|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Meeting/Project Name:** | ORD SPR Advisory Group Monthly Meeting | | |
| **Date of Meeting:** | Tuesday, February 27th, 2024 | **Time:** | 3:00-4:00 PM ET |
| **Meeting Facilitator:** | J. Constans | **Location:** | MS Teams |

|  |
| --- |
| MEETING OBJECTIVE |
| Provide the committee with updates and address next steps for future initiatives and projects |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ATTENDEES LIST *(check mark indicates attendance)* | | | |
| **Committee Members:** | ☒ Dr. Bob O'Brien  ☒ Dr. Joseph Constans | ☐ Dr. Miriam Smyth  ☐ Dr. Peter Hunt | ☐ Dr. Vetisha McClair |
| **Advisory Group:** | ☒ Dr. Steven Dobscha  ☒ Dr. Stephanie Gamble  ☐ Dr. Brian Marx  ☒ Dr. Bradley V. Watts  ☒ Dr. Edgar Villarreal | ☐ Dr. Stephen O’Connor  ☐ Dr. Susan Strickland  ☒ Dr. Melissa Mehalick  ☒ Dr. David Atkins | ☒ Dr. Wendy Tenhula  ☒ Dr. Lisa Brenner  ☐ Dr. Matthew Miller  ☐ Dr. Jodie Trafton |
| **Others:** | ☒ Maharsi Naidu  ☒ Carol Fowler |  |  |
|  | | | |
| **Support Staff:** | ☒ Imani Braxton-Allen (Titan Alpha) |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| MEETING NOTES |
| **Agenda:**   * 3:00-3:05- Review AMP Development * 3:05-3:35- Initial Results from SP Priority Survey * 3:35-3:45- Discussion Questions * 3:45-3:50- Next Steps   **Notes:**   * **Progress of AMP Development**   + Several documents have been completed.     - Completed:       * Role charter       * Unit charter       * Portfolio performance metrics     - Completed by under ISRM consideration:       * Executive committee charter (received feedback on)       * Purview statement       * Portfolio analysis ppt       * Position description   + Currently in progress:     - Critical research priorities   + Items in the pipeline (May-June 2024):     - Program announcements     - Funding model SOP   + Updates to executive committee charter:     - There were concerns of the investigators having advanced knowledge of the issues being discussed by committee.       * *Correction:* addressed through the conflict-of-interest policy: minutes to be published within one week of meeting, meeting discussions being broadcasted via TEAMS or WEBEX, and conflicted members will not be present for the voting part of meetings     - Also concerns surrounding members who are not federal employees. If the committee includes a non-federal employee, then the committee would have to be established a subcommittee of an existing FACA committee.       * *Correction:* eliminating the one proposed non-federal employee   + Several Problems were raised across ORD in regard to having focused RFAs     - A major proposed solution, that SPR will be implementing, is creating program announcements.     - A program announcement will provide clarity to investigators on how the VA will be reviewing the and funding research. These program announcements will be developed via Notices of Special Interest (NOSI). This will overall reduce the difficulty of navigating the process per AMP and increase collaboration. The NOSI will serve as an overview of interest priority areas and a list of RFAs, and context of scientific and budget matters.   + *Maharsi did a demo of the survey (can be viewed on recording)* * **Initial Results from SP Priority Survey**   + Distributed to the SPRINT listserv and responses were due approximately February 23rd. Also distributed to the VEC veterans and they have until February 28th to respond. Looking to send out to Chief Mental Health Officers and Suicide Prevention VISN leads and they would have until the second Friday in March to respond.   + Identification of survey takes:     - 91% investigators     - 1% Veteran     - 9% Administrator     - 35% Clinician   + Data Analysis (check recording for charts displaying data results)     - Ratings       * Rating: based the domains averaged priority score: 1 to 5, with 1 being a low priority domain and 5 being a high priority domain.       * Raw data: ranking based exclusively on the number of times a topic was placed at the highest level (#1 rank) during the ranking task.       * Weighted data: a ranking of 1 gives the domain a score of 10, down to a ranking of 10 gives the domain a score of 1. Combining all rankings across all responses results in these overall ranks.     - Surveyors were asked to contribute their thoughts of what the topic area should be for the RFA/NOSI     - Surveyors were also asked to rate veteran subgroups and how they could be prioritized.       * Minimal variance amongst subgroups       * Recommended to NOT use this information in any initial funding announcement. * **Next steps/ Discussion**   1. Complete collection of survey response      + Ran into an issue with surveying front line clinicians, believe that it would be too time consuming to get Union approval. Joe and Edgar working to possibly embed the survey in a large meeting with front line clinicians. (TBD)   2. Synthesize data/ determiner topics for SME input.      + Joe is proposing to use a working subgroup to go through the data and pick topic areas in which the group planned to solicit information for the SMEs.      + Edgar agreed to help with this effort.   3. Identify Research Gaps for NOSI      + SOTA versus solicit feedback from multiple subject matter experts.        - Broader range of feedback        - Avoid COI related to SME study area.        - Logistical benefits          * Overall consensus from the group to take this approach.   4. Hold executive session to vote on priorities (May 28th)      + Joe wants to determine capacity to attend meeting, so that we can have voting members present. Data collected from SMEs will be presented and their rankings of the priorities and then the voting members will vote.   5. NOSI (internal to ORD)      + Publish by July 1st      + Determine $ amount        - Dr. Constans will work on the NOSI in the meantime (following the executive session) that is due by July 1st, 2024.        - Check in with Dr. Bever to determine a feasible timeline/make sure it is in accordance with the deadline.   6. How should we identify the sets of SMEs?      + Using the working group to solicit additional SMEs in addition to how we are already identifying them. Identifying the group of SMES is critically important, it is also important to look for experts outside of the VA, this will help to decrease biases within the portfolio.   7. What does the output look like from the SME group?      + The SMEs would answer the standardized questions, while providing feedback/ justifying their reasoning, and then possibly draw conclusions based on the responses. Still working on how to compile the data produced from the group. |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| **ACTION ITEMS** |  |
| Work on standardized questions that can be asked | Due by the March meeting (3/26/24) |