RESEARCH ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
May 5, 2015
8:30-10:00am
Medical Sciences Building, Chancellors Conference Room S-30

Attendees: John Ellis, Clarice Estrada, MC Gaisbauer, Michael Grafton, Kent Iwamiya, Jim Kirakis, Eric Mah, Wallace Marshall, Irene McGlynn, Teresa Moeller, Suzanne Murphy, Michael Nordberg, Marge O’Halloran, Terri O’Lonergan, Christine Razler, Brian Smith, Paul Volberding

Guests: Ritesh Khanna, Jill Goldsmith

PRESENTATION: CGA Business Process Involvement (BPI); MC Gaisbauer
• MC Gaisbauer provided a follow up to her March RAB meeting presentation on the CGA Business Process Involvement (BPI) (see PowerPoint Presentation)
• The purpose for the review is:
  o Present high-level review of Contracts and Grants Accounting (CGA) business process improvement project
  o Proposed solutions for achieving future state to gather stakeholder feedback
  o Next step is to further develop acceptable proposed solutions
• The review used the same evaluation criteria that had been previously shared with RAB

Questions/Comments:
• Concern about too many password-required systems
• Important to prepare a process flow to show all these processes from a faculty member perspective all the way through the process: pre, departmental, post award

Next Steps:
• None noted

PRESENTATION: Space Management System; Ritesh Khanna
• Ritesh Khanna and Jill Goldsmith gave a presentation on UCSF’s Space Management System (see PowerPoint Presentation)
• The presentation focused on:
  o Project Goals, Governance and Scope
  o Current State of Space Management
  o Strategy for improvement
  o Project Timeline

Questions/Comments:
• New system will allow for what-if analyses
• Shared space can be multiple labeled
• We will be able to identify cores

Next Steps:
• None noted

PRESENTATION: OSR Update; Brian Smith
• Brian Smith gave an update on Office of Sponsored Research (see PowerPoint Presentation)
• The presentation focused on:
  o OSR key changes
  o Proposal and Award Activity
  o Feedback from stakeholders
  o OSR opportunities for transformation
  o Transformation timeline
  o Metrics

Questions/Comments:
• Collection of metrics
• Funding allocation subcommittee work

Next Steps:
• Update the overview slide to include the number of proposals
Contracts and Grants Accounting
Business Process Improvement

Proposed Path Forward

MC Gaisbauer, Assistant Controller
Michael Grafton, CGA Manager

MAY 5, 2015
Purpose of Review

- Present high-level review of Contracts and Grants Accounting (CGA) business process improvement project
- Review proposed solutions for achieving future state to gather stakeholder feedback
  - Next step is to further develop acceptable proposed solutions
    - Note, proposed solutions only focus on projects that could be carried out in the next 4 years
Business Process Improvement Approach

Dual Approach

- USCF Project Management Office led workshops
  - Evaluate the ABC’s of CGA processes to identify and eliminate non-value-added activities from the perspective of the customer – primarily the researcher:
    - Award Set-Up
    - Billing & Collection
    - Close-Out and Financial Reporting
  - Consider how Post Award Management Monitoring and pass-offs from pre-award (Office of Sponsored Research (OSR) and Innovation, Technology & Alliances) is performed throughout
- HURON technology assessment of the PeopleSoft Research Administration System (RAS)
Workshop #1 Briefing

- 25 participants from each control point across campus met on Feb. 11-12 to begin business process improvement activities

- Challenged by John Ellis to conceptualize a new process that could result in a “5 out of 5” customer satisfaction rating

- The team completed in each core area:
  - Process simulation
  - Value stream mapping
  - Observations of waste
  - Root cause analysis
  - FECRS drill (fix, eliminate, consolidate, rearrange, simplify)
  - Individual brainstorming of improvement ideas

  There was broad agreement about existing pain points
Workshop #2 Briefing

- Regrouped on March 9-10 to focus on refining improvement ideas and creating the future state map
- Reduced the current 5 sub-processes with 60+ steps to a single flow with 20 steps
- Key Types of Waste identified
  - Over-processing (op)
  - Motion (m)
  - Transport (t)
  - Waiting (w)
  - Defects (d)
  - Overproduction (o)
Workshop #2 Briefing

