

CTSA Clinical & Translational Science Awards Program

CTSA Program Steering Committee meeting
November 26, 2018, 3:00-4:30pm
Zoom Conferencing

SC Attendees:	Ebony Boulware David Center Harold Collard	Barry Collier Dan Cooper Bradley Evanoff Daniel Ford	Alan Green Phil Kern Donald Lloyd-Jones Tim Murphy	Reza Shaker Susan Smyth Joel Tsevat Martin Zand
NCATS Attendees:	Christopher Austin Penny Burgoon Michael Kurilla	Samantha Jonson Erica Rosemond Clare Schmitt		

Session	Summary Discussion	Action Item
Director's Update (C. Austin)	<p>C. Austin gave an update on the FY 2019 Budget.</p> <p>Status and Prospects of Labor-HHS-Educ. appropriation bill:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HHS is one of the two different minibuses passed on 9/28. Though seven remaining appropriations bills were not passed, we are not in danger of a government shutdown because our bill has passed. NIH is not affected. <p>Budget Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY 2019 budget amounts: NIH \$39.084 billion (\$2 billion increase or 5.4%, above FY18) NCATS: A nice increase to NCATS was made and we received more flexibility in how the CAN program could be run. 	
New Committee Members (C. Austin)	<p>Seeking New Steering Committee Members –</p> <p>C. Austin urged the current SC members to nominate others or ask others to self-nominate in order to fill the 4 SC slots becoming available at end of December, 2018. Additionally, we are seeking an Administrator to support the SC. Please use the criteria outlined on this web page for both positions and send nominations to Samantha Jonson (Samantha.Jonson@nih.gov) by Friday, November 30th.</p> <p>Members asked:</p> <p>Could we have an Administrator and UL1 PI from the same hub be considered? Yes, we will consider it. Please remember that are seeking a diverse Steering Committee. Administrator should convey why they want to be a part of the SC, must have ideas on how to make the program work better.</p> <p>While considering candidates, should we consider trying to keep the Pod composition the same? Members favored trying to keep the Pod structure from being disrupted.</p>	
Other Updates (C. Austin)	<p>C. Austin provided NIH and NCATS opportunities to the members</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Driving Innovation: NCATS Programs to Support Small Business & Research Org – for entrepreneur launching a business - 11/27/18 The Opioid Crisis and the Future of Addiction and Pain Therapeutics – novel targets, lessons learned, predictive therapeutic efficacy, new technologies – Register by Friday, January 11 at: https://events-support.com/events/NCATS-Pain-Addiction-Symposium. High registration may lead to a dial in feature to accommodate. 2/7-8/19 A Critical Evaluation of Animal Pain Models Workshop – 1/30-31/19 Natural Products and Pain: The Search for Novel Non-Opioid Analgesics – 2/6/19 	

	<p>Members were encouraged to attend or have other appropriate colleagues attend these webinars.</p>	
<p>STARWORK Update (S. Smyth)</p>	<p>S. Smyth shared a summary slide of STARWORK's activities concerning 1) Research support for translational scientists, 2) Debt Reduction, and 3) Building Translational Science as a Scientific Discipline</p> <p>Through the WFD DTF a KL2 survey of programs was conducted. The analysis was presented at last Spring's F2F and is working on publication. However, due to Pod Feedback, it appears as though communications have not been enough as Pods suggested we survey the programs. <i>Action: S. Smyth suggested we reach back out to our PIs and SC and re-share the findings of the work that has already been done through Workforce Development.</i></p> <p>In addition to this, STARWORK is proposing to survey the KL2 Scholars themselves building on the Program Survey and the work of D. Rubio broadly in the Translational Science space. Feedback from the fall F2F meeting will be incorporated in the survey. Our plan is to survey those KL2 scholars that have completed their term on the KL2 grant between the years of 2008-2017. We will look for correlates between career trajectories and outcomes.</p> <p>Discussion: <i>Do we have a sense of the number of people that will be missed? What would be the response rate?</i> How responsive they will be is unknown right now. We will be relying on the KL2 programs for the contact information. We did an MD-PHD survey that went back 30 years and had a 70% response rate and performed some statistical analysis around those that responded and those that did not. We hope to use this same approach with the KL2 survey.</p> <p>In addition to NCATS funded KL2, Institutions have KL2 populations that do the same thing. Should we be surveying them as well? Members were in favor of including the non-funded scholars in order to enhance our outcomes for the future. <i>Action: S. Smyth/J. Tsevat will take this back to the STARWORK committee for discussion.</i></p> <p>Debt Reduction is also being targeted as a barrier to investigators staying in the workforce. NCATS data has been discussed by KL2 Scholars and STARWORK committee. KL2 scholars do very well in NIH Loan Repayment as evidence by "of the 1784 unique KL2 Scholars, 736 applied to NIH LRP and 578 were awarded (78.5% success rate). NCATS invested about 2.5 million in the LRP. Actions to support an awareness would include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) that the LRP information be broadly disseminated. 2) KL2 PIs proposed regional workshops on NIH LRP. 3) NCATS could utilize the consortium listservs for the (KL2, TL1, Workforce, newsletter, PI, etc.) 4) Create a webinar for the CTSA Program scholars. <p>C. Austin commented that as most of the budgeted money is at other institutes, NCATS plays a role in sheparding the process and welcomes more KL2 applications.</p> <p><i>Action: M. Zand, CLIC to work with S. Smyth to develop a webinar and a dissemination/information plan to make scholars aware of opportunities and linking them to resources during the application process. Schedule a phone call to discuss a dedicated webpage and help with information already gathered.</i></p> <p>Do we have data supporting the underlying belief that the LRP is a positive factor in keeping people in the Clinical Translational Research and if they didn't have the LRP they would leave and do something else? Does it actually advance the NCATS mission? Or is it just making them financially better off? NCATS is interested in the former. <i>Action: S. Smyth offered that this question could be addressed through retrospective analysis with such questions as:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did you participate in LRP? {getting a sense of perception of that process} • Were you awarded? How did they perceive the impact of that towards their career choice? 	<p>S. Smyth/J. Tsevat will bring back comments from the call to the STARWORK working group.</p> <p>CLIC to work with S. Smyth to develop a webinar and a dissemination /information plan to make scholars aware of opportunities and linking them to resources during the application process.</p>

