RESEARCH ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
April 7, 2015
8:30-10:00am
Medical Sciences Building, Chancellors Conference Room S-30

Attendees: MC Gaisbauer, Kent Iwamiya, Jim Kiriakis, Gretchen Kiser, Kathryn Lee, Georgina Lopez, Eric Mah, Synthia Mellon, Suzanne Murphy, Michael Nordberg, Terri O'Lonergan, Christine Razler, Bill Seaman, Brian Smith, Matthew Springer, Paul Volberding

Guests: Emanuela (Emy) Volpe, Joanne Spetz

PRESENTATION: Resource Allocation Program (RAP); Emanuela Volpe, JD
- Emy Volpe provided a follow up to the March RAB meeting presentation on the Resource Allocation Program (RAP), (see PowerPoint Presentation)
- RAP is a campus-wide program the aim of which is to coordinate intramural research funding opportunities for UCSF. RAP is a consortium of 18 UCSF funding agencies which agree to run funding competitions together with the common goal of funding as much good science as possible.
- RAP facilitates:
  - Marketing of funding opportunities
  - Proposal submission
  - Proposal review
  - Collaborative award process

Questions/Comments:
- RAP submissions: If someone applies more than once, it would be helpful to know if there have been improvements made, i.e. if your score goes up or not, so adjustments can be made. Should also make it clear that the score doesn't necessarily compare with other scores, as the proposal can be approved for a number of other reasons (more relevant research, etc.)
  - This could also be good training ground for people to become NIH reviewers, since our reviewers are using NIH protocols and processes
  - Reviewing can be very beneficial; it can help teach you how to do a grant yourself.
- Tobacco center: thought that tobacco people would be the ones doing review?
  - Staying within RAP, actually have very few tobacco grant applications, should get the word out for people to apply
- Can only submit one grant per cycle, but can have several agencies possibly provide funding as mechanism does not go with a funder
  - Much of this is worked out during discussion among the funding agencies (a “horse trading” session) to ensure as many grants as possible are provided funding
    - Could be beneficial for applicants to know this
  - It was suggested that new investigators be allowed to submit more than one grant to get started, might be something to consider promoting/allowing

Next Steps:
- None Identified

PRESENTATION: Research Services Satisfaction Survey; Joanne Spetz, PhD
- Joanne Spetz reviewed the results of the OSR Satisfaction Survey and discussed updates for next annual survey (see PowerPoint Presentation)
- Overview of 2014 survey methods:
  - Fielded between June 23 and July 10
  - Convenience sample
    - 2,314 invitations sent to recent or current OSR customers
    - 944 invitations sent to OSRANNOUNCE & LIMITEDSUBS
  - Survey reminders sent June 26, July 1, 7, 10
    - Response rate = 33%
  - OSR staff perspective (n = 56)
    - Separate survey sent to all OSR staff: two open-ended questions
Fielded between July 22 and August 1
Response rate = 41%

Questions/Comments:
- Concerns with question on “During the last year, did you and/or any of your department administrators decide not to submit a proposal because fees were too high?”
  - Should ask department chairs, MSO’s if their faculty are aware of funding models and how billing is actually done, i.e. how is this communication done?
  - Update survey based on who is filling it out
  - Keep it as simple as possible
- Concerns with question: Hours spent “personally” on tasks for most recent submission: Preparing budget, justification, biosketches, resource description, subawardee documents, uploading to application system, etc.
  - Might be more beneficial to ask who is working on what part, who put in the specific time
    - Concerns with the delivery of service to various departments, valuable to know who has ownership over the specific tasks for a submission
  - Could ask a number of very detailed questions, but run the risk of people not filling it out. Again keep as simple as possible
  - Over time, the value of these survey/data point will increase, because we will be able to track performance over time
  - A caution: many faculty don’t remember the exact time they spend on various tasks, and may lose patience with survey
- Suggestions:
  - Ask only one or a few questions: are you satisfied with process of submission?
  - Have a more timely request for feedback, i.e. right after a proposal is submitted
    - General sense of faculty on RAB that the questionnaire is fine, as long as it is short
      - Will matter how quickly changes will be made
      - Need an area for feedback/comments
    - Maybe have a drop down/check box to identify if the survey responder personally did the work being identified or if someone else did
- Additional updates to survey
  - Be clear what is being asked about certain departments, etc.
  - Whom do you contact for questions about certain grants
  - Create a matrix
  - Links for more information for those that want/need to see it

