These minutes are intended to provide a summary of action & follow up items; a few discussion highlights are included.

**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.

---

**RESEARCH ADVISORY GROUP (RAB)**

**Attendees:** Diane Barber, Chip Chambers, Jane Czech, John Ellis, Susanne Hildebrand-Zanki, Gretchen Kiser, Steve Lazarus, Kathy Lee, Erik Liim, Georgina Lopez, Dan Lowenstein, Teresa Moeller, Suzanne Murphy, Michael Nordberg, Christine Razler, Bill Seaman, Matthew Springer, Paul Volberding

*Not present:* Mounira Kenaani, Synthia Mellon, Judy Moscowitz, Marge O’Halloran, John Radkowski, Louis Reichardt

*Via phone:* Elizabeth Boyd, Tejali Desai, Holly Ingraham

*Coordinator:* Jamie Antonazzo

**August 6, 2013 8:00-9:30 a.m. S-30**

**PRESENTATION: UCSF 2.0**

Jeff Bluestone

EVCP Jeff Bluestone presented a slide deck to the group outlining a new project called UCSF 2.0.

The concept of UCSF 2.0 is to generate a large number of big, bold ideas in a way that is different from a traditional strategic plan, with the hope of inspiring the next generation, and involving the entire UCSF community in the process. We have partnered with Institute for the Future, a non-profit that has worked on similar projects for many other institutions. The Institute has helped us design a game on a participatory platform using game mechanics to spark new ideas and inspire engagement. The game will be focused on reinventing the hospital for the 21st century. Jeff showed the group several examples of videos created by the Institute for other organizations, as well as a teaser for the UCSF project.

The game event, which will be open for 36 hours on September 11th to September 12th, will serve as **Phase 1** of the project, and will allow faculty, staff, students, alumni, non-UCSF stakeholders, global SMEs, as well as the general public to share big ideas about the future of health care in an interactive manner. Curators from Institute for the Future will maintain the game. There will be prizes and rewards for the most popular ideas, which will display as “trending” on the website that is being created for this project.

After the conclusion of the game, we will begin **Phase 2**, where idea workshops will be convened, made up of small groups of individuals who will look at the dozens of ideas generated from the game, and will develop forecasts and findings based on those ideas. From these reports and findings, we will narrow the ideas down further for **Phase 3**, refining the content with visual mapping of the ideas and further analysis, and finally in **Phase 4**, we will ultimately identify the 3-4 big ideas that we plan to move forward with.

A number of faculty, staff and student ambassadors for this project have been engaged across campus, and have been provided with FAQ’s and more information on the project, so that they can spread the word and encourage others to participate in the game when it comes online. If you are interested in becoming an ambassador, please let Jeff know.

**Questions/Comments:**

- Will we be required to register to participate? Yes, registration will happen on the website, which is due to be launched soon, but registration does not have to be via one’s real name, since some may prefer to post ideas anonymously.
- Will there be a phone app? Jeff explained that the phone app will likely not be ready in time, but that the game will be optimized for use on mobile browsers.
- What is the average time that people will spend playing the game? This varies greatly from person to person – it could be as short as 5 minutes - just enough time to register and offer an idea - or others could choose to spend significantly longer. There are no rewards for how long you spend in the game, only on the popularity of the ideas posted.
- Will there be a way to download the most popular ideas? There will be many ways to access the ideas that are most active/popular, via the trending list on the site, and in other ways within the game.
- What is the communication plan to reach people outside of UCSF? We will send targeted emails to donors, and friends of the Chancellor, flyers will be passed out to patients, and we will also be doing some local press.
- Is there a list of current ambassadors, so that we can share this with people who may want more information? This will be available on the website after it is launched.
- Are there students and postdocs on the ambassador list as well? Yes, both are participating.
Concern about launching the game on 9/11 was brought up, and Jeff explained that the intent was not to make a connection between the game and the events on 9/11, but that it was purely a timing issue, as this time worked best for the main stakeholders involved. Since this is an event focused on change, and the future, they felt that the 9/11 date would not serve as a major detriment or barrier for participation.

Concern was expressed about the potential risks involved in implementing some of these big ideas. Jeff explained that it is his understanding that no one idea generated here would be large enough to pose so much risk that it would be hugely detrimental to the university should it fail.