<p>Domain Task Force Working Group Update C. Schmitt</p>	<p>C. Schmitt shared that they are currently scheduling the next meeting.</p>	
<p>Common Metrics Initiative: 2018 and Beyond. (M. Zand)</p>	<p>M. Zand shared that the agenda would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of the Common Metrics Initiative Progress • CMI 2.0 • Pod Exercise. <p>M. Zand shared the results of the Hub Participation in Survey - Received 95 surveys from the Hubs participating regarding first set of reports. Received 60 number of unique hubs responding. Evaluators and Administrators most enthusiastic.</p> <p>Feedback will be included when addressing the Next Report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Hubs want TTC plan examples of those trending in right direction, 2) Simpler graphics – administrative and others that are not graphic savvy and needs to be simpler when leveraging for additional institute resources. 3) Better definitions – relates to the operational guidelines for collecting the data and trying to simplify summaries of how the data points were defined and identified. Limitations due to being faithful to the OG. 4) Use of Scorecard – highly adaptable and confusing. Several hubs renamed the metrics which scorecard permitted. Also used Scorecard for other local metric data, which is encouraged, but received incomplete data. Full report can be found on CLIC website: https://clic-ctsa.org/content/2016-common-metrics-hub-survey-report-feedback <p>Goal of next CM report– to provide both a quantitative and qualitative longitudinal perspective of the CM data for 2015, 2016, and 2017. Objectives including hub quantitative trend values, illustrate changes in hub data relative to consortium data, identify qualitative factors in the TTC plans since 2016 linking those changes in 2017, and allow for exploration of “what if” hypotheses.</p> <p>Communication Plan target date will be February 28, 2019. Presenting at the stakeholder group calls with: SC, PI Webinar, CM Exec. Comm., CTSA Program Evaluators. Goal is to engage the community in the process and to seek feedback on visualizations.</p> <p>Quantitative Methodology will include CM data extraction, clean the data, calculate median, IQR for all numerical data 2015 – 2017, longitudinal plots for each hub, and identify “exemplars”. Improvement would be identified as a decrease in days to IRB approval</p> <p>Qualitative Methodology to identify the exemplars, and the change/slope between 2-016-2017, selected those above 9% confidence interval, selected the top 5 hubs with highest slop and provided analyzed TTC Plans for “Days to IRB Approval”, “Percent of Pilots with at least 1 publication”, “Percent of TL1 Grads AND KL2 Grads engaged in Clinical Translational Research”</p> <p>TTC Plan Analysis included common themes/practices among de-identified hubs, consideration of mining software and best practices of de-identified hubs to be shared in reports sent to NCATS and hubs.</p> <p>CMI 2.0 – discussed the nearer term goals of –optimizing processes, new metrics, discussing findings, and identifying external stakeholder needs. Discussed longer term goals of - increased engagement of hubs and consortium. Currently performing an Assessment on how well the metrics are implemented at each hub with the goal of improving the metrics and moving forward without burden.</p> <p>Timeline of CMI 2.0 – began Sept. 2018 and on through April, 2019 will include review existing data/findings to define gaps, gather new data to refine potential improvements, develop recommendations to CMI 2.0, Present/Discuss/Finalize changes, and lastly gradual implementation using various data collection methods and stakeholders.</p>	

