzheimer's disease. *Neurology.* 1996;46:142-145.
- 732 31. Schmitt FA, Wetherby MM, Wekstein DR, et al. Brain donation in normal aging: procedures,
733 motivations, and donor characteristics from the Biologically Resilient Adults in Neurological Studies
734 (BRAiNS) Project. *Gerontologist.* 2001;41:716-722.
- 735 32. Olsen SJ, Malvern KT, May BJ, et al. Partnership with an African American sorority to enhance
736 participation in cancer genetics research. *Community Genet.* 2008;11:201-207.
- 737 33. Lindenstruth KA, Curtis CB, Allen JK. Recruitment of African American and white postmenopausal
738 women into clinical trials: The Beneficial Effects of Soy Trial Experience. *Ethn Dis.* 2006;16:938-942.
- 739 34. Wilbur J, McDevitt J, Wang E, et al. Recruitment of African American women to a walking program:
740 eligibility, ineligibility, and attrition during screening. *Res Nurs Health.* 2006;29:176-189.
- 741 35. Jones RA, Steves R, Williams I. Strategies for recruiting African American men into prostate cancer
742 screening studies. *Nurs Res.* 2009;58:452-456.
- 743 36. Fritsch T, Adams KB, Redd D, et al. Use of live theater to increase minority participation in Alzheimer
744 disease research. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord.* 2006;20:105-111.
- 745 37. McCallion P, Toseland RW, Lacey D, Banks S. Educating nursing assistants to communicate more
746 effectively with nursing home residents with dementia. *Gerontologist.* 1999;39:546-558.
- 747 38. Stevens AB, Burgio LD, Bailey E, et al. Teaching and maintaining behavior management skills with
748 nursing assistants in a nursing home. *Gerontologist.* 1998;38:379-384.
- 749 39. Pullen-Smith B, Carter-Edwards L, Leathers KH. Community health ambassadors: a model for
750 engaging community leaders to promote better health in North Carolina. *J Public Health Management Pract.*
751 2008;14(Suppl);S73-S81.

- 752 40. Israel BA, Cummings KM, Dignan MB, et al. Evaluation of health education programs: current
753 assessment and future directions. *Health Educ Q.* 1995; 22:364-389.
- 754 41. Connell CM, Kole SL, Benedict CJ, et al. Increasing coordination of the dementia service delivery
755 network: planning for the Community Outreach Education Program. *Gerontologist.* 1994;34:700-706.
- 756 42. Patton M. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods.* 3rd ed. 2002, Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Table 1: Main Events and Activities Associated with Each Step of the Network, Give first, Advocate for research, Give back, and Evaluate (NGAGE) Model Developed at the Rush Alzheimer’s Disease Research Center.

Step 1. Network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Identify and foster relationships with local leaders of organizations and other prominent community members. ➤ One-on-one meetings with community leaders and other prominent community members. ➤ Active in various organizations and groups by regularly attending related meetings, faith-based services, health fairs, and other organization-specific and community-based events; and serving as board members.
Step 2. Give First	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Development and provision of presentations and materials regarding prevention, early detection, and early treatment of AD/ADRD; cognitive health; and other critical topics in aging such as the link between cardiovascular and brain health. ➤ Development of programming requested by community members and provided in collaboration with experts at Rush, including question and answer sessions focused on community-identified topics such as Long COVID. ➤ Support of local community-based activities, including financial resources and non-financial assistance with events such as catering. ➤ Free health screenings. ➤ Encouragement of memory evaluations.
Step 3. Advocate for Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Development and provision of presentations regarding the purpose, value, and outcomes of research participation and related aspects including biospecimen collection and brain autopsy. ➤ Discussion of Rush ADRC studies and other NIH-supported initiatives and how to participate. ➤ Completion of an Interest Form - interest in research participation (yes, maybe, no).
Step 4. Give Back	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Annual newsletter for research participants and their social networks. ➤ Annual study-specific print communications and via social media platforms. ➤ Coffee gatherings. ➤ Collaboration with the NIH-supported ADEAR Center and the ADORE Repository. ➤ Annual health and back-to-school fair.
Step 5. Evaluate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Number of persons who enrolled into the Rush ADRC Data and Specimen Repository. ➤ Number of persons who consented to Rush ADRC research studies and other NIH-supported initiatives.

