Minutes for Advisory Council Meeting

Committee on Credible Practice of Modeling & Simulation in Healthcare

Date: August 24, 2017
Time: 2:00 PM CST

Means: Conference Call

Attendees: Jeffrey Bischoff
Pras Pathmanathan
Ahmet Erdemir
Anthony Hunt
Lealem Mulugeta
Gary Pradhan
Martin Steele
Marlei Walton
Grace Peng
David Eckmann

Not Available: Vasilis Marmarelis
Alison Marsden
Donna Lochner
Gary An

Agenda:

1. Review of Committee's progress – 20 min.
    a. See progress update at https://simtk.org/svn/cpms/doc/minutes/ac_20170824-pu.pdf
2. Membership & leadership transition – 10 min.
3. General feedback from the AC on overall progress – 10 min.
4. Goals for 2017-2018 – 10 min.
5. Other business – 10 min.

Key Points:

See Notes for details.

1. **Committee has been making progress, but the overall pace has not been at a rate that is desirable.** It is apparent the slow in progress is due to the burden on the co-chairs and Executive Committee members to balance their growing responsibilities in their own work and their contributions to the Committee. Recommendations were made to make future recruitment of younger and more energetic members to the Executive Committee to advance the Committee's objectives.
2. **Membership of the Committee is currently full.** There are currently no vacancies in both parts of the committee. Andrew Drach and Rajanikanth Vadigepalli recently joined the Executive committee, and Gary An was recently moved to the Advisory Council roster.
3. **Transition of leadership is required.** The Co-chairs have expressed their desire to step down, and recommended the promotion of new leaders who have the energy, interest and time to advance the Committee's work.
4. **Outreach activities have been quite successful.** There have been numerous conference publications as well as a webinar was hosted. The Committee also organized an afternoon session on Model Credibility

Plan at the IMAG/MSM meeting for the newest U01 awardees. Furthermore, two members have been invited by the Society of Simulation in Healthcare to organize a special forum, and give a special presentation regarding M&S in Healthcare.

5. **There is general consensus that the Committee's focus should be on the Ten Simple Rules activity.** By focusing on the Ten Simple Rules activity, the other tasks will naturally be tackled. So the Advisory council agreed this is the best strategy for the near future goal of the Committee.

Action Items:

See Notes for details.

1. *Finalize the Co-chair candidates.* Ahmet will discuss with Andrew Drach, and Grace will survey the IMAG membership to help identify a candidate that can represent the IMAG community.
2. *Ten Simple Rules documents need to be the primary focus.* The Executive Committee should make this a primary focus, and allow the rest of the objectives should be made as byproduct of the TSR activity. Once the TSR activity is complete, the Committee should redirect their focus to the remaining activities.
3. *Send link to Grace the Committee Summary Presentation .* Lealem will send the slides to Grace to be used as a call to the IMAG members for potential Co-chair candidates.

Notes:

1. **Review of Committee's progress and Feedback from the Advisory Council.** Ahmet went over the progress report. The report was made available online at the project site: https://simtk.org/svn/cpms/doc/minutes/ac_20160706-pu.pdf. The notes below cover discussions during the meeting regarding specific areas, and are not intended to cover topics covered in the progress report.
   General Discussion Overview:
   ○ While the Co-chairs' intent was to meet every six months with the advisory council, this meeting was arranged almost a year after the last one. This is due to the growing challenge the Co-chairs face to juggle their increasing responsibilities in their work obligations along with leading the committee.
   ○ The Committee has been making progress, even though it may not be at a pace we were initially hoping. The hope is that there will be some new leadership will emerge to help pick up the pace in the various activities.
   Ten Simple Rules (TSR) Task Overview:
   ○ Pras asked if we plan to reformat the TSR manuscript because it currently does not fit into the PLOS manuscript format guidelines. The article is currently more lengthy than what PLOS Computational Biology will allow.
   ○ Ahmet explained that there is also a plan to produce a final report/guidance document. So the initial plan is to write our thoughts as complete and comprehensive as possible so that the content can be used for the final report and guidance document. However, the plan is to have a more concise version that meets the journal's requirements when we submit for Journal publication. It was also pointed out that we are in fact missing some meat to the various sections of the document that need to be addressed before we can think about condensing it.
   ○ Ahmet also pointed out that by adding more meat to the document, it opens the opportunity for more articles. It was also discussed to some length at the recent IMAG MSM meeting, in addition to the Committee and Community perspective TSR articles, we should work towards publishing other articles to include:
     ▪ Definitions of key terms in support of the glossary task, and can serve as a siteable document regarding how the Committee defines key terms.
     ▪ Adding examples that can help communicate the processes of demonstrating credibility in accordance to the Credible Practice Guidelines the Committee is working to develop. This would be an expanded version of the poster the Committee presented at the last IMAG MSM meeting.