Next Steps: If anyone would like to become an ambassador for UCSF 2.0, please contact Jeff, or Janhavi Bonville (j.bonville@ucsf.edu).

PRESENTATION: Update - Lean 6 Sigma Award Process Workshop
Gretchen Kiser
The Lean 6 Sigma Award Process Workshop took place from July 23-26th, and was led by Fabrice Beretta from CTSI, with assistance from Gretchen. The objective was to reduce the duration from award/project agreement receipt to award/project agreement set up by 50% (from ~ 60 days currently). The workshop was centered on a detailed analysis of the current award process, and followed a typical Lean Six Sigma framework, using process mapping, cost, quality and speed metrics to propose a future action plan that will result in a more efficient process.

Some of the changes that will be made based on the results of the workshop are:

1. Award set-up ownership will be transferred to the Extramural Funds unit (EMF).
2. Ownership of process steps from Award Receipt to Award Execution will be transferred to the Research Management Services (RMS) team, which will be expanded through the addition of a ‘negotiation specialist’. Research Service Coordinators (RSCs) will handle the process from Award Receipt to Award Execution for simple negotiations, and RSCs will work with the negotiation specialist inside the team to handle complex negotiations.
3. A ‘triage’ position will be created to reduce the duration of receiving and assigning awards to the appropriate RMS teams.

The plan is to roll out the new model by the end of September. There will be no change in the number of personnel; all changes will be represented by a shift in responsibilities. By shifting ownership of award set-up and other processes, this will significantly reduce hand-offs, and eliminate a great deal of redundancy and waste.

Questions/Comments:

- Several years ago, we had a presentation made to this group about how the new OE model would significantly improve award set up time. Is this approach taking that process and making it even better, or have we slid back? There has been a slide back due to volume, and also due to inefficiencies which have been identified as we refine the processes in OE. The main problem has been with handoffs, which is why we held this workshop, and we are now planning to eliminate many of those in the new model.
- In regards to simple vs. complex negotiations – do we have an idea of the ratio of one to the other? It is roughly 5-10% that are complex.
- How will we be able to determine whether or not we may need to add more people in the future? We are very confident that for the time being the Lean process has identified ways to improve processes without adding more people, but this is something we will continue to evaluate in the future. Once we receive the results from the RMS survey later this year, we will have a better idea of the general satisfaction level with the current staff numbers.
- The issue of communication was brought up – some individuals are confused as to the process during this interim period. Gretchen explained that for the time being, everything is status quo, and any issues should go to the Manager of Contracts and Grants (Regnier Jurado) and his team, and/or to Marge O’Halloran or Susanne Hildebrand-Zanki. The changes are all happening on the back end at the moment. Improvements to the Centralized Agreement Contact Tracking

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
and Approval System (CACTAS) and eProposal will also help improve the transparency of the process during this transition period.

- Is there any update on post-award, and when that might be centralized? That is a separate issue which is handled by finance, and there are no plans at the current time to move forward with that.

PRESENTATION: Update – Bear Buy Town Halls                  Diane Barber
Diane provided a brief update on the Bear Buy Town Halls, which took place last week. The Mission Bay event had ~20 participants, and the Parnassus event had ~50 participants, most of whom were lab managers and purchasing admins, but some faculty attended as well. The two recent improvements that BearBuy has implemented were discussed at the meeting:

1. The online listing of what has been purchased by others at UCSF.
2. The “Craig’s List” of equipment for sale.

The town hall also generated feedback and discussion among the attendees, and many interesting ideas were discussed, such as the idea of installing freezers in strategic locations across campus which would serve as vending machines for individuals to purchase items at any time, rather than relying on vendors. Another idea discussed was potential cost savings in regards to service contracts.

This led the group into a discussion of whether we should use the methods Diane implemented in working with Bear Buy and apply those to other projects that could benefit from RAB’s influence. The group discussed the main elements that allowed for success with the BearBuy project, which are as follows:

1. Small group of people involved
2. Defined project
3. Limited end date
4. Item was not a “done deal” before we looked at it
5. Faculty took the lead in the process

Dan and Bill agreed to talk to Susanne Hildebrand-Zanki about potential EVCP projects that could utilize this small work group approach in the future. One possibility might be a small work group that Susanne has recently put together around the pre-award funding model. RAB members may want to participate, or it may be possible for RAB to take over this group.

