1. **Introductions of Members and Guests** *(Daryl Weinert)*

   Daryl welcomed everyone and thanked Becky O'Brien for hosting the meeting. Daryl announced there were four new members: Ken Sylvester, U-M Flint; Victoria Devulder and Janet Mitchell, College of Pharmacy; and, Karen Kirchner, School of Nursing. The group went around the room for introductions.

2. **Presentation:** RAAC Metrics Subcommittee Update *(Chris Allan)*

   Chris Allan, Chair of RAAC Metrics provided the subcommittee update.

   New members: Steve Beach and Brandi Berg of LSA are new. Chris DeVries (replaced Yvonne Sturt) and Laura Dickey (replaced Dan Stanish) are also new to the subcommittee since the last update.

   **Purpose:** To identify goals (actionable) and obtain measures. Sometimes looking at historical trends is good to spark more questions.

   **Activity:**
   - **Enhancing and expanding initial reports:** Gathered a lot of feedback to enhance/expand initial reports. The group has been in a data-digesting mode and looking at how to move forward. Suggestions were to provide more context to the data, with the ability to present in different ways. For example: In addition to indirect cost (IDC) rates, it can be helpful to look at dollars. Want to be proactive.

   We are looking at how to provide simple school / college level details of UMOR quarterly reports. Metrics group wants to provide in a concise way and not reinvent the wheel.

   Forecasting is on the radar. We want to make sure it is right and to keep focus on data areas before we move on to forecasting. Forecasting initiatives take time and a lot of effort.

   Next Steps: Tableau is the application chosen to present reports. Would like to provide more context on how to use the reports. Asking for the initial pilot group to explore reports and give feedback on what Phase II will need.

   **Department Hierarchy tree:**
   Looking to work with ITS to build model that will work with both BusinessObjects and Tableau. Working with ITS on design and will give Metrics something tangible to test. Goal is to provide a table in the data warehouse that reflects multi-level hierarchies beyond the department group.
Current & Pending / Other Support template:

Working with RAAC Communications on how to gather as much data as possible from a BusinessObjects query and put into an Excel template to provide a data set you can work with without having to input again. Met with ITS on design, and need to get into development. Timeline is up in the air. The solution would allow administrators the ability to pull as much information as possible from a canned query into a template for review and export in the sponsor’s format (e.g., NIH/NSF). The BusinessObjects query pulls data from available resources. Excel template allowed importing and updating of data, printing, and maintaining for future use.

Using NIH/NSF templates today and will look at other sponsors in the future. Will make template available on web along with training materials to allow administrators to download and use. NOTE: Mac computers are not happy with template, so recommending to test on PC. The recommendation for Mac users is to use Parallels Desktop or a remote desktop connection.

The next step is to have small pilot group (RAAC Metrics and RAAC Communications) test template and make available on web to download and use.

Access to reports:

Began by tapping into existing MCommunity Groups. Discovered a gap of people who have access to Data Warehouse was found. Metrics reached out to Identity and Access Management (IAM) in ITS. IAM was able to create a script adding these MCommunity groups to the list of those who have access to the suite of metrics. This constitutes approximately 1000 people total.

The current MCommunity groups who will have access to the suite of metrics are: RAAC, Budget Administrators Group (BAG), Deans, Research Associate Deans (RAD), eResearch Proposal Management Data Warehouse users. There are few gaps of people in pilot. Easiest solution: 1) grant eResearch Proposal Management data warehouse access, 2) add additional MCommunity groups. Need to relay to ITS to include in script.

Metrics will provide summary by RAAC unit and asking the group to review and comment on others who should get access.

The next activity is to build up a catalog of reports based on collected feedback and prioritization. Aid units in publishing their ideas as well - the availability of ideas can help others or lead to someone else’s better ideas. For instance, would like to have a catalog of the content within shared folders.

We will keep tapping into available resources (e.g., Award Management). Continue to investigate more opportunities for measurable data (e.g., comparing U-M to outside institutions). Delinquent progress reports - to link up and be proactive. Went around the university (schools/colleges/units) to ask what goals or metrics they would like to see measured. RAAC Metrics members are willing to come out and understand what information is needed to be more strategic.

