Research Administration Advisory Council (RAAC)
Committee-at-Large
Tuesday, October 18, 2016, 3:00 – 4:30 pm
College of Engineering, Lurie Engineering Center
1221 Beal Ave.
General Motors Conference Room, 4th Floor
(Directions attached)

MINUTES

1. **Introductions of Members and Guests (Daryl Weinert)** [3:00 - 3:05]

Daryl welcomed everyone and thanked Linda for hosting the meeting. There were 3 members that called in: Chad Heiser and Nate Phipps from School of Education, and Heather Offhaus from Med School. Daryl introduced two new members: Meenu Baxendale and Li Yong from SNRE.


Judy’s provided an update from the Training subcommittee. The committee is ready to release two (2) new pilot training programs - Advanced Budgeting 1 and Uniform Guidance - Cost Principles.

**Membership**
Judy Carrillo is the new Chair. Committee is represented by a wide range of schools/colleges. Sue Kelch is the newest RAAC Training member, from Medical School.

**RAMP↑**
3rd cohort for RAMP (Research Administrator Mentoring Program) has started. The program pairs Mentors (5+ years experience) with Mentees (6-24 mos. experience). The program runs Sept. - June. RAMP↑ provides a means to help newly RAs to access the knowledge/experience of experienced RAs.

**Navigate: Fundamentals**
The Navigate: Fundamentals course is underway. There are seven (7) classes that started in late September and will end November 30. We are now in the “develop proposal” phase. The audience is Research Administrators with up to 2 years experience. There are 32 current members, who are very engaged in the classes. Navigate: Fundamentals will be offered again in the Spring.

Two new pilot courses added:
- Uniform Guidance - Cost Principles.
- Advanced Budgeting 1

We were also considering an Advanced Sponsored Project Management course, but was put on hold.

These 2 courses were developed based on Survey responses from the RAN meeting and Focus Groups. The Leads were identified in June, and course delivery this fall. Leads were experts from schools/colleges and provided content for the courses.

**Uniform Guidance - Cost Principles**
A pilot course will be held October 25, 2016. There were 30 participants registered. A demo of the course (walk through) will be on the 20th. It is designed to help plan and manage Federally sponsored projects for UG Cost Accounting.

Principles including:
- UG compliance
- How to plan for UG expenses
- How to manage the lifecycle of projects that include UG expenses.
- Best practices and stewardships are also handled in the course.

Daryl asked how sign up was handled (first come/first serve?). There are no prerequisites in the course and applications were accepted as they were submitted. There is a waitlist if someone cancelled.

Co-leads are Cory Livingston and Judy Carrillo.

**Advanced Budgeting 1**
First of three courses. This course will be three (3) half-day sessions and limited to 15 participants. There were prerequisites and applicants were reviewed and selected by the team. Participants apply budget techniques to build their own budgets with budget justifications. Increasingly more complex elements and attributes. The course is very interactive. Advanced Budgeting 2 and 3 will be developed later.

Daryl asked why Advanced Budgeting was broken into 3 courses. Judy said it was a long, intensive course and decided the content had to be broken up into 3 more manageable courses for participants, especially since there is outside work that is required. A longer program presented other logistical challenges.

Debbie also noted that participants could choose to pick Advanced Budgeting 2 vs. Advanced Budgeting 1 if you need training in content from that level of class. Program announcement describes what components of the budget will be included so you know which to sign up for.

Lead: Cathy Seay-Ostrowski

Budget templates are extensive and will be good training for participants.

**Next for Training subcommittee:**
- looking at additional training opportunities
- Evaluation of fundamentals content for stand alone courses.
- Reviewing topics from previous surveys

Looking at different media - job aids, etc.. and there is still a lot of content that needs reviewing to inform what to offer next.

Scott Stanfill asked if they were looking at content or advanced topics. He said he presented on Day 5 and there is more content than can be delivered in one day. Scott will contact Judy later to give feedback.

Daryl asked about what pieces in Fundamentals could be broken into separate training for faculty. Judy said the group is working with David Mulder to move forward in these areas. Chris DeVries mentioned we took sections and ranked what would be best for faculty.

3. **Presentation:** Proposed ORSP Deadline Policy *(Craig Reynolds)*

Craig indicated we have the support of key players on the deadline policy to start the project plan. All will be consulted when it gets developed.
ORSP’s current policy is four (4) business days in advance of the sponsor's deadline. This policy has been in effect for many years and unfortunately is not enforced.

