Overview

• Brief Summary of Survey Development and Implementation

• Overview of Key Findings from Survey Sections

• The Meaning of 44.3%.
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2018 FWS Purpose

Re-assess and update estimates of federally-funded researchers’ administrative workload, following 2012 and 2005 surveys.

Provide empirical input toward a better understanding of focus areas for

• streamlining research administrative workload,
• making federally-funded research processes more efficient, and
• allowing greater focus on the science of the research.
Changes to the 2018 FWS

- Compares **time required** for administrative workload type to **priorities for change**, 
- Increases focus on **institution** and **funding agency** variables, 
- Elaborates information on writing **proposals**, 
- Increases attention to perceived **research climate** and support within the **institution**, 
- Provides pilot data to compare **% time estimates** with **hour-based estimates**.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Content Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Your Work &amp; Research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Your Institution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Agency Requirements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Responsibilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Research Administration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compliance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety and Security</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open-Ended Items (Suggestions; +/- Helpful)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2018 FWS Timeline and Process

• Throughout 2017: Survey developed and finalized;
• Oct/Nov 2017: Institution Commitments with Lists
• University of South Florida IRB approved study protocol (Pro00032832)
  • 111 of 154 (72%) FDP non-federal member organizations participated (with a total of 149 individual institutions)
• PIs on U.S. Federally Funded Research Projects (including both Contracts and Grants) that were active at any point during the 2016-2017 Academic Year
• Feb 12, 2018: Survey launched
• Apr 2, 2018: Survey closed
• Sep, 2018: Preliminary results
## Comparison of FWS Response Rates

A series of 3 surveys of Principal Investigators (PIs) on federally-funded projects which asked about time taken away from research by administrative and related requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period Assessed</th>
<th>FDP Organizations</th>
<th>PIs Invited</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY2004-2005</td>
<td>74% (73 of 99)</td>
<td>23,325</td>
<td>6,081</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY2010-2011</td>
<td>83% (99 of 119)</td>
<td>53,428</td>
<td>12,816</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY2016-2017</td>
<td>72% (111 of 154)</td>
<td>56,869</td>
<td>11,167</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background
Demographics: 2018 Modal Participant

• **Institution**
  - Public University (70%)
  - Very High Research (VHR) Institution (84%)
  - >$500M Research Expenditures, w/ Medical School (31%)

• **Participant**
  - White, Male, Full Professor, average = 52 years old
  - 1-3 federal grants with <$500K in annual direct costs
  - Funding from NIH (47%) and/or NSF (33%)
  - In Bio/Biomed/Clin Sciences (40%) [or Phys/Math/Engin (28%)]
Professional Characteristics

Appointment Length

- 2005
- 2012
- 2018

Percent of Respondents

9 mo apptmt

12 mo apptmt
Demographic Characteristics

Gender

Percent of Respondents

Male
Female

2005  2012  2018
Demographic Characteristics

Race/Ethnicity

Percent of Respondents

White | Asian | Other

2005 | 2012 | 2018
Funding Characteristics

Number of PI/CO-PI Grants/Contracts

- Less than 4
- 4 to 6
- More than 6

Percent of Respondents

- 2005
- 2012
- 2018
Funding Characteristics

Annual Total Direct Costs

Percent of Respondents

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

<$100M  $100-$999K  ≥$1M

2005  2012  2018
Portfolio includes:

- Basic
- Applied
- Other

Other = Training, Curriculum Development, Service, and/or “Other”
Principal Fields of Study

2012:
- Bio/Biomed
- Clin Sci/Med
- Eng/Comp Sci
- Beh/Soc Sci
- Phys/Math
- Other

2018:
- Bio/Biomed
- Clin Sci/Med
- Eng/Comp Sci
- Beh/Soc Sci
- Phys/Math
- Other
The large number of respondents provides a rich set of data, though the 20% response rate suggests some views may not be represented.

Participant Profiles are largely similar across surveys from 6 and 12 years ago.