Top 10 Waste Observations

- Manual excel tracking systems maintained (op)
- Manual creation of sponsor invoices and reports (op)
- Multiple systems accessed to complete single task (m)
- Redundant reviews (op)
- Transmittal of reports, files, workbooks (t)
- Many handoffs (w, op)
- Award set-up data (DeptID, Milestones) missing or wrong (w, d)
- No clear ownership of non-federal reporting (w, d, t, m)
- Manual Payroll Expense Transfers (PETs) (w, d, t, m)
- Too many email notifications (o)
Technology Assessment Briefing

Executive Summary

- RAS was heavily modified to meet UCSF needs at the time of implementation but changes have occurred in the regulatory environment and leadership creating misalignment between system and today’s business needs.
- The interconnectedness of RAS modifications limits the ability to adopt new functionality and retire non-essential modifications.
- Reliance on shadow systems reduces transparency and accuracy of reports as well as creates operational waste.
- Management reports and dashboards are not designed for the current operational needs.
- Hand-offs between OSR and CGA for new award and modifications results in delays in processing.
Technology Assessment Briefing

Executive Summary, continued

- CGA staff are not empowered to complete low risk tasks
- Distribution of CGA tasks makes it difficult for departments to know who to contact when they have questions
- PeopleSoft data is not consistent with award documents; necessitating additional reviews throughout the award life cycle
- Budget tracking and monitoring budget compliance are manual processes that occur only if there are overdrafts and during invoicing and close out
From Current State to Future State

Proposed path forward will move from current state of 5 processes with 60+ steps to a future state with a single flow of 20 steps

Awards Setup

Billing

Collections

FSR

Closeout

Proposed future state
Improvement Criteria

- Enhances Customer Satisfaction (Principal Investigators)
- Maximizes Process Performance
- Leverages the functionality of the University’s technology investments (e.g., RAS)
- Reasonable Return On Investment
Change Ideas Offered

- Reorganize CGA
- Offer sponsors only a set number of invoice and reporting templates
- Assign responsibility for all financial status reporting to CGA
- Re-evaluate pre/post award exchange of information
- Automate Payroll Expense Transfer (PET) processing
- Re-evaluate closeout process
- Leverage RAS upgrade
- Re-evaluate training programs
CGA Organization Alternatives

Today’s Structure

- Functional silos
  - Benefit: Staff preparedness
  - Con: Difficult customer interface
  - Transition Cost: None
CGA Organization Alternatives

Considered Alternatives

- **Grouping of Like Functions – 2 Options**
  - **Benefit**: Eliminate redundancy waste and improve customer interface with functions by having same person involved in similar activities
  - **Con**: Does not fully eliminate waste and interface issues
  - **Transition Cost**: Medium

![Diagram showing the process flow between Award Setup, Billing, AR & Collections, Financial Reporting & Close-Out, and Compliance]

- Award Setup
- Billing, AR & Collections
- Financial Reporting & Close-Out
- Compliance
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Considered Alternatives

- **Service Teams with End to End Processing**
  - **Benefits:**
    - Improved customer interface and process performance
    - Career growth opportunities
  - **Con:** Workload monitoring and personnel training is critical
  - **Transition Cost:** High

---

**Teams (# To Be Determined)**
- Award Setup
- Billing
- AR Management
- Financial Reporting
- Close-Out
- Routine Compliance Monitoring
- Customer Outreach

**Accounting Analysis**
- Data Analysis
- Letter of Credit Billing
- Cash Application

**Collections**
- Past Due Account Management

**Compliance**
- Special Monitoring
- ERS
- Audit Coordination
- Training Program and Policy Management

---
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CGA Organization Alternatives

Proposed Path Forward

▪ Long-Term Target: Service Teams with End to End Processing
  ▪ Step 1: Implement CGA Personnel Training Program
  ▪ Step 2: Merge Like Functions in 2 Phases
    – Closeout & Financial Reporting / Billing & AR & Collections
    – Award Set-up with the groups above
  ▪ Step 3: Implement Future State with RAS Upgrade
    – Provides enhanced workload tools
    – Align CGA Teams with OSR Teams
Limited Sponsor Report Options

Offer sponsors only a set number of invoice and reporting templates to improve process performance

- **Today’s State**
  - High cost of preparation and noncompliance
  - Results from assuming sponsor has special needs for both financial reporting and invoicing

- **Proposed Future State**
  - Have preset list of options (5-12 styles) to offer sponsor
  - Cost-benefit analysis of deviations from predetermined options
CGA Responsible for Financial Reporting

CGA performs federal financial reporting but only monitors private financial reports which are prepared in the departments.

