

**National Institutes of Health
Review Users Group Meeting Minutes
6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 3087
Bethesda, Maryland**

November 9, 2006

Present: Paul Rushing (chair: NIDDK); Luci Roberts (CSR); Daniel Fox (eRA); Tracy Soto (eRA), Derek Gault (eRA); Tina Faunteroy (eRA); Karen Trowbridge (eRA); Samuel Smith (eRA); Scarlett Gibb (eRA); Richard Kostriken (CSR); Jon Ivins (CSR); Ev Sinnett (CSR); Weihua Luo (CSR); Thamas Tatham (CSR); Khalid Masood (CSR); Phuong Pham (NCCAM); Michael Small (NCI); Lynn Amende (NCI); Rina Das (NHLBI); Bitu Nakhai (NIA); Roberta Binder (NIAID); Marita Hopman (NICHD); Mary Kelley (NIDCR); Nichelle Johnson (NIDCR); Neal Musto (NIDDK); Ernie Lyons (NINDS); Zoe Huang (NLM); Kishena Wadhvani (AHRQ); Leroy Worth (by teleconference; NIEHS)

1) Round robin of Introductions

Old Business

2) Paul Rushing reported on the Multi-component focus group

- Two meetings have occurred and no future meetings are scheduled, future meetings will be scheduled as needed,
- A handout summarizing the enhancement that explicitly affect multi-component projects and sub projects have been requested was circulated
- Enhancements in Peer Review will take effect in December:
 - Show/Hide sub projects
 - PI name will appear with each subproject
 - Subproject conflicts will appear on all reports
- Enhancements to the IAR site:
 - Show/Hide sub projects
 - PI name will appear with each subproject
 - Critique numbers will correspond to subprojects so that they sort as would be desired
- In addition, amended subprojects will rollover with the project

Question: can we adjust the order of review after the meeting so that the order of the subprojects in the summary statements is not the same as the order they were discussed in the meeting?

Answer: The review order that is in place when the meeting is released is the one that will be used to generate preliminary summary statements.

3) Tracy Soto reported on amendments and improvements to J2EE, a handout (attached) that was circulated contains these items

- Conflict sort problem has been fixed.
 - A question was raised about whether the problem with the sort order in which the conflicts were entered. This should also be fixed.
- Quick assign also is back online.
- A list of changes scheduled for 12/1 and 12/15 was presented

A question was raised about whether multiple PIs could be shown on the reviewer Scoring Sheet report? Would a show-hide button work for this? That seems like a reasonable solution that would accommodate everyone

A question was raised about whether the Client server version of Peer Review still be taken down in December? There are still bugs and the code freeze is going to prevent new fixes. There also

have been no training on the new platform. It is looking like the client server will not be taken down until after the code freeze is lifted in March

A question was raised about why the J2EE version is so slow? J2EE should be faster than client server shouldn't it? It is faster once the screens are loaded into the cache, but a client server platform will usually be faster than a web-based system.

New Business

4) The label on the button in Peer Review says "Budget Comments" but that is not what the label puts onto the face page or the second page of the SSs.

- There was discussion of the difference between budget overlap and budget recommendations and there is no button or label on the face page for budget overlap, adding a button for overlap might be a consideration for the future
- The committee voted (twice) to change the label to Budget Recommendations

5) Tina Faunteroy presented about the IAR Helpdesk

- Wants to find ways to partner with RUG to reduce Helpdesk call load and improve services
- Can no longer change reviewers' data
- Wants to present the top IAR requests in order to try to resolve them *en masse*:
 - When setting up the roster, the wrong person is chosen because of similar names in IMPAC2. Subsequently, when the IAR account is enabled, the wrong reviewer is enabled or a new, duplicative reviewer account is enabled, prompting the reviewer to create a new commons account. Then the reviewer cannot access the IAR site using the correct Commons account because that profile is not the one on the roster.
- Problem with users not being able to connect to IAR because they were not logging out correctly has been fixed, but users need to log out using the log out button.
- Problem with SRA unfamiliarity with meeting phases
 - There still is a problem with training; there are videos from the training in the Commons but people may not be aware of them
 - **Action Item:** Luci will get in touch with Scarlet and get a list of the training resources and distribute it to RUG members.
- Problem with reviewers not being able to access the meeting
 - This is most often because the MLG profile is incorrect, reviewer or the entire site is not enabled, or the reviewer never activated their account
- A number of suggestions were provided including being able to see the reviewers' screens, making training documents more widely available and user-friendly, videos, other informational support more widely available
 - The comment was made that SRAs need training in the modules, as well as the IAR site. Training is no longer included in the eRA budget.
 - A question was raised about whether, if CSR offered training in conjunction with eRA staff and posted it in video format on their web site, IC's would exploit this resource and whether they would feel excluded if training were offered in this context. The response from RUG members was that the IC's would use the videos, and would not feel excluded from the training process if they were invited to these sessions.

6) Luci Demonstrated the Quick Assign feature in J2EE Peer Review

- She pointed out along the way that the menu in J2EE makes you click through the group headings for the individual screens. These group headings are not linked to anything in the client server version of Peer Review, and they may seem unfamiliar

- A question was raised about why there are no pull-down menus. The decision was made long ago not to incorporate the additional programming that would be required to support pull-down menus, but it is not impossible to add them in the future. They are not available now.
- On the List of Applications screen, where Quick Assign is located, there is a Query Parameters window at the top. The question was raised about whether this window was really needed. The list can be sorted in ascending and descending order all of the columns on the page, and the browser menu also contains a “find in page” function (Ctrl-F) that can be used to locate a specific application. The query parameters window takes up space that could be used for the list of applications. RUG members were asked if anyone felt that they needed this Query Parameters window and no one indicated that they needed it.
 - a. A question was raised about whether there is any way to know whether anyone ever uses the Query Parameters window? There is no way to monitor its use.
 - b. There was agreement that the window can be removed.
- The Quick Assign feature was demonstrated as well as some of the other features on the list of applications screen
 - a. Luci raised a final issue pertaining to the electronic applications, which was that applicants have been violating quite egregiously the limits specified in the PAs for the number of published papers they can submit. They also are submitted Adobe versions of papers that can be easily obtained online, contrary to the instructions in the PA, and submitting Adobe documents that contain unpublished, and in some cases, “in preparation” manuscripts.
 - b. The comment was made that they were also appending several manuscripts together into a single attachment in order to circumvent the limits, making it necessary to actually go into each attachment and look to see how many papers are there.
 - c. When E-Corrections becomes available, we will be able to remove these appendix materials, but in the meantime, all we can really do is let the reviewers know that they should not consider all of these additional materials.

7) The last issue that was raised pertains to whether mail reviewers should be allowed to assign preliminary scores on the IAR site.

- It was agreed that RUG members should go back to their ICs review staff and get input about this.
- A RUG member raised the point that mail reviewers are recruited to address very specific areas of expertise and may not be well qualified to comment on the entire application. Therefore it is inappropriate for them to provide a score.
- A RUG member asked if it might be best to make this functionality an option on the Control Center screen.
- It was agreed to take this issue up next month.