



Clinical and Translational Science Awards Program

## Coordination, Communication, & Operations Support

---

### CTSA Steering Committee Webinar Summary June 9, 2025; 2:30-3:30 PM ET

#### Steering Committee Attendees:

Michael Kurilla, Co-Chair  
Elmer Bernstam  
Steven Bernstein  
Arleen Brown  
Andrea Carnegie  
Daniel Ford  
Michael Holinstat

David Ingbar  
Mimi Kim  
Julie Lumeng  
Grace McComsey  
F. Gerald Moeller  
Elizabeth Ofili  
Ruth O'Hara  
Reynold Panettieri

Doris Rubio  
Mark Schleiss  
Eric Vilain  
Sarah Wiehe  
Rosalind Wright

#### Not In Attendance:

Ted Wun, Co-Chair  
Vesna Garovic  
Steve Reis

#### NCATS Attendees:

Audie Atienza  
Patrick Brown  
Dale Burwen  
Soju Chang  
Pablo Cure  
Jamie Doyle

Gallya Gannot  
Chris Hartshorn  
Rebecca Katz  
Irina Krasnova  
Joan Nagel  
Katie Patel

Thomas Radman  
Erica Rosemond  
Joni Rutter  
Salina Waddy  
Annica Wayman

#### Invited Guests:

Tom Campion  
Melissa Haendel  
Cathleen Kane

Shawn O'Neil  
Gerry Stacy  
Anita Walden

Meredith Zozus

**CCOS:** Lauren Fitzharris, Kerry James, Lenore Roca, Amanda Scott

---

#### Welcome (Slides 2-7)

Speakers: Michael Kurilla

M. Kurilla welcomed members of the Steering Committee (SC), briefly reviewed the agenda, and announced an upcoming survey from the crowd-sourced topic: Collaborations with State and Local Governments.



### Questions and Discussion:

- S. Bernstein asked for elaboration on slide 4 about NOFOs for state funded research. M. Kurilla: There are some state-funded NOFOs that public health groups and academics can respond to, resulting in funding for collaborations between local public health departments and CTSA. R. Panettieri noted that in New Jersey, there was one for substance use disorders that came out asking for academic institutions to engage. He also mentioned another one on maternal health that they were successful in engaging.
- A. Brown asked how information should be reported out, noting that there might be redundancy in reported information. M. Kurilla said that the most convenient method for reporting should be utilized.
- E. Ofili asked for the “why” behind the emphasis on local/state impact given the previous focus on national impact and whether it was an effort to level-up CTSA. M. Kurilla noted that there are a lot of instances where CTSA are relied upon for expertise at the state and local level that are not talked about in many ways. NCATS is trying to capture this so they know what’s available and so that the CTSA community can be more aware of the types of impact CTSA are having with state and local agencies.

---

## **Real World Data workforce development across the translational spectrum (Slides 8-16)**

Speakers: Melissa Haendel, Shawn O’Neil

Presentation summary: M. Haendel provided the annual report out on the Real-World Data Workforce Development Taskforce, starting with an acknowledgement of the lead team members participating in the group. The working group has 139 members and 8 community members.

The working group had 3 deliverables, led by subcommittees. Those deliverables included:

- Assessing the RWD Training Education Needs.
- Developing a RWD Education Inventory
- Developing a RWD Maturity Model

M. Haendel reviewed the responses to questions submitted to the working group before taking additional questions from steering committee members.

### Additional Questions and Discussion:

- R. Panettieri brought up the use of natural language processing and whether fidelity could be improved by taking structured data and testing for missingness and other validation techniques using the NLP. He asked whether the group had a vision for how they would incorporate natural language processing in the current work.
  - M. Haendel agreed that with large language models, there are opportunities to leverage them- not only for extracting information from the unstructured data, but also for bringing those together with the structured data. They’ve done some work on that and found it to be a useful tool for improving data quality workflows

and reducing bias (or introducing bias in some instances). She said that is something that they are looking at while doing the needs assessments and inventory. She noted that there isn't a lot of existing training in this niche area so there's an almost ethical responsibility for everyone, not just the working group, to consider both the opportunities and potential for less desirable outcomes.

