# AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Award Verification Update</strong></td>
<td>Ellyn McCaffrey</td>
<td>8:30 – 9:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Lessard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharon Anderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. UCSF Open Access Policy / Verification requests</strong></td>
<td>Julene Johnson</td>
<td>9:00 – 9:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Topics for 2021 / Member Priorities</strong></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>9:15 – 9:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Member Roundtable Discussion</strong></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>9:30 – 10:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meetings are on the 2nd Tuesday of each month.

Guest: Sharon Anderson, Jeffrey Lessard

A. Award Verification Update

Ellyn McCaffrey, Sharon Anderson, Jeffrey Lessard

Beginning in April 2021, UCSF will implement a new award verification procedure to support PIs in meeting the requirements of Uniform Guidance for federal awards. PIs will cease using the Effort Reporting System, and will use the new Award Verification Tool, where they can view all sponsored awards and non-sponsored projects in a portfolio. The tool reduces burden by combining the Effort Reporting System & DocuSign Processes. Investigators should leverage their teams to use it and realize the tool’s full potential. Award Principal Investigators (Award Owners) are required to verify at least quarterly that payroll and other expenses for each sponsored award are allowable, allocable, and reasonable. Verification records will be used in support of meeting award terms and conditions when requested during all forms of award or program review or audit by a sponsor. Contracts & Grants Accounting will establish an escalation process for past-due verifications. Dashboards are comprehensive and rich with dense information. Investigators can see when all of their awards are ending. Award close outs are shown separately to ensure this activity. The new system will go live 4/12/21; more information can be found at controller.ucsf.edu/awardverification or via email AwardVerification@ucsf.edu.

B. UCSF Open Access Policy / Verification requests

Julene Johnson

Upon publishing an article, School of Nursing faculty often receive email about the UC Open access policy, stating their publications are ready for verification & upload. Do others receive these; what is response best practice? UC encourages but does not require response. How can faculty understand and address these requirements? ORCID ID is a unique digital identifier that distinguishes a researcher from all other researchers/authors of scientific papers and helps to identify authorship. The ORCID system can be accessed by Profiles and is helpful for keeping track of those who have left UCSF, changed their names, students, and identify who produces what. There is recognition that agencies will find this helpful in the Research Misconduct area, so it will likely become a requirement. This should be part of the onboarding process for faculty and students.

Action: Invite Annelies Taylor (UCSF Library Open Access expert) to discuss response options & consequences, whether she is available for consultations, if there are ways to streamline this process. Request a primer on why we should use ORCID ID.

C. Topics for 2021 / Member Priorities

All

The RAB seeks to find ways to improve key areas of UCSF research. What are some of the relevant, key issues or concerns the RAB should discuss in 2021? Are there issues from prior year(s) or new focus areas? Discussion:

- Regular updates on IRB protocol turnaround times would be helpful; they may indicate if the HRPP needs more support. The same holds for Contracts & Grants. Look at bench versus clinical research as COVID priority impacted timelines on some awards. A discussion on award set up/expiration would be helpful.

- Clinical Studies: Regulations and contract negotiation issues. This is distinct from research and would require the most focus. The net administrative burden of dealing with clinical studies is an ongoing concern; it would be good to hear from the clinical investigators and others who are trying to improve this. Invite Investigators, who are impacted by this; invite their staff who are handling negotiations & paperwork, too. Coordinate with the Senate Committee on Research. The Clinical Trialist Activation Committee (CTAC) is comprised of active clinical researchers and a good place to get the pulse of concerns (Hope Rugo & Payam Nahid lead CTAC). Have a subset of the RAB serve as a coordinating/communications group.
• **Research Analytics:** What questions are hard to answer; which could be informed by a dashboard (such as underrepresented minorities; co-investigators) & how to report on them. HR & where an award is administered. Awards and gaps. How to understand the overall research enterprise. Compare the various dashboards: Profiles, Dimensions, etc., & compare the tools, measurements, reports. What tools are available to develop these resources? Leslie’s (Yuan) group would be key here.

• **Space issues:** While there are various space committees (Parnassus Research Programming Task Force, for example), & coordination is ongoing, it is hard to know from the outside what is happening. **Action:** Shannon & Georgina will discuss offline.

• **COVID’s Impact:** on Research Recovery, on junior faculty.

• **Return to Work:** Katherine Tull is the contact for the Telework Task Force. **Action:** Winona Ward will contact Katherine Tull.

• **Contact information:** Develop a list of committees & task forces, indicating who is working on what, and their contact information

**Other Discussions**

**RAB’s Role ?**

• Bring issues to leadership that require their attention/ input
• Advise the Office of Research and Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost office on issues RAB needs their help.
• Communications: How should the RAB more actively bring things forward from our communities; could we be more deliberate about these roles, to fulfill all of our advisory roles.

**Committee Membership:**

• The current roster includes people who have not participated, and/ or have long tenures on the board. In selecting new member, new membership should be pulled from all campus sectors, particularly junior faculty, clinical versus basic science, central administration. What are their experiences? It would be beneficial to diversity and bring new perspectives; to consider issues/ resolutions from different angles.

• Certain members are on the Board in a role-based capacity, for example Hal Collard, Winona Ward, & Brian Smith serve as a resource to the group (based on their organizational roles) to answer questions, connect dots & take input. **Action:** Members: Submit names of new members to be considered.
  • Review current roster; include department title & affiliation to help decision making.
  • Consider RAB composition & headcount; solicit thoughts from the EVCP Office (12-20 total?)
  • Consider Term Limits

**Action:** All please email Wallace w/ further suggestions.

**D. Member Roundtable Discussion**

Deferred due to time constraints