



Peer Review JAD Meeting

Date: April 25, 2005,
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Location: Rockledge 1, Room 8111
Advocate: Eileen Bradley
Business Analysts: Mark Siegert; Sophonia Simms

Requirements Analyst: Daniel Fox

Next Meeting: Monday, May 9, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Rockledge 2, Room 6087

Action Items

1. (Sophonia Simms) Modify “As Is” business review model to reflect updates from the group.
2. (Group) Use Attachment 2 to list peer review products, roles, and timeframes.

Documents

1. [Peer Review Re-Design JAD Business Model](#)
2. [Peer Review Re-Design JAD – What’s Next?](#)
3. [Peer Review Products Collection](#)

Opening Discussion

Eileen informed group members that they may now post materials within the Internet Assisted Review (IAR). Multiple one megabyte files may be posted. Tom Tatham informed everyone that there is now a two hour turnaround time for scanned applications.

Business Process Modeling

Sophonia officially began the meeting by reviewing what the group has done so far. Using that information, they will discuss what will happen next in terms of goals within the peer review re-design. Up to this point, group members have defined various roles involved in the process, including the following: Scientific Review Administrators (SRA), Committee Management Officers (CMO), Grants Technical Assistants (GTA), Extramural Scientist Administrator (ESA), Program Staff, Review, Integrated Review Group (IRG) Chiefs, and Operating Divisions (OPDiv). Sophonia has incorporated all of the suggested changes made by the group and presented that new diagram for further review. The next step will to define input and output products associated with each activity across time (pre-meeting, meeting, post-meeting). This information will be used in developed detailed models of each Peer Review process. All of this will be studied by the group, and members will discuss and make improvements in order to finalize a list of features for the re-design. Guest presenters will discuss the use of various

technology such as knowledge management, eRequests and eNotification, in order to enhance the business process.

Eileen took time to congratulate the group's commitment, saying that the members have made enormous progress in helping to stay on task and develop this system.

Sophonia then led the group in reviewing the "As Is" business model, to which the group updated. The changes are reflected in the attached model.

Action: (Sophonia Simms) Modify "As Is" business review model according to suggestions of the group and present at the next meeting.

Homework

Sophonia stated that group members should identify input and output products. Refer to attachment 2. The group should use this document to indicate the various peer review products. OPDivs should produce a similar document to capture their products. A couple of examples of artifacts/products are the agenda and summary statements. Daniel Fox suggested that the group begin thinking about defining roles within the peer review process, particularly focusing on Referral Liaison (RL) roles and the differences between the IC Branch Chiefs and IRG chiefs.

Action: (Group) Use Attachment 2 to list peer review products, roles, and timeframes.

Attendees

Bradley, Eileen	Dortch, Eulas	Fox, Daniel	Paugh, Steve
Petrosian, Arthur	Rusch, Donna	Sigler, Kristeena	Simms, Sophonia
Soto, Tracy	Tatham, Tom	Wojcik, Brian	