Physician-Scientist Scholars Program Award (PSSP Award) (Bill Seaman)

Bill provided an update on the PSSP Program. The School of Medicine issued a call for applications on October 18, 2013. Nominations must come from the Department, so we ask that proposals be submitted to the Department by Monday, November 18, for internal review and selection of candidates to be put forward. The $250K per year in research support will come from the office of the Dean, School of Medicine. The Department of Medicine will provide half of the salary support, including fringe benefits, and the Division will provide the other half. (This is for salaries of $125K, the split for larger salaries will be negotiated.) Thus, all nominations should have the approval of the Division Chief. The PSSP Scientific Committee has clarified the maximum amount of training that will be allowed. The exact wording will be sent out soon, but the principal will be that the limit is no more than two years of post-residency research as of July 1st in the year of application, i.e., July 1, 2013 for the current round of applications.

Nominations from departments are due December 1, 2013.

Pre-Award Funding Model (Christine Razler)

Christine presented the new proposed pre-award funding model recently recommended to the UCSF Deans. One action item that came out of the meeting on April 3 of the Deans and Assoc. Deans for Finance and Administration was to approve the 13-14 RMS/C&G budget and for Susanne Hildebrandt-Zanki, to form a workgroup composed of the Assoc. Deans for Admin and Finance and department managers to explore alternative cost allocation models for pre-award services.

The initial recommendation from the group was to change the current funding model methodology, which assesses a percentage of indirect cost recovery to control points, to a new funding model based on the actual number of proposals submitted by control points. The proposals will be weighted based on complexity. The control points will be assessed on prior FY proposal counts. The committee agreed on the change for the following reasons:

- Charges for RMS Services directly reflect the actual work performed
- No advantage or disadvantage to those with variances in direct to indirect ratios
- Dean’s Office representatives reported that a majority of Chairs favored the per proposal model
- Maintains transparency in charging and simplicity in managing

The workgroup was provided proposal/award dollar volume data at the School level but these figures have not drilled down to the department level, so the impact to individual departments has not yet been analyzed. The SOM is being assessed approximately eighty three to eighty six percent of the total RMS bill. This gets charged to the Dean’s office and the Dean’s office charges the Departments. Other institutions were looked at (i.e. Harvard) that have a centralized pre-award service and their model was very similar to the UCSF proposed model.

**e-Proposal** – once this system is implemented, it will be able to track the type of proposal and volume a lot better than they’re able to do now.

**Resubmissions** – There is not an additional charge for resubmissions.

**Progress Reports and other types of correspondences** – no current plans to include these in the proposal volume methodology.
Susanne estimated at the most recent Research Advisory Board that the average cost of a grant submission would be approximately $2,000. There was concern expressed by members of that meeting, that individual investigators may be discouraged from submitting smaller proposals because of the per proposal methodology.

The council referred to NCIRE, which longer accepts awards that don’t conform with their indirect cost rate. There is concern that UCSF will follow this practice. This could be a new reality, if there is now a dollar value on small grants. It disproportionately affects divisions that rely on small foundation grants.

Feedback from Council Members was solicited:
John Fahy – proposed we spend ten percent of indirects on RMS. If it goes beyond this, ask should we really be putting in ten foundation awards for every R01? How do we use indirects to support the RMS? This may be something we can provide Dr. King – what indirects can / should be used for.
Mike McCune – The data would be good to see – divide out the grants for each Division between center, R01 type grants, and small grants, and ask how many of these were submitted last year and how many were submitted before RMS started. How many of those grants that were submitted were awarded, and what indirects came in, per division? This will provide a much better sense about what the dynamics are with respect to grant submissions.
Bill Seaman – will ask Talmadge where decisions about paying these costs will be made. If at the division level, we will need the data from the divisions.

The issue of RMS performance was brought up in relation to how much it costs. The overall consensus of the group is that RMS is not working well for faculty and there is not evidence that it is saving money. Part of the discussion at the campus level needs to be on improving pre-award services. Immediate feedback should be provided to the RMS via their “How Am I Doing” link at the bottom of their email signature block. This may be done with every interaction with the RMS. Click the link and fill out the survey with comments/suggestions. https://ucsf.us.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_9WDooV6eSiQQyUd

K Awardee Analysis (Kirsten Bibbins-Domingo & Christine Razler)

Framework – Kirsten and Christine are looking at K awardee data across the entire pathway. 1) The number of K applicants versus the success rate and breakdown by sites and divisions and types of science, 2) Of those who are funded, they propose to perform a case study by individuals, looking at appointment level at time of award and when they transition/promote and how does that transition happen over the life of their K. 3) K awardees who have subsequent R01 or equivalent funding. There are individuals who are in between trainee and faculty status – at what point of their K do they move, and how many are at adjunct professor level?

Current databases do not provide efficient answers to queries on individual records, (e.g. when someone moved, and/or when they were promoted), however, the goal is to research information for a small group that can be tracked and get the data by the next meeting. Moving forward, an idea would be to start a cohort of K awardees, have them complete a simple survey. Every six months ask them a standardized set of ten questions, using technology.

Future Meeting: Tuesday, December 10, 2013, 8:00-9:00, Parnassus Room S-226