The diversity of the sample has been increasing with each cohort (though only minimally).
Your Work and Research
“Of the total time you spent on work related to **federally funded research** during AY2016-2017, what **percentage of that time** did you devote to each of the following **activities**?

- ACTIVE RESEARCH
- PRE-AWARD PROPOSAL PREPARATION ACTIVITIES
- PRE-AWARD ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES
- POST-AWARD ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES
- POST-AWARD REPORT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES

**Caution:** Responses are rough estimates only—but hold internally consistent, good measurement properties, and reliable information about general perceptions.
2018 FWS Primary Results

“Of the total time you spent on work related to federally funded research during AY2016-2017, what percentage of that time did you devote to each of the following activities?

- ACTIVE RESEARCH
- PRE-AWARD PROPOSAL PREPARATION ACTIVITIES
- PRE-AWARD ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES
- POST-AWARD ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES
- POST-AWARD REPORT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES:

Time Away from Active Research
Percentage of research time associated with obtaining and managing federally-funded research, rather than actively conducting the research.

Time Taken Away from Research

Total Time Taken from Active Research

- 30%
- 35%
- 40%
- 45%
- 50%

2005: 42.3%
Time Taken Away from Research

Total Time Taken from Active Research

- 2005: 42.3%
- 2012: 42.3%
Time Taken Away from Research

Total Time Taken from Active Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Time Taken Away from Research

Pre-award and Post-award Time From Research

- Pre-award Proposal Prep
- Pre-award Admin
- Post-award Admin
- Post-award Report Prep

2012 vs 2018
Proposal Preparation Time (~16%)

% proposal preparation time that contributes to research and scholarship:

Mean = 38.7%

(of the 16% = 6.2% of time away)
16% Time Taken Away from Research

16%: Proposal Preparation Time

- Administrative Burden: 9.8%
- Scholarly Value: 6.2%
Proposal Preparation Time (~16%)

Number of proposals submitted in last 3 years:

Median = 4 (Mean = 6.0)
Funded = 1 (prereq. for being in study)
Not funded = 2
Pending = 1
Time Taken Away from Research

16%: Proposal Preparation Time

- Scholarly Value: 6.2%
- Administrative Burden: 9.8%
- (Minimum) Wasted Time: 8%

Given the sample was selected for being successful on at least one proposal.
# Grants versus Funding

![Graph showing the number of proposals/Grants versus funding categories. The x-axis represents total direct costs, and the y-axis represents the mean number of grants (last 1 year). The categories are: < $50K (N=900), $50-99K (N=1241), $100-199K (N=2157), $200-299K (N=1766), $300-399K (N=1856), $500-999K (N=1608), $1M-3M (N=982), > $3M (N=275).]
# Proposals versus Funding

![Graph showing the number of proposals and grants for different budget ranges.](image-url)
Your Work and Research: Summary

• Since 2012, the average estimated time taken away from research by pre-award and post-award requirements related to federally-funded research has increased from 42.3% to 44.3%.

• The increase appears to predominantly affect the amount of time spent preparing proposals and interim/final research reports.

• Although an estimated 39% of the time spent on proposal preparation may contribute to a PI’s scholarship, 50% or more of proposal preparation time is a complete waste due to rejections.
Federal Agency Requirements
Questions about Agency Requirements

Participants indicated which of their funding agencies had most burdensome administrative requirements (if >1 funding agency).

Then they were asked which Preaward and Post-award requirements they experienced.

Of those, participants were asked the priority for reducing administrative burden of each requirement.
Agency: **Pre-award**

High Priority Need for Change

![Bar chart showing percentage of respondents out of those experiencing responsibility for various pre-award responsibilities.](chart.png)
Agency: **Post-award**
High Priority Need for Change

**Post-Award Responsibility**
- Clinical Trial Monitoring
- Animal Care and Use Protections
- Human Subjects Protections
- Interim/Final Report Narratives
- Subcontract/Subaward Monitoring
- Interim/Final Expenditure Reports
- Biosafety and IBC
- Export Controls
- Dual Use Research of Concern and...
- Data Sharing/Storage/Security
- Financial Conflicts of Interest

**% of Respondents Out of Those Experiencing Responsibility**

- % High Priority
- % Highest Priority
Federal Agency Requirements: Summary

• Generally, fewer than 30% of respondents rated any agency requirement as a high priority need for change.

