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Clinical Trials Initiative: Overview

Primary focus for today:

• Feasibility
  • Site selection

• Implementation
  • Standardized Budgets and Management Fee
  • Recruitment Strategies

• Study management (safety!)
  • Clinical Trial Management Systems (OnCore, PowerTrials)
Clinical Trials Initiative

Over-Arching Goals

1. Bring innovative therapies to the patients we serve through scientifically rigorous, nationally competitive programs.

2. Insure excellence in the conduct and management of clinical trials, meeting all guidelines for superior performance and regulatory compliance.

3. Grow our portfolio of clinical trials through industry initiated and investigator initiated studies; federally and industry-funded; and local and multi-site trials.
Clinical Trials

National Trends & Expectations

• Accreditation
  • Training certification (GCP standards)
  • Site accreditation (Clinical Trials Transformation Initiative)

• **Scientific rigor**: design, consistency and transparency
  • Scientific Review Committees (rigorous methodology, trial design)
  • Coordinated reliance-based IRB reviews (SMART IRB)
  • ClinicalTrials.gov registration and posting of results
Clinical Trials

**National Trends & Expectations**

- **Site identification and study feasibility**
  - Strategic site identification: feasibility (TriNetX and ACT Network)
  - Multi-site studies initiatives (SHARe; NCATS Trial Innovation Network)

- **Implementation**
  - Consistent, harmonized single IRB processes
  - Consistent, standardized budgeting, contracting (eg, ACTA, FDP)
  - Competitive Time-to-Activation
  - Consistent achievement in meeting stated recruitment goals

- **Effective study management (safety!)**
  - Enterprise systems management of clinical trials within academic environments (eg, OnCore Enterprise & Onsemble community)
Clinical Trials

Site identification and feasibility

• Multi-site studies initiatives
  • NCATS Trial Innovation Network (TIN)

https://trialinnovationnetwork.org/

https://ncats.nih.gov/ctsa/projects/network
Clinical Trials

Site identification and feasibility

• Multi-site studies initiatives
  • CCTS SHARE Network

- RFAs: network-wide (pilots/training slots) reviewed by all Partners
- Panels: network-wide virtual and in-person
- Synergy calls: every other week domain calls every 2-4 weeks
- Meetings across all sites strategic discussions/senior leaders
- Training conferences SSCI, TS series, LACaTS Scholars
- Weekly Digest: events/announcements
Clinical Trials: Going to Scale
*Site Identification and Feasibility*

The Southeast Health Alliance for Research (SHARE)
*Transforming Science and Improving Health in the Deep South*

**Why Use SHARE?**

- Ease the administrative burdens that slow typical time-to-activation.
- Enroll sufficient numbers of qualified participants for clinical research protocols.
- SHARE offers access to a large, regional, and diverse population.
- Gain a valuable edge in competing for multisite trial research support.
- Spur trans-network innovation among faculty, physicians, other health care providers.
- Further access to a national trial network to accelerate your research to impact health.
Clinical Trials

Site identification and feasibility

- Multi-site studies initiatives
  - Strategic site identification:
    feasibility - does the site have a sufficient target patient population?
    (TriNetX and Accrual Clinical Trials Network)

Industry Sponsors

Federal Sponsors

TriNetX

TIN (via ACT Network)

Academic
Medical
Centers
Innovation & Development: CCTS as a catalyst - Recruitment of trials

Trials

2016
21
Accepted 24%  ~ 2/month

2017
31
Accepted 48%  ~ 3/month

2018
47
Accepted 51%  ~ 4/month

Data-warehouse for integrating clinical and research data
Typical TIN-CTSA site identification process

Trial PI submits cohort request at trialinnovation network.org

Cohort request and expression of interest goes to TIN liaisons at all CTSA sites

If interested, CTSA provides cohort numbers and site PI name to RIC. RIC collates information from responding CTSAs and gives it to trial PI

Trial PI selects sites and contacts site PIs; asks for letters of intent to participate

