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About This Report

The National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA) is a national organization of over 7,000 members. NCURA serves its members and advances the field of research administration through education and professional development programs, the sharing of knowledge and experience, and by fostering a professional, collegial, and respected community.

This document focuses on sharing knowledge and experience as a result of the recently conducted review of the research administration area of sponsored programs. Our objectives are to provide the institution with feedback on the institution’s management in support of research and to share recommendations and national best practices that might be considered at the institution.

While the review utilizes the NCURA Standards for Effective Sponsored Programs Operations, the Reviewers recognize that policies and practices vary at institutions and that not all Standards are applicable to each institution.

The NCURA Peer Review process is based on interviews with various stakeholders involved in research and research administration areas of sponsored programs. However, the NCURA Peer Review process does not necessarily validate information or data provided by individuals or departments in preparing this report. Further, the NCURA Peer Review does not evaluate personnel, nor does it perform an audit function. The results of this review, therefore, should not be used to make human resource decisions. It should not be used to evaluate departments outside the scope of the NCURA review (and is thus limited to use in assessments of Research Administration/Office of Sponsored Programs). Nor can the use of the results help assure fiscal, regulatory, or ethical compliance with federal, state, or local regulations. The recommendations offered in this review report should not be construed as an exhaustive list as these recommendations necessarily represent an analysis by a particular set of Reviewers and at a single point in time and based on interviews and procedures and processes of certain stakeholders and Research Administration/Office of Sponsored Programs procedures and processes that are contemporaneous to the issuance of this report.

Just as a decision to follow a recommendation cannot ensure regulatory or audit sufficiency, a decision by an institution “not” to adopt one or more recommendations does not necessarily mean that the institution is failing to meet legal requirements. Rather, the recommendations reflect an opinion of peer research administrators who are active in the field and familiar with structures and approaches at other institutions. There may, however, be elements of the local history, environment, or culture of which they may not have been fully cognizant. This document does not provide legal advice.
NCURA does not warrant that the information discussed in this report is legally sufficient.

The Executive Summary provides an overview of the report. The Current Environment for Sponsored Programs section discusses the many influences and pressures that have recently impacted research administration and created some of the current stresses. The remaining sections provide a detailed discussion of the Standards as applied to this institution and includes notable practices and recommendations throughout, along with the rationale for each.

NCURA will treat the contents of this report as confidential and will not disclose nor distribute the report outside individuals affiliated with the peer review program. There are no such restrictions on how the institution chooses to utilize the report.
Executive Summary

The National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA) would like to commend the University of New Mexico for undertaking an open and comprehensive review of the research administration infrastructure. The strong support for administrative efficiencies and accountability is evident with the decision of institutional leadership and the community to engage in a process that allows all members to participate and contribute.

The NCURA Peer Review Program is premised on the belief that it is a critical part of this review process to include experienced research administrators who have significant careers and are engaged nationally. This external validation allows UNM to incorporate best practices and models into their final action plans.

An evaluation of the research administration of sponsored programs at the University of New Mexico was conducted at the request of Vice President for Research Gabriel López. The evaluation was performed in November 2019 (site visit on Nov. 13 – 15, 2019; Appendix C for the Charge Letter and Appendix D for the site visit itinerary) by a Peer Review Team from NCURA (Appendix B for Bios).

The evaluation was framed by the Standards for Effective Sponsored Programs Operations (Appendix A) for the research administration of sponsored project activities. These Standards cover institutional expectations and commitments, policies, procedures and education, the central and unit-level operations supporting research and scholarship, and the relationship and partnerships across all institutional functions.
The NCURA Peer Review Team wishes to express its gratitude to the Office of the VPR, the Office of the Controller, and especially the Office of Sponsored Projects, who contributed to the compilation of materials that were provided to the Team, as well as to the assistance and hospitality provided during the site visit.

The University of New Mexico (UNM) is the flagship university in the State of New Mexico and is comprised of its main campus in Albuquerque and four system campuses in Gallup, Los Alamos, Taos, and Valencia County. UNM also has a Health Sciences Center (HSC) in Albuquerque. Although the HSC was not part of this review, the main campus and Health Science Center collaborate in both academic and research endeavors.

UNM most recently launched a university-wide strategic plan in 2018, referred to as UNM2020, and the Vice President for Research (VPR), Gabriel López, launched a five-year Research Strategic Plan in Fiscal Year (FY) 2017. The Research Strategic Plan complements both UNM2020 and the Grand Challenges initiative announced by the UNM President in the Spring of 2019. UNM2020 and the VPR’s strategic plans engaged both internal and external stakeholders when creating these plans. The VPR is commended for having a strategic plan that is referenced by UNM2020 as part of UNM’s strategy to advance discovery and innovation.

Given that the Office of Sponsored Projects (OSP) and Contract & Grant Accounting (C&G) appear to be one combined office within the organization chart for the Controller, the Peer Review Team views OSP as a combined pre- and post-award office reporting to one Director. For the purposes of this report, the Peer Review Team will reference the organizations as follows:

➢ Office of Sponsored Projects (OSP) as the combined pre- and post-award organization;
➢ OSP Pre-Award (OSP PA) as the proposal/award/contract teams; and
➢ OSP Contract & Grant Accounting (OSP C&G) as the post award teams.

The relationship between OSP C&G and central offices (e.g., Office of University Council (OUC), University Audit) are positive for the most part. The relationship between the Faculty Research Development Office (FRDO) and OSP is commendable, and the relationship between the University of New Mexico Foundation (an affiliated 501(c)3 organization) and OSP is praiseworthy.

In this report, we present a number of recommendations based on several thematic areas. In particular, the report discusses and makes recommendations in the following areas expanded upon in the remainder of the executive summary:

➢ The organization and structure of the sponsored programs offices
➢ UNM’s approach towards risk and risk management
➢ Communication and feedback mechanisms
➢ Training for faculty and staff

**Organization of Sponsored Programs Offices**

UNM made a decision to combine OSP PA and C&G with a primary reporting line to the Controller and a “dotted” reporting line to the VPR. It is common for a combined office to report either to the scientific or financial leadership. Dual reporting adds complexity and often stretches roles because the involved leaders must be unified in their mission and vision and must convey their shared vision to their direct reports and throughout the organization. Dual reporting necessitates the creation of a shared vision and development of strategies for implementing that shared vision. Continuity and predictability are key.

The Peer Review Team heard that constituents are unclear about the respective roles and responsibilities of the VPR and the Controller. As a result, constituents are sometimes unsure who to approach for problem resolution and where the authority lies to resolve both transactional issues and more systemic challenges. There can and should be a healthy tension between customer service and compliance, and this necessitates close coordination between the offices responsible for the research administration lifecycle. The constituents that the Peer Review Team met provided feedback that described the pre-award and post-award staff as two separate offices rather than a continuum. Attention is needed to balance the competing demands of customer service and compliance in the pre-award and post-award functions.

Both the OSP C&G staff and the FRDO/Faculty Research Support Officer (FRSO) staff demonstrate a true team identity, valuing each other as resources and valuing their leaders as advocates. OSP PA staff do not seem to demonstrate this same team identity.

Nearly all groups reported angst and confusion related to the high turnover and current lack of expertise (due to inexperience) in OSP PA. The Peer Review Team heard that they had to work with new people frequently on both proposals and awards; they were not notified when staff left and a new person was assigned to their transaction; and newly assigned staff were not well-versed in the field of research administration. The Peer Review Team felt that the OSP PA staff are working hard and are highly committed but their core knowledge and skills are at an elementary level. They are eager to learn and be trained but they require significantly more time-in-grade and additional knowledgeable mentors. Based on experience, the Peer Review Team believes it normally takes a solid two years for a pre-award staff member to achieve core competency in the profession and contracting staff typically take longer than that. That same two-year period would also hold true for post-award staff members.
There is a mission-critical need to stabilize OSP PA staff, including filling all OSP PA vacant positions as soon as possible. UNM would be well served to fill the Contracts Team vacancy with a senior qualified contract manager, preferably an individual with sponsored projects experience to help with the continued mentoring of existing staff. If UNM decides to combine the Awards and Contracts Manager positions, recruitment of an individual experienced with contracts becomes even more critical. Additionally, the Peer Review Team heard several comments about OSP’s staff leaving for departmental jobs or HSC jobs that had better compensation levels. UNM should assess and adjust OSP’s compensation levels to aid in equitable compensation, which will facilitate employee retention.

The Peer Review Team felt that UNM would benefit by shifting OSP PA to a constituency-based structure consistent with OSP C&G. Faculty, departments, and FRSOs all expressed a desire to build a relationship with their OSP staff members; it was indicated that they are able to do so with OSP C&G staff and wish to do so with OSP PA. The constituency-based structure has the added benefit of allowing staff to become cross-trained in agencies. In addition, the Peer Review Team believes a “floater” sponsored programs specialist should be added to better manage peak periods in proposal workload, vacations, and vacancies.

Although the Health Sciences Center (HSC) was not part of this review, the Peer Review Team was asked to provide an overview of comments received. The Peer Review Team heard that some offices support both the Main Campus and HSC (e.g., IACUC and Internal Audit) but there are two separate pre- and post-award offices. The HSC pre-award office does not use Cayuse. The most common piece of feedback the Peer Review Team received was the inability of the two campuses to solve Facilities and Administrative (F&A) distribution between the two campuses when they collaborate on a proposal submission. This is perceived as a major disincentive to the main and branch campus faculty.

**Formal Training Mechanisms**

There is generally a significant lack of training for both central and unit staff in research administration at UNM. There is a distinct lack of foundational training related to research regulations and requirements and on how those regulations and requirements pertain to day to day operational activities. Staff can do their jobs more effectively if they understand the boundaries within which they can appropriately operate. We heard an example of a faculty member who was required to get agency approval for budget changes despite the fact that the university already had the authority to make such changes internally. In some cases, faculty were informing OSP of what the regulation said – this should not happen. OSP staff should already know the rules and regulations and, perhaps more importantly, they should understand why such regulations are in place. UNM has already taken a big step to ameliorate this
problem by creating the Research Administrator Network (RAN) Workgroup to design campus training and education.

An internally cohesive training program (centrally across research administrative units and in academic units) should be created that focuses on internal, consistent training among all OSP personnel that incorporates foundational theory, hard skills, and soft skills, such as communication, organization, time management, and customer service. In addition, UNM should continue its work on a resource portal that would be available to all research administrators (and faculty) to provide a consistent repository of policy, best practices, procedures, and job aids.

There is a mixed response on the issue of PI training; some found it useful when they were starting out, others felt it was not valuable. There is a question about how to keep continuing education “fresh” and useful for senior faculty.

Risk and Risk Management
Research involves risk. For example, there is a risk from sponsored project non-compliance, information technology (IT) data breaches, Title IX non-compliance, and reputational risk. The VPR and the Controller will need to work together to understand the degree of risk that represents the acceptable collective institutional standard in advancing research at the institution. This will in turn position both the VPR and Controller to be optimally supportive of the OSP staff and other research compliance offices as they grapple with the day to day activities of research administration.

The Peer Review Team noted that UNM’s policies and procedures depict a research environment that is risk averse—atypical of a Research I institution. This is demonstrated via redundant reviews and checks and balances that are unlikely to yield benefit commensurate with the time expended and its associated cost. The Peer Review Team heard that, in many cases, review processes were leading to very low occurrence of transactions needing correction. Typically, a rate of error that is in the low single digits signifies adequacy of internal controls. Adding subsequent review cycles to completely reduce error or eliminate risk is counterproductive. This level of scrutiny may be perfectly appropriate for staff that are in training, but such scrutiny contributes to a lack of staff empowerment as well as process delays. Other mechanisms, such as monitoring or sampling, can help detect problems without stifling the research process. In our opinion, UNM’s appetite for risk is out of balance with its peers. Increased risk tolerance will likely encourage growth, reduce faculty administrative burden, increase time available to faculty for research, and improve faculty satisfaction, as well as incur reduced or slow growth of administrative costs during research expansion. If the institution instead needs to or prefers to keep its existing internal control structure, it will be necessary to invest significant additional resources into both administrative personnel and electronic systems to create high-functioning and efficient processes.
Communications and Feedback Processes
During the site visit, the Peer Review Team heard a significant amount of feedback on the absence of consistent and timely feedback and communication related to change in procedures, change in staffing assignments, change in policy or policy interpretation, inconsistent application of existing rules, inability to explain why a ruling has been made, or why a change is needed. Some PIs end up “shopping” for answers. There was concern about lack of responsiveness to emails or calls at many levels of the organization. Websites were better than before but contain broken links or are changed without notifying constituents.

Although the background materials provided to the Review Team indicated that policies would be shared for comment with faculty, faculty reported that this was not occurring on a regular basis and that it was unclear who is responsible for drafting, providing input on, or updating key communications or policies. Roles and responsibilities are not clearly stated or understood among the parties.

It is important to:

- Ensure that faculty receive relevant and timely communications about key policy, procedure, system, and organizational changes;
- Ensure that faculty are invited into the conversation about major changes impacting research and research management, including system changes;
- Evaluate faculty burden prior to implementing policy or procedural changes, including consideration of burden versus benefit;
- Create roles and responsibilities documents to help articulate the research lifecycle and who is responsible and which office to engage. Articulate PI responsibilities and make sure investigators are aware of their own responsibilities; and
- Make sure staff feel supported by leadership when faculty are rude or unreasonable.

Commensurate with the commitment that UNM has made to assessing, refining, and enhancing the research enterprise and to central research administration specifically, the following report identifies both notable practices of the institution (that should be continued and commended) and makes specific, tangible recommendations for senior administration to consider as it advances research administration. The notable practices and recommendations from the report are listed throughout the report. Each notable practice and/or recommendation includes both a description and rationale.
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Current Environment for Sponsored Program Operations

Any institution that is focused on developing a more research-intensive program faces a number of challenges. On one front is the challenge to embrace the culture of the institution and those existing or emerging priorities as relate to sponsored program activities. On the other front is the challenge to build or sustain an infrastructure that can nurture, facilitate, and support the growing demands of a research enterprise and meet both faculty expectations and institutional accountability.

Any research enterprise brings a measure of risk, accountability, and oversight to the institution that has not been previously apparent. These measures are in response to a parallel growth in attention by the federal government that is evidenced by escalating policies, regulations, and oversight. This increased involvement of the federal government in sponsored programs oversight has resulted in the need for higher degrees of specialization and education on the part of institutional sponsored programs staff. Institutions now maintain a delicate balancing act between developing the infrastructure for facilitating and moving forward research activities of their faculty and providing sufficient oversight and internal controls to demonstrate accountability and to mitigate risk.

In the last five years, institutions have been especially impacted by the external environment. Reduced funding, increasingly large-scale and multi-disciplinary research, and collaborations with foreign scientists and business have all contributed to complex relationships and issues of ownership. The recent federal attention on institutional operations through audits, whistleblowers, and investigations has not only exposed our institutions to the public but has brought increasing levels of Congressional attention. The resulting attention on how institutions manage their relationships and the use of the public’s funds often results in tighter institutional controls and more restrictive policies imposed on both the institution and faculty.

Many of our institutions are now recognizing that the growth of infrastructure and specialized expertise has not kept pace with the complexity of the current-day research relationships and the attention to government regulations and policies that are inextricably intertwined with the external funding.

The infrastructure supporting sponsored programs is always complex and it requires a periodic review to determine if it efficiently supports the efforts of investigators while also offering an adequate compliance posture with the regulations that underlie federal funding.
This general discussion of the current national environment within which all sponsored programs operations exist and the special challenges for transitioning institutions will serve as a foundation for the more specific discussion of this report.

Institutional Planning and Investment in the Research Enterprise

I. STANDARD for Institutional and Research Planning.

The institution has defined priorities and strategic plans as related to research and consistent messaging occurs at all levels. An institutional commitment to research and sponsored projects and the commitment to research administration infrastructure is clearly evident at all levels of the organization as appropriate to the institutional size, culture, mission, and strategic plans. Research administration leadership has clearly articulated action plans and metrics that support and advance the institutional research priorities.

Institutional leadership expects regular and thorough assessments of the effectiveness of research administration.

The University of New Mexico (UNM) is comprised of its main campus in Albuquerque and four branch campuses in Gallup, Los Alamos, Taos, and Valencia County. UNM also has a Health Sciences Center (HSC) in Albuquerque. Although the HSC was not part of this review, UNM and HSC collaborate in both academic and research endeavors. In addition, UNM has the distinction of serving as a Hispanic-Serving Institution with a Carnegie Commission on Higher Education classification of “R1: Doctoral Universities - Very high research activity” (R1 university).

Research has a prominent place in UNM’s strategic plan, as evidenced by UNM’s strategic plan, UNM2020, and the November 2018 launch of President Stokes’ “New Mexico Grand Challenges.” The three grand challenge areas are Sustainable Water Resources, Substance Use Disorders, and Successful Aging. Not only do these challenges align with state priorities, the Grand Challenges proposals received represented collaboration of more than 160 faculty and staff members from 60 distinct UNM departments, schools, and colleges.

In addition, Vice President for Research (VPR) Gabriel López launched a five-year Research Strategic Plan in Fiscal Year (FY) 2017. This plan complements both UNM2020 and the Grand Challenges, and UNM2020 references the research strategic plan as part of UNM’s strategy to advance discovery and innovation. UNM and the VPR
engaged internal and external stakeholders when creating these strategic plans. The VPR is commended for having a strategic plan.

- **Notable Practice:** The VPR is commended for having a strategic plan that engages internal and external stakeholders. Internal and external stakeholder input is key to a strategic plan's success. A strategic plan guides efforts and ensures transparency in decision-making on resource deployment.

The Peer Review Team did not view a progress report made in connection with the 2017 VPR Research Strategic Plan. While the VPR meets with the Associate Deans for Research (ADRs) and Center/Institute Directors, it was not clear if results and metrics from the VPR’s Research Strategic Plan are being shared with the campus community. The metrics for UNM2020 can be found on the university’s strategic planning webpage, and sponsored research metrics are also located there. The VPR’s strategic plan metrics are not as easily found on the OVPR’s webpage. Although the plan calls for a review on a bi-annual basis, it was not clear if progress reports/results are being disseminated to campus in a meaningful way.

- **Recommendation:** The VPR should consider linking to the UNM2020 dashboard to better highlight results. Showing progress in a “dashboard” fashion is a useful tool.

- **Recommendation:** The VPR should ensure that data and metrics are readily available and sent out to all of campus. Ensuring that campus understands progress in the VPR’s Research Strategic Plan allows transparency on how strategic decisions are made at the OVPR level.

This NCURA Peer Review represents a second review that UNM has conducted of its sponsored programs infrastructure, with more than ten years separating the two reviews. At many institutions, there is increasing attention on critical administrative operations and the need for a regularly occurring review cycle, as is found in academic program reviews to maintain academic accreditation. While the form for such review can be varied (internal or external), the process establishes an expectation for attention to the operational effectiveness, how well that operation succeeds in a fluid environment, and a venue for faculty to comment on process.

There are a number of techniques used by institutions to periodically review the effectiveness of administrative operations, to assess processes for areas of improvement and currency, and to review for compliance or risk.

- **Recommendation:** UNM should consider a follow-up review after recommendations from this report have been implemented for two or more years. This would allow UNM to assess its progress.
II. STANDARD for Institutional Investment in the Research Enterprise.

