

Research Administration Advisory Council (RAAC)

Wednesday, May 21, 2014, 1:00 - 4:30 pm

University of Michigan – Flint Campus

303 East Kearsley Street

AGENDA

Lunch [1:00 – 2:00]

The Ontario Room, 303 East Kearsley Street

Walking Tour of Flint Campus [2:00 – 3:00]

RAAC Meeting [3:00 – 4:30]

The Ontario Room, 303 East Kearsley Street

Meeting Minutes

The Research Administration Advisory Council (RAAC) meeting was held on May 21, 2014, 3:00-4:30pm at the University of Michigan Flint Campus, Ontario Room

Daryl Weinert called the meeting to order at 3:07pm.

1. Introduction to the Flint Campus

Dr. Vahid Lotfi, Senior Vice Provost & Dean of Graduate Programs,

Dr. Terry Van Allen, Director, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs

Dr. Terry Van Allen: UM Flint was founded in 1950's. UM Flint has three schools and one college, the Schools of Management, Health Professions and Studies, Education and Human Services, and the College of Arts & Sciences. There are approximately 8600 students, of which 1500 are graduate students. A new PhD program in Physical Therapy was recently added. There are more than 50 international students. The C. S. Mott Foundation funds international student recruitment. There is a dual enrollment program for high school students in addition to the Genesee Early College for high school students in Genesee County taking undergrad classes. Gerard Voland is the Provost.

Historically UM Flint has had a transfer program. After taking two years of classes here and maintaining 3.0 GPA, a student can transfer to UM Ann Arbor. Grad students do not teach classes, but do act as research assistants, so professors are teaching classes. Faculty on campus are both teachers and scholars.

External grants are funding research at the School of Health Professions (\$5 million of the \$8 million of research funds coming to campus). Research and research related activities are centralized in the Flint ORSP office, which handles the UROP program, the Flint IRB, and animal research on campus. The office hosts a student research conference each year, a faculty research conference every other year, a research workshop for faculty, and brings Chris Black from the Ann Arbor campus for grant writing workshops.

Dr. Vahid Lotfi: The Rackham Graduate School hosts three grad programs on the Flint campus, soon to be four programs. We are grateful to have UM Ann Arbor as a resource. The Ann Arbor campus provides resources and expertise that is invaluable to the Flint campus.

2. **Introductions of Members and Guests**

Everyone around the table introduced themselves and where they worked within the university. Daryl Weinert thanked Terry Van Allen for hosting us.

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

Debbie Talley reminded us that the indirect cost for other sponsored research is going down to 29% on July 1. Financial Status Report—both the NIH and NSF are getting concerned about us doing anything after 90 days. The risk is the loss of funding.

The Sponsored Programs Office has hired three new accountants recently. One accountant left the office last week.

4. **Update: ORSP** (*Daryl Weinert*)

The ORSP office has spent time developing a Mission Statement and Vision Statement recently. The Vision Statement was hammered out just this morning! The process started with a retreat in January where the Mission Statement and Values were developed. A retreat in July will be spent developing strategic objectives.

The “Vision for ORSP is to deliver seamless support making ORSP and UM the preferred partner for world-changing research.” Minimizing the burdens so faculty can do their research.

The Mission, “The Office of Research and Sponsored Projects enables and safeguards the conduct of research and other sponsored activity for the University of Michigan. We apply specialized regulatory, statutory and organizational knowledge in a timely and professional manner in order to balance the university’s mission, the sponsor’s objectives, and the investigator’s intellectual pursuits.” The challenge is to balance between our three different constituencies.

The ORSP Core Values:

Flexibility: a broad-minded, creative approach to solving problems, improving processes and developing new skills.

Equity: a fair-minded outlook to balance workloads, recognize achievement and create opportunities.

Community: a mutually supportive and positive workplace that encourages fun, the respectful exchange of ideas, and personal and professional growth.