Table 2. Number of Activities and Attendees Associated with Each Step of the NGAGE Model - Network, Give First, Advocate for Research, and Give Back - From Year 1 Through Year 11*.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	Year 12	Total Number
Step 1: Network													
Activities	69	73	118	89	51	79	75	106	265	93	77	52	1,095
Attendees	2,051	1,706	7,894	1,826	1,281	3,228	1,869	4,608	7,462	3,020	1,685	2,264	36,630
Step 2: Give First													
Activities	146	207	296	219	137	186	268	226	232	184	146	64	2,247
Attendees	20,106	15,819	21,550	9,869	9,283	8,923	12,547	9,175	9,992	3,625	3,514	3,529	124,403
Step 3: Advocate for Research													
Activities	200	150	160	76	97	75	75	82	75	16	10	13	1,016
Attendees	11,809	5,812	6,378	3,471	3,771	3,257	4,323	5,466	5,831	947	307	517	51,372
Step 4: Give Back													
Activities	84	109	112	65	53	43	44	59	87	81	68	68	805
Attendees	14,847	3,902	3,848	2,860	2,093	1,677	2,702	3,893	4,392	3,464	1,995	1,406	45,673
Total Number													
Activities	499	539	686	449	338	383	464	473	659	374	301	197	5,362
Attendees	48,813	27,239	39,670	18,026	16,428	17,085	21,441	23,142	27,677	11,056	7,501	7,716	265,794

*Year 1: July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012; Year 2: July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013; Year 3: July 1, 2013-June 30, 2014; Year 4: July 1, 2014-June 30, 2015; Year 5: July 1, 2015-June 30, 2016; Year 6: July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017; Year 7: July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018; Year 8: July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019; Year 9: July 1, 2019-June 30, 2020; Year 10: July 1, 2020-June 30, 2021; Year 11: July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022.

Table 3. Percentages of Attendees Self-Identifying as Black and Latino Adults Associated with NGAGE Model Steps - Network, Give First, Advocate for Research, and Give Back - From Year 1 Through Year 11*.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	Year 12	Total Number
Attendee Race/Ethnicity**, %													
Step 1: Network													
White	49.67	40.73	50.40	46.69	89.14	65.08	73.33	55.14	64.26	51.20	55.70	40.77	56.84
Black	34.68	53.13	41.08	25.32	9.38	31.24	23.00	35.51	31.00	44.54	37.67	53.00	34.96
Additional	15.65	6.14	8.53	27.99	1.48	3.68	3.67	9.34	4.74	4.26	6.63	6.23	8.20
Latino	6.11	7.05	7.40	26.17	74.82	50.92	46.56	16.38	38.47	11.91	7.91	16.38	25.84
Step 2: Give First													
White	48.25	40.48	31.69	46.69	54.46	68.25	56.12	61.95	59.18	65.48	49.62	43.77	52.16
Black	37.27	52.88	66.54	48.52	38.68	31.04	40.17	35.18	36.42	32.58	48.70	54.82	43.57
Additional	14.48	6.64	1.77	4.78	6.86	0.17	2.99	2.87	4.40	1.93	1.69	1.51	4.17
Latino	19.75	13.70	13.65	18.96	34.78	52.64	32.27	30.81	43.69	25.71	17.24	10.08	26.11
Step 3: Advocate for Research													
White	47.21	38.27	39.63	45.66	53.76	50.96	41.80	40.99	48.02	39.50	89.84	78.05	51.14
Black	48.60	58.66	59.00	52.60	44.85	47.93	56.49	58.16	48.75	60.48	5.85	21.95	46.94
Additional	4.19	3.07	1.37	1.74	1.39	1.11	1.71	0.85	3.23	0.02	4.32	0.00	1.92
Latino	16.16	2.64	12.32	17.71	27.87	34.11	12.25	24.23	35.85	58.54	29.45	7.16	23.19
Step 4: Give Back													
White	71.37	63.95	65.51	61.55	69.41	79.09	71.73	67.54	58.43	58.75	73.58	74.45	67.95
Black	15.00	27.19	24.36	25.45	25.78	17.37	23.07	28.44	34.48	32.69	19.66	23.12	24.72
Additional	13.63	8.86	10.13	13.00	4.82	3.54	5.20	4.02	7.08	8.55	6.76	2.43	7.34
Latino	10.05	9.41	10.14	7.14	7.41	12.59	20.75	18.46	7.08	9.59	5.55	21.66	11.65

