



## Peer Review JAD Meeting

---

**Date:** June 27, 2005,  
**Time:** 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.  
**Location:** Rockledge 2, Room 6087  
**Advocate:** Eileen Bradley  
**Business Analysts:** Mark Siegert; Sophonia Simms  
**Requirements Analyst:** Daniel Fox  
**Next Meeting:** Unknown

---

### Action Items

1. (Sophonia Simms) Send out Conduct Peer Review Process and HRSA Activities Diagram to group members for electronic review.
2. (Group) Return any changes and/or updates to the Conduct Peer Review Process and HRSA Activities Diagram to Sophonia via email.
3. (Eileen Bradley) Find out the exact, sequential process for creating rosters.
4. (Eileen Bradley) Send the group examples of copied, electronically submitted applications.

### Documents

1. [Peer Review Model Packet](#) (Includes: Conduct Peer Review Business Model, HRSA Activities Diagram, Model of Input/Output Products, Who Model-Peer Review Stakeholders)

### General

Sophonia distributed four models to the group. The first is the Peer Review High Level Activities Diagram which presents the activities associated with conducting Peer Review.. The second model is the Conduct HRSA (Health Resources and Services Administration) Peer Review Business Model. Sophonia pointed out the importance of this diagram, stating that the JAD group needs to be well aware of equivalent processes occurring within the Operating Divisions (OPDIVS).

The third model represents the artifacts involved in conducting a Peer Review. The items in green circles refer to “entities,” which are not physically touchable but exist in an electronic format. The items in yellow boxes can be physically touched (i.e. paper documents). The purpose of this page is to identify everything involved in or produced by this business process. The entities and artifacts on this model should be traced back to the high level activities diagram. If there is no activity that uses the artifact/entity then an activity should be added. The fourth model illustrates the Peer Review Stakeholders. The combination of the 4 models will be used to create the final business process models depicting how Peer Review is conducted.

## Activities Diagram (Near Complete) + HRSA Activities Diagram

Sophonia asked the room for the “final blessing” of the Peer Review diagram. Eileen Bradley suggested that, in order to supply the Center for Scientific Review (CSR) and all of the Institutes with a less confusing model, each action within the process should be designated under either CSR or Program. This will allow the Review Policy Committee (RPC) a clearer, more specific illustration of the business process. Eileen explained that CSR does about 80% of the review for NIH, while the other 20% is completed in-house by the institutes, of which Program is a division concerned with funding.

Sophonia stated that this model does not currently represent a timeline. The final version of it, however, will show the items and actions in sequential order. She will send both Activity Diagrams to group members electronically for approval. Any updates or changes for either model should be sent to Sophonia via email.

**Action: (Sophonia Simms) Send out Conduct Peer Review Process and HRSA Activities Diagram to group members for electronic review.**

**Action: (Group) Return any changes and/or updates to the Conduct Peer Review Process and HRSA Activities Diagram to Sophonia via email.**

## Model of Input/Output Products + Peer Review Stakeholders

Sophonia broke down this process into three main areas: a Review Plan, Meeting and Application (which has now been changed to the plural form Applications). She reminded the group that the most important thing to determine when reviewing this page is whether or not all inputs and outputs of the business process are represented. The lines between each heading illustrate the relationship between them. The group discussed the model and made the following changes and updates:

- Change Summary Sheets to Summary *Statements*.
- Add another COI (Conflict of Interest) called *Administrative Review*.
- Add a line between Review Plan and Application.
- Add an artifact box connecting to Applications called *Eligibility*.
- Change Bio-sketch to *Administrative Review* (applications like Bio-sketch are a part of the more general classification called Administrative Review).
- Connect Administrative Review to Meeting.
- Add an artifact box connecting to Meeting called *Minutes*.
- Make the line between Meeting and Application **thick** to imply greater importance.
- Add a **thick** line from Review Plan to Application in order to illustrate a triangular relationship between the main headings - Review Plan, Application and Meeting.
- Add an entity circle connecting to Meeting called *Meeting Format*.
- Add a line from Scores and Codes to Meeting, and change the current line from Scores and Codes to Applications to a reverse arrow.

- Change the line from Meeting to Summary Statements to a double-sided arrow.
- Move the Abstract entity circle from Applications to connect with Review Plan.
- Change Rosters circle (entity) to a box (artifact).
- Change Letters box to Letters *of Intent*.
- Add an artifact box called *Reviewer Material* that connects to Review Plan and Meeting.

The group discussed different ways and approaches to meetings, especially those conducted over a distance. The process of determining how a meeting takes place (via video, telephone, etc.) exists within the Review Plan. While members agreed that face-to-face meetings with reviewers are best, sometimes travel is impossible. There have to be other, viable alternatives, besides phone interviews, to in-person meetings that must work impeccably well (i.e. video conferencing).

Sophonia asked the group whether or not there was anything they needed to do to facilitate the Review Plan. Eileen stated that most of these actions, entities and artifacts fall into electronic review and are sent straight to the institutes and CSR simultaneously. Presently, this process is done by paper.

There was some confusion about creating rosters, and whether or not it was necessary to first create assignments or pull abstracts. Eileen said that she will check on this process and get back to the group. She also expressed concern that the electronic receipt of applications is being delayed because of appendix material for some reason. She said that she will send the group copied, electronically submitted applications.

**Action: (Eileen Bradley) Find out the exact, sequential process for creating rosters.**

**Action: (Eileen Bradley) Send the group examples of copied, electronically submitted applications.**

Sophonia will put together these final models (including any changes or updates sent to her via email) and present them at the next meeting. Because this may take time, she was not sure as to the exact date of that meeting, but will let group members know via email. Finally, Eileen called on the group to come up with presentable demos that might creatively make processes and methods more user/client-friendly. She also stated that she will be reconstituting the Review User Group (RUG) and will show this Conduct Peer Review model at that meeting. The RUG should know the magnitude of work and amount of progress that the Peer Review JAD group has accomplished. The group suggested that, before presenting this model at the RUG Meeting, it should be morphed into a simpler, more user-friendly form. It is a bit difficult to understand as it exists now, but with a little tweaking it should be presentable. Sophonia will work at making the model clearer to the general public.

## Attendees

Bradley, Eileen	Jaffe, Deborah	Li, Xiang-Ning	Luo, Weihua
Musto, Neal	Paugh, Steven	Rusch, Donna	Simms, Sophonia
Valeda, Kay			