



## eCGAP Focus Group

---

**Date:** Monday, December 20, 2004  
**Time:** 1:30 –3:00 p.m.  
**Location:** Rockledge 1, Room 2198  
**Advocate:** Jennifer Flach

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday, January 4, 9 a.m. to 11 a.m., Rockledge 1, Room 2198

---

### Actions Items

1. (Sara Silver) Investigate possibility of developing a Cool Tool so that Receipt and Referral staffers and/or Integrated Review Group Chiefs/Scientific Review Administrators can run a query on e-applications that are residing in the “three-day lag period”; update group at the next meeting.
2. (Sara Silver) Consult different ICs about the data fields they might require in a report generated by a Cool Tools query designed to list the e-applications assigned to a specific IC.
3. (All) Suggest data fields for a report generated by a Cool Tools query designed to list the e-applications assigned to a specific IC for review.
4. (All) Review and comment on proposed rules for verification.
5. (Jennifer Flach) Assemble or work with Scarlett Gibb to assemble a “canned” set of slides and a script on e-applications for SRAs and/or POs to present at various forums.
6. (Jennifer Flach) Consult Scarlett Gibb about implementing a formal communication/outreach plan for eCGAP initiatives before the system goes “open access;” forward Scarlett the list of communication methods/venues suggested by eCGAP Focus Group.

### Handouts

- eCGAP Notifications Handout  
[http://era.nih.gov/docs/Slides\\_Lags\\_e-notifications\\_eCGAP\\_Focus-Group-12-20-04.pdf](http://era.nih.gov/docs/Slides_Lags_e-notifications_eCGAP_Focus-Group-12-20-04.pdf)
- Verification Rules Handout  
[http://era.nih.gov/docs/Handout\\_Verification\\_Rules\\_eCGAP\\_Focus\\_Group\\_12-20-04.pdf](http://era.nih.gov/docs/Handout_Verification_Rules_eCGAP_Focus_Group_12-20-04.pdf)

### e-Notification Solutions for eCGAP System

At the last focus group meeting, Suzanne Fisher asked how a Receipt and Referral (R&R) staffer would know that an e-application was in a “three-day lag period”—the time between the Referral Officer saying “go” and the time the application is formally released from R&R.

Having agreed to investigate Suzanne’s question, Sara Silver presented her recent findings to the group. She explained that when an eCGAP application is assigned to an Integrated Review Group

(IRG), a lag of three business days ensues before the application is released from R&R. The status is “Application Entered,” the process stage is “Sent to Print Shop,” and the application will not appear on the eCGAP Referral Hitlist (but would appear in View Application Status).

Currently, Receipt and Referral users are not notified that an e-application is in a three-day lag period. The group felt that some means of informing Receipt and Referral users that an application is residing in a three-day lag would be very helpful. The group agreed that it would also be helpful if users could view (at the individual grant level) any changes that the R&R staffers make to the application before it is formally released from R&R. Sara said that a good long-term solution may involve featuring some kind display marker in the Peer Review module to denote applications that are in a three-day lag or building in some kind of e-notification. However, for February, she might be able to set up a query where users could access a list of e-applications that are residing in a three-day lag period; this, she said, might be a good short-term solution.

Sara also explained that, currently, IRG Chiefs/Scientific Review Administrators are not notified when an e-application is in a three-day lag period and will be soon approaching. The group felt that IRG Chiefs should have some kind of a warning.

Sara asked group members whether they would prefer a query or a notification to inform them about e-applications residing in a three-day lag period. Group members seemed to agree that a query would be more helpful, as notifications could become cumbersome and overwhelming. As a short-term solution, Sara said that she would look into the possibility of developing a Cool Tool so that RR staffers and/or IRG Chiefs/SRAs can run a query on e-applications that are residing in a three-day lag period. Both IRG Chiefs/SRAs and R&R staff could use this query. Sara agreed to investigate this possibility and update the group at the next focus group meeting.

**Action: (Sara Silver) Investigate possibility of developing a Cool Tool so that RR staffers and/or IRG Chiefs/SRAs can run a query on e-applications that are residing in the “three-day lag period;” update group at the next meeting.**

Sara also informed the group about her findings regarding the current notification system when an e-application is released from Receipt and Referral. When an application is released, the status is displayed as “Pending IRG Review” and an email is sent to the IRG Chief (or to the SRA). If a study section is assigned, an email is sent to the Principal Investigator (PI) and the Signing Official (SO). PIs can also log on to Commons to view the study section assignment and the email sent to PIs/SOs is held for three business days from the Division of Receipt and Referral (DRR) release date.

Finally, Sara updated the group on what is yet to be accomplished regarding notifications and solicited the group’s ideas for potential solutions:

- *Currently, if the e-application is assigned to an IC for review, there is no email sent. Where should this email be sent?—*The group said that it would very helpful if a single, compiled, comprehensive email were sent at the end of the day rather than several emails throughout the day. However, the group felt that e-notifications such as these would only work if users had the ability to customize how frequently they would like to receive the email, what information they’d like to see in the email, etc. However, knowing to whom to send this email is tricky because ICs have their own unique workflow and designated

authority. Sara said that until an organizational hierarchy is determined—and until there is a way to successfully identify the emails of IRG Chiefs—a query will have to suffice as a means of obtaining information on what IC an application has been assigned to for review.

