



Roll Call

NAACCR Board Present: Randi Rycroft, Winny Roshala, Mary Jane King, Monique Hernandez, Maria Schymura, Isaac Hands, Lori Swain, Kevin Ward, Lorraine Shack, Angela Meisner

Ex-Officio Member: Betsy Kohler

Staff: Lori Havener, Stephanie Hill, Charlie Blackburn

Governance

Owner

Strategic Issues for Discussion

1. Strategic Management Plan

Randi/Betsy

- Current updates for SMP
 - MP Strategic Alliances Follow-Up Documentation Below (already posted to SHARE site in Nov.)
We will need to discuss this in light of conversations we had with Ann Marie – our plan is currently heavy on the ‘Management’ part, and lacking in the ‘Strategic’ part. Will need to discuss how we rectify that and in what sort of timeframe.
- SMP SA Follow Up (Previously Posted on Board SHARE Site)
- Stan. And Reg. Dev. Goals (Previously Posted on Board SHARE Site)
- All. Goals (Previously Posted on Board SHARE Site)

Randi opened the meeting by welcoming everyone to the new year. They reviewed the process and thanked Steering Committees for their contributions. Randi wants to have the Board focus on the strategy piece and let the management piece proceed as initially planned. Specifically, she wants the Board to decide what strategy is and what management is within the plan. The committees are going back to their plans and re-organize the management versus strategy. Angela added that a template will be developed. Also, the Chairs have great ideas and plans but the organization wants to be purposeful in how to approach the strategy and management aspects. Monique asked for a summary of the meeting that outlined the meeting. Lori H. said that the minutes and recording are on the Board / Chair SHARE site. Winny added that the Board should look at how the Chairs will now revise how they are phrasing the plans which will help later in the update process.

2. Strategic Issue from December – How do we work with the College?

Randi

- Continued discussion from December.

Randi said that she went back to the recording and pulled out pieces to the puzzle on what needs to be understood and what strategies need to be highlighted. Some of the themes from the discussion are:

- NAACCR’s roles as preserving the best interests of registries (central and hospital).
- We mix the clinical and surveillance aspects. This is one of the central “tugs of war” that we have. This infrastructure is hard to disentangle the two pieces. We have to acknowledge the clinical need and perceived need for more data items and revised items. Also, the concept of the college and AJCC being interested in point in time analyses versus over time analyses.
- When there are changes in staff at the college, can we develop strategies around that for communication.
- Can we develop backward mapping? Helping us maintain the over-time needs analyses and potentially accommodate the clinical needs.
- More will be added once Randi has the chance to review the conversation again.
- Capture data on linkages and opportunities.
- How do we engage hospitals in strategies and physician liaisons?

Mary Jane added that the clinical needs are becoming more and more precise. It is difficult to be anything else if we need to report at the same time, same standards, and other requirements. She thinks we need to be less clinical. True real time is best locally. Lorraine thinks we should keep the clinical broader. Kevin thinks that the strategy discussions are ongoing already and being managed as well as they can. Through the newer groups like ML and HL Tactical Groups. This is an education process about

progress. In particular, he was pleased on the last ML Strategy Group meeting leadership in their efforts to educate those outside of NAACCR on the process and capture issues. Winny supports that approach of education over a period of time. We do not want this to be an issue of NAACCR versus another agency. This is and needs to be a partnership via dialogue.

- Randi asked if the Board is ready for a full strategy outline and discussion yet?
- She also asked what level of firmness with other agencies do we want to establish? “Our way or the highway? Or softer approach”? How do we address these issues?

Discussion also centered around field test and at what level is there something on the surveillance side where they have many codes but we only need a few. Maria asked how vendor software would be handled with XML and data elements. Kevin said he was not sure how those mechanisms would work. He said that it is a good question and one that needs to be addressed. In particular, Maria mentioned that there are issues to be worked out with vendors. Randi asked if there is an opportunity for two-tiered development to help and collaborate on standardization for rapid deployment for surgical data items and then also on surveillance take more time to consume the data. Winny said that we need to be sure to understand the impact and ripple effect. She thinks the ML Tactical group is the best group to handle this. Mary Jane thinks that resetting the expectations of the meetings is appropriate.

