

Illustration University  
FY2002 FY02 Sponsored Projects Administration Benchmarking Performance and Best Practices  
Institutional Demographics and Expenditures

Your responses throughout this survey should be institution-specific for the institution under which your account exists, not for a "system" or a number of institutions at varying locations. To check your institutional affiliation, go to Home and look under My Personal Information. If you have any questions about this critical matter, please contact Jennifer Lipnick at [jlipnick@kpmg.com](mailto:jlipnick@kpmg.com).

If you identify your institution as having a medical school, data for the medical school should be included throughout the remainder of your Sponsored Programs Survey.

Institutional Demographics

Is yours a land grant institution?

Is yours a minority institution?

Do you have a medical school?

Enrollment:

Enrollment Reported in FY2000, if available:

Total Institutional Expenditures

Explanation: The revenue data will be used to develop ratios of total revenues to sponsored program revenues. Use data provided for IPEDS Total Expenditures.

- For public institutions using GASB, use Part C line 19.

- For public institutions using FASB, or for independent institutions, use Part E line 13. Report in whole numbers, round to the nearest dollar.

Total Institutional Expenditures

Total Institutional Expenditures in FY2000 (if previously reported)

Illustration University  
 FY2002 FY02 Sponsored Projects Administration Benchmarking Performance and Best Practices  
 General SP Admin Costs and FTEs (1-2)

The following definitions should be applied to Questions No. 1 and 2 (Central Administration Costs and FTEs - GENERAL SPONSORED PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION)

For the purposes of this questionnaire, research and sponsored projects should be defined as inclusive of all scholarly and creative activities (research), and all service and teaching activities for which external funding is received. General Sponsored Projects Administration includes the following major sets of functions. If there are any exceptions to the representative activities for a specific question and they constitute more than 10 percent of your department's activity, please provide a note in the comments section.

Depending on your organizational structure, it may be necessary to report information for both an academic entity and one or more affiliated organizations such as a research foundation. The institution's reporting practices should parallel those used for the NSF Survey of Expenditures for Research and Development.

General Sponsored Programs Administration: This refers to both: (A) Pre-Award functions and (B) Post-Award non-financial administration functions as follows:

A. The Pre-Award function includes all activities that lead to the award of a sponsored project, grant or contract, and the accompanying initial budget planning and financial management activities. It includes the following representative activities to the extent they are performed in the institution's central sponsored projects administration office (if these functions are not included in your sponsored projects administration organization, they need not be included in your response):

- Disseminating information on funding opportunities to principal investigators (P.I.s)
- Assisting with proposal preparation tasks
- Logging and tracking proposals and awards
- Assisting with, reviewing, and approving proposals and budgets
- Copying, mailing or electronically submitting proposals
- Negotiating terms and conditions for contracts and grants
- Logging and tracking award notices
- Setting up initial accounts and accounting entries (if this is not done by a post-award financial office)

B. The Post-Award Non-Financial functions include activities not involving financial management which support and facilitate research projects and activities. The following are representative activities to the extent they are performed in the institution's central sponsored projects administration office (if these functions are not included in your sponsored projects administration organization, they need not be included in your response):

- Notifying principal investigators of awards
- Preparing public relations information about sponsored programs
- Ensuring regulatory compliance regarding biohazards and use of human and/or animal subjects
- Approving no-cost extensions and requests for increased funding
- Monitoring progress and non-financial reporting requirements, patent requirements, and other rebudgeting approvals
- Preparing and monitoring consulting and subcontracting agreements
- Coordinating and monitoring close-out activities

C. For the purposes of this definition General Sponsored Programs Administration does not include:

- Technology transfer functions and activities
- Management and operation of IRB's animal care and use committees, radiation safety committees, or other regulatory compliance activities.

Illustration University  
 FY2002 FY02 Sponsored Projects Administration Benchmarking Performance and Best Practices  
 General SP Admin Costs and FTEs (1-2) (continued)

QUESTION NO. 1: Central Administration Costs - General Sponsored Programs Administration

Explanation: The total actual direct expense for the central administration in FY2002 which can be directly attributed to General Sponsored Projects Administrative activities. Report gross costs actually incurred - do not offset them by revenue. These costs will be used to calculate the cost efficiency ratios for central sponsored projects administration. Include:

- Salaries - That portion of salaries of staff at the level of Chief Research Officer that is attributable to the day-to-day management of the function. In smaller institutions, Chief Research Officers may be involved in day-to-day SPA management activities. The time spent on those activities should be included.
- Benefits, including insurance, investment/retirement plans, tuition remission, child care, workers' compensation, unemployment, FICA, paid sabbaticals and paid leaves of absence, and any benefits paid from a central budget
- Supplies
- Telephone charges
- Postal costs
- Computer costs
- Central computing chargebacks
- Outsourced costs
- Contracted costs
- College work study student wages (regardless of the source of funds)
- All other expenses (regardless of the source of funds), restricted, unrestricted, budgeted or unbudgeted
- Exclude:
  - Costs allocable to technology transfer activities
  - Costs allocable to coordination of IRB, or other regulatory compliance committees
  - Internal allocation of central expenses (e.g. rent, utilities)
  - Capital costs
  - Debt service
  - That portion of salaries of staff at the level of Chief Research Officer or higher that is not attributable to day-to-day management of the function
  - Extraordinary costs incurred in FY2002 that may decrease the comparability of your data to that of other institutions

1. Central Administration Costs: General SP Administration

QUESTION NO. 2: Central FTEs - General Sponsored Programs Administration

Explanation: The Central Administration total FTEs in FY2002 dedicated to activities involved in General Sponsored Projects Administration. Use the institution's normal procedure for calculating full-time equivalents. The costs reported in Question 1 should generally reflect costs associated with the staff and activities of the FTE's reported here. These data will be used to calculate the staffing and workload ratios. Include:

- Part-time and full-time employees
- Professional and support staff
- Staff at the level of Chief Research Officer who are involved in day-to-day management of the function
- Paid or unpaid student workers (work study students, interns, graduate assistants)
- Temporary employees on the institution's payroll
- Outsourced and contracted FTEs
- Exclude:
  - Staff at the level of Chief Research Officer who are not involved in day-to-day management of the function
  - FTE dedicated to coordination of regulatory compliance activities
  - FTE dedicated to technology transfer activities

2. Central Administration FTEs: General SP Administration

Illustration University  
FY2002 FY02 Sponsored Projects Administration Benchmarking Performance and Best Practices  
Central Post-Award Admin Costs and FTEs (3-4)

The following definition should be applied to Questions No. 3 and 4 (Central Administration Costs and FTEs - POST-AWARD FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION)

For the purposes of this questionnaire, this includes functions such as cash management, coordinating, managing, and reviewing sponsored projects accounts to assure appropriate management of funds. It would encompass the following representative activities to the extent they are performed in the institution's central sponsored projects accounting office (if these functions are not included in your sponsored program administration organization, they need not be included in your response):

- Performing grant forecasting, maintaining grant and contracting accounting records
- Setting up initial accounts and accounting entries (if this is not done by the general sponsored programs administrative office)
- Monitoring budgets
- Maintaining property management systems
- Managing A-21, A-110 and A-133 compliance
- Performing cash management activities (including letter of credit draw downs, invoicing, deposits, and collections)
- Reviewing, approving, and monitoring all expenditures for appropriateness
- Preparing reports (including financial, effort, and equipment)
- Reviewing and approving cost transfers
- Coordinating audits by external auditors
- Approving establishment of and monitoring recharge center financial activities
- Coordinating and monitoring close-out activities

Depending on your organizational structure, it may be necessary to report information for both an academic entity and one or more affiliated organizations such as a research foundation. The institution's reporting practices should parallel those used for the NSF Survey of Expenditures for Research and Development.

If there are any exceptions to the representative activities for a specific question and they constitute more than 10 percent of your department's activity, please provide a note in the comments section.

Illustration University  
 FY2002 FY02 Sponsored Projects Administration Benchmarking Performance and Best Practices  
 Central Post-Award Admin Costs and FTEs (3-4) (continued)

QUESTION NO. 3: Central Administration Costs - Post-Award Financial Administration

Explanation: The total actual direct expense for the Central Administration in FY2002, which can be directly attributed to Post-Award Financial Administration activities. These costs will be used to calculate the cost efficiency ratios. Include:

- Salaries
- Salaries of staff at the level of Chief Research Officer and/or Chief Financial Officer who are involved in the day-to-day management of the function
- Benefits, including insurance, investment/retirement plans, tuition remission, child care, workers' compensation, unemployment, FICA, paid sabbaticals and paid leaves of absence, and any benefits paid from a central budget
- Supplies
- Telephone charges
- Postal costs
- Computer costs
- Central computing chargebacks
- Outsourced costs
- Contracted costs
- College work study student wages (regardless of the source of funds)
- Other expenses (regardless of the source of funds), restricted, unrestricted, budgeted or unbudgeted. Exclude:
- Salaries of staff at the level of Chief Research Officer and/or Chief Financial Officer who are not involved in day-to-day management of the function
- Costs incurred to conduct facilities and administrative cost studies and prepare indirect cost rate proposals
- Internal allocation of central expenses (e.g. rent, utilities)
- Capital costs
- Debt service, or any extraordinary costs incurred in FY2002 that may decrease the comparability of your data to that of other institutions

3. Central Admin Costs: Post-Award Fin. Admin.

QUESTION NO. 4: Central FTEs - Post-Award Financial Administration

Explanation: The costs reported in Question 3 should generally reflect costs associated with the staff and activities of the FTE's reported here. The Central Administration total FTEs in FY2002 dedicated to activities involved in the Post-Award Cycle. Use the institution's normal procedure for calculating full-time equivalents.

