

have found the Liaison Service to be a popular addition to research support, and plan to continue the service. We will continue to evaluate its user satisfaction and usefulness. Additional focus will be placed on whether the Service can improve approval times for human subjects research for protocols using the Liaison Service.

3080

### Ensuring Quality in Investigator-Initiated Clinical Trials through Monitoring Concepts Training

Amelia Spinrad<sup>1</sup>, Nancy Pire-Smerkanich, Eunjo Pacifici, Apurva Uniyal, Annie Xie, Annie Ly and Advaita Chandramohan

<sup>1</sup>University of Southern California; University of Southern California

**OBJECTIVES/SPECIFIC AIMS:** Because clinical trial results are instrumental in the approval of a new drug or changes to the practice of medicine, ensuring the accuracy and validity of collected data is critical in the clinical trial process. This function, routinely carried out by clinical trial monitors in industry-sponsored trials, is often lacking in investigator-initiated trials (IITs) conducted in academia. To address this challenge, we have developed a self-study module that can be used to cross-train academic researchers in essential concepts and practical approaches to monitoring. Furthermore, we are applying a framework drawn from implementation science in the development and launch of this initiative. This framework, as used in other educational programs, is employed here to close the gap between initiative and practice, thereby effectively disseminating this training would improve the quality of clinical trials in academia. **METHODS/STUDY POPULATION:** This research project applied exploration, installation and implementation stages of the implementation science process by 1) exploring the need for a new initiative, 2) disseminating results, 3) engaging stakeholders, 4) creating standard operating procedures (SOPs) for installation and implementation, 5) studying user satisfaction and effectiveness, 6) addressing feedback and 7) conducting implementation. **RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS:** From literature review and internet searches we determined that although numerous GCP training resources exist, most are too broad and lack the practical approaches to meet the complex requirements of monitoring. Moreover, most of the offerings identified are costly or inaccessible. With only about 65% of IITs reported as being monitored (Figures 1 and 2), it appears that there is a clear need for training tools that are easily available to a broader audience. And because monitoring skills are substantially different from those associated with research coordination, it is not surprising that research professionals believed that they would need additional training to become proficient. To address this need, we began developing a monitoring module. We engaged key stakeholders from academia and industry to gain insights into their needs. The results indicated that although our training module was effective, supplementary information on the fundamentals of clinical trials should be included for those new to the field. After incorporating suggested changes and completing the module, we conducted user testing to determine if our module is ready to be broadly disseminated (Figures 3 and 4). Following positive feedback from the group, we are currently in the process of disseminating our module and studying its impact. **DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT:** IITs are instrumental in translating academic research into product development. Deficiencies in the quality control of these trials can lead to inadequacies in data accuracy and validity that could lead to significant delays in bringing innovative therapies to patients. Recent NIH policies require data and safety monitoring for all of the trials it supports. The latest addendum to ICH GCP, E6(R2),

discusses a need for quality management across the clinical trial life-cycle. As we continue to disseminate and share information during the development of our self-study monitoring module, we are engaging key stakeholders from academia, government, and private institutions to understand and address quality challenges in conducting clinical trials. Finally, this research informs dissemination and implementation research, specifically for creating training for academic research professionals.

3076

### Findings from the first year of California's Workplace Violence Prevention in Healthcare standard (Title 8, Section 3342)

Rachel Odes<sup>1</sup>, OiSaeng Hong and Susan Chapman

<sup>1</sup>University Of California, San Francisco

**OBJECTIVES/SPECIFIC AIMS:** This research project aims to: 1) describe the incidents of workplace violence that have been reported to CalOSHA through the Workplace Violent Incident Reporting System for Hospitals; 2) determine if there are any relationships between the types of violent incidents reported and the unit or hospital where the event occurred; 3) describe what mitigation strategies facility representatives report having utilized immediately following a violent incident, such as changes to practice or involvement of law enforcement. **METHODS/STUDY POPULATION:** Reports submitted to CalOSHA pursuant to the Workplace Violent Incident Reporting System for Hospitals are considered public record and are available through the state's Public Records Act (PRA) mandate. Records from 7/1/17 – 9/30/18 were obtained through the CalOSHA PRA request process. Descriptive statistics and correlations were calculated using Stata. **RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS:** Records reporting 11,116 individual events of violence were analyzed. These results do not include reports submitted by the five California State Hospitals, a group of facilities which treated nearly 13,000 patients in 2017, many of whom have a psychiatric diagnosis and are undergoing treatment mandated by judicial decision. For each record, 111 variables were reported, including description of the event itself, characteristics of the workers involved, factors which may have triggered the event, and what measures were taken to mitigate the situation during and after the incident. All events identified an aggressor; 10,357 (93%) described this individual as a patient. 11,048 reports had a unit or hospital location listed to describe where the incident occurred. Of these, 9393 (84.5%) were inpatient, behavioral health, or surgical units. A physical injury was reported in 3672 events (33%) and stress/psychological impairment was reported in 536 (5%) of the incidents. Police officers were deployed to the scene following the incident in 1122 (10%) of reported events, resulting in arrest of the perpetrator in 402 (3.6%) of the reported incidents. **DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT:** While the impulse to address the high prevalence of workplace violence towards healthcare providers has led to deserved attention from policy makers, safety regulators, and healthcare unions, plans for ensuring that new initiatives are achieving their desired effect for workers have yet to fully materialize. An ongoing concern is that incidents are known to be under-reported through official mechanisms, leading to challenges in determining the scope of the problem itself and evaluating the efficacy of interventions to address it. CalOSHA's new reporting requirement and online interface provides a new channel for improving validity of prevalence data, as early findings indicate that less serious events are being reported through the system. In addition, information describing how hospital leaders report