



Transformative Research in Metabolism (TRiM)
Internal Steering Committee Meeting (ISC)
Friday, October 29, 2021
12:00 to 1:00 p.m. by Zoom
<https://alaska.zoom.us/j/899633093>

Meeting Objectives: Continue discussion of draft EAC Action Plans; Schedule EAC Interim Meeting; Plan for EAC Interim Meeting; and Share research/core updates.

- 12:00 p.m. Welcome All: Chair Khrys Duddleston
- 12:05 p.m. Review and act on ISC draft meeting agenda, 10.29.2021. Any changes?
- 12:05 p.m. Review and act on ISC draft meeting minutes, 9.24.2021. Any changes?
- 12:10 p.m. Old Business
- Retreat Evaluation, Goldstream Group, Jen Danielson, Evaluation Consultant
 - Is there any further discussion concerning TRiM's retreat?
- 12:20 p.m. New Business
- Schedule EAC Interim Meeting
- Do we want to schedule two half-day meetings or one full-day meeting? (To be decided by polling)
 - Two half-day meetings
 - One full day meeting
 - Dates Proposed (To be decided by polling) Dates available are:
 - Feb. 7
 - Feb. 8
 - Feb. 21
 - Feb. 22
- 12:30 p.m. Plan for EAC Interim Meeting
- Conduct Straw Poll of the proposed meeting topics (Yes/No):
 - Present and discuss EAC Action Plan
 - TRiM Committee Reports by Chairs - ISC, TAC, SAC
 - Presentations by Research PIs, Core Leaders, and Pilot Project PIs
 - Would it be helpful to have a template geared towards reporting for the presentations?
 - Other agenda topics?

- Final poll of agenda topics will be available on Tuesday, November 2 and due by Friday, November 5.
- Draft EAC agenda will be posted on google drive by Friday, November 12 for discussion and adoption at the Friday, December 3rd ISC meeting
 - Rationale - EAC recommendations are required for continuation of Projects 1, 2, and 3.

- 12:35 p.m. Continue discussion of draft EAC Action Plans
- Available for review - Documents are available to review and edit on the [shared google drive](#). Comments will be considered but deleted if not incorporated into the text.
 - Due - Edits will be due by Nov 30 for final discussion and adoption at the Dec. 3rd ISC meeting
 - Submit - We will submit the final Action Plan to the EAC for follow-up discussion at the next EAC meeting, February 2021
 - Rationale - Your feedback is essential for our “collective IQ.” No edits on the document will be interpreted as agreement as written.
 - What further information do you need from the Admin Core to inform your edits and final decision on the Action Plans?

12:50 p.m. Research Project and Core Snapshot Updates – All are invited to share.

12:55 p.m. Other Discussion

1:00 p.m. Adjourn

Next ISC meeting, Friday, December 3, 12:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m. Note: If you would like to present an update at the December ISC meeting, please let Khrys and/or Denise know. Thank you!



**Center for Transformative Research in Metabolism (TRiM)
Internal Steering Committee Meeting (ISC), Draft Minutes
Friday, September 24, 12:00 to 1:00 p.m., Virtual Meeting by Zoom**

Call to order: Chair Khrys Duddleston welcomed all and called the meeting to order at 12:06 p.m.

I. Attendance: UAA representatives present included Khrys Duddleston, PhD (ISC Chair and Project 2 PI) and Eric Henderson (AIMS Core, Lab Manager). UAF representatives were Kelly Drew, PhD (TRiM Director and PI), Robert “Trey” Coker, PhD (Project 3 PI), Anya Goropashnaya, PhD (Project 1 & Pilot Project PI), Carl Murphy, PhD (HaMR Core Leader and MIF Manager), Oivind Toien, PhD (HaMR Core and Pilot Project PI), Scott Jerome, PhD (HaMR Core), Pat Rivera (Admin Core), Hoshi Sugiura (Admin Core), Sheri Coker, PhD (Project 3), Larry Duffy, PhD (Dept. of Chemistry/Biochemistry), and Denise Daniello (Admin Core). Nagesh C. Shanbhag, MBBS, MSc, PhD (University of Sweden) and Jen Danielson (Goldstream Group) also joined the meeting.

