

CTSA Clinical & Translational Science Awards Program

CTSA Program Steering Committee meeting
 April 18, 2018, 8:00 -12:30 PM
 In-Person Meeting – Washington, D.C.

Steering Committee Attendees:

Christopher Austin	Dan Cooper	Melissa Haendel	Reza Shaker
Kathleen Brady	Brad Evanoff	Phil Kern	Susan Smyth
Ebony Boulware	Dan Ford	Donald Lloyd-Jones	Joel Tsevat
David Center	Alan Green	George Mashour	Martin Zand
Barry Collier	Jennifer Grandis	Tim Murphy	

NCATS/CLIC Attendees:

Jane Atkinson	Penny Burgoon	Tricia DiQuattro - CLIC	Kenneth Gersing
Samantha Jonson	Michael Kurilla	Pamela McInnes	Tracie Norman - CLIC
Deborah Ossip - CLIC	Mary Purucker	Erica Rosemond	Clare Schmitt

Session	Summary Discussion	Action Item
Common Metrics Update (Zand)	<p>Common Metrics visualizations reflects the overall efforts of the consortium to the Common Metrics initiatives.</p> <p>CLIC outlined long and short term goals for the Common Metrics Initiative (CMI) 2.0:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate as a consortium how to advance by continuing to define the direction of the program • Are the right metrics being utilized • Identify needs and make results visible; potential for a snap shot of progress <p>2016 IRB Duration Metric data analysis included the 59 hubs who reported the metric in 2017:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CMI data retained in a separate database allowed for the ability to incorporate Clinicaltrials.gov data to provide a much richer analysis of the metrics • The median IRB duration is approximately 42 days and offers <i>pros</i> and <i>cons</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Useful as a quick look ○ Offers a view of how the Consortium is doing ○ Data not collected from the beginning ○ The distribution is unknown • The consortium wants to avoid redundancy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Should a Single IRB be utilized? ○ Consider a metric on the TIN? • Data was analyzed based on the metrics that were inherited: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are these the right metrics? ○ What are the targets? ○ What is the intention for the metrics? • Timelines should be standardized and goals established for optimal execution 	<p>What are the boundaries of the de-identified reports? What are accomplishments to date and future vision?</p>