Dedication: a commitment to accomplish goals and objectives, and persevere through challenges.

Communication: a responsibility to provide the right information to the right people at the right time in an effective manner.

Integrity: an ethical, open and honest approach in the conduct of all activities.

Teamwork: collaboration in a collegial environment to reach common goals.

Customer Focus: a pledge to understand our customers’ needs and to provide the best possible service.

We are trying hard to incorporate these concepts in our daily ORSP work.

One third of the ORSP and SPO staff recently went through customer service training (provided by Sandler Training in Ann Arbor). Those trained will be ambassadors to the rest of the staff, teaching the staff what they learned.

There is a new monthly newsletter called the RAP. (Applause!) This is a monthly broad e-newsletter. We also introduced the RAPID e-newsletter for more urgent messages about funding. Krista Campeau is now doing Export Controls. There has been tremendous progress made on the Research Administration web project. This is a very complex undertaking with a lot going on behind the scene. The old website had 3,300 pages, we are now down to about 330 pages. Much of that was weeding duplicates, archived and out of date pages. The new website will be integrated with ORSP, OSP, UMOR and Compliance.

Daryl is domain steward for the research IT domain. There was an ADAC meeting yesterday that Daryl attended. Daryl made case for two big priorities—first the PI portal—to get a picture of what’s going on in various domains (IRB, UCUCA, etc.), and second, a stipend to look at what our options are for replacing eResearch. The PI portal is a Band-Aid solution. We must also develop a new tool to support research. This effort showed actual cost savings.

Also, Daryl asked for patience, as for various reasons the ORSP office finds itself short-staffed for the next month. We may be posting a position before the end of summer.

5. **Update: Uniform Guidance** (*Bryan Van Sickle/Craig Reynolds*)

Uniform Guidance (UG) is coming 12/26/14. These are new federal regulations. The UG document will be replacing OMB (Office of Management and Budget) circulars. At the FDP Meeting (Federal Demonstration Project) Craig and Bryan learned that none of the federal groups were able to release their implementation plans for UG to meet their June deadline. Many federal agencies were not even in attendance. The take home message was, one, they are looking at it, and two, the June deadline is not realistic. Bryan and Craig are thinking October is more likely. Consequently we still have no clue about UG implementation guideline. The next FDP meeting will be in September.

A UG working group meets every other week on campus, chaired by Bryan and Craig. The UG will have tentacles that will reach out across the institution, so others will be drawn into the working group, as needed, for instance, compliance. So far, the working group has had three meetings. They have looked at slides from the University of Minnesota, read the federal register, and there is a white paper from COGR to be read. The group created a matrix of sections of the UG that have changed or are problematic, identifying the campus business process owner, gaps, changes that will be needed, and the timeline involved. When the UG implementation plan is published we can cross check the matrix. Craig and Bryan are presenting the matrix at the next RADs mtg. There is a web page with basic information about plans, but it has no specifics at this time. Policy changes appear to be minimal.

Heather Offhaus asked if the FDP and COGR papers could be shared with us? Bryan said yes.

Scott Stanfill noted the previous discussion about sponsors wanting to be able to audit the UM and the suggestion of adding \$20,000 to accommodate this. Scott asked if subcontractors auditing costs would be an allowable direct cost on projects? Bryan replied that we are currently in a holding pattern. Sub-recipient monitoring is being ratcheted up each year on A133 review. Not a lot of specificity has been given.

Heather asked for clarification about UG implementation. Five-year project awards that started a year and a half ago will remain under the old circular. Is there a way to show people which regulations they are under? Daryl agreed this was a good question. An additional question is how our auditors will look it at. Daryl noted that there was a place-holder for UG findings presented to ADAC. Good news is we are at the same point as everyone across the country! No one knows any more than we do.

