**Objective:** To determine LRIC activities using a data-driven approach by evaluating and assessing factors related to the recruitment and retention (R&R) experiences of researchers at both institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General R&amp;R experience</td>
<td>Number of trials conducted, amount of funding allocated, recruitment success / difficulty, retention success/difficulty, reasons for success / difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness / Satisfaction with previously utilized resources</td>
<td>Various recruitment media (e.g., social media, recruitment services, provider referrals, EMR based tools, TV / radio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness / Satisfaction with institutional resources</td>
<td>Institutional resources and recruitment strategy (e.g. adequate resources, sufficient staff to support R&amp;R, researcher education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness / Satisfaction with CTSI-CN R&amp;R resources</td>
<td>CTSI-CN recruitment resources (e.g., registry tools, CTSI-CN website, EMR-based tools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of recruitment and retention resources</td>
<td>Importance of various resources (e.g., funding, streamlined IRB approval, PR &amp; Marketing support, informatics tools, community engagement, educational sessions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents At-A-Glance

- Total N=254  (Children’s National (CNHS) = 135; GW = 119)
  - 63% are CTSI-CN members

**Top 3 Researcher Roles**

- **CNHS**
  - Principal Investigator: 17.5%
  - Sub-Investigator: 6.7%
  - Research Coordinator: 15.8%
  - Other: 60.0%
- **GW**
  - Principal Investigator: 23.8%
  - Sub-Investigator: 6.7%
  - Research Coordinator: 13.3%
  - Other: 56.2%

**Top 3 Types of Research Conducted**

- **Clinical/Patient Oriented**
  - CNHS: 47.2%
  - GW: 87.1%
- **Socio-Behavioral Research**
  - CNHS: 26.6%
  - GW: 28.7%
- **Public/Population Health**
  - CNHS: 12.9%
  - GW: 29.6%

**Top 3 Department / School Affiliations**

- **CNHS**
  - Center for Translational Science (18.7%)
  - Center for Neuroscience Research (14.6%)
  - Center for Genetic Medicine Research (8.9%)

- **GW**
  - School of Medicine and Health Studies (31.5%)
  - Milken Institute School of Public Health (23.1%)
  - Medical Faculty Associates (17.6%)
General Recruitment and Retention Experience

- Studies conducted: 1-10 studies (48.1%), 11-20 studies (21.4%), 21-30 studies (11.3%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocated Funding to R&amp;R</th>
<th>CNHS</th>
<th>GW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$7,501 - $10,000+</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,501 - $5,000</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,001 - $2,500</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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How often do you meet your recruitment goals?

- Always: 20.0% CN (n=80), 10.4% GW (n=67)
- Most of the Time: 40.0% CN (n=80), 43.9% GW (n=67)
- Sometimes: 20.0% CN (n=80), 24.2% GW (n=67)
- Rarely: 7.5% CN (n=80), 17.9% GW (n=67)
- Never: 12.5% CN (n=80), 9.7% GW (n=67)

Level of difficulty with retaining participants?

- Very Easy: 12.8% CN (n=79), 8.1% GW (n=62)
- Easy: 32.9% CN (n=79), 28.7% GW (n=62)
- Fair: 34.2% CN (n=79), 31.1% GW (n=62)
- Difficult: 10.1% CN (n=79), 12.9% GW (n=62)
- Very Difficult: 0.1% CN (n=79), 0.2% GW (n=62)

- About 60% of researchers meet their goals most of the time or always
- 40% do not
- More CNHS researchers (~55%) have an easy time with retention
- 27% of GW have an easy time
## Reason(s) you believe research participants do not wish to enroll in a research study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNHS (%)</th>
<th>GW (%)</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>Indirect Cost Related to Participation (e.g. time away from work, child care, travel expenses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>Lack of Awareness (about research in general)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>Distrust, Fear, or Suspicion***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>Misconceptions About the Study (e.g. assumptions, negative press regarding the study treatment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>Location of Study Site (i.e., proximity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>Worry about potential adverse effects or negative consequences due to study participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>Lack of Access (i.e., do not know the study exists or how to access the study)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>Too Little Compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Personal Objections (e.g. faith-based objection)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Modifiable through community education
Awareness / Satisfaction with Recruitment Methods

% of Respondents that Have Never Used Before

- Television Ads
- Patient Recruitment Service (Acurian, Praxis)
- Online classifieds (Craig's list)
- Radio Ads
- Internet-based Ads
- Social Media (Facebook, Twitter)
- Print Ads
- Online Registry (ResearchMatch)
- Medical Records-based Tools (PowerTrials, i2b2)
- Independent Database (department)
- Recruitment Letter/Mailing Card
- Printed Flyers, info cards
- Direct Recruitment (meeting with community, in-…)
- Provider/Colleague referral

If used, majority “Satisfied”

CN (n=71)
GW (n=51)
Awareness / Satisfaction with Institutional Resources

% of Respondents that “Strongly Disagree” / Are “Unsure”

- My institution offers funding for R&R
- There are adequate staff to help explain/demo
- There are dedicated R&R staff to aid me
- There are adequate resources
- There are educational sessions on best practices
- Recruitment tools are affordable
- Institution does a good job making people aware of...
- My institution has several resources available
- Institution facilitates opportunities to interact with the...
- PR& Marketing offer assistance w/recruitment materials
- I know who to contact for information about resources
- IRB approval process for recruitment methods/materials is…
- I wish there were more resources/tools
- I wish there were more tools

CN (n=64)
GW (n=43)
Resources That Would Help With Recruitment: Desired Tools

- Dedicated R&R Liaison
- Assistance in creating a R&R plan
- Direct support/guidance from PR & Marketing
- Guidance documents for best practice and policies
- Assistance with ClinicalTrials.gov
- Bimonthly newsletter to PI
- R&R Liaison in Open Studio sessions
- Other

% of Respondents that think the tool would be helpful:

- CN (n=60)
- GW (n=40)
Resources That Would Help Connect With Community

% of Respondents that think the resource would be helpful

- Online research volunteer registry
- Research focused community engagement events
- Public education materials (W's of research)
- Research focused Community Advisory Board
- Research participant call enter/pre-screening
- Volunteer-directed clinical trial website including active studies
- 3rd party research advertising by an agency
- Community involvement in Open Studios
- Other
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Conclusions

- While many researchers are meeting R&R goals, a sizable minority are not
  - Successful PIs are a resource for establishing Best “local” Practices
  - Who are the PIs having trouble? Target for educational sessions
- Many researchers think poor participation is due to lack of awareness / distrust
  - Opportunity for LRIC and CE modules to collaborate to help all studies by increasing community knowledge and trust in CTSI-CN (CNHS, GW)
- An important step to increasing utilization of tools is to increase PI awareness of tools
  - PIs continue to rely on traditional recruitment tools (flyers / referrals not social media)
  - CTSI-CN Website is essential — will house training resources for PI on R&R best practices
  - Most PIs believe different tools will be helpful