

PCRNV Research Activity Survey

Summary of Results

Background and distribution

In 2016 the PCRNV compiled and circulated an online survey to assess current palliative care research activity across Australia and to identify what resources would be needed to increase research capacity. The survey was developed in Survey Monkey and an email link to the survey distributed to PCRNV and CPC mailing lists (approximately 500 contacts around Australia). People receiving the email link were also asked to distribute the link to colleagues working in palliative care who may not have been on the original mailing list. The survey was open from February 22 – April 15 and a total of 64 surveys were completed.

Demographics of respondents

- 52% were current PCRNV members, whilst 44% indicated an interest in joining with 5% stating that they did not feel that they would directly benefit from membership.
- Respondents were from all Australian states (with the exception of the NT) with the majority based in Victoria (72%) & NSW (9%).
- 36% of respondents currently worked in a palliative care department.
- The majority of respondents were nurses and academic researchers (27% each) or clinicians (24%).
- Most respondents worked in inpatient palliative care (25%) in an academic centre (24%) or in community based palliative care (19%) with no respondents listing their primary work area as outpatient palliative care.
- Most cited academic qualifications included Masters (31%), bachelors (24%) and PhD (16%) degrees.

Involvement in Palliative Care Research

- 64% of respondents indicated that palliative care research projects were currently being undertaken in their workplace, however 11% stated they were unsure whether any palliative care research was in progress.
- 93% respondents who indicated palliative care research was being undertaken in their workplace were personally involved in this research with the remaining 7% currently attempting to get a project off the ground.
- Those currently trying to get a project off the ground listed, small project grants/funding and mentorship as mechanisms of support which would enable them to get projects started.
- Of the 37 respondents currently involved in research, 32% (12) were involved in 2 projects with 5% (2) and 3% (1) involved in 3 and 4 projects respectively.
- 64% respondents stated they were CI's on projects (note 12% missing data).

Status of Research and needs identified

- 64% of projects were ongoing, 20% were completed and about to be published and 14% had not started or were in preparation to commence.
- Problems which were identified as part of these research projects included: recruitment issues/low response rates (n=6); limited time available to commit to research (n=5); understanding processes and time commitment for ethics/governance approvals (n=2); trying to get together consultative groups for meetings/to make agreements (n=2); lack of research culture at some institutions (n=2); acceptance of articles for publication (n=1) and resources needed to analyse large datasets (n=1).
- Successes of projects included: good recruitment/response rates (n=2), positive partnerships/collaborations (n=5); learnings/outcomes (n=2) and obtaining funding (n=1).
- In response to what assistance could help respondents with their current projects – the answers could be categorised into 3 main categories.

| Categories | Sub-categories |
|--|--|
| <i>Processes</i> | Mentorship (n=5), Collaboration (n=2) & Building Research Culture (n=1) |
| <i>Access to specific people/ services</i> | Statistical support/advice (n=3), Media support (n=1), Transcription (n=1), Clinicians (n=1) |
| <i>Funding to enable research</i> | RHD candidate funding (n=1), infrastructure funding (n=1), Research Assistance/RA (n=4), dedicated research time in current job (n=2) and ethics application (n=1) support (n=1) |