Chris mentioned RAAC Metrics is a volunteer group and asked for patience.

Daryl asked how the group has you interfaced with ITS. It would be good to have global research reporting. Although difference audiences, would be good to compare and reach out to Vijay Thiruvengadam at Information Quest (IQ). Chris wanted to have something more presentable before they go forward. Daryl asked to move this up in priority and does not want to see duplication. Daryl would like to be front and center on the analytics side, and would like to be at the next RAAC Metrics meeting when ITS presents. Would like to make sure they don’t go off in wrong direction.
Daryl also asked if they have communicated with the Caleb Smith in the Medical School. Caleb started to expand upon what the College of Engineering started, using eRPM data going back 7 years worth of data to predict proposal success. Should connect with Caleb. Feels we need to get ahead with using data.

Scott Stanfill asked about the practical value of knowing the likelihood if a proposal will be funded. Daryl said data can drive staffing levels, etc. Scott has a cost-benefit analysis and would be interested to see if we could find something uniformly shared with everyone.

Becky O’Brien mentioned another benefit is to see what faculty are not getting funding and point them to spend more time in different area, more training, etc.

   - Navigate Design Teams and Backup Presenters (David Mulder)
   - RAAC Road Show (Daryl Weinert)

The Navigate Training team developed 18-month training plan, including classes we have offered (e.g., Fundamentals and Uniform Guidance), as well as currently in development and ideas. A survey will be sent via RAPId and mentioned at the upcoming RAN meeting. Survey topics include:
   - RA additional topics (advanced)
   - Faculty training (asking RAs for priorities)
   - Lunch and Learn series - include both physical and virtual training. Looking for ideas for topics and for presenters.

David asked the group to make sure people fill it out or pass along to those in your unit that can contribute. We can then come back to this group with concrete topics and ask for presenters.

It was asked if there was a vision for faculty training. Is it going to be similar to classes now? David is going to validate at the next RAAC Faculty Advisory Council meeting. First, it would be for new faculty - more of a condensed version of Fundamentals course (½ day). Second would be for advanced / experienced faculty and maybe put in eModules.

Scott asked how would it be different from the required PEERRS module. David said the new Faculty training would not be required, and would be internal recommendation and not agency requirement. The content would take PEERRS course into consideration so it is not duplicated, or could add additional modules to PEERRS course. Daryl said feedback from Faculty is they don’t like the PEERRS course, so there may be a need for a different method. Scott indicated his new faculty liked PEERRS. PEERRS is limited - can’t do video, PPT slides, etc. The Faculty training would be more practically oriented than compliance oriented.

Constance indicated Faculty is interested in learning (feedback from Celebrate Research) and need to help them figure out how to get training, but need right mode, length that is required.

David said they will tap into departments doing this locally to combine efforts. Becky mentioned it will also help RAs know what training Faculty will be getting to help the process.

Daryl, Chris, and Debbie begun a roadshow initiative to promote and provide information about RAAC. They are going to continue to do these meetings, and let them know if they would like to be put on the schedule. The roadshow goes over accomplishments, what RAAC is about, and also to make sure they are not left out and be included into these groups.
4. **ITS Update:** *(Carolyn Pappas)*

**PM Performance:** There has been system slowness during last NIH deadline period. Click/Huron (vendor) is responding hourly and received a lot of fixes during the month. One update was on fixed memory management, but needed additional fixes that still had issues. We believe we have fixed some stuff, but continue to work with vendor.

**eRPM Updates:**
- SF424: Subaward Budget forms.
- Several research & related Subaward Budget attachment(s).
- Improved NIH validation messages to get more concise message.
- Updates to Sign activity in PAF - PI Sign PAF activity to include PI responsibility for lab safety.
- Resolved issue with display of investigators with “no space required” and corrected format on PAF Summary.
- Resolved Status Map on/off display. If you turn off it will stay off.

Export Controls - Technology Control Plans now have an automated amendment process workflow. New Standard Term for “Enhanced IT Requirements.” Craig said whenever there are enhanced IT requirements, check the flag on PAF so you can be in touch with IT professionals in your office.

