

**New Horizons in Radiotherapy for Older Adults with Cancer: Experience and Evaluation
of an Evidence-Based Interdisciplinary Webinar Series**

Investigators

Ewa Szumacher

Ewa.Szumacher@sunnybrook.ca

Odette Cancer Center

Department of Radiation Oncology, University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario

Krista Dawdy

Krista.Dawdy@sunnybrook.ca

Odette Cancer Centre

Department of Radiation Oncology, University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario

Shereen Akkila

sakkila@uwaterloo.ca

Odette Cancer Centre

Department of Radiation Oncology, University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario

Background for READS Grant Application

With the increasing Canadian life expectancy, currently at 83 years old (Statistics Canada, 2023), the cancer incidence amongst the older population is consequently increasing. Cancer care is becoming a challenge among older adults over the age of 70 (Roeder et al., 2023). Older adults with cancer experience toxicities from radiotherapy (RT) that their younger counterparts are less likely to experience (Colloca et al., 2020). Moreover, many physicians do not have the necessary skills to assess the complexities of older patients or to recognize the functional limitations that frail individuals have, resulting in many older adults with cancer not receiving appropriate care (Smith et al., 2014). There is a consensus on the fact that age should not be the deciding factor when assessing older adults with cancer (Colloca et al., 2020). Meanwhile, this population is also underrepresented in clinical trials, resulting in very little evidence for treatment efficacies and toxicities in older adults with cancer (Colloca et al., 2020). Due to the heterogeneity of the population, a current challenge in cancer care is identifying the optimal cancer treatment for older adults with cancer (Roeder et al., 2023). Research has demonstrated that new radiation technologies can be leveraged to optimally treat cancer in older adults while managing symptoms with reduced toxicity and improved quality of life (QoL) (Roeder et al., 2023). This requires strong interprofessional collaboration between all healthcare providers (HCPs) involved in the treatment of older adults, which this webinar series aims to encourage by gathering individuals from diverse backgrounds to share their experiences and knowledge. By promoting an individualized approach and multidisciplinary collaboration in the treatment of older patients with cancer, optimal treatments can be identified for this diverse population.

To ensure that all HCPs working with patients with cancer are well-versed on modern radiation technologies, this webinar aimed to promote team-based learning by generating expertise from radiation oncologists, radiation therapists, trainees, fellows, family practitioners, geriatricians, and allied HCPs in oncology. Through six, monthly, online sessions, an expert in the field of radiation oncology presented updates in the field pertaining to a specific radiation site. The program emphasized interprofessional learning and discussion of experiences and observations relating to geriatric oncology and the applications of modern radiation technologies in the clinical setting. Additionally, each session had a patient speaker with lived experiences to share their journey and answer questions. By integrating the voices of those with lived experiences in our webinar series, HCPs were to gain a better understanding of how they can better support older patients with cancer throughout their treatment journey.

Aim

Our grant budget of \$5000 was used to support the program planning and platform support through collaboration with the University of Toronto Faculty of Continuing Professional Development.

Objective of Project

To evaluate the feasibility and efficacy of the 6-month professional education program on modern radiation techniques for the care of older adults with cancer.

Secondary Objectives

1. Disseminate evidence-based information on modern radiation technologies.
 - Each session featured evidence-based updates on modern radiation techniques for a specific radiation site, presented by a professional in the field. Following this presentation, a patient with lived experience shared their perspectives on the topic and presented the opportunity for participants to ask questions.

- The post-session survey asked participants about their perceived level of learning following the session to understand whether this objective was fulfilled.
2. Engage participants from interdisciplinary background to share their knowledge and experiences regarding the treatment of older adults with cancer.
 - The webinar attracted participants from various healthcare disciplines, including radiation oncologists, family physicians, and nurses. This interdisciplinary engagement allowed for a holistic discussion about patient care and treatment options.
 - Survey responses highlighted the value of hearing from professionals across different specialties, with many participants appreciating the opportunity to discuss real-world challenges in the care of older adults with cancer.
 3. Evaluate the webinar course content, format, and efficacy using pre- and post-session questionnaires.
 - The post-session questionnaire evaluated the effectiveness of the course content, format and delivery.
 - The post-session survey encouraged participants to include their perspectives and feedback in a write-in box.

Summary of Results and Deliverables

The overall program had 47 registrants, and registrants were notified that they may join whichever sessions they deem relevant to their practice or interests. There were 19 attendees in Session 1, 16 attendees in Session 2, 11 attendees in Sessions 3 and 5, 12 attendees in Sessions 4 and 6.

