

# REPORT APPENDICES

RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION ASSESSMENT

---

# Appendix 1

## Reported Direct FTE's in Research Administration

Existing Direct FTE's	Agrilife	RS	HSC	TEES	TTI	RF	Total
Pre-Award FTEs	7	0.75	1	21.4	6	16	52.15
Post Award FTEs	6	6.25	2.5	13.7	3	14.2	45.65
Total Pre and Post Award	13	7	3.5	35.1	9	30.2	97.8
Other	2.2	3		44.3	13.7	57.4	120.6
	15.2	10	3.5	79.4	22.7	87.6	218.4

- As part of the analysis, System members were asked to provide the number of direct and indirect employees involved in research administration. Reported direct employees are summarized in the table above and indicate 218.4 total FTE's in TAMUS.
- Compared with benchmarks, number of pre-and post-award FTE's appears reasonable. RF and TEES account for a total of 167 (76.5%) of the 218.4 total direct FTEs, of which 120.6 were in 'other'.
- An evaluation of reported 'indirect employees' in research administration at TAMUS indicated high concentration of finance, administrative and other 'back-office'. In select benchmarks, cash management, HR/training and IT were included as part of direct central operations head counts.

# Appendix 2

## Pre-Award Productivity/Efficiency Comparison

### Proposals/FTE; TAMUS vs. Reporting Benchmarks

	<b>Agrilife</b>	<b>RS</b>	<b>HSC</b>	<b>TEES</b>	<b>TTI</b>	<b>RF</b>	<b>Total</b>
Proposals	1,653	130	70	2,139	583	1,880	6,455
Pre-award FTEs	7	0.75	1.0	21.4	6.0	16.0	52.2
Proposals/FTE	<b>236</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>124</b>

<b>Benchmarks (1)</b>							<b>Total</b>
	<b>B-1</b>	<b>B-2</b>	<b>B-3</b>	<b>B-4</b>			<b>Total</b>
Proposals	4,673	3,550	3,212	3,933			15,368
Pre-award FTEs	23	36	33	26			Mean
Proposals/FTE	203	99	97	151			<b>138</b>

# Appendix 3

## Post-Award Productivity/Efficiency Comparison

### Awards/FTE; TAMUS vs. Reporting Benchmarks

	Agrilife	RS	HSC	TEES	TTI	RF	Total
Active Awards	2,062	346	58	1,267	232	1,628	5,593
Post-award FTEs	6	6.25	2.5	13.7	3.0	14.2	45.7
Awards/FTE	<b>344</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>123</b>

### Benchmarks (1)

	B-1	B-2	B-3	B-4	Total
Awards	10,702	3,567	4,471	3,670	22,410
Post-award FTEs	49	36	38	24	147
Awards/FTE	218	99	118	153	<b>152</b>

# Appendix 4

---

## PI Satisfaction Rankings

- As part of the engagement, a sample of 2,338 research faculty were surveyed to understand customer satisfaction levels and perceptions about organizational resources and needs in pre- and post-award services.
- Of the PI's surveyed, responses were received from 820, for a response rate of 35 percent. PI's were asked to rate a number of pre- and post-award sub-service areas on a 7 point scale with:
  - 1 for 'very dissatisfied'
  - 2 for 'dissatisfied'
  - 3 for 'somewhat dissatisfied'
  - 4 being 'neutral'
  - 5 being 'somewhat satisfied'
  - 6 being 'satisfied'
  - 7 being 'highly satisfied'
- Preponderance of scores were rated in the 5 or 'somewhat satisfied' category, with TTI and Research Foundation with consistently highest scores, in the 6 category indicating 'satisfied'.

# Appendix 4

## PI Satisfaction Levels: Pre-Award Sub-Services

	College Station						Total Mean
	Agrilife	HSC	TEES	TTI	RF	RS	
Responses	<b>118</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>644</b>
<b>Pre-Award Services</b>							
Sponsored Program Development/Marketing	4.6	4.9	5.0	6.0	5.3	4.9	<b>5.1</b>
Proposal Development	5.0	5.3	5.4	6.4	5.8	5.0	<b>5.5</b>
Proposal review, approval, and submission	5.4	5.8	5.8	6.5	6.2	5.3	<b>5.8</b>
Budget development	5.7	5.8	6.0	6.6	6.2	5.3	<b>5.9</b>
Award review and approval	5.2	5.8	5.7	6.5	6.1	5.2	<b>5.8</b>
Contract negotiations	4.9	5.3	5.3	6.4	5.8	4.4	<b>5.4</b>
Mean	<b>5.1</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.6</b>
Median	<b>5.1</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>5.6</b>

