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What’s New!

▷ New ORPA Director
▷ Princeton Policies, Procedures, and Systems
  ▷ Export Control Training, Coeus, ORPA Website, Participant Support, Restricted Carryforward, Fabricated Equipment, Re-budgeting
▷ Sponsor Updates
  ▷ NSF PAPP Guide Updates, NASA No-cost Extensions, NIH and ASSIST vs. Workspace, Simons Foundation, Marie Curie Fellowships, Semiconductor Research Corporation (SRC)
▷ Quiz
ORPA has a new Director!
Princeton Policies, Procedures, and Systems
Coeus Replacement Project
Coeus at Princeton

Almost 2 decades of usage
Approaching end-of-life
Time to look for a new system
Working with Julie Ramirez, PATCO project manager
Coeus Focus Groups & Survey

focus groups
- Held 6/29-9/7
- 21 groups
- 66 people attending

online survey
- 9 respondents
- 3 anonymous replies

21 academic depts or centers & 8 central admin depts
- Attended a group and/or filled out the online form

included seasoned users & new users
Coeus Focus Group Questions

- **Coeus Likes**: 
  - #1 item to be improved
- **Coeus Dislikes**: 
  - Lots of consistent feedback
- **Areas of Improvement**: 
  - Some mixed feedback
Consistent Likes

› The system exists
› Does what it needs to do
› Ability to search many fields
› Coeus documentation
› Coeus help desk
Consistent Dislikes

- Old, clunky, outdated interface
- Too many icons
- Unused icons & fields should be hidden
- Not intuitive
- Hard to remove unwanted budget items or periods
- OH, EB, inflation rate should be more transparent & easier to adjust
- New users: difficult to copy proposals created before dept access was granted
Consistent Dislikes

› Proposal Hierarchy is clunky & time consuming
  › Should be one proposal # with multiple, linked budgets inside
  › Should be able to adjust OH rate by the line item
› Miss having proposals and awards in one system
Consistent Areas of Improvement

- Google-like “fuzzy” searching
  - Type-ahead
  - “Did you mean”
  - “Contains” searching (no wildcards)
- Guided, wizard-like entry
- Templates for specific proposal types by sponsor
- Display people and roles on one screen
Consistent Areas of Improvement

- Cost sharing is a nightmare
  - Entry, display, distribution, forms
- Clunky congruency review process
- PD # + IP # = too many #s
  - Overwrite and add versions to one existing #
- Budget
  - Excel download with embedded formulas
Consistent Areas of Improvement

➢ Google-like collaboration features
➢ Want integration with other systems
  ➢ RIA, FCOI, Prime...
➢ Dashboard, analytics, reporting, query capability
➢ Views based on persona
  ➢ Dept administrator view, PI view, GCA view...
### Split Feedback: s2s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please bring s2s back</th>
<th>Never using s2s again</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• It made submission easier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced duplicate data entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clunky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Didn’t check all sponsor rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Too stressful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NIH Assist &amp; GG Workspace are better</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Split Feedback: PI Cert & YNQ

**Should be electronic & inside the system**
- It’s 2018

**Paper needs to be an option**
- PI will not use electronic system
- PI needs help logging onto electronic system
- PI cannot navigate electronic system
## Split Feedback: Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Love Coeus Budget</th>
<th>Hate Coeus Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Auto calculates OH, EB &amp; inflation</td>
<td>* Too detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Coeus is “always right”</td>
<td>* Too difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* QA check</td>
<td>* Hard to match Excel budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Coeus calculates to the penny; prefer rounded amounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Too much duplicate data entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* PI wants to create or tweak budget in Excel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Prefer to upload Excel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Budget should be more like Excel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for feedback!
Next steps/timeline

▷ Replacement project updates on Coeus homepage
▷ RFP being written & sent this month
▷ Detailed feedback sessions in early October
▷ Receive & review vendor responses in October
▷ Invite vendors for onsite demos in November/December
▷ Select product in December
▷ Negotiate pricing with vendor in January
▷ Apply to SAGIT for funding in February
▷ Start implementation
Coeus Replacement Project

Questions?
Sponsored Research Dashboard
Sponsored Research Dashboard

Project initiated by DFR
- Involves CeDAR and ORPA

Tableau

Summarizes and visualizes external sponsored research data
- Proposals Submitted, Awards Received, Expenditures

Not a forecasting tool
Sponsored Research Dashboard

FY12-18 Data

- Coeus Institute Proposals, PS Awards, FIN067 Expenditures

Loaded approximately 1 month after the end of each quarter
University View

- Displays aggregated summary info
- Counts & amounts by division, sponsor type, sponsor group, sponsor, purpose
- Aggregated info can be downloaded

Unit View

- Details for your dept
- Counts & amounts for your dept, by sponsor type, sponsor group, sponsor, PI
- Raw data can be downloaded
Sponsored Research Dashboard

Released 8/20
- Chairs/Center Directors & Dept/Center Managers/Associate Directors
- 62 units with sponsored research

Access for yourself or administrators?
- Just ask!