The relationship of achieving research strategic goals is reflected in commitments in areas that support research (such as seed or bridge funding, shared cores, release time). This level of financial and other types of support is understood by the institutional leadership.

The budget for UNM’s OVPR is generated by F&A returns. The budget funds OSP, in addition to the OVPR, Category III centers, institutes/core facilities, and the compliance areas, such as IRB, IACUC, export control, and industrial security. In addition, F&A returns provide some internal/seed funding, though not to the same extent as seed funding provided by UNM’s peers. More information on this issue can be found in Standard XVI.

- **Recommendation**: UNM should re-evaluate the use of F&A returns to support internal/seed funding. Seed funding is another way to retain faculty.

From this F&A return support, the Peer Review Team believes UNM is aware of regulated requirements related to animal facilities and shared equipment/core facilities. This is not an uncommon model, but it is commendable that the OVPR supports a position in the Office of the University Council and partially supports college-embedded Faculty Research Support Officer (FRSO) positions.

The OVPR provides financial support for the Faculty Senate Research Allocation Committee and certain research recognition awards, such as the Annual Research Lectureship and the Community Engaged Research Lectureship. A smaller portion of the F&A returns are used for faculty retention and strategic areas related to the Grand Challenge.

During the review, the Peer Review Team heard a lot of concerns about F&A return practices. In one case, a faculty member indicated that start-up package funding from the OVPR had been eliminated. The Peer Review Team also heard about reduction of service/position eliminations when F&A returns decreased. It is noteworthy that the OVPR FY20 budget is more than $600,000 smaller than the FY15 budget.

The Peer Review Team was unsure if campus faculty and staff were aware of how returned F&A was being expended. There may be an opportunity for the OVPR to provide additional transparency on how F&A returns are used at UNM. Many universities and higher education organizations, such as the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR), have provided information/graphics to help explain the cost of research. While the OVPR’s website contained a document discussing F&A returns,
(https://research.unm.edu/sites/default/files/FY18%20Guideline%20for%20Return%20of%20Recovered%20Facilities%20and%20Administrative%20Costs.pdf), the Peer Review Team felt faculty and staff would appreciate having a better understanding about how F&A returns were being expended.

- **Recommendation:** UNM should engage with internal stakeholders such as the Associate Deans for Research to ensure that decisions on the use of F&A returns are well understood. UNM could make use of educational materials from other organizations and universities on how F&A is calculated and how it is distributed. Some examples are provided below:
  - Northwestern University (F&A Fun Facts): [http://www.northwestern.edu/asrsp/docs/02_FnA_Fun_Facts_new.pdf](http://www.northwestern.edu/asrsp/docs/02_FnA_Fun_Facts_new.pdf)
  - University of Washington: [http://finance.uw.edu/maa/fa/facosts](http://finance.uw.edu/maa/fa/facosts)

Research Enterprise Components and Structure

III. STANDARD for the Research Administration Organization.

Senior research leadership is represented in key academic and institutional groups and relevant shared governance or research advisory bodies have clear linkages with research administration.

The institution has identified offices and structures that support the overall management and administration of the research enterprise. In particular, there are offices responsible for the management of externally sponsored programs. There are defined and broadly communicated roles, relationships, and authorities between sponsored program offices, both centrally and where sponsored program functions may reside in different institutional sectors. Effective operational processes exist between sponsored program activities and business functions, such as travel, procurement, accounts payable, or HR.

Regular communications occur between sponsored programs areas that reside centrally. Where sufficient research volume and activity warrant, the institution has addressed the research administration infrastructure needs that exist outside the central operations.
UNM has several senior leadership committees, councils, cabinets, teams, boards, and roundtables to further the institutional mission and strategy. The vast majority routinely discuss research initiatives. The VPR and Associate VPR (AVPR) represent sponsored projects as members in each of these forums. The groups meet regularly and have defined purposes focused on supporting research, issues and developments related to research, industry engagement, the research strategic plan, the Grand Challenge initiative, human subjects research, conflicts of interest, and animal care and use.

UNM has a Faculty Senate as mandated by the Faculty Constitution. The Faculty Senate currently consists of 68 Senators, 63 of whom are elected by faculty within their college/school and 5 of whom are elected by Voting Faculty to serve at large. The number of Senators is based upon collegiate employment size.

The Faculty Senate has various councils and committees including a Research & Creative Works Council. Senators are expected to speak to their constituents, gain insight/knowledge, and represent those constituents when participating in Senate, councils, and committees. The VPR serves as an ex officio member within the Faculty Senate’s Research Policy Committee.

The UNM research administration infrastructure is led by the VPR under the direction of the Provost & Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. The offices reporting up to the VPR include:

- Office of Sponsored Projects (OSP), composed of Sponsored Projects Proposals & Electronic Research Administration, Sponsored Projects Contracts & Awards, and Contract and Grant Accounting
- Faculty Research Development Office (FRDO)
- Office of Research Compliance (ORC), composed of Research Integrity/Conflict of Interest, Office of Internal Review Board, and Biomedical Research
- Research Centers & Institutes
- VPR Administration & Finance
- Strategic Advisors

UNM has a main campus, four branch campuses, and a Health Sciences Center (HSC) who collaborate in both academic and research endeavors. HSC was not part of this review. While collaborations should be encouraged amongst the main/branch campuses and HSC, in practice collaborations are discouraged by inconsistencies with Facilities & Administrative return, as well as separate offices, policies, procedures, and systems.

OSP provides both pre- and post-award services, which is a common model. When a combined structure exists, the team typically has a single reporting structure, either to
the scientific or financial side of the organization. OSP has a dual report to the University Controller and the VPR. Dual reporting adds complexity since both leaders must be unified in their mission, vision, and strategies in order for the model and teams to succeed.

The Peer Review Team heard stakeholders across the institution describe two separate offices: Office of Sponsored Projects Pre-Award (OSP PA), which provides pre-award support, and OSP Contract & Grant Accounting (OSP C&G), which provides post-award support. OSP PA and OSP C&G have separate websites, organizational structures, processes, and systems. The roles of each office are unclear to the research community. Additionally, it was unclear the roles played by the Controller and VPR, as well as the level of authority granted to resolve issues as they arise.

- **Recommendation:** The Provost and the Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration (SVPFA) should determine whether dual reporting is the ideal structure. If so, the Provost and SVPFA should work with the Controller and VPR to identify unified vision, mission, and strategies, as well as roles and responsibilities pertaining to the oversight of sponsored projects. Vision, mission, and strategies should be communicated across the UNM research community.

OSP PA and C&G are further divided based upon the business function performed. OSP PA handles proposal review, approval, and submission; award receipt/negotiation; and Cayuse award setup, in addition to contract/subaward creation, negotiation, and execution. OSP C&G handles expenditure compliance, cost transfers, financial reporting, invoicing, letter of credit drawdowns, cash application, collection, and financial closeout. Subrecipient risk assessment is a shared responsibility between OSP PA and C&G. OSP PA operates on a “first in, first out” basis for proposals and awards while OSP C&G operates on a constituency basis. This is discussed in more detail in Standard IV: Research Administration Staffing and Development.

OSP communicates roles and responsibilities through the Faculty Handbook, Grants Management Training, annual Research Administrators Symposium, the OSP and Associate Dean for Research (ADR) collaboration meeting, Proposal Development and Award Guide (PDAG), and on each of the OSP websites. While these vehicles define roles and responsibilities in narrative form, both faculty and central and unit staff conveyed to the Peer Review Team that the research community does not clearly understand the roles and responsibilities. It is often useful to have a responsibility matrix for each step of the proposal and award process. A matrix provides an easy-to-read framework for who holds primary responsibility.

- **Notable Practice:** OSP PA has a Proposal Development and Award Guide and websites, which identify roles and responsibilities.
**Recommendation:** OSP should consider creating a Roles and Responsibilities Matrix. Such a Matrix would supplement information already available. The Matrix should address all transactions related to research application, receipt, funding, compliance, award management, and award closeout. A matrix which shows the lifecycle throughout the institution would give faculty and unit administrators a guide to utilize daily. Examples are included below:

- University of Maryland: [https://ora.umd.edu/about/roles](https://ora.umd.edu/about/roles)
- University of Minnesota: [https://research.umn.edu/units/spa/proposals/responsibility-matrix](https://research.umn.edu/units/spa/proposals/responsibility-matrix)
- Northeastern University: [http://www.northeastern.edu/research/raf/develop-my-proposal/roles-responsibilities/](http://www.northeastern.edu/research/raf/develop-my-proposal/roles-responsibilities/)

OVPR Research Information Technology supports OSP by assisting with technology and reporting. In 2019, the VPR appointed a Special Assistant to the VPR tasked with addressing specific issues affecting research related activities, such as controlled unclassified information, data management, and personally identifiable information. A designated IT Project Manager facilitates interactions between Central IT and the various research units to ensure needs are met in a timely fashion. Financial Systems Management (FSM) handles security and approval of Banner Roles; systems management for Banner, Cayuse, and MyReports; and project management support and IT support for financial systems.

The Faculty Research Development Office (FRDO) has team members assigned by school/college who assist with proposal development and submission. Additionally, schools/colleges have unit level staff who work closely with the faculty on proposals, awards, and transactions, which are routed to OSP for processing.

OSP has a strong and collaborative relationship with UNM Foundation. UNM Foundation also works closely with FRDO. While all transactions originate at the PI/School or college level, transactions are approved by OSP C&G, if fully or partially charged to a sponsored index, and then route to UNM Human Resources, Travel, Purchasing and Procurement, etc.

Faculty and unit-level staff expressed an uncertainty regarding which office they should engage for specific transactions and when requiring resolution of an issue. They also referred to delays encountered if a transaction was routed to the “wrong” office.

**Recommendation:** OSP should include on their website a list of the research-related transactions occurring throughout the life cycle. Transaction information should include guidance on:

- which office is the primary point of contact for each transaction,
how the office should be engaged,
when the office should be engaged,
what policies and forms pertain to the transaction, and
what documents should be provided to ensure submission is “complete” and handled in a timely fashion.

Providing a resource on the OSP website that points faculty and administrators to the appropriate office for all research-related transactions would provide clarity and transparency, save time, and eliminate frustration amongst faculty and staff.

An example is available on the University of Miami ORA website: https://www.ora.miami.edu/about-ora/Pre-Award/preparing-proposal/submitting-to-ora/index.html

OSP PA has delegated authority to create and negotiate contracts for sponsored activities. UNM’s Office of University Counsel (OUC) provides legal guidance and risk analysis during the negotiation process. OSP PA seeks advice on intellectual property, jurisdiction, and other contractual issues. OUC also interacts with OSP C&G for collection issues due to outstanding receivables. While OUC has a designated attorney for research, other attorneys may get involved based upon their area of expertise. The authority to sign contracts on behalf of UNM will be discussed in Standard XXII: Award Acceptance.

OUC has expressed an interest in learning more about research administration, participating in negotiations, and training OSP PA personnel. Due to a vacant Manager of Sponsored Projects Contracts & Awards position and a high work volume, utilizing OUC in this capacity would be beneficial.

- **Recommendation:** The OSP Director should explore the opportunity of utilizing OUC to train new staff on contract review and negotiations. Additionally, OSP Director may explore the opportunity to utilize OUC during peak periods where a backlog of contracts may exist and/or complex contract negotiation is required.

---

**IV. STANDARD for Research Administration Staffing and Staff Development.**

The institution has invested in and committed to a sufficient number of staff to (1) support the core functions of the research administration operation, with emphasis on sponsored programs administration and (2) meet obligations to sponsors and governmental and locally mandated regulations.
The institution has an appropriate research administration staffing plan that contains elements of recruitment, retention, professional development, and succession for key positions. Where sufficient research volume and activity or where operations are decentralized, the institution has unit-level research administrators residing at the department, school/college, or organized research unit level.

UNM has centralized research administrators for research development. These positions are a combination of central Faculty Research Development Office (FRDO) full-time staff and part-time or full-time staff affiliated with the FRDO office but located in select colleges. College-located staff that are part-time are also assigned collegiate level duties outside of the FRDO appointments. UNM provides central proposal review and submission and award negotiation and acceptance services through its Office of Sponsored Projects (OSP) with 4 FTE assigned to proposal review and submission, 3 FTE to grants award acceptance, and 3 FTE to contract negotiation and acceptance. Award activation and post-award activities are handled by 13 FTE Contract and Grant Accounting fiscal monitors. Resources may be requested via the annual budget process. There is no formal process for associating increases in research volume or complexity with staffing levels for the three offices. Collegiate and departmental staff exist in some colleges and are funded locally based on perceived need.

The Peer Review Team heard that OSP PA was understaffed. The degree to which this is true was not easily assessable since most of the OSP staff are too new in their positions to be able to provide full research administration services to faculty. It is, however, the case that at least the existing vacancies should be hired with skilled, knowledgeable staff who can both provide quality services to faculty and serve as mentors for the staff still learning, a matter discussed elsewhere in this document. It is also optimal to do advance planning for normal backfill needs, such as vacations, sick time, and vacancies. One way to accomplish this is to hire a “floater” staff member (a staff member without assigned portfolio) to nimbly move across teams to help with workload surges and temporary absences.

- **Recommendation**: The VPR, the Controller, and the OSP Director should create and implement an action plan to reduce the staff turnover in OSP Pre-Award (OSP PA). Part of this plan should be the addition of a “floater” sponsored program specialist position to better manage peak periods in proposal workload, vacations, and vacancies.

- **Notable Practice**: OSP Contract and Grant Accounting (OSP C&G) and the Faculty Research Development Office (FRDO) should be recognized for achieving a high degree of cohesiveness and stability of their respective staff.
One of the most important elements of a high-functioning research administration enterprise is a knowledgeable, stable, and nimble research administration office. The Peer Review Team noted that while FRDO and OSP C&G had normal or low staff turnover (20% over three years; 23% over three years), this is not the case with OSP PA. Turnover in OSP PA is high, with 10 of 16 FTE (62.5%) having turned over within the past three years. A discussion with the Human Resources (HR) department about “normal” turnover rates at UNM would be worthwhile. Nationally, a turnover rate of 10% per year or less, particularly when averaged over several years, would be considered indicative of a healthy organization.

Reasons reported for the significant turnover in OSP PA included: (1) the ability to obtain higher salaries elsewhere in the organization; (2) the inherent challenges of performing a high pressure position that includes many tight (and unenforced) internal proposal deadlines; (3) insufficient training to feel competent and provide high quality service in the role after a reasonable period of time; and (4) a sense that senior management will “side” with faculty regardless of the facts of a situation. It is not possible to fully mitigate all of these elements, but significant steps can be taken to enhance the work environment.

- **Recommendation:** The VPR and the Controller should work with HR to acknowledge the special skills required by staff throughout the OVPR, particularly in OSP, and to classify and compensate them accordingly. Particular attention should be paid to similar positions in the medical school and in academic units, ensuring parity of compensation when duties are equivalent. The inherent pressure that pre-award staff face during proposal deadlines must be considered when compensation rates are determined. Improving staff compensation (as well as other concrete indicators that staff are valued) will almost certainly improve retention rates which will allow for a greater number of experienced and skilled staff to provide high quality service to faculty.

The Peer Review Team noted that, while it is possible to adjust titles and salaries based on individual requests, we did not hear about the ability to review a group of staff (e.g., via a market assessment for an entire group, for example.) Presumably this is possible within UNM’s HR system, but a special request may need to be pursued.

One potential approach is for UNM to analyze the staffing and salary levels of those institutions they consider as their aspirational peers, which may be determined via the NSF Higher Education Research and Development (HERD) expenditure survey or through standard processes already used by the institution, or to ask their HR office to do a job market survey. Other institutions, including the University of Minnesota, have created contract and grant “job families” and even specialty tracks within those families and have performed market research on higher education compensation in this area (see University of Minnesota Contact and Grant Job Family: ...)
Most universities (Minnesota included) are happy to share such information upon request.

The Peer Review Team was pleased to learn that appropriate staff in FRDO and OSP are classified as exempt staff. In the judgment of this Peer Review Team, this classification is appropriate and helpful, and represents national best practice. This classification should help the university in its efforts to further refine staff levels and compensation.

- **Notable Practice:** UNM appropriately classifies its research administration professionals as exempt staff.

It is normal for faculty to be impatient and worried as their proposals are routed, reviewed, corrected, and submitted to sponsors under tight timelines. It is also normal for faculty to not fully understand why certain elements of their contracts necessarily require negotiation or why a certain expense cannot be legitimately charged to their project. At times, faculty expression of their concerns can rise to a level that exceeds mere frustration and includes yelling, swearing, rudeness, and threats to staff, particularly staff they do not know in person. The Peer Review Team heard that this has happened, but that staff are either uncertain how to report it or do not feel that reporting such behavior will result in corrective action. However, the Peer Review Team heard that this occurs at a level sufficient to impact staff morale and job satisfaction. It would be helpful for senior management to make it clear to staff that they expect faculty to treat staff with civility and decency, and that they are willing to take corrective action when this is not the case. Senior management should also invite staff to report instances when interactions exceed the normal level of expressed frustration and instead rise to the level of verbal abuse. Executive leadership and senior management should address some of the unrealistic demands by setting expectations and by emphasizing the importance of the activities completed by FRDO and OSP staff. Funding opportunities may be lost when policies and procedures are not followed and deadlines are not met; these policies and procedures are in place to ensure proposal submission requirements are adequately and timely met and are balanced with processing other proposal submissions and limited available resources.

- **Recommendation:** The VPR and the Controller should support staff facing unrealistic demands or excessive anger from investigators and share their decisions so that staff are aware both of the support they are receiving and of exceptions that need to be granted.

Currently, there is no structured succession plan for leadership within OSP or FRDO, though FRDO has provided opportunities for its staff to “step up and take on additional duties and responsibilities.” The Peer Review Team heard that some FRSOs assist PIs with award management and that FRSOs are working with OSP PA and C&G on the
RAN Working Group. This is perhaps natural, given many of the staff in OSP are very new to their positions and FRDO is essentially a flat organization. It will be important to create more defined career ladders as the office continues to mature and to build staff awareness of knowledge and skills expected in order to progress across the enterprise functions (research advancement, proposal preparation and submission, grant acceptance, contract negotiation, award initiation, post-award management, subaward management, etc.) or to move upward into senior individual contributor positions, supervisor positions, or management. An added benefit of creating such pathways is the opportunity for supervisors to better understand the career aspirations of their staff (or to help open their eyes to such possibilities), as well as to offer cross-training opportunities within the office. In addition, supervisors can better understand where they have staff knowledge or skill limitations that require additional individualized or staff-wide training. These sorts of discussions, even for staff who express no desire for promotion, can also help managers know what work parameters are of greatest importance to staff, particularly when there are generational or expectation gaps. Work parameters can include non-monetary issues, such as flex scheduling and telecommuting.

- **Recommendation:** The OSP Director and FRDO Director should create a succession plan for their respective staff and should be empowered to provide specialized training and opportunities for future leaders of the organization.
- **Recommendation:** The OSP Director should consider refining the organizational structure to provide staff a better defined and more intriguing career ladder, as well as to optimize service for faculty.

One recurring theme was a sense of “distance” between staff and their clients. This theme was cited both by central staff and by clients independently. Those staff who were closest to their faculty (both FRDO and OSP C&G) expressed much less sense of “disconnect” than did OSP PA staff. Faculty expressed frustration both by staff turnover across various teams within OSP and by the feeling that they needed to constantly work with a different individual each time they contacted the office. Staff sometimes were able to forge relationships with a given department or faculty member, but not with any consistent expectation.