	<p>2016 Pilot Metrics data can be askew if all hubs do not report their metric data; still do not have the data needed or a distributive system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metrics should reflect gaps and opportunities while extracting strengths • CLIC could utilize de-identified data to promote sharing of best practices • Metric should meet the criteria to avoid pitfalls • Common Metrics should be approached as a scientific problem; employ current data to maintain processes while addressing additional areas to discern where we stand as a network <p>There is a 2-Parallel Processes occurring that CLIC is encountering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current metrics have been collected and PIs are requesting feedback on their metrics and how their metrics compare to the consortia while maintaining confidentiality • In parallel, CLIC has the data and is assessing metric validity and opportunities for improvement 	<p>Engage in discussion about priorities then map metrics to priorities</p> <p>NCATS will be receiving a summary of de-identified reports</p>
<p>Domain Task Force Discussion (Rosemond)</p>	<p>NCATS Advisory Council Working Group on the IOM Report released May 2014:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IOM further defined strategic goals into Working Groups • ACWG (<i>Advisory Council Working Group</i>) charged to consider 4 of 7 IOM recommendations • Communication Plan- develop DTFs and report monthly <p><i>Suggested Enhancements for DTFs are located on slide 35 of presentation</i></p> <p>Questions to the SC members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the DTFs advancing translational science and converging the goals of the CTSA program? • Is the DTF structure feasible in addressing important topics; Or not optimally defined to allow progress? • The word “task force” connotes a task to be completed; current task forces are considered large interest areas • Is there a different or additional convening mechanism that might be used to solve these or other major outstanding problems in translation? • Should the DTFs have outcomes and metrics to gauge values? How do we know that the DTFs are advancing translational science and meeting the goals of the CTSA Program? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Do the DTFs have an infrastructure to allow for sustainability? ○ Avoid a sense of obligatory participation to cultivate a system of open communication ○ SC should assist in shaping concepts but not a the direct path ○ Value in having discipline specific groups but also identify larger projects to form inter-disciplinary groups ○ Academia and NIH are both categorical and can manage several issues that arise but not adequate for all problems; this is where the DTFs are valuable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Suggestion for the SC to identify emerging themes, offer resources along with scientific and administrative opportunities ➤ CD2H is examining the expertise types needed in the DTFs ○ An online program is currently being implemented by NCATS to provide a centralized location for Pod input and communication as well as status of the DTFs 	<p>Develop a smaller Task Force to address future of the DTFs</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Access will be provided to a private Google Suite for sharing information ○ Informatics DTF and CD2H face the challenge of discerning roles and avoiding duplicated efforts; the circle of engagement may need broadening <p>Summary of suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SC can mobilize members by functioning as a think tank ● Address translational science challenges and ideas by having bi-directional communication, ie: CLIC suggestion box ● Develop Operational Guidelines for DTFs and WGs to promote trans-DTFs projects and involving CLIC and CD2H to assist with a database to help solve translational science challenges ● Implementation of translational sciences challenges by holding workshops, mechanisms for annual meetings and conference support 	
<p>2013 IOM and 2014 NCATS Council Working Group Report Retrospectives and Moving Forward (Austin)</p>	<p>When the committee was originally formed, the members could not have any conflicts with anyone at another CTSA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IOM Committee was comprised of customers to offer insight into everyday problems that the CTSA program could assist with ● C. Austin’s thoughts (in italics) regarding the status of the program in regards to the IOM Committee’s 7 recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1: Strengthen NCATS Leadership of the CTSA Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Program has room for improvement</i> ○ 2: Reconfigure and streamline the CTSA Consortium <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Would like input from CLIC</i> ○ 3: Build on strengths of the individual CTSA’s across the spectrum of clinical & translational science <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Could be enhanced</i> ○ 4: Formalize and standardize evaluation processes for individual CTSA’s and the CTSA Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>On the correct path to attaining</i> ○ 5: Advance innovation in education and training programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Teams are performing adequately</i> ○ 6: Ensure community engagement in all phases of research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Need to provide a deeper definition of community</i> ○ 7: Strengthen clinical and translational research relevant to child health <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Moving forward reasonably well</i> <p>More information on the IOM report on the CTSA Program can be found here: http://www.nationalacademies.org/hmd/Reports/2013/The-CTSA-Program-at-NIH-Opportunities-for-Advancing-Clinical-and-Translational-Research.aspx</p> <p>NCATS Working Group of Council Charge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● How do we implement goals? How do we know we’ve been successful? ● How to identify critical issues excluded from the report <p>IOM report included four recommendations for the NCATS Advisory Council Working Group to consider; these evolved into Working Group Focus Areas. To address Focus Areas, strategic goal recommendations were developed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Need to explore the negative factors impeding realization of the ideal state; what are the positive factors that can be accentuated <p><i>Successes of each strategic goal are highlighted in blue, pages 78-81</i></p>	

<p>ModPod Reflections (Coller)</p>	<p>The Working Group of Council utilized the Results Based Accountability framework (RBA): Principle is to engage stakeholders by making decision-making process transparent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group viewed this principle as a good milestone to reflect on the program and see where it's going • Refocus on which stakeholders should be involved • Need to take advantage of strengths within each of the hubs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are several elements that contribute to successful planning that overlap at the institutional and national level ○ There is a deficit in capturing positive occurrences that have occurred within the CTSAs that should appear on the scorecard ○ CTSAs have advocated at the highest level of the institution for incorporating issues related to the research mission at the institutional level • If institutional research infrastructures are strengthened, that in turn will strengthen the TIN and offer opportunities to conduct studies 	
<p>Boulware Pod Reflections (Boulware)</p>	<p>What is the mission of the CTSA? What the goals of the activities are?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revisit the process of strategic planning/priorities; Recommendations may be outdated <p>Discussed issues around review process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who are completing the reviews? • How are the programs being evaluated to be funded? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ambiguity could be a potential barrier • There should be a focus on solving scientific problems 	<p>Gain a better understanding of review/peer-review process</p>
<p>Open Discussion (All)</p>	<p>Discussion ensured regarding RFAs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RFA could be structured to encourage innovation as a priority • Institutions are concerned grants could go away • How can the NCATS support what the CTSAs need to do? 	