Revised PRF Suggestions (8/28/09 - 9/15/09 Review Period)

Topic	Requested Change	Outcome
Proposal Summary	On the proposal summary, will the start and enddate and the direct, indirect and total costs still be listed? very important information for the file room staff. Thank you very much. The other changes look Wonderful!	No change needed
Address section	There should be space in the address section for submission of paper documents to name the person to whom the proposal will be addressed - 4 lines, not 3.	Change if space allows; otherwise, text can word-wrap
Asterisks	In the online version of the PRF, there are several red asterisks (in #5 after email/URL, for example). I don't see anything that ever indicates what they mean.	No change needed - will be clear in production version.
Typo	On the PDF version, I see a typo in #8 and #9. String is misspelled in the statement "Department will provide chart string in Section 19." Other than that, I like many of the improvements that have been made.	FIX
ID number	The _PRF ID#_ is missing from the 2nd & 3rd pages of the PRF. When I worked in SPA recently the PRF finally had been corrected to include the PRF # in the upper right corner of each page. This is really essential once again as there are times when the PRF is faxed to SPA and especially the 3rd page indicating the ink signatures obtained. If the PRF ID # is not included then the 2nd & 3rd pages could be from any PRF. Another scenario would be if SPA misplaces the cover page of a fax of the 3rd page only thus there's be no way to match up that page to a specific PRF> These are real issues that I experienced while employed as a GA in SPA.	FIX - Make sure header is on all pages
Matching & Cost Sharing	#19 a. & b. /Matching and Cost Sharing_ - the wording of these 2 statements has always been a problem for some departments submitting proposals. I Feel that each question needs to be worded more clearly. Maybe it should be a statement rather than a question, such as "Mandatory cost sharing, matching or in-kind required by sponsor and included in proposal" and "Optional cost sharing, matching or in-kind offered in proposal." Making statements and having people select "Yes" or "No" might clear up the confusion of this wording. It's clear to SPA staff but many in the departments using the PRF continually selected the wrong answers during my 5+ years in SPA. The rest of the prototype seems to have some good clear fields. I particularly like how #5 has been changed to require a field for the number of copies of the proposal with an actual line for SPA and the #1 filled in - GREAT!! Frequently the copy for SPA was missing when I worked there. Thanks for the opportunity to respond.	FIX - Change wording to recommendation
Q13b	Under Q13b, the number currently indicates 6-5654, which is the IRB central number. 6-2126 is the OAW phone number	Awaiting preference from offices involved

Revised PRF Suggestions (8/28/09 - 9/15/09 Review Period)

Q13f	Under Q13f, with the use of Recombinant DNA, replace "Office of Animal Welfare" with "Human Research Protection Program" and keep the 6-5654 phone number.	FIX
Q13	Instead of or in addition to the department name and phone numbers on all of the items under Q13, consider putting in a link to the relevant webpage of this department.	Discussed, department administrators prefer phone number; no change needed
Q13e	Under section for Stem Cells, Q13e, can you add the following text?: Conducting research on the transplantation of human fetal tissue: Studies involving human fetal transplantation research ineligible for federal or state funding must be registered with the Office of Regulatory Affairs/RIOP - Phone 612-624-2431. http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Research/FETALRESEARCH.html Conducting Research with Human Embryos or Embyonic Stem Cells: Studies involving human embryos or embryonic stem cell lines ineligible for federal or state funding must be registered with the Office of Regulatory Affairs/RIOP in the Office of the Vice President for Research - Phone 612-624-2431 http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Research/EMBRYONICSTE	Too much text for form, but will include in Help Text.
Q13 Use of controlled substance	Can we add some text on the use of controlled substance to Q13? If using controlled substance for research with humans, animals or for teaching, see the following website for instructions and training module: http://www.research.umn.edu/riop/controlsubst.htm - Phone: 612-624-0664	Will include in Help Text
Q13 Research Billing Info	Can you add information on Research Billing Information to Q13? Fairview Health Services and UMP: Does this research make use of Fairview Health Services and/or University of Minnesota Physicians (UMP) resources? If yes, the system should as for the TASCS number. http://www.ctsi.umn.edu/resources/platform/crbb/home.html U of M number for TASCS Support is 626-5203	No change - already addressed in #22
Section 13	For all of the items under section 13, can we create a query that would give reports on the approved grants that marked "yes" on any of these items? For example, if someone marked "yes" under use of Radiation Materials, can DEHS run a query that would tell them all of the funded grants who are doing work with Radiation?	No change needed; request for a query/report for post-production

Revised PRF Suggestions (8/28/09 - 9/15/09 Review Period)