Training
- Scheduled 2x a week in Sept
Sponsored Research Dashboard

Future plans

• Monthly data loads
• Improvements based on user feedback
Sponsored Research Dashboard

Questions?
ORPA Website Update

https://orpaprinceton.edu
Participant Support Costs

▷ In 2014, as part of Prime implementation, Princeton policy was revised to no longer require the segregation of participant support costs in separate accounts (i.e. ‘Projects’ in PeopleSoft).

▷ The use of the the PARTC cost element was to be used in monitoring participant support costs.

▷ Departments would have the option to use a separate project, but there was no longer a requirement to do so.
Participant Support Costs

Fast forward to summer 2018, and the decision has been made to revert to the original policy.

All new awards with participant support will be set up with a separate project for only the participant support costs.

This will be done regardless of the sponsor (i.e. this is not just for REUs or other NSF participant support costs).
Restricted Carryforward

While most grants allow unspent funds to be carried forward from one budget period to the next without sponsor approval, there are a number of exceptions.
Restricted Carryforward

- NIH T-series, P-series, and U-series awards always require prior approval for carryforward.
- NSF cooperative agreements generally, though not always, have a carryforward prior approval requirement.
- Federal contracts with base and option periods require approval for funds to be reallocated between periods.
- Some universities are restricting carryforward on subawards regardless of whether or not the prime award has such a restriction.
Restricted Carryforward

Internally, awards with carryforward restrictions are handled one of two ways, depending on if Princeton is the prime recipient or subrecipient.

When Princeton is Prime Recipient: Separate activities are created for each budget period.

When Princeton is Subrecipient: The creation of separate activities is at the discretion of the ORPA GCA.
Restricted Carryforward

- The *RESTR* attribute has been inactivated, and all awards with restricted carryforward will have one of the following attributes:
  - **RESTRA** – for awards with multiple activities created to manage restricted carryforward
  - **RESTRN** – for awards that have a carryforward restriction, but for which the creation of additional activities is not necessary (e.g. Princeton is a subrecipient).

- In either case, the approval process with the sponsor still must be followed; the only difference is how we account for the funds internally.
Fabricated Equipment

The updated fabricated equipment request form has been in use for about a year now. A few things to keep in mind...

- In the Fabrication Budget section, you should use the actual cost elements for what will be purchased (i.e. do not just label everything as Equipment).
  - If additional lines are needed, you can attached a separate spreadsheet or list of items.
- For the Estimated Completion Date field, the PI should indicate the actual date that the item is expected to be completed, and not just use the award end date by default.
- Do not forget to follow the Item Completion process once the fabrication is complete.
Re-budgeting

There are only two circumstances in which we will complete a formal re-budget internally and adjust line items in PeopleSoft.

1) To increase the amount of a subaward purchase order (the PO amount must match the budget line in PeopleSoft)

2) When a proposed budgetary change requires sponsor prior approval
Re-budgeting

» For most federal grants and cooperative agreements issued under Uniform Guidance, the Research Terms and Conditions and associated the Prior Approval Matrix specifically are your best first step in determining if prior approval is needed.

» For federal contracts, industry sponsored contracts, and foundation awards, the contract or award notice will indicate when approval is needed.

» The ORPA NOA will indicate if an award has prior approval requirements for re-budgeting.
Re-budgeting Case Study #1

A PI comes to you and wants to charge a portion of a piece of equipment on an NIH grant, and the equipment was not included in the approved budget.

Questions to ask:
▷ How much of the item cost is to be charged to this grant?
▷ What line will you reduce to accommodate this?
▷ Why is it necessary for the project?
▷ Will there be a change in scope as a result of this purchase?
Re-budgeting Case Study #1

Based on the answers to those questions, consider the following issues:

▷ If the line item to be reduced is PI salary, is the reduction 25% or more of what was committed?

▷ If the cost of the item is more than $25,000, can the PI provide a justification that there is not a change in scope?

▷ If more than one award is being charged:
  ▷ Is there a clear and reasonable explanation of how the cost is being split between the different awards?
  ▷ Does each of the awards being charged contain the same provision for title to equipment?
Re-budgeting Case Study #2

A PI wants to do a personnel-for-personnel re-budget on an NSF grant, specifically to use a postdoc to perform some of the research instead of a graduate student. Does this require prior approval?

Questions to ask:
› Why is this change necessary?
› Will there be a change in scope as a result?
Re-budgeting Case Study #2

Based on the answers to those questions, consider the following issues:

› Was any postdoctoral support included in the original budget? If not, a postdoc mentoring plan will need to be sent to the NSF Program Official via email.

› Do you have written documentation in your files about why this change is being made?
Re-budgeting

When deviating from the approved budget, a few best practices:

- Confirm with the PI if there is a change in scope.
- Check the ORPA NOA and sponsor award document for approval requirements.
- Document your files with some kind of written record the change and why it was made.
- When splitting costs between awards, be sure to have a clear, logical, and reasonable explanation for how the percentage for each award was arrived at.
- When in doubt, reach out to your ORPA GCA.
Sponsor Updates
Simons Foundation and Restricted Carryforward

- Simons Foundation now requires approval to carry forward balances from the current funding period to the next period for awards at a specific dollar threshold, unless stated in the award letter.

