Research Administration Advisory Council (RAAC)
Committee-at-Large
Tuesday, April 19, 2016, 3:00 – 4:15 pm
Ross School of Business
Room 2320, second floor
701 Tappan Avenue

MINUTES

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

Daryl called the meeting and thanked Jennifer Huntington from Ross Business School for hosting today’s meeting.

2. **Presentation:** RAAC Communications Subcommittee Update (Becky O’Brien)
(PDF of slides attached)

The Communications subcommittee is comprised of representatives from different schools, colleges, and central offices. Becky joined the committee and assumed the chair position as of March 1.

The goals of the committee are to identify and assess communication methods used at U-M for research administration. As issues are identified, the committee works to develop improved systems that support communications, recommend best practices, and facilitate through RAN meetings.

**Completed since October, 2015**

1. **RAN meeting - Feb. 2, 2016.**

   Various topics (OSEH, library, find funding, public access compliance presentations, network activity, and survey).

   Attendance:
   In-person - 119
   Remote - 58

   Continued improvements to RAN meetings:

   Developed questionnaire for presenters (to make sure presentation is targeted to RA audience). Survey of remote viewers (second time having remote viewers). Improved room setup, audio, “straying” problem of presenters, and engaged viewing documents and surveys.

   Results were listed:
   Attendance: September, 2014 and May, 2015 meetings were in-person only. May, 2015 remote users were added. Average - in person (70%), remote (30%) (based on 1 person calling in).
2. **Provide consultation for communications initiatives**
   - Videos for ORSP website.
   - Communication plan for RA newcomers,
   - Full recovery of indirect cost webpage

3. **RAP/id survey**
   - 22 question survey (collected responses through October 2015).
   - Received 83 responses. (see presentation below for survey responses)

4. **Review & feedback for inquiries**
   - Mostly good feedback. Readers are mostly staff working in research administration.
     Readers approved of the content, frequency (8-10 issues/yr.) and the communication of critical updates through RAPid newsletter. There were concerns about the length of *The RAP*. To address this we will maintain the frequency of *The RAP* but reserve it for more general updates, a feature article, professional development opportunities, events, and funding opportunities.
   - Constance indicated the original reason for developing the two newsletters back in 2014 was that too many individual email communications were going out. There was a need to aggregate information. We decided to create two publications:
     - **RAPid** - Single announcements that were urgent and could not wait for the monthly newsletter. These communications can be targeted to specific segments based on topic (e.g., health sciences, engineering).
     - **The RAP** goes to everybody who opted in (research administrators, members of the RADs, and RAAC, but may not go to all faculty/staff members).
   - Opportunity to sign up for any newsletter, interest in topics, etc.

5. **Consulted on OSEH communications to the RA community**

Daryl asked how would we send information to everyone in the university, for example on a regulatory notice. Constance said we would work with ITS to accomplish that.

Survey results:
- **RAP/id Survey:** Good content, would like more budget/case study information, and having more time to go through it was a big theme.
- Would like to add more topics (i.e., cost sharing, fund accounting, PI responsibilities).

Other initiatives:
- Pass along focus group feedback to Metrics Subcommittee for other support task force.
- RPPR Questions - resulted in RPPR reminders and best practice RAPid
- Consulted with OSEH to RA community.

In progress:
- RA awards after meeting. Presented by UMOR.
- Review and feedback of web pages (e.g., cost sharing)
- Review of Proposed eRPM updates
- Feedback on RPPR best practices
Working with ITS on availability of ERPM job aids. There are lots of training pages out there. We want to include links to job aids to some of the webpages to make it more efficient/easier to get to.

Future Work:
- Systematic review of website - focus on set of pages to review for the year.
- Brainstorming about community information sharing (e.g., forum/gathering/on-line bulletin board) for RAs
- Continue to plan and execute engaging in relevant RAN meetings
- Recommend content and propose ideas for RAP newsletter.
- Solicit and provide input to guide continued development of Research Enterprise website.
- Serve as an advisory group / sounding board for initiative to help RA community communications understand one another's needs and perspectives.

Daryl would like to make sure to go through a 3-4 year check on relevant website content. Get a methodology and timeline over the years for content review. The committee is looking to be more proactive and control content from that point. Constance confirmed there is a footer on each webpage with contact information (orspinfo@umich.edu) that routes to Constance to report information or recommend changes. Some pages have a purple “Questions” section that provides the contact information of an expert if they have a particular question. There is also an FAQ and Resource section at the bottom of most of the web pages.