• Pre-award: Highest priority areas are requirements for animal and human subject protections, budgets/budget justifications, and data management plans.

• Post-award: The #1 highest priority area is clinical trials monitoring, closely followed by animal and human subject protections, interim/final reports, and subcontracts.
Your Institution
Ratings about “Your Institution”

Participants were provided

(1) a series of statements about the research climate at their institution (repeated from 2012), and

(2) a series of statements about their institution’s research administration.

They rated each statement on a 5-point scale from

Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.
Perceived Research Climate

Sponsored research activity is a primary factor in my institution's promotion policies.

In my department/program, research is considered more important than teaching.

Average Rating (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree)
Perceived Research Climate

If I had to do it over again, I would still choose an academic research career.

Administrative workload associated with federally-funded research grants has increased in the last 5 or 6 years.

Research administrative workload is discouraging my graduate students from pursuing academic research careers.

Because of research administrative workload, I am generally less willing to submit federal grant proposals than in the past.

Average Rating (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree)
Institution’s Research Administration

My Institution…

- Effectively assists faculty with applying for federal grants and contracts.
- Effectively assists faculty with managing federally funded grants and contracts.
- Makes it straightforward to find answers about federal regulations related to research.
- Works to alleviate hurdles in collaborative research.

% of Respondents Who Agree with Each Statement
Perceived Research Climate

My Institution...

- ...has a culture of trust in researchers.
- ...ensures that researchers have an active voice on issues affecting research.
- ...avoids overreactions based on audit or legal concerns.
- ...regularly explores ways to reduce administrative burden on researchers.

% of Respondents Who Agree with Each Statement

- % Strongly Agree
- % Agree
• Although optimism remains, researchers increasingly agree that administrative workload is increasing and concern continues to grow that this workload threatens academic career paths for graduate students.

• While there is room for improvement, most respondents agree that their institution’s research management is generally effective.

• Most respondents do not feel that reducing administrative burden on researchers is a priority at their institution.
Research Responsibilities
Ratings of Specific Responsibilities

Participants indicated which of several administrative responsibilities they experienced.

For those experienced, respondents then rated how much each responsibility took time away from their active research from None at all to Very Much.

They then rated priority for reducing administrative burden from No need to change to High priority.

For those rated high, “drilldown” components were then rated on the same priority scale.
Specific Responsibilities: Prevalence 2018 and 2012

- Project Finances
- Effort Reporting
- Project Personnel
- Conflict of Interest (COI)
- Data Management
- Resp. Conduct of Rsrch (RCR)
- General Lab Safety
- Subcontracts
- IRB/Human Subjects
- Chemical Safety
- Intellectual Property
- Biosafety
- Info or Infrastructure Security*
- HIPAA
- IACUC/Animal Subjects
- Laboratory Access Controls*
- Recombinant DNA
- Radiation Safety
- Export Controls
- Clinical Trials
- Controlled Subs./Narcotics
- Select Agents/DURC

% of Respondents Experiencing Responsibility

[Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents experiencing responsibility for various administrative workload types in 2018 and 2012.]
Specific Responsibilities: Prevalence 2018 and 2012

- Project Finances
- Effort Reporting
- Project Personnel
- Conflict of Interest (COI)
- Data Management
- Resp. Conduct of Rsrch (RCR)

% of Respondents Experiencing Responsibility

2018

2012
Specific Responsibilities: Prevalence 2018 and 2012

- General Lab Safety
- Subcontracts
- IRB/Human Subjects
- Chemical Safety
- Intellectual Property
- Biosafety
- Info/Infrastruc. Security*