- Carry Forward requests need to be submitted with the progress report in Proposal Central (pC) 30 days prior to the end of the funding year, unless stated differently in the award letter.

- The department should work with SRA to confirm the anticipated balance for the report in pC.
Simons Foundation and Restricted Carryforward

Example language specific to certain Simons Awards:

- Grant funds may be carried over from year to year during the period of appointment without prior approval; however, no more than one month of summer salary and related benefits for the PI can be spent per award year.

- Overspending beyond the current awarded amount plus the carry-forward amount in any given year is not permitted.
Simons Foundation and Restricted Carryforward

- New activities are created for each period, regardless of whether approval is required for carry forward.

- The reason for this is to monitor for negative spending.

- The threshold for Automatic and Formal Carry Forward Requests can be found in the Simons Foundation Policies and Procedures document.
# Simons Foundation and Restricted Carryforward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Approved Annual Budget</em></th>
<th><strong>Unexpended Balance</strong></th>
<th>Automatic vs Formal Carry Forward Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants with an approved annual budget of $200,000 or less</td>
<td>$50,000 or less of the approved annual budget</td>
<td><strong>Automatic Carry Forward</strong>: Funds will automatically carry forward to the next funding year. A formal request is not required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than $50,000 of the approved annual budget</td>
<td><strong>Formal Carry Forward Request Required</strong>: Submit a Carry Forward Request web form in the Deliverables section of proposalCENTRAL. The request is due thirty (30) days prior to the end of the funding year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants with an approved annual budget of more than $200,000</td>
<td>25% or less of the approved annual budget</td>
<td><strong>Automatic Carry Forward</strong>: Funds will automatically carry forward to the next funding year. A formal request is not required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 25% of the approved annual budget</td>
<td><strong>Formal Carry Forward Request Required</strong>: Submit a Carry Forward Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Office of Research and Project Administration

Princeton Research
Simons Foundation and Restricted Carryforward

- Approved Annual Budget is the combined amount of awarded funds plus any previously-approved or automatically carried forward funds from the previous funding year.
- The unexpended balance thresholds above apply to the total amount across all subcontracts.
- If there is a variance between the submitted Carry Forward Request in pC and the actual amount at the end of the period, no action is needed if your actual carry over balance is within $20,000 (+/-) of what was anticipated.
NSF Updates

- New NSF PAPPG went into effect on 01/29/2018.

- Most significant changes:
  - The Project Description must contain, as a separate section within the narrative, a section labeled “Intellectual Merit.”
    - Note, this is in addition to the separate sections for Broader Impacts and Intellectual Merit that are both required for inclusion in the Results of Prior NSF Support section of the Project Description.

  - The Budget Justification is now permitted to be up to 5 pages in length, that is, 5 pages for Princeton and 5 pages per subawardee, as applicable.
There are a significant number of other changes, clarifications, and updates in the 2018 PAPPG, as well as in policy notices issued by NSF throughout the year.

For a full exploration on all that is new with NSF, please be sure to attend next month’s Coffee with ORPA, on Thursday, October 11.
NASA Updates

A few notes on NASA No-Cost Extensions

> Extension requests may only be submitted between 30 and 10 days in advance of the expiration date.

> An up-to-date progress report must be submitted with the request.

> We have the choice of using NASA’s generic justification, which states that the extension is needed "to assure adequate completion of the original scope of work within the funds already made available," or

> We can write our own justification, limited to 1,000 characters.
NIH: ASSIST or Workspace?

› Effective June 18, 2018, Coeus system-to-system submission functionality was discontinued.
  › Thus, you now have two options for submitting NIH applications; NIH’s ASSIST or Grants.gov Workspace.
  › With recent updates to Workspace, both systems now have the ability to:
    › validate and check for errors or warnings prior to submission; and
    › print a complete, fully assembled PDF of the application for quick review.
Marie Curie Fellowships

Marie Curie Fellowships are individual awards, funded by the European Commission (EC), with two phases, one at a European Union (EU) institution, and one at an institution outside of the EU.

- Princeton is unable to accept funding under these awards.
- We can still host Marie Curie fellows, but we cannot agree to be bound by the terms of the EC award.
- For the letter required at the proposal stage, the department chair may sign off on this.
- If the proposal is awarded, a brief, non-funded visiting researcher/hosting agreement will be negotiated by ORPA to cover the terms of the fellow’s time at Princeton.
SRC and pre-agreement to IP Terms

Semiconductor Research Corporation (SRC) recently modified its terms and conditions for research funding. The new intellectual property (IP) terms can affect the existing IP of those applying for these grants, including having an impact on those researchers considering the formation of a start-up company.

All PIs submitting to funding must sign an acknowledgement form for proposals that involve SRC funding, prior to submission of the proposal.

Please contact your ORPA GCA if you need a copy of this form.
Questions?
THANK YOU