- Pras concurred with the suggested plan based on his experience with similar work at the FDA.
- Lealem also noted that, even if the lengthier document is still in draft mode when we submit the Committee perspective article or any other article, the document may still be referenced as an original source. Since the document is public, anyone interested in getting more information about any aspect of the manuscripts we publish can access the more comprehensive report to gain better insight on the intent of the manuscript.
- The Advisory Council as a whole seems to concur on the development of comprehensive report, and from there publishing other more focused manuscripts for journal publication.

Visibility and Outreach Task Overview

- This is where the Committee has been doing a great job by presenting at conferences, and receiving invitation to conferences to organize conference sessions. Everyone is encouraged to discuss the activities of the committee at conferences and related events they may attend.
- All posters and abstracts are available on the SimTK project site.
- We've conducted webinars that have been useful in sharing ideas and perspectives of other groups who have been active in developing and implementing models and simulations. Joy has been instrumental in organizing these webinars. Any other suggestions from members on webinars we can host are most welcome, and all are encouraged to email the Co-chairs with their suggestions.
- The IMAG MSM meeting was very useful in leveraging the activities of the current awardees to learn about their credibility plans, for the awardees get feedback from the community. We're planning to write a brief report on the outcome of the MSM meeting that can be shared with the IMAG MSM community and the awardees.
- Grace suggested that we might consider having a follow-up to the feedback report regarding the Credibility session from the IMAG MSM meeting. Specifically to assess if we need to have the Credibility plan feedback to the awardees more than once a year. Ahmet suggested that more frequent feedback is desirable, and at a very minimum the awardees should provide a follow-up report at the next MSM meeting to outline what they've done with regards to the planned credibility plan and the feed-back they initially received.

  There was a general consensus that it would be beneficial to have a follow up meeting with the awardees twice a year. However, the Advisory Council and Co-chairs acknowledges the fact the awardees have substantial research and academic responsibilities at their respective institutions. So care should be taken to not overburden the awardees with reporting activities that may distract them from their research and academic obligations. The follow-up meetings should be designed to be helpful to the awardees to meeting their research objectives better.
  - Grace Peng suggested that the Committee could perhaps spearhead the organization of the follow-up meetings to ensure this is the case.
  - Marlie Walton suggested using a reporting forms that provide the awardees clear guidance areas to focus on and therefore help them meet their research objectives.

Literature Survey Task Overview:

- This moving forward slowly but organically as a result of the conference publications and other activities.

Glossary Task Overview:

- Nothing new discussed beyond what is covered in the progress update.

Workflows for Credible Practice Task Overview:

- Grace Peng mentioned that initiatives like the Brain Initiative have been working to figure out how to approach workflows. If the Committee is looking for input from other groups, she can help open communication between the Brain Initiative and the Committee. Since Tony Hunt is leading this effort, he will discuss with Grace offline to discuss how we might be able to collaborate with the Brain Initiative.
- Grace noted that the The Brain Initiative participants are trying to figure out how they should proceed, so they may actually need more guidance than they being able to provide feedback tot he

Committee. Tony responded by pointing out that it is not uncommon for most to feel like their workflow process is not sufficient and therefore not worth sharing/discussing. This is an obstacle we need to overcome if we are going to get better in this area. Given the new initiative requires that the awardees have these discussions, this might be a good opportunity to get over this hurdle.