While there is no single organizational structure that NCURA recommends and all models have pros and cons, organizational structures that allow relationships to be forged between one or a small team of individuals and a group of faculty or academic units can significantly minimize this sense of “disconnect” and improve both client and staff satisfaction. The most common of these models is the “constituency-based” model, where a single staff member or a small team of staff services a given set of academic units for all of their pre-award activities, post-award activities, or both.
UNM’s current OSP PA model focuses on staff serving a single business function (e.g., proposal submission, grant acceptance, contract negotiation, award setup) on a generally “next in line” workload assignment basis. Purposeful visits and dialogue between the clients and the staff serving those clients can resolve issues earlier and with less friction. Constituency-based models can also promote staffing having a greater sense of “ownership” of their transactions. Staff can more rapidly assess the quality of the transactions they are looking at and adapt accordingly (based on their knowledge of their units’ staff and faculty and their typical sponsors), and this model tends to create more interesting jobs for staff, since they will develop a more broad range of skills and knowledge.

The model has, of course, its own challenges. Staff must usually learn a broader range of skills/tasks/sponsors to be optimally effective. This can allow their positions to be more highly classed in the HR system but also mean they need to be better paid. Staff backups must be deliberate and planned, and departments and investigators are often reluctant to give up “their” person when it comes time for the currently assigned person to be promoted or leave. Workloads grow unevenly and staff reassignments must be addressed as well. Some institutions select “hybrid” models where staff operate in small teams with primary and backup assignments, which facilitates backup, allows for mentoring and both formal and informal team advancement, and for more complex tasks to be absorbed by the most senior members of the team.

- **Recommendation:** The OSP Director should consider re-organizing pre-award staff on a constituency-based model. This model could take place holistically (one assigned OSP pre-award person for all services) or it could involve senior and junior staff serving a set of units.

The Peer Review Team heard that OSP is not able to identify all the unit administrators and thus are not able to uniformly reach out to this cohort of critical colleagues. To be able to train effectively, to understand unit-level roles and responsibilities, and to communicate key policy and sponsor changes, it is essential to have a good grasp on unit-level support. In addition, when a unit is exceeding expectations, it may also be able to serve as a model for others. Creating a community of university research administrators will also be important as we talk further about training and consistency of practice in later sections of this report.

- **Recommendation:** The OSP Director should, with help from FRDO and academic leadership, undertake an analysis of unit level staff to both be able to identify unit research administrators and to understand the extent to which research is adequately supported at the unit level.
V. STANDARD for Resources to Support Research Administration.

The institution has in place a process to identify changing resource needs for research administration as related to changes in institutional priorities and the external environment. Such resources encompass space, desktop technology, office equipment, and financial resources to support the staff in carrying out research administration functions.

The background materials provided to the Review Team indicated that workloads of central research officers were monitored closely to determine proper staffing levels and that new positions could be funded through the annual budget process. This process was not articulated during the review itself, so it may be occurring without a formal structure involved. Staffing levels were difficult to assess for the pre-award side because of the newness of the staff in those positions and because unit level staffing was not quantified. The adequacy of pre-award staffing should be reassessed after there is a trained workforce that has been substantially in place for at least two years. If UNM grows its research enterprise as it desires, research administration staffing will need to grow as well; these assessments and growths will need to take place proactively so that it facilitates rather than hampers the growth process. The post-award staffing levels seemed adequate. The FRDO staff had considerable variance in what they are able to provide based on the college(s) they served, though, in general, clients viewed their support as highly valuable and did not cite any deficiencies in this regard.

At the present time, UNM is in a difficult position as they would like to grow their research enterprise but are facing budget challenges that impact existing faculty retention and limit recruitment packages for incoming researchers. In addition, they are not currently collaborating heavily with their medical school counterparts, which may in turn limit growth by not permitting the institution to harvest support for interdisciplinary projects.

Staff felt that they had adequate space, equipment, software, and desktop support to perform their assigned functions. Staff did indicate that the need to create Information Technology (IT) Help Tickets even for routine support needs was annoying and they would prefer access to a person who could perform this type of function, but that issue did not rise to a level of creating work issues.

Research Administration Communication and Outreach
VI. STANDARD for Research Administration Communications.

Research administration recognizes the importance of establishing mechanisms for timely, regular communication regarding sponsored programs trends and activity levels, policies and procedures, expectations, roles and responsibilities, changes in policies, and risk areas.

Appropriate lines of communication exist between the institution's senior research administrator(s) and the institution's overall senior leadership team.

The central research administration office provides regular communication to the investigators and staff about research administration, as well as opportunities to provide feedback. Current policies and procedures are readily accessible via websites and other appropriate means. Strong and regular communications exist between central offices and unit-level staff, as appropriate. Research administration periodically assesses the effectiveness of communication practices.

The VPR has weekly meetings with the Provost leadership and monthly formal meetings with the Provost. The VPR reports annually to the Board of Regents. In addition, the VPR sits on the Deans Council and attends meetings twice a month with that group. There is a bi-monthly meeting with Associate Deans for Research (ADR), Center Directors, AVPR and OSP, and a monthly meeting with Associate Deans for Research and institution-wide center directors. The VPR does not routinely meet with all research administration staff. Holding such a meeting would allow staff to better understand and follow their leader’s vision, strategies, and policies, as well as be able to ask questions.

- **Recommendation:** The VPR should consider holding periodic “town halls” for his staff for the purpose of sharing vision and strategy, priorities, goals, and progress, as well as to address any staff questions.

OSP has monthly meetings with the Research Administrator Network (RAN) and use a listserv and quarterly newsletter for communications in between. OSP noted that they currently feel their monthly meetings with unit administrators are not as engaging as they wish them to be. OSP’s website requests suggestions for monthly meeting topics but rarely receives submissions. A review of recent agendas showed good and relevant topics for these meetings, with the presenters coming from OSP or another central office. There do not appear to be presenters from among the units being served. Clients who attend the RAN meetings felt they were too “top-down” and focused on providing information rather than engaging in discussion of topics of mutual interest and/or concern.

The Review Team learned that there is an initiative currently underway to create a research administrator community of practice and undertake meetings that will be more interactive via direct unit administrator and FRDO engagement, including setting and
managing the agenda. This is to be commended. Such an initiative might include such topics as: unit-level best practices, tools, and forms; work process flows; identification and solutions for common issues that are impeding the smooth flow of work; new staff training templates; updates on changes in institutional or sponsor requirements or positions; common job descriptions or classification levels; unit staffing plans; job sharing; posting of jobs, etc. The Review Team heard that many of these ideas are already being factored into the planning process. It will be important to make sure this new initiative is aligned with the bigger picture to avoid becoming a “competing” initiative.

- **Notable Practice:** The Peer Review Team was impressed that the “Working Group” and FRDO felt the need for a community of practice was so strong that they were willing to carve out time to make it a reality despite their very busy schedules.

- **Recommendation:** The “RAN Working Group” (unit research administrators and FRDO) should work closely with OSP to create a jointly designed and run training and mentorship environment.

Although OSP has a monthly newsletter, clients felt that it was not as useful as it might be. Recipients indicated that they would prefer information about changed forms or agency requirements and institutional deadlines (e.g., postdoc hiring policies, summer appointments). The topic of content for a newsletter may well be a suitable topic for discussion in the joint group discussed above. In addition, given the previously stated challenges of identifying all the unit-level research administrators, it is likely that additional work is needed to make sure that the information is shared with all parties who need to know.

Probably the most critical missing piece of communication the Peer Review Team heard about was confusion about “who does what.” In addition to the problem of turnover, most stakeholders indicated they did not know where certain documents or questions were to be directed. While central offices were good about re-directing documents, this naturally adds to the processing timeline and it did not allow for a researcher or a unit administrator to know who to contact for the next time. We heard reports that “general” email addresses (particularly for OSP PA) were not always answered quickly, and the sender was left with the impression that no action was being taken on their request or question (even when that was not the case.) Standard III contains a recommendation that OSP create a searchable matrix or some other “quick guide” that directs faculty or unit staff to the right person/office.

It was noted that OSP already has training presentations about what functions the office and subgroups provide. Faculty, in particular, will not take the time to scroll through a slide presentation. Creating a faster mechanism to match questions with solvers remains necessary. The existing presentation may expedite this process. If the
recommendation to reorganize OSP to a constituency-based model is implemented, this tool may become less important.

Communication with investigators and with units generally seemed to be more limited than is ideal. PIs and unit administrators felt they did not routinely receive information when forms, policies, or procedures are updated; when staffing changes occur in central offices; or when agencies impose new requirements or regulations. Of particular interest for all parties was understanding the “why” of change, particularly when such changes are decisions made internally. Why are fields added, a form updated, or additional process steps added? What risk is being managed and what is the sound basis for the change being made? More communication would be welcome. Investigators said knowing the expectations and the reasons certain information is needed up front will help them get the process done correctly the first time.

Although the background materials indicated policy changes are communicated to the community for feedback prior to implementation, the Peer Review Team did not find a clear path described by stakeholders for this to occur outside of the Associate Deans for Research (e.g., that a process exists for distributing a draft, obtaining comments, reviewing comments, and making decisions on final language with communications back to stakeholders). For example, PIs did not seem to know about this policy review process, except if the faculty member sat on a Faculty Senate Committee or were part of a group that piloted a policy/change. It was noted, however, that the Research Policy Committee serves as a sounding board for senior leaders contemplating policies so that the concepts can be discussed prior to documents being created.

- **Recommendation:** For new policies or major policy changes, a more formalized (or at minimum, clearly communicated) stakeholder review process should be implemented.

VII. STANDARD for Outreach Efforts and Program of Education.

Research administration has established programs of education for research staff, faculty, postdoctoral fellows, and graduate and undergraduate students, as appropriate to institution size. Included in education is information regarding institutional and sponsor expectations for the conduct of sponsored programs and research, and the technology and tools available to support these endeavors. The institution has on-going educational programs for unit-level (department, college, center, other) research administrators where such exist.

Research administration recognizes the importance of introducing new investigators, staff, senior administrators, and unit-level research administrators to appropriate research resources, information, and continuing outreach activities to the academic community. Mechanisms are in place to identify such individuals. Where appropriate to the institution, mentoring programs for faculty exist to assist them with understanding approaches and philosophies to building a track record with extramural funding.
Research administration has defined mechanisms that make available information about research activities and successes to the greater research community and public.

UNM trains investigators through presentations at the annual new faculty orientation and through mandatory PI training. Compliance trainings, such as COI training, are handled by the relevant offices. The part of in-person training investigators felt was most valuable was meeting research administration personnel.

Faculty responses to the mandatory PI training were mixed. While some faculty reported that the training was useful, others indicated that it felt informational (like a checklist) but that it did not help them determine how to solve problems. Senior faculty also indicated that it did not feel applicable to them, as they are familiar with the material.

While PIs are required to retake the online training regularly, some faculty indicated that they are not retaking the training and that they have not received reminders informing them of their obligation to retake the training. OSP reported that it is challenging to do adequate follow up on investigators who have not taken the training, given other priorities.

Some institutions have adopted an approach that they will mandate PI training for new investigators in order to help ensure that faculty adequately understand what is required of them to serve as PIs or Co-PIs and then offer voluntary ongoing training in specialized topics. Examples of such topics are various "research ethics" courses or training in how to create/manage large-scale research projects, or how to mentor postdocs and junior faculty.

If training is mandatory, it is important that the requirement be enforced and applied consistently to the population of individuals required to undergo the training. This will aid in the training being taken seriously and will set the tone for ensuring faculty understand and accept their roles and responsibilities in research. Consequences should exist and be enforced for not taking the training (e.g., not allowing an index to be established on a new award or removing PI eligibility after one or more warnings) until such time as the requirement is met.

- **Recommendation:** The OVPR should review its requirements for mandatory training and, after making any adjustments it feels necessary, subsequently enforce its requirement for mandatory investigator training in a timely way.

Investigators expressed interest in effort certification training, though they also expressed appreciation for the high-quality emails that come with requests for certification.
The Peer Review Team found impressive that UNM holds an annual one-day Symposium for administrators in September offering a broad array of topics and breakout sessions. The symposium seemed well attended (119 for the 2019 offering) and well received by attendees. The Peer Review Team heard one request for future consideration of advanced topic sessions for those more senior administrators.

- **Notable Practice:** OVPR and OSP should be commended for its annual one-day Symposium for research administrators. This program promotes competency among staff whose units may not have the resources to send their staff to national or regional professional development conferences.

There are also twice-yearly training workshops for new research administrators, which have reached 54 attendees over the past two offerings. The agendas for these include the type of information entry-level research administrators appropriately need, though the limited time for the workshops necessarily limits the information that can be shared.

While the symposium and workshops are available, the Peer Review Team heard there is no master training program put on by the central offices at this time. Unless they had been in place for a long time, a significant number of central and unit-level staff reported they felt as though they needed additional training in order to perform their duties at optimal levels. The majority of unit-level training happens within each unit, and some colleges have their own groups. OSP is trying to assist by providing job aids and checklists on certain topics.

Most research-intensive institutions have training programs in place for central and unit-level staff, expanding on training that is available nationally through NCURA or Society of Research Administrators International (SRA International). Some even offer certificate programs for staff, allowing hiring departments to identify specially trained individuals for their unit-level research administrator openings. Not infrequently, institutions are willing to share their materials upon request. Regardless, the act of analyzing training programs from other institutions can help UNM decide which model/style would best serve their needs and how information could be organized.

Examples of training programs include:

- Stanford University: Cardinal Curriculum ([https://doresearch.stanford.edu/training](https://doresearch.stanford.edu/training))
- University of Minnesota SPECTRUM program ([https://research.umn.edu/units/spa/training-education/spectrum-courses](https://research.umn.edu/units/spa/training-education/spectrum-courses))
- University of Michigan NAVIGATE program ([https://orsp.umich.edu/training-workshops](https://orsp.umich.edu/training-workshops))

Among central staff, training occurred via attendance at national workshops and online training offers (webinars, training series, etc.) and significant on-the-job training, including work shadowing and 1:1 training with a supervisor. All central staff reported an interest in and/or a need for more broad-based training, including training in federal
and state regulations and an improved understanding of the principles or reasons behind a given federal or institutional policy. The Peer Review Team found that the newness of the staff, particularly in OSP PA, meant they had not yet had the opportunity to fully learn their craft. The staff were generally aware of their limitations in this area and were eager for more learning opportunities. The Peer Review Team concurred that significant knowledge and skill growth was still needed for OSP staff.

Generally, it will require 18-24 months for a central research administrator to achieve basic competency in their field, with more time needed for those who specialize in contract negotiation or work with industry, and yet more time to have both the confidence and the experience to handle highly specialized or “one-off” types of transactions. Key to achieving success long term is a deep understanding of standard federal regulations (for both grants and contracts) and why that position exists. Once that knowledge is gained, staff are in a position to know when requirements can or should be altered for a given transaction.

Some of this training can be provided through other university offices, including the Office of University Counsel, Risk Management, IRB and IACUC, Internal Audit, and through cross-training within OSP. Outside experts can also be brought in as well as time set aside for training in-house or sharing expertise with HSC. UNM is already taking good advantage of external training opportunities through NCURA, SRA, and similar organizations and should continue engaging in these areas to speed skill development.

One additional area of training that might be worthwhile is soft-skill training focused on topics like teamwork, effective communication, problem solving, conflict resolution, flexibility, work ethic, time management, and leadership. Hard skill training enables you to learn knowledge and skills necessary to perform tasks. Soft skill training enables staff to perform all aspects of their job well. The Peer Review Team did hear concerns raised about “who works for whom” and the tone in which information was conveyed, though there was widespread acknowledgement that OSP had developed a greater customer service mindset in recent years. Both meeting clients and taking the time to call rather than email should help alleviate inadvertent miscommunications.

- **Recommendation:** The Director of OSP should review training programs and create or borrow a more holistic training program for its central and unit-level staff, covering a broad range of sponsored research administration topics. It is critical for success that this be a major focus in the short- and medium term.

When asked what additional training would be useful, the Peer Review Team heard about:
➢ cost-sharing (including advanced topics on tracking and identifying allowable sources of funding),
➢ post-award management of cost-sharing,
➢ what prior approvals are needed on federal and state sponsored projects
➢ effort management
➢ how to handle projects with multiple budgets
➢ how to manage F&A splits across colleges (and especially with HSC)

Other topics that the Peer Review Team might suggest would include:
➢ Locating and interpreting funding opportunity announcements
➢ Proposal budget creation
➢ Managing summer appointments for academic year appointees
➢ Data management plans
➢ Human subjects rules for the research administrator
➢ Animal subjects rules for the research administrator
➢ The basics of F&A – what it covers and when is it appropriate to ask for a reduced F&A rate
➢ Use of agency-specific systems (e.g., FastLane, Research.Gov, Assist, NIH Commons, etc.)
➢ Managing revised budgets and Just-In-Time requests
➢ Contract negotiations – what does OSP do for my contract?
➢ Differentiating between gifts and sponsored projects
➢ Managing training grants and fellowships
➢ Assembling proposals
➢ Conflict of interest requirements
➢ Planning and managing subawards
➢ Equipment and purchasing requirements on federal funds
➢ Managing interdisciplinary projects and budgets
➢ Travel regulations
➢ Export controls
➢ Post-award oversight of sponsored projects – what to look out for
➢ Understanding closeout
➢ Fixed price versus cost-reimbursement agreements and what works best for what situation
➢ Single Audit requirements
➢ Patents, copyrights, and other forms of Intellectual Property
➢ Standard contract clauses and UNM’s position on them (publication, data rights, IP rights, termination, payment, indemnification, etc.)
➢ Tech commercialization and how it blends with sponsored projects
➢ The Uniform Guidance - definitions, allowable costs, public policy requirements, audit requirements
➢ Allowable and unallowable costs on sponsored projects

Research Administration Policy and Risk Assessment

VIII. STANDARD for Research Administration Risk Assessment.

The institution periodically assesses the level of risk inherent in existing research activities and in emerging areas including a process to assess research activities in leased space. The institution utilizes nationally identified methods to monitor the external landscape for new areas of potential risk. There is an appropriate relationship with the institution’s internal audit function. When external audits of sponsored programs occur, there is routine notification with senior leadership.

At most R1 universities, research administration is part of the institution’s enterprise risk management program. Some R1 universities follow the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO) framework to build an enterprise risk management program that assesses and monitors risk tolerance. Appropriate risk assessment and management provides for reasonable assurance to achieve an institution’s objectives. Risk management includes identification, assessment, and mitigation.

Risk assessment follows a divided path at UNM. The Board of Regents and its Audit and Compliance Committee receive regular reports from the UNM Internal Audit Department. In FY17, the Internal Audit Department submitted a five-year plan for university-wide risk assessment through the Board Audit and Compliance Committee. The Board of Regents and Executive Leadership receive regular reports during and at
the conclusion of external audits. One such example is the report-out of the successful audit resolution of the National Science Foundation (NSF) incurred cost audit; this information was contained in the Financial Services Division Annual Report and a report to the Board of Regents’ Audit and Compliance Committee.

While OSP and the Internal Audit Department focus leans more toward financial compliance, that work is complemented by UNM’s Compliance Office, the Office of Research Compliance, and the Office of the University Counsel (OUC). UNM’s Compliance Office maintains a comprehensive compliance directory on its website.

