Instructions for Session 3 Breakout Discussion Groups

DEVELOPING CROSS-CUTTING RESEARCH AND TRANSLATIONAL STRATEGIES

Instructions:

1) **Select a Breakout Group.** Each discussion group should include 8-10 people. If your first choice is at capacity, please join a group that has fewer participants
   a) Workshop participants choose to join 1 of 8 breakout discussion groups.
   b) Members of the workshop planning group and the workshop speakers should attend their assigned group to help facilitate the discussion (assignments are at the end of this document)

2) **Assign Roles & Responsibilities.** Please select a discussion lead (facilitator), a time-keeper, a note-taker, and a rapporteur for each group. Some of these roles can be combined.

3) **Review the breakout questions.** The discussion questions have a logical sequence. The response to Question 1 can (and should) generate a long list of ideas. The group should feel free to interpret the questions as they see fit. Quickly clarify any points of confusion.

4) **Individual Brainstorming.** Everyone has a different style of engagement. For Question 1, we encourage your group to allow people to brainstorm for a few minutes on their own.

5) **Group Discussion.** Please carefully allocate time to discuss (even if briefly) all of the questions. Also, please reserve some time to discuss what should be included in your groups’ report back.

6) **Report Back.** Your designated rapporteur will give a 3-minute report back of the group answers. We would like to display as many of your ideas as possible on an overhead screen. But, the report back should focus on the 5-7 issues the group thinks are of greatest priority. To ensure we have time for plenary discussion, the report back should not be a summary of everything the group discussed.

7) **Suggested Agenda.** To help you allocate time, we developed a suggested agenda. If it does not work for your group, that is ok. We recognize that time is a limiting factor. We hope this activity will stimulate continued discussion and action outside the confines of this workshop.

**Breakout Groups**

*The 4 Expert Advisory Boards on Research Priorities (Breakout Groups):*
   A. Immunotoxicology
   B. Epidemiology
   C. Disease Ecology
   D. Environmental Change (global warming, disasters, and other major changes)

*The 4 Expert Advisory Boards on Translational Priorities (Breakout Groups):*
   E. Convergence (developing and sustaining multidisciplinary research collaborations)
   F. Community Engagement (involving communities in research and policy decisions)
   G. Education and Training (ensuring mutual understanding across multiple disciplines and sectors)
   H. Capacity Building (facilitate sharing and use of information amongst local, national, and global stakeholders)
CRITICAL RESEARCH PRIORITIES TO ADVANCE THE SCIENCE
(Breakout Groups A, B, C, and D)

Fictional Scenario:

The National Agency for People and Planet (NAPP) wants to invest $10 billion over the next 15 years to advance research on the interconnections between environmental exposures and infectious disease. NAPP asked the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to assemble 4 expert science groups (you) to advise them. The executive leadership at NAPP are trying to decide how to spread their investments in regional, national, and global research. NAPP’s goals are 3-fold: (1) identify critical areas of research that needs investment; (2) outline key dimensions of research that we think are absolutely critical in order for it to be robust and useful for decision makers; and (3) develop an order of priority for their research investments. To this end, each science advisory board is tasked with developing ideas and priorities that NAPP leadership will use to inform their research investment decisions.

The 4 Expert Advisory Boards on Research Priorities (Breakout Groups):

A. Immunotoxicology
B. Epidemiology
C. Disease Ecology
D. Environmental Change (global warming, disasters, and other major changes)

Discussion Questions:

1. The pressing research questions. What are the research questions in [the science focus of this breakout group: immunotoxicology, epidemiology, etc.] that need answers in regards to methods, exposure, endpoints, host resistance, and populations variability, among other scientific dimensions?
2. Multidisciplinary input.
   a. Which of the questions from above need input from other disciplines to develop holistic answers.
   b. Which set of questions needs to be resolved within our field before it can be integrated into multidisciplinary research efforts
3. Timeframe. With sufficient funding, where do you expect science advances/breakthroughs in the near term (0-5 years), midterm (6-10 years), or long-term (beyond 2030)?
4. Impact on decisions. Which of the research questions are most likely to make an impact on (a) medical/clinical practices and interventions; (b) risk assessment; and (c) national or global public health goals and policies.
CRITICAL TRANSLATIONAL PRIORITIES TO FACILITATE THE USE OF RESEARCH IN DECISION-MAKING (Breakout Groups E, F, G, And H)