Proposing - All PAFs and final proposal documents must be received in ORSP 3 business days ahead of the sponsor’s deadline. Saturday and Sunday are not included in the 3 business days.

Proposals will not be submitted if they do not meet internal deadline. Craig mentioned a lot of the main sponsor deadlines (e.g., NIH) are known a year in advance and there is no need to be late.

PIs can request an exception to the deadline of one additional business day for exceptional circumstances (medical emergency, internet outage, natural disaster, emergency closing of U-M, PI was notified less than x weeks prior to deadline).

Heather asked if a PI is heavily supported by only one research administrator who gets sick will this be an exceptional circumstance? Craig asked to document this question as a lot of details need to be ironed out.

Exceptions must be approved by the school/college and an ORSP PR. This does not guarantee the proposal will be submitted before others that came in time.

Met with various groups, including the RAAC Faculty Advisory Council, Jack Hu and UMOR management, Associate Deans, various committees, and all support and feel comfortable moving forward.

There are a lot of reasons why we need the policy, but a main reason is courtesy for those faculty who get proposals in on time. ORSP staff is also at breaking point and compliance is an issue.

ORSP has developed a proposal and PAF review checklist with a 42 point review and is on website.

There are nearly 18,000 transactions that go through ORSP or Medical School = 9 transactions/hour. Twenty-five percent (25%) of the proposals (on average seven (7) proposals per day) are reviewed for submission that are due the same day. One PR can be called upon to submit up to 25 proposals/day. Need an hour/proposal to review. Also, seeing more non-governmental proposals with different sponsor requirement which take more time.

ORSP has taken steps to better prepare staff to handle the workload. Redistributed areas to reassign workloads. Worked on the HR and process front, however, need the Deadline Policy to be more effective.

Stanford, Washington, and Harvard have implemented deadline policies.

Extensive work will be need to be done in ORSP and other units (e.g., eRPM and procedures). Extensive change management will be put in place prior to “go live” date with job aids, RAPid newsletter announcements and presentations to stakeholders (RA Deans, RAAC, Schools/colleges, faculty groups). There will be an eight-month “soft launch” period. During the soft launch, ORSP will submit a proposal if deadline missed, however the PI will be notified that, under the new policy, the proposal would not have been submitted. During soft launch period, ORSP will report on policy adherence, automated email notice in eRPM, and notify stakeholders.

Melissa Karby asked if schools/colleges implementing their own deadline have seen a downtrend in their proposal submissions? Scott said no. And, during soft launch, will you document exceptions? Craig thought that was a good suggestion and would document.
Danielle Smith asked about collaborative proposals - how will those be handled? Sometimes we are the lead, sometimes not, and there can be delays. Craig thought it could be a good question for the RASC. Daryl answered that this is already being done for the sponsor deadline. The business processes may need to be adjusted to accommodate the ORSP deadline.

Scott said automated emails are great, but he does not create PAF until ready to submit. There will also need to be consideration for those that get institution approval and are processed after the award is in place (i.e., “complete package.”). Need to look at the issue (Heather would like the answer).

Heather mentioned that the Medical School is on board, but is still figuring out how to incorporate. Concerned it will push up the pipeline, and trying to figure out from a school how to alleviate that. How are the different scenarios going to be communicated, and need to work it out with school and colleges. Craig mentioned that the finer points have not been worked out yet. This will be a partnership with schools, colleges, and units.

Need to have a broad representation from schools and colleges to work through issues. Daryl said you should start thinking about how it affects your unit and start documenting. Implications are that the department has to communicate bad news if deadline not met, not ORSP.

Linda asked how school RAs should handle if they find errors and need to send back to the project team. Should they send on to ORSP with errors to meet deadlines? Daryl said you need to accommodate delays to get in on time. Need to give everyone involved in the proposal enough time to check for errors. Linda asked if proposals submitted with errors have been documented. Craig said yes, but internally.

4. **ITS Update:** *(Cathy Handyside)*  

System performance - performing pretty well today. Have good analytics in place to know when it is going to happen. Continuing to work with vendor on root cause. In the meantime rebooting the system for 5 mins.