% of Respondents Experiencing Responsibility
### Specific Responsibilities: Prevalence 2018 and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Workload Type</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIPAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IACUC/Animal Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Access Controls*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recombinant DNA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Trials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled Subs./Narcotics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Agents/DURC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Respondents Experiencing Responsibility
Specific Responsibilities:

- IACUC/Animal Subjects
- Project Personnel
- Project Finances
- Clinical Trials
- IRB/Human Subjects
- Subcontracts
- Data Management
- Effort Reporting
- Biosafety
- Controlled Subs./Narcotics
- Chemical Safety
- General Lab Safety
- Intellectual Property
- Info or Infrastructure Security*
- Recombinant DNA
- Radiation Safety
- HIPAA
- Export Controls
- Select Agents/DURC
- Resp. Conduct of Rsrch (RCR)
- Lab Access Controls*
- Conflict of Interest (COI)

% reporting substantial time spent (from 3=some to 5=very much)
Specific Responsibilities: Intensity 2018 and 2012
Specific Responsibilities:
Intensity 2018 and 2012
Specific Responsibilities:
High Priority Need for Change

- IACUC/Animal Subjects
- Clinical Trials
- IRB/Human Subjects
- Project Finances
- Subcontracts
- Effort Reporting
- Project Personnel
- Export Controls
- Recombinant DNA
- Controlled Substances/Narcotics
- Data Management
- Biosafety
- HIPAA
- Info or Infrastructure Security
- Chemical Safety
- Select Agents/DURC
- Intellectual Property
- General Lab Safety
- Resp. Conduct of Research (RCR)
- Radiation Safety
- Lab Access Controls
- Conflict of Interest (COI)
Specific Responsibilities: High Priority Need for Change

- **IACUC/Animal Subjects**: 40% Highest Priority, 10% High Priority
- **Clinical Trials**: 30% Highest Priority, 20% High Priority
- **IRB/Human Subjects**: 25% Highest Priority, 10% High Priority
- **Project Finances**: 25% Highest Priority, 15% High Priority
- **Subcontracts**: 25% Highest Priority, 15% High Priority
- **Effort Reporting**: 20% Highest Priority, 15% High Priority
- **Project Personnel**: 15% Highest Priority, 10% High Priority

Percentage Among Those Experiencing Responsibility

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50%
Specific Responsibilities: High Priority Need for Change

- Export Controls
- Recombinant DNA
- Controlled...
- Data Management
- Biosafety
- HIPAA
- Info or Infrastructure...
- Chemical Safety
- Select Agents/DURC
- Intellectual Property
- General Lab Safety
- Resp. Conduct of Research...
- Radiation Safety
- Lab Access Controls
- Conflict of Interest (COI)

% Among Those Experiencing Responsibility
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50%
Specific Responsibilities:
IACUC Drilldown

Responsibility Subcategory

- Three-year re-writes of IACUC protocols
- Protocol for initial IACUC review
- Rules regarding minor changes to IACUC protocols
- IACUC software or forms
- Turn-around time of IACUC applications/revisions
- Fit of IACUC processes to type of research and level of risk
- Annual IACUC reviews
- Quality (e.g., experience, knowledge) of IACUC reviewers
- Quality (e.g., experience, knowledge) of veterinary and husbandry support
- Training in animal care and use

% Out of Those Reporting High Need for Change in IACUC (N=1052)

- % Highest Priority
- % High Priority
Specific Responsibilities:
IACUC Drilldown

- Three-year re-writes of IACUC protocols
- Protocol for initial IACUC review
- Rules regarding minor changes to IACUC protocols
- IACUC software or forms
- Turn-around time of IACUC applications/revisions
- Fit of IACUC processes to type of research and level of risk

% Out of Those Reporting High Need for Change in IACUC (N=1052)
Specific Responsibilities: IRB Drilldowns

