



Peer Review JAD Meeting

Date: January 31, 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: Thursday, February 17, 10:00 a.m. –12:00 p.m., Rockledge 2, Room 6087

Action Items

1. (Sophonia Simms) Present updated Business Process Model, showing all changes suggested by the group and including global and “Parking Lot” issues.
2. (JAD Group) Continue to define Peer Review Business Process Model.

Documents

- Peer Review Re-Design JAD Steps

Business Process Modeling

Eileen Bradley stated that the group needs to discuss and define a Business Process Model for the JAD as it presently exists. After this step-by-step definition is agreed upon by the group, the group will begin discussions regarding features and improvements for the redesign. Sophonia Simms passed out the current Peer Review Business Process to the group, explaining that it was the “As IS” Activities Diagram. This figure is the basis from which the group will work to build a new Peer Review business process model. She also provided a document, the [Peer Review Re-Design Steps](#), which outlines the activities the group will take to develop the business process in forthcoming planning meetings. Sophonia then asked the group to assist her to compile sequentially any high-level activities involved in conducting peer review. She presented the following list of high level activities:

1. **Receive Applications**
2. **Assign Applications to Study Section/IRG**
3. **Organize Meeting**
4. **Conduct Peer Review Meeting**
5. **Enter Application Scores**
6. **Generate Summary Statements**
7. **Process Expenses**

The group then opened for discussion and developed a list of the following activities associated with peer review:

Receive Competing Applications and Supporting Material

- Receive Paper applications
- Receive Electronic applications
- Receive Supplemental material
- Perform Administrative Review/Basic Screening

Assign Application to IC/IRG

- Review by Grants Management (OPDiv – HRSA)
- Perform Administrative Review/Basic Screening
- Check Basic Eligibility

Assign Applications

- Review Application type and science
- IRG Chief's Review/IC Referral Office Review
- Administrative Review
- Assign Workgroup

Create/Maintain Meeting

- Determine type of meeting
- Set Meeting Date
- Set Location
- Establish FACA/Non FACA Meeting
- Maintain Percentile Table
- Establish individual workgroups
- Assign workgroup to parent committee
- Provide request to CMO
- Determine conflicts of interests
- Determine whether a site visit is needed

Prepare Applications for Meeting

- Create Subprojects

Organize Meeting

- Assign Applications
- Perform Administrative Review/basic Screening
- Select Permanent or Ad Hoc Members
- Determine conflicts of interest
- Set order of review
- Add agenda
- Utilize IAR
- Order CDs
- Determine meeting logistics
- Create preliminary critiques and scores

Post Organization/Pre-Review Activities

- Determine order of review

- Perform Streamlining
- Hold conference/orientation with reviewers
- Report to parent committee
- Edit critiques

Conduct Peer Review

- Hold site visit meeting
- Conduct administrative orientation
- Compile score sheets
- Edit critiques
- Verify streamlining
- Hold reviewer discussion
- Hold applicant discussion
- Hold administrative discussion
- Perform DFO duties
- Determine conflicts of interest
- Perform note taking
- Conduct SRA evaluation
- Perform post meeting administration
- Sign meeting

Process Expenses

- Conduct CSR verification
- Process expenses via contractor (HRSA)

Global activities

- Communicate with applicant
- SRA welcome letter
- SRA/applicant communication
- Create Council Rounds
- 901 Changes
- Communication with Reviewers
- Communicate with program staff

Parking Lot

- Eliminate pre-assigned applications. Follow same path as unsolicited
- Notifications to CMO
- Ways to do discussions
- Define meeting structure
- Reviewers determine conflicts of inters with SRA override

- Enabling reviewers in IAR
- More seamless integration
- Automatic subproject creation
- Establish term, e.g., conflicts
- Calculate all parameters
- Need more flexible rules
- User interface

The group decided to end at *Conduct Peer Review* for the week. Sophonia will put together an updated list for the next meeting, to be held on 02/17. She will also compile a list of global issues, or those changes, additions, deletions, and suggestions that will apply to every headline throughout the process. The group will continue to define the rest of the process next time. Sophonia will also present “Parking Lot” issues, or those topics to be discussed at a later time.

Action: (Sophonia Simms) Present updated Business Process Model, showing all changes suggested by the group and including global and “Parking Lot” issues.

Action: (JAD Group) Continue to define Peer Review Business Process Model.

Attendees

Bradley, Eileen (CSR)	Luo, Weihua (CSR)	Soto, Tracy (OD)
Colderone, Gerald (CSR/BBBP)	Paugh, Steve (OD/LTS)	Tatham, Tom (CSR)
Dortch, Eulas (ECD)	Petrosian, Arthur (CSR/SBIB)	Valeda, Kay (NHLBI)
Fox, Daniel (OD)	Rusch, Donna (HRSA)	Wojcik, Brian (NCI)
Greenberg, Linda (AHRQ)	Shabestari, Behrouz (CSR)	Zucker, Sherry (OD)
Jaffe, Deborah (NCI)	Siegert, Mark (OD)	
Li, Xiang-Ning (CSR/SBIB)	Simms, Sophonia (OD)	