Constance gets feedback on web pages, and with the Communications Subcommittee will work on a systematic update and review cycle, perhaps correlating the content updates with the research project life cycle and/or looking at particular content areas, like Cost Sharing, to make sure the content is accurate and coherent and helpful..

3. Discussion: RAAC Metrics: Roles and Responsibilities Phase II roll out (Carole Bach)
[PDF Handout presented by Carole.]

Roles and Responsibilities is in final version of Phase II - covers time from after proposal submitted to when you have a PG in hand (Award Negotiation / Acceptance). Will mimicked same structure as Phase I. Had to collapsed things into unit administration, and units can mimic this template and break it out for their units and add to it.

Next Phase will go on ORSP Website, and make it on a RAP notice.

Moving on to Phase III (will be Award Management) and have had conversation on what it will look like. Looking to see how big we can make it so there is not much time commitment needed. Heather will be coming back to you for volunteers. Will have 3 leaders for the committee. Looking to get others on the committee, but current members can stay on. Close out will be separate (Phase IV).

4. ITS Update: (Cathy Handyside)
[PDF slides attached]

Update:
- PM Performance - Carolyn presented on the corrupted documents in SF424 - having problems processing document and hangs. Received some fixes from the vendor and haven't seen the problem since.
- Persistent system slowness - have put measures in place, but not able to test to simulate the load of NIH deadline to be effective. Had an one issue since (3/21/16), but the system recovered itself after 5 min. Made adjustments on how it handles data and seemed to fix itself. Have completed...
load testing, but still need to wait until end of May to see how it will handle the large data. Still test
the last week of May to make sure it works. Problem is how the system is handling memory
management. PAF summary and 424 are affected. Looked through to see what could be tweaked
to make it more efficient. Making changes this coming weekend, and have to re-apply to all PAFs
(all 80,000+). Area is in bottom in path summary (approvals) and specifically what it is approved
for. So made this more efficient. Still want to tweak other parts in PAF summary, but will need to
handle later with more agreement.

- System will be offline 6:00-6:15 p.m. this Friday. There were no objections from the group.
- Export Controls (EC) - adding Export Controls question to the remaining Unfunded Agreement
type (non-disc., date use, other, master). If question is answered yes or unsure, there will be a
message (in red) that Export Controls apply, will stay until answered no, or will need review by EC
officer.
- Made changes to the Clone process. PAF no longer will clone the Project Representative. Required
to enter before you route the PAF.
- Clinical Trial project teams will now be able to create a clone of a PAF that started as a Clinical
Trial Routing Form (CTRF).
- Workspace message if PAF includes sponsor requiring COI review (e.g., UM startups, sponsor
requires COI review, or includes companies where UM has equity).

NIH FORMS-D - applicable for:
- Proposals with deadlines of May 25, 2016 and later. Made one update to the system to enable to
download FORMS-D. One more change is needed for FORMS-D validation. Expecting patch this
Friday.
- Phase 1 - April 4 - completed - available to download in eRPM.
- Phase 2 - May 2, 2016 -
- Forms-D NIH validations available in eRPM
- PHS Fellowship Supplemental Form V3.0.

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

NSF Audit - The Auditors asked for follow up information (on 2 questions) from the schools involved, and
has been issued and hopefully completed soon.

New staff: May 2, 2016:
- 4 Accountants
- 2 Interns

COGR has been working with the Office of Management and Budget on the procurement related
standards of Uniform Guidance. Looking at $3500 procurement limit (vs. $3000) and going back to see
what administrative burden that will have on the research administration process. Hopefully will have
news next month.

Effort for Research faculty - meant as a tool to look at the Best Practice Policy Guidelines that UMOR has
on making sure research faculty are spending time other than appointed to research projects. If working
on proposals, really should not be charged to sponsored projects. It was a result of an internal audit. Need
to make sure you are managing the research staff properly. Implementation is July 2017 and may be
delayed (a year), but not determined at this time.

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

HR changes:
● New Administrative Assistants - Lesley Hart and Ashley Tillotson.
● One Administrative Assistant position still open.
● Assistant Project Representative - Naomi Fink left ORSP. The Assistant PR position was posted, and ORSP will begin interviewing for a replacement.
● Assistant Director position - almost closed.
● Amanda Coulter - took a position as an attorney with a firm working with Clinical Trials contracts. She will continue to work on a part-time basis until a new training manager is in place.