- S. Bernstein acknowledged that while industry partnerships might be outside of the working group's scope, outreach to some of the largest vendor's might be useful in providing insights, streamlining and focusing the work of developing the maturity model and assessments. He asked the committee if they would consider reaching out to vendors, and in the case of scalability, reaching out to ONC.
  - M/ Haendel stated that given the limited resources, this type of outreach might not be possible. Additionally, she reminded the committee that this work is about training needs and not about the actual infrastructure or data assets itself. While the distinction is modest, it is helpful in assessing the value of reaching out to a large vendor whose training and resources might not be available to everyone. She acknowledged that it might be worth it to have a conversation with ONC, who might be interested in the outcomes and engaged in future projects.
- M. Kurilla asked about analytic flexibility as available data sets become bigger and bigger and everything becomes significant. Where are we in establishing good practices about how we approach using big data.
  - M. Haendel acknowledged this as a good question considering how particular the community is about data quality. A lot of times when you see real world data analytics, there's not a lot of transparency or prominence for how the data was managed. There are opportunities to help institutions improve practices through collaboration but training around data quality and how to document prominence is still very immature. S. O'Neil agreed, especially since so much of the audience is coming from a clinical trial background where they don't have to worry so much about this so the need for these trainings will increase.

## BIDS Update (Slides 17-26)

Speaker: Tom Campion

Presentation summary:

T. Campion provided an update on BIDS EC, highlighting the development of the BIDS charter for approval by the Steering Committee.

The presentation included a review of the group's objectives: to develop a shared vision for biostatistics, biomedical informatics and data science; and define a charter for the CTSA BIDS Enterprise Committee. T. Campion reviewed the groups milestones, approach to developing the charter and EC, as well as the current state of the group.

The group proposed a charter to the Steering Committee that includes increasing the number of voting members by 2 and electing a new lead team which would have 7 members. Following acknowledgement of the individuals and groups that contributed to the development of the BIDS

charter, T. Campion left the call so that the Steering Committee could vote on the proposed charter.

Seventeen (17) committee members voted unanimously to approve the charter for the BIDS enterprise committee.

## **Practical Applications of CTSA Concept Mapping (Slides 27-36)**

Speakers: Cathleen Kane, Gerry Stacy

Presentation summary: C. Kane introduced their presentation on using concept mapping data to do a follow-up poll focused on impact measures. She and Gerry Stacy introduced themselves before beginning their discussion. She reviewed the participation and standout findings from the initial research, including consensus on the importance of long-term impact measures and some divergence when it comes to roles (admin vs. evaluation).

The goal of the proposed survey is to capture leadership perspectives on the near-term utility and relevance of CTSA impact measures, especially under current funding pressures. The objective is to launch a focused and practical poll to re-rate priority impact measures collectively identified through the concept mapping initiative. Key deliverables would include a clear snapshot of impact measures currently in use at multiple hubs that could be combined to provide higher-level impact and a gap analysis of missing measures useful in the current climate/landscape.

C. Kane and G. Stacy presented an overview of the poll and proposed timeline & milestones before addressing questions from the Steering Committee.

### Questions and Discussion:

- G. McComsey enthusiastically supported the ideas put forth in the presentation and highlighted the timeliness of the topic in relationship to content for the fall meeting.
- E. Ofili seconded support for concept mapping, stating that she would read the group's report.
- M. Kurilla was intrigued by Cath's concept of "shelf life" and asked how frequently they would go about refreshing so that they eliminate the things that are no longer necessary.
  - C. Kane responded that if they get the type of results and participation that they anticipate, this survey can be used as a rehearsal for a repeatable survey that can be conducted at regular intervals.

## **WSVS Working Group Extension (Slide 37)**

Sixteen (16) Steering Committee members voted unanimously to approve a 6-month extension for the William Schnaper Visiting Scientist (WSVS) Working Group.

## **Adjourn (Slide 38)**

M. Kurilla adjourned the meeting.

**Next Steering Committee Webinar Monday, June 23, 2025, at 2:30-3:30 PM ET**