



Clinical and Translational Science Awards Program  
**Coordination, Communication, &  
Operations Support**

---

**CTSA Steering Committee Meeting Summary**  
**April 13, 2026; 2:30-3:30 PM ET**

**Steering Committee Attendees:**

Mike Kurilla, Co-Chair  
Grace McComsey, Co-Chair

Elmer Bernstam  
Steven Bernstein  
Andrea Carnegie  
Daniel Ford  
Vesna Garovic  
Michael Holinstat  
Mimi Kim

Michael Kurilla  
Julie Lumeng  
Grace McComsey  
Gerry Moeller  
Elizabeth Ofili  
Reynold Panettieri  
Dominic Reeds

Mark Schleiss  
Marisa Spann  
Sarah Wiehe  
Eric Vilain  
Karen Wilson  
Ted Wun

**NCATS Attendees:**

Audie Atienza  
Kris Bough  
Patrick Brown  
Soju Chang  
Jennie Conroy  
Pablo Cure  
Anthony Dibello  
Jamie Doyle

Stephanie Ezequiel  
Stacia Fleisher  
Gallya Gannot  
Chris Hartshorn  
Rebecca Katz  
Irina Krasnova  
Francisco Leyva  
Joan Nagel

Katie Patel  
Thomas Radman  
Erica Rosemond  
Yolanda Vallejo  
Annica Wayman  
Yanji Xu

**CCOS:** Lauren Fitzharris, Kerry James, Amanda Scott\*

\* *SC Coordinator*

---

**Welcome and Consent Items (Slides 1-3)**

Speakers: Mike Kurilla, Grace McComsey, Amanda Scott

The meeting opened with welcome remarks and confirmation of quorum. The steering committee reviewed the Real-World Data Workforce Development Across the Translational Spectrum Survey, which had previously been revised based on Steering Committee liaison feedback. With no objections, the survey was approved for dissemination and will launch on April 29.

---

**WG Extension Request (Slides 4-5)**



Speaker: Amanda Scott

Presentation Summary:

Amanda Scott presented a request to extend the Case Studies Working Group from June 2026 to December 2026, citing unanticipated multi-site IRB delays, scale and complexity of qualitative analysis, and the need to complete final synthesis and dissemination. Dan F. questioned why IRB was required given the absence of PHI; responses from Kerry J., Elizabeth O., Grace M., and others explained that multi-site publication intent triggered IRB requirements across hubs.

Broader discussion followed on IRB inefficiencies and reform, with comments from Elmer B., Karen W., and Michael K., who noted NIH and FDA-level interest in improving IRB timelines.

**Decision/Next Steps:** The extension was unanimously approved through December 31, 2026; IRB efficiency was identified as a potential future Steering Committee agenda topic.

## Annual CCOS Satisfaction Survey (Slides 6-13)

Speaker: Kerry James

Presentation Summary:

Kerry James introduced the proposed annual CCOS feedback survey, noting it has already been reviewed and approved by NCATS and is shared with the Steering Committee for input, not approval. CCOS will finalize the survey in the coming weeks, submit for OMB and IRB review, and aim for late May/early June 2026 launch, with results shared with NCATS, the Steering Committee, and the broader consortium.

Key Questions & Responses:

Q (*Grace M.*): Can respondents save progress and return later?

A (*Kerry J.*): This should be possible in REDCap but CCOS will confirm with the Survey Team.

Q (*Steven B.*): Can responses be linked to specific CTSA's?

A (*Kerry J.*): No, responses will be anonymized and role-based only.

Q (*Grace M.*): Will the survey capture whether respondents are PIs, administrators, or hold other roles?

A (*Kerry J.*): The survey only asks for high-level CTSA role categories and does not collect identifying information to preserve anonymity.

Q (*Dan F.*): What are the main content areas/questions to be asked, and how will CCOS use the results?

*A (Kerry J.):* The survey focuses on exposure to CCOS services, familiarity with offerings, satisfaction levels, priority for future planning, and includes open-ended improvement suggestions; results will guide CCOS and NCATS planning.

---

### **Pod Spotlight: Michigan Institute for Clinical & Health Research (Slides 14-16)**

Speaker: Julie Lumeng

Presentation Summary:

Julie L. presented comparative findings from six CTSA's on EAB structures, covering membership composition, term limits honoraria, meeting formats, preparation practices, and follow-up models. The discussion emphasized variability cross hubs and highlighted benefits of focused deep dives, shorter meetings, and deliberate discussion of challenges rather than accomplishments.

Key Questions & Responses:

*Q (Julie L.):* What do NIIH program officers value most in the EAB report, given the tension between comprehensive program coverage and focused problem discussion

*A (Mike K.):* NIH looks for:

- Shared challenges across CTSA's that may indicate systemic issues
- Evidence that previous weaknesses are being addressed
- Identification of emerging opportunities and technologies
- Context for institutional idiosyncrasies that impact grant management

He emphasized that broadly shared challenges help NIH consider consortium-level solutions.

---

### **Adjourn (Slide 17)**

The next SC meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 27 on Zoom.