Next Steps:
- Dan, Bill, and Michael will meet with Susanne to discuss RAB operations and possible small-group projects before our next meeting.
- Susanne plans to report on the issues surrounding Clinical Research Billing at a future meeting.
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An Experiment to Identify Bold Ideas for the Future

Today’s Objectives

• Describe what UCSF “2.0” is
• Indicate how you can help
• Get your feedback on inspiring participation

UCSF
Mark Laret
Jeffrey Bluestone
John Ford
Kathy Balestreri
Janhavi Bonville

Institute of the Future
Brinda Dalal | project lead
Marina Gorbis | senior advisor
Rod Falcon | research director
Kathi Vian, Rachel Hatch | phase 1 directors
Sara Skvirsky, Nicole Tindall | project managers

Over 50 UCSF Faculty Ambassadors nominated

An experiment transcending existing Strategic Plans to think 10-15 years out into the future
Purpose of UCSF 2.0

• UCSF remains at the top for research, clinical care, and education, nationally and internationally. We play a key role in making key basic science discoveries and translating discoveries to patient care.

• But... the world is changing. We are in the midst of a revolution for research and healthcare.

• We face challenges on many fronts, from NIH and State funding declines, to increased regulatory hurdles both at the bench and in the clinic, as well as the increased failure rates in bringing new drugs to market to treat and prevent disease.

• Scientific discovery, clinical care and education is more expensive, more complex, more interdependent, and more interdisciplinary.

• We need to address all this, and more, to remain ahead.

UCSF 2.0- How is this Different?

Key Questions

• How do we look to the future – the next 10 years and further?
• How can we define, not just react to, the environment? Are we positioning UCSF to continue to be known for Innovation in SF and the Bay Area? Should we be redefining Health Sciences in the future?
• Are we rewarding smart risk taking and encouraging new efforts to create value for UCSF, our faculty, staff, and patients/citizens in health care and beyond?
• How do we inspire the next generation?

Desired Outcomes

• Take advantage of a unique opportunity: our strengths, our position in Silicon Valley, education, and fundamental and clinical efforts to challenge the future of biomedical research.
• Engage the broader community in generating ideas to generate enthusiasm and excitement, as well as commitment
• Ideas that allow us to take risks and make critical strategic investments

NOT another strategic plan
UCSF 2.0 – The Concept
– hundreds of ideas

Evolving a UCSF Enterprise for the future

THE PROJECT | Phases

**Phase 1**
Online Foresight Event

**Phase 2**
Foresight Workshops

**Phase 3**
Visual Graphics & Map

**Phase 4**
Further Idea Development and Definition and ultimate identification of 3-4 big ideas

**June- September**
- Official Project kickoff
- Develop video, game website
- Develop public messaging and game participation (leadership + ambassador meetings)
- Game event in September
- Analysis of results

**October-November**
- Idea workshops
- Recruit participants
- Develop forecasts
- Develop findings and graphic summaries

**December**
- Idea "mapping"
- Refine content
- Produce print-ready and digital versions of idea maps that can then be used to incorporate into long term Vision
PHASE I PROCESS | 7 Steps

1. Design a provocative video
2. Create a website to build engagement
3. Rally participants with direct outreach
4. Launch the game
5. Guide the game play
6. Blog the best of the game play
7. Analyze and share the results

PHASE 1 | A Game-like Event

a 36-hour game on a participatory platform using game mechanics to spark new ideas and inspire engagement
A Future Scenario from 3 viewpoints

Scene 1 | the individual view
Scene 2 | the institutional view
Scene 3 | the global view

Elements of Scenario:
- UCSF’ers able to “see themselves” in the scenario: education, research, patient care
- Balance of large scale bold ideas and UCSF-specific unique aspects
- Intended to be thought provoking and help generate new and unprecedented ideas
WHO ENGAGES | A Broad Audience

