

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW 2002-2003
UNIVERSITY PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL'S EVALUATION
for the
Office of Sponsored Programs
SERVICE/RESEARCH CENTER

I. COUNCIL'S GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE CENTER

The Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) facilitates the acquisition of grants and other funding by faculty. It has existed for 17 years and is an important component of a University seeking excellence. While OSP has made some significant progress over the past few years, the importance of increasing the University's acquisition of external resources is becoming more and more essential to the mission of this university. It is vital that any campus perception that external support is "ancillary to teaching and service" be changed. Grants should be seen as supporting research, teaching, and service (in fact, there are several cases of grant-supported teaching and service related projects).

The Council would like to suggest a paradigm shift in the way OSP's relationship to the campus community is viewed. The one-on-one work that Jackie Givens has provided to many faculty has clearly been very successful on a small scale, but this model will necessarily limit expansion if more and more faculty and units become involved in grant work. The roles and responsibilities of OSP and various academic units in grant acquisition must be clearly defined if we are to significantly expand our efforts in this arena. We suggest that this office work with faculty and administrators across the Colleges/Schools to develop a 2 to 5 year strategic plan to increase grant acquisitions at the university. Specific objectives with clear implementation strategies should be identified and include the resources needed to achieve these goals.

Focus of Evaluation

Self-Study Eval

Council's Eval

PRODUCTIVITY INDICATORS

II. Summary of Center's Overall Productivity
Council's Observations:

Very Strong

Satisfactory

There are dollar amounts of grants provided and numbers of faculty the OSP has serviced. The supplemental response to the self-study provides additional data (e.g., 54% of proposals submitted in 2001 were funded). We also wonder how other OSP's within our system compare after 17 years of existence as well as over the last five years; i.e. "hit rates" per number of proposals submitted, dollar averages, etc. How many dollars are the result of grants repeated or follow-up due to faculty success and requiring little, if any support effort, by the OSP?

Suggest including additional measures to assess effectiveness and to compare with other OSP units in USG.

II A. Fulfillment of the Center's Purpose & Attainment of Goals
Council's Observations:

Very Strong

Satisfactory

The efforts to redirect staff to the OSP office area to support post-award administration should be commended. We have come a long way in reducing some of the challenges our PI's faced in this arena.

The Council would like to see the goals per year for the last five years, as well as goals this year, to be able to support the productivity claims. There is no doubt that the OSP "sees its ultimate charge as increasing the level of sponsored programs at the University so KSU can fulfill its mission." This implies

proactive influence and commitment to jointly defined College and department goals of faculty throughout the university. The support effort is important but there must be a shared commitment and accountability for actual results.

II B. Services Rendered by the Center to the Campus Community **Very Strong** **Satisfactory**
Council's Observations:

The self-study reports many activities performed by the OSP. What appears to be missing is the effectiveness of these activities in terms of (a) focused efforts in high priority areas jointly defined by client and customer groups (i.e. deans, department chairs, center directors), (2) jointly defined goals that are assessed, (c) OSP goals – one year, three year, five year in terms of expectations, addressing short-falls of current performance levels, innovations in operations and provision of services, and professional development of OSP staff. Specific effectiveness measures are needed for the distribution process of award opportunities and semester workshops that are offered (e.g., how many faculty seek assistance for grants they identified from the newsletter? How many workshop participants go on to write grants that are funded?).

II C. Services Rendered by the Center to External Communities **Satisfactory** **Satisfactory**
Council's Observations:

OSP has no responsibility to the external community.

II D. Grants & Contracts Acquired by the Center **Not Applicable** **Satisfactory**
Council's Observations:

It is recognized that OSP “assumes credit for the increase in the level of sponsored programs,” and that “KSU faculty apply for and receive grants and contracts, not the OSP.” The Council feels that OSP and academic leadership needs to be more proactive in order to influence the entire process. Academic units and OSP should jointly be held accountable for achievement of shared goals and objectives. The paradigm that internal consulting units are “advisory and supportive” is diminishing in business organizations. Academic organizations need to rethink internal support units in terms of effectiveness criteria and assessment; especially given the economic realities today. Education is being asked to be more accountable for outcomes and demonstrate effectiveness by accreditation agencies as well as society. This will necessitate a paradigm change in the relationships with internal “support” units. Quality, effectiveness, and process excellence is the responsibility of everyone at KSU – not just specific units.

II E. Center Publications, Reports, & Professional Presentations **Not Applicable** **Satisfactory**
Council's Observations:

While OSP publishes the monthly *Grants Opportunities Newsletter* and the *Annual Report*, provides workshops, and makes conference presentations, there is no indication of the quality of these efforts.

II F. Sponsorships, Endowments & Gifts Acquired for the Center **Not Applicable** **Weak**
Council's Observations:

The Council respectfully asks “why not?” There must be opportunities for proposals to enhance internal collaboration, enhance process excellence through the use of technology, etc. OSP is self-supporting because of use of indirects from grants support OSP activities.

II G. Sales, Service Fees, & Income Generating Activity **Not Applicable** **?**
Council's Observations:

OSP does not see itself as a revenue-generating unit. Is there a need to consider this unit as a cost center that has the ability to share its expertise throughout the university and possibly offer services to external sources, on a fee basis; esp. in the not-for-profit area.