The Peer Review Team learned that UNM keeps abreast of new sponsor requirements and regulations not only from sponsoring agency announcements but also through memberships in the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU), the Council on Governmental Relations (Cogr), and the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP). An example discussed was the National Science Foundation’s (NSF) new term and condition requiring awardee organizations to report findings and determinations of sexual harassment. UNM’s process to meet the term and condition involved the OVPR, the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO), and the OUC.

With respect to leased space agreements, UNM does rent space for sponsored research activities. The OVPR uses part of its budget to cover leased space, which means that research conducted in this leased space is considered on-campus and subject to on-campus F&A rates. This arrangement also allows UNM to adhere to its institutional research regulatory oversight requirements.

IX. STANDARD for Research Administration Policy.

| The institution possesses a transparent process for policy development for those policies not imposed externally (such as specific government regulations). Policy ownership and the associated approval process are clearly established. |
| The institution periodically reviews sponsored program policies and performs appropriate audit and assessment activities to ensure that those policies continue to meet the needs of the institution and are being followed by institutional personnel. Where research administration operations exist outside the central office and that either establish or implement policy, the institution has established the relationship between central policies and the policies and procedures of these other operations. |

University-wide policies reside in a central location under the UNM Policy Office. While the Policy Office is responsible for developing and revising policies, a policy owner is defined for each. Policy owners solicit input from subject matter experts as policies are created and updated. Additionally, individuals may send the Policy Office new or
revised policies for consideration. After the Executive Cabinet reviews and comments on draft policies, the entire campus community is given an opportunity to review and comment during a 30-day review and comment period. The 30-day review period is announced in the UNM News Minute.

Currently, UNM sponsored projects policies reflect the Controller and HSC Executive Officer for Finance and Administration as the policy owner. Policy owners are responsible for ensuring currency of policy, as well as responsible for taking corrective action when non-compliance is detected.

It is also important for senior leaders to be actively seen as supportive of and consistent with institutional policies and practices. If exceptions to policy are warranted, senior leaders should articulate that they are in fact granting an exception (and ideally, why they feel an exception is needed in that particular instance.) This open communication helps all parties “predict” behavior for future situations and serves as ongoing reinforcement of or refinement of institutional positions. These instances can also help the institution recognize when a policy or procedure is repeatedly not working well and may need to be revised or clarified.

The Peer Review Team heard from multiple constituencies that they were unsure when to approach the VPR and when to approach the Controller with transactional escalations or exceptions to standard practice or policy.

- **Recommendation:** The Controller should review all sponsored projects policies for appropriateness with the designated policy owner. Where updates are warranted, this should occur. Additionally, it would be helpful to create and share guidelines about which senior officers will make decisions and when such decisions must be made in joint collaboration.

Although OSP states they review and revise sponsored projects policies and procedures annually, most policies contain an issue or last revised date of 2015 or earlier. Up-to-date policies should exist to ensure effective management of sponsored projects. The Team noted two policies—subawards and effort reporting—which should be updated to reflect current Uniform Guidance references.

- **Recommendation:** The OSP Director should implement a review of all established sponsored project policies to bring them in line with currently stated review expectations. Where updates are warranted or additional policies needed, these should be provided to the policy owner and Policy Office for consideration. Such a review should include staff and other subject matter experts as needed. OSP should document its review by adding a “Last Reviewed” date to each and, ideally, synopsize any significant edits that were made. OSP should revise Subaward Policy 2470 and Effort Reporting Policy E120 to reflect current Uniform Guidance references and requirements.
• **Recommendation:** The OSP Director should implement a regular review of procedures and ensure these are transparent and understood by central and unit-level staff. The Office of Sponsored Projects should stay abreast of changes in regulations through webinars, listservs, and attendance at professional meetings and inform the research community accordingly. Currently, all policies are housed on the UNM Policy Office website and organized by management categories: organization, administration, personnel, procurement, etc. Policies pertaining to sponsored projects are not grouped together, easily identifiable, or easily accessible to the research community. While OSP C&G houses select policies on their website, OSP PA only houses procedures and guidelines on their website. Given that the institution and sponsors expect faculty and unit/central staff to manage sponsored projects in a compliant fashion, the research community needs ready access to needed information to aid them in this process.

• **Recommendation:** VPR, Controller and OSP Director should consider a streamlined website linking to all sponsored projects related information (pre- and post-award policies and procedures) in a single online location that is easily searchable.

---

**X. STANDARD for Research Administration Business Continuity.**

Research administration has a business continuity plan to maintain functional operations during or shortly following disruptive events. A disruption may include utility failures, communication disruptions, fire, explosion, or the inability to access the workplace due to safety or transportation issues.

Research administration periodically assesses its business continuity plan and ensures that appropriate research administration units and committees are informed.

The OVPR maintains an emergency plan and a member of the staff serves on UNM’s Emergency Management Team. The Review Team did not review the emergency plan while on-site. The research administration operations affected by emergencies and disasters appear to be handled within the broader campus plans. This would include communications to both the IRB and IACUC committees. Within the Facilities Services Office, there is an emergency management program found at [http://emanage.unm.edu/](http://emanage.unm.edu/). UNM Administrative Policy 2520 [http://policy.unm.edu/university-policies/2000/2520.html](http://policy.unm.edu/university-policies/2000/2520.html) addresses the overall process for data loss protection. The Chief Information Officer is the process owner for this policy.

OSP has completed a business impact analysis as part of its disaster recovery plan. It is a useful assessment tool for campus closures as well as disaster planning.
Faculty Engagement and Faculty Burden

XI. STANDARD for Faculty Engagement and Faculty Burden.

Relative to the size of the research enterprise, the research administration areas have considered the collective impact and burden on faculty and explored mechanisms to reduce or manage that burden. Faculty are provided opportunities to discuss challenges or impediments. The institution’s research leadership has engaged the faculty senate as appropriate.

UNM does not have an ongoing internal process to review sponsored programs burden per se, but OVPR leadership responds to issues that arise through regular meetings with the Research Policy Committee as well as through meetings with Associate Deans for Research and Center Directors. Faculty did not feel that they had input on changed or proposed sponsored projects policies, though most felt that this was likely handled elsewhere (e.g., through their Associate Dean for Research or Center Director).

Most commonly, faculty contact their Associate Dean for Research with issues or challenges, though they can also submit issues directly to the Faculty Senate Research Policy Committee or contact the VPR, one of the AVPRs, or the FRDO or OSP Director.

Although many expressed frustrations with the level of administrative burden they experienced in performing research, some were not sure what specifically should be changed. A few themes for improvement related to administrative burden were identified, however, as follows:

Faculty reported the greatest administrative burdens with purchasing, with travel reimbursements, and with F&A distribution agreements (especially with the HSC). They also reported that they frequently did not know which central office or person to go to for a specific business need. Relative to purchasing, they noted being required to produce quotes at time of proposal (which they felt should not be necessary, especially since only a small percentage of proposals get funded) and being asked to obtain sponsor re-approval for items already in their sponsor-approved budget. Also noted were administrative hoops required to purchase from a specific vendor to match existing equipment (and thus obtain consistent results). In some cases, the Peer Review Team noted that there might be a good reason why Purchasing might need additional documentation from a PI (to meet government bidding requirements, for example) but it did not appear that faculty were informed about the basis or reasoning behind the requests made to them. As noted in the Standard VI, articulating the basis for a policy or practice change or the reason why additional information is needed
(e.g., federal purchasing requirement for costs exceeding the certain threshold, or to determine the degree to which the decision involves a risk to the institution) helps educate requestors as well as letting them know that the request is not arbitrary or spurious. As noted elsewhere in this document, the Peer Review Team felt that some internal requirements exceeded federal requirements and were generally inconsistent with the levels of risk that other research-intensive universities are willing to accept. Adjustment in risk tolerance might increase faculty satisfaction and reduce administrative cost/burden to the institution with minimal if any added institutional risk.

One faculty member said, “we learn by doing.” A number of faculty felt that the interpretation of requirements varied greatly within the central research office staff and from year to year, and there was concern about the degree of knowledge staff possessed, though they recognized this may be because the staff are new. Faculty indicated that rules or policies or interpretations would change without communication to them. (see Standard VI: Communication for more details)

Faculty also reported challenges (mostly timing) with sponsored project issues that fall outside of “routine” grants and contracts and which need special handling, including contracts that are not lab science or were with community-based organizations. They reported concern with high-level of turnover in OSP (though they were not clear whether this was due to internal reassignment or people no longer working in that office.) They were generally satisfied with the level of support they received locally, though they noted that the extent of such support varied widely from department to department. Faculty with dual appointments indicated they would pick which unit to use based on their satisfaction with the level of support able to be provided.

Faculty also reported administrative burden with rebudgeting (timing, need to obtain unnecessary sponsor approval when no such approval was required, requirements to budget to very specific levels of detail).

No specific recommendation is being made on most of the topics listed here as the OVPR has already initiated a Purchasing Committee to address issues in the purchasing/travel arena and other recommendations in this report are likely to serve to address the remaining issues.

- **Recommendation:** The OVPR and the Controller should consider specifically addressing the topic of “burden versus benefit,” particularly in regard to faculty administrative burden, as a part of major policy and procedure changes.
Research Administration Systems and Data Management

XII. STANDARD for Information Systems Supporting Research Administration.

The institution has in place appropriate information systems to support research administration and sponsored programs and has processes that integrate proposals, awards, financial management, subawards, and compliance reviews. There is sufficient IT support for systems. As appropriate to the size and scope of the research enterprise/portfolio, the institution has implemented appropriate and integrated electronic systems. The institution periodically assesses research administration technology needs.

Appropriate to the size and volume, the institution provides access to real-time financial data.

UNM utilizes the following systems to support research administration: Cayuse for proposal submission, award receipt, contract negotiation tracking and subaward tracking; IRBNet and Opinio for IRB; Opinio for COI; and TOPAZ for IACUC. Banner is the financial system of record. All of these systems allow UNM to integrate with government-wide or agency specific proposal submission processes. As an example, Cayuse was one of the first systems to allow researchers to use the National Science Foundation’s (NSF) Research.gov proposal entry system.

The Peer Review Team learned that OSP uses Cayuse for capturing proposal data and that the various systems listed above are not integrated, with the exception of both IRB and COI using Opinio. This is causing frustration with the campus community and, since data is being “double entered,” there is greater risk for error. Banner does have the capability to capture proposal submission data, but UNM does not use that module. Rather, UNM relies upon Cayuse for all proposal submission data and Cayuse is not known for having robust reporting tools.

The Peer Review Team learned that UNM has created a workgroup to look at potential alternative electronic research administration systems – the main campus and HSC run two completely different systems. Part of this workgroup’s charge is to investigate how to “tie” Banner and Cayuse and/or look at other systems. While UNM may not have had a periodic review of research administration technologies available, this is a good first step for such a periodic review.

- **Recommendation:** UNM should investigate utilization of the Banner proposal module and automate the Cayuse-to-Banner data entry. Oregon State University (OSU) is an example of a school using Banner and Cayuse that
has automated the proposal data entry into Banner. By using Cayuse’s Data Mart, OSU mapped the Cayuse proposal data to the Banner proposal module screens. Use of this module would eliminate duplicate manual entry and allow UNM to create more robust proposal reporting tools.

If UNM is going to investigate utilizing another system-to-system product for proposal submission, one of the evaluation criteria must be IT staff support. With the Cayuse system, IT support demands may be less than other systems. During the site visit, the Peer Review Team did not learn of any specific staffing issues within Financial Systems Management (FSM).

The Banner Financial system offers “real-time” financial data for PIs and staff for financial management. In 2017, MyReports was launched to provide tools for PIs and staff that is easier to use than Banner reports. Standard XIII: Institutional Management of Research Administration Data will discuss this in further detail.

OSP relies upon emails and forms sent to the IRB and IACUC for information, which are completed and returned to OSP. It is unclear if OSP makes use of the automated message Cayuse can send to the IRB or IACUC. The Peer Review Team was told that account setups would not be delayed for absence of appropriate IRB or IACUC approvals, but absence of an up-to-date COI disclosure would delay award setup. This issue is also raised in Standard XVIII: Proposal Review and Submission and Standard XX: Award Acceptance.

In the case of Public Health Service (PHS) awards, OSP will not stop setup when a Financial Conflict of Interest (FCOI) disclosure is incomplete. Standard XX: Award Acceptance contains a recommendation on this issue.

UNM uses Banner’s effort reporting capabilities, which faculty can find in “LoboWeb.” UNM performs effort certification on a semi-annual basis, by individual. The system requires a pre-review before anyone can certify effort. UNM has not moved to a project-based payroll certification system that can be certified at the project level. Since UNM is a member of the FDP, the Peer Review Team encourages OSP to look at the possibility of moving to project-level payroll certification.

OSP C&G’s website has nice guides and tutorials for completing effort reporting. It is not clear, however, if there is an escalation process to deal with late effort reports. This will be discussed in more detail in Standard XXIII: Sponsored Programs Fiscal Management.
XIII. STANDARD for Institutional Management of Research Administration Data.

Accurate and accessible data on sponsored programs activity and management are maintained, and the data covers areas that relate to efficiency and research management metrics, such as submissions, awards, and turnaround times. Data is collected regarding institutional actions, such as F&A waivers, and sponsor requirements, such as personnel training. Trends in activity over time are tracked and appropriately reported. As appropriate to the institution, research administrative data also includes clinical trials, clinical research, and other externally sponsored activities.

Essential to any institutional research enterprise is the availability of data for University leadership, faculty, and staff. To be useful, data must be timely, accurate, consistent, and easy to obtain. UNM primarily utilizes two systems: Cayuse SP for pre-award data and Banner Finance for post-award financial data. Cayuse SP contains all proposal data, including federal proposals submitted System-to-System (S2S). Banner contains some common pre-award data that is only entered for funded projects, as well as all post-award financial data and is the “source of truth.”

In February 2017, the Financial Services Division Main (FSM), Office of Sponsored Projects (OSP), and the Office of the VP for Research (OVPR) launched the Sponsored Research Data Portal in MyReports. This Business Intelligence tool combines Cayuse data with Banner Finance data, providing the research community with one-stop access to pre-award and post-award data – proposal, award and expenditures - through interactive dashboards with drill down capabilities. Proposal and award trends – quantity, dollar, and sponsor type – are also available through the dashboards. The research community can schedule any of these reports to be automatically delivered to email addresses based upon the selected frequency (e.g., weekly, monthly, quarterly).

- **Notable Practice**: FSM/OVPR leadership are commended for making accurate and accessible data on sponsored projects activity available to the research community. Both institutions and sponsors expect faculty to be responsible for each award from a technical and financial perspective. It is imperative that faculty have timely and accurate access to data to assist them in this role.

- **Recommendation**: The OSP Director should develop PI-specific training addressing the essentials of project financial management, including what tools and information are available to them, how to access these tools, and how to interpret financial reports. This training may also include participation by the central and departmental administrators who can provide their expertise on forecasts, projections, and transactions in process.
Current users of Finance MyReports automatically have access to the new Sponsored Research tab. Other interested users can request access to the portal. There are three levels of access: basic, intermediate, and advanced. Basic access allows users to run published reports and schedule them to be delivered via email. Intermediate access also allows users to extract detail data from the dashboards for further analysis and custom reporting need without the need for technical or query writing knowledge. Advanced access allows users to write their own custom queries, reports, and charts using the InfoAssist report-writing tool. To obtain advanced access, there is a prerequisite training to train the user on how to deploy InfoAssist.

- **Notable Practice:** FSM/OVPR leadership are commended for recognizing the technology savvy researchers and research administrators, who desire to access, analyze, customize, and run custom queries, reports, and charts. Providing three levels of access and the training needed is vital to the success of the research community.

- **Recommendation:** The VPR should ensure, at a minimum, all principal investigators have access to these tools. The access may also include Co-Investigators and departmental administrators who often provide their expertise in the management of sponsored projects.

OSP C&G also has a repository of standard financial reports available to all campus researchers.

OSP tracks performance metrics for each central sponsored projects function, team, and team member. This includes the quantity of activities or transactions processed, as well as the processing times for each. Capturing performance metrics by function, team, team member, and processing times enables the institution to identify trends, peak periods, and workload growth, which can be valuable when assessing staffing needs. Additionally, as UNM strives to improve performance, processing times can be a key indicator related to efficiency, automation, and streamlining.

Performance metrics data is captured through excel workbooks maintained by team members and team leads. Significant data is captured within these workbooks: UNM identifiers, PI, sponsor, etc. OSP staff reported to the Peer Review Team the value of these workbooks and how it facilitates awareness across OSP of work in process. OSP staff also acknowledged the time it takes to maintain these workbooks, as well as the time needed to translate raw data into meaningful reports focused on quantity and processing times.

Compliance review requirements and approvals data is maintained by these compliance offices and are captured in various systems: Opinio, Topaz, IRBNet, Access database and Microsoft Excel. OSP does not have access to these systems and is reliant upon reports, emails, or other notifications to verify if compliance
requirements and approvals have been obtained or training requirements have been met. OSP staff reported to the Peer Review Team that this could delay set up times.

- **Recommendation**: The VPR should examine whether existing data fields could be utilized to track performance measures and compliance data to **eliminate manual tracking**. Maintaining this data in the source system will facilitate data capture in a single location, eliminate opportunity for human error, and facilitate a streamlined and automated approach while eliminating redundant steps.

### Institutional Research Partnerships and Associations

**XIV. STANDARD for Institutional Research Partnerships with Other Organizations.**

The institution has established strategic agreements for all long-term affiliations or relationships with other organizations that are participating or collaborating in research activities (e.g., hospitals, institutes, agencies). These agreements are periodically reviewed. These relationships apply to research activities flowing in from, as well as out to, the partner(s). Additional relationships include research-related institutional services (e.g., oversight for regulatory compliance areas such as human or animal research) provided to other organizations.

UNM has an affiliated 501(c)3 foundation—the University of New Mexico Foundation (UNMF). UNMF also submits grant proposals where an eligible applicant must be a 501(c)3 organization. A memorandum of understanding exists to facilitate proposal submissions and award acceptance.

Decisions about gifts/grants and about how to approach various non-federal sources of support appear well coordinated and with all parties not only operating with common understandings, but also highly committed to making the process work efficiently for all stakeholders. The Senior Director of Development at the Foundation works very closely with FRDO as well; they meet monthly to collaborate and to co-manage private foundation’s limited competitions. UNM Foundation (UNMF) is very thoughtful about evaluating whether something is a gift or grant and provides advice when OSP asks for input on transactions they are processing. UNMF uses The Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) guidelines to make determinations, as well as some guidelines from Harvard.
The relationship between OSP and UNMF is exceptional. The Peer Review Team was very impressed and found this to be among the very best working Foundation/OSP relationships the members have seen.

- **Notable Practice**: UNM is to be commended for its unusually strong and highly cohesive and effective working arrangement with their Foundation.

The terms of the UNMF-UNM MOU allow UNMF proposal submissions to reside in Cayuse. If an award is made, UNMF confers with OSP PA on any terms and conditions, confirms that the awards’ terms and conditions do not violate UNM policies and procedures, and transfers 100% of the award to C&G.

- **Notable Practice**: The working relationship between OSP and UNMF is a model to which other universities should aspire. A MOU between UNM and UNMF makes proposal submission and award acceptance seamless between the two organizations.

UNMF also collaborates with FRDO on private foundations’ limited competitions.