• faculty
• staff
• students and postdocs
• alumni
• key non-UCSF stakeholders

Game is Open to All, but Key Audiences are Targeted

OUTREACH | Many Channels

• ambassadors
• face-to-face meetings
• school deans
• internal distribution lists
• external mailing lists
• social media channels (UCSF + IFTF)
• word-of-mouth

What are other ways to invite participation and representation?
How You can Help

Immediate Next Steps:
- Provide input and ideas on engaging others, now
- "Ambassador Kit" Materials being prepared to provide to ambassadors and leaders:
  - One pager on project
  - Details on how to pre register for game and how to play
  - Answers to FAQs
- Help spread the word:
  - Word of mouth
  - Existing meetings
  - Encourage colleagues to pre-register and prepare ideas prior to Game Launch Date
- Participate! Share your ideas and input
- Phase 2 and beyond:
  - Attend workshops to further develop ideas
  - Help us with further idea definition and development/ ownership of ideas

Modes of Engagement
- pre-game huddles to prepare cards
- pizza parties on Game Day hosted by Ambassadors
- email submissions for those who cannot participate in realtime

GAME OUTCOMES | Broad and Bold

- Broad community engagement and participation
- Surfacing of themes from grassroots and throughout the community
- Identifying new voices of leadership and outlier insights
- Building enthusiasm about thinking about the future of UCSF
Award Process

Lean Six Sigma Workshop
23-26 July 2013

Led by Fabrice Beretta (CTSI Planning, Evaluation & Tracking (PET))
with assistance from Gretchen Kiser
Objective and methodology

• Objective: reduce the duration from award/project agreement receipt to award/project agreement set up by 50% (from ~ 60 days currently)

• Methodology – follow a typical Lean Six Sigma framework using the DMAIC approach:
  – Define: map the process
  – Measure: identify Cost, Quality, Speed metrics
  – Analyze: analyze process/data and problem solve
  – Improve: propose future state solution and action plan
  – Control: ensure that improvements deliver on the initial objective
## Workshop framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tuesday – <strong>Define and Measure</strong></th>
<th>Wednesday – <strong>Measure and Analyze</strong></th>
<th>Thursday - <strong>Improve</strong></th>
<th>Friday – <strong>Improve and set up for Control phase</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach</strong></td>
<td>• Define scope of process</td>
<td>• Drill down into process and statistical data</td>
<td>• Compare models by cost, quality, speed</td>
<td>• Hear from Faculty (PIs) from OSR Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Define process</td>
<td>• Analyze process</td>
<td>• Select model</td>
<td>• Develop detailed implementation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Map process</td>
<td>• Propose future state process and team model</td>
<td>• Develop implementation plan and performance metrics</td>
<td>• Develop performance metrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
<td>• Understand process customer and supplier requirements, cost quality speed metrics</td>
<td>• Leaning out the process by removing waste (unnecessary hands-off, waiting steps, checking the same info twice, reduce steps, do steps in parallel,...)</td>
<td>• Select a future state process and team structure to enable it</td>
<td>• Assign owners/ responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Detailed operational mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Propose a detailed action plan to management to get to future state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers</td>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>Input</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS team collects info for COI COI UCOP (IDC)</td>
<td>PI files disclosures, takes COI training, and signs off on patent doc Complete agreement Released COI IDC waiver completed</td>
<td>Output from previous step</td>
<td>Receive 7 days</td>
<td>1. Time stamp for paper docs 2. Forwarded to central email account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI files disclosures, takes COI training, and signs off on patent doc Complete agreement Released COI IDC waiver completed</td>
<td>Output from above Actual proposal/award COI requirements IRB/IACUC requirement GESCAR requirement UCSF terms and conditions for agreements</td>
<td>Review 1 hour</td>
<td>1. Assignment to RSC team analyst and Award Specialist by Senior Associate 2. Determination: type of agreement, type of action (industry contract, i.e., non C&amp;G) 3. Record in tracking system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Controller</td>
<td>Complete agreement</td>
<td>Award terms and conditions PI terms and conditions (proposal) Prescribed response</td>
<td>Negotiate 30-45 days</td>
<td>Terms and conditions: Publication terms, legal, risk, privacy, financial (IP, indemnification, governing law, use of name, confidential information, data rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Released COI</td>
<td>Signature Terms Output from previous</td>
<td>Execute 1-2 days</td>
<td>Fully executed (signed/approved) agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IDC waiver completed</td>
<td>Output from previous</td>
<td>Set up award 4-5 days</td>
<td>1. Award number: dollar amount, budget period 2. Notification email to &quot;Customers&quot; 3. EMF then creates a Fund #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## High Level Process & key gaps/findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Step (currently owned by Award Team)</th>
<th>Key gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receive &amp; Review award (6-7 days)</td>
<td>High volume of awards centralized to unstructured mailbox, need to identify sponsor's deadline, need better determination of award ID#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess award &amp; Collect required documents (7 days)</td>
<td>Too many hands-off between RSC and Award team, uploading same documents in many locations, too many systems, COI/IRB/IACUC/IDC can hold up the process if they are not ready ahead of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate Terms and Conditions (30-45 days)</td>
<td>Too much volume to process, many parties need to be involved, inconsistent categorization of simple vs complex negotiations, inconsistent negotiation practices, changing legal practices from non NIH partners, need more efficient mechanism to keep list of proscribed responses and UCSF decision makers updated and easily accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execute &amp; Set up award (4-5 days)</td>
<td>Need accurate information more rapidly, double checking information that should be already accurate by a that stage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current process - Award team owns the process**