II. Agenda, 9.24.2021: Hearing no objections or additions, the agenda was approved.

III. Draft Minutes, 7.2.2021: A motion to approve the minutes was made by Trey and seconded by Carl with no objections. Minutes were approved by poll results.

IV. Announcements: Trey shared the news that the ITHS five-year NIH renewal grant request was approved in the amount of \$63 million dollars, which is important for the Pacific Northwest region served by ITHS (Institute of Translational Health Sciences, based at the University of Washington). Trey worked with ITHS on this successful application.

V. Old Business: Joint INBRE-Retreat and polling results from TRiM’s retreat.

Kelly prefaced this discussion by stating her hope for the retreat to provide direction for the Center going forward. Much of the retreat is focused on team building, much needed as we have not been able to meet in-person for some time. Kelly expressed her appreciation in advance to everyone for their participation in the retreat and thoughtful input. She also thanked Denise for helping to organize the retreat and the ITHS facilitators who worked with the Admin Core regarding the agenda, by offering ideas and resources. Kelly discussed the intent behind the EAC recommendations which is to provide ideas and suggestions about how to make the Center more successful, even though we might find some of their recommendations off target. The EAC members are well-respected in the scientific community, Kelly explained, and have a solid track record of long-term NIH funding. We “pay” them to give us ideas and suggestions to make the Center more competitive and successful. Kelly noted that we should think of the EAC members more as “mentors” helping us to succeed and grow sustainably as a Center.

Denise reviewed the status of the retreat planning. TRiM submitted a request proposal to INBRE asking for their support for a joint retreat. INBRE accepted TRiM’s proposal and offered to provide generous support to cover our costs in exchange for TRiM’s participation and assistance with retreat logistics.

However, in August, INBRE decided to postpone the October retreat to spring 2022 due to rising COVID cases and the challenges of holding an in-person meeting.

VI. New Business: Discussion of the Retreat Agenda

In light of INBRE's decision, TRiM polled our staff to ask if we should postpone TRiM's retreat to coincide with INBRE's or to go ahead and schedule for this fall either in a virtual or face-to-face setting. ISC members indicated their support for an on-line retreat, due to personal safety concerns about COVID, and to move forward with scheduling TRiM's retreat this fall. Thirty-nine percent of those polled indicated their preference for scheduling 2 hours on a Friday during TRiM's Journal Club with the rest of the retreat scheduled for a Saturday. (Four scheduling options were proposed.) Overall, those responding indicated support for the proposed agenda items, especially for developing the EAC Action Plan which garnered the highest number of votes cast (67%). Training in Team Science Principles and Team Building Activities, each receiving 33% of the votes cast, received the lowest support, which some observed may have resulted from a lack of information about these activities. We also asked TRiM participants to tell us if any of the proposed agenda items should be excluded. TRiM team building activities, research updates, and collaboration planning received a couple of votes each as possible items to omit. At a follow-up poll conducted the following week during Journal Club, those present indicated their support for scheduling the retreat on Oct. 1-2, as this was the original date many had already reserved on their calendar when the original INBRE-TRiM joint retreat was being discussed. Favorable time slots were 11 a.m.-1 p.m. on Friday, Oct. 1 and 11 a.m. to 3 p.m. on Saturday, Oct. 2, according to the polling results. Denise noted that an important outcome from the retreat will be to develop a response to the EAC recommendations that can be shared and discussed with EAC members at an upcoming meeting to be scheduled. TRiM's grant calls for two meetings with the EAC annually. The first EAC meeting for 2021 was held in June.

Kelly walked through the 2-day retreat agenda noting that Day 1 would focus on team science training and Day 2 for EAC Action Plan discussion and resource sharing. She also noted the Happy Hour planned for Friday afternoon and described the "meme game" activity planned. The Admin Core worked with the Institute of Translational Health Sciences (ITHS) to develop an interactive agenda that included training in team science principles and skills; TRiM discussion of identified EAC recommendations; and resource sharing of research and cores by investigators and core leaders. Nine EAC recommendations of the original 21 were identified for the retreat's discussion while the remaining were reserved for future Journal Club sessions and follow-up administrative meetings.