Next Steps:
- Joanna will consider recommendations for updates to the survey
Resource Allocation Program (RAP)

“One Application, Many Funding Opportunities, One Deadline”

Emanuela Volpe, JD
Research Development Office

5/8/2015
Definition

RAP is a campus-wide program the aim of which is to coordinate intramural research funding opportunities for UCSF. RAP is a consortium of 18 UCSF funding agencies which agree to run funding competitions together with the common goal of funding as much good science as possible.

RAP facilitates:
• Marketing of funding opportunities
• Proposal submission
• Proposal review
• Collaborative award process
Mission

RAP’s mission is to make application for intramural research funding efficient and accessible for all applicants, and to coordinate and minimize the redundancy of the application and review process among funding agencies.

RAP is financially supported by the Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost’s Office, by the Dean of the School of Medicine and by the Funding Agencies.
Review Process

• 10 highly-specialized standing review committees provide a fair, rigorous, and transparent peer-reviewed process

• Applications are assigned to a review committee organized by subject area

• Applications are reviewed by two individuals with area-specific expertise and discussed by the entire review committee

• Applications are scored according to criteria listed in the descriptions for each grant mechanism using the 1-9 NIH scoring scale
Review Committees

1. Basic HIV/AIDS, Infectious Diseases & Global
2. Cancer
3. Career Development
4. Clinical HIV/AIDS, Infectious Diseases & Global
5. Clinical Sciences
6. Health Policy & Social Sciences
7. Mobile Health Research
8. Molecular Medicine
9. Neurosciences
10. Technology
Various Grant Mechanisms

All fall within the following categories:

• Career Development
• International
• Multidisciplinary
• Pilots for Junior & Established Investigators
• Technology
Benefits

• Broad visibility to the entire UCSF research community
• Twice yearly pre-determined funding cycles (typically Feb. and Sept.) allow for planning
• One application fits all grant mechanisms
• Transparent review and award process
• Participating funders may fund proposals outside of their area(s) of interest supporting submissions to programs that have exhausted their funds thus increasing the overall final funding
• Shared costs and less administrative burden on programs
• Feedback to applicants helps with RAP resubmissions and submissions to other grants
• Benefits to large center grants:
  o Broad dissemination of opportunities enables the participation of the largest number of researchers on campus
  o New applications that include these review and award processes are attractive to reviewers
Academic Year 2013-2014 Statistics

Funding Cycles Fall 2013 & Spring 2014

- Total applications submitted through RAP: 381
- Proposals reviewed by RAP Committees: 336 (1 withdrawn)
- Proposals with Independent Review: 44
Academic Year 2013-2014 Statistics

Funding Cycles Fall 2013 & Spring 2014

Proposals Reviewed by RAP Committees

• Applications reviewed: 336
• Awards made: 118 (35% success rate)
• Funds distributed: $3,969,614
Academic Year 2013-2014 Statistics

Funding Cycles Fall 2013 & Spring 2014

Proposals with Independent Review

• Total applications submitted: **44**
• CTSI-Catalyst – 30 proposals
• Diabetes Research Center Pilot Diabetes – 9 proposals (Spring cycle only)
• Diabetes Research Center Pilot Obesity – 5 proposals (Spring cycle only)
• Awards made: **12**
• Funds distributed: **$590,300**
OSR Satisfaction Survey

Joanne Spetz, PhD
Philip R. Lee Institute for Health Policy Studies & Center for the Health Professions

April 2015
Overview of 2014 survey methods

- **Office of Sponsored Research online survey**
  - Fielded between June 23 and July 10
  - Convenience sample
    - 2,314 invitations sent to recent or current OSR customers
    - 944 invitations sent to OSRANNOUNCE & LIMITEDSUBS
  - Survey reminders sent June 26, July 1, 7, 10
  - Response rate = 33%

- **OSR staff perspective (n = 56)**
  - Separate survey sent to all OSR staff: two open-ended questions
  - Fielded between July 22 and August 1
  - Response rate = 41%
Samples in survey data analyses 2013 vs. 2014

