RESEARCH ADVISORY GROUP (RAB)
November 5, 2013  8:30-10:00 a.m.  S-30

Coordinator: Jamie Antonazzo

PRESENTATION: Recommendations from the Pre-Award Funding Model Workgroup  Susanne Hildebrand-Zanki
Susanne provided an update on the draft recommendations that came out of the Pre-Award Funding Model Work Group. This group, consisting of the Associate Deans for Administration and Finance, as well as department and finance managers, was charged by the Deans to explore alternative cost allocation models. The main draft recommendation to come out of the group is that the funding model should use the number of proposals submitted as the basis for pre-award cost allocation. Control points will be assessed based on the prior year proposal volume. A further recommendation is to separate proposals into 3 tiers based on complexity:

- Career-like Awards
- RO1-like Grants
- Large Multi-PI/Project Proposals

Several different models were discussed and the rationale for why proposals were chosen was based on several key points:

- Proposals are most directly linked to the work of Research Management Services (RMS).
- With roll out of eProposal we now have the ability to identify proposals by type, something that was not possible with Proposal Express.
- Using either direct expenses or indirect cost recovery as a basis introduces varying degrees of unfairness in the form of cross subsidization at the department level.

Additionally, School of Medicine department chairs have indicated that they are in favor of moving to proposals.

One of the concerns in the past had been that charging per proposal might discourage junior faculty from submitting large numbers of proposals, however, the chairs felt that faculty are generally encouraged to submit as many proposals as possible so that they are able to secure as much funding as possible, and that this was not a large concern.

Questions/Comments:
- Are we concerned about the possibility of a chair turning down a proposal that they feel does not have a good chance of being funded? The possibility of this happening exists now, and the chairs did not feel that the change would create any greater risk.
- What about small proposals that may cost more to put through than they bring in? The average cost is $2000/proposal, so this is not considered to be a huge risk.
- Do we know the cost for each tier? This is to be determined based on the number and type of proposals submitted and the budget for the next fiscal year. We have an analyst working out of the EVCP Office who will be tasked with analyzing the data from last year at the end of December.
- Will we also be looking at withdrawn proposals? Yes, we are aware that there is often work done on proposals that do not end up getting submitted and we will be looking at this.
- How are we doing with the current proposal workload in RMS? We are currently doing 90+ per person, and our goal was 89, so sustainability is a major focus.
- Will eProposal allow for more proposals to be submitted? Yes, though we are hoping that since the workload per person is already so high, this tool will still serve to make the workload more sustainable.
These minutes are intended to provide a summary of action & follow up items; a few discussion highlights are included.

**DISCUSSION: RAB Input and Feedback**

Susanne Hildebrand-Zanki/All

Susanne explained that the EVCP office would like to establish a more systematic way of collecting feedback on the rollout of campus research administration initiatives. It would be great for RAB to help with this by serving as a place for members to bring up “pain points” that the EVCP office may not hear about otherwise, so that they can be addressed more quickly.

As an example, Susanne mentioned that Stanford has a policy advisory group that meets monthly and looks at how various initiatives are rolled out. It would be great for RAB to serve as something similar, as this would allow the EVCP to gain a deeper understanding of the issues, as well as to deliver better service.

The group discussed suggestions for ways to facilitate this, as follows:

- Raise the profile of RAB via members sharing more info with departments
- Identify a way to collect feedback from faculty, perhaps via a suggestion box online
- Identify a topic of the month that the EVCP is looking for feedback on, and have members collect anecdotal feedback on that topic, and then bring those back to the group
- Invite key personnel from various areas (Bob Eaton – EH&S, Jim Wilkerson - LARC) to give updates at future meetings
- Ask members to report back from the Academic Senate and other faculty committees that have already taken up some of these issues (Example: Tejal Desai serves on the Academic Senate, and Michael Nordberg serves on the faculty committee for the UC Hall Decant Project)
- Set aside a few minutes at the end of each meeting to bring up issues for discussion
- Add a link to RAB on the UCSF faculty site, and on the Research Administration Bulletin

Suggestions for future meeting topics:

- Invite Chip Chambers to talk about CRC plans (suggested by Kathy Lee)
- Invite Catherine Lucey, Chair of the Clinical Science and UC Hall Decant Project Faculty Committee (Suggested by Susanne Hildebrand-Zanki/group)

**Next Steps:**

- Bill Seaman asked the group to send issues for future discussion to himself, Dan Lowenstein, or Michael Nordberg.
- Synthia Mellon, Matt Springer, and Michael Nordberg agreed to form a small group to look at the Chemical Safety SOP Rollout Issue.

---

**Charge to the Research Advisory Group (RAB)**

- To provide input to the Office of Research, and ultimately the EVC&P, about the needs of investigators and administrators in conducting research and administering extramural funds.
- To guide priority setting and critical assessment of quality improvement efforts in the Office of Research
- To work with the Office of Research staff to ensure the successful implementation of the current Quality Improvement Project
Pre-Award Funding Model Workgroup

Report to the RAB
November 5, 2013

Susanne Hildebrand-Zanki
AVC, Research
Charge from the Deans:
form a workgroup composed of the Assoc. Deans for Administration and Finance and department and finance managers to explore alternative cost allocation models.

Members of the funding model work group included:
Clarice Estrada, CVRI
Susanne Hildebrand-Zanki, OSR
Lynda Jacobsen, SON
Jane Meier, OB/GYN
Michael Nordberg, SOP
Anja Paardekooper, SOM
Christine Razler, DOM
Susan Schultz, SOD
DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

• Use the number of proposals submitted as the basis for pre-award cost allocation.

• A further recommendation is to stratify proposals into 3 tiers based on complexity:
  
  F, K like value = 1x
  R like value = 2x
  P, U, T like value = 4x

Control points would be assessed based on the prior year proposal volume.
Rationale

• Proposals are most directly linked to the work of RMS
• With roll out of eProposal we now have the ability to identify proposals by type, something that was not possible with Proposal Express.
• Using either direct expenses or indirect cost recovery as a basis introduces varying degrees of unfairness in the form of cross subsidization at the department level.
• Additionally, SOM department chairs have indicated that they are in favor of moving to proposals
### Proportion of Costs allocated to Control Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Based on Directs</th>
<th>Based on Indirects</th>
<th>Based on Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVCP (LPPI, Proctor, etc.)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>