Updates to functionality - Roll-out is October 31:

Agreement Acceptance - new automated process - replaces PAF-R - “paper based” form. Will include those scenarios when submitting proposal (covered in ORSP business policy). The system will guide you through who needs to sign (ORSP/OTT signatures required) and will send emails to all email recipients with required action. Publication restrictions are unique and require signature of Department Chair and Dean - activity will be accessible to these parties.

Will learn and update as needed.

Steve Beach asked if these will have a different state? Cathy indicated they will be their own unique contract type (similar to subcontract to PAF). Will see them in progress and notified in the Subway Map (new).

**PAF Workspace Changes:**

- Subway map - visual of pre and post submission. Images indicate if in progress (yellow triangle), pending action (red hexagon) or are complete (green circle). Will have a toggle if you do not want to use map.
- A lot of the text will be moved to left navigation bar.
Scott asked are there plans to have an icon on home page (looking at all PAFs) to see what actions are stopped. Cathy answered that she will take this back to the design team.

Type-ahead technology - the research administrator or administrative personnel contact information can be entered differently. As the name is typed, the system will suggest matching names.

Automating Export Controls / Technology Controls - current process includes a lot of emails between Export Control group and PI and not efficient. So the automated process will be in release, and will pull information from PAF and UFA and send out activity and obtain signatures via eRPM workflow. They require signatures from Department Chair and Dean.

5. **Sponsored Programs Update:** *(Debbie Talley)*

   [4:05 – 4:15]

Working on single audit - auditors are still reviewing. No news is good news. NSF audit - report was issued and communication is being worked on to go out to everyone. They have contacted us on findings in the audit. May have to reach out to schools for some items, but hopefully resolve on our own.

New supervisor - Melissa Denny. This is Sponsored Programs busiest time, and will have communications to get reports back probably sooner during holiday time.

Council on Governmental Relations (COGR) - Debbie and Craig are going this week (in Wash. DC). OMB will be there and hopefully will talk on Uniform Guidance. Will know more on thresholds of bidding, new dates on implementing standards, etc. for implementation next June.

6. **ORSP Update:** *(Craig Reynolds)*

   [4:15 – 4:25]

Sharon Sivyer is going to retire the end of this year. Sharon is managing project representative for Private Sponsors - Blue Team. Huge loss for ORSP. She will continue to help out after retirement, but need to move forward and need to move up two Assistant Project Representatives (Maize and Blue team) and report to Tom Zdeba. Will have announcement in a couple weeks.

It is a challenging time with the three (3) new Assistant Project Representatives in training, and losing Sharon. It takes 18 months to get back new project representatives trained.

Institutional Certificates - There has been a change in the genome-wide association study policy: IRB will review policy, but won’t be signing - just ORSP.

Award Management / Government structure - number of advisory teams would be supplemented by a lead team, but decided rather than have the lead team we already have the RAAC Executive Committee to advise on policy and business process changes.

7. **Closing and Future Meetings:** *(Daryl Weinert)*

   [4:25 – 4:30]

   a. November 15, 2016 meeting at U-M Dearborn will also include a lunch and tour; more information to follow.
   
   b. Meetings in need of a host:

   - Tuesday, February 21, 2017
   - Tuesday, March 21, 2017
   - Tuesday, April 18, 2017
   - Tuesday, September 19, 2017
   - Tuesday, October 17, 2017
   - Tuesday, November 21, 2017
Will meet Nov. 15 in Dearborn. There will be an optional lunch and tour. Daryl recommended for the group to make time and take the tour of the campus.

We have one more meeting before holiday break. We are still looking for hosts for the 2017 meetings.

RAAC Committee-At-Large Meeting Dates
- Tuesday, November 15, 2016, 3:00 – 4:30 pm @ U-M Dearborn (Becky O’Brien, RAAC Communications Subcommittee)
- NO DECEMBER MEETING
- NO JANUARY MEETING

Executive Committee Meetings
Wolverine Tower, Conference Room 1025
- Tuesday, November 8, 2016, 3:30 – 5:00 pm
- Tuesday, December 13, 2016, 3:30 – 5:00 pm
- Tuesday, January 10, 2017, 3:30 – 5:00 pm
AGENDA:

- Update on Subcommittee membership
- Ongoing Projects
  - Research Administration Mentoring Program - RAMP
  - Fundamentals: Navigate
- Two new pilot course offerings
  - Uniform Guidance-Cost Principles
  - Advanced Budgeting I
- What’s Next
**Current Subcommittee Membership**

- Judy Carrillo, Subcommittee Chair, Medical School
- David Mulder, ORSP/Sponsored Programs
- Lori Deromedi, UMOR
- Michele Feldkamp, CoE
- Cathy Handyside, ITS
- Kullie Kennedy, ORSP
- Sue Kelch, Medical School (*new member!*)
- Melinda LaRocca, Public Health
- Cathy Seay-Ostrowski, Biomedical Engineering
- Susan Powell, CoE
- Chris DeVries, ORSP/Sponsored Programs
- Lea Tune, Sponsored Programs
- Pat Turnbull, U-M Dearborn
- Lana Tyrrell, ULAM/Medical School
- Beth Wenner, ORSP

---

**Research Administration Mentoring Program (RAMP) Update**

**3rd Cohort Now Underway**

**Program Overview**

- RAMP will run for 9 months (September - June)
- 22 participants
- 11 matched pairs
- Mentors have > 5 years of research administrative experience at UM
- Mentees have > 6 months of research administrative experience at UM
Introductions
Fall 2016 Matched Pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Mentee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mentee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Krause</td>
<td>Jodi Caviani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Young</td>
<td>Marina Lukyanchuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Burnside</td>
<td>Lynn Kujawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Mann</td>
<td>Tawny Dekar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Bernhardsson</td>
<td>Ariel Mallet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Hug</td>
<td>Jessica Mirelez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Prieur</td>
<td>Barbara Munsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianna Banka</td>
<td>Jill Granger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Thomas</td>
<td>Tabitha Rohn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Parker</td>
<td>Amanda Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rula Karapatsakis</td>
<td>Phillip Boetsch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Navigate: Fundamentals

Fall 2016 Training Schedule

- **Day 1**: Wednesday, September 28
- **Day 2**: Wednesday, October 12
- **Day 3**: Wednesday, October 19
- **Day 4**: Wednesday, November 2
- **Day 5**: Wednesday, November 9
- **Day 6**: Wednesday, November 16
- **Day 7**: Wednesday, November 30

Course will be offered again in Spring
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Aili</td>
<td>LSA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lynn Kujawa</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Meinzer</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicole Sleeva</td>
<td>Med School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Alber</td>
<td>UMOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Jo LaPointe</td>
<td>Med School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Brisbois</td>
<td>Business &amp; Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whitney Mertz</td>
<td>Med School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Dahlgren</td>
<td>Med School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jessica Mirelez</td>
<td>Med School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Alber</td>
<td>UMOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicole Smith</td>
<td>LSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jo LaPointe</td>
<td>Med School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Lockhart</td>
<td>UM-Dearborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney Mertz</td>
<td>Med School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Brisbois</td>
<td>Business &amp; Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Lockhart</td>
<td>UM-Dearborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Dahlgren</td>
<td>Med School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marina Lukyanuchuk</td>
<td>Taubman College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Lukyanuchuk</td>
<td>Taubman College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Moore</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Brisbois</td>
<td>Business &amp; Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Lockhart</td>
<td>UM-Dearborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Dahlgren</td>
<td>Med School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marina Lukyanuchuk</td>
<td>Taubman College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Lukyanuchuk</td>
<td>Taubman College</td>
<td></td>
<td>Samantha Moore</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Moore</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Brisbois</td>
<td>Business &amp; Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Janet Paulson</td>
<td>UM-Flint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Lockhart</td>
<td>UM-Dearborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Dahlgren</td>
<td>Med School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marina Lukyanuchuk</td>
<td>Taubman College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Fortune</td>
<td>SPH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ariel Mallette</td>
<td>LSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Franklin</td>
<td>UMOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Manley</td>
<td>Med School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amanda Rasnake</td>
<td>Med School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Rasnake</td>
<td>Med School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Wintergerst</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Hou, SNRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reynaldo Martell</td>
<td>LSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Franklin</td>
<td>UMOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Manley</td>
<td>Med School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amanda Rasnake</td>
<td>Med School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Franklin</td>
<td>UMOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Manley</td>
<td>Med School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amanda Rasnake</td>
<td>Med School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Hou, SNRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reynaldo Martell</td>
<td>LSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Hoy, Med School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer Martin</td>
<td>LSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Hoy, Med School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maggie Seeger</td>
<td>UMOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Hoy, Med School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Hoy, Med School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Training Offerings - Pilots**