- Fit of IRB processes to type of research and level of risk
- Turn-around time of IRB applications/revisions
- Protocols for initial IRB review
- Rules regarding minor changes to IRB protocols
- IRB software and forms
- IRB continuing review process
- Consent form for initial IRB review
- Quality (e.g., experience, knowledge) of review board members
- Training in human subjects protections

% Out of Those Reporting High Need for Change in IRB (N=1533)
Specific Responsibilities:

IRB Drilldowns

- Fit of IRB processes to type of research and level of risk
- Turn-around time of IRB applications/revisions
- Protocols for initial IRB review
- Rules regarding minor changes to IRB protocols
- Consent form for initial IRB review
- Quality (e.g., experience, knowledge) of review board members
- Training in human subjects protections

% Out of Those Reporting High Need for Change in IRB (N=1533)
Specific Responsibilities:
Project Finances Drilldowns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Finances</th>
<th>Highest Priority</th>
<th>High Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant expenditure balances (transparency, accuracy, timeliness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant expenditure approval/justification process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal budget preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant-related purchasing procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues related to payroll on grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal institutional routing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Among Those Reporting High Need for Change (N=2719)
Specific Responsibilities:
Project Finances Drilldowns

- Grant expenditure balances (transparency, accuracy, timeliness)
- Grant expenditure approval/justification process
- Proposal budget preparation

% Among Those Reporting High Need for Change (N=2719)
Specific Responsibilities: Subcontracts Drilldowns

- Getting subcontract agreements in place
- Overseeing subcontract financial matters (e.g., budgets, expenditures, etc.)

Bar chart showing the percentage of those reporting high need for change (N=1277):

- Including subcontract documentation in proposals
- Documenting subcontractor monitoring
- Overseeing, reporting subcontractor performance
- Overseeing subcontract compliance, safety/security issues
- Managing issues specific to international subcontracts

% Among Those Reporting High Need for Change (N=1277)
Specific Responsibilities: 
Data Management Drilldowns

- Developing data mgmt. plans
- Identifying appropriate external data repositories, uploading the data
- Institutional resources for data sharing
- Plans to satisfy appl. laws, regulations
- De-identifying/cleaning data to meet federal reqs. for data sharing
Specific Responsibilities: COI Drilldowns

- Level of detail required in COI report (e.g., travel, meals)
- Filing annual, transactional disclosures
- Development of management plans
- Terms of management plans

% Among Those Reporting High Need for Change (N=517)
Specific Responsibilities: Summary

- The patterns of **prevalence** of responsibilities is similar to 2012, although **data management** and **COI** responsibilities were experienced **more often** in 2018.

- **Intensity** patterns were also similar to 2012 with exceptions. Intensity values were **higher** in 2018 for **data management**, **controlled substances**, and **biosafety**, and **lower** in 2018 for **select agents**.

- **High priority for change** generally **mirrored intensity** patterns.

- **Specific drilldown patterns** were similar to 2012.
Open-ended Items
### Open-ended Feedback: Suggestion Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Categories: Suggestions</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>1192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>1175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Writing</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Personnel</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IACUC</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Personnel</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Categories: Suggestions</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Management</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of Interest (COI)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Reporting</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export Control</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open-ended Feedback (Example):
Proposal Suggestion Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce or Improve Required Proposal Components</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Guidelines, Instructions, and Requirements</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints about Proposals</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Burden Associated with Proposals</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic System</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Process</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Resources</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>737</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open-ended Feedback (Example):
Proposal Most Helpful Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Burden Associated with Proposals</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic System</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Resources</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>825</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Barriers</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Lead Time</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Burden Associated with Proposals</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing of Proposals</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency/Federal Submission Issues</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>441</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open-ended Feedback: Summary

• Respondents offered thousands of open-ended comments aimed at both agencies and institutions.

• Proposals and Report Writing were the topics of more open-ended suggestions than any of the individual administrative responsibilities.

• The availability and quality of administrative support is one of the most prevalent themes in all three sets of open-ended feedback.

