From the ADR:

Working with GRO, What You Need to Know

For this newsletter, I wanted to focus a bit on our post-award team in GRO. As I stated last month, a post-award team member is assigned to the faculty member when they receive a notice of grant award. Karen Kirchner, the Manager in GRO, makes the assignment. Karen’s standard operating procedure now is to assign a faculty member to the post-award team member to help that faculty member manage all of their grants. She even tries to assign the same post-award team member to faculty who are collaborating closely together, however, that is not always possible and I will explain why below.

GRO currently has three post-award team members: Gary Vandermade, Mary Eyler, and Venece Williams. Karen recently developed a sort of “acuity” rating to measure the complexity of various grants. Therefore, when making assignments to her post-award team, Karen must keep in mind not only the number of individual grants, but the complexity of managing those grants. She is trying to distribute the workload equitably amongst her staff. That is why it won’t always be possible to keep large teams with numerous complex grants assigned to the same post-award team member.

So what makes grants complex to manage? There are several things that make grants complex to manage including hiring numerous temporary positions, multiple subcontracts, multiple subawards, cost sharing, special reporting, federal reporting and larger grants such as training grants or program project or Center grants.

The role of your post-award team member is to help you manage the financial aspects of your grant. They are involved with helping to get the short code and budget set up, helping you with oversight of your budget so that spending meets regulations, but also assisting in hiring temporary research staff to implement your grant activities. They track and keep your effort in line with the budgets developed for your grant, including completing forms to adjust effort when needed. Post-award will also pay invoices that are received from the work of the grant, after you approve them for payment. Post-award triages all payments off the grants through SN Finance office who assists GRO in completing the actual payments and travel reimbursements.
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Finally, they will assist with progress reports and financial statements. This includes but is not limited to complex grant fiscal reporting that is not completed by our Sponsored Programs office as well as RPPR’s and other sponsor financial reporting.

Who is actually responsible for all aspects of grant management including financial? The Principal Investigator is responsible. The post-award team member is your partner, but the PI is ultimately responsible and needs to stay on top of all spending, progress report dates, and invoicing.

Just like with pre-award, your post-award team member is a collaborator in your work. That means it is important to communicate with them often, keeping them in the loop with any changes, upcoming expenses, personnel who are starting or finishing their roles, and to let them know when you will be out of email communication. Please be respectful and respond to their email requests, particularly around spending questions and invoice payment authorization, in a timely fashion; within 2 to 3 days maximum. They cannot independently authorize payment of an invoice. The PI, or their designee (such as their project manager), must approve invoices. So if you want to keep the people who are working on your grants happy and paid, please review these invoices promptly.

Other helpful information about working with your post-award team member:

- If your funded grant includes the need for a consultant or contract that is not already set up, let your post-award team member know right away;
- Talk with your post-award person about interim or annual reports that are required and discuss what things are required for that report so that you both can plan accordingly;
- Your post-award team member should not create your travel reimbursement forms that are charged to your grant. Their role is to verify that sufficient money is in your account and that the funds are not restricted. Grant project managers are available to help with these sorts of administrative needs. If you do not have a project manager, then your receipts can be given to your post-award person who will get them to Finance to create the CONCUR report.

As always, my door is open to anyone who wishes to discuss processes, strategies and their insights/experiences.

Deb
Hopefully all of you are aware that every year right around this time (February-March), Faculty Activity Schedules (FAS) are being determined. FAS are spreadsheets that report to the Department Chairs where faculty effort is being consumed. This information is used to help in making course teaching assignments. In order to make teaching assignments, your department chairs rely on accurate accounts of your administrative and grant effort. The Grants and Research Office (GRO) supplies the information about grant effort. In order to provide the most accurate and up to date information to the Department Chairs, GRO NEEDS TO BE IN THE KNOW.