Trey offered two recommendations regarding the retreat for consideration. First, he suggested that we invite input from TRiM's committees regarding the EAC recommendations and to pass along an invite to members of the President's Professors, Translational Advisory Committee and the Strategic Advisory Committee to the retreat. Second, Trey noted that TRiM's investigators should have been more involved in developing the retreat's agenda and selecting the specific items for discussion. Kelly agreed but explained that according to the grant, the ISC is charged with discussing the EAC report and as a group, coming up with a plan to address the recommendations. As we have not had time to develop a plan with the ISC, Kelly noted, this conversation was moved over to the retreat. Jennifer Sprecher, with the ITHS, helped to develop the agenda by grouping similar EAC recommendations together to create "concepts" for the breakout discussion sessions while holding back others for Journal Club discussions and future administrative meetings. The items selected by ITHS for TRiM discussion were ones that were thought to benefit from our group's collective guidance. As requested by the ISC at the July 2021 meeting, Denise created a spreadsheet of TRiM's committee discussions that showed some alignment with the EAC

recommendations. This document was shared with the ISC and suggested that it could be used as a reference document for the EAC Action Plan discussion.

Trey observed that the ISC should make more time to have these important conversations involving the retreat and the EAC recommendations and to begin earlier with planning activities. Better planning, he explained, results in enhanced participation and faculty engagement. Pulling together the retreat was done too quickly and decisions should have been made by COBRE investigators, not outside organizations. Others agreed with Trey's observation but also noted that the August ISC meeting was cancelled due to a lack of attendance when the retreat's agenda would have been discussed in more detail.

Khrys suggested that we move forward and use the agenda as presented with changes, as needed, regarding the EAC items identified for discussion. She suggested that we ask ITHS to make modifications to the retreat's agenda as follows:

1. Allow participants the ability to move in and out of EAC Action Plan breakout sessions so that they may contribute to more than one breakout session, if they so choose.
2. Respond to requests for changes to EAC recommendations during the EAC Action Plan breakout sessions as we may want to focus on fewer recommendations than those currently scheduled.
3. Remove EAC item #15 from breakout discussion because productive collaborations are "organic" in nature.
4. Use one room for Research Sharing, instead of multiple breakout sessions, so that everyone hears what is being shared in order to increase awareness and opportunities for collaborations.

Khrys also suggested that we decide a date for the interim EAC meeting soon as people make travel plans for the winter break. Using TRiM's calendar, to be sent out by Dawniel Dupee, TRiM's key personnel will be asked to identify dates when they would not be available for the interim EAC meeting.

The November ISC meeting was rescheduled to December 3rd because the original date conflicted with the Thanksgiving holiday. Dr. Anya Goropashnaya's Journal Club presentation on December 3rd was rescheduled to December 10 with her approval.

VII Adjourn: The meeting adjourned at 1:18 p.m.

Next meeting: Friday, October 29, 2021, 12:00 noon to 1:00 p.m.

Center for TRiM Retreat Feedback Survey Report 2021

October 2021

Prepared for:

Center for Transformative Research in Metabolism (TRiM)

Kelly Drew and Denise Daniello

University of Alaska Fairbanks

Prepared by:

Goldstream Group

PO Box 83418

Fairbanks Alaska 99708

www.goldstreamgroup.com

Trina Resari-Salao, Evaluation Consultant

Jennifer Danielson, Evaluation Consultant

The TRiM program hosted a team retreat on October 1&2, 2021. Though the original plan was to have an in-person retreat in collaboration with INBRE, the agenda and format had to change to a shorter, online format because of local health concerns. The workshop was facilitated by representatives from ITHS (Institute of Translational Health Sciences) and the revised meeting agenda had three objectives:

1. Gain one or more new skill(s) to facilitate a team approach
2. Better understanding of team members' communication style
3. Build camaraderie and enhance desire to collaborate

The following are the results of the feedback survey collected anonymously from the participants in the week following the retreat.

