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The SPORE program, according to NCI policy, must be evaluated prior to the re-issuance of the Program Announcement (PAR).

SPORE PAR was re-issued in 2009 without an objective evaluation
- Reorganization of the NCI SPORE Program into DCTD from the NCI OD in 2008
- Guideline revision as a result of (1) recommendations of the GHWG of CTAC to emphasize collaborations across NCI funding mechanisms and smooth the transition points on the translational research continuum, and (2) fiscal realities
- NCAB working group reports on SPOREs and Cancer Centers:
  - 2010: To Create a Strategic Scientific Vision for the National Cancer Program and Review Progress of the National Cancer Institute

In 2011, DCTD contracted with the Science and Technology Policy Institute (STPI) to do an extensive data capture and analysis of the SPORE program.
• The Scope of Work consisted of 11 questions.

• Questions were based on the Guidelines and focused on the unique features of the SPORE as a translational research program as well as accomplishments that have had an impact on the practice of oncology.

• STPI was not asked to judge the program, but to provide the data and analysis so that the NCI Leadership (and its advisory committees) could make the ultimate judgments.
Scope of Work

1. What specific concepts or scientific findings from SPORE research have had an impact on the practice of oncology?

2. How well have SPOREs been meeting the translational goal of reaching a human end-point within the 5-year funding period?

3. How well have basic and applied scientists worked together on the design and implementation of individual research projects?

4. How well have SPOREs collaborated with other SPOREs in their own organ site or across organ sites; with other NCI networks (e.g. Cancer Centers and Cooperative Groups); with other government and non-government biomedical research mechanisms; or with industry to move important findings along the translational research pathway (with the ultimate goal of having an impact on medical practice)?
5. How well have SPOREs used the flexibility option to change research direction to have an immediate impact on improving cancer prevention, detection, diagnosis, and/or treatment?

6. How well have SPOREs fostered translational research careers?

7. How have SPOREs used the Developmental Research Program for pilot studies?

8. How well have the specialized resource Cores supported the research projects?

9. Did the Biospecimen/Pathology Core provide materials for investigators outside the SPORE?

10. How many clinical trials/studies were initiated and completed within SPOREs?

11. What are the significant publications from SPOREs since 2004?
Role of CTAC

- This presentation is to describe the process and provide information only—no voting action is required at this time.

- Comments and suggestions on process and usefulness of the data.

- The full report for the NCI Leadership will be available later in the fiscal year.