Imagine the following scenario. John Smith and Collette Agarwal submitted an R01 as MPI’s back in June. In December, they learned that their grant was scored in the fundable range. However, their grant won’t go to funding council until June and the Just in Time (JIT) request has not yet been made. Therefore, both Drs. Smith and Agarwal receive full teaching assignments in March for the coming fall term. The JIT request comes in early June, it goes to council, and in August, Drs. Smith and Agarwal learn they are being funded; the Notice of Grant Award (NOGA) comes in September with a start date of September 1. Now Drs. Smith and Agarwal are over assigned and this causes their Department Chair(s) to have to TRY to reassign some teaching. This in turn puts some of their colleagues in a situation where they may be notified of teaching assignments late affecting their ability to prepare appropriately. If the teaching cannot be reassigned, then Drs. Smith and Agarwal will not get the appropriate release time.

HOW COULD THIS SITUATION HAVE BEEN AVOIDED? If Drs. Smith and Agarwal had notified their pre-award team member and Karen Kirchner of this score, then GRO could have included the potential for this funded effort on the FAS sheet. Then there would be no headaches for Department Chairs, no increased stress for cherished colleagues, and the funded PI’s would not be overworked.

Similarly, it is helpful for GRO to be informed when grants are not discussed or scored at less desirable levels. In fact, if every faculty member who submits a grant application could report to GRO as soon as their review is complete and they know whether they were scored or not, it would improve the accuracy of the FAS reporting immensely. Individual faculty do not have to “guess” about whether their score will result in funding or not. The ADR and GRO, in collaboration with the Department Chairs, will determine how this information will be interpreted onto the FAS reporting sheet.

Other helpful information:

- When the SN is a subaward, the information we have available is year to year, so we cannot extend your grant effort out for the duration of the award because we do not have information on what that is. Therefore, in this scenario, requesting a copy of the notice of grant award (NOGA) from the administrative home will improve FAS reporting as the full dates of the grant period will be known.
- Keep in mind that NOGAs may not equal the submitted budget so reporting to GRO any changes in effort based on budget reductions is essential for accurate information.

Remember, all of this helps you, your colleagues, and ultimately our students.

**Look Familiar?**

In an effort to decrease the volume of incoming e-mail **FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES** will no longer be sent by e-mail. They can be found in the GRO **M**box. These may change daily as new information comes in and will be updated at least monthly for expired materials. It would be a great habit to check this site at some regular interval.
What is the Revised Common Rule (45 CFR 46)?
- It is the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects.

What does this mean to UMSN research teams?
There are 4 major Regulation changes that apply regardless of funding source:
- Continuing review: no longer required for some minimal risk research – U-M Implementation: Continuing Review.
- Informed Consent: new “Key Elements” section and rearrangement of content designed to facilitate a potential subject’s decision to participate or not. U-M Implementation: Informed Consent.
- Single IRB-of-Record (sIRB) – this applies to most federally funded collaborative research projects located in the US. Starting January 20, 2020, these projects will be required to use a single IRB (commercial, academic, or hospital-based). U-M Implementation: NIH Single IRB-of-Record (sIRB).

My study is not federally-funded – does this still apply to me?
- Yes. The eResearch system made changes in June 2018 to support the HRPP (Human Research Protections Program) Flexibility Initiative (also known as the Michigan Initiative). This is an ongoing effort to review current U-M human subjects protection policies and procedures to reduce administrative burden and streamline processes for investigators and their teams. If you are using eResearch, you are already taking advantage of this initiative.

How can I be sure that my study is in compliance with the Revised Common Rule?
- The UM eResearch application was updated in June 2018 to reflect most of the regulatory changes covered by the Revised Common Rule. If you are using eResearch, you are likely in compliance.
- Research teams can meet the new requirements by continuing to use eResearch as a guide for submitting the information necessary for IRB review using the new consent templates (this link takes you to Research Ethics & Compliance and the new templates). Details of the informed consent changes are here.

What if my study was approved before January 21, 2019?
- Research approved prior to January 21, 2019 is not required to transition to the revised Common Rule requirements.
- When you submit an amendment or Scheduled Continuing Review (SCR), the IRB staff will work with you to determine whether your project should remain under the old rule or transition to the new rule.

What if my study is awarded new federal sponsorship on or after January 21, 2019?
- If your study is awarded new federal funding on or after January 21, 2019, your project must meet all of the Revised Common Rule requirements.

More questions?
- See the Research Ethics & Compliance webpage on the Common Rule & Other Changes
- Contact your IRB staff liaison (see eResearch and look under your study for name and number of staff liaison)