- **Today's State**
  - High cost of preparation and noncompliance for private financial reporting
  - High state of confusion surrounding source, location and responsibility for private financial reporting

- **Proposed Future State**
  - Have CGA perform all financial reporting – private and federal
    - Dependencies: Limited Sponsor Report Options and RAS Upgrade
Pre/Post Award Exchange of Information

Award set-up is untimely, has high defect rate and generally viewed as painful process by all involved parties

- Today’s State
  - Lack of understanding of involved parties of all the information required throughout the award lifecycle
  - Multiple systems involved in accumulating the award and supporting documents
  - RAS requirements not aligned with today’s business needs
  - Information not gathered from appropriate responsible party at appropriate process time
  - Lack of trust of the involved parties and systems
Pre/Post Award Exchange of Information

Flow required information consistently, efficiently and timely

- Proposed Future State
  - Clear definitions of award lifecycle terms
  - Agreed-upon complete contract terms and conditions (T&Cs) checklist for pre-award
    - Cost-benefit analysis of deviations from predetermined T&Cs
  - Clear roles and responsibilities and associated timing of their duties, including prerequisites and dependencies
  - Transparent interface for all involved parties to stage of award
    - Automated system checks before award moves to next stage
    - Automated transfer of all required information for next stage
Online PET Processing

Manual processing of PETs causes posting delays and defects

- **Today’s State**
  - High cost of preparation and delays for PETs
  - Impacts financial reporting and closeouts

- **Proposed Future State**
  - Facilitate PETs through web-based interface with automated content, workflow and posting
Closeout Process

Closeouts are not timely and creating orphaned transactions

- Today’s State
  - No clear controls to stop transactions from posting to GL
  - Noncompliance with sponsor timing requirements
    - Risk will increase under Uniform Guidance
  - High rate of reopens
  - Forced closeout processes create orphaned transactions during renewals

- Proposed Future State
  - Redefine closeout roles and responsibilities, including timing
RAS Upgrade

Highly customized system that is no longer synchronized with business needs

- Today’s State
  - CGA processes are manual and occurring outside of RAS
  - RAS does not provide customer transparency into the lifecycle
  - RAS requirements not aligned with today’s business needs
  - Information not gathered from appropriate responsible party at appropriate process time
  - Documents stored in multiple places
  - Lack of trust of the involved parties and systems
RAS Upgrade

RAS should execute routine tasks and provide transparent view of the activity; allowing CGA employees to focus on valuable analysis

- Proposed Future State
  - Automate invoicing and financial status reporting
    - For clinical trial and similar billing, evaluate workflow options
    - Workflow for RSA and PI approval when required
  - Manage all CGA transactions through RAS
  - Control timing of GL posting to awards via RAS
  - Create system checklists for CGA processes
  - Automate forms to load information into RAS, e.g., project set-up
RAS Upgrade

Proposed Future State, continued

• Incorporate changes from Re-evaluate Pre/Post Award Exchange of Information action item

• Portal views with alerts for customers and CGA into award lifecycle/workflow
  – Provide CGA workload metric monitoring dashboards
  – Evaluate implementation of department level security
  – Provide management reports / dashboards
Training Programs

CGA training programs are focused on procedures and infrequent

Today’s State

- PAM series is procedure centric and only twice a year
- Need for understanding of life-cycle exists
- Need for orientation for new employees
- Need for cross-training between pre-award, post-award and departments
Training Programs

Proposed Future State

• Implement a robust training and outreach program, which is coordinated with pre-award partners
  – Addresses internal CGA training needs
  – Addresses cross-training needs with pre-award
  – Addresses cross-training needs with department
  – Addresses PAM series on lifecycle content
    ▪ Consider frequency and modes of offerings
    ▪ Consider new employee training
  – In future organization state, consider outreach program
TOPICS

- Project Goals, Governance and Scope
- Current State of Space Management
- Strategy for improvement
- Project Timeline
PROJECT GOALS

- Implement end-to-end space system that encompasses technology, business processes and reporting to enable UCSF to manage space as a strategic asset.

