

Supplemental Digital Form 1

Vanderbilt Institute for Clinical and Translational Research (VICTR) Studios Moderator Checklist: A Tool to Assist Studio Moderators

Welcome (5 minutes)

- Explain the general purpose of studios
- Introductions (yourself, the experts, any other attendees and the PI)
- Review the studio agenda
- Encourage the experts to ask questions during the presentation if something is unclear or needs clarification; otherwise ask them to reserve questions or comments until the end of the presentation
- Encourage the experts to complete the expert comment sheet before they leave the studio
- Remind the PI to keep his/her presentation to 15 minutes or less
- Ask the PI to begin by stating what he/she wants to get out of the studio

Discussion (60 minutes)

- After the PI finishes his/her presentation, re-state the main purpose/focus of the studio before starting the discussion
- Open the discussion by asking the experts if they have any specific questions for the PI or any points they would like clarified
- Intervene when necessary (e.g. whenever the discussion drifts off onto a tangent that is not related to the main purpose); reiterate the main purpose and re-focus the discussion
- Try to engage all of the experts at some point during the discussion

Closing Remarks (10 minutes before the close of meeting)

- Provide a brief summary at the end of the studio; perhaps have each expert state one or two important take-home points or review questions submitted by the PI
- Thank the experts for their time and participation
- Remind the experts to complete their comment sheet and to give them to the coordinator at the end of the studio
- Remind everyone (experts and PIs) to complete the evaluation which will be e-mailed within a day or two

***Thank you for your willingness to serve as a studio moderator.
Your contribution helps makes this worthwhile service possible.***



Supplemental Digital Form 2

Vanderbilt Institute for Clinical and Translational Research (VICTR) Studios Expert's Comment Form

Expert Name: _____ **Date:** _____

Principal Investigator: _____

We appreciate your participation and value your time. In an effort to maximize the benefits for everyone involved, we have developed an Expert's Comment Sheet. Please comment on the points listed below during your pre-review or during the course of the studio. The moderator will collect/review these comments at the end of the studio and then summarize the feedback to the group. (Please feel free to use the back of the page if necessary.)

1.	Strengths of the project:
2.	Weaknesses of the project:
3.	Challenges associated with the project:
4.	Opportunities associated with the project, e.g. networking, funding:

Additional Comments

(Reviewer's Signature)

(Date)

Supplemental Digital Form 3

Vanderbilt Institute for Clinical and Translational Research (VICTR) Studios Investigator Evaluation

We are constantly trying to improve the studio process and would appreciate if you could take a few minutes to provide some feedback based on your recent studio experience. Your individual responses will be kept confidential.

Name: (Please enter full name) _____

The studio website was easy to navigate and use.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

The scheduling/communications for this studio were handled in a timely and efficient manner.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

The studio moderator managed the allotted time in order to address my questions.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

The time for this studio was adequate in length to cover the issues/questions.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

The relevant experts were present at the studio session.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

I was satisfied with the studio session.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable since I am not seeking compensation

The studio process was worth my time.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

The expert feedback was conveyed to me in an appropriate way.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

This studio improved the quality of the science, research project or manuscript.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Would you recommend a studio session to a colleague?

- Yes
- No

Would you request studio services from other experts in the future?

- Yes
- No

Would you be willing to participate as an expert in future studios?

- Yes
- No

Would you request studio services again from the individuals participating in this studio?

- Yes
- No

Did your studio result in any of the following? (Check all that apply)

- Grant submission
- Manuscript submission
- Delayed grant submission
- Delayed manuscript submission
- Major proposal/manuscript revisions

Suggestion 1 for improving the quality of the studio:

Suggestion 2 for improving the quality of the studio:

Suggestion 3 for improving the quality of the studio:

Supplemental Digital Form 4

Vanderbilt Institute for Clinical and Translational Research (VICTR) Studios Studio Expert Evaluation

Thank you for taking the time to provide valuable feedback on the studio process. We are continually trying to improve the studio process for everyone involved and your comments will help us tremendously.

Name of Studio Expert: (Please enter full name) _____

Institution: (Check all that apply)

- Vanderbilt
- Meharry
- Other: If other, please specify: _____

Title:

- Pre-Doctoral Fellow
- Post-Doctoral Fellow
- Resident
- Clinical Fellow
- Research Fellow
- Clinical Instructor
- Research Instructor
- Assistant Professor
- Research Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Research Associate Professor
- Professor
- Other: If other title, please specify: _____

Degree: (Check all that apply)

- APN
- BS
- MD
- MPH
- PhD
- RN
- Other: If other degree, please specify: _____

Department: _____

Division: _____

LAST name of PI to whom you provided expertise: _____

Date of Studio: _____

Type of Studio:

- T1
- T2
- Basic Science

I had the relevant expertise to address the researcher's specific issues or questions.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

The studio moderator managed the allotted time in order to address the researcher's issues/questions.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

The studio process was worth my time.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

The scheduling for this studio was handled in a timely and efficient matter.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

This studio improved the quality of the science or research project.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

The funds allocated were adequate for the services I provided.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable since I am not seeking compensation

The time for this studio was adequate in length to cover the issues/questions.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

The investigator was prepared for the studio.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

If you disagree or strongly disagree, please specify where the PI could have made improvements. (Check all that apply)

- Pre-studio preparation, e.g. development of study documents
- Knowledge of the literature
- Studio presentation

I was able to provide a substantive contribution to the project either through discussion or written comments.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

My contribution to the studio was related to which of the following topic areas: (Check all that apply)

- New measures
- New conceptual framework
- Identifying new sources of bias
- Selection and use of scales
- Specific aims and/or hypotheses
- Study population
- Study design
- Background & significance
- Preliminary studies
- Identification of potential collaborators
- Subject recruitment/retention
- Implementation
- Biostatistics
- Journal selection
- Choice of study section
- Presentation of data in manuscript
- Guidance on response to reviewer critiques
- Recommendation of additional experiments for inclusion in manuscript
- Other: If other type of contribution, please specify:

If requested by the PI, would you be willing to provide additional guidance to the PI following the studio? (Please note that no additional compensation will be provided for follow-up following the studio.)

- Yes
- No

Would you be willing to participate as an expert in future studios?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please specify up to three areas of CONTENT expertise for which you would like to be considered for future studios:

If yes, please list up to three areas of METHODS expertise for which you would like to be considered for future studios:

Please suggest up to three ways that the quality of the studio process could be improved:

Invoice: Translational Studio, Expert Consult (Amount: \$150)

Following a studio, experts may be compensated \$150.00 for participation, which would be deposited into a non-federal cost center (provided by the expert). In accordance with federal law pertaining to percent effort though, you may only be reimbursed for your time if you currently have uncommitted effort available to apply to this project. Also, individuals receiving salary support from the CTSA grant may or may not be eligible for reimbursement (please check with your Division Chief for more information).

Are you seeking compensation for this studio?

- Yes
- No

Is this studio expert consultation DIRECTLY related to your role on the CTSA grant?

- No
- Yes
- Not Applicable

Do you have non-federal effort available to be compensated for this studio participation?

- Yes
- No

Cost Center Number: (Note: May NOT be a Federal Cost Center) _____

Administrator's Name: (Please write full name) _____