6. **Presentation: RAAC Process Subcommittee** (*Heather Offhaus*)

See Heather's presentation attached to these minutes

The Process Subcommittee has been working diligently. New initiatives have been presented to RAAC EC. The UFA system is up and running. Each project has a champion. Best Practices were developed for an eRPM PAF Communications Document, which has been turned over to the Communications Subcommittee for their input. The Subcommittee is moving forward with the Electronic Budget Allocation Form (7471). They are hoping to roll it out at the end of the summer. The award process is moving forward. It is a long haul project; will see incremental work done on it. The initial conversations will be at the RAAC level. The project, When to Use Request ORSP Action has been abandoned as the UFA has replaced it.

Plans for the next six months:

- Roles, Responsibilities and Risks in Research Admin Process—the Subcommittee has identified a plan of attack. They will need volunteers to look at policies and create recommendations, so watch for a call out for help.
- Unit driven Batch Admin Personnel Changes in eRPM project is just starting. The Subcommittee will be reviewing system functionality and potential. They are just starting to see if this is a feasible functionality.
- Early review of Budget Templates for potential incorporation in eRPM.
- The issue of consideration of transparency in eRPM. Status –nothing yet.
- The Subcommittee remains “On Call” to ORSP and SPO for changes to electronic systems as proposed/handled for implementation by ITS and with comment on ORSP/SPO initiatives.

Two issues were identified at the last RAN Meeting

1. Open Request ORSP Action to reviewers.
2. Creating one y/n question that could supersede many of the other y/n questions on the PAF—checking with UMOR to see if they are open to this. RAAC feedback is that they like these ideas.

Coming soon: another survey for the research administration community!

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

There will be no RAAC meeting in June. We will reconvene in July. The July meeting will be hosted by Carole Bach in the conference room of the new ISR building on Thompson on July 15, 2014 from 3:00 – 4:30 pm. We will introduce the RAAC by-laws at this meeting.

Thank you to Terry Van Allen for hosting us!

Adjournment

Daryl Weinert adjourned the meeting at 4:30pm

Minutes submitted by Lisa Kiel

Update to RAAC

Process
Subcommittee

May 2014

Members

Bach, Carole

Barber, Yvonne

English, Anita

Ford, Stephanie

Herrick, Teresa

Offhaus, Heather

Pappas, Carolyn

Reynolds, Craig

Thomson, Anne

VanSickle, Bryan

Sturt, Yvonne

ISR

School of Public Health

UMTRI / UMOR

College of Engineering

Ross Business School

Medical School

ITS

ORSP

LSA

Sponsored Programs

ORSP & Sponsored Prog

Organization

Task Forces



Focus Groups



Work Groups



Process
Group

RAAC
Exec
Comm



FULL RAAC

○ Finished

- UFAs
- Best Practices: eRPM PAF Communication Document

○ Moved Forward

- Electronic Budget Allocation Form (7471)
- Award Process
 - Complete high-level statement
 - Prioritization of items
 - Break work into workgroups

Best Practices – eRPM PAF Communication

Champion: Elizabeth

Status: *Turned over to Communications Committee to use as they see fit!*

Activities:

- Champion polled RAAC for concerns / examples / handling;
- Found a counterpart at ORSP to talk through issues;
- Drafted a version to review

Why we like it: It scored high on the priorities of schools and colleges survey and it could make things easier for many, even if not strictly enforceable.

UFAs in eRPM

Champions: Heather (RAAC) /Sharyn (ORSP)

Katie (OTT) / Cathy (ITS)

Status: Rolled out and turned over!

Activities since last RAAC Presentation: Communication and roll out plan, webinar, full campus use.

Why we like it: An electronic system for routing, approval, and subsequent access to everything in the paper SSP system.

Transparency!

Electronic 7471/ Budget Allocation Tool

Champion: Yvonne B. / Bryan

Status: Specs for system – ITS Programming

Activities: Cross-campus work group to define needs, draw up work flow and functionality. Visited with RAAC in November for some process rules

Why we now like it: Close to done! Expect testing in “late summer” and then roll out. Stay tuned!