UNM also has partnerships and have executed Master Blanket agreements with three National Laboratories. These master agreements facilitate an expeditious negotiation of work orders/task orders for sponsored agreements by negotiating “blanket” terms and conditions that do not change on an individual work or task order. If UNM has a desire to increase its partnerships with other National Laboratories or other agencies, participation by the VPR is very important.

UNM also has some master agreements with industry sponsors. This type of arrangement for industry sponsors works in the same manner and expedites negotiation of sponsored agreements.

**XV. STANDARD for Research Associations with Non-Employed Individuals.**

The institution has clear definitions for relationships with individuals who are engaged in conducting sponsored programs, but who are not employees. Such individuals include visiting scholars, courtesy faculty, or other individuals not paid by the institution but who are afforded space and responsibilities associated with research activities.

UNM’s policy on Eligibility for Principal Investigator Status clearly delineates who can serve as a principal investigator. The policy builds upon UNM’s Faculty Handbook. UNM permits visiting faculty (i.e., visiting faculty from other institutions) to serve as PIs on sponsored projects. Emeritus faculty are also allowed to serve as PIs on sponsored projects. Part of the appointment process for visiting faculty and/or scholars is the
acknowledgement that administrative departments take responsibility for performance/adherence to terms and conditions for visiting faculty/scholars and emeritus faculty.

In addition to visiting and emeritus faculty, UNM also has two other types of non-employee appointments: The Letter of Academic Title (LAT) and a Joint Appointment. The LAT appointment is a non-paid position, but these positions are allowed to serve as PIs. Joint Appointment positions are a specific arrangement with National Laboratories, such as Los Alamos National Laboratory. Individuals holding a Joint Appointment are also allowed to serve as a PI. The Joint Appointment agreement itself provides expectations for such appointees.

Research Development Operations

XVI. STANDARD for Research Development.

The institution has created a strategy for developing critical research partnerships both internally and externally. As part of partnership development, the institution focuses on research team building, federal relations building, and ensuring necessary collaborative and core research facilities and resources are available and maintained.

The institution focuses on research capacity building with special attention on identifying and nurturing areas of institutional strength.

The institution supports faculty in grantsmanship development by providing monetary resources, such as internal seed funding, educational opportunities, and support services.

UNM recognizes the importance of developing critical research partnerships and promoting sponsored projects growth through external research funding. The Faculty Research Development Office (FRDO) works in close collaboration with OSP, providing essential research support in colleges, centers, and departments. FRDO associates, known as Faculty Research Support Officers (FRSOs), report to the OVPR and are housed either locally in units or in the OVPR.

FRSOs provide the following services:

➢ Identification of Funding Opportunities,
➢ Interdisciplinary and Collaborative Proposal Collaboration,
➢ Research Collaboration and Partnership Building,
➢ Workshops and Seminars,
➢ Proposal Planning and Development, including:
  o Navigating Proposal Submission Process,
  o Letters of Support,
  o Biosketch/CV Review and Formatting,
  o Broader Impacts Consultations,
  o Budget and Budget Justification Development,
  o Editing and Proofreading of Narrative Sections, and
  o Graphic Design Support; and

➢ Policy Consultations.

The FRDO Director attends meetings with Associate Deans for Research and Center Directors as well as with UNM Foundation and the UNM Government & Community Relations offices. This allows UNM to bring people together at opportune times based upon research development needs. All of these methods allow FRDO to support the implementation of the President’s Research Grand Challenges Initiative.

The OSP and the FRDO websites provide valuable information to aid the research community including upcoming workshops; materials from prior offerings; institutional rates and facts; resources for writing; sample sponsor forms and templates; checklists; instructions; facilities, equipment and other resources example and many other valuable tools. In some cases, valuable information is duplicated on both websites. In other cases, valuable information is only located on one website. This can cause confusion as the research community either must go to both sites or risks an unawareness of valuable resources available.

Table 1: Website Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOOL</th>
<th>OSP PA WEBSITE</th>
<th>OSP C&amp;G WEBSITE</th>
<th>FRDO WEBSITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION/RATES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW TOOL LINKS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSLETTER</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINING SESSIONS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPONSORED RESEARCH DATA PORTAL LINK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICIES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATISTICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Recommendation**: The Directors of OSP and FRDO should collaborate on assessing existing tools, identifying additional tools needed, and developing materials needed to aid the research community. An institutional resource document should be developed describing the institutional resources available (Core research facilities, equipment, expertise, and other resources available). This document is vital for the faculty who can cut and paste applicable sections into their proposals. Once developed, the document should be reviewed quarterly and updated when warranted.

UNM’s 2020 Women in STEM competition invites eligible PIs to apply for the following internal awards:

- $3000 for travel expenses for a research collaborator to visit UNM or for the UNM faculty to travel to meet with a collaborator, or
- $10,000 for seed funding for new research for a single PI proposal, or
- $15,000 for seed funding for new research if two women STEM faculty at UNM collaborate on a proposal, or
- $8,000 for a 2 to 3-day workshop that brings together 5 - 10 scholars to develop ideas and research across STEM departments and disciplines.

In addition, the OVPR provides internal/seed funding made available from F&A return. Various schools and colleges have also offered internal/seed funding when available.

• **Notable Practice**: The FRDO/FRSO program is extremely well received across the institution by faculty, deans, chairs, and central administration. Those FRSOs embedded within units build rapport with their assigned faculty, are easily accessible and serve the research community. The FRSOs are a resource to one another. If a situation is new to one FRSO, they reach out to another and learn what to do. If one FRSO is out on vacation/medical leave, another FRSO will cover her area of responsibility.

**XVII. STANDARD for Sponsored Program Funding and Proposal Services.**
The institution provides faculty/investigators, staff, and students access to information on prospective sponsors (such as government, local, corporate and private foundations, international agencies). The institution assesses the quality of usefulness of its information resources. Stakeholders are provided resources, tools, and assistance, as appropriate to the culture of the institution, the level of activity, and the relative importance of research in strategic goals. Appropriate to the size and needs of the institution, assistance is extended to assist investigators and research personnel in responding to funding opportunities and preparing letters of intent, pre-proposals, and proposals. Clear expectations exist for training appropriate to responsibilities for all levels of staff engaged in sponsored program funding and proposal services at central and unit levels.

The OSP PA staff often share program announcements with FRSOs. FRSOs currently use ProQuest’s Pivot to match faculty interest and areas of institutional strength with funding opportunities. ProQuest’s Pivot also assists with research funding opportunities for limited submission opportunities. When such opportunities are identified, they are communicated to the faculty via the website and campus listserv. Targeted announcements are also forwarded to chairs, deans and Associate Deans for Research as deemed appropriate. This is an appropriate distribution mechanism to alert key areas to those opportunities where the sponsor limits submissions.

While Pivot can provide some metrics, OSP PA is not currently utilizing this system and functionality. FRSOs use a ticketing system, FIRST, for tracking the services provided to the campus community. FRSOs track proposals, which FRSOs assisted, and whether these proposals were funded. This enables them to track the efficacy of services provided.

- **Recommendation**: OSP PA and FRDO should collaborate on the tracking of competitive proposals to assess overall UNM proposal success ratios. While it may be beneficial to assess the success of FRDO, most universities identify their proposal success ratios in comparison to peer and aspirant institutions.

There are many tools available to institutions for locating funding opportunities. Some tools allow a matching of funding opportunities to faculty profile interests resulting in electronic (and immediate) delivery of information about that opportunity. Not only are such systems timely but they also direct the information to the target individuals. While all systems require some review by the end-user to refine what information is the best match to his/her interests, generally the automatic targeting and delivery can provide a wealth of information.

- **Recommendation**: The Directors of OSP and FRDO should contact peer universities and inquire as to the funding identification tools used at their institutions. Inquiries should include the number of faculty using their products,
faculty satisfaction, and submission vs. award data to assess if the product(s) may be a viable option for UNM.

OSP PA provides FRDO weekly new funding opportunities, which FRSOs disseminate to their assigned faculty. Additionally, FRSOs are well versed in customizing Pivot searches, attending “lightning talks” to learn of faculty research interests, and tracking faculty interests in limited competitions. This equips FRSOs with significant knowledge regarding faculty area of expertise and interest, which is utilized to recommend the most appropriate funding opportunities and identify research collaborators for interdisciplinary and collaborative proposals.

FRDO offers several training and informational sessions to faculty and staff each semester including:

- A grantsmanship boot camp
- CAREER workshops
- Opportunities to work with external sponsors
- A variety of research development related topics

FRDO also participates in faculty orientation annually, assists with limited competitions as needed, and hosts meetings/visits with sponsor programmatic staff. FRDO collaborates with early career investigators assisting them in strategies for success: identifying relevant funding opportunities, explaining sponsor requirements, and assisting them in the development of their applications.

Many FRSOs began their career in central administration and then moved to schools or colleges. In some cases, FRSOs worked at UNM’s Health Science Center before moving to a school or college. As a result, FRSOs are well trained research administration professionals with extensive experience, proficiency, and understanding of research development. They have the knowledge and resources needed to perform their responsibilities. During high turnover periods and training of newer staff in OSP PA, FRSOs are often more knowledgeable than the OSP PA staff.

- **Notable Practice:** OVPR and the Directors of OSP and FRDO are commended for the success of the FRDO program. When a proposal is prepared in collaboration with an FRSO, rarely are issues identified with that proposal from an administrative/financial standpoint.

- **Recommendation:** OSP and FRDO should share training opportunities, develop new research tools and resources, and work together to educate both their own staff and unit staff about these tools and resources. Both units report to the OVPR and should present a united front across the institution.
Both are best equipped to serve if they are equally knowledgeable and promote the same resource tools to the research community.

FRSOs provide the research community with a) proposal writing assistance including writing, editing, and proposal preparation and b) assistance in facilitating the development of complex and multi-disciplinary/multi-site collaborative proposals and proposals in areas identified as institutional strengths.

It is important to note that FRSOs do not exist within all colleges and schools. Where a FRSO does not reside within the unit, faculty work with unit-level staff. While some are highly skilled and have primary responsibilities focused on research support, other unit-level staff are less experienced with the requirements associated with proposal development and rely heavily on FRSOs to assist them in their proposal development support.

- **Recommendation:** Directors of OSP and FRDO should identify individuals working on proposal development that are less experienced/knowledgeable and target training on proposal development for those individuals.

**Sponsored Program Operations**

**XVIII. STANDARD for Proposal Review and Submission.**

---

The institution has a consistent approach for reviewing and processing proposals that is in compliance with institutional and sponsor guidelines and requirements. Such processes include budgeting, cost sharing, and specific sponsor policies. Proposal review includes processes for needs of special solicitation requirements and voluntary waivers of F&A. The roles and responsibilities associated with the proposal review and submission activities are clearly understood by all stakeholders.

Management systems and the proposal review process interface smoothly with compliance processes/systems and the systems/processes for accepting and managing any subsequent awards. There is a clear process for subrecipients in both proposals and as awards. The institution clearly distinguishes sponsored programs from gifts. The institution has clearly defined and communicated internal processes for sponsors that restrict the number of applications.

Clear expectations exist for training appropriate to responsibilities for all levels of staff engaged in sponsored program proposal review and submission at central and unit levels. The central and unit-level staff has adequate understanding of submission requirements for electronic and non-electronic proposal submissions.

---

OSP PA’s Proposal Development and Award Guide (PDAG) distinguishes gifts from grants and stipulates the appropriate offices granted the authority to handle these transactions. OSP is responsible for grants and UNM Foundation is responsible for
gifts. In some cases, each office receives some proposals that should be handled by the other office. Both offices acknowledge “gray areas” where the determination could be either. The Peer Review Team was told that awards are classified as sponsored projects if there is ambiguity. OSP PA and UNM Foundation have a strong relationship, which allows them to discuss and determine how an activity should be coded. OSP PA and UNM Foundation could expand on existing resources and collaborate in the development and utilization of a shared decision tree to help in distinguishing gifts from sponsored projects. Some examples are included below:

- Harvard University: https://research.fas.harvard.edu/policies/gift-vs-grant
- University of California Irvine: https://research.uci.edu/sponsored-projects/gift-vs-grant/index.html
- University of Michigan: https://orsp.umich.edu/what-sponsored-project
- Northwestern University: https://osr.northwestern.edu/policies/giftsvsgrants
- Penn State University: https://policy.psu.edu/policies/ra04
- University of Minnesota: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Bw3yHuGQzD8CN3dfYW4yb0JOSFE/view?usp=sharing

OSP PA is responsible for the review and submission of all sponsored projects proposals for the main campus and four branches of UNM. PIs and department chairs must provide or secure approval by the dean before proposals are electronically routed to OSP PA. OSP PA reviews proposals by appointment and this entails either a two-hour or a four-hour review, based upon sponsor requirements and proposal complexity. The first half of the appointment enables OSP PA to review all materials provided. The PI or a designee must be available by phone or email for the second half of the appointment to address any questions or concerns detected during the OSP PA review.

There are two types of review. A Comprehensive Proposal Review requires the proposal be submitted to OSP PA in complete and final form a minimum of two business days prior to the sponsor’s deadline. An Essential Component Review is an abbreviated review and occurs when a proposal is routed to OSP PA with insufficient time to do a Comprehensive Review. With all Essential Component Reviews, the PI is solely responsible for all proposal materials outside of the OSP PA reviewed items.

- **Notable Practice:** The proposal appointment practice is working well and is valued by all parties.
The Essential Component Review allows OSP PA to confirm: effort and fringe benefits of PI and key personnel; PI proposal certification is acquired; COI disclosures are complete; applicable F&A rate or reduced rate is approved; cost sharing commitments are approved; subaward letters of commitment are included; acknowledgement of all representations and certifications are appropriate; and proposal materials are consistent with guidelines.

The Comprehensive Review includes all of the above as well as: eligibility criteria; internal budget calculations are accurate; budget justification conforms to budget and meets applicable requirements; formatting, page count and other formatting requirements are met; and review applicable regulatory requirements.

When the sponsor has a limited submission requirement, OSP PA checks with FRDO to ensure the PI was selected to move forward with his/her submission. When the sponsor incorporates provisions that may require negotiation, OSP PA Proposal Team will consult with the Contracts Team. The OVPR reviews and approves all F&A waivers/reductions. UNM discourages voluntary cost sharing. Mandatory cost sharing is captured within Cayuse; the PI or department must identify the funding source supporting the cost share and PI, dean and/or chair approval is required.

While UNM accepts classified research, no classified research is occurring on-site at UNM. OSP PA is responsible for reviewing non-classified proposal materials and will work closely with UNM Industrial Security Department (ISD) when needed. The OSP PA Proposal Team also consults with ISD on matters of foreign influence. OSP PA’s Contract Team also works with ISD on non-classified contracts.

As stated earlier, UNM does not have a systematic link between proposal and compliance systems. OSP PA reviews proposals and identifies when compliance review/approval is warranted. OSP PA alerts the appropriate compliance groups, such as IRB, IACUC, Biosafety, COI. Each group has a different and manual process to alert OSP PA when review/approval has occurred. Two examples are shown below:

➢ FCOI Office provides a weekly report of individuals who have completed their disclosures. OSP PA confirms personnel included in a proposal to that list manually. If individuals are included within the proposal but do not appear on the FCOI list, OSP PA alerts the FCOI Office. OSP PA is only confirming FCOI disclosure. OSP PA is not assessing whether COI training has occurred, and they are not assessing whether there are familial or other conflicts. While beyond the scope of this report, the institution should review their COI process to incorporate checks for familial, financial, or institutional conflicts with each proposal, as this would be a better practice.

➢ Export control issues pertain to the individuals working on a research project, where they are travelling to/from, what data results from the research, who the data may be shared with, as well as the goods used/generated because of the research. Currently, OSP PA
does not assess proposals for export control or European Union General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) concerns. Assessing export control and GDPR concerns prior to submitting a proposal will enable UNM to minimize, if not eliminate, compliance risks associated with export controls and data privacy.

OSP PA staff expressed concerns with the current manual process since it is time consuming and pertains to a deadline driven function.

- **Recommendation:** OSP PA should check for compliance concerns, including conflicts of interest, export controls, and GDPR concerns specific to each proposal prior to submission.
- **Recommendation:** The Director of OSP should assess whether all compliance areas can be captured within Cayuse and if an interface can be built between Cayuse and the compliance systems.

OSP PA staff have varied levels of expertise due to high turnover. OSP PA attempts to train new hires through one-on-one training. In some cases, relatively new employees train new employees. Onboarding and training of staff is discussed in more detail in Standard IV: Research Administration Staffing and Staff Development.

As is standard practice in the industry, the institution has a defined authority levels for signatures on proposals and contracts. This is discussed in more detail in Standard XX: Award Acceptance. While the VPR is the official Authorized Organizational Representative, he has delegated proposal signature authority to the OSP PA staff. No issues were reported with regard to signature authority or turnaround on signatures.

**XIX. STANDARD for Award Review and Negotiation.**

The institution has a consistent process to review terms and conditions of grant, contract, and cooperative agreement awards, including the relationship to original proposal budget. Incoming subawards are reviewed for the terms of the subaward and the flow-through terms of the prime award. Processes include routine communication with PIs.

The institution evaluates all awards for sponsor restrictions on such items as the use of funds, appropriate project personnel, publication rights, or intellectual property to ensure compliance with institutional policies that govern the research activities of the institution.

Processes are in place for ancillary agreements, such as non-disclosure agreements or data use agreements.

Clear expectations exist for training appropriate to responsibilities for all level of staff engaged in sponsored program award review and negotiation at central and unit levels.
When awards (sponsored, material transfer, data use, or confidentiality) arrive at OSP C&G electronically (at osp@unm.edu), via mail, or via a sponsor’s portal, the front desk assistant matches the award to a Cayuse record and forwards the email notice to awards@unm.edu or physically places the award documents with the Award Team supervisor. Alternatively, the sponsored project specialist may receive and route the award to awards@unm.edu for handling.

Awards that require negotiation, including all contracts, material transfer agreements, data use agreements, and confidentiality agreements, are routed to the OSP PA’s Contracts Team; regular grants and cooperative agreements are routed to the OSP Award team for handling, though cooperative agreements may also require negotiation assistance from the Contracts team.

The award setup guide clearly delineates those items that must be reviewed for accuracy by the Awards team staff member. These items include:

- project period of performance
- comparison of the proposed budget with the awarded amount and budget
- cost share and program income requirements
- billing terms; carryforward requirements.
- reporting requirements
- special grant terms and conditions
- audit and retention
- FARs/DFARS
- representations and certifications
- export control
- compliance reviews (COI, human subjects, animal subjects)

The setup guide indicates a substantial re-review of the budget at time of award, including using Excel to ensure that the Award Budget Sheet adds correctly and verification of each account code and its match to the awarded budget. Given the considerable rebudgeting flexibility within most grants and cooperative agreements have today, these reviews indicate a degree of precision that is likely not needed. For standard federal grants and most private awards that allow rebudgeting, it should be acceptable to ensure that budget amounts are within the correct category (e.g., salaries, supplies, other direct costs, travel, subawards) and that the exclusions to the MTDC base are calculated correctly before setting up the award. Creating a greater degree of precision can cause delays and add extra administrative burden without adding true benefit to the project or the university.
• **Notable Practice**: OSP has an admirable comprehensive Award Setup Guide and Contract Procedure documents which clearly articulate award acceptance procedures.

