

NRDS Training and Communication Working Group**Tuesday August 4, 2015****Meeting Minutes**

Action Item	Who	By When
Add Wendy Wong to the NRDS Listserv	Neesha Desai	8/5/15
Add a primary and secondary category of stakeholders	Neesha Desai	8/12/15
Include an approach to reach out to those who have not responded before the deadline	Neesha Desai	8/12/15
Work with Policy Co-leads to discuss petition for waivers	Neesha Desai/Ginger Riley	8/15/15
Update the word document to add the intent for the workflow to maximize efficiency and clear direction.	Neesha Desai	8/15/15

Agenda Topics

Welcome/Update – Neesha Desai welcomed the callers to the call and provided a brief update from the Content Working Group. She announced that the working group has completed review of all 4 AE and 16 SAE forms and they will kick off this official 2 week review process on August 6th, 2015.

Bulletin/Newsletter

- RECOMMENDATION 1, WG Co-Lead (Ginger R.): Did all see the bulletin/newsletter?
 - RESPONSE, NCI (Mary C.): I saw it and shared with others. We thought it was a great format.
 - RESPONSE, COG (Wendy W.): I think it was sent to Smita, I did not receive it.
 - **Action Item:** Neesha D. add Wendy Wong to the NRDS Listserv
 - RESPONSE, Theradex (Diana V.): I took a look at it and that it looked good
- COMMENT 1, WG Co-Lead (Ginger R.): As the co-leads, we discussed the time commitments for this working group; we understand this is not your only commitment. We are trying to continue the activity of the bulletin and the communication workflow – we are trying to ease any time burden up front but we will be very reliant on you to review the contributions we provide forward.

Voting Guidelines – Ginger Riley discussed the voting guidelines. We identified a need to ensure all recommendations across the NRDS group are vetted and documented appropriately. We are hoping to establish a voting process for all WGs to adopt and follow. This is very similar for the voting process or the CFC activities. The stakeholders (or a representative) will be responsible for providing a response. The stakeholders only get one vote and is responsible for taking the information back to their organization to provide one consolidated vote. There is a two week timeframe, if no answer is provided, the response will be null. The stakeholders can request an extension to the Project Manager and this will be discussed with the co-leads. The co-leads will provide a summary at the next meeting; if more than 50% approval, we will consider it vetted but if it is a tie or disapproved, it will be taken back for discussion. If there is a group that does not want to adopt the vetted recommendation, we will work with the policy

group to provide a policy for this possible exemption.

- COMMENT 1, NCI Leadership (Dianne R.): Everyone represents an organization and we need to ensure communication is good. It is important that all take this seriously.
 - RESPONSE, WG Co-Lead (Ginger R.): We will be circulating a guidelines document for review, if you feel the stakeholder responsibilities need to be called out more, please let us know.
- RECOMMENDATION 1, WG Co-Lead (Ginger R.): I think there should be a primary and secondary, does the groups agree?
 - RESPONSE, NCI Leadership (Dianne R.): Yes, I agree with that
 - RESPONSE, NRG (Amy K.): Yes
 - RESPONSE, COG (Wendy W.): Yes
 - Action Item: Add a primary and secondary rep in here.
- COMMENT 2, NCI Leadership (Dianne R.): Will a group be contacted to let them know that their response is a null; the vote could be lost or something?
 - RESPONSE, WG Co-Lead (Ginger R.): I think that is something we can consider. If we implement that, maybe it should be a few days before the deadline.
 - RESPONSE, NCI (Neesha D.): In the past, about 2 days before the deadline, we would reach out to the centers that have not responded, remind them of the deadline, and ask if they need any further information
 - RESPONSE, Theradex (Diana V.): I agree with this approach.
 - Action Item: The group agreed to add the approach of contacting the groups that have not provided a response 2 days prior to the deadline.
- RECOMMENDATION 2, NCI Leadership (Dianne R.): How do you know when something is being vetted and approved, except for the stakeholder? It seems like things must be vetted first before we petition for a waiver. I think this would need to go through the policy group. I do not know how detailed the appeal from an organization to not adopt would be but it seems we would need a policy in place for this.
 - Action Item: It would be a good idea to engage the policy and governance group on this issue.
- COMMENT 3, NCI (Mary C.): Just to get the process in the correct order, whatever we are voting on will be vetted, once the vetting is complete, the results are published, and then this process would be implemented. I am not sure where the policy group comes in.
 - RESPONSE, WG Co-Lead (Ginger R.): The policy group would come in if there is an exemption, if a group does not want to adopt a vetted recommendation.
- Next Steps – Circulate the Word document, prior to next call. Group members, please review and provide any considerations/feedback.

Communication Workflow – Ginger Riley briefed the need, the goal, and the intent of a communication process.

Does the group also see a need for the communication workflow?

- COMMENT 1, NCI (Mary C.): I think what is laid out is pretty straight forward. If everyone knows how communication should flow and there is an interruption in the process, we will be able to see it and take care of it. I think a communication workflow is a good thing.
- RECOMMENDATION 1, NCI Leadership (Dianne R.): I would add another intent, to maximize efficiency and clear direction.
 - NCI (Mary C.) and COG (Wendy W.) agreed

- **Action Item:** Update the word document to add the intent for the workflow to maximize efficiency and clear direction.
- COMMENT 2, COG (Wendy W.): I think it is good to have this set up so we have a guideline to follow when communicating.

Stakeholders – Ginger Riley provided a list of identified stakeholders, are there any additional stakeholders not identified?

- RECOMMENDATION 1, NCI Leadership (Dianne R.): How about groups that are impacted by the decisions? Members of the curation community (caDSR) may not be included in the NCTN/NRDS but they will be impacted by the decisions made.
 - RESPONSE, WG Co-Lead (Ginger R.): I see this as an initial communication workflow for NRDS but it can be expanded to include those affected by the decisions, maybe even LPOs. This would be a great discussion.
 - **Action Item:** Include 2 categories for stakeholder, Direct Stakeholders and Impacted Groups (include caDSR and additional groups to be determined)

Type of Communication – Are there any additional vehicles of communication we want to provide, other than e-mail/listserv?

- RECOMMENDATION 1, NCI (Neesha D.): I think it would be beneficial to add this information to the Wiki
 - The group agreed

Reason for Communication – Are there any additional examples of when to send out communications?

- COMMENT 1, NCI (Mary C.): Are there additional times you would want to communicate workgroup activity status other than this list, for example, just an update?
 - RESPONSE, WG Co-Lead (Ginger R.): Normal updates will be provided on the bulletin but one thing we do not have here is achievements. I think the monthly bulletin is an achievement in itself and we should be communicating these type of achievements.
 - RESPONSE, NCI (Mary C.): That is a good example, also any time you issue these type of communication around the status of the group, it brings the information to the stakeholder's attention.
- COMMENT 2, WG Co-Lead (Ginger R.): Please let us know if there are any additional thoughts or recommendations around the communications.

Attendance:

Name	Affiliation
Wendy Wong	Children's Oncology Group (COG)
Dianne Reeves	NCI
Mary Cooper	NCI
Christina Warmington	NCI, Essex Management
Neesha Desai	NCI, Essex Management
Amy Kryzskiewicz	NRG
Diana Vulih	Theradex
Ginger Riley	Westat