Survey response

13 retreat participants responded to the survey. Not all participants answered every question.

Satisfaction

The first section of the survey was about satisfaction. Responses are shown in Table 1. Most respondents reported general satisfaction with the retreat. Fifty percent or more of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with eight of the 11 statements on satisfaction. Of particular note, 91.7% of respondents indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that interactions between participants were collegial. The weakest response was for “the timing of the retreat was good for my schedule;” this is also the only statement that a respondent strongly disagreed with.

Table 1. 2021 TRiM Retreat Feedback: Satisfaction

	n	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly Agree
The meeting was a good use of my time	12	0.0%	16.7%	41.7%	33.3%	8.3%
Activities were carefully planned	12	0.0%	16.7%	25.0%	25.0%	33.3%
The objectives of the meeting were clear	12	0.0%	8.3%	8.3%	58.3%	25.0%
Time was used effectively.	12	0.0%	8.3%	41.7%	25.0%	25.0%
The presenters were effective instructors	12	0.0%	8.3%	16.7%	50.0%	25.0%
The facilitators were effective leaders	12	0.0%	8.3%	25.0%	33.3%	33.3%
The timing of the retreat was good for my schedule	12	8.3%	33.3%	33.3%	16.7%	8.3%

My questions and concerns were addressed	12	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	0.0%
Interactions between participants were collegial	12	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	50.0%	41.7%
The distance delivery format was effective	11	0.0%	18.2%	27.3%	45.5%	9.1%
An appropriate balance between presentation and interaction was achieved	12	0.0%	8.3%	16.7%	58.3%	16.7%

Takeaways

The second section of the survey was about participant takeaways. Responses are shown in Table 2. Participant responses were mixed. More than half of respondents indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that they 1) have a better understanding of team members’ communication styles and 2) have drafted actions in response to EAC recommendations. The weakest responses were for 1) learning one or more new skill(s) to facilitate a team approach, 2) building team camaraderie and enhanced desire to collaborate, and 3) creating opportunities to share ideas about each other's projects.” It is worth noting that no participants strongly disagreed with any of the statements.

Table 2. 2021 TRiM Retreat Feedback: Takeaways

	n	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly Agree
I learned one or more new skill(s) to facilitate a team approach	12	0.0%	8.3%	50.0%	33.3%	8.3%
I have a better understanding of team members’ communication style	12	0.0%	8.3%	33.3%	50.0%	8.3%
We built team camaraderie and enhanced desire to collaborate	12	0.0%	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%
We have drafted actions in response to EAC recommendations	12	0.0%	8.3%	33.3%	41.7%	16.7%
We created opportunities to share ideas about each other's projects.	12	0.0%	8.3%	50.0%	33.3%	8.3%

Value

The third part of the survey asked participants to assess how valuable the retreat was to them. Overall, the participants found value in the retreat. The majority of participants, after we removed those who indicated that an item was “not applicable”, found all specified aspects of the retreat to be moderately or very valuable. All respondents reported that they

found the research sharing presentations to be moderately or very valuable. Details are in Table 3. In addition, participants could rate the value of the whole retreat on a scale of one to ten stars. Ratings varied widely, with participants selecting ratings from three to 10 stars. The average rating was 6.3 stars; see Table 4.