- *At this point, there is no email sent to anyone in the IC. Should we build this into “Cool Tools?” Should we add a query to Web QT? Should we send an e-notification? Long-term, how should this be incorporated within business areas?*—The group agreed that developing a Cool Tool query for February would be a good short-term solution. Sara said that she would begin consulting different ICs about the kinds of data fields they might require in a report generated by a Cool Tools query. She asked group members to consider data fields as well and to bring examples to the next meeting.

**Action: (Sara Silver) Consult different ICs about the data fields they might require in a report generated by a Cool Tools query designed to list the e-applications assigned to a specific IC for review.**

**Action: (All) Suggest data fields for a report generated by a Cool Tools query designed to list the e-applications assigned to a specific IC for review.**

In response to the question about adding another query to Web QT, David Wright commented that such a solution was excellent but would only be possible in the future. As for e-notifications, the group felt that they would be helpful, but only if a single e-notification was sent at the end of the day and if users could customize the information displayed in that notification. Finally, the group felt that it would be important to ensure that e-notifications were suitable for the wide range of IC and business area needs.

## Verification Plans

Sara distributed a handout listing proposed verification rules for handling receipt deadlines of e-applications: (ENTER URL to HANDOUT).

The group reviewed the handout and asked Sara to clarify what happens when a PI rejects an application after reviewing it. Sara explained that currently PIs are asked to send in a paper version of the application. Group members asked if the original electronic application is stored in addition to the scanned paper application. Sara said that both are stored, but the scanned paper application (in this particular case) would be viewable by NIH. However, if NIH needed to compare the two applications, this could be done.

Finally, Sara asked group members to email her if they wish to contribute any additional comments about the proposed verification rules.

**Action: (All) Review and comment on proposed rules for verification.**

## eCGAP Outreach

Jennifer Flach said that before eCGAP goes “open access,” it is essential that PIs and SOs understand the importance of thoroughly reviewing an application during verification. Jennifer

asked the group how the eCGAP group might effectively communicate this message to PIs and SOs. The group contributed the following:

- Describe the electronic application process and the role of the Service Providers.
- Develop a “stock” host of slides and a script that SRAs and Program Officials could present when attending conferences.
- Feature a segment on e-applications at an NIH Regional Workshop.
- Distribute handouts/brochures on e-applications at booths during conferences, workshops, training sessions.
- Feature FAQs on the eRA website and/or NIH eRA Commons website.
- Present “canned” set of slides during Scientific Society meetings.
- Publish article in *Peer Review Notes* that is distributed during Study Section meetings. The deadline for the next edition is in early January.
- Submit press releases about e-applications to professional scientific societies; have Dr. Zerhouni push these releases. This might ignite interest in submitting e-applications for the June 10 deadline.
- Include a notice on Notice of Grant Awards that says “For your next application, please consider submitting electronically...”
- Publish advertisements in *Chronicles of Higher Education, Science, etc.*
- Feature a banner/write-up on the main grants page on the NIH website.
- Present “canned” slides during Council.

Jennifer thanked the group for their excellent contributions and said that the next step would be to develop a “canned” set of slides and a corresponding script for SRAs and POs to present at various forums. She said that she would also consult Scarlett Gibb, Branch Chief for eRA Planning, Communications, and Outreach, about implementing these suggestions via a formal communications/outreach plan.

**Action: (Jennifer Flach) Assemble or work with Scarlett Gibb to assemble a “canned” set of slides and a script on e-applications for SRAs and/or POs to present at various forums.**

**Action: (Jennifer Flach) Consult Scarlett Gibb about implementing a formal communication/outreach plan for eCGAP initiatives before the system goes “open access;” forward Scarlett the list of communication methods/venues suggested by eCGAP Focus Group.**

## **Review of Action Items from Dec. 7 Meeting**

1. (Jennifer Flach) Take discussion about how to integrate OPDIVs’ workflow with NIH workflow format to outside group and share outcome with the eCGAP Focus Group. *Will meet with Planning, Communications and Outreach Branch chief and update group at next meeting.*

2. (eCGAP team) Work on accomplishing some type of notification by the February/March timeframe so ICs and Review Groups have sense of workflow coming their way. Work on long-term plans for integrating workflow plan for OPDIVs. ***Still obtaining feedback from the Service Providers.***
3. (Sara Silver) Check on how Receipt & Referral staffers know that they are in the three-day lag period. ***Done.***
4. (Jennifer Flach) Follow up with Commons staffers to see why AHRQ (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality) information cannot be viewed in Commons. ***Making some progress.***
5. (All) Review revised electronic corrections feature list and send comments back via email. ***Discuss feature list at the next meeting.***
6. (All) Review group purpose statement and roster and send comments/changes back via email. ***Done.***

## **Attendees**

Armistead, Allyson (LTS)	Panniers, Richard (CSR)	Swain, Amy (NCRR)
Fisher, Suzanne (CSR)	Silver, Sara (OER)	Tatham, Thomas (CSR)
Flach, Jennifer (OER)	Sinnet, Everett (CSR)	Wehrle, Janna (NIGMS)
Goodman, Michael (OD)	Stanfield, Brett (CSR)	
Long, Kelly (HRSA)	Stick, Melissa (NIDCD)	