• Open-ended feedback on most and least helpful institutional practices can be summarized on an individualized institution basis.
What’s in a Number?
How Much Requirement-related Workload on Federally-Funded Research Is Reasonable?

Time Taken From Research:

44.3%
How Much Requirement-related Workload on Federally-Funded Research Is Reasonable?

Time Taken From Research:

- 33%?
- 30%? 44.3%
- 25%?

Maybe a different percentage for different cases?
How Much Requirement-Related Workload on Federally-Funded Research Is Reasonable?

The lowest based on what can be gleaned from the survey:

~30% time away from active research
How to Have the Lowest Workload:

- Basic Research
- Physics or Math
- DOE, NASA or NSF (w/ only 1 funding agency)
- Neither IRB nor IACUC
- One project with <$100K Annual Expenditures
- Private University or Health Research Institute
- VHR University $900M Annual Expenditures
- White and Male
- Full Professor with no administrative role
Time Taken Away: Demographic Characteristics

![Bar chart showing average time away from research in 2012 and 2018 for males and females.](chart.png)
How to Have the Lowest Workload?

Chasing an administrative workload number can be troublesome.

The primary value of these data may be in the details…thoughtfully evaluating where and how we can reduce the workload pushing the numbers.

Thank goodness FDP is here to provide a venue to make that possible.
Thank you.
How to Have the Lowest Workload:

• Basic Research

• Physics or Math

• DOE, NASA or NSF (w/ only 1 funding agency)

• Neither IRB nor IACUC

• One project with <$100K Annual Expenditures

• Private University or Health Research Institute

• VHR University $900M Annual Expenditures

• White and Male

• Full Professor with no administrative role
Time Away from Active Research Based on Type of Research

- Basic Only
- Applied Only
- Applied & Basic
Time Away from Active Research Based on Type of Research Projects

- Basic Only: Average Time Away = 30
- Applied Only: Average Time Away = 40
- Applied & Basic: Average Time Away = 50
- Applied/Basic w/ Other: Average Time Away = 45
- Other Only: Average Time Away = 60

Comparison shows that the highest average time away is for Other Only, followed by Applied/Basic w/ Other, Applied & Basic, Applied Only, and Basic Only.
Time Away from Active Research

Based on Type of Research

- Basic Only: 36%
- Applied Only: 19%
- Applied & Basic: 15%
- Applied/Basic w/ Other: 6%
- Other Only: 24%
Time Away from Active Research Based on Type of Research

- **Basic Only**: 2012 (30), 2018 (40)
- **Applied Only**: 2012 (40), 2018 (50)
- **Applied & Basic**: 2012 (50), 2018 (60)
- **Applied/Basic w/ Other**: 2012 (60), 2018 (55)
- **Other Only**: 2012 (50), 2018 (65)
Time Away from Active Research Based on Type of Research

Research Portfolio Includes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Research</th>
<th>Mean Percent (%) Time Taken Away</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic (N=6601)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied/Translational (N=5595)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training (N=1776)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (N=643)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development (N=413)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Time Away from Active Research Based on Type of Research

Research Portfolio Includes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Research</th>
<th>Mean Percent (%) Time Taken Away</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic (N=6601)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied/Translational (N=5595)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training (N=1776)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (N=643)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development (N=413)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Task by Type of Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Award Proposal Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Award Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Award Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Award Report Prep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to Have the Lowest Workload:

- Basic Research
- **Physics or Math**
- DOE, NASA or NSF (w/ only 1 funding agency)
- Neither IRB nor IACUC
- One project with <$100K Annual Expenditures
- Private University or Health Research Institute
- VHR University $900M Annual Expenditures
- White and Male
- Full Professor with no administrative role
Time Taken Away: Principal Fields of Research

**Principal Field**

- **Bio (N=3296)**
- **Clin/ Med (N=1135)**
- **Psych/ Beh/Soc (N=1542)**
- **Engin/ Comp (N=1429)**
- **Phy/ Math (N=1690)**
- **Other (N=1952)**