In conclusion, Randi thinks that we may be close to outlining strategies for engagement for this topic. The Board is new to the strategy discussions and asked members for input on how to proceed with future discussions. Winny thanked Randi for her role in getting the group going in this direction. She suggested having Ann Marie Hill help with the discussion? The group agreed.

3. Strategic topics for discussion in February or March

Randi/Betsy

- What topic should we tackle next?

Betsy suggested asking about the issue of power to NAACCR by funders. How NAACCR reacts to funding and the change of funding over time. What happens to the balance of power when NCI expands to more registries? Lori S. also thought how NAACCR could create its own research institute on paper and strategically.

Steering Committee Reports

Suggested Report Structure

- a. *Any concerns about how the SC is functioning in the following areas?*
 - *Member engagement*
 - *Meeting management*
 - *SC leadership*
 - *Delegation of work to subcommittees*
- b. *Significant accomplishments*
- c. *Resources needed*
- d. *Any documents the Board will need to review/approve in the next couple of months?*
- e. *Specific requests of the Board from the SC?*
- f. *What items did the SC flag to forward to Communications?*

Standardization and Registry Development

4. Steering Committee Update

Isaac / Mary Jane

Mary Jane said that there were various topics discussed. The summary is below.

- HL7 and the future of it. Is it obsolete? Documentation of background.
- Summary of Volume V changes is being reviewed.
- Auto Consolidation scan of who was doing what. CDC and other registries efforts.
- SMP goals and objectives / charter.
- Cancer informatics update.

Research and Data Use**5. Steering Committee Update****Lorraine / Kevin**

No update required at this time.

6. Map Story Proposal**TBD**➤ **VMap Story Proposal Documentation**

Heather Zimmerman, MT and Terry Dolecek, UIC, IL provided a proposal on a Map Story that would be held on the NAACCR web site. This would be used for sharing the HPV cancers but also to show how other central cancer registries or researchers could do a similar project on a different topic. Terry added that this may be integrated to future plans of the web site and communication of data that is being worked on right now (SEER Explorer). Betsy assumed these would be individual projects. This is not necessarily a template but more of a demonstration and example of how the data could be used. A real life example as to how data could be communicated. Betsy asked if registries would be able to add their own data to this tool. Heather said that each state would probably need their own ARC GIS services to accomplish something similar. Monique thanked them for presenting and mentioned that she is familiar with ESRI licensing and she is a supporter of the context around the data. She asked if the group would be open to accessing others to have access to the methods on how it was done. Heather and Terry thought that the committee would be supportive of this idea. Maria said that NPCR already requires their grantees to perform certain reports like HPV and she is supportive of a concept like this but may not want to do that topic because it is already being done by NPCR. Heather agreed but the group thinks that more integrating health data sources would be added. The group would like to use this as a sample story but add stories as time goes along. They plan on hosting it on the NAACCR web site. The maintenance cost also includes updates to data but they will look into it.

The Board discussed this topic and if they are ready to provide guidance on next steps. Monique said that this concept is part of the registry of the future is important. She thinks that this is an important communication piece and can be used as a best practices method. Kevin thinks that maybe the Board could suggest a different cancer other than HPV so as not to interrupt efforts already being done by CDC. Isaac agreed with the concepts of different data. Monique would like to add this to the agenda for communications of cancer data.

Randi asked if there was a motion.

There was a motion to have the group go back and find alternative ways of how this will be useful to the membership. Develop a methodology where this (Map Stories) will be beneficial to the NAACCR membership. Additionally, the Board wants alternative topics that CDC already mandates (like HPV).

