

2014-10-07

Meeting Information

Date:	October 7, 2014
Time:	12 EDT/11 CDT/10 MDT/9 PDT

Attendees: David Blake and Ross McKinney, Co-Chairs; Elizabeth Boyd, Mike Champa, Susan Ehringhaus, Julie Gottlieb, Betty Harvey, Raymond Hutchison, Norman Kahn, Raj Mehrotra, Pamela Miller, Heather Pierce, Bill Sacks, Cory Schmidt, Valerie Smothers and John Sweeney.

Agenda Items

1 Review [minutes](#) of last call

Dr. McKinney made minor corrections and the minutes were accepted.

2 What is a use case? Discuss [example](#).

Ms. Smothers provided background information about use cases. The Curriculum Inventory working group developed technical standards for the exchange of curriculum data. Medical schools are now using this standard to send data to the central AAMC Curriculum Inventory system. She further explained a use case is an example of how the standard is being used to achieve a particular goal. Use cases clarify the goal of the standard and what it is meant to enable. The Curriculum Inventory System standard enables the curriculum management system to export data which is then sent to a central data base. Each use case has a unique identifier, a title, and actors, which are systems and people playing a particular role, such as learner, faculty, etc. Use cases also have trigger event, something that triggers the exchange described in the use case. There is a success end condition, the end goal, assumptions, descriptions of what we're trying to do, and a step by step transaction of what happens. Exceptions can be noted to specify what happens when something goes wrong; potential standards that can be relevant can be identified.

3 Review [proposed use cases](#) based on IOM report and related AAMC activities

Ms. Smothers received valuable input from Ms. Pierce and edited the use cases yesterday. Ms. Smothers asked the group if those use cases looked appropriate or are we missing anything. Dr. Blake questioned the distinction between two and three. Ms. Smothers answered number two involves an individual requesting information be sent; number three is an organization requesting information be sent. Ms. Pierce asked if that would be a pull instead of a push. Ms. Smothers edited the use case to reflect that correction. Dr. McKinney commented if that was going to be a pull, information would only be pulled if an individual gave access. Ms. Smothers confirmed that would happen if faculty member wanted home institution to have access by default. Mr. Sachs thought there were a lot of pieces missing, like how systems identify individuals, and how data is identified as to what it is. Ms. Smothers noted how systems identify individuals can be put in as an assumption; most of those use cases are use cases of the system rather than the standard.

Dr. Blake suggested the example of individual user wanting comparison or benchmarking information that is stored in a central depository. Mr. Sachs commented use cases are in one direction, an individual reports to a central data base to the AAMC repository, to journal, or society. When the journal has a question about disclosure, how does that get communicated? Mr. Hutchinson thought they used some conventional method of communication. The repository should be continually updated. If a journal updated a disclosure, the individual would update their information and you could submit that to the organization. Ms. Pierce and Ms. Smothers will update use case with elements the group suggested.

The group discussed how organizations and users would specify a subset of data to be sent. Dr. McKinney suggested adding a use case for the organization receiving data to define a profile of what it wants to receive. Mr. Champa proposed use cases for the organization registering with the central repository, the individual registering with the central repository, and the individual providing information to the local Conflict of Interest system which sends information to central repository. He asked if a user can go in themselves and enter information. Ms. Smothers suggested breaking the first one into two separate use cases. Dr. Blake commented that if people are required to go into two separate systems that will be a disincentive. Use cases where existing applications feed information into a central repository is going to be a central use case. Mr. Hutchinson agreed. Dr. McKinney added that pulling information from a central repository is another option. Mr. Sacks commented that different institutions have very unique question sets that may overlap considerably with data sets going to the central repository; using that data set to satisfy local system is unlikely.

Dr. Blake, asked about third use case, central repository sends report to requesting organization. It reads like a journal is being preauthorized by a user, but if we're talking about user home institution, they might prefer to access to it. Ms. Smothers will update the use cases. Mr. Champa added how a person registers has to include unique id that's standard. Ms. Miller commented the Orcid group is trying to accomplish this; we might be able to piggy back on that. Ms. Smothers emphasized the standards developed should support the AAMC system but be applicable to other entities as well.

The group discussed adding a use case related to annual disclosure and checking to make sure it has been completed. The institution may ask individual researchers or faculty to review their information annually and sign off that it is still up to date. Most institutions and feds require that. Mr. Sacks recommended that the requirement be data should be accurate in the last 30 days. There needs to a time stamp on every data element. Ms. Pierce agreed that each entry would have a time stamp and the system would be able to provide reminders. Organization requires the ability to confirm everything is current and updated. Ms. Smothers added a use case "an organization sets up a schedule for individual attestation." Ms. Schmidt suggested getting data for all of those people who have submitted in the past year would be another use case. Dr. Blake commented that would be a variation of an existing use case related to pulling data.

Mr. Sacks commented an organization could query the data base for updated data. Ms. Pierce emphasized that the central repository using these standards would be able to interface with many other institutional or organizational systems. Mining and review of pushed data would be done on the local organization's system.

4 Discuss other possible use cases (please share your ideas)

5 Open discussion

Ms. Smothers mentioned the next step was to write up the use cases and provide to the group for review. Drs. McKinney and Blake suggested forming a sub working group to do the work and then present the results to the group at the October 28th meeting.

Decisions

Action Items

Drs. McKinney and Blake will form a group to work with Ms. Smothers to develop the use cases.