Award Process (Overall)

Champion: Carole / Bryan / Craig / Cathy

Status: Compiled list of all topics - Unit Perspective

Activities:

- “Award System Wish List” completed with descriptions and business purposes;
- Currently looking at how to organize an “award”

Why we like it: Even though it is a project for the “long haul” is has the potential for huge impact, even in breaking up the list to smaller bites and priorities

What we need from you: **Focus group:** Attend a meeting on the current proposed set up of the award

When to Use Request ORSP Action

Champion:

Status:

Activities:

Why we abandoned it: ORSP released very clear directions on use of Post Award Change Form, as well as shared guidance on when to use. If we feel there is still significant campus confusion, we can resurrect, but for now – off the plate!

○ Finish

- Electronic 7471s / Budget Allocation

○ Ongoing

- Standardize Unit v. Central Roles/ Responsibilities/ Practices with a Risk Assessment
- Award Process

○ Start

- Unit-driven way to batch change PRAs in eRPM
- *Early* review of Click-designed budget templates for potential incorporation in eRPM
- Definition of requirements for creating an eRPM systematic way for handling >20% change in award acceptance
- Consideration of transparency related to projects - PAF side of eRPM

Roles and Responsibilities/Risks in Research Admin Process

Champion: Heather/Craig
Status: Identified a plan of attack

Activities: Reviewed possible approach with RAAC Process; plan to use the Process Team to define the areas to review and what an output might look like. Then establish workgroups as each area is tackled. (They will not be at the same time!)

What is the potential: Defining processes, clarifying roles, empowering where the risk lies, and establishing expectations.

What we need from you: Volunteers to meet, parse apart other institution's policies, and drive a recommendation for the treatment at UM. Call will go out defining responsibilities and approximate time commitment.

New

Unit-driven batch administrative personnel changes in eRPM

Champion: Carolyn

Status: Just starting

Activities: Volunteers have been identified. Carolyn will be convening the group in the next couple weeks.

Next steps: Review system functionality and potential solutions

What we need from you: Nothing yet. We have plenty of volunteers.

Early review of budget templates for potential incorporation in eRPM

Champion: To be decided

Status: None!

Activities:

Next steps: A very small focus group is going to try out potential functionality in the eRPM system with an Excel budget import to Grants.gov in eRPM.

What we need from you: Nothing on the soon end. We have to figure out what it is first.

Definition of requirements: eRPM systematic solution handling >20% change in award acceptance

Champion: Anita E.

Status: Early stages of understanding the issue

Activities: Initial discussion to start to think about scope

Next steps: Conversion of the current SOP into process steps so that the “value” of the project can be determined.

What we need from you: A couple volunteers that have run into this on a regular basis and are familiar with the ins / outs of the SOP.

Consideration of transparency – PAF side of eRPM

Champion: To be decided

Status: None!

Potential: It could open some search capability and functions currently not present due to the viewing rules.

Next steps: We will have to campus-wide decide on the +/- from the unit perspective and then (if it might be a go forward) work with ITS on the cost of converting.

What we need from you: Gut reactions and comments? We will be discussing in the Process group and likely taking to EC.

- RAAC Process will continue responding:
 - To changes to electronic systems as proposed / handled for implementation by ITS
 - With comment on ORSP / Sponsored Program initiatives
 - Close out emails in late May

- Two items were mentioned repeatedly as good ideas... Are they?
- Opening “Project Team Request for ORSP Action” to Reviewers
 - Especially since the Post Award Change form requires multiple signatures, last to sign could upload instead of sending to project team to post.
- Creating one Y/N Question that could supercede many of the other Y/N questions on the PAF.
 - We have a call in to UMOR for dialog around the compliance implications and whether UMOR would even entertain!

- Another Survey!
 - Fall 2014
 - Similar to initial survey
 - What are the issues important to units 18 months later?
- **Please complete when it arrives in your mailbox!**



Thank You!

See you in six months....
