

Draft proposals for management of TPC business

Face-to-face meeting format

- **Face-to-face meetings:** at AAPM and ASTRO will be three hours long. Of this two and a half hours will be spent on TPC business and an additional half hour will be spent on brainstorming on new ideas that sub-committees should be focusing on.
- **SC /Liaison reports:** All reports by SC and Liaison will be sent one month ahead of time to the chair of TPC. TPC chair will distribute these to TPC members within one week of receipt of all reports. Liaison reports will be divided into two groups. One group will present their report near the beginning of the meeting. The second group will present their report at the end. This format will then be rotated at the next meeting. Each SC chair and liaison will request the TPC chair the maximum time needed for presenting their oral report. Chair will allocate time appropriately. Format of oral report will be as follows:
 - Action items
 - Mention the names of the active Task Groups, TG chairs, sunset date and status of the TGs
- Chair at his/her discretion will limit all tangential discussions to a few minutes.
- **Brainstorming session:** The goal of this session is for TPC to be proactive in a top down approach to provide guidance on what the SCs and WGs should be focusing on. Members/liaisons/SC chairs will provide the chair of TPC one month ahead of time new ideas for the brainstorming session at the face-to-face meeting. Selected number of ideas will be discussed. Member responsible for submission of the idea chosen for discussion will lead the discussion.
- **Have bi-monthly** conference calls or calls on demand to take care of TPC business.

Responsibilities of Subcommittees

- **Authority of subcommittees (SC):** Subcommittees will be empowered to take ownership of all subcommittee activities.
 - **Quality of TG proposals:** The Subcommittees should ensure that all new TG proposals are of highest quality in nature before sending it to TPC. All TG proposals should be complete such that it shouldn't require much discussion by TPC for approval.
 - **Report review [See the new flow chart for details]:** Review of all TG reports by the SC should be of the highest quality. Consider getting professional support such as outsourcing editorial assistance (science writer) with HQ support in writing the TG reports at the early phase. The report when it comes to TPC for review process should be of such high quality that TPC wouldn't have to spend significant amount of time reviewing/rewriting it.
 - **New TG proposals :** See the new flow chart for details
 - **Expectations:**
 - Consider setting more formal expectations. In areas where lots of activities are pending, consider setting priorities. e.g. there are multiple reports ongoing in the proton working group. Consider TPC providing input to the SC chair in conjunction with an honest status report on all TGs that are in progress.
 - Consolidate critical topics being monitored by their WGs, along with an indication of whether they thought it had potential for a TG proposal or white paper, etc and at TPC this information could be reviewed in the brainstorming session, to fast track/prepare proposals etc that are in line with strategic goals.
- **Quarterly conference calls:** Have quarterly conference calls with all subcommittee chairs to take care of all sub-committee business. Action items that require TPC approval can be done by e-mail vote/t-con or at

the face-to-face meeting. Post minutes from the meetings/t-cons to the TPC website so that all TPC members and Science Council can track the progress. Identify topics that should be taken to the full TPC group.

TG report and concept proposal review process

- **No. of TG reports:** Are there too many TG reports? Will the process mentioned above enhance the quality of proposals to be sent to TPC for review thus screening out proposals that are not of highest quality?
- **Length of reports:** TG reports are too long. Although not one size fits all, a suggested format might be:
 - not be more than six pages (?) in length
 - The report should include an abstract, brief introduction, charge of the TG, recommendations and reasons for these recommendations.
 - Incorporate appropriate clinical practice component to the report
 - If necessary details of the background can be printed on the web or as an accompanying report.
- **Consider if there is room to define different tiers (and timelines) of reports:** The brachytherapy groups have a method that allows them to do updates to existing reports. Within external beam, we often start over rather than leveraging existing guidance. Consider defining classes of reports which we would want to follow a different format. The SC chairs should review various TG reports that originated in their SC and propose a general format for reports to be published from their SC. Proposal will need to be reviewed and accepted by Huq and SC chairs.
- **Review process and period:** The review process is too long. The current review process has been modified by Jean and Huq to make the review process more efficient. This new process needs to be discussed and approved by TPC.
- **TG report review process:** Sometimes report approval gets delayed because during a second review of TPC reviewers (new or previous) identify additional items of concern that should have been identified during the first review. See the new flowchart that addresses this problem.