Include:

- Part-time and full-time professional and support staff
- Staff at the level of Chief Research Officer and/or Chief Financial Officer who are involved in the day-to-day management of the function
- Paid or unpaid student workers (work study students, interns, graduate assistants)
- Temporary employees on the institution's payroll
- Outsourced and contracted FTEs.

Exclude:

- Staff at the level of Chief Research Officer and/or Chief Financial Officer who are not involved in day-to-day management of the function
- Staff FTE dedicated to preparation of F&A cost proposals

4. Central FTEs: Post-Award Fin. Admin.

Illustration University  
 FY2002 FY02 Sponsored Projects Administration Benchmarking Performance and Best Practices  
 Number of Proposals and Awards (5-8)

QUESTION NO. 5: Number of Proposals Submitted

Explanation: The total number of proposals for sponsored projects submitted by the institution to external sponsors in FY2002. This response will be used to calculate General Sponsored Projects Administration workload ratios.

NOTE: Every funded project must have at least one proposal counted for it. The answer for this question should not be less than the answer for Question 7, the number of awards. A sponsored project (such as is sometimes awarded by an industry sponsor) in which an award precedes or is concurrent with a proposal arriving at the sponsored projects office, must have a proposal counted for it, even if a formal proposal had not previously been administratively processed.

Include:

- All proposals that received institutional approval, including proposals that did not get funding
- Resubmittals (a resubmittal occurs when the original proposal is declined, then another proposal based on the declined proposal is submitted later)
- Non competing continuing proposals
- Proposals for supplements to ongoing projects (supplementals)

Exclude:

- Revised budgets (if the proposal is essentially accepted, except for budget or other minor revisions, do not count it as a separate proposal)

5. Total Number of Proposals Submitted

QUESTION NO. 6: Number of New or Competitive Renewal Proposals Submitted

Explanation: Of the number reported in Question 5 above, how many are either new or competitive proposals? This number will be used to calculate success rates on submitted proposals. The response here is a subset of the response to question 5.

Include:

- All proposals new projects or competitive renewals, including proposals that did not get funding
- Resubmittals (a resubmittal occurs when the original proposal is declined, then another proposal based on the declined proposal is submitted later)
- Submissions to multiple sponsors should be counted once for each submission to each sponsor
- A sponsored project (such as is sometimes awarded by an industry sponsor) in which an award precedes or is concurrent with a proposal arriving at the sponsored projects office, must have a proposal counted for it, even if a formal proposal had not previously been administratively processed

Exclude:

- Non-competing proposals
- Revised budgets (if the proposal is essentially accepted, except for budget or other minor revisions, do not count it as a separate proposal)
- Incremental funding actions on a previously awarded project

6. Number of New or Competitive Renewal Proposals Submitted

QUESTION NO. 7: Number of Awards

Explanation: The total number of grants, agreements, and contracts that received funding in FY 2002. Count each award that received funding. Awards that are divided into separate internal projects count as one award. This number will be used in conjunction with the response to Question 5 to calculate post-award workload ratios. The number reported here should not be more than the number reported for Question 5.

7. Number of Awards

QUESTION NO. 8: Number of New Awards and Competitive Renewals.

Explanation: Of the number reported in Question 7 above, how many are either new awards or competitive renewals? Awards that are divided into separate internal projects count as one award. This number will be used to calculate success ratios. The number reported here should not be more than the number reported for Question 6. This response is a subset of the response to Question 7.

8. Number of New Awards and Competitive Renewals

Illustration University  
 FY2002 FY02 Sponsored Projects Administration Benchmarking Performance and Best Practices  
 Number of PIs' Funded Programs, Accounts Receivables (9-13)

QUESTION NO. 9: Faculty, Staff, and Administrators who are Eligible to be Investigators/Project Directors

9A. Total Eligible Sponsored Programs-Performing Faculty/Staff FTE:

Explanation: Provide the total eligible sponsored program-performing FTEs employed by the institution for FY2002, regardless of the source of funds from which they are paid. This number should include faculty and staff who are expected to seek outside support for their activities. The number will identify the size of the potential research and sponsored project-performing community. It may be used to compute sponsored project and proposal activity ratios. Research and sponsored projects should be defined as inclusive of all scholarly and creative activities (research), and all service and teaching activities for which external funding is received.