Sign PAF activity - Scott said a PAF conflict of interest box was checked and said it took a month to get PAN. Asked how to know if there is a conflict of interest and not wait a month to find this was the problem. The PAF Summary will indicate if there is a conflict of interest and not wait for it get through process. They can also update a “conflict of interest” at any time. Daryl wanted Carolyn to add to spreadsheet to go over at next meeting. Constance asked if we should include in newsletter tip. Request to let her know if communication was needed.

New Sign PAF Language - have not changed anything, except for new language (point #5).

Next upgrade is framework (portal upgrade). Currently on version 6.1.3 and planning to go to version 8.0.2. No user facing changes on interim version, but will have user facing changes on May 5.

Award Management - new approach for managing projects in post-award. Trying to align M-Pathways financials, and collect related proposal PAFs.

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

Audit - Single (A133) Audit - still working with auditors on finalizing. Two findings: One related to travel - Fly America Act - requires using US fly carriers. The other ongoing issue is related to equipment. When we purchase equipment using federal funds how do we dispose/track inventory - we need to address. When we purchase equipment with federal funds, you have to properly handle it and keep records up to date.

NSF Audit - we are hoping to hear on NSF audit resolution - still working on 2 issues - equipment and another small issue. Hoping to get wrapped up soon (March 31).

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

Craig said Sharyn Sivyer retired from ORSP - effective Jan. 1. Sharyn is working part-time helping with transition. Have two new Assistant Project Representatives - Stephanie Stenberg (Private Sponsors team) and Dan Garber (Private Sponsors team). Both have JD.
Have 3 promotions for Assistant Managing Project Representative: Ryan Lankton, Government Sponsors team reporting to Kathy DeWitt. Tony Nielsen and Patrick Woods, Private Sponsors team reporting to Tom Zdeba.

Federal Wide Research Conditions - still not released.

Uniform Guidance - Micro purchase threshold (currently set for $3K) - going in effect July 1, 2017. There were two (2) federal laws passed that the threshold should be $10K or above. We feel OMB will state the threshold will remain in tact ($10K) and extend the other procurement requirements until 2018.

Final Rule on Protection of Human Subject - goes into effect Sept. 19, 2018 and working diligently to make sure we comply.

Federal Agency - NIH had a lot of notices and have been announced in RAPids.

- Post Doc Fellow stipend
- SF424 application guide and grants policy guide statement released
- RPPR - new version and new requirement for Type 2 applications. Under new policy have to submit interim RPPR that will count as the final if Type 2 is funded.
- There is a new limitation on appendix materials.
- New guidelines on font sizes and font types.
- Any multi-site clinical studies will use single IRB of record. The single IRB requirement can direct charge some costs, and if U-M acting as single IRB it gets a little fuzzy.

NSF - new proposal and award policies and procedure guide.

- DOD - Air Force scientific of research is getting serious of holding funds if delinquent. Have separate IRB and approval processes and need to make sure you pay attention.

APG - New deadline policy.

- Daryl presented to APG and they agreed we should have a deadline policy, but had the same questions we received from other groups. Good dialogue. Agreed 80% of work has predictable deadlines and there is no excuse. It was how we work with exceptional situations (especially with multi schools). Daryl will be meeting with them again and wanted the group to be aware all the Deans were at that discussion.

7. Closing and Future Meetings: (Daryl Weinert) [4:25 - 4:30]

We are planning the Celebrate Research event to recognize those that received their first research award. Intended for new faculty, but can include some senior faculty from other universities. We invite the Department Chairs, Research Associate Deans and Deans. Going to be more proactive to get list to those groups. Daryl asked the group to ask any faculty they think should be included. The event is on Thursday, May 4 from 3:30 - 5:30 p.m. and asked group to participate.

Next meeting is March with ISR hosting. Will have Process Subcommittee update.

Constance mentioned the live streaming for upcoming RAN meeting will be handled a little differently so would like feedback.