II H. Return on Investment **Very Strong** **Strong**
 Council's Observations:

Annual budget for OSP is \$215,000 (including salaries for the Director, Associate Director, and Administrative Assistant, and the operating budget). Last year OSP played a critical role in acquiring over \$5,000,000 in grants and contracts for the University.

II I. Contribution to Achieving KSU's Mission **Very Strong** **Strong**
 Council's Observations:

It is the position of the Council that the OSP is supportive of the mission of KSU. A rating of very strong could be achieved if the campus paradigm shift is successful. The importance of OSP and grant acquisition to a thriving and growing regional university cannot be understated.

QUALITY INDICATORS

III. Summary Conclusions About the Strength of the Center's Overall Quality **Very Strong** **Satisfactory**
 Council's Observations:

In 17 years there have been no compliance problems cited by state, federal, BOR or granting agencies. While this is certainly a statement about quality, the Council would like to see elements of the quality assessment put in place in order to demonstrate evidence of continuous measurement and continuous improvement.

III A. Public Recognition, Honors & Awards Received by the Center **Not Applicable** **Weak**
 Council's Observations:

There must be opportunities for internal and external recognition by clients served as well as professional associations to indicate quality achievement recognition.

III B. Stakeholder Satisfaction with the Center's Work & Accomplishments **Very Strong** **Satisfactory**
 Council's Observations:

The one-on-one support given to individual faculty is seen as highly valuable by those individuals. While 83% of faculty survey reported that OSP was responsive to their needs, there is no evidence of the quality of the services provided. Detailed information should be gathered from the respondents who rated OSP as "somewhat responsive." As important is soliciting information from faculty and administration and center directors who do not use the services of OSP. The limited responses of customer satisfaction indicated opportunities to improve and we saw no follow-up to address issues and create proactive development plans.

III C. Other Assessments of the Quality of the Center's Work **Very Strong** **Strong**
 Council's Observations:

Program Review for **Office of Sponsored Programs**

III D. Center's Responsiveness to State Needs & Changing Conditions **Not Applicable** **Weak**
Council's Observations:

Throughout the Council's assessment is that changing economic conditions and Board of Regents funding shortfalls requires new paradigms to meet internal needs and external expectations. The OSP and academic leadership must engage in this thinking and make changes that reflect innovation, joint accountability to outcomes, and continuous improvement.

III E. Quality of the Faculty & Staff Supporting the Center **Very Strong** **Very Strong**
Council's Observations

Very dedicated staff. Redirection of personnel to support grant administration has been very successful.

III F. Quality of KSU Facilities & Equipment Supporting the Center **Very Strong** **Very Strong**
Council's Observations:

III G. Quality of the Overall Annual Financial Investment **Satisfactory** **Very Strong**
in the Operation of the Center
Council's Observations:

Again one must assess the "comparative group" off what are the objectives, goals, and expected results given the current resources and use of technology. In addition, the roles and responsibilities and ways of coordinating internally give rise to issues of increased investment. The supplemental response indicates, at a minimum, an additional staff person to support one-on-one work with faculty writing grants is essential. What is the long-range plan for OSP and how will additional staff accomplish those objectives? Should we consider a more de-centralized model to advance grantsmanship (e.g., an OSP support person in appropriate college/school)?

III H. Quality of Advanced Technology Available to the Center **Very Strong** **Very Strong**
Council's Observations:

III I. Leadership Position of the Center **Very Strong** **Satisfactory**
Council's Observations:

There are no measurements offered to support the self-evaluation. What is the vision for OSP for next 2-5 years? What has it been for the last 5 years. How has this been communicated throughout the campus?

IV. CENTER'S VIABILITY AT KSU **Very Strong** **Very Strong**
Council's Observations:
Essential!

V. MODEL CENTER POTENTIAL **Very Strong** **Satisfactory**
Council's Observations:

Model status can only arise from innovative approaches to achieving joint objectives, forward looking leadership, and being "benchmarked" with the "best of the best."

VI. COUNCIL'S OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE PLANS FOR IMPROVING QUALITY & PRODUCTIVITY

VII. EXPAND, MAINTAIN CONSOLIDATE, OR DISCONTINUE **Not Evaluated** **Expand**
Council's Observations:

Expansion should be accompanied by a strategic plan with specified goals and objectives that can be measured for quality and productivity.

COUNCIL'S RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP

- **The University must provide the commitment and resources to increase external funding if we are to continue as a dynamic, innovative, and thriving institution.**
- **Paradigm shift in the thinking between how OSP and faculty in the College/Schools work together must take place in order to significantly advance acquisition of external resources. While the one-on-one support provided to individual faculty has allowed us to develop to the place we are now, a different model is needed to take us to the next phase.**
- **OSP should work with faculty and administrators to develop a 2 yr to 5 yr strategic plan of OSP and identify university commitment to resources to implement the plan.**
- **Clarify the roles and responsibilities between OSP and the Office of Development regarding funding from Foundations.**
- **Develop more systematic assessment of quality and productivity indicators.**