* Year 1: July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012; Year 2: July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013; Year 3: July 1, 2013-June 30, 2014; Year 4: July 1, 2014-June 30, 2015; Year 5: July 1, 2015-June 30, 2016; Year 6: July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017; Year 7: July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018; Year 8: July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019; Year 9: July 1, 2019-June 30, 2020; Year 10: July 1, 2020-June 30, 2021; Year 11: July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022. ** Race refers to Black/African American, White, or Additional (i.e., American Indian/Native American, Asian American and Pacific Islander, and multiracial) categories; Ethnicity denotes Latino or Non-Latino.


Table 4: Participation in the Rush Alzheimer’s Disease Research Center (Rush ADRC) Data Repository and Rush ADRC and Other NIH-Supported Research Studies Across Participants and by Participant Race and Participant Ethnicity From Year 1 To Year 11*.**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	Year 12	Total Number
Consented and Entered into the Rush ADRC Data and Specimen Repository from the Community													
Participants, N	232	357	384	418	241	150	116	44	26	45	59	63	2135
White %	62.50	63.87	62.50	71.77	67.22	80.00	74.14	86.36	65.38	75.56	59.32	71.43	70.00
Black %	22.41	13.17	27.34	22.49	27.39	10.67	13.79	9.09	26.92	11.11	38.98	25.40	20.73
Additional %	15.08	22.97	10.15	5.75	5.39	9.33	12.06	4.55	7.70	13.33	1.69	3.18	9.27
Latino %	14.66	3.92	5.21	5.98	5.81	12.67	16.38	0.00	3.85	4.44	8.47	4.76	7.18
Joined Rush ADRC and Other NIH-Supported Research Studies													
Participants, N	452	609	472	384	489	333	668	835	604	192	465	402	5905
White %	70.58	44.83	54.24	53.39	71.98	53.45	55.96	62.28	42.88	61.46	65.59	56.97	57.80
Black %	28.98	54.68	45.13	44.79	19.84	36.94	37.65	32.34	52.32	33.33	26.24	35.82	37.34
Additional %	0.44	0.49	0.63	1.82	8.18	9.61	6.40	5.39	4.80	5.21	8.18	7.22	4.86
Latino %	3.54	1.97	4.45	5.47	17.38	23.72	10.03	10.18	5.79	14.06	10.97	10.95	9.88

* Year 1: July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012; Year 2: July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013; Year 3: July 1, 2013-June 30, 2014; Year 4: July 1, 2014-June 30, 2015; Year 5: July 1, 2015-June 30, 2016; Year 6: July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017; Year 7: July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018; Year 8: July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019; Year 9: July 1, 2019-June 30, 2020; Year 10: July 1, 2020-June 30, 2021; Year 11: July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022.

** Race refers to Black/African American, White, or Additional (i.e., American Indian/Native American, Asian American and Pacific Islander, and multiracial) categories; Ethnicity denotes Latino or Non-Latino.

Figure 1: The NGAGE Model, Community and Participant Input on Study Activities, and Individual Rush ADRC Study Operation.



Outer circle represents community-based events and activities associated with steps of the NGAGE Model, including Step 1: Network, Step 2: Give first, Step 3: Advocate for research, and Step 4: Give back.

Middle circle represents community and participant input throughout the research process, including A. Question development, B. Prioritization of topics, C. Approach to the study, D. Dissemination of materials and study findings, and E. Execution of the study.

Inner circle represents individual study activities, including the Religious Orders Study, African American Clinical Core, and Latino Core.

At the core is **Step 5. Evaluate** of the NGAGE Model.