- Inspire a cultural shift at UCSF towards an environment of transparency and collaboration as it relates to space management.
**PROJECT GOVERNANCE**

**Executive Sponsors**
John Plotts, Dan Lowenstein

**Project Team - Owner**
Lori Yamauchi

**Core Project Management Team**
- Ritesh Khanna - Director, Space Analytics, Campus Planning
- Jill Goldsmith - Project Manager
- Ron Campbell – Project Manager - Operations
- Erika Luger – Project Specialist
- Bob Pizzi – Space Management Supervisor
- Alvin Cantor - Director of Systems & Operations Improvement, MC
- Lisa Lettau – Space Management Analyst
- Mimi Sosa – ITS Deputy Director
- BRG Member – Reeves Davis, Gary Bilal

**Steering Committee**
- Lori Yamauchi, Campus Planning (Chair)
- Michael Bade, Capital Programs
- Alvin Cantor, Med Center
- Maye Chrisman, DOM
- Clarice Estrada, CVRI
- Tim Mahaney, Med Center
- Esther Morales, Real Estate
- Michael Nordberg, SOP
- Anja Paardekooper, SOM
- Jerome Sak, BRM
- Susan Schultz, SOD
- Jason Stout, HR
- Bonnie Maler, SOM
- Barbara Hollinger, Faculty, SON
- Ethan Weiss, Faculty, SOM

**Business Process Teams**
UCSF staff with BRG guidance
Project Scope

**Space Inventory**
- What space does UCSF have?
- What are the key attributes (e.g., location, sq. feet)?

**Utilization**
- For what purposes is space being used?
- How densely occupied is the space?
- Is space being used effectively?

**Assignment**
- What space is assigned to which Business Units, Control Points, and Departments?

**Research**
- Where are Principal Investigators conducting research?
- Provide optimal space usage for research
- Produce metrics for research grants associated with departments and assigned space

**Personnel**
- Where are personnel physically located?
SPACE MANAGEMENT CORE ACTIVITIES AT UCSF

- Track Physical Space
- Integrate Data Sources
- Track Funding & Costs
- Track Occupancy
- Track Utilization
- Reporting
**Identified Issues: Summary of Issues Found**

### Technology
- Lack of systems integrations
- Separate systems for campus and med center
- Not scalable
- Insufficient level of detail and data specificity
- Cannot do “what if” analysis

### Business Process
- Inconsistent processes to track occupancy and use of space
- Lack of end user training on functionality and data definitions
- Employee location is not accurately tracked
- Roles and Responsibilities are not clear and impact who should perform quality assurance tasks
- Lack of triggers to update Space inventory for renovations

### Space Management Issues
- Lack of data transparency impacts Technology, Business Processes and Reporting
- Inconsistencies in data management between the Med Center and Campus

### Reporting
- Lack of confidence in data accuracy
- Data gaps – i.e. dry vs. wet labs and shared vs. split space
- Canned reporting output is difficult to understand
- Space data used in silo-ed reporting efforts
- Lack of end user training on functionality and data definitions
- Employee location is not accurately tracked
- Roles and Responsibilities are not clear and impact who should perform quality assurance tasks
- Lack of triggers to update Space inventory for renovations
CURRENT SYSTEMS USING SPACE DATA

Space Inventory System
(system of record)

Archibus
Med-Center

CRIS (F&A Rate)

FMTrack (Maximo)

ArcGIS
AutoCAD

Real Estate Database

Unifier

Heritage

SRS

MCStaff

CRIS

KinCAD

Revit

Capital Budget database

PeopleSoft

Data Warehouse

Aperture

ICR Benchmarking

Classroom Mgmt.