**Administrative Task by Principal Field**

- **Pre-Award Proposal Prep**
- **Pre-Award Admin**
- **Post-Award Admin**
- **Post-Award Report Prep**
How to Have the Lowest Workload:

• Basic Research
• Physics or Math
• NASA, NSF, or DOE (w/ only 1 funding agency)
• Neither IRB nor IACUC
• One project with <$100K Annual Expenditures
• Private University or Health Research Institute
• VHR University $900M Annual Expenditures
• White and Male
• Full Professor with no administrative role
Time Taken Away: Funding Agencies

- NASA
- NSF
- DOE
- NIH
- DOD
- NIJ/DOJ
- Interior
- USDA/NIFA
- DOT
- NEA/NEH
- HHS
- Educ

Time Away from Research
Time Taken Away: Funding Agencies

- NASA
- NSF
- DOE
- NIH
- DOD
- NIJ/DOJ
- Interior
- USDA/NIFA
- DOT
- NEA/NEH
- HHS
- Educ
Time Taken Away: Funding Agencies

- NASA
- NSF
- DOE
- NIH
- DOD
- NIJ/DOJ
- Interior
- USDA/NIFA
- DOT
- NEA/NEH
- HHS
- Educ
Time Taken Away: Funding Agencies

- **Time Away from Research**
- **% Basic Only**
- **% Other Only**

The chart illustrates the time taken away from research by various funding agencies, with specific data points for NASA, NSF, DOE, NIH, DOD, NIJ/DOJ, Interior, USDA/NIFA, DOT, NEA/NEH, HHS, and Educ.
Time Taken Away: Funding Agencies

- Time Away from Research
- % Basic Only
- % Other Only
- % Applied Only

Time Taken Away:
Funding Agencies

% Time Away from Active Research

Number of Federal Funding Agencies

1
2
3+

35
40
45
50
55
How to Have the Lowest Workload:

• Basic Research
• Physics or Math
• DOE, NASA or NSF (w/ only 1 funding agency)
• **Neither IRB nor IACUC**
• One project with <$100K Annual Expenditures
• Private University or Health Research Institute
• VHR University $900M Annual Expenditures
• White and Male
• Full Professor with no administrative role
Time Taken Away: Human and Animal Subjects

Average Time Away from Research

- Neither
- IRB
- IACUC
- Both

Type of Research Projects
Time Taken Away: Human and Animal Subjects

- Neither: 30, 2012; 35, 2018
- IRB: 40, 2012; 45, 2018
- IACUC: 42, 2012; 47, 2018
- Both: 45, 2012; 50, 2018
Time Taken Away: Agency Differences for “Simplest” Research

---

**Basic Research; No IRB or IACUC**

- **NASA**
- **NSF**
- **DOE**
- **NIH** (Highest)
- **DOD**
How to Have the Lowest Workload:

- Basic Research
- Physics or Math
- DOE, NASA or NSF (w/ only 1 funding agency)
- Neither IRB nor IACUC
- **One project with <$100K Annual Expenditures**
- Private University or Health Research Institute
- VHR University $900M Annual Expenditures
- White and Male
- Full Professor with no administrative role
Time Taken Away: Number of Grants/Contracts and Amounts
How to Have the Lowest Workload:

• Basic Research
• Physics or Math
• DOE, NASA or NSF (w/ only 1 funding agency)
• Neither IRB nor IACUC
• One project with <$100K Annual Expenditures
• Private University or Health Research Institute
• VHR University $900M Annual Expenditures
• White and Male
• Full Professor with no administrative role
Time Taken Away: Private vs Public VHR Universities

![Bar chart showing the mean percent research time lost by institution classification.](chart.png)
How to Have the Lowest Workload:

- Basic Research
- Physics or Math
- DOE, NASA or NSF (w/ only 1 funding agency)
- Neither IRB nor IACUC
- One project with <$100K Annual Expenditures
- Private University or Health Research Institute
- **VHR University $900M Annual Expenditures**
- White and Male
- Full Professor with no administrative role
Time Taken Away: Institutional Correlates
How to Have the Lowest Workload:

- Basic Research
- Physics or Math
- DOE, NASA or NSF (w/ only 1 funding agency)
- Neither IRB nor IACUC
- One project with <$100K Annual Expenditures
- Private University or Health Research Institute
- VHR University $900M Annual Expenditures
- White and Male
- Full Professor with no administrative role
Time Taken Away:
Demographic Characteristics

![Graph showing mean percent (%) time taken away by race/ethnicity and administrative task by race/ethnicity.](image-url)
Time Taken Away:
Demographic Characteristics

Average Time Away from Research

Male
Female
Time Taken Away: Demographic Characteristics

![Bar chart showing average time away from research by gender and year (2012 and 2018).]
Time Taken Away: Demographic Characteristics

![Bar chart showing mean percent time taken away by gender.](chart1.png)

- **Gender:** Male (N=5008) vs. Female (N=3123)

![Bar chart showing mean percent time taken away by administrative task and gender.](chart2.png)

- **Administrative Task by Gender:**
  - Pre-Award Proposal Prep
  - Pre-Award Admin
  - Post-Award Admin
  - Post-Award Report Prep
How to Have the Lowest Workload:

- Basic Research
- Physics or Math
- DOE, NASA or NSF (w/ only 1 funding agency)
- Neither IRB nor IACUC
- One project with <$100K Annual Expenditures
- Private University or Health Research Institute
- VHR University $900M Annual Expenditures
- White and Male

- Full Professor with no administrative role
Time Taken Away: Professional Role

![Bar graph showing mean percent (%) time taken away by academic rank.]

- Professor (N=5382)
- Associate Professor (N=2523)
- Assistant Professor (N=2063)
- Instructor (N=146)
- Other (N=930)
Time Taken Away: Professional Role
Time Taken Away: Professional Role

![Graph showing the mean percent (%) time taken away by different administrative roles and tasks. The graph compares No Admin Role, Center/Program Director, Department Chair, Provost/Chancellor/Vice President/Dean, Pre-Award Proposal Prep, Pre-Award Admin, Post-Award Admin, and Post-Award Report Prep. The x-axis represents the administrative roles, and the y-axis represents the mean percent (%) time taken away. The bars indicate the mean with error bars for variability.](image)
How to Have the Lowest Workload:

• Basic Research
• Physics or Math
• DOE, NASA or NSF (w/ only 1 funding agency)
• Neither IRB nor IACUC
• One project with <$100K Annual Expenditures
• Private University or Health Research Institute
• VHR University $900M Annual Expenditures
• White and Male
• Full Professor with no administrative role
How to Have the Lowest Workload?

Chasing an administrative workload number can be troublesome.

The primary value of these data may be in the details...thoughtfully evaluating where and how we can reduce the workload pushing the numbers.

Thank goodness FDP is here to provide a venue to make that possible.
Individualized Institution Reports

- Reports provided to interested institutions summarizing results of their researchers’ experience
- General comparisons to (unidentified) similar institutions
- 2018 vs 2012 for those who received w012 report
- Detail depends on number of responses
- ERIs: Attempt to make summary info available if >10 respondents and >20% of possible respondents participated
- Cost: Covers primarily graduate student effort; varies by detail of report (est. $500-$5,000)
- Call for interested institutions in the next month
Distribution of Time Away Estimates
2012 Gender Time Away

![Bar chart showing gender time away percentages]

- Female:
  - 15.1%
  - 7.7%
  - 6.0%
  - 15.5%

- Male:
  - 12.9%
  - 7.5%
  - 5.4%
  - 15.4%
2012 Race/Ethnicity Time Away

- White: 15.0%
- Asian: 17.7%
- Hispanic, Latino: 16.2%
- African American: 15.6%
- Other: 15.2%

Categories:
- Post-award administration
- Pre-award administration
- Interim and final reports
- Proposal preparation