Include:

- Sponsored project-performing employees [DM1] are those whose specific assignments customarily are made for the purpose of conducting instruction, research, or public service as a principal activity (or activities), and who hold academic-rank titles of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, lecturer or the research equivalent of any of these ranks
- Deans, directors, associate deans/assistant deans, department chairs or heads who hold faculty rank or are otherwise eligible to do sponsored programs
- Faculty FTEs on paid leave or sabbatical
- Adjunct faculty (if allowed to be involved in sponsored activities)
- Clinical faculty eligible to be involved in sponsored activities
- Replacements for faculty FTEs on paid leave or sabbatical (if allowed to be involved in sponsored activities)

Exclude:

- Adjunct faculty (if not allowed to be involved in sponsored activities)
- Clinical faculty not eligible to be involved in sponsored activities
- Staff professional employees (such as counselors, coaches, lawyers, admissions and registrar officers)
- Replacements for faculty FTEs on paid leave or sabbatical (if not allowed to be involved in sponsored activities)

9A. Total Eligible Sponsored Programs-Performing Faculty/Staff FTE

9B. Total Research-Eligible Faculty/Staff FTE:

Explanation: Provide the total eligible research-performing FTEs employed by the institution for FY2002, regardless of the source of funds from which they are paid. This number will identify the size of the potential research-performing community. It may be used to compute research project and proposal activity ratios. Research should be defined as inclusive of all scholarly and creative activities..

Include:

- Of the number of FTE identified in Question 9.A above, include only those who are research-eligible or have research as an element of their assigned duties

This will be a subset of the number reported for Question 9A above.

9B. Total Research-Eligible Faculty/Staff FTE

QUESTION NO. 10. Number of Active Investigators

For the purpose of this question, Investigator is defined as any faculty-level staff member (counted in your response to Question 9) who participated in an externally sponsored activity: research, training, demonstration, and service. Active means that the individual had external support and/or submitted at least one proposal for external support during FY2002.

Explanation: This number may be used in participation rates and service ratios for pre - award sponsored program administration. Report the total number of research and sponsored programs-performing employees listed as principal investigator or project director, or co-PI/PD on sponsored projects active any time during FY2002, or listed as an investigator, principal investigator or project director, or co-PI/PD on a proposal submitted during FY2002. Do not count an individual more than once[DM2].

10A. Number of Active Investigators

Include:

- Those investigators whose proposals were submitted in FY2002, whether or not the projects received funding
- Those investigators whose projects were active and funded during FY2002, whether or not the projects received funding in FY2002

This number will be a subset of the number reported for Question 9A above.

10A. Number of Active Investigators

Illustration University  
 FY2002 FY02 Sponsored Projects Administration Benchmarking Performance and Best Practices  
 Number of PIs' Funded Programs, Accounts Receivables (9-13) (continued)

## 10B. Number of Active Research Investigators

## Include:

- Those investigators whose research proposals were submitted in FY2002, whether or not the projects received funding
- Those investigators whose research projects were active and funded during FY2002, whether or not the projects received funding in FY2002

This number will be a subset of the numbers reported for Questions 9.B and 10.A above.

## 10B. Number of Active Research Investigators

## QUESTION NO. 11: Number of Funded Investigators

For the purpose of this question, Investigator is defined as any faculty-level staff member (counted in your response to Question 9) who participated in an externally sponsored activity: research, training, demonstration, and service. Funded means that the individual had external support during FY2002.

Explanation: This number will be used in service ratios for post-award financial management. Report the total number of research and sponsored activity-performing employees listed as investigator, principal investigator or project director, or co-PI/PD on sponsored projects active during FY2002. Do not count an individual more than once [DM3].

## 11A. Number of Funded Principal Investigators/Project Directors

## Include:

- Those investigators whose externally-sponsored projects were active and funded during FY2002, whether or not the projects received funding in FY2002.

This number will be a subset of the number reported for Question 10.A above.

## 11A. Number of Funded Principal Investigators/Project Directors

## 11B. Number of Funded Research Investigators

## Include:

- Those investigators whose externally-sponsored research projects were active and funded during FY2002, whether or not the projects received funding in FY2002

This will be a subset of the numbers reported for Questions 10.B and 11.A above.

## 11B. Number of Funded Research Investigators

## QUESTION NO. 12: Number of Funded Grants, Agreements, and Contracts

Explanation: This number will be used to calculate post-award workload ratios and annual unit costs of post-award financial management functions. Report the total number of projects active as of June 30, 2002, or the last day of the fiscal year ending in 2002. Sub-projects of large, multi-project grants (NIH program-project grants or NSF center grants, for example) should be counted as individual projects.

## Exclude:

- Awards that are divided into separate internal accounts for each fiscal year of their life should count as one award [DM4].
- Inactive accounts (closed and terminated projects funded by grants, contracts, and other agreements).
- Projects past their termination date, but not yet formally closed

## 12. Number of Funded Grants, Agreements and Contracts

## QUESTION NO. 13: Percentage of Sponsored Project Accounts Receivable more than 120 Days

Explanation: This number is intended to be a measure of sponsored projects receivable collections. Report the percentage of sponsored projects accounts receivable that are 120 days or older as of the end of FY2002.