Table 3. 2021 TRiM Retreat Feedback: Valuable Content

	n	Not at all Valuable	Slightly Valuable	Moderately Valuable	Very Valuable
The sessions on Team Science Principles including personal styles and empathetic listening	12	0.0%	16.7%	58.3%	25.0
The sessions and breakout rooms to discuss EAC suggestions	11	0.0%	36.3%	18.1%	45.4%
My PSI report	12	16.7%	16.7%	41.7%	25.0%
Learning about the communication styles of my colleagues	12	0.0%	16.7%	50.0%	33.3%
The research sharing presentations	12	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Happy hour	8	25.0%	12.5%	37.5%	12.5%

Table 4. 2021 TRiM Retreat Feedback: Overall Value (n=13)

	3 Stars	4 Stars	5 Stars	6 Stars	7 Stars	8 Stars	9 Stars	10 Stars
Count	1	2	2	1	4	1	1	1
Percent of Response	7.7%	15.4%	15.4%	7.7%	30.8%	7.7%	7.7%	7.7%

Open Response

Open response questions let respondents more freely assess the retreat. All open responses are included below.

What was most satisfying about the TRiM Retreat?

- *The most satisfying thing was to hear that others share similar concerns and have ideas for solutions*
- *Ideas about possible collaboration*
- *I'm not sure about satisfying, but probably the most helpful was the instructions/discussions lead by the presenters from UW.*
- *Break out rooms that allowed for more discussion*
- *Got to know research/pilot projects that I was not really familiar with. And also had an opportunity to talk in small groups.*

- *It was good to meet with people though I would prefer in person.*
- *The opportunity to discuss strengths and limitations with faculty from UAA.*
- *That we got it done and got substantive input on the EAC comments.*
- *Developing responses to the EAC Action Plan.*
- *Reiterating the EAC recommendations and proposing projects to fulfill those recommendations.*

What was least satisfying about the TRiM retreat?

- *The least satisfying thing was the amount of prep-work, emails, changes in schedules, additional emails, etc.*
- *Too much discussion/confusion about what was supposed to be happening. Obviously too few people did the pre-work and/or paid attention to instructions*
- *The team science portion took more time than it should have.*
- *Having to spend Saturday as ‘retreat’.*
- *break room work moderately in zoom environment.*
- *The retreat agenda was planned and developed without any definitive feedback from project PI's and/or Core Leaders.*
- *The virtual format was as good as it could be, but really falls short in supporting conversation!*
- *Scheduling on a Saturday, but necessary given everyone's busy schedules.*
- *That it was held during the transition season from fall to winter which is a very busy time with unpredictable weather. The lull seasons are best for meetings i.e. third week of July, August or February.*
- *No complaints*

Will you use the information you learned about communication styles to improve your interactions with TRiM team members?

Responses to this question were coded into three categories and summarized in Table 5. One-word responses are only accounted for in the table, and longer responses are listed below.

Table 5. 2021 TRiM Retreat Feedback: Likelihood to use the communication style information (n=10)

Response	Count	Percent of Response
Yes	7	70%
No	1	10%
Maybe	2	20%

- *Yes! I was sorry that all people were not comfortable sharing their styles.*
- *Yes. Appreciated learning new communication skills and the concept of "psychological safety" for team work.*
- *I will. I hope that those who really don't put effort into improving their communication interactions and tools, now have the desire to practice these skills.*

How can the retreat be more valuable to you and your work with the TRiM project?

- *First, narrow the scope and keep the workload within the confines (hours) of the retreat. A retreat should spark curiosity and rejuvenate one's zeal for the subject (in this case, research). I felt like this retreat was merely "checking the boxes" from a template of what a retreat should look like. I felt no inspiration. Much of this may have to do with COVID and a zoom mode of delivery.*
- *More time for research presentations needed*
- *Team building activities should be in person. The different discussion groups should've been randomized more. I kept getting teamed up with the same people.*
- *Need to bring in more people*
- *It would have been nice to do the retreat in person, but I understand that it was better 'virtual' at the moment. I enjoyed the retreat! Thank you!!!*
- *To me, involving in a group activity gives a better understanding of how to communicate with each other.*
- *An in person format will be helpful*
- *The retreat showed the value of the collective IQ when we are all together in brainstorming activities using psychological safety norms and what we can achieve.*
- *Spend time actually working on action plans for the EAC recommendations. Also, have members practice the communication skills with intention; these skills have to be encouraged and practiced constantly for them to become habit. That is very important, because what is the point of spending time and money taking the personal style and versatility test if we don't actively use the techniques?*