2. **Membership & Leadership Transition:**
   - We will need to start thinking ahead about how we are going to start relieving our veteran members with new blood. So if anyone has any ideas for new members, please let the Co-chairs know.
   - If any Advisory Council members are planning to step down, please let the Co-chairs know.
   - The current Co-chairs are becoming burned out, and are becoming quite limited on time they can spend on the Committee's activities. Therefore a transition of leadership is in order. The Committee can also greatly benefit from strong leadership with new perspectives. In this light Andrew Drach of University of Texas and Pras Pathmanathan of FDA.
   - The Co-chairs nominated the two candidates based on:
     - Their high level of interest in the subject matter of the Committee
     - Their high energy involvement in the Community as a whole
     - The guidelines of the Committee formation outlines that the Co-chairs should be representatives of the IMAG/Government (Pras) and MSM/Research (Andrew) communities.
   - Pras declined the nomination as the next Co-chair who will serve as the IMAG representative as he is already leading a very large initiative within the FDA. However, he made the offer to transition to the Executive Committee.
   - Lealem asked Grace to look thorough the IMAG members to see if anyone would be suitable and willing to step in as an IMAG representative Co-chair. Lealem will send Grace the Committee Summary presentation to Grace she can circulate to the IMAG members.
   - Ahmet will speak with Andrew Drach regarding his nomination as an MSM representative Co-chair.
   - Previously Marc Horner was identified as a potential Co-chair to represent the MSM community. This was later revised since Marc was recently elected as Vice Chair for the ASME V&V40 Sub-committee, and it was deemed more appropriate by the Co-chairs to have Marc (along with Tina) serve as a representative of V&V40 to the Committee; which tends to be more focused on industry regulatory activities.
   - Grace was not familiar with Andrew, so Ahmet provided brief overview of his background regarding
   - Although anyone who is willing to do the work is welcome to step up, the Co-chair's recommendations are with the interest of forming a balanced representation and appropriate push-pull relationships between the different stakeholders, and providing strong leadership for the Committee.
   - The Co-chairs explained the initially proposed transition cycle of 2 years. However, the Co-chairs did an extra term based on the recommendations of the Executive and Advisory Members. The committee is currently in its fifth year, and late by one year for transition due to scheduling issues and the Co-chair's limited time to follow through on key activities of the Committee.
   - The Co-chairs expressed the challenge of keeping up with the administrative work required to keep the Committee moving forward steadily. The fact that there is a need to juggle multiple activities within the committee also makes it very challenging to maintain focus. So it was best to have new leadership that has the energy and time to manage both the technical and administrative work of the Committee.
   - In light of the leadership challenges, the following ideas were discussed:
     - Grace suggested the possibility of having an administrative lead so that the Co-chairs can focus on the nuts and bolts of the technical work (e.g. TSR activity). Ahmet voiced the concern that having an admin lead may not be so feasible without paying someone to do it. Grace noted that this was also an issue within IMAG as well, and the Steering Committee may need to be engaged to help come up with solving this problem.

- - A proposal was also made to have one co-chair take care of the administrative work while the other handles the technical tasks. Ahmet and Lealem noted, although co-chairs are free to organize themselves as they see fit, the Committee formation guidelines were written to ensure that the work gets equally shared. In addition, it is not uncommon that only one of the Co-chairs is available to conduct meetings and lead initiatives. So it is important that both Co-chairs be well versed in all aspects of the Committee's work so that they can step in for each other where needed, and ensure progress.
    - Lealem brought up the discussions previously held with Grace on the possibility of converting the Committee into a Society or Nonprofit organization that can appropriate funds to hire personnel like administrative staff.
  - Regardless of the way forward, the Committee needs to deliberately implement the Vice Co-Chair and Past Co-Chair positions to ensure stability and continuity in the leadership.
  - If there are any other ideas on how to help with better transition and leadership support, all are invited to submit their ideas to the Co-chairs.

3. **Goals for 2017-2018:**
   - The general recommendation put forward was that the Committee prioritize the TSR articles. By focusing on this task, the other tasks will naturally be completed. For example:
     - Definitions of key terms will need to be agreed upon
     - Examples will need to be identified and referenced appropriately
     - Conference presentations can easily be produced from the progress made
   - Although the TSR activity is a primary goal, members are not prohibited from focusing on the other activities if they feel inclined to do so. If there is interest, members can act as point of contacts for the different tasks (e.g. Tony is the POC for the workflow activity).

4. **Other Business:**
   - None