A reminder email containing the session link was sent prior to each session. Following the session, an email containing a post-session questionnaire was distributed. The first questionnaire, collecting responses for the first session, had 9 respondents of 19 attendees. The second had 4 respondents of 6 attendees. The third and fifth both had 3 respondents of 11 attendees. The fourth and sixth had 4 and 2 respondents of 12 attendees, respectively.

All sessions went smoothly in terms of presentation and organization, and many participants expressed their appreciation for the incorporation of the patient perspective. A summary of the post-session questionnaire results can be found below for each of the 6 sessions.

Conclusion

Overall, the 6-month webinar series successfully met its primary objective by providing healthcare professionals with valuable updates on modern radiation oncology techniques. The positive feedback and improvement in participant knowledge and confidence suggest that the program was both feasible and effective. The insights gained from the post-session surveys will be used to refine future educational offerings, ensuring they continue to meet the evolving needs of healthcare professionals in this field. Limitations of this project based on observation and participant feedback are the lower attendance levels and room for improvement in cultural relevance for diverse backgrounds.

Moving forward, we plan to use the feedback collected to guide the development of future webinars, potentially expanding the series to include additional topics in cancer care for

older adults, addressing emerging technologies in radiation oncology, and exploring methods to recognize cultural differences.

Acknowledgement

The investigators wish to thank the READ grant for your generous support

Quantitative Evaluation

Session 1

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	Total
The program/session met the stated learning objectives: Indications for radiotherapy (RT) for older women with breast cancer (BC)	0	0	0	1	8	9
The program/session met the stated learning objectives: Modern radiation technologies and approaches that can be used in the treatment of BC in older women post-breast conservation surgery (BCS) or unsuitable for surgical resection	0	0	1	0	8	9
The program/session met the stated learning objectives: De-escalation of treatment in older patients	0	0	1	1	7	9
The program/session met the stated learning objectives: Role of geriatric assessment (GA) and shared decision making (SDM) in deciding on and planning RT in older patients with BC	0	0	0	1	8	9
The program/session content was relevant to my discipline/profession	0	0	2	0	7	9
The program/session content met my expectations	0	1	1	0	7	9
The program/session content was well organized	0	0	1	1	6	8
Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest was clearly communicated	0	0	0	1	7	8
There were adequate opportunities to interact with my peers	0	0	1	1	6	8
I will use the information I learned in my practice	0	0	1	1	6	8

	No	Yes
Did you perceive any degree of bias in any part of the program?	9	0
Did you find that the program was accessible?	0	9
Did you find that the program was inclusive?	0	9

The program will encourage me to consider changes in my current practice	3	5
--	---	---

“Please describe how the program was not accessible or not inclusive and share any suggestions you would like to see for future programs.”

- No responses

“What was the most effective part of the session? Why?”

Respondent 1: The patient experience (it could have been shorter)

Respondent 2: The patient’s presentation was reassuring

Respondent 3: Including GA relevance, as I work in a geriatric oncology service and wish to increase referral volume for ROs.

Respondent 4: Patient input

“The changes [to practice that] I am considering are:”

Respondant 1: Deescalation of treatment

	I am not considering changes in my current practice because...
I do not see the need to make changes to my current practice.	0
I am thinking about changes and have the necessary resources but not ready to make them yet	1
I am already implementing recommended practices	0
The information was not relevant to me	2
I do not have the required resources to implement these changes	0
Total	3

“What suggestions do you have for improving the program/session?”

Respondent 1: Speak slower to the physician presenter. I think it’s important to note that not all attending are radiation specialists -so how does the interdisciplinary group fit in all of this. You mentioned working with geriatricians more closely (how about having them present 1/3 of the

presentation to discuss what they would bring to a hypothetical patient) address what they would bring to the scenario.