Daryl mentioned we will offer Navigate: Fundamentals in the fall. The Navigate team is working on training programs for Uniform Guidance, Advanced Budgeting, and Advanced Sponsored Project Management (which may be delayed a month to 6 weeks).

Federal Information Security Modernization Act (FISMA) - Watch for terms and conditions that will put IT security on projects. The text has been written and be shared in upcoming RAP communications.

Scott brought up the Fair Labor Standards Act and the change in law of salary level of exempt employees. HR is looking into it. Currently the salary is $24K or above to be considered exempt by FLSA law. The new law would increase the salary to $54.4K (regardless of appointment). It has gone in front of congress, and Daryl said it has been decided to pass the increase in Mid-June, so HR will have to re-evaluate how to input into system. Craig mentioned the university would continue to put pressure on congress on ramifications of such law.

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

Daryl went over the upcoming meetings below. Mentioned if anyone had suggestions for topics, please see Yvonne.

Daryl closed out the meeting thanking everyone and those on the phone.

---

RAAC Committee-At-Large Meeting Dates
- Tuesday, May 17, 2016 (Dan Stanish, RAAC Metrics Subcommittee @ Ford School of Public Policy)
- Tuesday, June 21, 2016 (Heather Offhaus, RAAC Process Subcommittee @ School of Social Work)
- NO JULY MEETING
- NO AUGUST MEETING

Executive Committee Meetings
Wolverine Tower, Conference Room 1025
- Tuesday, May 10, 2016, 3:30 – 5:00 pm
- Tuesday, June 14, 2016, 3:30 – 5:00 pm
- Tuesday, July 12, 2016, 3:30 – 5:00 pm
- NO AUGUST MEETING
Research Administration Advisory Council
Communications Subcommittee

Update to RAAC Committee-at-Large
April 19, 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Subcommittee Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stacey Althouse, ORSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Chavez, Sponsored Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance Colthorp, ORSP and Sponsored Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Deromedi, UMOR Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Disney, School of Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Handyside, ITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Kisabeth, Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Madias, LSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky O’Brien (Chair), School of Information*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Phillips, Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne Sturt, OSRP and Sponsored Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Turnbull, Dearborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corey Turner, School of Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Becky O’Brien joined and assumed position of chair as of March 1
Communication Subcommittee Charge

The RAAC Communications Subcommittee seeks to:

- **Identify and assess the communication methods** currently used at U-M for research administration

Once identified, **work to develop improved systems** that support robust, consistent and effective communications within the research administration community

- **Recommend best practices** by topic, purpose, and/or method

- **Facilitate and foster communications to and among research administrators by conducting the quarterly** Research Administrators Network (RAN) meetings
Completed Since Last Update

Since October 2015…
Accomplishments

RAN Meeting - February 2, 2016

Provide Consultation for Communications Initiatives

RAP/id Survey

Review & Feedback for inquiries

Consulted on OSEH communications to the RA Community
Research Administrators’ Network (RAN) Meetings

Topics:
- OSEH Presentation
- Library Presentations
- Find Funding
- Public Access Compliance
- Network Activity: Connect with a Content Expert Colleague
- Surveyed to gauge interest in potential future presentations

Attendees:
- 119 in-person, 58 remote
- Remote Viewers - Room/audio was better

Emcee:
- Cathy Handyside

Agendas and presentations on the RAN webpage:
http://orsp.umich.edu/ran
RAN Meetings: Continued Improvements

Questionnaire to Presenters:

- Ensure topic and presentation targeted for RA Audience
- Orient presenters to what RAN is and who the audience is

Remote Viewers Survey

- Room setup and audio was better
- Resolved presenters “straying” problem
- Engaged - viewing documents and taking surveys
RAN Meetings: The Numbers

### Total RAN Attendees Per Meeting

- **In-person (per Sign in Sheet)**
- **Remote (per Login)**
- **Room Capacity = 224**

#### Attendee Numbers:
- **September 2014** (157 Total): 157
- **February 2015** (187 Total): 187
- **May 2015*** (189 Total): 114
- **October 2015** (231 Total): 171
- **February 2016** (177 Total): 119

### RAN Attendees: Average In-Person vs. Remote

- **In-person (per Sign in Sheet)**: 69.6%
- **Remote (per Login)**: 30.4%

*Note: ** signifies estimated or provisional data.*
Provided Consultation to Communications Manager