• **Notable Practice**: OSP and their Export Control Officer have created a useful list of terms for staff to use to identify potential export control issues.

• **Recommendation**: OSP and Unit Administrators should reassess award budget review process to determine if it can be simplified and streamlined.

The OSP PA Contracts Team is involved in all contracts and with other awards where negotiation of terms is required. The Contracts Team uses the Contract Review Checklist and the Contract Procedure guide as tools to help them identify and obtain desired contractual language positions for the university. In addition, the Office of University Counsel has created several core documents for use by staff to help obtain university-preferred positions on such topics as indemnification and choice of law.

PIs are afforded the opportunity to review Contract documents prior to acceptance to confirm their willingness to accept terms and conditions.

While the Contract Procedure document is an excellent starting point, it is common for negotiations to be far more complex than a single given stated position or a single language position, and staff need to understand the basis for each and every university negotiation position in order to be able to understand both principles and parameters (including permissible fall back positions) to enable negotiations to be effective. OSP PA Contract staff reported that they do not always know the “why” behind what they are negotiating.

Several offices are key in expanding core knowledge and understanding of institutional positions and should be seen as trainers for OSP PA Contract staff in this regard, chief among these are the Office of University Counsel, the Export Control Office, the Technology Transfer Office, and IT security/data privacy and management staff for the university. Staff reported that they are not routinely receiving specialized training at this time, except for Export Controls. The Office of University Counsel noted that they had lost their (highly valued) IP attorney and are short-staffed at the moment, but that they would be happy to provide more training to OSP PA.

• **Recommendation**: OSP PA Contract staff should take the topics already listed in their Contract procedures guide and identify which areas are most problematic for their negotiators. They should work with other University offices and outside experts to provide advanced training in these areas for their negotiation staff. This training should include providing the reasoning behind the university’s position on each topic and adding “fallback” language or parameters outlining the limits of what staff are permitted to negotiate.
XX. STANDARD for Award Acceptance.

The institution has a process in place that allows the formal acceptance of a sponsored award by designated individuals or offices. The award acceptance process interfaces smoothly with processes for proposal submission and award management. Clear expectations exist for training appropriate to responsibilities for all levels of staff engaged in sponsored programs award acceptance at central and unit levels.

UNM requires staff to complete a “Financial Services Signature Cover Page” backed up with the award document, proposal summary sheet, solicitation, statement of work (SOW), correspondence, exception approvals, and signature markers and requires that a log entry be added (“pre-review log”). This packet requires OSP supervisory review and approval prior to being forwarded to the Controller’s Office for signature. A primary signatory and backup are available. No substantive delays were reported in the signatory process. The Controller’s Office reported that while they had questions on some transactions, very few needed to be rejected prior to signature. A very low incidence of rejection is indicative of (1) strong adherence to office procedure and (2) a process step that may not be needed (or at least, that may not be needed in all cases).

While every institution makes its own decisions as to signatories, it is common for the senior management team of the pre-award office (at minimum) to hold signature authority after successfully passing a probationary period and demonstrating knowledge/competence in the field. UNM may wish to consider refining its process so that transactions are either signed by OSP managers or that only certain transactions deemed high risk (e.g., large or complex business and industry agreements, federal contracts over a given dollar threshold, transactions involving other exceptions to University policy) are routed to the Controller’s Office for signature. Delegating signature authority to lower levels of an organization tends to expedite award processing while at the same time increasing morale and demonstrating senior leadership confidence in the quality of their staff. A change would also reduce administrative burden since a pre-review log would no longer be needed.

At minimum, UNM should consider refining its business process so that fully trained OSP staff (those whose packets are complete and accurate almost all of the time) are able to enter routine transactions into the signature process without supervisory review.

- **Recommendation:** UNM should review its process for signature of contractual documents and consider re-aligning signature responsibility with institutional risk.
The Peer Review Team was made aware that many of the OSP staff are very new and thus still learning their jobs. It is entirely appropriate for transactions to be carefully reviewed by more knowledgeable staff trainers or supervisors during the learning process. As noted elsewhere, this can take from 18-24 months. Until such time that OSP is able to adjust staffing classification and pay and undertake other enhancements needed to improve retention, the need for this duplicative review process is appropriate but should be factored into staffing resource decisions made for OSP.

The award setup guide indicates that compliance approvals are obtained manually via email requests to the relevant offices. As resources become available, work should be undertaken to automate connections between the systems. This will not only reduce administrative burden on staff in both offices, but will also help identify any instances where a compliance approval has lapsed and the sponsored project will need to be financially reviewed to ensure that subject-related costs are not incurred during the lapse period. In the short term, improvements could take the form of granting OSP staff online access to certain parts of the OIRB system or other online compliance system. See the systems section of this report for more information and specific recommendations.

The Award Setup guide indicates that OSP PA will not hold up an award from being processed for PHS COI disclosures. It is unclear whether this is intended to mean that the award can still go forward to OSP C&G but will not be set up until the COI review has been completed or if it means that it will be set up and the COI officials simply notified. Because PHS specifically prohibits funds from being expended if an FCOI exists but is not yet managed, reduced, or eliminated, UNM must make sure that award setup does not occur (or new funds are not added) if a disclosure is missing or if there is a positive disclosure but the case is still awaiting FCOI review. There were inconsistent answers from staff during the review process, but this may have simply been lack of awareness of what action other offices take on the matter.

- **Recommendation:** UNM should verify that PHS awards are not set up (nor funds released) unless all applicable FCOI disclosures have been made and conflict of interest management plans are in place.

**XXI. STANDARD for Award Activation and Notification.**

The institution has a defined process to place a sponsored award in the accounting system and to make funds available to the investigator for expenditures. The institutional notification process for award activation is timely and clearly conveyed to appropriate personnel, such as investigators, researchers, and unit-level research administrators. Notification includes appropriate documentation to investigators and others. The institution has considered the use of pre-award spending accounts.
Clear expectations exist for training appropriate to responsibilities for all level of staff engaged in sponsored programs award activation and notification at central and unit levels.

OSP has clear procedures in place outlining roles and responsibilities and timelines for award activation. The Peer Review Team heard that the timelines stipulated in policy are achieved most of the time. Following acceptance of the award terms, the award setup guide directs staff to re-review the proposal record for completeness and accuracy before proceeding with award setup. The award record is then established in Cayuse by OSP PA using the award setup guide instructions. Staff are instructed to add temporary notes in the “award remarks” section but not add notes in the “notes” tab until the supervisor has reviewed the award package. The “award remarks” notes are then copied and pasted into a separate PDF document to give to the supervisor for review prior to record finalization. The award setup instructions specify that the Cayuse proposal budget should not be brought forward into the award record but instead be re-keyed. This is because the proposal record budget likely requires changes and is not at the Banner account code level.

After completing the Cayuse record, the OSP PA staff member creates a new paper package for supervisor review that includes a copy of the transmittal, the award documents, the award budget sheet (if one has been provided), the proposal summary sheet, the proposal solicitation, the correspondence, and other relevant information. The staff member also fills out an award routing sheet and places the paper package in the bin for supervisor review. The OSP PA staff member also completes the “award review log.” If approved by the supervisor, the temporary notes are copied and pasted from “award remarks” into “notes” for permanent entry into the record. The staff then fills out an OSP scanning Request form and specifies what needs to be scanned.

After the documents are scanned, the package is returned to the staff member for an independent verification that all documents have been uploaded and saved properly. At this time, the staff member will send a notice of completion to the PI, department admin, and fiscal monitor along with an attached copy of the award package.

As outlined in the discussion above, the process for award acceptance is labor intensive and there are many handoffs between groups within the office and with senior management. This issue occurs during award setup as well. Discussion with staff indicate that, except for training issues, few errors are made. This would suggest that there may be an excessive number of checks and balances in place to avoid errors, and more efficient processing could be attainable by reducing the number of “re-checks” of information and instead move to other oversight mechanisms, including spot checks or sampling.
• **Recommendation:** OSP should refine their business processes for award setup to (1) minimize handoffs and (2) trust staff to perform their assigned functions without supervisor review, after successful completion of training.

• **Recommendation:** OSP should consolidate award packages so that only one set of documents is used, even if certain people need to review only some of the documents, and should move to greater reliance on uploaded/scanned documents and e-signatures whenever possible.

• **Recommendation:** OSP should move from 100% review of award packages to a sampling or spot check methodology, especially with low risk transactions.

After all OSP PA award setup tasks are complete, the award moves to OSP C&G for setup in Banner. There is no automated interface that moves the record from Cayuse to Banner at this time, so data is re-keyed. Re-keying data is always of concern because of the increased likelihood of data entry errors and because the manual effort required to avoid such errors adds labor time and administrative burden, even when it is done efficiently. As noted in more detail in Standard XII, it would be productive for UNM to create an electronic interface between Cayuse and Banner. OSP C&G staff re-reviews some of the data already reviewed by OSP PA (e.g., demographic information about the project, program income, cost-sharing, F&A) and adds other financially oriented information.

OSP C&G obtains the Award Budget Sheet (ABS) from the department if not already provided by OSP PA and uses that to assign funding to specific account codes in Banner (at the item level, rather than at the category level). Research intensive institutions often find that practice to be impractical, as the labor required to keep budgets at that level and handle the myriad of rebudgeting requests that would normally arise during a research project exceeds any benefit from the greater insight into how spending is planned. It is common among major research institutions to budget at the categorical account level (e.g., “supplies”) and then charge at the more specific subaccount level (“glassware”). This approach provides a nice balance that allows for a pragmatic review of financial progress of comparing actual expenses against budgeted costs while avoiding the labor involved with maintaining precise budgets for an inherently imprecise activity.

• **Notable Practice:** OSP C&G has a well-defined, step-by-step 41-page award setup guide (different than the guides used by OSP PA).

• **Recommendation:** OSP should map their award negotiation, acceptance and initiation process and create a single, streamlined, seamless end-to-end process that minimizes duplication of effort, uses a single common set
of uploaded data, and adds clarity about the roles/responsibilities assumed by each staff group.

- **Recommendation:** UNM should consider migrating its award setup approach to allow budgeting at the categorical level (while continuing to spend at the account code level)

---

### XXII. STANDARD for Subaward Management and Monitoring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outgoing subawards are written, reviewed, and negotiated to reflect sponsor flow-through requirements (including federal award identification, when applicable) and institutional policy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subawards made from federal funding are evaluated for risk of non-compliance, and for determination of appropriate subaward monitoring. Dependent upon the assessment of risk, monitoring strategies are effective and appropriate. Subawards made from federal funding are verified that they are audited in accordance with 2 CFR 200.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear expectations exist for training appropriate to responsibilities for all levels of staff engaged in sponsored programs subaward responsibilities at central and unit levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responsibility for subawards is a shared responsibility among PIs/units, as requestor; OSP PA, as the group responsible for subaward issuance; and OSP C&G, as the group responsible for the financial aspects. At the time of proposal, a statement of work, budget, budget justification, and a letter of commitment is included in the proposal that comes to OSP PA. Unit staff have access to a document that delineates the differences between a subaward and a contractor agreement (vendor agreement) to help them distinguish between the two. In general, the factors listed in policy to distinguish subrecipients from vendors accurately reflect federal regulations, but two factors are included that are not a part of federal regulations and are not accurate delineators. First, the policy indicates that one indication of a subrecipient is that it “distributes federal dollars further down the pipeline.” While the purpose of this statement probably is intended to mean that the subrecipient may issue second tier subawards, the verbiage used does not make that clear, and is not a delineator since vendors, too, are likely to distribute federal dollars farther down the pipeline when they pay their suppliers. Secondly, the final bullet for what vendors do is “assume the risk if performance is more costly or time consuming than expected.” This is actually the difference between a fixed price versus a cost-reimbursement subaward, but is not a delineator between subrecipients and vendors, and therefore should be removed from the chart.

- **Recommendation:** The Controller and HSC Senior Executive Officer should update their Policy 2470: Sub-award Administration to remove or clarify the
final bullet for “Sub-Recipient Factors” and the final bullet for “Vendor Factors.”

OSP PA reports that there are rarely problems with units classifying transactions correctly at time of proposal and that misclassifications are also rarely uncovered at time of award. This is admirable, as this is typically a source of “gray” in the research administration world that causes institutions some difficulty and UNM does not offer a training course on subawards, though the topic has been included in its RAN meetings. This may, however, be a topic to monitor as UNM increases its research volume and does more work with partner organizations.

At time of award, the staff member setting up the award corresponds with the OSP PA staff member assigned to subawards to initiate the process. The PI/department is responsible for completing a Subaward Request Form to the C&G Fiscal Monitor to initiate the subaward. OSP C&G verifies that the subaward was listed in the proposal for an amount not more than what was requested in the proposal. The Review Team noted that, while it is usually appropriate for an agency prior approval request to be made for subawards not included in the approved budget, it is often not necessary to obtain agency approval simply because the budget amounts do not match, particularly if the subaward amount is not materially different and if the PI’s award already allows rebudgeting authority. Unless the amount of the subaward triggers a change in scope or the award has restrictive rebudgeting rules, it is likely that no agency approval is needed, even if the amount is higher than the approved amount.

- **Recommendation:** OSP should review their business practice to determine if and when agency prior approval is needed for subawards that were approved in the award but funded at a rate higher than in the approved budget.

All parties have access to policy #2470: Sub-award Administration, and the Subaward Guide to help them with the process. The roles of the various offices, including the responsibilities of the PI, are clearly spelled out in the policy and guide.

- **Notable Practice:** UNM has wisely included a specific statement in its subaward policy directing PIs and others not to make verbal commitments to a potential subrecipient until a properly executed subaward has been issued.

- **Notable Practice:** UNM has both a sound Subaward Administration Policy and a very helpful Subaward Guide that helps outline the process steps and requirements associated with issuance and management of subawards.

One of the classic challenges in research administration is the issuance of subawards, particularly new ones. Delays can easily occur because award setup typically must
occur before subawards can be issued and the subaward issuance process necessarily involves risk assessment and audit review, creation of the subaward itself, collection of FFATA data (for most federal subawards), waiting for subaward signatures, and then issuance of a PO to allow invoices to be paid in the institution’s financial system. The Peer Review Team noted that the UNM subaward process includes many back-and-forth process steps across people and units (unit to OSP C&G, OSP PA Award Team to staff member assigned to subawards, OSP C&G Fiscal Monitor to OSP C&G Supervisor for subrecipient risk assessment and audit review, OSP C&G Supervisor to OSP PA subaward issuance person to negotiate, routing for signatures once subrecipient has signed, transmittal back to OSP C&G supervisor for capture of FFATA reporting requirements, OSP C&G supervisor to OSP C&G Fiscal Monitor to create a PO.) This back and forth process, with some individuals performing only a single review step, can cause delays in what is typically already a challenging process. Given the inherent challenges, steps should be taken to minimize handoffs and ensure only those deemed essential for checks and balances. Since OSP properly uses FDP forms (subaward forms and risk assessment tools) for its routine subawards, many transactions should be able to be created and issued with little or no negotiation or alteration of proposal documents or detailed reviews.

- **Recommendation:** OSP, with help from unit administrators, should review their subaward process and determine which steps could be combined, adding specialized training if needed.

It was noted that during our review that the individual assigned to issue subawards was brand new and therefore was still learning her position. For this reason, we were not able to fully assess institutional subaward knowledge and process.

The subaward guide reflects a solid understanding of risk assessment and audit review. We noted that neither the workflow process nor the Subaward Guide has been updated in the last three years. This may be the reason that the guide does not account for UNM’s inclusion in the FDP Expanded Clearinghouse and the streamlined process it offers for risk assessment/audit review.

- **Notable Practice:** We commend OSP for joining the FDP Expanded Clearinghouse initiative and for taking advantage of the expedited risk assessment/subrecipient monitoring functionality offered therein.

- **Recommendation:** OSP should update their Subaward Guide to note the process changes/improvements that are gleaned from UNM’s Expanded Clearinghouse membership, and how staff are informed that they may use the expedited process.

We would like to commend UNM for an unusually complete and detailed subaward closeout process. This important and often overlooked step can contribute to timely
programmatic and financial closeout of sponsored awards. Like other processes, however, the process used is more detailed than is required by regulation. For example, it is not always necessary to obtain patent information from subrecipients (should be needed only for contracts and for certain agencies, such as DOD) since federal regulations permit subrecipients to retain their own IP rights to inventions they develop under subawards. In addition, most subawards do not require active management of property. In contrast, it is important to receive an invoice marked “final” so that there cannot be later questions about whether all costs have been accounted for.

- **Recommendation:** OSP should review its subaward closeout policy and refine it to minimize administrative burden and processing steps that are not needed to meet federal/sponsor requirements.

XXIII. STANDARD for Sponsored Programs Fiscal Management.

The institution’s control environment provides reasonable assurance regarding the effectiveness and efficiency of operations, reliability of financial reporting, and compliance with applicable laws and regulations. The institution maintains internal controls through processes, systems, and tools to ensure compliance with institutional and sponsor guidelines and requirements. Fiscal data is readily available through published reports, queries, or integrated systems for transaction processing, review and tracking of activities, and reporting. Clear expectations exist for training appropriate to responsibilities for all level of staff engaged in sponsored programs fiscal management at central and unit levels.

UNM utilizes Banner for post-award management and reporting. The Peer Review Team learned that newer reporting tools in MyReports have been rolled out to allow PIs access to proposal, award, expenditure, and F&A recovery information. As mentioned earlier, the Peer Review Team also learned that a workgroup has been formed to look at IT systems and integration strategies.

UNM has adequate policies and/or procedures on topics such as award management, award closeout, cash management, cost accounting standards, cost sharing, and residual balance. All of these policies and procedures reside on the OSP C&G website and/or the UNM Policy Manual webpage. Extra compensation is a policy that resides in the OVPR and the effort reporting policy resides in the Faculty Handbook.

The Peer Review Team did not find issues that would definitively pose a financial compliance risk to the university during this review. There are two items, however, that have the potential to pose a financial compliance risk. Those items are the absence of
an escalation feature in the effort reporting processes and an incorrect record retention requirement.

Staff interviewed did not seem to understand record retention requirements. While the policy posted on the OSP C&G website correctly quotes when the record retention “clock” begins, staff believed the “clock” begins at the project end date.

- **Recommendation:** OSP C&G should ensure that record retention dates are correct for sponsored awards, particularly federally funded awards. OSP C&G should clarify when the record retention period begins and communicate accordingly. Clarity on a record retention schedule enables OSP to retain files as regulations require and comply with sponsor regulations.

As mentioned in Standard XII: Information Systems Supporting Research Administration, there does not appear to be an escalation process for unreturned or late effort reports. Effort reports are the equivalent of “source documentation” or “receipts” for salary expenses. Absence of effort reports means absence of a “receipt” for that salary expenditure. Given that payroll expenditures, associated fringe benefits, and F&A expenditures represent approximately 70% of sponsored projects expenditures, absence of effort reports can easily become unallowable expenses. UNM’s Internal Control Matrix indicates that effort certifications are used to ensure the appropriate level of effort has been expensed to the award. If there is no completed effort report, UNM cannot ensure the appropriate level of effort has been expensed to the award.