CTSA institution provides letter of intent to participate for grant application
Questions & Discussion
Clinical Trials
Implementation

• Implementation
  • Consistent, harmonized single IRB processes
  • Consistent, standardized budgeting and contracting (e.g., ACTA, FDP)
  • Competitive Time-to-Activation
  • Consistent achievement in meeting stated recruitment goals
Clinical Trials
Implementation

• Implementation
  Consistent, harmonized single IRB processes
  • SMART IRB initiative
    • All CTSA Hub institutions, nationwide
    • Total of 539 institutions (https://smartirb.org/participating-institutions/)
  • Single IRB harmonization initiative
    • Duke, Vanderbilt, UAMS CTSA-sponsored project
      (Underway)
• Implementation

Consistent, standardized budgeting, contracting (eg, ACTA, FDP-CTSA)

• What’s happening nationwide?
  • Re-organization of the clinical trials processes
  • Standardized operating procedures (budgeting, training, implementation)
  • Migration from ad hoc to CTMS

• Who’s involved?
  • CCTS has contacted >25 peer organizations
  • (Penn, Hopkins, Yale, Duke, Minnesota, Indiana, Wash U, Kentucky, Ohio State, MGH, Florida, MUSC, Michigan, UNC, UAMS, Colorado, Wisconsin)
Clinical Trials

Implementation

Consistent, standardized budgeting, contracting (eg, ACTA, FDP-CTSA)

What are institutions doing nationwide?

- Yale: a 38-58% increase in up-front budgets thru coordination of negotiations
- Duke expects a 10% surcharge on TDC (in addition to IDC)
- Average IDC is 30.06% (N=26, median=30%, range 25-43%)
- Administrative start-up ($10 to >$25K; definitions vary)
- Back office invoicing is an area of interest and attention
# Feasibility

The challenge
Clinical trials are often under way before the site and sponsor truly have the information necessary to ensure the study is productive downstream. This leads to a lot of extra time and resources in the study start-up phase.

---

## 8 Months

average time to move from pre-visit through to site initiation\(^4\)

## $20,000 – $30,000

estimated cost of initiating a site\(^8\)

---

$1,000

---

To enhance feasibility assessments:
Improve feasibility questionnaires and ensure sites only participate on trials that will be mutually successful.

## Sponsors

- Give sites enough time for thoughtful answers
- Make simple changes to your traditional questionnaire
- Identify the right point person to answer questions
- Follow up with ALL sites that submit a questionnaire

## Sites

- Pick up the phone and talk to the sponsor
- Don’t just tell the sponsor what you think they want to hear
- Do a reverse feasibility questionnaire
- Know your deal breakers and when to walk away

---

Questions & Discussion
Clinical Trials

Implementation

- Consistent achievement in meeting stated recruitment goals
The challenge
Defining targets and accurately predicting enrollment numbers can be a guessing game. Lack of communication between stakeholders leads to over- or under-estimated enrollment numbers that ultimately set sites up for failure.

According to the Tufts University CSDD report in 2013

- 39% of sites meet their enrollment targets
- 37% of sites under-enroll
- 11% of sites in a given trial fall to enroll a single patient

For more accurate enrollment predictions:
Honest and open communication between sites and sponsors upfront so everyone is aware of necessary study details and has what they need to ensure accurate estimates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsors</th>
<th>Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allow sites to explain variables to estimates</td>
<td>Showcase your past enrollment performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell sites where you are in the process</td>
<td>Be honest about competing studies and don’t overestimate your enrollment potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share changes to I/E criteria with sites and let them update their enrollment numbers</td>
<td>Get what you need from the sponsor to be more precise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clinical Trials Implementation