## 13. Percentage of Sponsored Project Accounts Receivable more than 120 Days



**Illustration University  
 FY2002 FY02 Sponsored Projects Administration Benchmarking Performance and Best Practices  
 SP Expenditures by Source (14)**

QUESTION NO. 14: Sponsored Project Expenditure Dollars during FY1997-FY2002

Explanation: The total amount reported as expenditures for sponsored project purposes in FY2002, FY2001, FY2000, FY1999, FY1998, and FY1997.

- Include federal, state, local, and private grants, agreements and contracts, total expenditures
- If expenditure data for FY2002 are not immediately available, please provide data for the remaining fiscal years with your initial report, and submit the FY2002 expenditure data when available.
- Note: If you cannot separate awards into these categories, please note in a comment below and report all awards in the Other category.
- The total per year for your institution is the most important number to report.
- For sources of funds, record your institution's immediate, specific sponsor. For example: If a federal agency makes a grant to private industry, and the private company subcontracts part of that grant to your institution, the source of funds that you record is the private company.
- To record sources of funds: Federal Government should include all U.S. Government agencies, Industry should include for-profit organizations, State Government should include all state funds, and Other should include all other sponsors or be the category you use if you can not provide a breakdown by specific categories.

	Federal Government	State Government	Industry	Other	Total
FY2002					
FY2001					
FY2000					
FY1999					
FY1998					
FY1997					

Comments or notes

Illustration University  
FY2002 FY02 Sponsored Projects Administration Benchmarking Performance and Best Practices  
Division of Functional Responsibility (15)

QUESTION NO. 15: Division of Functional Responsibilities

This question is intended to provide a profile of how your institution is structured to conduct sponsored projects administration.

Refer to the definitions on pages 2 and 3. Please choose the description that most closely reflects your institution's structure for sponsored projects administration.

Use this space to provide any explanatory details on the option selected above.

Illustration University  
 FY2002 FY02 Sponsored Projects Administration Benchmarking Performance and Best Practices  
 Degree of Functional Decentralization (16)

## QUESTION NO. 16: Degree of Functional Decentralization

For the sponsored projects administration functions listed below, please indicate your estimate of the degree of centralization or decentralization between the staff in central sponsored projects administration and your institution's constituent organizations (e.g., the specific school/college administering grants, and the departments within the schools administering grants). Estimate the degree to which the function /activity is generally performed centrally or by non-central staff or offices.

Your responses should be estimates of what occurs in those colleges and departments most actively involved in sponsored projects and should not include those programs not actively involved in sponsored projects. This question seeks a measure of where the activities occur in your institution-it is not a comparison of your institution to any other.

1 = Highly Centralized ... 5 = Highly Decentralized

	Degree of Decentralization
a. Disseminating information on funding opportunities to principal investigators (P.I.s); Assisting with proposal preparation tasks.	
b. Reviewing and approving proposals and budgets.	
c. Copying and mailing proposals to sponsors.	
d. Electronically submitting proposals to sponsors.	
e. Managing Award Process: Negotiating terms/conditions for contracts/grants; Receiving/tracking award notices; Setting up initial accounts/accounting entries; Notifying PIs of awards.	
f. Exercising signatory authority to bind the institution (accepting awards and contracts).	
g. Monitoring progress and non-financial reporting requirements and patent requirements.	
h. Preparing consulting and subcontract agreements.	
i. Monitoring consulting and subcontract agreements.	
j. Management and operation of IRBs, animal care and use committees, radiation safety committees, or other regulatory compliance activities.	
k. Performing purchasing for sponsored projects.	
l. Reviewing, approving, monitoring all expenditures for appropriateness; Reviewing/approving cost transfers; Project close-out activities.	
m. Reviewing and approving no-cost extensions and requests for increased funding.	
n. Preparing public relations information about sponsored projects or the research programs of the institution.	
o. Maintaining property management systems.	
p. Performing grant forecasting.	
q. Maintaining grant and contracting accounting records; Managing A-21, A-110 and A-133 compliance.	

Illustration University  
 FY2002 FY02 Sponsored Projects Administration Benchmarking Performance and Best Practices  
 Benchmarking Metrics Self Report

Notes on interpreting benchmarking metric data. The values for each metric constitute the inter-quartile range for all institutions in the study sample.

Top of the First Quartile corresponds to the 25th percentile of institutions in the study sample. 25% of the institutions in the study sample fall at or below this value.

Median corresponds to the 50th percentile. Half of all institutions in the study sample fall below this value and half fall above.

