National Cancer Institute

Proposed Evaluation Plan for Assessing Implementation of the Clinical Trials Working Group (CTWG) Recommendations

CTWG Evaluation Working Group
Final Report

Clinical Trials and Translational Research Advisory Committee

July 13, 2011

National Cancer Institute

Context for Presentation

- Goal of overall CTWG evaluation
  - Assess performance and impact of implemented CTWG initiatives on effectiveness of the overall NCI clinical trials enterprise
- Goals of the CTWG Evaluation Working Group
  - Refine the proposed evaluation plan
  - Establish a timeline for implementation
- Goals of today's discussion
  - Present final report of the Working Group
  - Describe proposed next steps
  - Request CTAC approval of report and plan

National Cancer Institute

Activities Since March 3 CTAC Meeting

- Preparation of final report draft (March-May)
- Input from Working Group on draft report (June)
- Completion of final report (July)

Working Group Membership

Extramural Members

- Peter Adamson (Co-chair)
- Dan Sargent (Co-chair)
- Deb Bruner
- Deborah Collyar
- Arlene Forastiere
- Steve Grubbs
- David Parkinson
- Joel Tepper
- George Weiner
- George Wilding

NCI Members

- Jeff Abrams
- Deborah Jaffe
- Lori Minasian
- Meg Mooney
- James Zwiebel

Facilitators

- CCCT: Sheila Prindiville/ Elizabeth Dean
- STPI: Judy Hautala/Brian Zuckerman/Rachel Parker

National Cancer Institute

Evaluation Plan Overview

- Four primary evaluation components
  1. System Outcomes
  2. Disease Steering Committees
  3. Investigational Drug Steering Committee
  4. Collaboration

- Limited to trials under purview of the Scientific Steering Committees and contained in current CTEP/DCP databases

National Cancer Institute

1A. System Outcomes: Trial Quality Quantitative Measures

- Percentage of trials that complete accrual
- For trials that do not complete accrual, collect data on reasons
- Percentage of trials that definitively answer primary question
- Percentage of trials published in peer-reviewed journals
- Percentage of early-phase trials that influence the design of a late-phase trial

National Cancer Institute

1B. System Outcomes: Scientific Importance & Clinical Relevance of Trial Results

- Qualitative interpretation and expert judgment required
- Preliminary Measures
  - Novelty of trial results
  - Results sufficiently meaningful to warrant practice changes (e.g., two-week extension of survival likely not meaningful)
  - Results led to real-world practice changes
  - Results led to stand alone publication based on secondary aims

National Cancer Institute

1B. System Outcomes: Scientific Importance & Clinical Relevance of Trial Results

- Convene initial expert panel
- Pilot the proposed measures and criteria on all Phase III trials completed in a recent year (e.g., 2009 or 2010)
- If approach judged feasible, annual evaluation of trials completed in past year
- Periodic review of whether trial results impacted real-world practice

National Cancer Institute

1B. System Outcomes: Clinical Relevance of Trial Results - Quantitative Measures

- FDA Approvals (NDA/sNDA)
- NCCN guidelines
  - NCI-supported trials referenced
  - Recommendations that reference NCI funded trial
- CMS coverage determinations deleted
  - Pilot analysis demonstrated data collection not feasible

National Cancer Institute

1C. System Outcomes: Efficiency of Trial Initiation & Conduct - Quantitative Measures

- Efficiency of trial initiation
  - Time from Letter of Intent (LOI) receipt by NCI to trial opening for accrual (CTEP early drug development trials)
  - Time from concept submission to a Steering Committee to trial opening for accrual (CTEP late-phase and DCP symptom management trials)

- Efficiency of trial conduct
  - Trials meeting originally projected accrual rates
  - Trials with revisions to the projected accrual rate
  - Trials meeting a revised projected accrual rate
  - Trials with substantive amendments not resulting from new safety information
  - Average number of substantive amendments per trial not resulting from new safety information

National Cancer Institute

2. Disease Steering Committees: Evaluation Methodology

- Quantitative and qualitative approaches
- Evaluation on an individual Steering Committee level
- System Outcome data limited to trial quality and scientific importance/clinical relevance of trial results
- Analysis of timeline performance in approving concepts
- Qualitative analysis via stakeholder interviews
  - Steering Committee members (including Group disease committee chairs)
  - Task Force members
  - NCI staff
  - Group leadership
  - Investigators who submitted concepts

National Cancer Institute

2. Disease Steering Committees: Evaluation Topics

- Timeline Performance
- Quality of Concept Evaluation
- Influence on Concept Development
- Portfolio Management
- Collaboration

National Cancer Institute

3. Investigational Drug Steering Committee: Evaluation Methodology

- Predominantly qualitative approaches
- Expert panel review of IDSC impact
- Database analyses of collaboration
- Qualitative analysis via stakeholder interviews
- Bibliometrics and document review

National Cancer Institute

3. Investigational Drug Steering Committee: Sample Evaluation Measures

- Value of IDSC recommendations regarding targets
- IDSC role in enhancing Clinical Development Plan (CDP) quality
- Quality of process for developing and reviewing CDPs
- Degree to which IDSC process has improved incentives for collaboration
- Impact of IDSC reports and guidelines on design of early drug development trials

National Cancer Institute

4. Collaboration: Analysis of Program Guidelines

- Analyze Cooperative Group, SPORE, and Cancer Center guidelines
  - Assess incentives and disincentives for collaboration
  - Build on definitions of collaboration developed by the Guidelines Harmonization Working Group of the CTAC Coordination Subcommittee
- Potential incentives include:
  - Scored review criteria associated with collaboration
  - Option to use funds from the base award to conduct or promote collaborative activities
  - Supplemental funds available for collaboration

National Cancer Institute

4. Collaboration: Quantitative Measures

- Percentage of CTEP funded Phase II trials (and patients on trials) involving collaboration across multiple institutions

- Percentage of Phase III trials (and patients on trials) involving collaboration across multiple Cooperative Groups

- Extent of industry collaboration
  - Investigational agents provided to CTEP
  - Companies collaborating with CTEP

National Cancer Institute

Proposed Next Steps: System Outcome Measures

- Database Analyses:
  - Begin annual analysis in 2011 for measures relying on data already collected in NCI databases
  - Prioritize in 2011 measures requiring additional data collection and establish a timeline for inclusion in NCI databases
- Expert Panel:
  - Convene an initial panel in 2011-2012
    - Develop measures and criteria for evaluating scientific importance and clinical relevance of trial results
    - Pilot the evaluation methodology to determine feasibility
  - If feasible, begin annual evaluations in 2013
- Document Analyses:
  - Develop methodology in 2011 for measuring impact on FDA approvals and practice guidelines
  - If process deemed feasible and results meaningful, begin annual analysis in 2012

National Cancer Institute

Proposed Next Steps: Other Measures

- Disease Steering Committees
  - Evaluate each Disease Steering Committee five years after inception and every five years thereafter
  - GI and GYN Steering Committees evaluated in 2011-2012
- IDSC
  - Evaluate IDSC in 2011-2012 and every five years thereafter
- Collaboration
  - Analyze program guidelines in 2012 when the current Cooperative Group guideline revision is complete
  - Conduct database analyses in 2011-2012 and every three years thereafter

National Cancer Institute

Discussion

- Comments/questions on proposed measures
- Comments/questions on proposed next steps
- Decision on acceptance of report
- Decision on proposed next steps