RAAC Committee-At-Large Meeting Dates
● Tuesday, March 21, 2017, 3:00 – 4:30 pm @ ISR (Heather Offhaus, RAAC Process Subcommittee)
● Tuesday, April 18, 2017, 3:00 - 4:30 pm @ Medical School, NCRC (Judy Carrillo, RAAC Training Subcommittee)
● Tuesday, May 16, 2017, 3:00 - 4:30 pm @ SNRE (Becky O’Brien, RAAC Communications Subcommittee)

Executive Committee Meetings
Wolverine Tower, Conference Room 1025
● Tuesday, March 14, 2017, 3:30 – 5:00 pm
● Tuesday, April 11, 2017, 3:30 – 5:00 pm
● Tuesday, May 9, 2017, 3:30 – 5:00 pm
RAAC - Metrics
Subcommittee Update
February 21, 2017

Agenda

▸ Background
▸ Activities
▸ Looking forward
Background
-- subcommittee members
-- what are metrics?

Background: RAAC Metrics members

Chris Allan, Chair (ISR)
Steve Beach (LSA)
Brandi Berg (LSA)
John Cristiano (Dearborn)
Chris DeVries (Sponsored Programs/ORSP)
Laura Dickey (ORSP)

Linda Forsyth (Engineering)
Jeff Longe (ORSP)
Adam Mall (Sponsored Programs)
Mike Randolph (ITS)
Joel Scharboneau (Nursing)
Patricia Schultz (Dentistry)
Bryant Sheppard (Medical School)
Metrics

- Measurement of progress
  - How am I progressing toward a goal?
  - How am I doing compared to history?

Activities

since last update in May
7 Activities

- **Progress with initial reports**
  - Review of feedback from 90+ suggestions collected from ~100 attendees at presentations to 11 schools/colleges/units
  - Prioritization of feedback based on polls within RAAC Metrics subcommittee
- **Department Hierarchy tree**
- **Current & Pending/Other Support template**
- **Access to reports**

8 Activities: Progress with initial reports

- **Enhancing and expanding initial reports**
  - Accounts Receivable
  - Award Rates
  - Collaborations
  - Indirect Cost analysis
  - Submission Lead Time
- **Additional suggestions**
  - Simple proposal/award counts and amounts
    - S/C/U details of UMOR quarterly graphs
  - Forecasting
Activities: Progress with initial reports

Next steps
- Working with ORSP Communications and RAAC Communications subcommittee on formal rollout activities (e.g. a webpage home for reports, tutorials)
- In the meantime, once we’ve worked through applying some feedback from the original reports, we’ll have a soft rollout, notifying RAAC of the availability of reports in Tableau

Activities: Department Hierarchy tree

Goal
- Provide a table in the data warehouse that reflects multi-level hierarchies beyond the Dept Group
- Make that table available to users of tools like BusinessObjects and Tableau

Status
- Members of RAAC Metrics and other units met with ITS Information Quest (IQ) to discuss design
- ITS IQ finalized design (on paper), awaiting development to allow testing
Goal
▷ Provide a tool to allow administrators the ability to pull as much information as possible from a canned query into a template for review and export in the sponsor’s format (e.g. NIH/NSF)

Status
▷ BusinessObjects query created to pull data from available resources
▷ Excel template created to allow pasting of data, updating, printing, and maintaining for future use

Next Steps
▷ Having a pilot group of users test and provide feedback
▷ Will make template available on web, along with training materials, to allow administrators to download and use
**Goal**
- Limit administrative burden (on campus and within RAAC Metrics) of maintaining user access by tapping into existing M-Community groups

**Status**
- Investigated existing M-Community groups that would have good candidates for access
- Worked with ITS Identity and Access Management (IAM) and IQ on getting a group for data warehouse users

**Automatically generated access (based on M-Community Groups)**
- RAAC committee-at-large
- Budget Administrators Group (BAG)
- Deans
- Research Associate Deans (RAD)
- eResearch Proposal Management data warehouse users
What if I have someone that doesn’t fit in one of those groups?

