Research Administrators Forum  
February 9, 2012

Welcome
Marcia Smith  
Associate Vice Chancellor for Research

Agenda

- Welcome and Announcements – Marcia Smith
- Data Management Tool
  - Sharon Farb, Associate University Librarian, and  
  - Todd Grappone, Associate University Librarian for Digital Initiatives and IT
- OHRPP/Office of Radiation Safety Committees – Kathy Wadsworth
- OCGA Initiatives – Patti Manheim
  - Streamlining Proposal and Award Processes Phase I - Report on Award Intake Pilot Project
  - Streamlining Proposal and Award Processes Phase II - Proposal Deadline Statistics and Notices, Minimum Proposal Submission Requirements and Phasing in Proposal Intake
  - NIH Salary Cap Guidance for Proposals and Awards
- EFM Initiatives – Tracey Robertson
  - NIH Salary Cap Guidance for Post Award Management
  - Single Fund Number Initiative
  - ARRA Funds and Spending Timelines
  - Fund Closeout – Department Threshold for Recertification
- RPC Update – Ann Pollack
  - Policy 600 – PI Eligibility

Upcoming ORA Training Opportunities

- Proposal Preparation & Submission  
  - February 22, 2012 – 9:00 am – 3:30 pm
- Subawards in S2S Grants  
  - February 23, 2012 – 9:00 am - Noon
- Post Award Administration  
  - March 28, 2012 – 9:00 am– 3:30 pm
- Effort Reporting  
  - April 2, 2012 – 9:00 am – 3:30 pm
- Rapid Close-Out Tool  
  - April 3, 2012 – 9:00 am - Noon

Please fill out the survey forms
DMPTool for Data Management Plans

Todd Grappone and Sharon E. Barh
Presented to the Research Administrators Forum (RAF)
February 9, 2012

NSF Awards to UCLA in FY 2010-11

- $84,364,252.00
- 7.5% of awarded dollars to UCLA come from NSF

Federal Dollars for Science and Engineering

- UCLA was ranked 5th in 2007 (most recent data available from NSF)
- UCLA is consistently ranked in the top 10

NSF Requirement for Data Management Plan (DMP)

“Proposals must include a supplementary document of no more than two pages labeled ‘Data Management Plan.’ This supplement should describe how the proposal will conform to NSF policy on the dissemination and sharing of research results.”
Reasons for the DMPTool

- NSF requirements for data management plans beginning Jan 2011
  - For instance, University of California researchers received over $600 million from NSF in FY 2010/11
- Other agencies following suit: NEH, DMS
- NEH has data sharing requirements

UCLA Project participants

- Todd Grappone
- Judy Connolly
- Sharon Park
- Lisa Federsel
- Courtney Hoffner
- Tony Aponte
- Anita Colby
- Claudia Horning
- Jen Weintraub
- Stephen Davison
- Gary Thompson
- Darrow Cole
- Dawn Setzer

Data Management

This concept refers to the activities in the research lifecycle that involve some aspect of planning, collecting, processing, editing, preparing, documenting, verifying, analyzing, preserving, discovering and repurposing data; a Data Management Plan should articulate how these data activities will be conducted in a research project;

The “WHAT” of e-research data activities

Data Stewardship

This concept refers to the individuals, parties or institutions taking responsibility for data management activities across the research lifecycle; a Data Management Plan should identify the data stewards associated with a research project;

The “WHO” involved in e-research data activities
DMPTool for Data Management Plans

- Helps researchers meet requirements of NSF and other U.S. funding agencies.
- Guides researchers through the process of creating a data management plan.
- Is available to everyone.
- Provides additional help for researchers at DMPTool partner institutions – like UCLA.

NSF Dissemination and Sharing Policy

"Investigators are expected to share with other researchers, at no more than incremental cost and within a reasonable time, the primary data, samples, physical collections and other supporting materials created or gathered in the course of work under NSF grants. Grantees are expected to encourage and facilitate such sharing."