# Appendix 4 cont'd

## Overall PI Satisfaction Levels; Pre-Award

<b>Overall customer service provided in research administration</b> <b>As defined by...</b>	<b>Agrilife</b>	<b>HSC</b>	<b>TEES</b>	<b>TTI</b>	<b>RF</b>	<b>RS</b>	<b>Mean</b>
Pro-active communications in pre-award customer service (initiating service calls versus reactive calls in service situations)	4.8	5.1	5.3	6.2	5.8	4.9	<b>5.4</b>
Timeliness of response in providing pre-award customer service	5.2	5.5	5.5	6.4	6.2	5.2	<b>5.7</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>5.5</b>

## Appendix 4 cont'd

### PI Satisfaction: Pre-Award People

<b>People involved in pre-award administration</b>	<b>Agrilife</b>	<b>HSC</b>	<b>TEES</b>	<b>TTI</b>	<b>RF</b>	<b>RS</b>	<b>Mean</b>
As defined by...							
Technical knowledge of research administration / research compliance rules	5.4	6.0	5.6	6.3	6.1	4.9	<b>5.7</b>
Service Attitudes	5.6	6.0	5.8	6.6	6.4	4.9	<b>5.9</b>
Mean	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>5.8</b>

## Appendix 4 cont'd

### PI Satisfaction Levels; Post-Award Sub-Services

<b>Post-Award Services</b>	<b>Agrilife</b>	<b>HSC</b>	<b>TEES</b>	<b>TTI</b>	<b>RF</b>	<b>RS</b>	<b>Total</b>
Research and regulatory compliance	4.7	5.6	5.3	6.3	5.9	4.6	<b>5.4</b>
Establishing awards and accounts	4.4	5.9	5.5	6.5	6.2	4.8	<b>5.6</b>
Project monitoring and management	4.4	5.4	5.3	6.2	5.8	4.2	<b>5.2</b>
Sub-award and contracts monitoring	4.6	5.3	5.1	6.2	5.8	4.4	<b>5.2</b>
Financial management, compliance	4.7	5.6	5.4	6.3	5.9	4.6	<b>5.4</b>
Purchasing	4.8	5.9	5.1	6.3	6.1	4.4	<b>5.4</b>
Travel administration	5.0	5.6	5.1	6.4	6.2	4.3	<b>5.4</b>
Billings	4.7	5.8	5.4	6.3	6.0	4.4	<b>5.4</b>
Account close-out	4.5	5.8	5.3	6.3	6.0	4.8	<b>5.5</b>
Mean	<b>4.6</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>5.99</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5.4</b>
Median	<b>4.7</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>5.4</b>

## Appendix 4 cont'd

### Overall PI Satisfaction Levels; Post-Award

<b>Overall Customer Satisfaction as defined by</b>	<b>Agrilife</b>	<b>HSC</b>	<b>TEES</b>	<b>TTI</b>	<b>RF</b>	<b>RS</b>	<b>Mean</b>
Pro-active communications in post-award customer service (initiating service calls versus reactive calls in service situations)	4.1	5.6	4.9	6.3	5.7	4.1	<b>5.1</b>
Timeliness of response in providing post-award customer service	4.2	5.6	5.2	6.4	5.9	4.4	<b>5.3</b>
Mean	<b>4.2</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>5.2</b>

# Appendix 4 cont'd

## PI Satisfaction Levels; Post-Award, People

<b>People in Post Award</b>	<b>Agrilife</b>	<b>HSC</b>	<b>TEES</b>	<b>TTI</b>	<b>RF</b>	<b>RS</b>	<b>Mean</b>
Technical knowledge of research administration / research compliance rules	4.9	5.8	5.3	6.3	6.0	4.8	<b>5.5</b>
Service attitudes	4.9	5.7	5.4	6.5	6.2	4.4	<b>5.5</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>5.5</b>