THE MOTION TO HAVE THE GIS GROUP RECOMMEND THE BEST DATA PRODUCT FOR DISPLAY AND METHOLOGIES WAS PASSED**Professional Development****Owner****7. Steering Committee Update****Lori S. / Monique**

Lori S. said that the group met in December. They focused on the SMP planning more than anything else. No large-scale updates are pertinent. More will be available at the February meeting.

8. NCRA Central Registry Badges**Lori S**

Lori provided an explanation to another group (SEER Managers Call) around the concept of a "Badge" or endorsement on CTR work. Lori reminded the NCRA's membership is largely based off of individual members. They always seek to provide value and career acknowledgement for the completion of classes or courses. This badge could be at the footer of your email, office, or print out. It is a common program for other professions. There is a small group developing core competencies of working in a registry and a series of education that could be developed to earn a badge or badges. This is intended to be entry level and not necessarily a long-time CTR. They hope to roll it out by their June conference. The concept is less formal than a large-scale curriculum but still a part of the process none the less. Winny asked if there was any input from the NAACCR Pro. Dev. Work group. Stephanie asked if this is something that a person would get every year or have renewals. Lori said that it is not an annual renewal concept. She compared it to scout badges. This would be something that will be date related but only because of the relevance of the topic area.

9. Charges for NAACCR Forum**Charlie**

- ACTION: Vote
- Fees and Proposed Budget Overview

Charlie provided the proposed budget and fees for the NAACCR Summer FORUM. He said that fees for virtual conferences are running approximately 50% - 70% of the in-person conferences. This is primarily driven by technology costs. He recommended a base early registration fee for member of \$250. Late registration was recommended at \$350. Non-member fees would be \$75 more for each level. Student and retired would be \$175 for early bird and \$50 more for late registration. The Board asked clarifying questions on transfers, deadlines, and potential costs. Charlie answered the question as needed.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED NAACCR FORUM CONFERENCE FEES AS PRESENTED WAS APPROVED**10. NAACCR Mid-Year Meeting Overview and Preliminary Outline****Randi**

The date of meeting is February 17, 2021. There will be an AM session and a PM session.

Strategic Alliances**11. Steering Committee Update****Randi / Betsy / Winny**

No update required at this time.

Communications**12. Steering Committee Update****Angela / Maria**

The group is updating the SMP and also working on the Narrative editorial.

Other Board Business**Program Updates**

- **Program Updates**

- Canada

Lorraine / Mary Jane

- No update.

- NPCR

Monique / Maria

- No update.

- SEER

Kevin Angela

- Data submission and annual reports are due soon.

Consent Agenda**13. Minutes**

- December 16, 2020 Minutes

14. Correspondence

- View Mid Level Group Notes
- No View High Level Group Notes

15. Geocoder Monthly Report

- Geocoder Report

16. Executive Director's Report

- ED Report

17. Membership Applications

- None

18. Financial

- Current Financials

19. Adjournment and Next Meeting

All

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA WAS PASSED

Schedule of Board Meetings July 2020 – June 2021

February 17 (Board / Chair Online Meeting), March 17, April 21, May 19, June 16 (no in-person)

Board Standing Reminders and Information

2020 – 2021 Liaisons

Committee/Priority Area	Current FY21
Standardization & Registry Development	Isaac Hands/Mary Jane King (Junior)
Communications	Angela Meisner/Maria Schymura
Research & Data Use	Lorraine Shack/Kevin Ward
Professional Development	Lori Swain/Monique Hernandez (Junior)
Strategic Alliances	N/A
Nominating Committee	No need w/new bylaws
Mid-Level Tactical Group	Kevin Ward
High-Level Strategic Group	Randi Rycroft/Winny Roshala

NAACCR Board Action Items

Item	Responsible BOD Member / Person	Status
January		
Randi will contact Ann Marie to see if an environmental scan is something she can help us with the process.	Randi	
Add data visualization to agenda for future discussion.	Monique	