
RESEARCH ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)

March 3, 2015 8:30-10:00 a.m. S-30

Attendees: Jane Czech, Clarice Estrada, John Ellis, MC Gaisbauer, Mounira Kenaani, Jim Kiriakis, Larisa Kure, Gretchen Kiser, Steve Lazarus, Kathryn Lee, Georgina Lopez, Teresa Moeller, Suzanne Murphy, Michael Nordberg, Christine Razler, Bill Seaman, Brian Smith, Matthew Springer, Paul Volberding **Not present:** Diane Barber, Chip Chambers, Cathy Garzio, Holly Ingraham, Eric Mah, Wallace Marshall, Irene McGlynn, Sythia Mellon, Marge O'Halloran, John Radkowski, Louis Reichardt, Nirao Shah **Guests:** Mandana Khalili and Emy Volpe **Coordinators:** Jamie Antonazzo and Ana Canillas

PRESENTATION: F&A Policy and CGA Process Improvement Project – MC Gaisbauer

MC Gaisbauer delivered overview presentations on (1) the Impact to Facilities and Administration (“F&A”) Costs When Moving On-campus from Off-campus and (2) the Contracts and Grants Accounting (CGA) Business Process Improvement Project.

- **(1) Impact to Facilities and Administration (“F&A”) Costs When Moving On-campus from Off-campus:** For faculty moving from off-campus to on-campus, the UCSF campus principle is consistent with the UCOP Contract and Grant Manual Section 730 policy related to F&A cost. MC discussed that she did not expect support for researchers’ efforts to be negatively impacted by a change to their work location. She reviewed that there are 133 awards associated with faculty members that moved into Mission Hall and that had rent charged to them in the last or current fiscal year. The rent over this period of time (one and one-half years) totals \$2.4M. Some of these awards do not end until 2019. Therefore, it seems it would be in the interest of the campus to convert some of this rent to recoverable costs during the remaining life of the awards. The goal is to capture as much of the indirect costs as possible. MC next discussed how the move date from off-campus to on-campus can impact the budget. Included in the presentation was a chart illustrating the modified rate calculation for a revised budget based on move date.

Questions/Comments:

- The modified indirect cost rates will be calculated award by award based on the remaining budget. Budgeted amount will be reviewed vs. actual.
- Rate is determined by move date listed in RSA notification email. If move does not happen by planned date, adjustments can be made.
- New rates from NIH are available for circumstances that include: current lease still in effect when moving; negotiated on-campus rate is not full rate; and rate increased, but did not go to the full rate.
- **(2) Contracts and Grants Accounting (CGA) Business Process Improvement Project:** MC discussed the impetus for the CGA Business Process Improvement Project: (a) the PeopleSoft Financial System will be upgraded to the newest version in the next year; (b) the PeopleSoft Research Administration System (RAS) has been in place for approximately 10 years; and (c) the underlying CGA business process and organization continuously have changed during this period with no formal reassessment. The project will evaluate the CGA business process and organization for opportunities to increase service levels, efficiency, effectiveness and transparency while leveraging the upgrade. MC reviewed the project objectives including assessing core processes, post-award monitoring, and alliance relationships and determining which opportunities and pain points to address. The assessment process will be conducted through workshops. The first phase is to explore, analyze and seek possible improvements with a goal to deliver a current state process map, issues list, prioritized improvements list and a high-level implementation plan. A subsequent workshop will focus on refining improvement ideas and creating deliverables. MC discussed that before improvements are implemented, the ideas will be reviewed by RAB and CPFO.

Questions/Comments:

- Lots of systems exist. There must be a better way to consolidate and coordinate to create to streamline. Navigation through the systems is not friendly -- A group is working on the entire continuum to make process more accessible and transparent with tools to navigate through the system.
- Service oriented approach with focus on making product, interface and process better is inspiring.
- How are outreach and validation from stakeholders conducted? A list is important to ensure people don’t fall through the cracks. – "MC is reaching out to stakeholders to make sure aligned. The process included representation from the stakeholder to incorporate their perspective and then the proposed action plan will be vetted with the CPFO, SOM Dept. Manager

Charge to the Research Advisory Board (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

Advisory Committee and the RAB before final action to ensure alignment with the stakeholders. The process includes documentation of the collected feedback and its disposition.

- Given UCSF's past approach to system implementation, it is important consider leveraging the delivered functionality of our systems. One of goals is to remove modifications from system if delivered functionality exists for the process.
- Regarding "service." Please define. What is the scope of service? Before going to the different University groups, need to have this clearly defined. – Term available in purpose statement on Controller website.
- Funding impacts operationalizing systems.
- A pain point is incorrect award set-up.
- Value of Workshops includes teams getting together to understand each other's process.
- At the end of day, we're looking for better reporting tools.

Next Steps:

MC plans to bring back to results from Workshop 2 to RAB to validate on right track.

PRESENTATION: Resource Allocation Program (RAP) Hardship Awards – Mandana Khalili/Emy Volpe

Emy Volpe provided a brief overview and introduced Mandana Khalili. RAP is part of the Research Development Office (RDO). RAP manages the dissemination, submission review and award of intramural funding opportunities. Mandana Khalili presented an overview of grant mechanisms available that address the following categories: Hardship, New Child Award (formerly Post Child-bearing), Re-Entry and Under-represented Faculty and Fellows. She shared the trending results for each of the categories. She reviewed in detail hardship criteria for investigators who are experiencing a temporary interruption in funding, particularly how the funding lapse has come about and the impact on career goals. She also explained that eligibility criteria have been modified and have likely impacted data in the slide presentation. An award through RAP is \$30K for one year. Data indicates that many of the hardship applications resulted from funding gaps. Mandana also discussed that when hardship submissions are not funded it is based on determinations of not being a true hardship, low scientific merit or no future potential for obtaining funding. For those Hardship submissions that were rejected, analysis indicates that mentoring may assist poor proposals.

Questions/Comments:

- What follow-up data available after award funding gap?
- Why are there multiple applications? Perhaps applications should be done in phases with rolling due dates and processed with faster and more responsive reviews? Perhaps create quarterly awards instead of semiannual?
- Timing is critical. For example, if received two years of funding, potentially there may be months before reapplication for additional funding with no certainty to receiving a grant again. Under these circumstances, difficult to plan for the future.
- Another shortcoming to awards is applying when already in hardship, instead of anticipating.
- This program is an improvement from past where there no program existed.
- Awards have been critical to maintaining individuals in the lab.
- Reliance on reviewer comments, particularly addressing and assessing scientific rigor with dual review of proposal.
- If applicant not initially accepted, applicant could resubmit.
- Work with bridge funding for synergy. Get a working group from this group to address such issues as bulk funding gap, review cycles, economies of scale.
- For some, \$30K is not worth the application process, they would rather go to their Dean. The dollar amounts make a difference.
- Funds do not need to be returned if receive multiple awards, unless an award is from an external source.

Additional Comments: Apologies for any inconvenience caused by the conference phone connections.

Charge to the Research Advisory Board (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