- **Recommendation:** While the current policy discusses the potential for uncertified effort to become unallowable, OSP should create an escalation process that ensures return of effort reports. An example of an escalation process can be found in Oregon State University’s effort reporting guidelines: [https://research.oregonstate.edu/sites/research.oregonstate.edu/files/effort_reporting_guidelines_10-16-16.pdf](https://research.oregonstate.edu/sites/research.oregonstate.edu/files/effort_reporting_guidelines_10-16-16.pdf)

The Peer Review Team heard frustration with what they called “UNM’s risk averse” culture; an example of moving funds to participant support was given. The PI was told they would need sponsor prior approval to rebudget funds into participant support. The PI was unsure whether the answer was correct and contacted their Project Officer to see if this was correct. The PI was told sponsor approval was not necessary.

Under the Uniform Guidance and the Federal Research Terms and Conditions, many prior approvals have been removed. OSP C&G may be requiring too many prior approvals. In a typical internal control matrix for R1 universities, the “risk vs. reward” of constantly going to the sponsor for unnecessary prior approval requests would be considered In a typical internal control matrix for R1 universities, the “risk vs. reward"
of constantly going to the sponsor for unnecessary prior approval requests would be considered too risk averse.

- **Recommendation:** OSP should not solicit a prior approval from a funding agency if the award already grants UNM sufficient authority to make the change in-house. The Peer Review Team recognizes that there may be certain circumstances where UNM chooses to obtain agency prior approvals for very unusual circumstances. These are rare, however.

  A copy of a simplified prior approval matrix for Research Terms and Conditions is found in Appendix F.

Another related frustration from the campus community is what is seen as award setups with “too detailed a budget.” It may be an artifact of older regulations, but the examples given of the sponsor’s approved budget contained only one line for “supplies” but the award setup process broke it down to lab supplies, computer supplies, etc. The Award Budget Sheet (ABS) also shows budget categories for computing purchases under $1,000, computing purchases between $1,000 and $5,000, and computing purchases greater than $5,001. Under the Uniform Guidance, there is no such categorization. For most federally funded awards, rebudgeting requirements are much more relaxed. While it might not take a lot of time to set up award budgets to this level of detail, it also may not be necessary. As UNM’s research portfolio grows, OSP should look for ways to streamline processes.

- **Recommendation:** OSP should move from 100% review of transactions to a sampling or spot check methodology, especially with low risk transactions.

Through its Information Security and Industrial Security Offices, UNM has a robust system to monitor export control and CUI issues.

---

**XXIV. STANDARD for Sponsored Programs Administrative Management.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear policies and procedures exist for implementing award requirements, such as record retention, property control, or data retention.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution has established systems for management of non-financial aspects of awards and the administrative management functions interface with those requirements. The institution has established processes to monitor and report program performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear expectations exist for training appropriate to responsibilities for all level of staff engaged in sponsored programs administrative management at central and unit levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNM possesses various policies found at R1 universities and which aid in the management of sponsored programs. These policies reside on the Policy Office’s webpage. The policies pertaining to sponsored programs also reside on the C&G webpage. UNM OSP has a comprehensive list of procedures which reside on the OSP and C&G webpages. In addition to formal policies on effort reporting, cost sharing, unallowable costs, and cost accounting standards, there are also policies on progress reporting, record retention, data retention, intellectual property, and property control. There is no formal roles and responsibilities document, however. This has been discussed in Standard III: Research Administration Organization.

Both OSP PA and C&G websites have guidelines and Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) to help guide researchers in the processes and approvals needed to complete key administrative transactions, such as proposal budgeting and completing and submitting progress reports. UNM does not have a formal process to ensure progress reports are submitted by PIs, but final report submission is captured in OSP C&G’s closeout process.

The Peer Review Team could not find a policy on administering the salary caps enforced by certain Federal agencies. While the main campus may not have many, if any, awards requiring administration of a salary cap, UNM’s planned growth in their research portfolio warrants such a policy.

- **Recommendation:** OSP should establish a formal policy concerning managing sponsor-established salary caps (e.g., NIH Salary Cap and graduate student compensation cap, USAID contract salary cap, etc.). Establishing a formal written guideline will help OSP C&G and PIs should more awards requiring salary cap administration are received in the future.
Appendix A: Standards for Effective Sponsored Program Operations

The National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA) developed these Standards to represent the institutional baselines that provide a supportive environment for the conduct of research and other sponsored activities as well as the broad operational and core functional areas of sponsored programs management.

Unlike an audit, this peer review performs an assessment of your research administration "program" that goes beyond merely highlighting deficiencies in process. The assessment contains three interrelated features: senior and experienced research administrator Reviewers, the Standards, and a philosophical approach that provides consistency in the review process with an understanding of institutional culture. These key features result in an assessment of effectiveness of sponsored research environments at the institutions undergoing peer review.

The NCURA Standards are used by experienced and senior research administrators to assess the effectiveness of the research administration program. While recognizing that institutions differ in organizational structure and institutional priorities, these Standards reflect how the institution integrates the research enterprise with its institutional goals and expectations and operationalizes effective sponsored programs administration. The Standards allow Reviewers to assess how closely that integration relates to institutional and stakeholder goals and expectations. The Standards contain a list of over 165 features that are utilized by the Reviewers during their assessment and that are used as the basis for the written report.
Appendix B: NCURA Peer Review Team Bios

The National Council of University Research Administrators offers a formal system of assessment for sponsored programs and research compliance (Peer Review) and focused assistance (Peer Advisory Service). Both programs provide information on effective practices, techniques for success, and models of excellence. Setting standards and identifying quality of organizational performance are expected functions of all organizations.

**Patricia Hawk, TEAM LEAD**

*Number of Years in Research Administration: 33*

*Institutions:* University of Virginia, US Environmental Protection Agency, University of Oregon, Oregon Health & Sciences University, Oregon State University

Patricia Hawk has been involved in research administration for more than 30 years, and recently retired as the Assistant Vice President for Sponsored Research and Award Administration at Oregon State University (OSU). Pat began her career as a research administrator in the Office of the Associate Provost for Research at the University of Virginia. Pat has also worked at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Office of Research and Development as an Extramural Projects Coordinator. Pat also served as a Sponsored Projects Administrator at the University of Oregon before going to Oregon Health and Sciences University (OHSU) to serve as the Assistant Director of the Sponsored Projects Administration Office. Pat left OHSU and joined OSU’s Cost Analysis Office in June 2004, where her primary responsibility was to prepare OSU’s Facilities and Administrative (F&A) rate proposal and review/revise OSU’s Disclosure Statement (DS-2). Pat joined the Office of Sponsored Programs in 2005 as Assistant Director and took over as Director in July 2007. In 2015, OSU combined its pre- and post-award offices into the Office for Sponsored Research and Award Administration and chose Pat to lead this new office.

Pat’s been an active member in NCURA during her research administration career, as a presenter and a program committee member. She has served on national and regional program committees, and has also co-chaired the 47th Annual Meeting Program Committee in 2005 and FRA VIII in 2007; in addition she has co-presented the NCURA TV Program entitled “A-110 for Departmental Administrators” and more recently moderated NCURA TV’s “Critical Issues for Departmental Administrators” in 2010. She has served as a faculty member of the Fundamentals workshop, the Financial Research Administration Workshop, the Departmental Research Administration Workshop, and currently serves as a Global Travelling Workshop Faculty. Pat has served on the Board of Directors in three different capacities and has also served as NCURA’s President. She recently served as the NCURA Magazine’s Senior Editor and is an NCURA Distinguished Educator.

**Jill Frazier Tincher, MBA, CRA**

*Number of Years in Research Administration: 25*

Jill Frazier Tincher has been involved in research administration for more than 25 years and currently serves as the Director of Sponsored Programs Administration at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG). Jill began her career as a research administrator at the University of Virginia, where she served in various capacities, including the Office of the Associate Provost for Research and Development and the Office of the Vice Provost for Research. She then moved to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), where she served as the Assistant Director of the Office of Research and sponsored Programs Administration.

At UNC, Jill was responsible for the development and implementation of policies and procedures for sponsored programs. She also managed the budget and financial operations for sponsored programs and served on the university’s research integrity committee. In addition, she has served as a faculty member of the Fundamentals workshop, the Financial Research Administration Workshop, the Departmental Research Administration Workshop, and currently serves as a Global Travelling Workshop Faculty. Jill has served on the Board of Directors in three different capacities and has also served as NCURA’s President. She recently served as the NCURA Magazine’s Senior Editor and is an NCURA Distinguished Educator.
Institution: University of Georgia

Jill Tinchler currently serves as the Executive Director of Sponsored Projects Administration at the University of Georgia (UGA) overseeing pre and post award management from a central perspective. Jill and her team work closely with sponsors, faculty and departmental administrators to ensure sponsored projects are managed consistently and effectively. Prior to joining UGA, Jill served as the Executive Director in the Office of Research Administration at the University of Miami, where she oversaw Pre-Award functions including: proposal review, approval and submission; Medicare Coverage Analysis preparation and clinical budget development and negotiation; and contract creation, negotiation and execution.

Jill has spent many years focused on strategies to improve how universities obtain and maintain its research funding – looking at ways to automate and streamline processes; provide transparency throughout the institution; gather and analyze data; improve policies and processes; etc. In recent years, she led a Clinical Trials Task Force, including faculty and central/departmental administrators, tasked with assessing how UM could improve study start up times. Many recommendations resulted from this task force, subsequently were implemented and clinical processing times significantly improved.

During her 25 years in this profession, Jill has worked in both departmental and central administration, performed pre and post award functionalities, conducted research administration training, served on numerous university/faculty committees, created/implemented university-wide policies, participated in systems and process improvement initiatives, automated and streamlined research administration management, as well as engaged in department-central research administrator networking groups. Jill has been an NCURA Peer Reviewer for 3 years and is currently an NCURA SPA II traveling faculty member. She is a Certified Research Administrator.

Pamela A. Webb
Number of Years in Research Administration: 32
Institutions: University of California, Los Angeles; University of California, Santa Barbara; Northwestern University, Stanford University, University of Minnesota

Pamela A. Webb is the Associate Vice President for Research at the University of Minnesota. In this capacity, she is responsible for pre-award and post-award non-financial services supporting about $790M in research awards annually, as well as research compliance, negotiation of F&A rates, effort reporting, and export controls. Prior to her appointment at the University of Minnesota in July 2007, Pamela led pre-award and post-award administration in the Office of Sponsored Research at Stanford University. Pamela has been involved in research administration for 32 years, including 12 years at the University of California-Los Angeles as well as UC Santa Barbara, Northwestern University, and Stanford.

Pamela has served as a national officer of her professional association (the National Council of University Research Administrators, NCURA) and served two terms on NCURA’S Board of Directors. In October 2009, she received NCURA’S Distinguished Service award, and in August
2016, she received NCURA’s highest honor, the Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award. She has co-chaired a national conference on Electronic Research Administration and serves as a reviewer for NCURA’s Peer Review program and as a faculty member for NCURA’s Sponsored Projects Administration travelling national workshops. Pamela previously served on the Federal Demonstration Partnership Executive Committee. She currently serves on the Council of Governmental Relations Board of Directors, and chairs their Research Compliance and Administration Committee. She recently accepted a three year appointment to serve on the National Science Foundation’s Business Operations Advisory Committee. Pamela is a frequent presenter at the national and regional level, specializing in electronic research administration and subawards, as well as helping research administrators learn the complex regulatory environment.

NCURA Staff Assisting with this Engagement

Christina Hansen

*Years in Research Administration:* 31
*Institutions:* University of California, Los Angeles, University of California, Irvine

Christina Hansen is well known in the Research Administration profession as a progressive manager, mentor and educator. She began her research administration career at the University of California, Los Angeles in central administration supporting proposal and award management for several schools. Later, as Assistant Director for Health Sciences, she strengthened alliances with compliance committees, improved relations with University Advancement, and developed negotiating tools for clinical trials.

In 1988, Chris moved to the University of California Irvine campus as Director of the Office of Contract and Grant Administration where she developed initial campus policies and written procedures supporting proposal and award processes, established an electronic database for the office, and ensured departmental administrators were aware of sponsored research responsibilities. As the campus award totals increased from $50M to $300M, she became Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research and assumed management responsibilities for sponsored projects, human subjects, animal subjects, conflict of interest, export control, ARRA reporting, and awards data management. She collaborated with other offices to implement the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, develop the whistleblowers policy and the campus conflict of interest policy, and coordinate a campus-wide response to export control regulations. She also served as a co-director of the steering committee to implement Kuali electronic research administration programs.

With over 30 years’ experience in research administration, Chris is knowledgeable in a wide range of research administration topics including proposal processing, principles of research, conflict of interest management, gift/grant determination, research ethics, and export controls. She was instrumental in the development of the UCI Research Administration Management Program (RAMP), a certificated program for departmental staff and others on essential proposal and award functions.

Chris has been an active volunteer with NCURA. She served as faculty/moderator for five NCURA videoconferences and as faculty for NCURA’s Fundamentals of Sponsored Projects
Administration and the more advanced Sponsored Projects Administration: Level II workshop. She was a co-author of *The Role of Research Administration*, an NCURA monograph, and was on the Editorial Advisory Board of *Sponsored Research Administration: A Guide to Effective Strategies and Recommended Practices*. In addition to serving as Workshop Coordinator and member of NCURA National Meeting Program Committees, Chris presented at numerous meetings and conferences for NCURA and other research administration organizations, i.e., Public Responsibility in Medicine & Research, Society of Research Administrators International, Council on Governmental Relations, and the Federal Demonstration Partnership. She was an Invited Panelist at the Conflict of Interest Workshop organized by the National Institutes of Health in 2002 and served on the Board of COGR.

Chris held several positions within the NCURA organization. For the Western Region, she served as the Secretary-Treasurer and as Regional Chair. Chris was NCURA Secretary and a member of the Board of Directors. She served on the Professional Development Committee and the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee (chair, vice-chair) and is an active volunteer on NCURA projects and peer reviews. Chris has served on peer review panels for seven universities. She received the NCURA Distinguished Service Award in 2002 for her sustained and distinctive contributions to the organization and was recognized by Region VI with the Linda W. Patton Emeritus Award in 2016.
Appendix C: Charge Letter

October 11, 2019

NCURA Peer Reviewers,

At the University of New Mexico, students, faculty, and staff engage in a wide range of research, creativity, and innovation activities. UNM is a comprehensive, Carnegie-designated Research 1 university, and is also a Hispanic Serving Institution, a minority-majority institution and, arguably, the premier research university for minorities in the country. We are proud of our excellent researchers and strive to give them the support they need to excel in work which contributes to our society’s intellectual, artistic, and economic well-being. To maintain an effective, responsive and comprehensive research administration function within our organization, it is important to periodically review the various administrative units which play a role in research administration. This letter serves as my request for such an NCURA Peer Review. The activities which we request be the subject of your review are housed in the Office of Sponsored Projects, Contract & Grant Accounting, the Office of the Vice President for Research, the Faculty Research Development Office, the Office of Research Compliance, and the Industrial Security Department. Other offices provide support; all relevant efforts to be examined are delineated in our Briefing Book responses.

Research administration for UNM’s main and branch campuses was last reviewed by our NCURA peers in 2007, and while self-assessment is ongoing, with special scrutiny during our recent Research Strategic Planning process, we recognize the value of seeking external review at this time. It is important to ensure that research administration processes are optimized as we look to increase research activity on campus, with special focus on our new Grand Challenges initiative. As our researchers increase their activity, the support we provide must be effective to allow them to do their best work.

I understand that your review will be guided by the twenty-four NCURA Standards, and we anticipate you will have comments on all areas. Our Briefing Book addresses all twenty-four, and we ask the committee to pay particularly close attention to the Issues/Areas of Concern delineated in the Briefing Book. Furthermore, we would like to draw your attention to some points which may cross boundaries of the standards, but are critical to the research mission, and we would welcome feedback on the following further points:

1. Improvement of employee retention in central offices and units;
2. Opportunities that reviewers see to streamline procedures to reduce faculty burden;
3. Increasing efficiency in research contract and grant processing;
4. Clarification of roles and responsibilities across central offices and units;
5. Optimization of communication and collaboration between research leadership, central and unit administrative staff, and PIs, including as it impacts interdisciplinary strategic initiatives.

Office of the Vice President for Research
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505.277.5126 | Office of the Vice President for Research | 1 University of New Mexico | M5G05 5480 | Albuquerque, NM 87131
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There are two additional significant contextual issues that are currently limiting our effectiveness as a research institution and that impact our ability to fully address the NCURA standards. The first is that, over the last three years, the size of our faculty has declined significantly with many research active faculty being recruited to other universities. In my opinion this is in good part due to compensation issues and the fact that the state of New Mexico was one of the last to emerge from the Great Recession. The second limitation is our poor integration with the research strategy and infrastructure of the UNM Health Sciences Center, which despite close proximity and mutual reporting to the same Board of Regents, operates as an almost entirely separate, and sometimes competitive, research institution. While I understand that these larger issues are mainly beyond the scope of the twenty-four NCURA standards we have addressed in our Briefing Book, I would appreciate any guidance or advice you may have as to how we may address these two major impediments that UNM is facing in its progression as a research institution.

I thank you for your willingness to undertake this review, and I look forward to working with you during the process and receiving your report at the conclusion of your work.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gabriel P. López, Ph.D.
Professor of Chemical & Biological Engineering
Vice President for Research
## Appendix D: Site Visit Itinerary

### Three-Day Central Sponsored Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 1 of 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 8:45</td>
<td>Entrance Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gabriel Lopez, Vice President for Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Metzger, University Controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pamela Cheek, Associate Provost for Curriculum and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 - 9:30</td>
<td>Research Policy/Advisory Committee/ADR’s (list names and departments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Melissa Thompson</strong>, Associate Professor Anthropology; Faculty RPC representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cindy Pierrat</strong>, Director of Access Services &amp; Undergraduate Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Patricia Henning</strong>, Associate Vice President for Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Derek Hamilton</strong>, Assistant Vice President for Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Thomas Turner</strong>, Associate Dean for Research, School of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tim Castillo</strong>, Associate Dean for Research, School of Architecture &amp; Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sylvia Cebulos-Parichis</strong>, Associate Dean for Research, College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 - 9:45</td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 - 10:45</td>
<td>Name, Director/Manager Proposal Development Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Jo Daniel, Director Faculty Research Development Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 - 11:00</td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - 12:00</td>
<td>Name, Director/Manager, Sponsored Programs, Pre-Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosa Gonzalez-Rosenblatt, Director Office of Sponsored Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michelle Casias, Manager Office of Sponsored Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rebecca Valdez, Sr. Sponsored Projects Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 - 1:00</td>
<td>Lunch and Executive Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 - 2:30</td>
<td>Staff, Sponsored Programs, Pre-Award (list names and positions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamey Cook, Sr. Sponsored Programs Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tim Wester, Contract and Grant Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nick Olson, Sponsored Projects Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brittany Lacero, Sponsored Projects Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shannon Jaramillo, Sponsored Projects Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shawnee Martinez, Sr. Sponsored Programs Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel Lukes, Sponsored Projects Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Jones, Sponsored Projects Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan Singe, Sponsored Projects Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melissa Sanchez, Sr. Sponsored Programs Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 - 2:45</td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2:45 - 3:45  Deans/Associate Deans/Directors Research Centers and Institutes (list names and positions)

- Edd Schumilochn, Associate Dean for Research, Electrical & Computing Engineering
- Scott Tonigui, Associate Dean for Research, Director Center on Alcoholism Substance Abuse and Addiction (CASAA)
- Arash Mafi, Center Director, Center for High Tech Materials (ChTM)
- Mary Tsiongas, Associate Dean for Research, College of Fine Arts
- Kathryn Jacobson, Associate Dean for Research, Anderson School of Management
- Fernando Garzon, Center Director, Center for Micro Engineered Materials (CMEM)
- Patrick Bridges, Center Director, Center for Advance Research Computing (CARC)

3:45 - 4:00  Executive Session

4:00 - 5:00  Faculty Group (may be focused to a particular college) (list names and departments)

- Greg Taylor, Distinguished Professor Physics
- Melissa Bokovsky, Professor History
- Chris Perfetti, Assistant Professor Nuclear Engineering
- Shirley Baros, Director Earth Data Analysis Center
- Jessica Goodkind, Associate Professor Sociology
- Jon Houck, Research Associate Professor, Center on Alcoholism, Substance Abuse, and Addictions
- Karl Benedict, Research Professor and Director of Research Data Services, College of University Libraries and Learning Sciences
- James Cavanagh, Associate Professor: Psychology Department
- Carlos López Leiva, Associate Professor: Language Literacy Socio-cultural
- David Larder, Assistant Professor: Individual Family Comm Educ IPCE
- Diana Nordrup, Professor Emerita, Biology
- Brady Horn, Associate Professor, Economics Department
- Miriam Chavez, Professor and Chair Valencia campus (will call in)

Transportation Pick-up Information

Day 2 of 3

Transportation Pick-up Information: UNM will pick up the reviewers at the hotel at 7:15am.