# Appendix 4

## PI Satisfaction Levels; Administrative Efficiency

<b>Overall Admin Effectiveness</b>	<b>Agrilife</b>	<b>HSC</b>	<b>TEES</b>	<b>TTI</b>	<b>RF</b>	<b>RS</b>	<b>Mean</b>
Efficiency in processing proposals	5.3	5.9	6.0	6.5	6.3	5.0	<b>5.8</b>
Efficiency in processing awards	4.7	5.9	5.4	6.4	6.2	4.7	<b>5.6</b>
Pro-actively solving day-to-day operating problems and challenges	4.4	5.8	5.2	6.3	5.9	4.0	<b>5.3</b>
Mean	<b>4.8</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>5.6</b>

# Appendix 5

---

## Review of Business Processes; Proposal Review, Awards Negotiation

- Proposal review, submission and approval: While this process area was rated with a high degree of variability among PI's among System member offices, areas of greatest concern were timing and delays, and related challenges in proposal routing and contract review. The internal routing process was of particular concern, when modifications are necessary to meet submission guidelines. While the MAESTRO system should assist PI's in increased monitoring and transparency in managing proposals, routing and timing issues are made more complex by the distributed service structure at TAMUS, and represents a key area of assessed improvement opportunity.
- *'Ideas that Work'*: The Wisconsin Proposal Electronic Reporting System (WISPER) is the electronic routing system for proposal submissions and agreements at University of Wisconsin. Proposal related documents are attached to a WISPER record, and signatures and approvals of the PI, Department Chair and Dean's offices are all addressed electronically. A key functionality allows for budget revisions to occur at the time of an award, which assists in more effective fiscal management.
- 'Awards negotiation and acceptance Contract negotiations were independently rated by PI's and research administrators as an area of significant variation in performance between System member offices. If not managed effectively, this has a variety of implications influencing research productivity and faculty motivation.
- *'Ideas that Work'*: In terms of 'ideas that work' at benchmark institutions Purdue has established a Peer Review Panel for review of non-standard proposals. The Panel has been developed with cross-functional leadership including the Director of Sponsored Program Services, VP for Research Office, Purdue Research Foundation and representation from relevant Colleges and Departments. A primary goal is the ability to convene the Panel within 48 hours to address key contract exceptions or other items, to support timely resolution.

# Appendix 5

---

## Review of Business Processes; Awards Management, Financial Management and Reporting

- Awards management: Also in the post-award area, the area of account closeout was rated by both PI's and research administrators as an area of greatest variation among offices. Frequent concerns were also noted regarding the length of time to establish accounts (in some cases taking several weeks) and process sub-accounts and these areas should be a primary focus in future process improvement and re-design initiatives.
- Financial management and reporting: In written comments and in interviews, financial management of grants and awards was frequently noted as a concern. Among PI's, sub-service areas involving purchasing, timeliness of billings and account closeout were noted areas of significant variation among contract and grant offices. In written comments, faculty noted needs for more and higher quality financial information for managing awards, that is available real-time. Timeliness of setting up account numbers and providing accounting information, particularly payroll data was assessed as a concern, as well as travel budgeting and reimbursements involving TAMU. (This was not the case with regard to TAMRF, in which travel reimbursements were frequently reported as timely and straightforward.)

# Appendix 5

---

## Review of Business Processes; Performance Management

- Performance management: For over nine years, TAMRF utilized the ProMES Performance Measurement System. The system was organized around a series of criteria for both pre and post-award, relating to such areas as service delivery, training and development and financial management. The System is currently in re-design phases, however represents a strong feedback mechanism for organizational learning and process improvements at the Research Foundation.
- *'Ideas that Work'*: GC Accounting at University of Washington utilizes an Operational Performance Dashboard, based on balanced scorecard reporting design. This design emphasizes measurement in four integrated areas: customer service; internal business processes; financial management and; learning and growth. Used in conjunction with regular customer satisfaction surveys of faculty, the dashboard is credited with helping increase feedback and learning, organizational focus and accountability for desired improvements over a sustained period.

# Appendix 5

---

## Review of Business Processes; E-Research

- E-research: In conjunction with TEES, TAMUS has invested in development of MAESTRO, a research administration data management system to support effective management of pre- and post-award processes. MAESTRO is intended to allow PI's to manage their accounts utilizing expenditure, award and other summary information. In the pre-award area, MAESTRO is intended to enhance proposal and budget development, as well as improve proposal routing through a proposal summary database for enhanced monitoring. An outgrowth of the EPIC system developed by TEES, MAESTRO is intended to provide more integrated management capabilities to PI's and System members, and has been the focus of an extensive development effort over the past two years.
- *'Ideas that work'*: Purdue University is a Steering Committee member of the COEUS consortium (led by MIT), and uses the COEUS system for pre-award services. Key functionalities of the system include: proposal development; a negotiations module that supports effective tracking of agreements and; and IRB module. COEUS is integrated with Purdue's SAP, enterprise business system. This system includes finance, HR and payroll modules and a 'grants management module' for post-awards management, which is used by SPS in awards management.