Top of the Third Quartile corresponds to the 75th percentile. 25% of the institutions in the study sample fall at or above this value. Thus, 50% of the institutions in the study sample fall between the Top of the First Quartile and the Top of the Third Quartile. 50% fall outside that range. If your institution falls outside the inter-quartile range, it is in the bottom 25% or the top 25% of institutions in the study sample for that metric.

#### A. Sustaining or Enhancing Sponsored Projects Activity and Funding

These metrics are intended to be high-level indicators of institutional sponsored projects activity. They focus on indicators of faculty participation in sponsored projects, and overall institutional track record in the growth of sponsored projects activity and funding. Variations in faculty participation and activity will be influenced by many factors, including institutional mission, research strengths and priorities, etc.

##### Number of Proposals Submitted per 100 Faculty/Research FTEs

Higher is Better

This metric reflects the intensity of faculty proposal preparation activity. It is likely to be higher if faculty from many units are involved in preparing and submitting proposals for external support; as well as when a higher fraction of faculty within each unit are active in proposal submission.

2000

Count: 57

Top of the First Quartile: 46

Median: 94

Top of Third Quartile: 144

##### Percentage of Faculty/Research Staff Working as Principal Investigators

Higher is better

This metric is an indicator of the competitiveness of faculty activities, the ability of faculty to successfully craft appropriate proposals, and the ability of faculty members to successfully target potential funders for their research and to sell their ideas.

2000

Count: 57

Top of the First Quartile: 22%

Median: 42%

Fourth Quartile: 59%

##### Sponsored Project Dollars (Expenditures) per Faculty/Research FTE

Higher is better

This metric can tell senior administration how productive faculty is in securing external support for their activities. It is an indicator of the effectiveness of faculty proposal development, and the ability of faculty members to successfully target potential sponsors for their research, sell their ideas, and successfully craft appropriate proposals. It can also demonstrate to some extent the success of the research administration function in supporting the faculty in these efforts.

2000

Count: 57

Top of the First Quartile: \$29,687

Median: \$73,091

Top of Third Quartile: \$110,607

##### Number of New Awards as a Percent of Number of New Proposals Submitted

Higher is better

In addition to being a measure of overall effectiveness in proposal development, this percentage metric also reflects the ability of faculty to develop new markets for their ideas. Since this metric is based on the number of new proposals submitted in a year, and the number of new awards for the same year, it is possible to exceed 100% when a number of proposals submitted in prior years are funded, and that causes the number funded in the year to exceed the number submitted.

2000

Count: 51

Top of the First Quartile: 50%

Median: 57%

Top of Third Quartile: 64%

Illustration University  
 FY2002 FY02 Sponsored Projects Administration Benchmarking Performance and Best Practices  
 Benchmarking Metrics Self Report (continued)

B. Containing the Costs & Improving the Efficiency of Sponsored Projects Administration

These metrics focus on overall productivity and efficiency of sponsored projects administration and post-award financial management functions in terms of transaction costs and staffing ratios. Variations in staffing ratios and transaction costs among institutions will be influenced by many factors, including organizational structure and responsibilities, complexity and mix of transactions, process quality, etc.

Number of Proposals Submitted per Central Sponsored Projects Administrative FTE

Higher is better

This metric may measure one or two things: (1) the overall efficiency of sponsored projects administration in the area of proposal development; or (2) the extent to which the sponsored projects administration function is decentralized to academic units.

2000

Count: 58  
 Top of the First Quartile: 54  
 Median: 82  
 Top of Third Quartile: 132

Central Sponsored Projects Administrative Cost per Proposal Submitted

Lower is better

Like the previous metric, this metric also measures either (1) the overall efficiency of sponsored projects administration in the area of proposal development; or (2) the extent to which the sponsored projects administration function is decentralized to academic units.

2000

Count: 58  
 Top of the First Quartile: \$466  
 Median: \$676  
 Top of Third Quartile: \$1,320

Number of Awards per Central Sponsored Projects Administrative FTE

Higher is better

This metric reflects both efficiencies as B1 and B2, as well as the size distribution of funded projects.

2000

Count: 58  
 Top of the First Quartile: 34  
 Median: 64  
 Top of Third Quartile: 101

Central Sponsored Projects Administrative Cost as a Percent of Sponsored Project Dollars Expenditures

Lower is better

Like the previous metric; this percentage metric measures both administrative efficiencies, as well as the size distribution of funded projects.

2000

Count: 58  
 Top of the First Quartile: .6%  
 Median: 1.0%  
 Top of Third Quartile: 2.1%

Number of Funded Projects per Central Post-Award Financial Administrative FTE

Higher is Better

This metric may also be either a measure of administrative efficiency in the post-award, or simply an indicator of the extent to which post-award administration may be decentralized into units.