- Uniform Guidance - Cost Principles
- Advanced Budgeting I
- Advanced Sponsored Project Management
  - on hold
Uniform Guidance

- Designed to help plan and manage Federally sponsored projects for UG Cost Accounting Principles, including:
  - importance of UG compliance
  - how to plan for UG expenses
  - how to manage the lifecycle of projects that include UG expenses

Course Limit: 30 participants

Schedule:
- Date: October 25, 2016
- Demo: October 20, 2016

Uniform Guidance Design Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-Leads</th>
<th>Cory Livingston (Sponsored Programs)</th>
<th>Judy Carrillo (Med School)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Experts</td>
<td>Robyn Bollman (Engineering)</td>
<td>Jacob Schlag (LSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sue Keller (Med School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Trainers</td>
<td>Cory Livingston</td>
<td>Jacob Schlag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Donna Boyer (Med School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>David Mulder</td>
<td>Laura Coddington (Finance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raquel de Paula Silvius (Finance)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advanced Budgeting I

- First in a series of three that will move the learner through increasingly more advanced budgeting topics
  - Participants apply budget techniques to build their own budgets with budget justifications, each with increasingly more complex elements and attributes

Course Limit: 15 participants

Schedule (½ day)
- Day 1: October 28, 2016
- Day 2: November 8, 2016
- Day 3: November 29, 2016

Advanced Budgeting I Design Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Cathy Seay-Ostrowski (Biomedical Engineering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Experts</td>
<td>Stacey Althouse (Med School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kerri Cross (ISR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kimberly Mann (Engineering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trina Bailey (Med School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruth Halsey (Med School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Trainer</td>
<td>Cathy Seay-Ostrowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>David Mulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laura Coddington (Finance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raquel de Paula Silvius (Finance)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What’s Next......

- Identify additional advanced training opportunities
  - Evaluating Fundamentals content for stand alone courses
  - Reviewing topics from previous surveys
A New ORSP Internal Deadline Policy

Office of Research and Sponsored Projects

What is ORSP’s current deadline policy?

- ORSP reviews and approves all proposals seeking external funding.
- The deadline for submitting the Proposal Approval Form (PAF) and final proposal is four (4) business days in advance of the sponsor's deadline.
- ORSP’s policy is not enforced and is regularly ignored.
What are we proposing?

- All PAFs and final proposal documents must be received in ORSP 3 business days ahead of the sponsor’s deadline, e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor Deadline</th>
<th>Internal Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM ET, Friday, June 5</td>
<td>5:00 PM ET, Tuesday, June 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM ET, Friday, June 5</td>
<td>12:00 PM ET, Tuesday, June 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 PM ET, Friday, June 5</td>
<td>5:00 PM ET, Tuesday, June 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM ET, Monday, July 16</td>
<td>5:00 PM ET, Wednesday, July 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are we proposing?

- PAFs/proposals not received by the internal deadline will not be submitted
- PIs (or their delegates) may request an exception to the internal deadline of one additional business day in the event of exceptional circumstances
- **Examples of Acceptable Exceptional Circumstances**
  - Unanticipated medical emergency of PI or an immediate family member
  - Natural disaster
  - Emergency closing of U-M due to severe weather
  - PI was notified by sponsor of funding opportunity less than X weeks prior to the deadline
- **Examples of Unacceptable Exceptional Circumstances**
  - More time is needed to complete the proposal
  - Sub-contractor/sub-recipient documentation is late
  - Heavy teaching, patient care, or administrative responsibilities
  - Failure to complete required registrations in advance of the due date
What are we proposing?

- Exceptions must be approved by the school/college/institute and an ORSP Managing PR, whose approval is not guaranteed.
- Proposals granted an exception will not be submitted at the expense of other applicants for the same deadline who were timely.

Soliciting feedback...