“Please list any topics you would like to see addressed in future program/sessions:”

Respondent 1: planning

Respondent 2: skin cancer and geriatric assessment in older patients

	For physicians only: please indicate which CanMEDS/CanMEDS-FM roles you felt were addressed during this program/session? (this is a required question for physicians only)
Medical Expert/Family Medicine Expert	4
Collaborator	3
Communicator	2
Health Advocate	3
Leader	0
Professional	2
Scholar	1
Total	15

	What attracted you to attending this program/conference Please select all that apply.
Updating Knowledge	9
Wanted to change how I do things in my practice	4
Speaker(s)	2
Networking	2
Location	2
Accredited Program	2
Total	21

	What is your health profession, role, discipline? Please check all that apply.
Physician - RCPSC Specialty or Intl. Equivalent	5

Physician - Family and Community Medicine or Intl. Equivalent	3
Nurse Practitioner	1
Other	1

	For how many years have you been in practice?
Not in practice	1
< 10 years	3
10-20 years	3
21-30 years	2
30+ years	0
N/A	9

Session 2

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	Total
The program/session met the stated learning objectives: Learners should be better able to describe modern radiation technologies, as well as indications and best practices of RT in major cancer sites such as breast, lung, palliative RT, and CNS, from the leaders in the field	0	0	0	0	4	4
The program/session met the stated learning objectives: Better understand the perspectives of patients undergoing treatment (through patient-speakers), and how they can better support older patients with cancer throughout their treatment journey. 0	0	0	0	0	4	4
The program/session content was relevant to my discipline/profession	0	0	0	1	3	4
The program/session content met my expectations	0	0	0	0	4	4
The program/session content was well organized	1	0	0	0	3	4
Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest was clearly communicated	0	0	1	0	3	4
There were adequate opportunities to interact with my peers	0	0	0	0	4	4
I will use the information I learned in my practice	0	0	0	1	3	4

	No	Yes
Did you perceive any degree of bias in any part of the program?	4	0
Did you find that the program was accessible?	0	4
Did you find that the program was inclusive?	0	4
The program will encourage me to consider changes in my current practice	1	3

“Please describe how the program was not accessible or not inclusive and share any suggestions you would like to see for future programs.”

- No responses

“What was the most effective part of the session? Why?”

Respondent 1: Dr. Louie’s presentation.

Respondent 2: I found the session clear and relevant

Respondent 3: patient perspective

“The changes [to practice that] I am considering are:”

Respondent 1: I am retired, but will use information to support my friends with a cancer

Respondent 2: diagnosis increased PPI

	I am not considering changes in my current practice because...
I do not see the need to make changes to my current practice.	0
I am thinking about changes and have the necessary resources but not ready to make them yet	0
I am already implementing recommended practices	0
The information was not relevant to me	0
I do not have the required resources to implement these changes	0
Total	0

“What suggestions do you have for improving the program/session?”

Respondent 1: Perhaps more publicity to attract more participants

“Please list any topics you would like to see addressed in future program/sessions:”

Respondent 1: More on prevention

Respondent 2: skin cancer in older patients - SIOG guidelines

	For physicians only: please indicate which CanMEDS/CanMEDS-FM roles you felt were addressed during this program/session? (this is a required question for physicians only)
Medical Expert/Family Medicine Expert	0
Collaborator	0
Communicator	0
Health Advocate	0
Leader	0
Professional	1
Scholar	0
Total	1

	What attracted you to attending this program/conference Please select all that apply.
Updating Knowledge	4
Wanted to change how I do things in my practice	1
Speaker(s)	0
Networking	1
Location	0
Accredited Program	0
Total	6

	What is your health profession, role, discipline? Please check all that apply.
Physician - RCPSC Specialty or Intl. Equivalent	1
Physician - Family and Community Medicine or Intl. Equivalent	0
Nurse Practitioner	1
Other (please describe)	2

Caregiver advocate	1
Retired nurse	1

	For how many years have you been in practice?
Not in practice	2
< 10 years	1
10-20 years	0
21-30 years	1
30+ years	0
N/A	4

Session 3

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	Total
The program/session met the stated learning objectives: To understand the importance of palliative radiation in the care of older adults with cancer	0	0	0	1	2	3
The program/session met the stated learning objectives: To be able to recognize indications for palliative radiation	0	0	0	1	2	3
The program/session met the stated learning objectives: To understand the goals of palliative radiation	0	0	0	1	2	3
The program/session content was relevant to my discipline/profession	0	0	0	1	2	3
The program/session content met my expectations	0	0	0	1	2	3
The program/session content was well organized	0	0	0	1	2	3
Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest was clearly communicated	0	0	0	2	1	3
There were adequate opportunities to interact with my peers	0	0	0	2	1	3
I will use the information I learned in my practice	0	0	0	1	2	3

	No	Yes
Did you perceive any degree of bias in any part of the program?	4	0

Did you find that the program was accessible?	0	3
Did you find that the program was inclusive?	0	3
The program will encourage me to consider changes in my current practice	1	2

“Please describe how the program was not accessible or not inclusive and share any suggestions you would like to see for future programs.”

