RESEARCH ADVISORY GROUP (RAB)
July 2, 2013 8:30-10:00 a.m. S-30

Attendees: Diane Barber, Jane Czech, John Ellis, Gretchen Kiser, Steve Lazarus, Erik Lium, Dan Lowenstein, Teresa Moeller, Suzanne Murphy, Sarah Nelson, Michael Nordberg, Marge O’Halloran, Christine Razler, Matthew Springer
Via phone: Elizabeth Boyd, Roland Henry, Susanne Hildebrand-Zanki, Georgina Lopez
Coordinator: Jamie Antonazzo

PRESENTATION: OSR Reorganization

Susanne Hildebrand-Zanki

Susanne explained that the main goal of the recent OSR reorganization is to deliver pre-award service more efficiently, timely, and at a consistently high level of quality. The division of responsibilities between Contract and Grants (C&G) and RMS is not currently working as well as anticipated. Specifically, the separation of the awarding process from the proposal submission is resulting in delays due to the fact that C&G staff and RMS staff need to navigate a number of handoffs in order to get an award set up, and solving this issue is the main reason for the reorganization. Consolidating proposal submission and award acceptance into the Research Management Services (RMS) organization will help with these issues.

A plan has been put into place to hold a workshop with C&G and RMS staff, where they will map out the entire award process and determine how this process can be executed in the most efficient way, with the least amount of handoffs. Once the process maps have been identified, SOPs and service level agreements will be built around those, and training for RMS and C&G staff will be implemented. PIs should not be impacted during this process, as all changes will happen on the back end.

Additionally, C&G has now been renamed Government and Business Contracts (G&BC). The division of responsibilities between RMS and G&BC will be as follows.

RMS will be responsible for:
- Proposal preparation and submission, award acceptance
- Award acceptance, negotiation, issuance, and setup
- Subcontracts out
- Training

G&BC will be responsible for:
- All contracts: city and county, state, federal, and business
- Incoming subcontracts for which the prime source of funding is a contract
- Data and reporting
- eProposal support

Questions/Comments:
- Who is responsible for foundation grants? RMS – they will handle everything that is not a contract, including all grants.
- Who would handle subcontracts in? RMS – this would be handled like any other award.
- Who would handle VA clinical contracts? G&BC – this would be handled like any other contract.
- The issue of confusion between business and industry was brought up. There is concern that there may be confusion with people understanding that industry-sponsored projects and the business contracts handled by G&BC are separate. The idea was brought up of renaming this group, possibly removing the word “business”.
- Regarding contracts with other institutions, what is the reasoning for not moving these into RMS? For instances where the prime award is a contract, the rules are different, and the expertise for dealing with these rules lies with G&BC.
- Who will be participating in the process-mapping workshop? Susanne and Marge explained that it would be a number of representatives from RMS and the awards teams, as well as Susan Lin from EMF, Christine Razler from the Pre/Post
Thinktank, as well as representatives from COI, and from John Radkowski’s group. It will be co-led by Gretchen Kiser and Fabrice Beretta, and will be based on Lean Six Sigma concepts.

- A suggestion was made to have a faculty member join the workshop, and while the group felt this would be a good idea, since the workshop will be four full days, it is unlikely that we’d be able to get faculty participation for this. However, we will invite faculty to the relevant portion towards the end of the workshop.

- The comment was made that we should be careful about combining award negotiation and proposal processing, as this may cause problems. Susanne explained that we will base decisions on workflow on the recommendations that come out of the process-mapping workshop.

- The issue of communication was brought up – some members of the group felt that since there is not really any effective change in service until after the workshop, this creates some confusion. Marge agreed to work on a new communication that would go out explaining all of this.

- The issue of having the appropriate bandwidth for training was raised, as this training will be happening at the same time as eProposal training. Marge and Susanne agreed that his would be a challenge, and that they are working on figuring out the best way to handle it.

**Next Steps:** Marge and Susanne agreed to come back to the group with an update, most likely in September.

**PRESENTATION: Update on BearBuy**

As a result of the discussion during our last meeting, Diane and Holly Ingraham agreed to meet with representatives from BearBuy in a breakout session to discuss possible changes that would allow for more cost savings. Three faculty members – Diane, Holly, and Jeff Butch, a junior investigator from Diane’s department, as well as Jim Hine, Ross Bausone, and Andrew Clark from BearBuy got together last month for a very productive meeting. BearBuy is very eager to hear about and implement changes that could benefit researchers and save money.

As a result of this meeting, they have decided to hold two town hall meetings that will be open to faculty and administrators centered on ideas for cost savings in purchasing. The meetings will take place in late July at Mission Bay, and at Parnassus on August 1st. The agenda for these meetings will be decided on soon.

Another significant change that came out of this meeting is that BearBuy is now working on making their database available to everyone, so that purchases are visible. This would give investigators and labs the ability to see who may have purchased a large quantity of a particular item, so that they can work with them directly to purchase only the amount that they may need. This was a suggestion made at the RAB meeting in May, which was discussed further in the breakout meeting.

Diane also raised the question to the group of RAB possibly effecting more change by taking a more proactive role through similar small group or subcommittee meetings on select issues. The group expressed interest in exploring this.

**Next Steps:** Diane will send the dates and locations of the upcoming town hall meetings to the group.

**Next Steps:** Diane asked the group to send over suggestions of places to publicize the town hall meetings outside of faculty listservs to her at diane.barber@ucsf.edu. (Teresa Moeller suggested the Lab Managers listserv, and agreed to send that information to Diane.)

**Next Steps:** Co-chair Dan Lowenstein asked that the group send over suggestions for additional RAB members either to him (Lowenstein@medsch.ucsf.edu), or to Bill Seaman (bseaman@medicine.ucsf.edu), as they are currently in talks with Jeff Bluestone on this topic.

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
Office of Sponsored Research Reorganization

Report to the RAB

July 2, 2013

Susanne Hildebrand-Zanki
AVC, Research
Goal: To deliver pre-award service more efficiently, timely, and at a consistently high level of quality

Strategy
Consolidating proposal submission and award acceptance into the Research Management Services (RMS) organization

Rationale
The division of responsibilities between Contract and Grants (C&G) and RMS is not working as well as anticipated. Specifically, the separation of the awarding process from the proposal submission is resulting in delays due to the fact that C&G staff and RMS staff need to navigate a number of hand offs in order to get an award set up.
Actions

• C&G award team moved to RMS – June
• Workshop to map out optimal award process – end of July
• Identify training needs for all staff – end of July
• Train staff and transition to integrated function – by December
• C&G renamed Government and Business Contracts (G&BC) to continue as a separate unit charged with negotiating all non-industry contracts on behalf of UCSF – July
RMS

- Proposal preparation and submission
- Award acceptance, negotiation, issuance, and setup
- Subcontracts out
- Training
Government and Business Contracts

Functions to remain in GBC

- City and county contracts
- State contracts
- Federal contracts
- Incoming subcontracts for which the prime source of funding is a contract
- Business contracts
- Data and reporting
- eProposal support
The New Organization

Office of Sponsored Research (OSR)
June 2013