**Meeting Schedule**

- May 10, 2016: RAAC Executive Committee
- June 14, 2016: RAAC Executive Committee
- June 27, 2016: RAAC Faculty Advisory Council
- Sept. 7, 2016: Jack Hu & UMOR Management Team
- Sept. 12, 2016: U-M Medical School Office of Research
- Sept. 12, 2016: RAAC Faculty Advisory Council
- Sept. 30, 2016: Research Policies Committee
- Oct. 12, 2016: Research Associate Deans
- Oct. 18, 2016: RAAC Committee at Large
- Nov. 8, 2016: RAAC Executive Committee (progress report)
- Nov. 9, 2016: Research Associate Deans (progress report)
- Nov. 15, 2016: RAAC Committee at Large (progress report)
- 2017 (TBD): RAAC Committee at Large (progress report)
Rationale for a new policy

- The lack of a deadline policy is unfair to timely faculty.
- Late proposals risk not being submitted on time.
- Late proposals risk being submitted without meeting the sponsor’s requirements.
- The explosion of sponsor-mandated proposal systems increases the complexity of ORSP’s work and the time it takes to submit a proposal.
- Late proposals receive little-to-no compliance review.
- ORSP staff are at the breaking point.

What does ORSP do to enable proposal submission?

ORSP conducts a 42 point review . . .

assuming we are given enough time
What does ORSP do to enable proposal submission?

Proposal Approval Form (PAF) Review

- If limited submission, ensure UMOR approval is uploaded to PAF.
- Ensure Project Long Title corresponds to title on proposal.
- Check relationship to previous Project/Grant, if disclosed
- Class code is correct.
- Sponsor(s) properly identified, including Sponsor role, ID and contact information.
- Deadline is correct or is not entered when no deadline exists.
- Faculty named on PAF are listed in proposal (and vice versa).
- U-M PI eligible to serve in role or, if not eligible, approved by Dean’s Office.
What does ORSP do to enable proposal submission?

Proposal Approval Form (PAF)

- Compliance factors (e.g. animal research, human subjects) are correctly identified and correspond to proposal.
- Related agreements, both funded and unfunded, do not prohibit proposal submission.
- Use of third party intellectual property does not prohibit proposal submission.
- Use of U-M proprietary technology does not prohibit proposal submission.
- Encumbrances/licensing of U-M intellectual property to third parties disclosed to sponsor.

Proposal Approval Form (PAF) Review

- Start/end dates correspond to proposal.
- Budget corresponds to funding requested in proposal.
- Indirect cost rate corresponds to indirect cost rate used in proposal.
- Indirect cost rate does not exceed rate appropriate to class code.
- U-M Cost Sharing, Non-U-M Cost Sharing and Other U-M Commitments correspond to proposal, and are documented and approved.
- Rackham’s cost share program, when applicable, is recorded in U-M Other Commitments as shortfall.
What does ORSP do to enable proposal submission?

Proposal Approval Form (PAF) Review

- If applicable, subcontractors have provided letters of commitment and, for PHS submissions and sponsors that adopt PHS practices, FCOI forms.
- Sponsor RFP, FOA, or equivalent (or applicable link, when allowed) provided.
- PI conflict of interest question answered.
- Signatures/approvals present and correct (i.e., for Administrative Home, Personnel with Effort, Cost Sharing, Ineligible PI).

What does ORSP do to enable proposal submission?

Proposal Review
What does ORSP do to enable proposal submission?

Proposal Review

- When project team submits proposal via sponsor’s online system, proposal information provided by project team matches information provided in the PAF.
- When ORSP submits proposal via sponsor’s online system, proposal information in sponsor’s system matches information provided in the PAF.
- When ORSP submits proposal via sponsor’s online system, sponsor’s online system available to ORSP.
- Administrative data complete and correct (e.g., EIN, DUNS, FWA, authorized official data, etc.).
- Required components of proposal included.
- Sponsor’s file naming and format conventions followed.

What does ORSP do to enable proposal submission?

Proposal Review

- Page length limits observed.
- Budget compliant with sponsor guidelines/requirements, for example:
  - Sponsor prohibits equipment purchases or restricts funds to student stipends.
- Cost sharing requirements met.
- Indirect cost rate does not exceed rate allowed by sponsor.
- Budget items consistent with Uniform Guidance (2 CFR 200) and the Cost Accounting Standards, when applicable.
- Uniform Guidance monitored costs appropriately justified.
What does ORSP do to enable proposal submission?