Track Physical Space
Track Occupancy
Track Utilization
Track Costs

○ UCOP
  Reporting
○ EHS
○ Service Now
○ Sustainability
○ Control Points & Departments

Capital Budget database

Real Estate Database

Unifier
STRATEGY TO BUILD A FOUNDATION FOR SUCCESSFUL
SPACE MANAGEMENT

Information to Manage Space as a Strategic Asset

Provide Clear and Accurate Real-time Reporting that is easy to access

Integrate Other Data Sources

Accurate Data

Define Business Processes to Generate & Collect Data
Define Roles and Responsibilities
Establish Clear & Consistent Data Definitions
Align Incentives

Implement an Easy to Use, Intuitive and Scalable System
SELECTED ARCHIBUS FOR THE TECHNICAL SOLUTION

A Web-based, User-Friendly System

- Campus & Med Center on same system
- Supports Real Estate leasing
- Scalable
- Integrates with graphical visualization technology (CAD, BIM, GIS)
- Integrates with other UCSF systems
- Flexible, configurable security and access
- Easily navigable
- Mobile application

Robust Reporting Analysis & Forecasting

- Real-time space data
- Graphic displays
- Ad hoc and canned reporting
- What If? Scenarios
- Anticipate space needs

Assign Space Attributes

- Highly configurable data fields
- People to a location, room, workstation
- Assign Sponsored Awards to rooms
- Capture condition of spaces
- Ability to attach documents
PROPOSED PROCESS IMPROVEMENTS

- Streamline processes for updating space data
- Robust training and communications plan
- Clear roles and responsibilities for space planners/managers/contacts and Campus Planning
- Regular physical audits
# High-Level Project Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Build: Space Management Module &amp; Report, Mobile Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Configuration</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Testing</td>
<td>(Campus Planning Only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Data migration</td>
<td>Lease Module Go Live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrations</td>
<td>Campus Go Live Wave 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lease Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Survey for UCOP in SIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data Migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SIS to Archibus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On-going Campus-wide Physical Space Audit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On-going IT, Admin and End User Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Functional Design
- Conceptual Design sessions with Project Team & BRG
- Detailed Business Process Design sessions with SME groups

## Technical Design
- Technical config and design requirements approved

## Project Team Ramp Up
- Project Team & SME groups educated in Archibus
- Project Plan Developed
- BRG educated in UCSF’s systems

## SIS Data Validation
- Data consistency improved in the current database

## On-going Change Management Communications
PROJECT TIMELINE
WAVES 2 AND 3

- Wave 2 – begins March/April 2016
  - Tracking location of contract and grant award
  - Condition and photos of rooms

- Wave 3 – TBD
  - Clinical research location
  - Scheduling of space
  - O&M costs
QUESTIONS?
UCSF Office of Sponsored Research
Update to Research Advisory Board

Brian Smith
May 5, 2015
Contents

- OSR key changes
- Proposal and Award Activity
- Feedback from stakeholders
- OSR opportunities for transformation
- Transformation timeline
- Metrics
- Other updates
## Proposal and Award Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposals</td>
<td>5,461</td>
<td>5,189</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontracts</td>
<td>1,848</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards*</td>
<td>$1.218B</td>
<td>$1.041B</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fiscal Years 2013-2014 and 2012-2013 respectively – note, 2014 Awards are net SFGH Affiliation Agreement.
OSR Key Changes

- August 2011: RMS launched
- July 2013: LEAN process analysis
- July 2013: GBC created (proposals and awards for government contracts, PSAs, TAAs)
- August 2013: Grant award activity moved to RMS
- September 2013: Award set-up activity managed by CGA
- Fall 2013: Industry-related work transferred to ITA/ICD
- October 2014: Award activity distributed out to RMS teams
- October 2014: RMS Team A relocated from Minnesota Street to Mission Hall
Stakeholder Feedback

Feedback from stakeholders, mirrors that of OSR leadership:

- Strengthen communications; effectively engage stakeholders
- Develop/maintain productive relationships between RSC & PIs
- Establish service level expectations & consistency across teams
- Improve subaward services
- OSR staff development
- Training: OSR staff and PIs/research administrative staff
- Improve technology
- Use informative metrics
OSR opportunities for transformation - I

Building Partnerships

Stakeholder Engagement
- Cost allocation subcommittee formed [Feb 2015]
- OSR Advisory Board to review OSR budget [Mar 2015]
- Allocation discussion with stakeholders and final allocations distributed to control points [Mar 2015]
- Research Services Satisfaction Survey [June 2015]

