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| **Strategic Planning and Alliances Steering Committee**  **July 5, 2022**  **Meeting Notes** | | | |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Attendance** | | | | | | **Members Present:**  Randi Rycroft (chair)  Betsy Kohler | Ann Marie Hill  Dennis Deapen  Jenna Mazreku | Winny Roshala  Mary Jane King  Iris Zachary |  | **NAACCR Staff Present:**  Karen Knight | | | | |
| **AGENDA ITEM** | **DISCUSSION** | **ACTION/FOLLOW-UP** |
| 1. Roll | | |
| 1. Review notes – Randi | * + - * Notes approved. |  |
| 1. Summer Forum: ideas/topics for SPA to consider? Randi | * + - * What SPA has been discussing (faster reporting) is already being done by SEER/NPCR. Major investments are being made in somewhat different ways. Are cancer registries and NAACCR working on this? Are SEER/NPCR working together? Seems like they are working on their own agendas.       * Betsy said this is why we have Strategic Alliances. SEER/NPCR do talk to each other but activities don’t appear to be coordinated. There is an interest in collaborating but they each have their own agency priorities. Each agency working on their own solutions, e.g., SEER DMS-specific and CDC-software-specific; both concerned about their own constituency.       * At this point, rapid reporting focused primarily on path. CDC focused on recruiting/onboarding national labs so the process is more efficient. NCI mostly focused on hospital path feeds. Some states don’t have direct hospital feeds. There are a lot of operational pieces not being considered. Tools need to be different for national vs. hospital path reporting.       * Murky responsibility of out of state path labs reporting nationally.       * For rapid reporting, seems the priorities would be in common. Randi said for the NCI project, seems more idealistic. CDC might be able be able to make it a bit more practical for registries.       * Priorities differ based on mechanisms, needs, funding priorities but activities somewhat complementary.       * Mary Jane said NAACCR may need to step in to ensure continuity of data standards. Data may look the same but inside the package the data may not be so. For example, when is a case a case? Another example is that two different path reports on the same case but can be very different.       * The purpose of electronic path reporting is to receive the incidence data more quickly. This is the first source of data for many cases.       * This will impact our conversations about Strategic Alliances. What is NAACCR’s role.       * Mary Jane suggested perhaps explaining to this group more detail about what they are doing. They might welcome the opportunity. Randi said they have done this sort of thing in other forums but may be able to do so for this group.       * Ann Marie asked about clarifying roles between SPA and HLSG. Randi asked if we need to wait and see what HLSG does. Betsy said we’ve been talking to Heidi Nelson about the need for HLSG to take on a more strategic role, and there is an overlap with Cancer Surveillance Partners. Starting to plan a summit for the winter. Betsy trying to re-invigorate, in concept, the National Cancer Coordinating Council. Ann Marie said discussing with HLSG to move in that direction; seems to be a willingness right now.       * Randi said perhaps the voice of SPA would be to bring a reality check to the initiatives being proposed. Would be good to provide input before implemented. How is NAACCR’s role different than NPCR/SEER talking to their funded registries? Make sure states working with both initiatives don’t have to handle the burden by themselves. Being a bridge between funded initiatives, more neutral voice. “Safer” than for individual registries. | * Consider asking NPCR/SEER representatives to share more detail on their initiatives with SPA. |
| 1. Update on SPA in-person meeting – Randi | * + - * Randi reminded the group the plan was to meet in conjunction with the in-person Board meeting.       * NAACCR is looking at the week of September 26th for the in-person Board meeting and a couple of different options for venues (California or New Orleans).       * SPA would meet first for a day and a half day overlap with the Board. The Board would then have their in-person meeting.       * After addressing #6, revisited this plan to add another day. Discussed possibility of SPA flying in Sunday, meeting Monday, Tuesday and half day Wednesday with the Board. The Board would meet Wednesday and half day Thursday. Betsy cannot be at the meeting on Monday. A HLSG meeting is scheduled 3-4:30 ET on Monday and several members will need to attend or will need to reschedule. Discussed possibility of sitting in on the HLSG call. | * Members to pencil in the week of September 25th for an in-person meeting, flying in Sunday. * Randi will keep the group updated. * Betsy will check with Charlie about feasibility of expanding the meeting to start Monday. |
| 1. Update on metrics provided to the SMP Workgroup – Randi 2. Developed a system/process/checklist for engaging partners and stakeholders and assessing effectiveness of partnerships 3. NAACCR Board adopts and implements SPA strategy recommendations – this could also be measured as “the number of…”. | * + - * Randi provided the group the draft metrics created. We are trying to answer the question, what does success look like?       * Betsy had provided at the last meeting the following: 1) define where we are going; 2) define roles of NAACCCR and each of the partners in moving toward the goals: and 3) develop a timeline.       * Ann Marie said work with current partners and future partners. Will need to work on framing our value to the partners, especially with informatics, genomics, etc.       * Dennis made some suggestions. The group discussed the following revised goals/draft metrics: * define & document where we’re going and a timeline 🡪 documented destination and timeline * define roles of NAACCR/partners and their projects for the members (meet need of registries to be informed) 🡪 roles/projects of partners documented * identify/clarify gaps (communicate to members) 🡪 gaps identified and documented * identify partners to help address gaps 🡪 partners engaged to address gaps * findings communicated to members and partners   + - * Need to communicate with both members and partners.       * Mary Jane suggested an annual report.       * Make the Board aware of the gaps and potential strategies to address them. (See Randi’s item #2 from list to the left.       * Consider communications between “Coordinating Council”/HLSG and SPA. What does communication look like between them? Will need to address this. | * Karen will send the discussed list to Randi to edit. * Randi to send to SPA members & SMP. |
| 1. Strategic Alliances – Randi  * American College of Radiologists interested in partnering with NAACCR because they have a data item they want to propose for collection. Randi said how would we establish a sustaining partnership. They have been open to feedback so far. * Plans for pre-work and in-person work – could work on Power & Interest Grid – which partners might be missing. | * At our in-person meeting, will be working on Strategic Alliances, defining/assessing roles of partners. * Ann Marie has worked with American College of Radiologists, and they were a good group to work with. * Will need their reporting at some point for cases without pathology. Some states already pursuing radiology reporting. * Meeting pre-work discussed. See action items to the right for list. | Members will   * Review list of organizations already provided and answer questions:   1. What is the benefit of the group to be in partnership with NAACCR?  2. What groups are not on the list but should be?   * Identify gaps that will need additional partnerships. * Note how difficult it might be to establish new partnerships.   Karen will ensure the list of organizations & Power and Interest grid are added to the SHARE site. |
| 1. Continue discussion of ideal cancer surveillance data model – Randi | * Topic not covered on this call. |  |
| 1. Other | * Karen reported all members will need to set up a new password on the my.naaccr.org site. This impacts your myNAACCR account and the SHARE site. When you navigate to the site you will be asked to change your password. After setting up your new password, you can navigate back to the page you were trying to reach. Note that the SHARE site will be finishing up its migration in the next day or two. Karen will upload documents from this meeting then. |  |
| 1. Next Meeting | * Tuesday, August 2 at 11:30 am ET |  |