Goals of the DMPTool, I

- To provide researchers a simple way to create a Data Management Plan by giving them information from the funding agency.
  - Questions asked by the agency
  - Any additional explanation or context provided by the agency
  - Links to the agency website for policies, help, guidance

Goals of the DMPTool, II

- To provide researchers with additional information from their local institution:
  - Resources and services to help them manage data
  - Help text for specific questions
  - Suggested answers to questions that they can simply cut-and-paste
  - News and events related to data management on their campus
Add local information

- Help text, Links to resources and services, Suggested answers, Contact information
- Information can be added at various levels for researchers at UCLA:
  - All data management plans
  - All data management from a particular funding agency, e.g.
    NSF Biological Sciences Diversiﬁcation
  - A particular question within a data management plan
    https://bib.h formatDate.org/dmptool/main/wiki/Documentation

Questions?

- Contact us at data@library.ucla.edu to participate
- Important links:
  - Funder Templates:
    https://bib.h formatDate.org/dmptool/main/wiki/Documentation
  - DMPTool Blog:
    http://blogs.library.ucla.edu/dmptool

UC3EZID (easy-eye-dee)

- Create a persistent identifier: DOI or ARK
- Add object location
- Add metadata
- Update object location
- Update object metadata
The New Group at ORA

Kathy Wadsworth
ORSC and OHRPP Policy & Education

What is the ORSC?

Provides administrative support for the Radiation Safety Committee (RSC) and 4 subcommittees:

- Medical Radiation Safety Committee (MRSC)
- Radioactive Drug Research Committee (RDRC)

* New subcommittees:

- Academic Radiation Safety Committee (ARSC)
- Clinical Operations Radiation Safety Committee (CORSC)

Need for Increased Oversight

Cocaine users are at risk for radiation overdoses in CT scans.

U.S. NRC
Protecting People and the Environment

Radiation Offers New Cures, and Ways to Do Harm

As North American cities struggle to close a nuclear waste facility that has had radiation overexposure—this is what has happened, struggling to become, and its waste facilities. Occurred, increase pain and finally, radiation became serious, public health officials worried about the potential for serious health problems.
OCGA Updates
Patti Manheim, Director
February 09, 2012

STEAMLINING PROPOSAL AND AWARD PROCESSES

• PHASE I – Award Intake and Set-Up Pilot Initiated:
  • OCGA launched a joint initiative focused on improving processing timelines for unilateral awards and receipt and tracking of complex awards
  • Awards Processed to Date: 458 awards
  • Average Turnaround Time: 3.6 days from Award receipt to account set up

STEAMLINING PROPOSAL AND AWARD PROCESSES

Award Set Up Time Has Improved by 80%

STEAMLINING PROPOSAL AND AWARD PROCESSES

• Benefits:
  • Quicker Access to Funds
  • Timely and Consistent Communication at Key Process Points:
    • Award Received
    • Award Set Up Complete
  • Key Data to Understand:
    • Where an Award is in the Process
    • What is Holding Up Activation
  • Reduction of retroactive transactions due to late account set-up
STEAMLINING PROPOSAL AND AWARD PROCESSES

PHASE II – Proposal Intake and Processing

• 60% of the proposals received by OCGA are considered “incomplete”

• Incomplete proposals risk the following:
  • Delayed award set-up
  • Insufficient time for a meaningful OCGA review because we are waiting for at least the minimum documents
  • Full compliance with sponsor regulations is not ensured if we do not have the sponsor regulations
  • Insufficient time to correct errors/validations that arise from sponsor systems

OCGA will pilot the following Proposal Intake Process with select departments:

• Specific staff will become the central contact for receipt of all proposals

• OCGA will conduct an initial review to confirm minimum documents are included:
  • Do not meet minimum requirements: the proposal cannot be reviewed and missing documents will be requested
  • Does meet minimum requirements: compliant the proposal package will be assigned to OCGA team for review

• Standard communication at key process points

• Once PATS is deployed, we will be able to provide real time data for proposals on the ORA portal

STEAMLINING PROPOSAL AND AWARD PROCESSES

Proposal Intake Pilot – First Steps:

• Identify pilot departments

• Meet with departments to discuss process and answer questions

• Confirm departments’ understanding and agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Requirements for Review</th>
<th>Requirements for Review, Approval &amp; Submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed EROS with PI Signature</td>
<td>Completed EROS with all required signatures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Guidelines</td>
<td>Sponsor Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Sponsor forms requiring OCGA signature</td>
<td>Final Proposal (budget, science, agency required signatures, biosketches, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Budget with Budget Justification</td>
<td>Subaward Documents (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief description of the proposal aims or proposal abstract</td>
<td>PI Expiration Letter (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subaward Documents (if applicable)</td>
<td>Signed/Completed COI forms (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STEAMLINING PROPOSAL AND AWARD PROCESSES

Proposal Intake Pilot – Next Steps:
• Pilot begins
• Measure intake and processing timelines
• Share feedback from pilot participants
• Phase in all departments

DANGER IN LATE PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

Complete proposal packages are due into OCGA 5 Business Days prior to Sponsor Deadline
• Over 75% of our monthly proposal volume is received within 0-3 days of the sponsor deadline

DANGER IN LATE PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

Risks - If the proposal package is not received within this timeframe, we risk the following:
- Sponsor rejection of incomplete proposals
- Invalidation and system errors
- Underfunding due to budget errors
- Compliance issues that would cause UCLA to reject the award
- Delays in processing awards

DANGER IN LATE PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

• NIH Warns Potential Dangers when submitting an application near the deadline.
DANGER IN LATE PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

HELP US HELP YOU:
• Complete proposal packages are due into OCGA 5 Business Days prior to the sponsor deadline date
• At any other time prior to the 5 day deadline, you can submit a proposal package that includes the minimum required documents

Advantages:
• Sufficient time for review and correction of system errors
• Project costs are correctly calculated
• Expedited award processing
• General happiness

NIH SALARY CAP

• Effective 12/23/2011 Decreased Salary Cap - Executive Level II - $179,700
• Link to Notice: http://grants1.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-12-035.html
• All applications to all DHHS Operating Divisions —not just NIH, AHRQ and SAMSHA - should not exceed this salary cap
• What does this mean for our current awards?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of FY 2012 Award Received</th>
<th>Salary Cap</th>
<th>FY2012 Award</th>
<th>What happens to my categorical budget?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive (New and Renewal)</td>
<td>$199,700</td>
<td>$179,700</td>
<td>The FY2012 award will not be decreased to adjust for the decrease in the salary limitation as no adjustments are required. Future years will also not be adjusted down. Future years may be unbudgeted elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Competing with Initial Issue Date on/before 12/22/2011</td>
<td>$179,700</td>
<td>$179,700</td>
<td>The FY2012 award will not be decreased to adjust for the decrease in the salary limitation as no adjustments are required. Future years will also not be decreased to adjust for the Executive Level II Salary limitation. Future years may be unbudgeted elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive (New and Renewal)</td>
<td>$199,700</td>
<td>$179,700</td>
<td>The FY2012 award will not be decreased to adjust for the decrease in the salary limitation as no adjustments are required. Future years will also not be decreased to adjust for the Executive Level II Salary limitation. Future years may be unbudgeted elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Competing with Initial Issue Date on/after 12/22/2011</td>
<td>$179,700</td>
<td>$179,700</td>
<td>The FY2012 award will be decreased to adjust for the Executive Level II Salary limitation. Future years will also be adjusted down. Future years may be unbudgeted elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| FY2011 and prior awards:       | $199,700  | $179,700     | The carry forward of funds budgeted for personnel from Fiscal Year 2011 and prior may not be affected as the salary levels were made.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of FY 2012 Award Received</th>
<th>Executive Level I: $189,700</th>
<th>Executive Level II: $179,700</th>
<th>What Happens to My Awarded Budget?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive (New and Renewal) with initial issue date on or before 12/22/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No decrease in award will be made for first year as Executive Level I salary applies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Competing with initial issue date on or before 12/22/2011</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Future years will be decreased to adjust to the Executive Level II salary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive (New and Renewal) with initial issue date on/after 12/22/2011</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Award will be decreased to adjust to the Executive Level II salary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Competing with initial issue date on/after 12/22/2011</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Executive Level I salary applies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2011 and prior awards</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Executive Level II salary applies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NCRR Publication Acknowledgement**