<p>Common Metrics Initiative: 2018 and Beyond. (M. Zand)</p>	<p>CMI Timeline for 2019 - Move up timeline for when hubs receive the reports in order to look at change in the previous year and use that data to create better TTC Plans. Also looking for innovative ways to provide faster real time feedback relative to the rest of the consortium.</p> <p>Action: Pod EXERCISE to review the Common Metrics Initiative 2.0. PI Survey by December 14, 2018. Questions in the survey include identifying priorities at consortium level, future metrics, and adding value to the metrics at the hub level.</p> <p>The survey is really short and gives a great deal of room for free-form responses. Pods to answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do we have the right level of consortium level metrics in measuring the effectiveness? • At the pod level if you could see a metric what would it be? • Are the ones being collected useful? And how? • What should be the top priority of new metrics? • Can only roll out 1-2 metrics a year, what should we focus on? • Hubs have diff. levels of engagement and we want to add value. <p>What consortium level metrics are helpful to NCATS and others promoting the consortium as a national level resource? Working with Patricia, the NCATS Liaison to seek similar feedback. Addressing both groups and will identify intersecting responses from PIs and Pods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appreciate separating hub level from consortium level perspective. • Need benchmarking AND future metrics to provide quantitative justification in order for an institution to consider reallocating resources to drive institutional improvement. 	<p>Pods to provide feedback via RedCap Survey. Information and instructions will be disseminated to the SC in an email.</p>
<p>Alliance for Clinical Research Excellence and Safety (ACRES) (Austin and Kurilla)</p>	<p>NCATS has been approached by the Alliance for Clinical Research Excellence and Safety (ACRES) and C. Austin requested the Steering Committee members to initiate a “Pod Exercise” of researching and sharing feedback via the CLIC Suggestion box on whether we as an organization should engage with this group. A deadline was set for COB, Friday, December 21, 2018.</p>	<p>Pods to provide feedback via CLIC Suggestion Box. Information and instructions will be disseminated to the SC in an email.</p>
<p>Upcoming Meetings (S. Jonson)</p>	<p>Upcoming Meetings: December 10, 2018: Steering Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agenda to include SC members impressions and lessons learned - 2 Pod Feedback Exercises to be conducted in the month of December 	

Steering Committee Action Items

V. November, 2018

Task	Name	Description	Action	Target Completion Date	Owner
1	CTSA Program U54 Review Processes	SC members brought up the issue of the review process in comparison to the Cancer Centers review and that no PIs are on the review panels. July Update: DCI leadership met with the NCI Cancer Center Director regarding "branding" and how they structure their review panel.	NCATS will conduct an analysis of their review structure.	TBD	NCATS
3	Steering Committee Taskforce on Sustaining the Translational Science Workforce (STARWORK)	The STARWORK Taskforce will: 1) Identify barriers that exist to sustaining the translational science workforce, 2) Provide guidance for interventions / investments to achieve the best possible environment to sustain the translational science workforce, and 3) Generate a white paper that articulates the vision for the ideal environment to sustain the careers of investigators performing translational science.	Workgroup is currently meeting and will report back to the SC at the October in-person meeting.	March, 2019	Susan Smyth
5	FOA feedback	Develop a broad-reaching feedback mechanism on previous FOA	NCATS is developing a comprehensive multi-stakeholder plan and will report back to the SC at a later time.	TBD	NCATS
7	Branding: Talking Points for Institutional Administration	Talking points for PIs for the institutional administration on the value of being a part of the CTSA Program consortium. NCATS will develop revised talking points. NCATS staff will reach out to the SC for input. More details to come.	Steering Committee to focus on the topic after the after the workgroup of the DTF sunsets.	Late Fall 2018 - Early Winter 2019	Steering Committee
9	IT Platform for Collaboration	Develop a space where SC can house working documents, discussions, polling, etc.	NCATS working on a log-in federation for NCATS G-Suite Enterprise system.	October 2018	Ken Gersing
11.	SC & Administrator Nominations	Members urged to either recommend new SC members and an Administrator or encourage people to self-nominate	Follow the criteria from the web page shared and try to avoid a disruption to the current Pod structure while nominating	Applications due 11/30/18	SC Members
13.	Workforce Development	Workforce Development KL2 Survey data	Reach back out to PIs and SC members and re-share the findings of the work done through Workforce Development		S. Smyth

14.	STARWORK	Should we expand the population for KL2 survey? Yes. Include the non-funded KL2 scholars to show how institutes are matching or exceeding what is being funded.	Bring back suggestion to the STARWORK committee	December STARWORK meeting	S. Smyth, J. Tsevat
15	STARWORK	Debt Reduction – disseminate LRP information, KL2 PIs proposed regional workshops on NIH LRP, NCATS to utilize consortium listservs, CTSA program scholars create a webinar. Add question to KL2 survey addressing retrospective analysis on applying for LRP.	Schedule meeting: CLIC to work with S. Smyth to develop a webinar and dissemination/information plan to make scholars ware of opportunities and linking them to resources during the application process	As determine by. Schedules	S. Smyth, M. Zand
16	Common Metrics Initiative 2.0	Need hubs and consortium level feedback	CLIC to send POD Exercise to SC to disseminate to their respective Pods	12/14/18	CLIC
17	ACRES	Should we engage with this organization?	CLIC to send POD Exercise to SC to disseminate to their respective Pods	12/21/18	CLIC