#2	The recommendation is to add text to the example under the Short Title. As is, it states, (to easily identify the PRF prior to routing the PRF for approval). The recommendation is to add next to this (e.g., PI last name/Agency/Part of grant title/Due date). The reasoning is that she thinks a lot of people are not aware that they can enter whatever they want and she thinks the example gives people good ideas of pertinent information that could be useful to other departments.	No change needed, but additional guidance can be furnished in Help Text
#3	The question is is the "Due Time" mandatory? I told her no but please let me know if that's wrong.	No change needed.
#9	Under the first example, the effort total is not added correctly so she wants to make sure the automatic adding feature will be correct. Also, in this example the job is listed a professor but on the pdf, it's listed as research assistant. She just wants to make sure that these are only glitches for the mock up and that on the final product, that fields will be added correctly in EGMS and show up correctly on the PRF. I told her they would.	Verify this is already part of the design
#10	Can we check research and clinical trial at the same time? I told her we could. If I'm wrong, please let me know.	No change needed (answer is "yes")
#11	Under administrative change, she's unclear as to when it is necessary to check this box as they currently don't route a new PRF when there's a change in PI. I personally don't have experience with this so was not sure how to answer. I did tell her that I thought examples/reasoning would be listed under the help button. Her thoughts is that is more than likely a postaward issue.	No change needed, but additional guidance can be furnished in Help Text
#12	You can ignore the question mark next to b. as I went over this with her. However, under c., she is wondering for clarification sake, if a button could be added under "no F&A requested because" that says "not allowed by sponsor" as she does not alway need to send backup to SPA depending on the agency.	No change needed (user required to use suite of options already listed), but additional guidance can be furnished in Help Text
#15	Proposes that b. says "If this is a renewal . . " instead of "Is this a renewal . . .". Regarding d., how do we find out if investigators outside of the department have any active patents? Is this something we just will need to ask all investigators listed on a grant?	FIX - wording
#19	At the end of the sentences for a. and b., she recommends instead of saying "submission sponsor" since the sponsor isn't submitting the application, that it says "sponsor for this submission". I answered her second question under this field so you can ignore this part.	Already fixed by adoption of different wording suggested by another user

Revised PRF Suggestions (8/28/09 - 9/15/09 Review Period)

#21	The question was wouldn't this be a sub-contract and I told her that no a foreign component does not always involve a sub-contract.	No change needed.
Proposal Abstract	The Proposal Abstract or Executive Summary should be listed as number 23 in EGMS to be consistent with the pdf. Also, the Notes should be listed as number 24 to be consistent with the pdf. Also the pdf just says Executive Summary and not Abstract or Executive Summary like it does in EGMS.	Make sure language is consistent online and PDF
Routing chain	You can disregard her written question on the routing chain as discussed this.	No change needed
#19	#19 on the pdf is not consistent with what's checked in EGMS. It should say "is proposed but not required".	Printed PDF combined options for legibility; no change needed
Last page	On the last page of the pdf, she's wondering if the x500 will also appear on the signature line like it does now and if it is a paper copy PRF, what signature lines will appear since x500s won't be listed in EGMS?	CHANGE - if ink signature, still allow for x500 entry to populate signature lines. If e-sig, remove signature lines (only have the table)
#13 a & b	For #13 a. and b., when the protocol is exempt, would it be possible to list the exemption category?	FIX- a single digit field after status and Code number
#14	For #14, can the word potential be added back in (Is there a potential financial and business conflict of interest?)?	FIX - add potential conflict back in
#8	On the pdf form, #8, can the total effort be listed by adding another column maybe? That way faculty see the total of their effort. The fear is that they will focus on the paid effort thinking that the cost share doesn't count.	Yes - list total effort
#9	Under #9, the term Investigator can be interpreted in different ways. There weren't any suggestions for a better name but thought maybe better training might help. For example, on PPG or Center grants, a lot of times faculty are listed as Project or Center/Core Leaders and some departments list these people as investigators on PRFs and other departments don't. Where in reality the groups' feeling is they are investigators. Maybe list a definition of who is considered an investigator?	No change needed, but additional guidance can be furnished in Help Text

Revised PRF Suggestions (8/28/09 - 9/15/09 Review Period)

Deny button	Can we get rid of the "deny" button altogether? Apparently, if someone hits the "deny" button instead of the "okay" or "return" button it deletes the information on the PRF and all of the information has to be re-entered. The consensus in our group was that it wasn't needed since anyone on the routing chain has the option to return it. Sometimes people have inadvertently clicked this button instead of one of the others and the documents has had to be re-created.	FIX - Remove deny button
Other group thoughts:	***** Group needs to analyze emails**	In Progress by Workgroup
	***** Can the approve/deny buttons stand out more somehow?**	Under investigation by programmers
	***** Curious about a confirmation of action page after approval**	Under investigation by programmers