Reviewed and Provided Feedback:

- Wayfinding Videos for ORSP Website
- Communication Plan for RA Newcomers Training
- Full Recovery of Indirect Cost Webpage
- RAP/id Satisfaction Survey
RAP/RAPid Survey

- Conducting a 22-question survey
- Collected responses through October 2015
- 83 responses received
- High-level Findings
1. Readership: Most readers are staff in research administration or central offices (about 75%), and only about 8% of respondents are faculty.
2. **Visuals:** Most (about 55%) can’t distinguish between the RAP and RAPid newsletters. Additionally, some had concerns about contrast of color and size of header.

**Response:** In immediate response, we began in November to reduce the size of the header from 600 to 500 pixels, and to change the links to a dark instead of a light blue. There may be opportunity to further distinguish and rebrand the RAPid and the Calls for Intent to Submit.
3. Content: Most read most of the articles. Over 65% read most or all of the communications, and 28.9% claim to read all.
4. Frequency is highly approved as long as individual articles reach them in time.

8. Frequency of Newsletter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too Infrequent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just right</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too frequent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Do you have any comments about the frequency of the newsletter?

No.

It seems about right because I would prefer that it not be too lengthy.

As the volume of research in Student Life is limited, I keep up with research administration mainly through these communications or in networking with others, rather than through the actual work itself. I am happy to receive any and all communications and newsletters.

I think it’s important information to the health of the University, so the frequency seems appropriate to me.

Once a month for the RAP is OK, but it is a lot of information to digest at one time. Two a month, with one focusing on UoM policies and procedures; and another one with sponsor updates and deadlines might be easier to digest.

I’m more likely to ignore frequent communications.
Response to Frequency: We are maintaining the frequency of *The RAP* (8-10 issues per year), but we are extracting some information from *The RAP* and placing this content in the *RAPid* newsletters instead:

- Critical updates will no longer be folded into *The RAP*. Our audience engages with the communications better when they are separate and distinct as *RAPid* announcements (based on the Survey, click-throughs, and informal feedback).

- We will send Sponsor updates separately and remove the Sponsor News section from *The RAP*.

- *The RAP* will be reserved for updates that for one feature article, new resources and professional development opportunities, events, and funding opportunities.
5. Would you recommend that a colleague subscribe to The RAP and RAPid?
Over 91% recommend the newsletters!
“It's not topics, it's TIME. Research Admins out in the Units have little if any time but to *skim* topics for immediate relevance with regards to upcoming deadlines or changes in policy, etc. And then, if we see a topic, we have to go skim it quick and then loop back around to read in-depth later on.

“More how to information. More budget. I want to know what others are doing in my field. What about case studies from units?”

“Good content. I don't always have time to read all of it, but I do catch what is important to me.”

“Somewhere between ‘just right’ and ‘too many.’ Some issues of the RAP have too much content to absorb in one reading. I find that I don't always go back to read the items I missed after my initial pass.”
“I have enjoyed the increased level of communications from ORSP, and the fact that notices are now combined together. That said, some of the RAP emails are VERY long, and you have to plan time to read them and digest them. That said, I know that there is a lot going on in the world of research and this may be unavoidable.”

“Topics appear to have overlap, not sure what exactly is different between the two emails.”

“A lot to read but I don't know what to leave out. I like it better than the Med School newsletter.”
“Possibly too many articles. I certainly have not done an exhaustive study. Also, I think the number of articles is driven by the amount of items that need to be addressed within the standard cycle of release for the newsletters. But, it is difficult for me at least to retain much information from more than a couple articles at a given time.”

“I like that fact that you archive them because, usually after I read it over, I delete it because my email is so overwhelming. Then... later, I'll often be reminded of something and go back to the archive to check it out again.”

“Cover hot topics like Cost Sharing; Fund accounting; PI responsibilities”

“Thanks for the hard work on it. We love it.”
Help with Other Inquires and Initiatives

Provided focus group feedback to RAAC Metrics Subcommittee for “Other Support” task force

RPPR Question

Resulted in RPPR Reminders and Best Practice RAPid

Consulted with OSEH regarding communications to RA community
IDEA
LOADING ...
In progress:

- Next RAN Meeting
  - Friday, May 20th 2-3:30pm
  - Jack Hu presenting at end of RAN meeting
  - Research Administrator Awards presented by UMOR after meeting

- Review & Feedback of Web Pages
  - Cost Sharing

- Review of Proposed eRPM updates
- Provide Feedback re: RPPR best practices as process undergoes changes
- Availability of eRPM job aids
What problem did we need to solve?