Location of Day's Meetings: Business Center, Rm 3019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 8:45</td>
<td>Vice President, Finance/Controller (or other top finance stakeholder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Metzger, University Controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julian Sandoval, Chief Financial Services Officer, Controller Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 - 9:00</td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 - 10:00</td>
<td>Staff, Contracts Unit (list all names and positions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melissa Sanchez, Sr. Sponsored Projects Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan Sishe, Sponsored Projects Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle Burwinkle, Accountant 2, Contract &amp; Grant Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 - 10:15</td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 - 11:15</td>
<td>Name, Director/Manager, Sponsored Programs Post-Award/Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeremy Hamlin, Associate Controller Contract &amp; Grant Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teresia Hammitt, Fiscal Services Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jessica Armijo, Fiscal Services Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosa Gonzalez-Rosenblatt, Director Sponsored Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 - 11:30</td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 - 12:00</td>
<td>Name, General Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrick Hart, Associate University Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 - 1:00</td>
<td>Lunch and Executive Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 - 2:30</td>
<td>Staff, Sponsored Programs Post-Award/Accounting (list names and positions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthony Gallegos, Sr. Financial Services Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pat Eads, Sr. Financial Services Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kwaku Sraha, Sr. Financial Services Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alan Watts, Sr. Financial Services Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denise Vigil, Accountant 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michelle Ritter, Accountant 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moe Bundojo, Accountant 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Seegers, Accountant 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Medina, Accountant 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ricardo Trejo, Accountant 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Burwinkle, Accountant 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle Gurule, Accountant 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ernesto Trujillo, Accountant 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Herrell Accountant 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan Perry, Accountant 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 - 2:45</td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 - 3:45</td>
<td>Unit/Departmental Research Administrators (list names and units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pete Morgan, Chief Financial Officer, School of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Maddaloni, Financial Officer, School of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karen Walker, Sr. Business Manager, Center for High Tech Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Polaco, Financial Analyst, School of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dianne Mulder, Business Operations Manager, Institute for Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yolanda Sanchez, Department Administrator R2, Civil Engineering Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sidney Mason-Coom, Manager of Operations, Center on Alcoholism, Substance Abuse &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheri Lesansee, Program Manager, Center for Health Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andra Kiscaden, Sr Business Manager, EPSCoR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carolina Aguirre, Sr. Program Manager, Valencia Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 - 4:00</td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 - 5:00</td>
<td>Research Compliance (IRB, IACUC, Conflict of Interest, ISD) (list names and positions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ana Andric- Tomlinson, Director of Research Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 8:30</td>
<td>Victor Griego, Interim Director, Internal Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 - 9:15</td>
<td>Name, Director/President, Development (Foundation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Betsy Till, Sr. Director of Development, UNM Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 - 9:30</td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 - 10:30</td>
<td>Research Administration Information Technology (list staff and positions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rebecca Valdez, Sr. Sponsored Research Officer (OSP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naren Tarkere, Executive Director, Analytics &amp; Strategy (FSM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Gassaway, Information Security and Privacy Officer (UNM IT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grace Faustino, IT Project Manager (VPRO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrick Bridges, Professor Computer Science; Director of the Center for Advanced Research Computing; Chair Research IT Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 - 10:45</td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 - 11:45</td>
<td>Faculty Group (may be focused to a particular college) (list names and departments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melanie Moses, Professor Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Cabaniss, Professor Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rafael Fierro, Professor ECE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Witt, Professor Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ann Gibson, Professor, Health Exercise and Sports Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Vorobieff, Professor Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Hanson, Professor Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sally Seidel, Professor Physics and Astronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hatley Heinz, Research Scientist Cradle to Career Policy Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steve Marti, PI Gallup Branch (will call in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antoniette Abeysa, Assistant Professor Gallup Branch (will call in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brady Corry – PI Taos Branch (will call in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 - 12:45</td>
<td>Lunch and Executive Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 - 1:45</td>
<td>Proposal Development Unit (list names and positions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monica Fishel, Faculty Research Support Officer, VPR’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carmen Melendez, Faculty Research Support Officer, VPR’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephanie Tolight, Faculty Research Support Officer, VPR’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 - 2:00</td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 - 3:00</td>
<td>Open call-back session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 - 3:30</td>
<td>Executive Session, exit meeting preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 - 5:00</td>
<td>Exit Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gabriel Lopez, Vice President for Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Metzger, University Controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Holloway, Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patricia Henning, Associate Vice President for Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Jo Daniel, Director Faculty Research Development Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosa Gonzalez-Rosenblatt, Director OSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeremy Hamlin, Associate Controller, Contract &amp; Grant Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michelle Casias, OSP Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transportation Pick-up Information
Appendix E: NCURA Resources

GUIDE TO NCURA’S MEMBERSHIP BENEFITS, EDUCATION, AND PROGRAMS

MAXIMIZE YOUR NCURA MEMBERSHIP

MEMBERSHIP BENEFITS INCLUDE:

✓ Access to our professional networking site Collaborate – home to our listservs, communities, discussions, resource libraries and Volunteer Central. This is a great place to connect with other Research Administrators, discuss hot topics, share best practices, and stay ahead of the curve in the administration for research.

✓ Automatic membership into one of our eight regions connects you with other Research Administrators in your area.

✓ Volunteering gives you the opportunity to establish a strong network of peers, to acquire new skills and experiences, to help guide the future of NCURA, and to help advance the profession of Research Administration.

✓ NCURA Magazine’s eXtra is a compilation of the very latest news and must-read information sent directly to your inbox each Monday.

✓ NCURA members who enroll in the JHU online Master of Science in Research Administration Program will receive a 10% discount.

✓ Exclusive member discounts for all NCURA meetings, conferences, education, and bookstore purchases.

✓ Free postings to NCURA’s Career Center (a savings of $300 per posting) as well as access to all current job listings.

✓ Access to NCURA’s Member Directory to find the colleague you need by area of expertise and responsibility to grow your network.

✓ Access to both current and past issues of the NCURA Magazine, published six times a year.

✓ Members-only access to educational videos from meetings and conferences including full session videos.

✓ Weekly 2-3 minute videos on diverse topics posted to our YouTube Tuesday channel, which can be used in institution on-campus training programs.

NOT A MEMBER YET?
JOIN TODAY!

NCURA as an organization is the essence of my professionalism in the sense that this is where I’ve learned and grown as a research administrator and it is an opportunity to continue that growth from here to the future.

Dave Richardson
Associate Vice Chancellor for Research
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
NCURA Distinguished Educator

WHO ARE RESEARCH ADMINISTRATORS AND WHAT IS NCURA?
The Research Administrator works with dedicated and brilliant researchers and scholars who often are on the cutting edge of their field and with the government and private sponsors that require stewardship for the funding they provide. NCURA is the professional home to 7,000+ research administrators, and we foster innovative and collaborative education and networking as we support research... together.

NCURA
National Council of University Research Administrators
1015 18th Street NW, Suite 901
Washington, DC 20036
+1 (202) 466-3894 | www.ncura.edu
NCURA HOSTS 3 NATIONAL MEETINGS A YEAR

Annual Meeting of the Membership
The annual meeting of the membership is held in August each year in Washington, DC. Over 2,000 of our 7,000+ members attend. We begin with a full day of workshops and senior level seminars which are a supplemental training program open to all registrants of the annual meeting. This in-depth, targeted training and professional development includes offerings for those new to the profession to our most senior level members.

We then embark on two and a half days of presentations, discussions, open forums and networking opportunities spanning all areas of research administration including, but not limited to, Pre-Award, Post-Award, Compliance, Departmental, Intellectual Property, Contracts, International, Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions, Electronic Research Administration, and Medical Center/Hospital issues. This also includes our Sunday and Tuesday evening events, dinner groups, regional networking events, and numerous volunteer activities that create the opportunities for you to meet and connect with your colleagues and create your peer network. In addition, to the education and networking opportunities provided, our sponsor and exhibitor partners will be available to share information on the products and services to support you and your institution.

Financial Research Administration (FRA)
Join over 1,000 members for this special topic conference on post-award issues, held every year in a new location between February and late March.

Pre-Award Research Administration (PRA)
This conference of over 600 participants is held back to back with the FRA conference noted above, covering in-depth pre-award sessions and discussions.

TRAVELING WORKSHOPS
NCURA offers 7 different workshops that are 2 or 2 ½ days and travel around the country throughout the year. And, with a commitment of 60 participants, NCURA can bring one of these 7 workshops to your campus!

› Contract Negotiation and Administration Workshop
› Departmental Research Administration Workshop
› Export Controls Workshop
› Financial Research Administration Workshop
› Level I: Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration
› Level II: Sponsored Project Administration: Critical Issues in Research Administration
› The Practical Side of Leadership: A Senior Level Workshop

NCURA Workshops: Global Edition
NCURA has hosted workshops in Europe, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia focused on the fundamentals and advanced topics of research administration. These workshops also serve as venues for forming research collaborations and partnerships while also enabling research administrators to develop their professional networks. Workshops can be customized to fit the needs of your institution. Previous workshop topics have included:

› Funding Opportunities
› Successful Grant Proposal Preparation
› Financial Management
› Regulatory Compliance

For more information on how you can bring this workshop to your country, please contact Claire Chen at chen@ncura.edu

“I greatly enjoyed the dynamic employed by the presenters, who were all clearly collegial and comfortable with each other’s differing styles. The depth and breadth of their knowledge and passion for the subject matter was clear, yet they were still accessible and entertaining.*

Michael Gouin-Hart
Director, Office of Sponsored Programs
Grand Valley State University
NCURA 10 WEEK ONLINE TUTORIALS - LEARN AT YOUR OWN PACE!
These primers are intended for those new to each area or who have had very limited exposure.

A Primer on Intellectual Property in Research Agreements
A broad introduction to the basics through actual research and licensing agreements, plus negotiation tips.

A Primer on Subawards Under Federal Assistance Awards
An overview of the complex process from drafting and negotiating through review.

A Primer on Federal Contracting
Understand the federal contracting process, regulations, negotiation and risks.

A Primer on Clinical Trials Management
Focused on Clinical Trials Management, including key administrative, financial and regulatory issues that arise from planning through close-out.

REGISTER TODAY AND START THE FIRST LESSON anytime that works for your schedule. You will have ten weeks, from the first time you login, to complete the course.

WEBINARS
License to use as onboarding training or include in your existing campus training.
1. 2. 3.
CEUs available for all participants.
Registrations include on-demand viewing and MP4 downloadable copy.

Recent Topics Include
- Research Terms and Conditions
- Effort Reporting
- Data Security
- Regulated Research Data
- The Revised Common Rule
- Cost Sharing
- Data Transfer and Use Agreements
- Developing Policies and Procedures
- Managing Risk in an International Environment
- Communication Strategies for International Collaboration
- Communication with IRBs
- Internal Controls
- Single IRBs
- Public Access Policies
- Diving into Contracting

LIFE CYCLE SERIES
The Life Cycle video webinar series covers the major components of the research project life cycle. The webinar series, case studies, forms and supplementary resources can be incorporated into your institution's on-boarding and continuing education programs.

- Compliance - 2 Part Series; Two hours each
- Award Monitoring/Award Management - 2 Part Series; Two hours each
- Award Negotiation and Acceptance - 3 Part Series; 90 minutes each
- Pre-Award / Budgeting - 3 Part Series; 90 minutes each
- Proposal Development - 3 Part Series; 90 minutes each

NCURA WEBINARS AND LIFE CYCLE OF THE AWARD SERIES ARE YOURS TO KEEP!
Registration includes a license for you institution to download, post and embed the webinar in your institution's internal training systems for continuous use on your campus!
Available at onlinelearning.ncura.edu
PUBLICATIONS

Need to expand your knowledge? Visit the NCURA Store online for more information and to purchase these affordable resources!

- Compensation – Personal Services: Managing and Reporting Effort
- Cost Sharing: An Overview
- Facilities and Administrative Costs in Higher Education
- Establishing and Managing an Office of Sponsored Programs at Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions
- A Primer on Clinical Trials for the Research Administrator
- A Primer on Intellectual Property
- The Role of Research Administration
- Writing and Negotiating Subawards
- Regulation and Compliance: A Compendium of Regulations and Certifications Applicable to Sponsored Programs
- Sponsored Research Administration: A Guide to Effective Strategies and Recommended Practices
- Uniform Guidance Desk Reference

On-demand Downloadable Publications
- How to Manage a Financially Focused University Research Audit Effectively
- A Primer on Export Controls
- Additional topics coming soon!

Research Management Review (RMR) – NCURA’s Online Scholarly Journal

As the scholarly journal for NCURA, the RMR is concerned with the broad range of issues affecting the administration of research and the changing research environment at the national and international levels.

NCURA Magazine

NCURA’s magazine is published six times a year with cutting edge pieces on management, perspectives on federal policy written by members and non-members, and the latest information and explanations on topics of interest to Research Administrators.

FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

NCURA Fellowship programs are a joint initiative between NCURA and our sister research administration organizations as well as between our U.S. Regions and the International Region. These programs are intended to reduce barriers to global research administration and create an administrative framework conducive to global research collaboration.

NCURA currently offers 5 different Fellowship programs a year. The Fellowship programs have two underlying objectives: (i) the training of research administrators, and (ii) enhancing global research collaboration. These Fellowship programs will provide an opportunity for research administrators to travel to another country’s research organization and to immerse themselves in a program of mutual learning and knowledge exchange.

PEER REVIEW PROGRAM

Are you looking to enhance your sponsored programs operation or to engage leadership in a discussion about research administration? In a confidential process similar to an academic program review, NCURA matches a team of senior research administrators to your institution. The review uses standards that represent the core and vital functions of sponsored programs, regardless of size and type of institution. After reviewing background materials you provide, the reviewers conduct 360-degree interviews with institutional stakeholders during a site visit. At the completion of the review, the institution receives a detailed written report that provides valuable feedback addressing program strengths and areas for improvement. Use NCURA Peer Review for risk management/compliance, enhanced faculty service, operational efficiencies, business process improvement, and improved communications.

PEER ADVISORY SERVICES

NCURA Peer Advisory Services assist institutions in planning research administration infrastructure and priorities, as well as with addressing specific areas within the institution through deep analysis or education on specific topics.

- Research Administration Planning
- Focused Analysis
- Directed Education

For more information visit: www.ncura.edu/institutionalprograms/peeradvisoryservices
Appendix E: Attachments

Simplified Prior Approval Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Approval Item</th>
<th>Waived/Required</th>
<th>Exceptions/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in scope</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>This applies to all awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in PI specified in award</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>NSF also requires prior approval for change in co-PIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement from the project for more than 3 months, or a 25% reduction in time devoted to the project by the approved PI</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>NSF also requires prior approval for co-PIs; NIH also requires approval for any other individuals specifically named in the Notice of Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subawards not included in the original proposal</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>NIH waives the requirement for domestic subawards that do not change the scope of work; NIFA waives the requirement unless the subaward is another Federal agency or the subaward would be more than 50% of the total dollars of the award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subaward based on a fixed amount up to the simplified acquisition threshold</strong></td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Note institutional simplified acquisition thresholds from the Uniform Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incurred costs more than 90 days pre-award</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incurred costs 90 days prior to the agency’s award start date (pre-award spending)</td>
<td>Required for Dept. of Energy</td>
<td>Note that Federal contract funding does not allow pre-award spending; incoming subawards may allow pre-award spending, but it needs prior approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate a one-time no-cost extension of the period of performance up to 12 months</td>
<td>Waived</td>
<td>Note that extension of Federal contact funding is typically allowable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiate subsequent no-cost time extensions or an initial time extension greater than 12 months</strong></td>
<td><strong>Required</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Carry-forward of unexpended funds (balances) to subsequent budget periods</strong></th>
<th><strong>Waived</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note that NIH requires prior approval of carry-forward if the award is not subject to simplified non-competing award process (SNAP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Transfer amounts budgeted for indirect costs to absorb increases in direct costs, or vice versa</strong></th>
<th><strong>Waived</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIH requires prior approval if the transfer constitutes a change in scope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rebudgeting among direct costs categories for Federal awards in which the cumulative amount of such transfers exceed or is expected to exceed 10% of the approved budget</strong></th>
<th><strong>Waived</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIH requires prior approval if the transfer constitutes a change in scope; this waiver does not apply to amounts budgeted for participant support costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rebudgeting funds to participant support cost categories</strong></th>
<th><strong>Waived</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note that NIH requires that participant support costs be mentioned in the Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) in order for them to be allowable; NSF requires prior approval if the rebudgeting is moving funds to the “other” category in participant support costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rebudgeting funds from participant support categories</strong></th>
<th><strong>Required</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIH waives this requirement unless there is a change in scope. Note that NIH requires that participant support costs be mentioned in the Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) in order for them to be allowable, however.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Changes in approved cost sharing or matching required</strong></th>
<th><strong>Required</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIFA waives this requirement if the change constitutes a reduction in the amount of approved cost sharing/match</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are some less commonly used prior approvals, e.g., use of program income. Please contact OSP if there are any questions about required prior approvals.
While the prior approval matrix does serve for larger Federal sponsors, it is important to re-state that a specific award can have different prior approval requirements than what is shown in the matrix. In addition, agency prior approvals will come from the sponsor’s grants officer. The one exception to this is that NSF’s project officer approves rebudgeting from the participant support costs budget category.

It is also important to remember that certain requirements must also be followed. Examples are:

- The Fly America Act is applicable to Federally-funded awards—either a prime award or an incoming subaward. Compliance with this law typically requires air travel on U.S. owned or “flag” carriers. Foreign travel is also expected to comply with institutional international travel policies.

- Suspension and Debarment Rules (Executive Orders 12549 and 12689) are applicable to all Federally-funded awards—either a prime award or an incoming subaward. An institution must certify if it is either suspended or debarred from doing business with the Federal government; this certification is done at the proposal stage by the Authorized Organizational Representative (AOR). An institution must also document that it is not doing business with individuals or entities that are suspended or debarred. OSP documents that potential subawardees are eligible for doing business with the Federal government for outgoing subawards, and Procurement documents that potential vendors are eligible for doing business with the Federal government for procurement actions.