- No responses

“What was the most effective part of the session? Why?”

Respondent 1: Actually offering treatment

“The changes [to practice that] I am considering are:”

Respondent 1: None

	I am not considering changes in my current practice because...
I do not see the need to make changes to my current practice.	0
I am thinking about changes and have the necessary resources but not ready to make them yet	0
I am already implementing recommended practices	0
The information was not relevant to me	0
I do not have the required resources to implement these changes	1
Total	1

“What suggestions do you have for improving the program/session?”

Respondent 1: None

“Please list any topics you would like to see addressed in future program/sessions:”

Respondent 1: skin cancer in older patients

	For physicians only: please indicate which CanMEDS/CanMEDS-FM roles you felt were addressed during this program/session? (this is a required question for physicians only)
--	--

Medical Expert/Family Medicine Expert	0
Collaborator	0
Communicator	0
Health Advocate	0
Leader	0
Professional	1
Scholar	0
Total	1

Session 4

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	Total
The program/session met the stated learning objectives: Learners should be better able to describe modern radiation technologies, as well as indications and best practices of RT in major cancer sites such as breast, lung, palliative RT, and CNS, from the leaders in the field.	0	0	0	1	3	4
The program/session met the stated learning objectives: Better understand the perspectives of patients undergoing treatment (through patient-speakers), and how they can better support older patients with cancer throughout their treatment journey	0	0	0	0	4	4
The program/session content was relevant to my discipline/profession	0	0	0	1	3	4
The program/session content met my expectations	0	0	0	1	3	4
The program/session content was well organized	0	0	1	0	3	4
Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest was clearly communicated	0	0	1	0	3	4
There were adequate opportunities to interact with my peers	0	0	1	1	2	4

I will use the information I learned in my practice	0	0	0	1	3	4
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

	No	Yes, speaker's funding	Yes, speaker's mention of specific pharmaceuticals or products within the program content	Yes, speaker's expression of personal opinions creating undue influence	Yes, other (please describe)
Did you perceive any degree of bias in any part of the program?	3	1	1	1	0

	No	Yes
Did you find that the program was accessible?	1	3
Did you find that the program was inclusive?	0	3
The program will encourage me to consider changes in my current practice	2	2

“Please describe how the program was not accessible or not inclusive and share any suggestions you would like to see for future programs.”

Respondent 1: It was easy to access the program but somehow it was not easy for someone who has got different culture, We could not understand it very well.

“What was the most effective part of the session? Why?”

Respondent 1: Most of the part was good but when it come to culture it was not easy , because we have different culture , that seem like not respecting the other party and yet we seem to have been moving together.

Respondent 2: Not sure one part more effective

Respondent 3: The best part was the experience & feedback the patient shared with us.

“The changes [to practice that] I am considering are:”

Respondent 1: In depth knowledge & research about certain topics in my study.

	I am not considering changes in my current practice because...
I do not see the need to make changes to my current practice.	1
I am thinking about changes and have the necessary resources but not ready to make them yet	1

I am already implementing recommended practices	1
The information was not relevant to me	1
I do not have the required resources to implement these changes	1
Total	5

“What suggestions do you have for improving the program/session?”

Respondent 1: our African culture has to be respected and we have a love for our culture yet the whites do not appreciate it

Respondent 2: No suggestions

“Please list any topics you would like to see addressed in future program/sessions:”

Respondent 1: I need to have a one-on-one with some of the pro-active members and see our way out, because in the last conference, I was taken like no body and yet my culture is totally different and we need to respect others .

Respondent 2: New Technologies like Gamma Knife help with the treatment to deliver a precise dose

	For physicians only: please indicate which CanMEDS/CanMEDS-FM roles you felt were addressed during this program/session? (this is a required question for physicians only)
Medical Expert/Family Medicine Expert	0
Collaborator	0
Communicator	0
Health Advocate	0
Leader	0
Professional	1
Scholar	0
Total	1

Session 5

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	Total
--	-------------------	-------------------	----------------------------	----------------	----------------	-------

The program/session met the stated learning objectives: Learners should be better able to describe modern radiation technologies, as well as indications and best practices of RT in major cancer sites such as breast, lung, palliative RT, and CNS, from the leaders in the field	0	0	0	0	3	3
The program/session met the stated learning objectives: Better understand the perspectives of patients undergoing treatment (through patient-speakers), and how they can better support older patients with cancer throughout their treatment journey	0	0	0	0	3	3
The program/session content was relevant to my discipline/profession	0	0	0	0	3	3
The program/session content met my expectations	0	0	0	0	3	3
The program/session content was well organized	0	0	0	0	3	3
Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest was clearly communicated	0	0	0	0	3	3
There were adequate opportunities to interact with my peers	0	0	0	1	2	3
I will use the information I learned in my practice	0	0	0	0	3	3

	No	Yes
Did you perceive any degree of bias in any part of the program?	3	0
Did you find that the program was accessible?	0	3
Did you find that the program was inclusive?	0	3
The program will encourage me to consider changes in my current practice	1	2

“Please describe how the program was not accessible or not inclusive and share any suggestions you would like to see for future programs.”

