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Overview

• Brief Summary of Survey Development and Implementation
• Overview of Key Findings from Survey Sections
• The Meaning of 44.3%.
2018 Faculty Workload Survey (FWS)

Thanks to:
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• SoundRocket (Scott Crawford, Julie Smith, Jillian Hunsanger, Robert Young)
• FDP Administrative, Faculty, and Tech Representatives
• USF Graduate Student Team (Andrea Ranieri, Elizabeth Fuller, Sandra Kauffman, Alaina Talboy, Jessica Jordan, Joanna Lawler)
• FDP Executive Committee and FDP Foundation
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 topic 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.
# Survey Content Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your Work &amp; Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agency Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Research Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-Ended Items (Suggestions; +/- Helpful)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2018 FWS Timeline and Process

• Throughout 2017: Survey developed and finalized;
• Oct/Nov 2017: Institution Commitments with Lists
• Nov 2017: 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 were presented
Comparison of FWS Response Rates

A series of 3 surveys of Principal Investigators (PIs) on federally-funded projects 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 mo apptmt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 mo apptmt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph showing appointment length with data from 2005, 2012, and 2018.
Demographic Characteristics

Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding Characteristics

Number of PI/CO-PI Grants/Contracts

Percent of Respondents

Less than 4 | 4 to 6 | More than 6

- 2005
- 2012
- 2018
Funding Characteristics

Annual Total Direct Costs

Percent of Respondents

- <$100M
- $100-$999K
- ≥$1M

2005 2012 2018
Funding Characteristics

Portfolio includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Type</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

2018

Bio/Biomed

Clin Sci/Med

Eng/Comp Sci

Beh/Soc Sci

Other

Phys/Math

Other fields include:

- Bio/Biomed
- Clin Sci/Med
- Eng/Comp Sci
- Beh/Soc Sci
Principal Fields of Study

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

2018
- Bio/ Biomed
- Other
- Clin Sci/Med
- Eng/Comp Sci
- Beh/Soc Sci
- Phys/Math
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.
"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
Time Taken Away from 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

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

Total Time Taken from Active Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Time Taken Away from Research

Pre-award and Post-award Time From Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-award Proposal Prep</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-award Admin</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-award Admin</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-award Report Prep</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposal Preparation Time (~16%)

% proposal preparation time that contributes to research and scholarship:

Mean = 38.7%

(of the 16% = 6.2% of total time away value)
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

Note. Given participant inclusion criteria requiring at least 1 funded project, these values do not reflect outcomes for those who were not successful in obtaining federal funding (who would have more unfunded). Thus, the values should not be used to infer funding rates.
16% Time Taken Away from Research

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

![Graph showing the relationship between number of proposals/Grants and total direct costs. The x-axis represents total direct costs in different brackets (< $50K, $50-99K, $100-199K, $200-299K, $300-399K, $500-999K, $1M-3M, > $3M), and the y-axis represents the mean number of grants (last 1 year). The graph indicates that the mean number of grants increases as the total direct costs increase.](image)

- N=900 for <$50K
- N=1241 for $50-99K
- N=2157 for $100-199K
- N=1766 for $200-299K
- N=1856 for $300-399K
- N=1608 for $500-999K
- N=982 for $1M-3M
- N=275 for > $3M
Proposals versus Funding

Number of Proposals/Grants versus Total Direct Costs

- Mean # of Proposals (last 3 years)
- Median # of Proposals (last 3 years)
- Mean # of Grants (last 1 year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Direct Costs</th>
<th>Mean Proposals</th>
<th>Median Proposals</th>
<th>Mean Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $50K</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50-99K</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100-199K</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200-299K</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300-399K</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500-999K</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1M-3M</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $3M</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N:
- < $50K: 900
- $50-99K: 1241
- $100-199K: 2157
- $200-299K: 1766
- $300-399K: 1856
- $500-999K: 1608
- $1M-3M: 982
- > $3M: 275
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 may be largely a 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 at that agency.

