

## **RAC Meeting 10/08/2009**

### **1. New Ideas**

Vanessa Foreman, RAC Chair proposed that we consider the new idea of conducting Best Practices presentations and discussions in a number of areas discussed at the September RAC meeting. Vanessa would like to conduct these presentations beginning with our next closed RAC meeting which is scheduled for January 2010.

Vanessa asked Ken Fahnestock if he would present on the topic of COEUS to provide insight on shortcuts and tips to help COEUS users. Ken agreed to put something together and pass it by Vanessa for review and comments.

Vanessa also asked Miek Siegers if she would do the same for the topic of budgets.

Vanessa asked the group for additional topics that could be presented in the future. Among those discussed were effort reporting, procurement and compliance issues. More discussion and potential presenters will be determined at a later meeting.

### **2. Committee Reports**

#### **Cherri Helms – *Continuing Education***

The committee is open to bringing in NIH type speakers to conduct training on specific topics. Those topics would need to have to be identified in order to pursue this presentation.

There is an encore presentation of the May 2009 OMB Circular A21 discussion planned for Monday, October 12th from 1:30 to 3:30 in the Bressler Building Hosick Lecture Hall (BRB 1-010) Dr. Jarrell is encouraging all who did not attend the initial presentation to attend this one. There is also a similar presentation planned for faculty as well.

If you have any suggestions for possible continuing education classes please send your suggestions to Cherri Helms (chelms@umm.edu).

#### **Libby Guarnera, Gene Severance & Bill Hoffman – *Deliverables Subcommittee***

First item for discussion is billing by the Center for Clinical Trials. What is the procedure for start-up invoices from CCT; they are not being submitted to RF. There needs to be better coordination between CCT and RF and the department in this area.

Budgets on deliverable or fixed price accounts need to be reviewed. There is no budget amounts entered into RAVEN. We would like to see some sort of budget information entered into RAVEN to help track income. Final payments are a particular issue. Since many final payments require submission of some sort of report, often this is overlooked by the PI and subsequent late notices are being sent to the sponsor that should not be. This failure to issue payment is not the fault of the sponsor. Communication with the Department and/or PI should be considered BEFORE issuing any late notices to the sponsor to allow us to determine what the reason is for the missing payment.

Timing of invoices issued to sponsors needs to be better coordinated with the Departments.

Payments that have been received against invoices need to be better monitored by RF and need to be processed in a more timely fashion. When checks received cannot be easily matched with a particular project, the Department should be contacted in a timely manner to help resolve the issue of where the payment belongs.

Payments that are less than originally invoiced are a problem. Departments should be involved in helping correct the discrepancies in these matters to prevent RAVEN accounting issues.

The form for deliverable deposits should not be the same as for clinical trial deposits. A new form should be developed for this process.

Invoices being entered in RAVEN causes a problem in understanding the true balance of the account. This issue needs to be looked into to help Departments better reconcile the revenue posted to the project ID's. We understand the general accounting principles involved but to include revenue with invoices gives an untrue total of project revenue, which then reflects in untrue total department revenue. An alternative method of access to total project/department revenue needs to be looked into.

Summary – What was presented in presentation 3701 (Billing and Collections) is not working up to par and needs to be tweaked. Recommendations are that we refer to the agreement and guidelines when posting payments.

### 3. Questions from the group

There was great concern in the statements presented at the two RF policy presentations that stated that a Senior Administrator was required to perform a sample quality review and will sign off on the review within the Department. This was an item included on the new policies but was never discussed or communicated to Departmental personnel as a requirement or for input.

Questions were raised as to who in RF we were supposed to forward budget revisions to as formal instructions for new procedures have not been received by departments.

### 4. Kenneth Fahnestock- ***Financial Reporting and Closeout***

Policy was well thought out and prepared. Practice is still an issue that we feel needs to be addressed.

30-60-90 reports need to be routinely issued.

Old accounts are currently being closed (many years old).

Suggest that there be an easy way to close out project ID's that is simple in nature.

Examples are shared instrumentation grants, conference grants and fellowship grants.

Subcommittee will formulate suggestions to refine processes that will be submitted to Financial Services.

Meeting adjourned.