- No responses

“What was the most effective part of the session? Why?”

Respondent 1: Question and answer period, excellent presentation by Dr Menjek and Dr Norris
 Respondent 2: Discussion

“The changes [to practice that] I am considering are:”

Respondent 1: Use Carg scale to assess for chemotherapy toxicity risk in seniors awaiting chemotherapy.

Respondent 2: GA assessment in selected patients

	I am not considering changes in my current practice because...
I do not see the need to make changes to my current practice.	0
I am thinking about changes and have the necessary resources but not ready to make them yet	0
I am already implementing recommended practices	1
The information was not relevant to me	0
I do not have the required resources to implement these changes	0
Total	1

“What suggestions do you have for improving the program/session?”

- No responses

“Please list any topics you would like to see addressed in future program/sessions:”

- No responses

	For physicians only: please indicate which CanMEDS/CanMEDS-FM roles you felt were addressed during this program/session? (this is a required question for physicians only)
Medical Expert/Family Medicine Expert	2
Collaborator	0
Communicator	0
Health Advocate	1
Leader	0
Professional	1
Scholar	1

Total	5
-------	---

Session 6

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	Total
The program/session met the stated learning objectives: Identify unique care needs of older adults diagnosed with cancer and their caregivers	0	0	0	0	2	2
The program/session met the stated learning objectives: Understand the complex issues prevalent to older adults and the impact these have on cancer treatment	0	0	0	0	2	2
The program/session met the stated learning objectives: Identify strategies and resources to support older adults living with cancer and their caregivers	0	0	0	1	1	2
The program/session content was relevant to my discipline/profession	0	0	1	0	1	2
The program/session content met my expectations	0	0	0	0	2	2
The program/session content was well organized	0	0	0	0	2	2
Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest was clearly communicated	0	0	0	0	1	1
There were adequate opportunities to interact with my peers	0	0	0	1	1	1
I will use the information I learned in my practice	0	0	0	0	1	1

	No	Yes
Did you perceive any degree of bias in any part of the program?	2	0
Did you find that the program was accessible?	0	2
Did you find that the program was inclusive?	0	2

The program will encourage me to consider changes in my current practice	0	1
--	---	---

“Please describe how the program was not accessible or not inclusive and share any suggestions you would like to see for future programs.”

- No responses

“What was the most effective part of the session? Why?”

Respondent 1: I am very impressed with the comprehensive programs available to this

Respondent 2: community patient input

“The changes [to practice that] I am considering are:”

- No responses

	I am not considering changes in my current practice because...
I do not see the need to make changes to my current practice.	0
I am thinking about changes and have the necessary resources but not ready to make them yet	0
I am already implementing recommended practices	0
The information was not relevant to me	0
I do not have the required resources to implement these changes	0
Total	0

“What suggestions do you have for improving the program/session?”

- No responses

“Please list any topics you would like to see addressed in future program/sessions:”

- No responses

	For physicians only: please indicate which CanMEDS/CanMEDS-FM roles you felt were addressed during this program/session? (this is a required question for physicians only)
Medical Expert/Family Medicine Expert	0
Collaborator	0
Communicator	0

Health Advocate	0
Leader	0
Professional	1
Scholar	0
Total	1

Appendix A

TOTAL

PERSONNEL						
Name	Role	Base Salary	Percent Effort			
Dr Ewa Szumacher	PI	\$0	0%	\$0		\$0
Krista Dawdy	Co-PI	\$0	0%	\$0		\$0
Shereen Akkila	Co-Investigator	\$0	0%	\$0		\$0
Fringe		\$0	0%	\$0		\$0
Total Salary				\$0		\$0
Total Fringe				\$0		\$0
Subtotal PERSONNEL				\$0		\$0
TRAVEL						
Domestic travel						\$0
\$0						
Subtotal Travel						\$0
\$0						
EQUIPMENT						
						\$0
\$0						
Subtotal Equipment						\$0
\$0						
SUPPLIES						
				\$0		\$0
Subtotal Supplies				\$0		\$0

