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Objectives

Better understanding of perceived values.

A model that can be ‘tweaked’ for your own use.

Knowledge that better service can be provided without mega bucks.
Challenges With Current Metrics

Office of Research Administration is a business unit within a non-profit, academic setting.

Established financial performance metrics not always appropriate.

Current emphasis of research funding.

Increased accountability and regulations.

Lack of academic research in this area.
Is There a Better Method?

Balanced Scorecard (Kaplan & Norton, 1992)

Businesses need to look at non-financial factors.

Consistent, reliable, and comprehensive system of measurements.

Look beyond the numbers to better the numbers
Is There an Even Better Method?

The Balanced Scorecard later modified for non-profit sector by Niven (2003)

- Internal Business Perspective
- Employee Learning & Growth Perspective
- Financial Perspective
- Customer Perspective

Driving force in non-profits to determine other perspectives.

Focus of research study.
Who determines the relevant factors for the Balanced Scorecard?

Customers are a Captive Audience – no choice in the matter.

Research the customers/user groups –
Principal Investigators (Faculty)
Department Administrators (Staff)
How can we determine relevant factors for Balanced Scorecard?

What services do these two user groups perceive as important for Office of Research Administration to provide?

Determine if these services are similar or different between the two groups.

Determine if demographic (public vs. private) factors play a role in the preferences of the two groups.
The Research Plan

Online Survey – Four Pages

22 services listed

1 open-ended question

Initially asked to rate the importance of each of the 22 services using a Likert scale.

Then asked which of the 22 services were currently available at their current institutions.
The Research Plan

80 institutions were identified.

40 Public Institutions
20 Very High Research
20 High Research

40 Private Institutions
20 Very High Research
20 High Research
The Research Plan

Received responses from 72 different institutions.

Response Rate -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PI Responses</th>
<th>DA Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>433/1450</td>
<td>235/1040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institution Breakdown -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PI Survey</th>
<th>DA Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 public</td>
<td>33 private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 public</td>
<td>29 private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Research Plan

Population Breakdown –

- PI Survey - 33.7% public 66.3% private
- DA Survey - 51.9% public 48.1% private

Respondents primarily from Medical/Health Sciences colleges and universities.

- PI – 87.9%
- DA – 60.6%
18 of 22 services scored $\geq 50\%$ by both groups as “Important” or “Very Important”.

4 of the 18 services scored $\geq 90\%$ by both groups as “Important” or “Very Important”.

5 additional services scored $\geq 90\%$ only by department administrators as “Important” or “Very Important”.
What is important to both groups

*Services shared by PIs and DAs –*

Phone messages returned in 24-48 hours.

Easy access to forms.

Internal account set-up in a timely basis.

Email messages returned in 24-48 hours.
What is important to one group?

_Additional services from DAs only—_

- Training for new DAs.
- Training updates for staff.
- Easy access to policies.
- Equal treatment for all departments.
- Team effort attitude displayed by central personnel.
What other factors bring value to the Office of Research Administration?

Unexpected large number of responses received from both groups to the open-ended question.

Pls - 121  DAs - 106

Four themes

Staffing Related
Communication Related
Online Related
Survey Items Related
Are both user groups related?

*Between the groups:* Conducted Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel (linear by linear) chi square analysis to find significant differences.

*Significant differences between PIs and DAs:*

- Friendly phone tone
  - More important to DAs than to PIs
- Confidential hotline
  - More important to DAs than to PIs.
Are user groups related demographically?

Chi-square analysis – ordinal cross-tabulate

**PI Group:**
Type of Institution - Public versus Private
Amount of Individual Research Funding

**DA Group:**
Type of Institution – Public versus Private
Amount of Research Funding in Portfolio
Are user groups related demographically?

**PI Group: Type of Institution**

Importance of training updates.

69.3% of public rate as “Very Important” vs. 61.2% of private.

**PI Group: Amount of Research Funding**

Flexibility in negotiations.

The lower the amount of funding, the more need for flexibility.

Same person pre-award and post-award.

The larger the amount of funding, the less important to deal with the same person.
Are user groups related demographically?

**DA Group: Type of Institution**

- Flexibility in negotiations.
  - 43% of public rate as “Very Important” vs. 31% of private.

- Technical Assistance.
  - 62% of public rate as “Very Important” vs. 45% of private

**DA Group: Amount of Research Funding**

- Same person pre-award and post award.
  - 40% of < $10 Million rated as “Very Important” (N = 8).
Internal Business Perspective

New employee trainings provided centrally.
Confidential hotline operated centrally.
Training updates conducted by central personnel.
Easy access to forms maintained centrally.
Easy access to policies provided centrally.
Technical assistance from central unit.
Employee Learning & Growth Perspective

Phone messages returned within 24-48 hours.
Respond to email messages within 24-48 hours.
Process internal account setup paperwork on a timely basis.
Communicate end date notifications for research awards.
Answer phone calls with friendly tone.
Promote a team effort attitude towards research.
Financial Perspective

Notices of general funding opportunities compiled centrally.

Funding notices personalized towards research expertise.

Flexibility in negotiations regarding research.

Web listing of available funding opportunities.

Billings and collections done centrally.

Equal treatment through the institution.
Implication for Practice

Tool in determining strategic allocation of resources.

Prioritization of service offerings.

Ability to adapt for other service centers within institution and can be used at Department/College level.

Can adapt scorecard towards specific user groups.
There’s more to come......

Any questions????
Related Findings

Lack of knowledge on part of both PIs and DAs of the total amount of research dollars at current institution.

30% of PIs either did not know or incorrectly stated total amount of research dollars.

28% of DAs either did not know or incorrectly stated total amount of research dollars.
Related Findings

Opposing results regarding organizational structure.

PIs prefer dealing with one individual for both pre-award & post award. (58.5%)

DAs prefer dealing with different individuals for pre-award and post award. (58.6%)

Designation of Certified Research Administrator and Flexible Hours of Operation not considered “Important” or “Very Important” by ≥50% of both groups.
Comments

**Staffing**

“Enough personnel for both pre and post award to handle the workload without crisis.”

“The office is often under-staffed which leads to bottlenecks.”

**Retention**

**Competence**

**Service Attitude**
Comments

Communication

“listing of who does what.”

Designate one person just to answer the phones and direct calls to the correct staff member.

Promote communications between other departments at the institution.

Timely
Comments

Online

Use it more!
Online transmissions – especially IRB.
Online library of forms and templates.
Online trainings.
Principal investigators whom valued consistency and equal treatment also desired flexibility in the negotiation process.

PIs want quicker negotiations of contracts.

DAs stressed “maintaining a team approach.”
Summary

PIs and DAs value similar services but the degrees of value may differ between the groups.

DAs place higher emphasis on training services than do PIs.

Demographics do not play a major role in the perceptions of either group.

Approximately 3 out of 10 individuals are not aware of correct amount of total research funding at their current institution.
Thank you for your attention!