



eCGAP Focus Group

Date: Monday, February 14, 2005
Time: 1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Location: Rockledge 1, Room 2198
Advocate: Jennifer Flach

Next Meeting: Monday, March 21, 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m., Rockledge 1, Room 2198

Action Items

1. (Sara Silver) Check to see if any new institutions submitted applications for the Feb. 1 receipt date.
2. (Manju Subramanya) Send an email to the Focus Group asking them to review the improved 'Cool Tool' and send any comments to Sara Silver.
3. (Mike Goodman) Have the 424RR/agency specific forms sent out electronically via Manju and request group to send suggestions for formulating the instructions on the forms that go out to applicants. Send feedback to Mike.
4. (Jennifer Flach, Mike Goodman) Arrange for Office of Research Services staffers to give presentation at future eCGAP Focus Group meeting

Update on Feb. 1 Submissions

Jennifer Flach

Jennifer reported that eCGAP received 19 applications electronically for the Feb. 1 receipt date. A similar number of applications are expected for the March 1 receipt date. Jennifer also informed the group that the Center for Scientific Review (CSR) is rethinking its proposal to extend the submission date for electronic receipt for the June/July time frame. The reason is a reevaluation of some technical issues in CGAPRR that are, for instance, resulting in applications not correctly transferred to referral officers identified in 'Breakout' of the applications. If the issues are fixed by March, CSR may reconsider. However, at this point, CSR is concerned that CGAPRR is not ready to handle a jump in volume and therefore feels it may be prudent at this time not to extend this incentive for grant applications submitted electronically for the June/July receipt dates.

Jennifer also noted that two of the six Service Providers did not participate in the Feb. 1 cycle. One Service Provider did not find any applications that fit the requirements; she was unsure why the other did not participate. Janna Wehrle asked if any new institutions submitted applications for Feb. 1. Sara Silver said she would check on that and get back to the group.

Action: (Sara Silver) Check to see if any new institutions submitted applications for the Feb. 1 receipt date

Equity for paper and electronic submission

Everett Sinnett

Everett brought up an issue associated with the Internet Assisted Review, a module that allows a reviewer to see the applications, submit their critiques and initial priority scores via the Internet. He said there is a need for equity in the paper process and the electronic process in making the appendix available to reviewers. Currently in the paper process, the appendix is made available to primary and secondary reviewers but not to others around the review table. In the electronic process, the appendix rests in the grants folder and is accessible to all reviewers. A group member asked if the appendix can be requested by other reviewers in the paper process. Everett replied that he did not know because in his experience, no reviewer had asked for it. The group noted that if the appendix can be requested by other reviewers in the paper process, it is a non issue, since it is then available to all reviewers in both paper and electronic processes.

Table Talk

Volunteers needed—Jennifer stated that the eCGAP team plans to begin requirements gathering in a few weeks for adding consortia to the eCGAP process and needs volunteers to assist in the process. Everett Sinnett and Michael Goodman volunteered. The group suggested that it may be a good idea to also get someone in Grants Management and in Program (involved in clinical activities). Suzanne White was mentioned as a potential recruit. JJ Maurer asked about the difference between a consortium and a subproject. Jennifer explained that a consortium is a much smaller undertaking, from a technical perspective (*A consortium agreement is a collaborative arrangement in support of a research project in which part of an activity is carried out through a formal agreement between the grantee and one or more other organizations. Source: NIAID Glossary*). A subproject is a research project within a project that typically has a research plan. With some exceptions, consortium members do not submit separate research plans. An exception may be among some OPDIVs. Skip Moyer noted that when AHRQ gets a consortium, for instance, the agency may want a budget and research plan for each consortium member. Sara Silver noted that one reason the eCGAP Team wants to create the capability for handling consortia is to boost the number of electronic applications coming in. With that in mind, it may be prudent to start with a simple kind of consortium, get the numbers up and then phase in other kinds.

Action item: (All) Volunteer or suggest volunteers to assist the eCGAP Team in collecting requirements for adding consortia to the eCGAP process.

Cool Tool—Sara Silver said she had a link sent out to the group on the ‘Cool Tool’ eCGAP query to pull up grant applications in the three-day lag period between the time the Referral Officer says “go” and the time the application is formally released from Receipt and Referral. She had received a couple of responses from the group and improved on the query. Sara said she would have Manju send out another email to the group asking them to review the improved ‘Cool Tool’ and send in comments. The ‘Cool Tool’ also needs to be publicized outside the focus group to Scientific Review Administrators (SRAs) and Grant Technical Assistants (GTAs). The Cool Tool is an interim measure; eventually, the query will be built in to the e-notification queue.

Action: (Manju Subramanya) Send an email to the Focus Group asking them to review the improved ‘Cool Tool’ and send any comments to Sara Silver.

New 424RR/agency specific forms—Sara printed and handed out the new forms to the group at the Feb. 1 meeting for feedback but did not receive any comments. Michael Goodman said he would send out the forms electronically, through Manju, to the group for comments. The group suggested that feedback consist of comments/remarks/suggestions that would be useful in terms of formulating the instructions that go out to the applicants. As for a timeframe for using those forms, Jennifer noted that eCGAP is preparing to accept live applications in a pilot using 424RR in the summer of 2005 through Grants.gov.

Action: (Mike Goodman) Have the 424RR/agency specific forms sent out electronically via Manju and request group to send suggestions for formulating the instructions to applicants. Send feedback to Mike.

Bring in ORS folks for future meeting—Jennifer said it might be a good idea to bring in people from the Office of Research Services, the group that cuts the CD for the grant applications, to give the eCGAP Focus Group a presentation. It would be helpful to get a sense of how much room an application could take on a CD. Jennifer said that Mike Goodman and she would try to arrange such a presentation.

Action: (Jennifer Flach, Mike Goodman) Arrange for ORS folks to give presentation at future eCGAP Focus Group meeting

Attendees

Dixon, Diana (OD)	Karen, Sandy (HRSA)	Silver, Sara (OER)
Fisher, Suzanne (CSR)	Maurer, JJ (OD)	Sinnott, Everett (CSR)
Flach, Jennifer (OER)	Moyer, George (Skip) (AHRQ)	Stallone, Don (OD)
Goodman, Michael (OD)	Panniers, Richard (CSR)	Subramanya, Manju (LTS/OD)
Long, Kelly (HRSA)	Prenger, Valerie (NHLBI)	Wehrle, Janna (NIGMS)