- The transfer of NIH grants from the National Center for Research Resources (NCRR) to other NIH funding components has led to several questions about the acknowledgement language to be used in publications, press releases, etc. NIH has requested we use the following language:

  “This project was supported by the National Center for Research Resources and the [new funding component] of the National Institutes of Health through Grant Number XXXXX.”
EFM Updates

- NIH Salary Cap Guidance for Post Award Management
- Single Fund Number Initiative
- ARRA Funds and Spending Timelines
- Fund Closeout - Department Threshold for Recertification

Salary Cap Guidance

The use of current FY2011 funds and carry-forward funds from FY 2011 and prior fiscal years can be used to pay salary at the Executive Level I rate of $199,700.

- EFM is in the process of developing a report that will help us monitor funds that will continue to use the Executive Level I salary cap.
- EFM will review anyone paid at the Executive Level I rate of $199,700 to ensure that it complies with the terms of the award.
Use of Single Fund Number started February 1, 2012:

Long-standing practice called for certain awards such as Program Project Grants, Training Grants, and Cooperative Agreements to be assigned a new fund number for each year of the award. The Single Fund number transitions to one fund number per award for all awards.

Reduces administrative burden and costs campus wide:
- Elimination of an estimated 1,000 fund set-up and close-outs each year
- Faster activation of continuation awards for PI’s
- Decrease in the number of cost transfers
- Increase in on-time submission of reports and invoices
- Decrease in the number of revised financial reports.
- Decrease in the number of required pre-award spending accounts (RAS)
- Decrease in recycled fund numbers
- Decrease in required changes in recharge IDs for PIs

On January 30th a memo was sent to ORA News announcing the implementation of single fund number and the many benefits of a transition to single fund number.

We have received some positive feedback:
"Thank you for championing this change! This is great news. I also really appreciate the detailed description of the benefits, and I know my faculty will as well. You have made many PIs and Research Administrators very happy today... ”

The process for implementing Single Fund Number has been discussed extensively with, and developed by, representatives of RAPID work groups, campus committees, ORA staff, and members of the RAPID Steering and Faculty Advisory Committees.

Throughout the process we tracked and developed FAQ documentation to aid in the transition to Single Fund Number.

The FAQ's were sent out on January 30th in the ORA News announcement and can also be found on the New EFM Website: http://ora.research.ucla.edu/EFM/Pages/EFMAnnouncements.aspx
Language on the 90, 30, and 0 day notices has been updated to represent the **budget period** and not the **project period**. These notices are more generic so please pay attention to your budget versus your project period end date.

**Notification Attention and Subject**

**90 Day Notification**
- **To:** PI
- **Cc:** Department Administrator
- **Subject:** IMPORTANT NOTICE: Sponsored Award Budget Period Expires in 90 Days

**30 Day Notification**
- **To:** Department Administrator
- **Cc:** PI
- **Subject:** IMPORTANT NOTICE: Sponsored Award Budget Period Expires in 30 Days

**Fund Expiration Notification**
- **Subject:** IMPORTANT NOTICE: Sponsored Award Budget Period Has Expired

---

**SFN – Process**

**Process for Interim Financial Reports**
- EFM completes the financial report based on the General Ledger expenses
- EFM reviews the unallowables and will send the Interim Report and a list of the unallowables to the department fund manager
- Dept. fund manager has 5 days to review and approve the interim financial report and respond to EFM
- If dept. does not respond within 5 days EFM will submit the interim report (excluding the unallowables) to the sponsor

**Process for Restricted Carry-Forwards:**
- EFM completes the financial report, indicating carry-forward amount to be requested
- EFM will de-appropriate the funds from the current year and move the funds to a carry-forward holding account (400005) linked to the current fund
- Dept. continues to work with OCGA to request carry-forward
- Once approved, funds will be re-appropriated and removed from carry-forward holding account

---

**SFN – Exception Request Form**

- Exceptions to this new process will be granted on a very limited basis
- Requests for exceptions can be submitted for review using the Exception Request Form (also sent out on January 30th in the ORA News and can be found on the EFM website)
- Form should be completed and submitted to the intake team: oraawards@research.ucla.edu
- The form will be reviewed by ORA Leadership

---

Please complete all necessary actions below:

**ENSURE ALL DELIVERABLES HAVE BEEN COMPLETED AND SUBMITTED TO SPONSOR** (including):
- Progress Reports, Invention Statements, Technical Reports

**FUND IS TO REMAIN OPEN:** Please work with your OCGA/OCT/OIP and EFM contacts, as needed, on the following:
- Non-Competing Continuations
- Amendment Request (Renewal, Additional Funding, etc.)
- No Cost Time Extension Request
- Carry Forward Request
- Collect Final Subawardee Invoice for the budget period (all final subawardee invoices are due to UCLA 45 days after the budget end date)

**FUND IS READY TO CLOSE:**
- Complete the RAPID Smart Closeout Tool and submit to EFM by the deadline. The tool can be downloaded here:
EFM Updates

- NIH Salary Cap Guidance for Post Award Management
- Single Fund Number Initiative
- ARRA Funds and Spending Timelines
- Fund Closeout - Department Threshold for Recertification

ARRA Updates

Memo will be sent to the ARRA Listserv:
- OMB will limiting no-cost extensions for funds beyond September 30, 2013
- Other agencies have released notices indicating that they will not allow no-cost extensions for ARRA funds beyond September 30, 2013.
- Prior written approval to extend beyond the September 30, 2013 date will only be considered if one or more of the following circumstances exist:
  - The project is long-term by design, and acceleration would compromise core programmatic goals.
  - The project must undergo a complex environmental review that cannot be completed within this time frame.
  - Contractual commitments by the grantee with vendors or sub-recipients prevent adjusting the timeline for spending.
  - Other special circumstances may exist

Recent letters from NSF have requested that PIs with ARRA Awards that (1) extend beyond September 30, 2013 or (2) are eligible for no-cost extensions that will extend the award beyond September 30, 2013 submit a written request for the extension to their Program Officer.
- The requests that we have seen from NSF have a due date of March 2nd.

Please review all your ARRA awards and contact your Program Officer as soon as possible if you have awards that:
1) Extend beyond Sept. 30, 2013
2) End before Sept. 30, 2013 but you will anticipate the need for a no-cost extension
ARRA Updates

EFM will be following-up with e-mail reminders to specific PIs who have ARRA awards which:

• Have end dates that extend beyond September 30, 2013
  or
• Have a balance greater than 100k

EFM Updates

• NIH Salary Cap Guidance for Post Award Management
• Single Fund Number Initiative
• ARRA Funds and Spending Timelines

Department Threshold

• PI Threshold remains $500
• As of February 1st we have implemented a department threshold for recertification of closeout packets of $100

What does this mean?

• Department submits their closeout packet to EFM.
• EFM reviews the closeout packet and the final number differs from the department by > $100. EFM will not be required to receive re-approval from the department and can submit the final invoice and/or financial report to the sponsor.
• EFM will e-mail the final invoice and/or financial report to the department.

Questions or Comments

Please send any questions or comments to:
rapidfeedback@research.ucla.edu
UCLA Policy 900: Principal Investigator Eligibility

• Sets forth the eligibility requirements, duties and responsibilities of a UCLA Principal Investigator

• Describes the processes for requesting and approving exceptions to the eligibility requirements

UCLA Policy 900: Principal Investigator Eligibility

• Updates effective January 17, 2012

• Changes made in response to feedback from the Graduate Division and departments

• Primary changes affect postdoctoral scholars and other trainees who may not normally serve as a PI, Co-PI or Multiple PI

UCLA Policy 900: Principal Investigator Eligibility

• Policy amended to reflect UCLA’s recognition of the fact that proposal preparation is an important aspect of training

• Policy now indicates that postdoctoral scholars and other trainees may apply for research training and mentored training grants that help enhance their professional skills and prepare them for research independence
UCLA Policy 900: Principal Investigator Eligibility

• Other changes made to provide clarification and to emphasize the fact that academic units must provide space and access to facilities, and take responsibility for effectively managing projects when they support PI exception requests

Requests for exceptions:

• Reviewed and approved by campus officials with authority to grant exceptions (see UCLA Delegation of Authority 201.05)
• Individual schools may make local decisions about review of PI exception requests