2000

Count: 58  
 Top of the First Quartile: 61  
 Median: 98  
 Top of Third Quartile: 157

Illustration University  
 FY2002 FY02 Sponsored Projects Administration Benchmarking Performance and Best Practices  
 Benchmarking Metrics Self Report (continued)

B. Containing the Costs & Improving the Efficiency of Sponsored Projects Administration (continued)

Central Post-Award Financial Administrative Cost per Active Project

Lower is better

Like the previous metric, this metric also reflects both administrative efficiencies, or the extent to which post-award administration may be decentralized into units.

2000

Count: 58  
 Top of the First Quartile: \$300  
 Median: \$445  
 Top of Third Quartile: \$724

Sponsored Project Dollars per Central Post-Award Financial Administrative FTE

Higher is better

Like the previous two metrics, this metric also reflects both administrative efficiencies, or the extent to which post-award administration may be decentralized into units. This metric may reflect post-award administrative efficiencies, as well as the extent to which the institution's project portfolio is tilted toward larger dollar projects.

2000

Count: 58  
 Top of the First Quartile: \$3.98 Millions  
 Median: \$7.21 Millions  
 Top of Third Quartile: \$11.36 Millions

Central Post-Award Financial Administrative Cost as a Percent of Sponsored Project Expenditures

Lower is better

Like the previous three metrics, this metric also reflects both administrative efficiencies, or the extent to which post-award administration may be decentralized into units. This metric may reflect post-award administrative efficiencies, as well as the extent to which the institution's project portfolio is tilted toward larger dollar projects.

2000

Count: 58  
 Top of the First Quartile: .4%  
 Median: .7%  
 Top of Third Quartile: 1.1%

C. Measuring Administrative Staffing Support

These metrics focus on administrative staffing ratios relative to faculty population served. They are intended to provide indicators of the efficiency and adequacy of administrative service levels. Variations in staffing ratios will be caused by many factors, including organizational structure and responsibilities, nature of service provided, and level of service demands.

Number of Funded Principal Investigators per Central Sponsored Projects Administrative FTE

Higher is better – measuring efficiency

This is a measure of administrative efficiency and effectiveness (hits per unit cost of administration).

2000

Count: 58  
 Top of the First Quartile: 20  
 Median: 36  
 Top of Third Quartile: 52

Illustration University  
FY2002 FY02 Sponsored Projects Administration Benchmarking Performance and Best Practices  
Benchmarking Metrics Self Report (continued)

C. Measuring Administrative Staffing Support (continued)

Number of Funded Principal Investigators per Central Post-Award Financial administrative FTE

Higher is better

This metric reflects both efficiencies in post-award administration, as well the size distribution of funded projects.

2000

Count: 57

Top of the First Quartile: 27

Median: 42

Top of Third Quartile: 63

D. Maintaining and Improving Institutional and Sponsor Accountability

This metric is an indicator of the effectiveness of institutional practices in billing and collection of sponsored projects receivables.

Percent of Sponsored Projects Accounts Receivable over 120 Days Old

Lower is better

2000

Count: 46

Top of the First Quartile: 7%

Median: 16%

Top of Third Quartile: 27%

## Illustration University

## FY2002 FY02 Sponsored Projects Administration Benchmarking Performance and Best Practices

## A. Practices to Promote Faculty Participation

## Practices to Promote Faculty Participation in Research and Sponsored Activities

The purpose of the following questions is to document institutional sponsored project administration practices and policies with respect to incentives for faculty participation in research/sponsored programs. For the purposes of these questions, include only programs or practices that are funded or initiated at the central institutional level (e.g. the institution's chief research or academic officer).

For Questions 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7, use the following definitions in choosing the level of deployment of the practice:

- No: The practice or policy does not exist.
- Concept Only: The practice or policy exists in concept, but no formal or systematic approach is under implementation.
- Beginning: A formal and systematic approach has been started, but with major gaps in implementation or concept that inhibit progress in achieving our ultimate goals.
- Intermediate: A sound systematic approach, responsive to primary objectives. No major gaps in implementation, though some areas in very early stages.
- Advanced: A sound, systematic approach fully responsive to overall objectives. Approach is relatively well deployed with no major gaps.

1. Does the institution have reassigned time or relief policies and procedures available for faculty members to cover their other responsibilities when they take on research or other sponsored activities?

2. Reassigned-time practices are managed by (check all that apply):

Department heads or Center directors

College Deans

Institutional executives

System executives

Other (identify below):

Identify Other:

3. Does the institution provide proposal writing and editing assistance (through contract support or with in-house staff) to support faculty and staff ?

Identify Other:

4. Does the institution provide funds for gathering early-stage data (pilot projects or preliminary experiments to generate data to make a proposal more competitive) to include in proposals?

5. Does the institution provide start-up funds to new faculty members to get their externally-sponsored projects underway?

6. Does the institution provide funds to academic units based on levels of F&A cost recovery from sponsored activities?

7. Does the institution have formal recognition activities to promote faculty participation in research or other sponsored activities?