Participation by TPC/SC/WG/TG membership in the business of respective groups

- **Key expectations:**
 - Active participation in the majority of discussions (teleconference and face-to-face); participate in the review process, expect to provide written comments to at least 50% of the reports submitted to TPC; expect to be the lead reviewer of 1 or 2 TG reports (this a multi-year commitment that may extend beyond service to TPC for consistency; the SC chairs may be an exception to this because they will always review the reports that come out of their SC); and participate in other TPC special projects as interested (e.g. Safety Stakeholders group has several TPC members).
 - Expect 100% voting by participants present in all TPC activities. If a member does not have the expertise to vote on a given TG report or proposal s/he should abstain from voting. However, the candidate should let the chair/Vice Chair inform of such a situation and go on record that s/he does not have the expertise to vote.
 - Huq and Moran to support more engagement by tracking lead reviewers and making sure that new reports are assigned to a lead reviewer who is not a lead reviewer yet.
 - Place a brief statement of the expectations of TPC and SC members on our website.
 - Question: What to do with a member if s/he does not participate in the TPC activities?

Communication with other societies

- Enhance communication with other societies such as ASTRO, Technology Assessment Institute (TAI) etc so that development of documents etc are not duplicated
 - Additional questions regarding synchronizing or staging our reviews. For example the WGPE report on incident reporting was under review by ASTRO with a deadline of Feb 19. We need TPC input on the report as well. It is not clear why ASTRO & TPC reviews were overlapped.

Maximum utilization of HQ support in management of TPC activities

- Formalization of how we spend our time and money
 - Work with HQ to look at TGs, focus, money spent by TGs
 - Take a higher level view of the Science activities that TPC wants to accomplish (in conjunction with revisiting where TPC fits and where we want to fit with respect to Strategic Planning)
 - Evaluate if there are any urgent activities overseen by TPC that would benefit from \$ for a face-to-face meeting or other support to decrease the timeline from concept to publication.
- Establish a mechanism of tracking of progress of all SC activities.
 - Improve our use of AAPM web-provided tools.
 - Possible action: Have Michael Woodward do a training session for TPC and SC chairs. Use web tools and require chairs to provide regular reports. By having groups use existing tools frequently, SC chairs will only need to supplement what the WG and TG chairs write for TPC to know what the activities are.
 - Provide feedback to HQ on enhancement of tools that would help TPC and SC leadership track progress.
 - Consider a bulletin to all SC, WG, and TG chairs on how we would like tools to be used. Try improvements with some existing TGs. Consider asking Michael Woodward to cover some of these things in his education session at the annual AAPM meeting.
 - Once changes are approved, consider having a WebEx led by TPC or SC chairs to TG chairs on the changes that we would like to implement.
 - Record all votes and results electronically (even T-con and face-to-face). HQ was going to work on a mechanism where the outcome could be recorded by AAPM staff. Removes redundancy re: approving sunset extensions when we may have already done that. Tracks the outcome of major decisions. Provides data on the web re: timeliness of TPC vote on submitted reports. (This was briefly discussed at the Council Chair meeting in November at HQ.)
- More active evaluation of SC and WG chairs and making sure that there are vice chairs appointed by the chairs for all groups. Also, for members expiring.
 - Possible action: In Sept of each year, ask HQ to generate a report to TPC chair, vice-chair and SC chairs of the dates of service for the chair and vice-chair of each SC and WG where the service term of the chair expires at the end of that year. Also, ask HQ to send each chair and vice-chair a list of members whose terms are expiring at the end of that year.
 - HQ can make it easier for TPC and SC leaders to make sure any leadership changes or renewals are done in a timely way.
 - Have clear guidance on the website re: process for appointing chairs (by chair 1 level above) and vice-chairs (by chair at that level)

Collaboration with ESTRO and IAEA

- Formalize collaboration with ESTRO and IAEA. Where possible, develop reports in close collaboration with IAEA and ESTRO.