Of those, participants were asked the priority for reducing administrative burden of each requirement at that agency.
Agency: Pre-award
Rated High Priority Need for Change

Pre-Award Responsibility

- Animal Care and Use Protections
- Human Subjects Protections
- Budgets and Justifications
- Data Management Plans
- Collaborators and Other Affiliations...
- Responsible Conduct of Research
- Postdoctoral Mentoring Plans
- Biosketches
- Financial Conflicts of Interest
- Research Plan/ Project Narrative

% of Respondents Out of Those Experiencing Responsibility

- % High Priority
- % Highest Priority
Agency: Post-award

Reported High Priority Need for Change

- 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 (beyond institution IRB and IACUC), 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 (beyond IRB and IACUC), interim/final reports, and subcontracts.
Participants viewed

(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
Institution’s Research Administration

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>% Strongly Agree</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...has a culture of trust in researchers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...ensures that researchers have an active voice on issues affecting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...avoids overreactions based on audit or legal concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...regularly explores ways to reduce administrative burden on researchers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Respondents Who Agree with Each Statement
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 perceived 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
Specific Responsibilities: Highest 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
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%
Specific Responsibilities:
Medium Prevalence 2018 and 2012

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

% of Respondents Experiencing Responsibility

2018
2012
Specific Responsibilities: Low Prevalence 2018 and 2012

- HIPAA
- IACUC/Animal Subjects
- Lab Access Controls*
- Recombinant DNA
- Radiation Safety
- Export Controls
- Clinical Trials
- Controlled Subs./Narcotics
- Select Agents/DURC

% of Respondents Experiencing Responsibility
Specific Responsibilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Workload Type</th>
<th>% of Respondents Out of Those Experiencing Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IACUC/Animal Subjects</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Personnel</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Finances</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Trials</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB/Human Subjects</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontracts</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Reporting</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosafety</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled Subs./Narcotics</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Safety</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Lab Safety</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Property</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info or Infrastructure Security*</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recombinant DNA</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation Safety</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPAA</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export Controls</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Agents/DURC</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resp. Conduct of Rsrch (RCR)</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Access Controls*</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of Interest (COI)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% reporting substantial time spent (from 3=some to 5=very much)
Specific Responsibilities: Higher Intensity 2018 and 2012

- IACUC/Animal Subjects
- Project Personnel
- Project Finances
- Clinical Trials
- IRB/Human Subjects
- Subcontracts
- Data Management
- Effort Reporting
- Biosafety

% of Respondents Out of Those Experiencing Responsibility

Copyright (c) 2019 Sandra L. Schneider. Please do not use, share, or copy without permission.
Specific Responsibilities: Mid/Lower Intensity 2018 and 2012

- Controlled Subs./Narcotics
- Chemical Safety
- General Lab Safety
- Intellectual Property
- Info/Infrastruct Security*
- Recombinant DNA
- Radiation Safety
- HIPAA
- Export Controls
- Select Agents/DURC
- Resp. Conduct of Rsrch (RCR)
- Lab Access Controls*
- Conflict of Interest (COI)

% of Respondents Out of Those Experiencing Responsibility
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: Top in High Priority Need for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Workload Type</th>
<th>Highest Priority</th>
<th>High Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IACUC/Animal Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Trials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB/Human Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Finances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Among Those Experiencing Responsibility
Specific Responsibilities: Other 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

Highest Priority
High Priority
Specific Responsibilities: IACUC Drilldown

Responsibility Subcategory: Three-year re-writes of IACUC protocols
- % High Priority
- % Highest Priority

Responsibility Subcategory: Protocol for initial IACUC review
- % High Priority
- % Highest Priority

Responsibility Subcategory: Rules regarding minor changes to IACUC protocols
- % High Priority
- % Highest Priority

Responsibility Subcategory: IACUC software or forms
- % High Priority
- % Highest Priority

Responsibility Subcategory: Turn-around time of IACUC applications/revisions
- % High Priority
- % Highest Priority

Responsibility Subcategory: Fit of IACUC processes to type of research and level of risk
- % High Priority
- % Highest Priority

Responsibility Subcategory: Annual IACUC reviews
- % High Priority
- % Highest Priority

Responsibility Subcategory: Quality (e.g., experience, knowledge) of IACUC reviewers
- % High Priority
- % Highest Priority

Responsibility Subcategory: Quality (e.g., experience, knowledge) of veterinary and husbandry support
- % High Priority
- % Highest Priority

Responsibility Subcategory: Training in animal care and use
- % High Priority
- % Highest Priority

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility Subcategory</th>
<th>% High Priority</th>
<th>% Highest Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fit of IRB processes to type of research and level of risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn-around time of IRB applications/ revisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocols for initial IRB review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules regarding minor changes to IRB protocols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB software and forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB continuing review process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent form for initial IRB review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality (e.g., experience, knowledge) of review board members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in human subjects protections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% 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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(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

Issues related to payroll on grants
Proposal institutional routing

% 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.)

- 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

% Among Those Reporting High Need for Change (N=1078)
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>
</tbody>
</table>
# Open-ended Feedback (Example): Proposal *Least Helpful* Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 Active Research:

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

Time Taken From Active 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

Average Time Away from Research

- 2012
- 2018

Male
Female
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.
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