- 2013 first-ever evaluation conducted as exploratory research.
  - All staff and faculty surveyed.
- 2014 evaluation of current users
  - Convenience sample extracted from current database and listservs
- Completed surveys only
  - Some people started the survey but did not submit
### How would you describe your role?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013 Total</th>
<th>2014 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other staff/administrator</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-doc</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff researcher</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic non-faculty</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How many years have you worked at UCSF?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013 Total</th>
<th>2014 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0—4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5—12</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 or more</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### In the last 12 months, have you been involved in submitting any proposals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall satisfaction of active users
I'm satisfied with my current pre-award services.

2014 (n = 753) 2013 (n = 1,002)
Overall satisfaction by role and year using 3-point satisfaction scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Post-doc</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Post-doc</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is the overall change significant? Faculty & post-docs only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Significant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matched respondents</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RMS specific quality ratings - 2014

Significant changes in bold font

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unmatched faculty &amp; post-docs</th>
<th>Matched faculty &amp; post-docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding funding</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing timeline</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting deadlines</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating progress</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget communications</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete application</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission communication</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials without errors</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for cost</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# GBC specific quality ratings – 2014

Significant changes in bold font

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unmatched faculty &amp; post-docs</th>
<th>Matched faculty &amp; post-docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notifying when finalized</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting for PI interests</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating communications</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating progress</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuing subcontracts</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing awards</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding requirements</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Development Office (RDO) knowledge and use

Have you heard about RDO? (N = 754)
- 59% (446)
- 41% (308)

Have you used RDO services? (N = 308)
- Yes
- No
- 47% (146)
- 53% (162)
RDO specific quality ratings - 2014

Pivot Funding opportunity training: 3.6
Overall Interaction: 3.9
Building Teams (BTIR): 3.2
Resource Allocation Program (RAP): 4.0
Limited Submission Program (LSP): 3.8
Large multi-investigator project (LGDP): 3.7

Rating Scale: Poor, Fair, Good, V good, Excellent.
Customer perspectives from survey

Source: Responses to open-ended questions...
  • What recommendations do you have for improving research services from RMS, CBG, and/or RDO?
  • What else would you like to tell us about your experience with research services from RMS, CBG, and/or RDO?

Sample: 401 respondents generated 598 comments. All comments were analyzed for themes.
## Key Issues & Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Strengthening effective communications | Each team will develop & implement plan for personalized communications  
Staff will increase 1:1 interactions |
| Productive relationships between RSC & researcher | RMS improving primary & secondary assignments so familiar individuals are available during peaks & absences |
| Staffing turnover, hiring more staff | Partner more closely with departments in staff hiring  
Monitoring workload metrics for rebalancing staff & team assignments |
| Subcontract services | Focused process improvement planned and delivered for subaward processes by spring 2014 |
### Key Issues & Action Plan

| Service level expectations, consistency across teams | Campus workgroup established to review & update RMS service partnership agreement |
| Increase levels of expertise across staff | Expand training program |
| Better marketing of GBC activities (and dissolution of C&G) | GBC is developing a comprehensive communication plan & web-based tool to help faculty & departments determine which office is responsible |
| Improve marketing of RDO office | RDO is aligning with the Vice Chancellor’s office |
| | RDO is developing a marketing plan |
2015 Survey Plans: Sampling Changes

- All RMS Principal Investigators from the past year
- All GBC users from the past year
- OSR listserv subscribers
- All department MSOs and financial staff
- Staff as identified…
  - …by RMS/GBC staff as being involved in grant preparation
  - …by respondents as being involved in grant preparation
2015 Survey Plans: Questionnaire

- More information about departments (to link to RMS teams)
  - Listing of departments through which proposals are submitted
- Finances: “During the last year, did you and/or any of your department administrators decide not to submit a proposal because fees were too high?”
- Opinion of quality of support from RMS coordinator (5 points, inadequate to great)
- Hours spent “personally” on tasks for most recent submission
  - Preparing budget, justification, biosketches, resource description, subawardee documents, uploading to application system, etc.
  - What type of proposal was it?
- New GBC questions