RSC & PI Relationships
- Established secondary RSC assignments for departments [Dec 2014]
- Recurring meeting schedule for each department/division established and posted on OSR website [Feb 2015]
- Invite clients to participate in the selection of new RSCs & team managers [Mar 2015]
- Meet with researcher at the start of each proposal and offer to meet after submission of each proposal, to assess submission process [June 2015]
OSR opportunities for transformation - II

Best Practices & Process Improvement

Service Level Expectations

• Service Partnership Agreement (SPA) workgroup to finish draft [March 2015]
• Discussions with stakeholders about draft SPA [April 2015]
• Implement SPAs [June 2015]

Subaward Process

• LEAN workgroup to be formed [March 2015]
• LEAN process to be completed and implemented [TBD]
OSR opportunities for transformation - III

Training

• For PIs: Coordinate new faculty research training with department counterparts [July 2015]
• For OSR staff: Improve new staff onboarding; Update Research Administration 101 & quarterly trainings [Mar 2015]
• Research Administration Think Tank: build pre and post award template library, and identify common training needs [June 2015]

Communications

• Training modules being created for OSR staff to reinforce proactive & effective communication strategies. First training for current staff [Mar 2015]
• Develop additional training modules to reinforce customer service oriented approach to interactions between RMS and researchers/departments [June 2015]

OSR Staff Development

• OSR staff development workgroup formed [Jan 2015]
• Staff development plan to be finished [April 2015]
• Review results of staff exit interviews with client departments to develop retention strategies for valued employees [start June 2015]
OSR opportunities for transformation - IV

Technology & Metrics

Technology
• iMedRIS (eProposal) governance group re-convened [Oct 2014]
• iMedRIS (eProposal) enhancements implemented [dates to be determined]

Metrics
• OSR Advisory Board Metrics workgroup formed [Mar 2015]
• Metrics framework established & reporting mechanism finalized [May 2015]
• Three months of Metrics reported [August 2015]
**OSR transformation timeline**

- **Building Partnerships**
  - Secondary RSC assignments established December 2014
  - Recurring meeting schedule posted to OSR website February 2015
  - Clients invited to participate in selection of new staff March 2015
  - Cost allocations review February – March 2015
  - Cost Allocations Subcommittee formed February 2015
  - OSR Advisory Board to review budget March 2015
  - Allocation discussion with stakeholders and final allocations distributed to control points March 2015
  - Customer Satisfaction Survey distributed June 2015
  - Offer to meet with researcher at the start & finish of proposal process beginning June 2015

- **Best Practices & Process Improvement**
  - Service Partnership Agreement workgroup review August 2014 – March 2015
  - Review SPA draft with stakeholders April 2015
  - Service Partnership Agreement Implementation beginning June 2015
  - LEAN process completion and implementation beginning June 2015

- **Training**
  - Subaward LEAN process workgroup to be formed March 2015
  - Improved OSR staff onboarding & training schedule March 2015
  - Pre-/Post award resource & training collaboration June 2015
  - Collaborate with depts. for new faculty research training July 2015
  - Development & delivery of Communication Strategy training modules Module 1 to rollout March 2015 Module 2 to rollout June 2015
  - OSR Staff Development workgroup & plan January – April 2015
  - Review exit interview results with clients, develop retention strategies beginning June 2015

- **Technology & Metrics**
  - iMedris governance group reconvened October 2014
  - OSR Advisory Board Metrics workgroup formed March 2015
  - Metrics framework established & reporting finalized May 2015
  - Enhancements/integration of iMedris system
  - Three months of metrics reported August 2015
Metrics

- Proposal volume
- Award volume
- Throughput/Turnaround times
- Volume of work by each RMS team, by each RSC
- Funding mechanisms, by type, by sponsor
- Success Rate (amounts proposed vs. amounts funded)
- Others?
  - PI Dashboard will also be created
Other Updates

- Participating in Contracts and Grants Accounting (CGA) “business process improvement” effort

- “Research Administration Coordination Group” discussing systems and processes for UCSF research administration units, with goal to make them more seamless for researchers and other stakeholders