# Appendix 5

---

## Review of Business Processes; Research Administration Training

- Research administration support and training: Training of research administrative personnel is primarily organized by individual System offices at varying levels of formalized development. As an important element in developing human talent and standardized management processes for enhanced service quality and efficiency, we have assessed significant improvement opportunities in this area at TAMUS.
- *'Ideas that Work':* The University of Washington provides a certificate training program for all research administrators in which classes are offered three times a year. Grants and contracts accounting also provides mandatory training for PI's to assist them in understanding key post-award processes; while the Office of Sponsored Programs provides faculty with training in grants management and pre-award processes, which PI's are required to take every four years.
- While not formally included among institutional benchmarks for this engagement, the University of Michigan has organized the Research Administrators Instructional Network (RAIN), which is a formal training program for research administrators. The program focuses on key processes, policies and ethics issues influencing sponsored projects and includes seven training modules, with an expectation that all research administrators complete each.

# Appendix 6

## Summary of Phase I RASS Costs; “Revised Department Numbers Report”

	Research Administration Cost by Member					TOTAL	TAMRF
	AGRILIFE	TAMU	TAM-HSC	TEES	TTI		
<i>Salaries and Wages</i>	\$ 2,311,468	\$ 3,353,251	\$ 693,000	\$ 4,200,950	\$ 2,209,194	\$ 12,767,863	\$ 3,719,569
<i>Group Insurance</i>	308,164	410,737	87,360	420,300	240,485	1,467,046	-
<i>Fringe Benefits</i>	406,819	590,172	122,037	738,397	388,818	2,246,243	1,137,020
<b>Total Payroll and Benefits</b>	<b>\$ 3,026,451</b>	<b>\$ 4,354,160</b>	<b>\$ 902,397</b>	<b>\$ 5,359,647</b>	<b>\$ 2,838,497</b>	<b>\$ 16,481,153</b>	<b>\$ 4,856,589</b>
<i>Operations and Maintenance</i>	\$ 380,284	\$ 360,902	\$ 22,300	\$ 891,429	\$ 243,023	\$ 1,897,938	\$ 1,244,004
<i>Travel</i>	35,182	6,461	6,000	55,972	3,092	106,707	27,111
<i>Equipment</i>	-	10,493	5,000	30,500	13,773	59,766	41,164
<b>Total Other Operating Expenses</b>	<b>\$ 415,466</b>	<b>\$ 377,856</b>	<b>\$ 33,300</b>	<b>\$ 977,901</b>	<b>\$ 259,888</b>	<b>\$ 2,064,411</b>	<b>\$ 1,312,279</b>
<b>Total Cost before Payment to TAMFR</b>	<b>\$ 3,441,917</b>	<b>\$ 4,732,016</b>	<b>\$ 935,697</b>	<b>\$ 6,337,548</b>	<b>\$ 3,098,385</b>	<b>\$ 18,545,563</b>	<b>\$ 6,168,868</b>
<i>TAMRF Admin Fee</i>	858,834	2,361,586	1,866,485	22,451	826,900	5,936,257	(5,936,257)
<b>Total Cost of RA</b>	<b>\$ 4,300,751</b>	<b>\$ 7,093,602</b>	<b>\$ 2,802,182</b>	<b>\$ 6,359,999</b>	<b>\$ 3,925,285</b>	<b>\$ 24,481,820</b>	<b>\$ 232,611</b>
<b>Sponsored Research by entity</b>	<b>\$ 78,357,776</b>	<b>\$ 71,771,343</b>	<b>\$ 32,470,492</b>	<b>\$ 73,849,772</b>	<b>\$ 36,488,230</b>	<b>\$ 292,937,617</b>	<b>\$ 82,897,351</b>
<i>% Total Research</i>	20.8%	19.1%	8.6%	19.6%	9.7%		22.1%
<b>RA % Sponsored Research</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>9.9%</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>10.8%</b>	<b>8.4%</b>	<b>7.4%</b>
<b>FTEs</b>	<b>52.16</b>	<b>84.28</b>	<b>15.6</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>42.91</b>	<b>269.95</b>	<b>85.5</b>