

Implementing structured assessments to determine research readiness and capacity among communitybased clinical oncology network sites

BACKGROUND

NETWORK



Our cancer center has built a network of community oncology sites

POPULATION

Sites have diverse patient populations and institutional capacities





Diverse patient populations at our community network sites provides a unique opportunity to address issues related to disparities and health equity

PRIORITIES

Increasing the reach of clinical research opportunities by bringing research into the network is an institutional priority



THE PROBLEM



Patients from rural and underserved community sites are rarely included in research

THE BARRIERS

Community oncology clinics often lack research expertise and infrastructure available at large academic cancer centers



Research readiness is difficult to assess, is usually trial and error, and takes time to align available research with site capabilities

GOAL AND APPROACH



Standardize the assessments of research readiness in community sites and to identify actionable barriers to research

METHODS: RESEARCH READINESS ASSESSMENT

Survey tools included:

Research readiness was assessed and survey responses were collected from 13 sites network sites. Business managers and site staff were selected to complete the institutional capacity assessment and the ORIC assessment. Key staff were selected based on their knowledge of site systems and infrastructure.

1. Institutional readiness assessment

a. Specific facility and personnel capacity (e.g. CLIA certified laboratory, investigational drug pharmacy including ability to provide investigational product accountability and storage, systems to identify and randomize patients), IRB system in place

b. Perceived timeline for research readiness, specific gaps and barriers, interest in different levels of clinical research (e.g. remote, observational, drug interventional CT Phases I-III)

2. Validated tool to assess organizational readiness to implementing change (ORIC)



Christina R. Crabtree-Ide, PhD, MPH¹, Rachel Evans, PhD, MS, CCRP², Elizabeth Bouchard, PhD, MS¹, Katia Noyes, PhD, MPH³, Mary Reid, PhD⁴, Laurie Smith, MA², Kathryn M. Glaser, PhD, MA¹

¹Department of Cancer Prevention and Control, Roswell Park Comprehensive Cancer Center, ²Department of Clinical Research Services, Roswell Park Comprehensive Cancer Center, ³Deparment of Epidemiology and Environmental Health, University at Buffalo, ⁴Department of Medicine, Roswell Park *Comprehensive Cancer Center*

Roswell Park Comprehensive Cancer Center, Buffalo, NY 14263

OUTCOMES

Institutional readiness, timelines, and institutional priorities varied by site. Results of the structured assessment provided baseline information to assist clinics with resources needed for different types and phases of research.

| Assessment category | Results |
|--|--|
| Knowledge of specific steps that need to be addressed to launch new research studies | Most business managers had unclear ideas of gaps and steps to launch research |
| | Mean=0.7, where 0=not a clear idea of gaps, 1=somewhat clear idea, 2=clear, 3=very clear, N/A=no gaps, immediately ready) |
| Saps and barriers | Research study staffing |
| | Clear understanding of the types of research available |
| | Resources |
| | Training |
| mmediate readiness to roll out tudies | Mean=1.7, where 0=Never, 1=More than 1 year, 2=Between 6 months and 1 year, 3=Between 3 and 6 months, 4=Between 1 and 3 months, 5=Immediate ability |

LESSONS LEARNED

- No rural or underserved community sites reported being immediately ready to roll out research studies of any kind
- Disseminating surveys to a single practice champion (e.g., business manager) is an efficient way to assess research readiness of community oncology practice sites Designated staff and a concrete set of steps for research roll-out may benefit community sites

Contact: Christina.Crabtree-Ide@RowellPark.org