

Review User Group (RUG) Meeting Minutes

September 14, 2006 2:00–3:30 pm in Room 3087/Rockledge 2

Meeting called to order at 2:00 p.m.

In Attendance: Paul Rushing (NIDDK), Luci Roberts (CSR), Tracey Soto (eRA), Daniel Fox (eRA), Mark Siegert (eRA), Derek Gault (eRA), Vicky Fadeley (eRA), Richard Kostriken (CSR), Jon Ivins (CSR), Ev Sinnett (CSR), Jeannette Hosseini (NCCAM), Lynn Amende (NCI), Lorrita Watson (NCMHD), John Glowa (NCRR), Steve Birken (NCRR), Keith McKenney (NHGRI), David Wilson (NHLBI), Roberta Binder (NIAID), Michael Bloom (NIAMS), David George (NIBIB), Rita Anand (NICHD), Jerry McLaughlin (NIDA), Mary Kelley (NIDCR), Neal Musto (NIDDK), John Richters (NINR), Zoe Huang (NLM), Chris Langrub (CDC), Kishena Wadhani (AHRQ), Weihua Luo (CSR), Behrouz Shabestari (CSR), Phyllis Artis (DEAS), LeRoy Worth (NIEHS)

- Luci Roberts chaired this meeting, welcomed everyone and asked all in attendance to introduce themselves.
- Announcement made that upload of Draft Summary Statements in WordPerfect format to the REV module of IMPAC II will be discontinued.
- Chairperson asked the meeting to vote on prioritizing the following enhancements. Consideration should be on the basis of being able to work remotely in an emergency most effectively.

1. Pre-Formatted Preliminary Summary Statements

Issues discussed:

- Will this work for all Mechanisms? Multiple Project applications?
- Unknown at this time.
- How will the system clean up the Reviewer critiques? There will be limited (if any) clean up of the submitted critiques.

Note: There is a new macro available from Tom Tatham. There are some issues with download / update of Summary Statement macro that have delayed its distribution to CSR staff, but training in the use of the new version is ongoing and it is available to the ICs. Luci will forward the information needed to obtain the new macro to RUG for further distribution (done 9-15-2006).

2. 2. Electronic Conflicts of Interest Forms

Issues discussed:

- Security/ Confidentiality
- How reviewers would access the forms
- FACA policy: Are electronic signatures accepted for COI
- How reviewers would submit the form
- Meeting minutes and both pre- and post meeting conflicts forms would be needed

3. Virtual CD

Issues discussed:

- Security / Confidentiality of applications
- Can all aspects of the actual CD be replicated in the IAR system? (Currently, all the information on the CD can be made available in IAR, although the program announcements and review guidelines must be uploaded into the IAR site manually. It is not in a one button operation.)
- Performance issues with heavy use during meetings
- Internet access at the meeting site
- Will this be an unnecessary burden to the reviewers?

There was a vote taken to determine which priority each of the above enhancements should have and the vote results were:

1. Electronic Conflict of Interest forms
2. Pre-Formatted Preliminary Summary Statements
3. Virtual CD

Volunteers were solicited to serve on a focus group for Electronic Conflict of Interest.

- J2EE Peer Review Module. Pilot open to all users. Please encourage everyone to use it and report any problems to the analyst. The goal is to shut down the client server by the end of the year and we need user input on issues they may have with the new J2EE version.

Some of the issues reported were with the assignment screen and system Performance.

Problems with the J2EE Peer Review Module should be reported to the **ORIS Peer Review J2EE Support** distribution list, which can be found on the global address list.

- Discussed an upcoming enhancement for IAR Final Score Implementation. There was a spirited discussion on the pros and cons of using this enhancement and when it should be used to its maximum benefit.
 - Concern was raised about reliance on a tool that might suffer performance issues with heavy use during meetings, and that there may be unreliable internet access at the meeting site
 - A modification of the proposed tool was voted on and approved that would, by default, hide the “calculated score” column on the Final Scores List of Applications page, and provide a “show” button that could be clicked to reveal this column.

4. Multi-Component Focus Group

Paul Rushing proposed that a multi-component focus group be formed to begin to discuss potential modifications to the Peer Review module, IAR, etc. in order to better accommodate multi-component applications (e.g., P30s, P50s, P01s). He asked that anyone interested in participating in the group contact him.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

dg

Addendum: RUG members were welcomed to stay after adjournment to hear discussion with the eRA programmers whether modifications to the IAR site were necessary and possible to better accommodate asynchronous electronic discussions. It was agreed that this issue should be discussed at the October meeting.

The next RUG meeting is scheduled for October 12, 2006 2:00–3:30 p.m. in Room 3087/Rockledge 2.