



Committee Management User's Group (CMUG)

Meeting Date: November 17, 2004, Wednesday
Time: 1:00–2:30 p.m.
Location: Rockledge 2, Room 7111
Advocate: Anna Snouffer
Chair: David Clary
Analyst: Sophonia Simms
Next Meeting: December 15, 1–4 p.m., Rockledge 2, Room 7111 (*note new date*)

CM Web URL: <http://apps.era.nih.gov/cm/>

Data Integrity

Maria Bukowski

Duplication of records in the IMPAC II system continues to be a problem. Although different methods have been used over the years in an attempt to decrease the duplication, the problem still exists and may grow more troublesome if appropriate measures are not taken. Currently, a Data Integrity contractor is working on this issue by scanning, collapsing, and cleaning duplicate profiles. However, this process, while effective, is proving tedious; another method needs to be determined.

Recently, Maria met with Anna Snouffer to discuss how NIH staff could more easily identify individuals in the system and more successfully match duplicate profiles. Maria concluded that one of the best and most distinct identifier is most definitely the Commons ID. Short of that, she feels that the Institution, Degree, Year, and Name are the ultimate combination of identifiers. The group, however, suggested that this combination may not be foolproof, as individuals may have multiple degrees from multiple institutions. This could become tricky.

In an attempt to understand how and why duplicate files are being created, Maria assembled a survey questionnaire for the group and asked them to complete it within the week. The questionnaire asks participants to comment on the data they enter when searching for an individual's profile, provide suggestions for additional data fields that would help users search and locate correct profiles, among other items. Maria said that before NIH can resolve duplication of profiles, it is essential to understand how users are creating these duplicates in the first place.

The group offered the following insights:

- It would be helpful to search for profiles by middle name. The group said there have been several cases where two individuals have the same name and nothing else to distinguish them; a middle name would prove immensely valuable. Maria said that the system will, eventually, require a full legal name. She believes a full legal name will help alleviate a lot of the duplication.
- The group said that there have also been a few instances of fathers and sons with the same name, the same degrees, etc. Maria asked the group to send her a list of these

troublesome instances. The group recommended that the Helpdesk be notified of this list as well so that they do not collapse the wrong profiles in the future.

Person ID Field

All

The group inquired about the difference between Person ID and Role ID. Maria said that she has been working to publish and distribute training material on this very matter. She is working with Patty Austin to post a profile handbook on the eRA website. She will update the group on any developments.

Mail Reviewers

All

At the last CMUG meeting, group members asked for the correct way to enter a mail reviewer in CM. Group members stated that when they entered the reviewer as “other person,” they could not get a voucher or 1715 report. Apparently, if the reviewer is added as ‘other person,’ there will not be any member data because it will be unavailable (grayed out). The committee type should be entered as SEP or Special Emphasis Panel for ‘other person.’ Set the travel type to ‘V’ and a voucher is created. If the mail reviewer is added as ‘other member,’ enter member type as ‘12’ and ‘Ad Hoc.’

Anna stated that one could add mail reviewers either way, but she preferred people adding them under the category ‘other person,’ because these reviewers are not regular members of the committees and should not be counted as such on end of the year reports.

Anna said that she would continue look into the matter but advised the group to continue using “Other Person” until further notice.

DEAS Questions Review

David Clary

DEAS Website: <http://extramuralmeo.nih.gov/index.asp>

David provided the answers to a series of questions about the Division of Extramural Activities Support (DEAS) that CMUG members had raised several weeks ago. He explained that the questions were submitted to Mary Frances Deutsch, Director of DEAS, and addressed by her at the last Committee Management Officers meeting:

1. *How should Extramural Support Assistants (ESA) be listed on the roster?*—ESAs should be listed as OD employees. The address should be where they are physically located.
2. *Frequently, ESAs help with various stages of a meeting. In this case, who should be listed on the meeting roster?*—Only the ESA who is physically at the meeting should be listed on the meeting roster.
3. *Who should be contacted for problems/concerns with ESAs?*—Task Leaders should be contacted first, then Employee Supervisors if necessary.
4. *Who is the direct supervisor for ESAs and Task Leaders?*—Employee Supervisors are supervisors of both. Task Leaders do not have any supervisory authority over ESAs.

5. *What is the promotion potential for the Division of Extramural Activities Support (DEAS)?*—ESAs: Grades 5/6/7. Task Leaders: Grade 8. Employee Supervisor: Grades 11/12. HUB Manager: Grades 13/14.
6. *Can we ask questions or request information from ESAs directly?*—Yes. DEAS encourages a working relationship with IC staff and ESAs.

Attendees

Armistead, Allyson (PCOB/LTS)	Kaplan, David (OD)	Simms, Sophonia (OD)
Campbell, Bonnie (AHRQ)	Kemmerle, Donna (NIDCD)	Sinnett, Everett (CSR)
Caraballo, Kim (NICHD)	Manouelian, Denise (NIDDK)	Snouffer, Anna (OD)
Clary, David (OD)	Martin, Michael (OD)	Valeda, Kathryn (NHLBI)
Colston, Carmen (AHRQ)	Reid, Cikena (NINDS)	Vilensky, Zena (NCI)
David, Tracey (OD)	Rustin, S. Lisa (NCI)	Whelan, Kate (NIMH)
Grabner, Caroline (NHLBI)	Scibek, Carol (CSR)	Wigmore, Al (NICHD)
		Willis, Virginia (NIAAA)