1. Receive
2. Receive
3. Review
4. Assess and Collect
5. Negotiate
6. Execute
7. Set Up

**Proposed Model - ownership transferred to RMS teams**

1. Receive
2. Triage
3. Review
4. Assess and Collect - RSC who did the proposal
5. Complex negotiation?
6. Negotiate simple
7. Execute
8. Negotiate Complex
9. Execute
10. Set Up
Key elements of future state

1. Award set-up ownership is transferred to EMF
2. Ownership of process steps from Award Receipt to Award Execution is transferred to the RMS team which is expanded through the addition of a ‘negotiation specialist’
   a. RSCs handle the process from Award Receipt to execute for simple negotiations
   b. RSCs work with negotiation specialist inside the team to handle complex negotiations
3. A ‘triage’ position is created to reduce the duration of receiving and assigning awards to the appropriate RMS teams
4. Service Level Agreements are created between COI, IRB and RMS to ensure that the input in the process meet the needed requirements from RMS
5. Communication between COI, IRB, RMS and Departments is improved through various channels
6. Cactas is upgraded to streamline documentation and reduce errors
Benefits of future state

- Reduced number of hands-off on documentation that RSCs are the most intimate with since they handle the proposal process
- Reduced duplication of efforts
- Flexibility for handling the volume of simple negotiations which can be handled by many RSCs
- Specialist negotiators are focused on complex negotiations
- Potentially improved career paths and exposure to various aspects of the business for RMS team members
Success criteria

• Team management practices must be consistent between teams and must address competing priorities (proposals vs. awards)

• Training will be key for RSCs.

• Workload of ‘negotiation specialists’ and their reporting structure must be carefully assessed as RMS teams expand in scope.
Status & next steps

• Draft implementation plan generated and being assessed and finalized by Management
• The broader organization will be provided the opportunity to bring input during the month of August
• Transition plan to be completed by the end of August
• Team F and J to pilot new process now, team E and D to start end of August – all with pre-vetted, simple transactions.
• New model to be fully rolled out by the end of September
# Future State implementation timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Phase</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Target completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer of activities</strong></td>
<td>Transfer award set up to EMF for NIH grant</td>
<td>Now to 9/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer Industry contracts to ITA/OTM</td>
<td>Process mapping workshop in August – early September, transfer completed by 10/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business process update</strong></td>
<td>Update job descriptions, roles and responsibilities for new team model with input from pilot team</td>
<td>08/05 to 09/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update all team SOP and process documentation</td>
<td>09/30 to 11/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade configuration of IT systems where needed</td>
<td>08/15 to 12/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team deployment</strong></td>
<td>Pilot new team model with pre-vetted, simple negotiation transactions</td>
<td>Team J and L start piloting in August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create sub-award team (team K)</td>
<td>08/15 to 10/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Train all Team Managers, RSC and Negotiators on new team model &amp; process</td>
<td>10/31 to 12/31 - All teams to deploy new process – January 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>