Illustration University

FY2002 FY02 Sponsored Projects Administration Benchmarking Performance and Best Practices

A. Practices to Promote Faculty Participation (continued)

8. Institutional recognition activities are managed by (check all that apply):

Department heads or Center directors

College deans

Institutional executives

System executives

Other (identify below):

Identify Other:

9. How are externally-sponsored activities treated in your institutional faculty promotion and tenure policies? Check any that apply:

Research and other externally sponsored activities are not considered in our policies.

Research is a primary factor in our promotion and tenure policies.

Research is a secondary factor in our promotion and tenure policies.

Other sponsored activity (service, training, demonstration) is a primary factor in our promotion and tenure policies.

Other sponsored activity (service, training, demonstration) is a secondary factor in our promotion and tenure policies.

Other (identify below):

Identify Other:

Illustration University  
FY2002 FY02 Sponsored Projects Administration Benchmarking Performance and Best Practices  
B. Practices for Staff Development

Practices for Staff Development for Sponsored Program Administration

The purpose of the following questions is to document institutional sponsored project administration practices and policies with respect to the training and career development for research administrators. For the purposes of these questions, include only programs or practices that are funded or initiated at the central institutional level (e.g., the institution's chief research or academic officer).

For Questions 1 and 2, use the following definitions in choosing the level of deployment of the practice:

- No: The practice or policy does not exist.
- Concept Only: The practice or policy exists in concept, but no formal or systematic approach is under implementation.
- Beginning: A formal and systematic approach has been started, but with major gaps in implementation or concept that inhibit progress in achieving our ultimate goals.
- Intermediate: A sound systematic approach, responsive to primary objectives. No major gaps in implementation, though some areas in very early stages.
- Advanced: A sound, systematic approach fully responsive to overall objectives. Approach is relatively well deployed with no major gaps.

1. Does the institution provide a formal in-house or in-service training program for staff with research administration responsibilities?
2. Does the institution have an internal certification requirement that must be met in order to exercise varying levels of delegated authority?
3. Does national certification of research administrators play a role in selection and promotion of research administrators?
4. Does the institution have formal job classification elements which can be used on positions throughout the organization that cover research administration positions?

## Illustration University

## FY2002 FY02 Sponsored Projects Administration Benchmarking Performance and Best Practices

## C. Practices for Organizing and Managing

## Practices for Organizing and Managing Sponsored Program Administration in the Institution

The following questions are designed to elicit information about practices for organizing and managing sponsored project administration in a decentralized environment.

For these questions, use the following definitions in choosing the level of deployment of the practice:

- No: The practice or policy does not exist.
- Concept Only: The practice or policy exists in concept, but no formal or systematic approach is under implementation.
- Beginning: A formal and systematic approach has been started, but with major gaps in implementation or concept that inhibit progress in achieving our ultimate goals.
- Intermediate: A sound systematic approach, responsive to primary objectives. No major gaps in implementation, though some areas in very early stages.
- Advanced: A sound, systematic approach fully responsive to overall objectives. Approach is relatively well deployed with no major gaps.

1. Does the institution delegate signatory authority for institutional approval of proposals to levels below the institutional level (e.g., schools, colleges, other academic or research units or departments)?
2. Does the institution delegate institutional signatory authority for proposals and awards to more than one individual in the central sponsored programs office in addition to the institution's primary authorizing official?
3. Does the institution fully or partially fund research administration positions at academic unit levels from institutional funds?
4. Does the institution's central SPA office employ research administration staff who are assigned to and located within academic units to support activities there?
5. Does the institution have a formal mechanism for coordinating research administration activities at all levels of the institution (e.g., research administration advisory committee, or other representative body)?
6. Does the institution have an adequate system of grants management policies and procedures in place as a means of ensuring consistency of treatment in similar situations? In answering this question an adequate system generally includes coverage in the following areas: proposal and application costing, other support, program income, effort reporting, conflicts of interest.
7. Does the institution have in place and conduct a program of ongoing institution-wide training on grants and contracts management policy and procedures for research faculty and staff and staff with research administration roles responsibilities in the conduct and administration of externally supported research and training.
8. Does the institution have a comprehensive matrix of roles and responsibilities that identifies the individuals, e.g., the responsible institutional official, principal investigators, department chairs, departmental administrators, deans, sponsored projects staff, and others who have specific roles and responsibilities in the conduct and administration of Federally sponsored projects, especially biomedical and behavioral research and research training supported by federal grants and contracts?

Illustration University  
FY2002 FY02 Sponsored Projects Administration Benchmarking Performance and Best Practices  
Comments, Suggestions, Complaints...

This Web version of the SP survey was

Data entry was

Printed output was

The validity checking was

We will take this survey again next year

Comments or suggestions?