

## **Evaluating Program Metrics Through Dashboard Utilization**

E. Nurminen, A. Lalanne

*UCSF Helen Diller Family Comprehensive Cancer Center*

### **1. Background**

At our institution, each oncology program is evaluated on a range of metrics, including study activation timelines, accrual, data completion and quality, and regulatory compliance. These metrics are housed across multiple institutional systems, requiring substantial manual effort to compile and interpret. We have put in significant effort to centralize this data across several dashboards. While these dashboards create more visibility, we have not standardized the review process, cadence and action planning across programs.

### **2. Goals**

To operationalize the use of dashboards by developing a structured framework for reviewing programmatic metrics, identifying areas where goals are not being met, developing a detailed plan, and implementing these strategies to improve overall performance.

### **3. Solutions and Methods**

In partnership with our applications programmer, we developed several centralized dashboards that aggregate metrics from multiple systems. Dashboards were organized into several key areas:

- Study activation timelines
- Study accruals, including screen fail rate and studies that haven't accrued any patients within the first 90 days on enrollment
- Data completion and monitoring visit compliance

The dashboards were designed to provide high level visibility of performance metrics and reduce reliance on manual data reconciliation. Recognizing that the dashboards alone are not sufficient, we plan to develop a structured review framework. This framework will outline defined review cadences, development and implementation of action plans, including delegation of responsibilities and explicit timelines.

### **4. Outcomes**

These dashboards have allowed for better transparency of program performance metrics for both cancer center leadership and clinical research managers in each oncology program. In 2025, the dashboards averaged an aggregate of 150 views each month. At this time, there are inconsistencies in review cadence and actionable steps (after review) across programs.

### **5. Lessons Learned and Future Directions**

We have learned that the creation of these dashboards has minimized manual effort to review these metrics manually. There are still data points that aren't captured in these dashboards so it is important

*Category: Cross-Cutting Innovation and Collaboration – Work in Progress*

to get additional feedback from the clinical research managers to determine if the current dashboards meet their needs and can then add, remove or modify specific metrics.

Next steps include the following:

- Solicit feedback from cancer center leadership and managers
- Develop a framework to outline defined review cadences, development and implementation of action plans, including delegation of responsibilities and explicit timelines
- Implement use of framework and continue to iterate based on how effective the dashboards are at improving established goals