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Summary

Update on the Uniform Guidance – 2 CFR 200

1. Did you find this discussion topic of interest to you?

![Bar chart showing responses]

- Strongly Disagree: 1, 0% (0 responses)
- 2, 0% (0 responses)
- 3, 1, 7.1% (1 response)
- 4, 4, 28.6% (4 responses)
- Strongly Agree: 5, 9, 64.3% (9 responses)

2. Will you use the information presented in your daily work?

![Bar chart showing responses]

- Strongly Disagree: 1, 0% (0 responses)
- 2, 0% (0 responses)
- 3, 4, 28.57% (4 responses)
- 4, 4, 28.57% (4 responses)
- 5, 6, 42.86% (6 responses)

https://docs.google.com/a/berkeley.edu/forms/d/1y8tmrSVhPHv530HxwmT4sczOjuThxfwzxZpYP3MiRck/viewanalytics
3. What did you like most about this Roundtable?
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F. Overall Feedback of Roundtable

1. What did you like most about this Roundtable?

1) Relevant to the RA’s daily work and provide tips/or best practice in dealing with common challenges faced by the; 2) Gain a better understanding of the CGA process and timeline in handling budget upload; 3) Meet our CGA supervisor and Analysts in person informative and efficient training.

The selection of material to cover was informative, shedding light on many of the areas that both department research administrators and central contracts and grants officers need a better understanding of in order to work together more successfully. It was apparent that both of our units appreciated the session and would like more of this collaboration in the future.

Partnering with CGA colleagues - not just CGA leadership - Having time to ask questions - by anyone was very good, too

It was very nice to meet the folks from CGA.

It is a chance to get clarification on some problems and procedures.

That CGA joined us, and that the presentations went into a lot of detail.

The fact that our partners on campus (CGA) were present and we were able to meet and talk face to face.

Explaining some of the outstanding issues with CGA clearly.

I most liked being able to see both sides present -- we often only see one side of the process so it's helpful to understand the reasons for what the other side is doing.

The information on the internal process inside CGA.

2. What could have improved this Roundtable?

A focused presentation on fewer topics and allow time to go through the process, system navigation and interactive F&Q session.
Use real examples.

More CGA analysts should have attended. CGA had multiple opportunities to tell us what they wanted, but, RAs did not receive the same consideration. We need CGA analysts to relate to us better and differently in multiple contexts. Those could have been spelled out explicitly, and, CGA should step up and actively change their practices in terms of interacting with us better/more/actively. In addition, the current position on CGA for 45, 60, 90, 120, or mid-month closeouts is ambiguous with regard to the number of days CGA has to review. In other words, the "20 days for CGA review" does not apply to the 45, 60, 90, or mid-month close dates. Youseff was explicit about this to me in the reception prior to the event. All he said to me was, "you'll have to work it out with your analyst". My comment is that it's not helpful to leave this ambiguity in place, because it means we won't know what the CGA analyst is doing (timing wise), and we'll have to pursue finding out if the CGA analyst doesn't proactively contact us. (This has been the norm prior to the current module.) It would be better if CGA would decide on a number of days, e.g., 5 for 30-days, 10 for 45, and 15 for 60. Or SOMETHING that forces clarity into the cycle. (Yes, there might be exceptions, but those can be identified.)

More time. 1-1/2 hours was not enough.

May be more examples of what is been discussed for example what make some of the technical delays in budget posting

I feel like this roundtable could have been improved if we were able to submit questions in advance so that CGA could present some helpful alternatives or solutions.

3. What topics would you like presented at future Roundtables?

RA workcenter navigation and reporting queries; PI portfolio current state demonstration; Lesson learns from most recent NSF audit.

Most roundtables cover topics in a general sense, like the uniform guidance. However there are very thorny, confusing, unclear issues in the UG. When a roundtable is general or makes summary presentations, I don't learn much and I'm definitely not challenged. I would rather the thorns and problems and confusions be laid on the table for discussion. - As an example of the above, recently CGA contacted an RA as part of a closeout process for an NSF grant, and asked why equipment was purchased when it wasn't in the original budget. They asked for written approval from NSF. AFAIK, the PI has approval to re-budget in any category, including equipment (see the NSF Matrix) without NSF prior approval. The RA provided that explanation. (This was many weeks ago, and CGA has not yet responded with "ok" or "bad" yet.) The topic of prior approvals and how to understand them, is worth reviewing. Some RAs default to "always ask for agency approval", and some generally do not. - the nitty gritty of participant support - what were the findings of the recent audits at UCB, and how are we handling this category now? I know Kim Paige and Youseff are doing a training, but I can't attend. - There have been 1 or more recent significant audits at UCB. I would like to know the findings and what lessons we can take from them. - I'm not well versed on NIH. Likewise I'm sure other RAs lack knowledge about different agencies. I would love it if I could meet with experts in NIH and have them walk through a proposal, the issues they solve, and in post-award, what are the key issues to track. - Working with budgets in Excel: A topic that surfaces all the time: how do you construct a DOD budget with multiple tasks and phases? I would like 3-4 RAs who love their templates, to demonstrate how
they are constructed. Being able to see 3-4 variations on budgets, with the experts "working them", would be very helpful. I'm sure I can think of more but not at the moment. :)

1) Team2-ERSO specific metrics on all functional areas. 2) MLA’s, IUT’s, policies and processes unique to working with the Labs. 3) Sponsored Project Office (SPO) - responsibilities and proposal review time line with firm expectations from the faculty to be "hands off" of proposals. 4) Agency specific info sessions (DARPA, NIH, NASA, NSF, etc). 5) Travel and Entertainment policy updates.

Payroll suspense accounts: ways to improve it

Cost Share in the RA Grants WorkCenter (presentation on the purpose of the Cost Share CF1 code, how does the cost share contribution report match up to the Cost Share CF1, how to address committed matching funds and whether or not they can be assessed the 2% CSS Assessment Fee)

Number of daily responses