

Strategic Planning and Alliances Steering Committee
March 5, 2024
Meeting Notes

Attendance		
Members Present: Randi Rycroft (chair) Winny Roshala Mary Jane King	Monique Hernandez Stephanie Hill Jenna Mazreku Iris Zachary	Mignon Dryden Betsy Kohler NAACCR Staff Present: Karen Knight Ann Marie Hill
AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
1. Roll – Karen		
2. Review February 6th notes – Randi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes were approved. 	
<p>3. Updates from the Board – Winny</p> <p>Winny said that the Certification Task Force provided an update to the Board at the last meeting. They will have a Coffee Break in May. There are also plans to conduct a registry directors survey for input on certification. Betsy will offer a message prior to the survey to set the tone of the importance of the survey. Because the Task Force is under the Board, they will report at their monthly meetings.</p> <p>The Board also discussed the efforts to fill the Executive Director position.</p> <p>Next week there will be a Board/Chair meeting in Santa Barbara to discuss the Executive Director transition and the Strategic Plan. There will be a Town Hall on March 27th to get feedback from members on the 2024-2027 Strategic Plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Randi said Bozena asked if the Certification Task Force could share with the registry directors the document on high quality registries developed by SPA SC. The group agreed that would be okay. The group reviewed the high-quality registry document. Mary Jane pointed out that in Canada the roles for data collection/production and research are different than in the US. For instance, participating in research varies by Canadian registry. Monique said that at their registry, they can focus on data access and utilization but cannot directly do their own research. She agreed that it would be helpful to clarify what “support research” means. Ann Marie said that RDU SC has stated that there needs to be more focus on research and data use in central registries and perhaps a role for advocacy. Betsy said that the intent of the list was to help generate discussion like we are having now. The Task Force can change it as they would like. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Randi will let Bozena know SPA SC is okay with sharing the document. Randi will share with members any relevant information from the Board/Chair meeting.
<p>4. Discuss leadership changes this year – Randi</p> <p>At the last meeting, the group discussed that this year includes two major leadership changes – NAACCR and SEER. We also had a recent change in the American College of Surgeons. SPA SC may be involved in suggesting strategies to address these changes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ann Marie asked what SPA SC’s role will be during these transitions. Randi asked the group what can SPA SC do to forge new relationships. Mignon said she thinks it is a good idea to discuss this. Our approach may depend on who the new leaders are. There may be opportunities to educate them. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stephanie suggested that SPA SC could put together some history of relationships with partners and the value of these partnerships. Then, where there is an opportunity to meet with the new leaders, we would have valuable information prepared. Monique said that the Executive Director Transition Team is discussing the onboarding process. It may be helpful to let the Board know that SPA SC can support this effort. What is needed will depend on the experience of the new person. She thinks we will know more after next week’s Board/Chair meeting. Ann Marie said with the new Executive Director, there is an opportunity to open the door with new partners. The groundwork for potential partners could be done by SPA SC. Randi said that we have also discussed documenting the value of NAACCR to others/partners. Ann Marie asked if we have held focus groups with partners about the value of NAACCR. Stephanie said she would rather tell them the value of NAACCR, as they may not understand the full value of NAACCR. Randi said we can go ahead and document the value of NAACCR to other organizations. If there are other strategies going forward, we can discuss. 	
<p>5. USCDI+ Cancer Data Exchange project – Karen</p> <p>Karen has been invited to participate in work on a USCDI+ use case for cancer data exchange with the U.S. Office of the National Coordinator. Uses include research, clinical trials and cancer registries. Lori Havener is also attending these meetings. We just got approval for Jenna Deniaud to attend also, who is funded from NPCR and is a SEER Research Support Registry. They will have a Data Summit in May and the ONC lead for the project may speak at the annual conference.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ann Marie asked if SEER was included, and Karen said NCI has been involved and SEER started attending last week. Regarding the workflows, concern was raised that they hope this does not result in an outcome similar to that with Meaningful Use. 	
<p>6. Liaison updates, if available – Randi/All</p> <p>Winnie: High-Level Strategic Group met yesterday, and the proposed v25 data items were presented for their vote. Voting will take place next week.</p> <p>Mignon: There is an upcoming CAP webinar on March 21st titled, “Finding, Organizing, and Using CAP eCP Data to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stephanie clarified that the MLTG made recommendations to HLSG for v25 changes. HLSG sees the MLTG vote and can approve those that MLTG did not recommend. Winnie asked if there were any registrars on the College’s measures committee. Angela Constantini is on the committee. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Karen will send a listserv on the CAP webinar.

<p>Accelerate Cancer Research.” The content is intended for cancer registries.</p> <p>Randi attended the Quality Assurance Data Committee (ACOS); they are going through a process of evaluating their performance measures. They are forming teams for different sites and making recommendations to revise or eliminate elements. They are also evaluating the feasibility of a registrar collecting the information for each measure and the clinical impact of the measure. There will not be an impact on the registry since they do not include any data items. They want the approved measures in place by the end of the year. None of the measures will affect accreditation status; but they may tie them to a standard in a few years.</p>		
<p>7. Discuss whether to meet in person in Boise – Randi</p> <p>Randi asked if the group would like to meet in person in Boise. None of the members voiced a reason to meet at this time.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Randi and Karen will be in contact after next week’s Board/Chair meeting to decide.
<p>8. Summarize meeting for reporting to the Board – Randi/All</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SPA SC is planning to create a document identifying the value of NAACCR to other organizations. 2. Betsy will be suggesting to the Board that they consider asking SPA SC to research potential sponsors for the next annual conference. 		
<p>Next Meeting is rescheduled for April 2nd, 11:30 – 1:00 ET.</p>		