Patient Care Costs						
				\$0		\$0
OTHER EXPENSES						Final Budget Expenses in CAD
Consultation and Web Services			\$7412 CAD		\$2450	\$7412

Zoom Licensing (through UofT CPD Office)			In Kind		\$0	In Kind
Data Analysis			\$3056		\$1850	\$2964
Administrative Supplement			\$500		\$500	\$500
Gift Compensation for Patient Partners			Not accounted for in original budget proposal			\$200
Dissemination of Information			\$600		\$600	\$600
SubTotal OTHER COSTS					\$0	\$0
Total MDA Direct Costs			\$5000		\$5000	\$11,676 CAD
Subtotal Direct Costs			\$5000		\$5000	
Exchange Rate March 17, 2025, CAD to USD Rate: 0.68474 https://www.rbcbank.com/cgi-bin/tools/cadusd-foreign-exchange-calculator/start.cgi						\$5000 USD = \$7302 CAD
Modified Direct Total Cost					\$5000	
Indirect Costs			not allowed	0%	\$0	\$0
Total Costs			\$5000		\$5000	\$5000
Budget Justification						
Senior Personnel						
No monetary allotment in the budget						
Ewa Szumacher MD, FRCP(C), Med (Principal Investigator) Associate Professor in the Department of Radiation Oncology University of Toronto and a Radiation Oncologist at the Odette Cancer Centre, Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre. She completed her masters in higher education at OISE/ UofT, with sub specialization in health profession education. She is an affiliate scientist at the Sunnybrook Research Institute and member of the Wilson Center. In 2016 Dr Szumacher was appointed Director, Continuous Education and Professional Development UTDRO and in 2018 appointed as a President of American Association for Cancer Education. Dr Szumacher will be responsible for leading and coordinating all aspects of the proposal.						
Krista Dawdy MRT (T), BSc, MSc (Co-Principal Investigator) Clinical Educator /Clinical Coordinator and Radiation Therapist, Odette Cancer Centre, Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre. She is also a member of Practice Based Research at Sunnybrook. Instructor, in the Department of Radiation Oncology University of Toronto with an Academic Appointment at Michener Institute of UHN. She completed her masters in Radiotherapy and Oncology at Sheffield Hallam University. She will be responsible for co-leading, developing content						

and organizing meetings for faculty. Krista will also work with participants to ensure their objectives are met within the workshop and the RA to facilitate data collection, completion and analysis.

Shereen Akkila (Research Assistant)

Shereen Akkila is a research assistant at Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre. She is a 4th year undergraduate student at the University of Waterloo, specializing in Health Research. She will be assisting with program development, logistic organization, and data collection, completion, and analysis.

University of Toronto office of CPD Accreditation Fee and webinar support (\$7214)

Accreditation / certification for Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada, College of Family Physicians of Canada (CFPC), American Medical Association, and the European Union of Medical Specialist credits. This ensures that the program meets University of Toronto standards for accredited CPD programs and achieves a high educational rigor and aligns with ethical standards that meet the Policy on Sponsorship Support of University of Toronto Accredited Programs.

Accreditation also allows for promotion on the U of T CPD and CFPC event listing

Data Analysis (\$2964.68)

Included in Research Assistant Allotment in budget

Compensation for wages for a research assistant responsible for research related activities including but not limited to data entry, analysis, manuscript preparation and management of qualitative information. The RA will participate in the webinar series and collect any qualitative information. They will participate in scheduled meetings including support the development of the webinar series and review evaluations post session. (\$22.39/hr X 115 hours + 4% vacation + 14% benefits = \$2964.68 CAD) Dollar figure given from SRI – RA 4 rate.

Dissemination of Information (\$600)

Dissemination of information will be completed through conferences and a manuscript. Some of funds will be utilized to cover printing costs and registration costs of attendance to conferences where the information will be shared.

Gift Compensation (\$300)

Gift compensation was awarded to patient partners who participated in the individual webinar. This was a token of appreciation of their time and support for the webinar series. \$50 x 4 gift cards were given to patient partners.

Total expenses were **\$11,676 CAD**, with a deficit of \$4374 covered by the Principal Investigator. A large portion of the grant was paid towards University of Toronto Continuing professional Development services, that helped support the development and success of these 6 webinars. Costs included website creation, accreditation fees, advertising and webinar promotion and technical support throughout the 6-webinar sessions.