Fictional Scenario

The National Agency for People and Planet (NAPP) wants to invest $10 billion to implement a collaborative research-to-action investment strategy. NAPP asked the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to assemble 4 expert multidisciplinary groups (you) to advise them. The executive leadership at NAPP are trying to decide how to spread their investments in translational activities to help ensure that research findings on the interconnections between environmental exposure and infectious disease make a difference. NAPP’s goal is to identify the critical research-to-action components (from the inception of a project, including community engagement, to policy development and decisions) to prioritize for investment. To this end, each multidisciplinary advisory board is tasked with developing ideas and priorities that NAPP leadership will use to inform their research-to-action investment decisions.

The 4 Expert Advisory Boards on Translational Priorities (Breakout Groups):
- **E.** Convergence (developing and sustaining multidisciplinary research collaborations)
- **F.** Community Engagement (involving communities in research and policy decisions)
- **G.** Education and Training (ensuring mutual understanding across multiple disciplines and sectors)
- **H.** Capacity Building (facilitate sharing and use of information amongst local, national, and global stakeholders)

Discussion Questions:
1. **Barriers.** Identify major barriers or hurdles that inhibit effective [the topic of this breakout-group: convergence, community engagement etc.] to conduct, access, or use emerging research on environment pollutant and infectious disease. What makes these challenges particularly sticky (hard to overcome)? [identify 5-7 barriers for your topic]
2. **Opportunities.** What are the institutional/programmatic opportunities that could be leveraged to overcome the barriers?
3. **Time frame.** Given the opportunities and sufficient financial support, what steps could be implemented to overcome the barriers in the near term (0-5 years), midterm (6-10 years), and long-term (beyond 2030)?
Suggested Agenda

9:05 **Overview of the Breakout Activity**
– *Gary Ginsberg*, New York State Department of Health

9:00 **Breakout Group Discussions**

9:10 Introductions & Ice Breaker (5 mins): Name, affiliation, and the name of food that begins with the same letter as your first name.

9:15 Assign roles & responsibilities (2 mins): Volunteers to be a discussion lead to keep the focus on the questions; time-keeper; note-taker; and rapporteur

9:17 Review the questions as a group (3 mins). Quickly clarify any points of confusion.

9:20 Individual brainstorming (5 mins). Use the notepads to jot down your thoughts/responses to Question 1.


9:35 Discuss Question 2

9:45 Discuss Question 3

9:55 Discuss Question 4 [only for the Critical Research Priorities groups]

10:15 Discuss what to include in the report back (5 mins). Group lead (or rapporteur) ensures everyone is on the same page about what to share. Each group will have 3 mins for a report-out. The report-out should focus on priorities. The report-out should not be a summary of everything the group discussed.

10:20 **Break**

10:35 **Plenary Report Backs and Discussion**

**Moderator:** *Gary Ginsberg*, New York State Department of Health

10:35 – 11:00 Report Backs. Rapporteur present groups 5-7 top priorities

11:00 – 11:30 Plenary Discussion

**Breakout Group Assignments**


b. Epidemiology: Aaron Cohen, Molly Kile, *David Savitz*

c. Disease Ecology: Laura Kahn, Rodney Dietert

d. Environmental Change: *John Balbus*, Maureen Lichtveld, Justin Remais

e. Convergence: *Meghan Davis*, Keith Martin, Helen Petach

f. Community Engagement: Nil Basu, *Margaret Karagas*

g. Education and Training: *Melissa Perry*, Josh Rosenthal


*member of the workshop planning committee