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Purpose & Context
A key goal for the Delaware INBRE Program is to accelerate the translation of basic biomedical research advances into clinical practice to enhance patient care and the health of Delawareans.

Delaware INBRE researchers routinely describe challenges associated with conducting clinical and translational research (CTR). To facilitate translational research activities in Delaware, the STRiDE Initiative was established, with the aim of developing infrastructure and fostering partnerships among academic and primarily clinical institutions.

To systematically identify barriers, facilitators, collaborations, resource needs and beliefs related to the conduct of CTR, we implemented a needs assessment to members of the Delaware INBRE research network.

Methods
We derived the STRiDE needs assessment survey primarily from two established CTR surveys (Weston, Bass, Ford, and Segal, 2010 and Dolor, Greene, Thompson, Baldwin, & Neale, 2011).

Four evaluation questions guided the study and focused on:
• Prevalence & types of CTR conducted
• The barriers & facilitators
• Beliefs about CTR
• Amount of collaboration among partners

Sample Details
The sample is drawn from the network’s four institutions that conduct research – two hospitals, one research university, and one primarily undergraduate HBCU.

We distributed the survey to 923 potential CTR researchers in the Delaware INBRE network through an online system, and 412 participants responded. We removed incomplete responses and those not relevant to biomedical research (N=117).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCHS</th>
<th>DSU</th>
<th>Nemours</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Responses</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results
Prevalence & types of CTR conducted
• Individuals involved in implementing CTR ranged from 23%-98% across partners.
• The most commonly reported types of CTR:
  • evaluation or treatment or therapy for human volunteers (52%),
  • translation of mechanistic studies into initial human testing (36%), &
  • improving access to care (32%).

Barriers & facilitators to CTR
• At each institution, the number of significant barriers to conducting CTR varied widely.
• The most significant barriers dealt with:
  • intra- & inter-institutional collaboration
  • funding
• Facilitators to CTR vary by institution (eg.
  • funding, statistical support)

Beliefs about CTR
• Over 70% of respondents have positive beliefs about CTR (large non-response rates).
• CTR is professionally fulfilling.
• Scientists who can cross the lab-clinic divide are in demand.
• CTR needed to improve health outcomes

Collaboration among partners
• Many participants collaborate within and across institutions, commonly for scientific expertise, clinical participants, & equipment

Recommendations
It’s beneficial to engage stakeholders in multiple steps of an evaluation project such as program description, survey design, data collection strategies, and results dissemination.

Active involvement in an evaluation project helps stakeholders feel valued and confident about the project.

A Survey Pathway Diagram is a valuable tool for communicating with clients and optimizing the survey structure.
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