- Option 1: grant the user eResearch Proposal Management data warehouse access
- Option 2: provide RAAC Metrics the name of an M-Community group you maintain that would include the user – we can include it with the automatic groups

How can you help?

- Following the meeting, we'll distribute a summary by RAAC unit of who would receive access with this approach
- The summary will contain a link to detail by individual, allowing the RAAC unit to review and think about others they’d like to include
Looking forward beyond Next Steps

Goal - build up a catalog of reports
- Work on existing list of reports based on collective feedback and prioritization
- Aid units in publishing their ideas as well -- the availability of your ideas can help others or lead to someone else’s better ideas
How will we do this?

- Participate in projects that will make data more available
  - e.g. Award Mgmt
- Continue to investigate more opportunities for measurable data
  - e.g. comparing UofM to outside institutions
  - e.g. delinquent progress reports
- Help from schools/colleges/units
  - Have a goal or metric you’d like to see measured? We’d love to hear it.

Questions?

ask away now or later at RAAC.Metrics@umich.edu
ITS Update

Carolyn Pappas
RAAC CAL Meeting
February 21, 2017

Overview

● Update on PM Performance

● eRPM Updates
  ● SF424 – Completed Feb. 18, 2017
  ● System Update – Completed Feb. 20, 2017

● eRPM Vendor Upgrade
  ● Planned for April/May

● Award Management
Update on PM Performance

- System Slowness during NIH deadline period
  - Continuing to work with vendor, Click/Huron
  - Received fix for memory management issue
    - Applied in late January
    - Fix memory issue, but continued to observe contention issues
    - Continued mitigation strategy of performing maintenance during business day to clear contention and restore acceptable performance
  - Received several additional fixes for specific contention issues
  - Continuing to work with vendor

eRPM Update – SF424

- Updates to Subaward Budget Forms
- Added support for the several Research & Related Subaward Budget Attachment(s)
- Improved NIH validation messages when required documents are missing.
● Updates to Proposal Approval Form (PAF)
  ● Attestation language on the PI Sign PAF activity updated to include language on PI responsibility for lab safety (if applicable).
  ● Resolved issue with display of investigators with no space required on the PAF Summary
  ● Resolved issue with Status Map on/off display
● Export Controls - Technology Control Plans now have an automated amendment process workflow.
● New Standard Term – “Enhanced IT Requirements”

New Sign PAF Language

```
Sign PAF

By selecting Sign PAF and clicking OK, the undersigned, to the best of their knowledge and belief:
1. Certifies that the information submitted within the application is true, complete, and accurate.
   a. Certifies that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or claims may subject the PI to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties (OHH funds only).
2. Certifies the proposed work is consistent with University unit objectives and all faculty involved in the proposal have agreed to participate.
3. Certifies that no Federal appropriated funds have been or will be used to influence or attempt to influence the granting of this award.
4. Accepts the obligations and commitments described in the proposal.
5. Agrees to perform the work in accordance with University and sponsor policies, which includes maintaining safe practices for the conduct of the project, reporting safety incidents, using properly commissioned lab space (if applicable), and properly disposing of or removing hazardous materials or equipment (if applicable).
6. Agrees to accept responsibility for the scientific or programmatic conduct of the project and to provide the required progress reports if an award is made as a result of this proposal.
7. Certifies that the Conflict of Interest Statement above is true, complete, and accurate, and agrees to disclose any new outside interests or changes to existing outside interests during the term of the proposed project following the instructions at Disclosure Process.

Sign the PAF: [ ]
```
eRPM Vendor Upgrade – April/May 2017

- Huron/Click Framework Portal Upgrade
  - Currently on version 6.1.3
  - Planning two stage upgrade to version 8.0.2
    - Upgrade to interim version – Weekend of March 31, 2017
      - Limited user-facing changes
    - Upgrade to version 8.0.2 – Weekend of May 5, 2017
      - Updated user interface
      - Updated Microsoft technology

Award Management

- New approach for managing projects in post-award
- Introduces a single award number
  - Aligns with M-Pathways Financials
  - References all related Proposal Approval Forms (PAFs)
  - Includes references to all related compliance records and sub-contracts
Thank you for your time!