

CTSA Biostatistics/Epidemiology/Research Design (BERD) Key Function Committee

Evaluation Group

January 27, 2009

Meeting Summary

BERD Evaluation Group

Time: 4:00 PM – 5:00 PM ET

Attendees: D. Rubio, Pittsburgh (Chair); L. Beckett, UC Davis; D. Del Junco, UT-Houston; D. DeMets, UW-Madison; D. Dixon, NIAID; F. Enders, Mayo; S. Hurwitz, Harvard; T. Karrison, Chicago; Y. Li, Duke; I. O Abrams, NCRR; R. Oster, Alabama-Birmingham; B. Pollock, UT-San Antonio; P. Wakim, NIDA; K. Wittkowski, Rockefeller

I. Welcome and Introductions

Dr. Rubio welcomed members and gave a brief overview of the November 20, 2008 meeting of the Evaluation Group. Dr. Rubio then suggested that the first two items of the agenda, Review Sections of the Evaluation Guidelines and Next Steps, should go together as the group is continuing to build the document.

II. Review Sections of the Evaluation Guidelines and Next Steps

Dr. Rubio presented the group with some general questions as to the next steps for the Evaluation Guidelines document.

- Should the Evaluation Group send the Guidelines to other Key Function Committees (KFCs)?
- Should the Guidelines be posted on the Wiki?

Dr. Rubio explained that the document has only been discussed within the BERD Evaluation Group. Dr. DeMets suggested that the document should be formally sent to the BERD KFC in order to obtain its endorsement. He further suggested that the Evaluation KFC should be made aware of it, and that all 38 CTSA institutions should be privy to the living document as a resource.

Members reached consensus to first send the Guidelines to the BERD KFC for endorsement and then to the Evaluation KFC for endorsement. After that, the BERD Evaluation Group will seek endorsement from NIH.

Discussion then ensued on specific elements of the document. Members weighed the merits of paper and web versions of forms, the importance of what information is collected as opposed to how the information is collected, and whose signatures should be on the forms.

Members decided that the form should have two signatures -- that of the CTSA Science collaborator and that of the BERD collaborator. Further, the Group agreed that getting the information it wants is of greater importance than of how the

information is obtained, and that perhaps it should require the investigators provide information on the first part of the form and have the statisticians provide information on the second half.

The BERD Evaluation Group decided to have two tables at the beginning of the document, the first of which would list the six major areas. The second table would list the other two items, which were identified as the tools used along the six major areas. The group also decided to remove 4A.

Other suggestions were made regarding the addition of sections about co-authorship and collaboration, as well as adding links to a few of the already existing web portals, and putting the Guidelines on CTSPedia or the Wiki. The group decided to keep each of these matters as future discussion points, but to keep them out for the BERD KFC meeting on January 29.

III. Nominations For Chair of Evaluation Group

Dr. Rubio noted that she has been serving on the Evaluation Group for approximately one year, and that she would like to move the Chair to another person. The BERD Evaluation group thanked Dr. Rubio for her service as Chair.

The BERD Evaluation Group then determined that it would be best for the BERD KFC Chair to appoint a new chairperson.

IV. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the BERD Evaluation Group is scheduled to take place on Tuesday, February 24, 2009 from 4:00 PM – 5:00 PM ET.

The meeting adjourned at 4:51 PM ET.

V. Action Items

#	Action Items	Owner	Due Date
1	Inform the BERD KFC Chair of interest in serving as Chair of BERD Evaluation Group	Evaluation Group Members	2/13/09
2	Send the most recent version of the Evaluation Guidelines document	Doris Rubio	1/28/09