Proposal Review

- Compliance factors (e.g. animal research, human subjects) properly disclosed.
- Sponsor-required representations, certifications and other forms acceptable or modified as necessary.
- Review non-negotiable terms and agreements to obtain necessary institutional approvals for submission (e.g., Gates Foundation, Keck Foundation).
- Institutional approvals necessary for non-negotiable terms and conditions obtained.
- Signatures/approvals present and correct.
- Agreement negotiated prior to submission, when required (e.g., Teaming Agreements).

How active are U-M faculty? (FY14-FY16)

Value of Proposals: $4,757,807,340

Actual $ Awarded: $1,248,815,919
How do ORSP and the Med School* support the U-M research enterprise?

A New ORSP Internal Deadline Policy

Rationale for a new policy

- ORSP’s policy is not strictly enforced and regularly ignored.
- 25% of the 7,247 proposals in FY16 were routed or finalized within 0.41 business days of the deadline

On average, seven (7) proposals per day are not ready for submission until the day they are due! But averages can be deceiving...

*The UMMS Grant Review and Analysis Office has delegated authority to submit Grants.gov proposals to NIH.
Daily proposal submission spikes pose a challenge

The busiest months...

One Project Representative can be called upon to submit up to 25 proposals per day!

A New ORSP Internal Deadline Policy

Maximum number of submissions per day per PR, by FY quarter.
A New ORSP Internal Deadline Policy

Submission lead time, by campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Upper Whisker</th>
<th>Upper Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Lower Quartile</th>
<th>Lower Whisker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Alfred Taubman CAMUP</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Human Growth &amp; D.</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of LIT, Science &amp; Arts</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Pharmacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford School of Public Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Social Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross School of Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Dentistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nat Resource and E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Social Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamps School of Art &amp; Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM Transport Research Inst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submission lead time, by UM Ann Arbor School/College/Institute

[Bar chart and other data related to submission lead times by various schools and institutes]
Non-government sponsors are an increasingly frequent target

Non-government sponsors create greater variability and often require more time to review

Rationale for a new policy

ORSP staff are stressed and demoralized

- High numbers of late proposals
- High demand for quick turnaround times
- High expectations for quality customer service
- High numbers of grants/contracts to process

- Very high levels of staff stress
But in spite of it all...

ORSP staff still provide great service!

Overall Customer Satisfaction is consistently in the 90-95% range!

What have we done so far?

- All managers have taken Lean Office training to better understand ways to streamline work
- Government Team reorganized by department rather than sponsor
- Government Team PRs cross-trained to handle multiple sponsors
- Tool to assess workload equity implemented
- Proposal/PAF review checklists created -- generic, NIH and NSF
- Campus-wide proposal submission roles and responsibilities matrix developed
Who has made a hard internal deadline policy work?

- **Stanford University**
  - 5 business days for admin shell
  - 3 business days for final proposal
  - 1 exception since policy implemented in February 2015

- **University of Washington**
  - 7 business days for admin shell
  - 3 business days for final proposal

- **Harvard University**
  - 5 business days for final proposal

- **Yale University**
  - 5 business days for final proposal

- **University of California, Irvine**
  - 5 business days for admin shell
  - 8 business hours for final proposal
How will we implement the policy?

● Planning and design phase for eRPM and policy changes
  ○ In consultation with RAAC and with assistance of ITS
  ○ Schools/colleges/units given time to develop own deadline policies.
● An aggressive change management plan prior to the “go live” date, with job aids, newsletter articles, and presentations to stakeholders (e.g., Research Associate Deans, RAAC, schools/colleges, faculty groups).
● An 8-month “soft launch” prior to the “go live” date
  ○ PIs informed if their proposal would not have met the internal deadline.

How will we implement the policy?

● Automated email notice in eRPM of internal deadline
● School/college/unit reporting on policy adherence
● As the the “go live” date nears, stakeholders re-engaged through general and targeted communications
Problems with a two-tiered review approach

- Potential for changes following initial review
- “Admin Shell” not sufficient for ORSP to determine whether proposal meets sponsor requirements
- Final review of complete and final proposal is only useful if there is enough time for project team to fix problems
- “Two touches” is inefficient
  - Another ~5,000 reviews (assuming 100% of gov’t proposals & 50% of non-gov’t proposals)
  - Another ~2,500 person hours (assuming 30 min/additional review)
- Last minute chaos unresolved
- Leap-frogging over timely faculty still an issue