- Implementation
  Consistent achievement in meeting stated recruitment goals: tactics
  - **Announcements** of study availability
    - ClinicalTrials.gov
    - Print, radio, digital media campaigns
    - In-person contacts (recruitment tables or booths)
  - **Data driven, investigator-initiated**
    - i2b2-supported Hub-based individual level information (IRB)
    - Recruitment Retention Shared Facility (incl. navigation)
    - Network supported: SHARe and Trial Innovation Network (TIN)
  - **Participant-initiated**
    - XpertTrials (NLP search of ClinicalTrials.gov)
    - Trials Today, Research Match, eReporter
  - **Sponsor-initiated** (eg, ThreeWire, a WCG company)
Clinical Trials

Site feasibility

- Multi-site studies initiatives
- Strategic site identification: feasibility (TriNetX and Accrual Clinical Trials Network)

![](diagram)

Industry Sponsors

Federal Sponsors

TriNetX

TIN (via ACT Network)

Academic Medical Centers
Clinical Trials Implementation

- **Multi-site studies initiatives**
  - Strategic site identification: **feasibility** *(TriNetX and Accrual Clinical Trials Network)*
Typical steps when planning a clinical trial with TIN-CTSA site identification process

1. Before TIN request to find additional sites:
   - Trial Principal Investigator (PI) develops a trial study question.
   - PI works with other members of his/her investigator team to develop the outline of a protocol and design.
   - PI determines how many participants need to be enrolled in the trial.
   - PI determines how many participants can be enrolled at his/her institution and the institutions of any co-investigators.

2. PI submits a proposal to trialinnovationnetwork.org to find additional sites through the CTSA hubs.
   - A cohort assessment / expression of interest procedure is conducted through the RIC – see next slide for that process. Ideally, we ask for 30 days to complete this task.
   - Usually, development of the trial study question through submission of the grant application takes about 6 months.
   - PI ultimately determines which clinical sites comprise his/her trial study team.
Typical TIN-CTSA site identification process

1. **Trial PI submits cohort request** at trialinnovation network.org
2. Cohort request and expression of interest goes to TIN liaisons at all CTSA sites
3. If interested, CTSA provides cohort numbers and site PI name to RIC. RIC collates information from responding CTSAs and gives it to trial PI
4. **Trial PI** selects sites and contacts site PIs; asks for letters of intent to participate
5. **CTSA institution** provides letter of intent to participate for grant application
Looking for clinical trials?

UAB Clinical Trial Search

heart

Clinical Trial Search
Find & register for ongoing clinical studies with our new clinical trial search engine >>
Clinical Trials
Recruitment of Subjects

Find a Clinical Trial
CCTS researchers conduct many kinds of studies, including clinical trials. We seek people with specific medical conditions as well as healthy volunteers.

I Want to Participate in Research

Current UAB Patient?

Subjects connected to Trials (2018)

48 Enrolled
207 Pending
621 Not Enrolled

Geographic distribution
Questions & Discussion

CCTS
Center for Clinical and Translational Science
McClintock named new director of the UAB Office of the IRB
Adam McClintock has been named director of the UAB Office of the Institutional Review Board for Human Use (IRB) following a national search.

McClintock [served] as the human research protections manager for OhioHealth Research & Innovation Institute, and previously served as the operations manager in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at The Ohio State University. Mr. McClintock [started] his new position [at UAB] on January 28, 2019.

“I am honored to join the leadership team within the UAB Office of the Vice President for Research, in such a vibrant environment for human subjects research,” McClintock said. “I am eager to begin working with the talented and dedicated individuals who make up the Office of the IRB.”
Clinical Trials

Effective Study Management

• Effective study management (safety!)
  • Enterprise systems management of clinical trials within academic environments (eg, OnCore Enterprise & Onsemble community)
Effective study management:

- Research Study Summaries and Patient Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Studies in Cerner</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number without research summaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy (migrated from Siteminder)</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New that are active</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New that are pending</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Studies in Cerner</td>
<td></td>
<td>252</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number without research summaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy (migrated from Siteminder)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New that are active</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New that are pending</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* plus 16 not live  * plus 1 on hold
Questions & Discussion