- Useful eRPM training documents exist but may be hard to find.
- Communications Subcommittee reviewed.
  - Felt documents would be useful to RAs.
  - Recommended cross-linking on ORSP website, correlating to project lifecycle.

What improvements are being made?

- In progress by ITS and Communications
- Driving traffic to resources that already exist, but were not easily found by research administrators.
Future Work:

- Systematic Review of Website
  - focus on a set of pages to review for the year

- Brainstorming about Community Information sharing/Forum/Gathering/Bulletin Board
Current and Ongoing

Continue to plan and execute engaging and relevant RAN meetings (ran-plans@umich.edu)

Recommend content and propose ideas for RAP newsletter

Solicit and provide input to guide the continued development of the Research Enterprise website

Serve as an advisory group and sounding board for initiative-based communications to help the research administration community understand one another’s needs and perspectives.
Questions?
ITS Update
Cathy Handyside
RAAC Committee-at-Large Meeting
April 19, 2016
Topics

• Update on PM Performance

• eRPM System Update – 4/22/16

• SF424 (Grants.gov) Update – 5/2/16

• NIH FORMS-D Validations
Update on PM Performance

• Grants.gov SF424 Corrupted Document Issue
  – No occurrence since 3/4/2016

• System Slowness
  – Last occurrence 3/21/16 3:45PM
    • 5 minute duration, system self-recovered
  – On-going investigation
    • Issues related to memory management
eRPM Update – 4/22/16

• Friday night implementation - 6:00-6:15PM

• PAF Summary Tuning
  – Step one (of many)
  – No change to what you see
  – Change to the way the info is pulled

• Export Controls
  – Question added to Unfunded Agreements (Non-Disclosure, Date Use, Other)
  – Workspace Message added
• PAF Clone Changes
  – Will no longer clone the ORSP PR.
  – Clinical Trial project teams will now be able to create a clone of a PAF that started as a Clinical Trial Routing Form (CTRF).

• Workspace Message when PAF sponsor requires COI Review
  – Includes sponsors such as UM Start-ups, etc.
    • “Sponsor requires COI review. ORSP will seek COI and Regental approval when needed.”
SF424 (Grants.gov) Update – 5/2/16

• NIH FORMS-D

• Phase 1 - April 4, 2016 - Complete
  – New/Updated NIH FORMS-D available for download in eRPM.

• Phase 2 - May 2, 2016
  – FORMS-D NIH Validations available in eRPM.
  – PHS Fellowship Supplemental Form V3.0.
ITS Update
Cathy Handyside
RAAC Meeting
April 19, 2016
Topics

• Update on PM Performance

• eRPM System Update – 4/22/16

• SF424 (Grants.gov) Update – 5/2/16
  • NIH FORMS-D Validations
Update on PM Performance

• Grants.gov SF424 Corrupted Document Issue
  – No occurrence since 3/4/2016

• System Slowness
  – Last occurrence 3/21/16 3:45PM
    • 5 minute duration, system self-recovered
  – On-going investigation
    • Issues related to memory management
eRPM Update – 4/22/16

• Friday night implementation - 6:00-6:15PM

• PAF Summary Tuning
  – Step one (of many)
  – No change to what you see
  – Change to the way the info is pulled

• Export Controls
  – Question added to Unfunded Agreements (Non-Disclosure, Date Use, Other)
  – Workspace Message added
eRPM Update – 4/22/16 (Continued)

• PAF Clone Changes
  – Will no longer clone the ORSP PR.
  – Clinical Trial project teams will now be able to create a clone of a PAF that started as a Clinical Trial Routing Form (CTRF).

• Workspace Message when PAF sponsor requires COI Review
  – Includes sponsors such as UM Start-ups, etc.
  • “Sponsor requires COI review. ORSP will seek COI and Regental approval when needed.”
SF424 (Grants.gov) Update – 5/2/16

• NIH FORMS-D

• Phase 1 - April 4, 2016 - Complete
  – New/Updated NIH FORMS-D available for download in eRPM.

• Phase 2 - May 2, 2016
  – FORMS-D NIH Validations available in eRPM.
  – PHS Fellowship Supplemental Form V3.0.