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We provide solutions to:

- Higher Education
- K-12
- Healthcare Organizations
- Hospitals
- Municipalities
- Non-profits
Our full-cycle proposal development solutions were developed to enable increased competitiveness and results for our partners. They include:

- RFP analysis
- Relationship building strategies
- Grants calendar for specific grant makers
- Funder overview/analysis
- Funding prospect research
- Grants capabilities assessment survey and analysis
- Grantseeking strategy memo
- Mission critical proposal review
- LOI production
- Comprehensive proposal review/critique
- Concept paper development
- Program/research design consulting
- Proposal rewriting
- Foundation proposal production
- Federal proposal production
- Foundation grant outcomes reporting
- Multiyear comparative data analysis
- Grant application renewal review
- Proposal rewriting and resubmission
- Quantitative and qualitative program evaluation
- Grant evaluation
Objectives

1. Define grant capacity and preparedness
2. Review what the research administration literature says about assessing institutional grant capacity and preparedness
3. Discuss key elements from the literature for conceptualizing assessment of grant capacity and preparedness
4. Describe key constructs that will enable assessment
5. Discuss how the elements and constructs combine to make assessment possible
DEFINING GRANT CAPACITY AND PREPAREDNESS (READINESS)

• Grant capacity: a characteristic which includes consideration of potential in respect to volume, complexity, qualification, and aptitude.

• Grant preparedness: the relative level of readiness to pursue grant activity, in general, and in respect to specific projects.

• Interrelationships among and distinctions between capacity and preparedness.
WHAT TREATMENT HAVE THE FOLLOWING TOPICS RECEIVED IN THE LITERATURE OF RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION IN THE LAST 15 YEARS?

1. Assessing institutional grant readiness.
2. Assessing institutional grant capacity.
3. Improving efficiency or quality of research administration processes.
4. Computing return on investment or value of sponsored program activity.
5. Influences on grant or research activity.
6. Description of grant or research facilitation activity (or recommendations for the same) based on experience.
Structured review employing a modified PRISMA pattern

Research administration publications consulted (1051 articles)
- NCURA Magazine (2007-2013); 398 articles
- NCURA’s Research Management Review (1987-2013); 168 articles
- SRA’s Journal of the Research Administration (1997-2103); 195 articles
- Grant Professionals Association’s Journal of the American Association of Grant Professionals (2004-2013); 92 articles
- National Grant Management Association’s Journal of the National Grant Management Association (1982-2013); 198 articles

Looked for titles and abstracts that addressed topics related to assessing grant capacity and readiness
Considering the Literature

ASSESSING INSTITUTIONAL GRANT READINESS AND CAPACITY

1. Current practice is subjective, local, and limited.

2. Subjective and local activity means there is a lack of reliable internal and external benchmarks.

3. Limited scope can be OK if it is a departmental evaluation or contributing to a bigger picture assessment.

4. There have been no publications regarding assessment of institutional grant capacity in the 32 years of information reviewed.
1. **Infrastructure and corporate culture are key elements** in sponsored programs’ success.

2. **Common concerns are present** in all types of entities with sponsored program activity.

3. Applicable **standards** are **desirable, can be established, and have practical application.**

4. **Expectations are important.** Communicate that it is expected and it is more than likely to get done.
IMPROVING EFFICIENCY OR QUALITY OF ADMINISTRATION PROCESS FOR FUNDING AGENCIES

1. Authors believe that compiling analytical tools to measure and evaluate funder characteristics is possible and desirable.

2. Multiple evaluative processes have been developed in respect to funders.
COMPUTING ROI OR VALUE OF SPONSORED PROGRAM ACTIVITY

1. ROI is important but its calculation needs to take institution goals, characteristics, and commitments into account.

2. ROI, since it is mission- and practice-related, cannot be easily compared across institutions except in simplistic ways.

3. Various offices involved with research administration contribute to ROI in idiosyncratic ways.
INFLUENCES ON GRANT OR RESEARCH ACTIVITY

1. Uniformity or at least predominantly consistent messaging is important.

2. Some inducements and barriers are also critical paths since they have been shown to be statistically significant in studies.

3. The lists of recognized inducements and barriers for grant and research activity have remained stable over a 15 year period.
1. Organizational structure is important for effectiveness and efficiency.

2. Organization structures vary even among highly effective institutions.

3. Putting best practices into place in large dynamic settings like IHEs is difficult and OSP influence on the process is limited.

4. Understanding faculty, their roles, commitments, practices, and preferences is important.

5. Consistent lists of recommendations across two decades.
Lessons Learned Regarding Assessments of Capacity and Readiness

THINGS TO CHANGE

- Subjective and local nature of current practice
- No systems considering institutional capacity
- Confusion of grant readiness with requirements for proposal preparation

ITEMS TO PAY ATTENTION TO

- Infrastructure
- Culture
- General and uniform concerns (often related to organizational structure and practice)
- ROI as a mission- and practice-focused measure
- Leadership (expectations, messaging, inducements/barriers, implementing best practices)
- Statistically significant inducements and barriers
## Categorizing the Lessons Learned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>IDENTIFYING WHAT TO MEASURE AND HOW TO MEASURE IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **CULTURE**    | • Organizational characteristic(s) that support grant activity?  
                 • Project-specific considerations? |
| **INFRASTRUCTURE** | • What does an organization need?  
                     • What must be present for the proposal/project to succeed? |
| **PEOPLE**     | • Who influences grant processes across the organization?  
                 • Who are active in or needed for a project being proposed? |
| **POLICIES**   | • Organizational level aids, inducements, barriers.  
                 • Project-level best practices, inducements, and barriers. |
1. Separate *organizational* capacity and preparedness from *project-specific* capacity and preparedness.

2. Identify *meaningful and representative categories* for measurement on the basis of what is known, what is applicable, and active investigation.

3. Utilize *multiple streams of data* and *triangulate*.

4. Seek the *ability to benchmark or compare* through objective measures, rubrics, or involvement of the same persons or types of persons.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHORS</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PUBLICATION</th>
<th>CONTENT TYPE</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
<th>KEY CONCEPTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSING GRANT READINESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Limited and old info (all cats)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurup &amp; Butler</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>JAAGP</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Broad stroke topics to consider when discussing an organization’s preparation for grant activity plus a checklist of frequently requested items.</td>
<td>1. Current practice is subjective, local, limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Subjective and local = lack reliable internal and external benchmarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brophy</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>JAAGP</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Grant readiness as key concerns in proposal development activity.</td>
<td>3. Limited = OK as means contribute to bigger picture or dept. eval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **ASSESSING GRANT CAPACITY** |      |             |              |                                                                     | 1. No documented activity during a period extending across as much as 32 years (time ranges of pubs. considered are as short as 9 year [GPA] but as long as 32 years [NGMA]). |

| **IMPROVING EFFICIENCY/QUALITY OF PROCESS** |      |             |              |                                                                     | 1. Infrastructure and corporate culture are key elements in sponsored programs success. |
|                                           |      |             |              |                                                                     | 2. Common concerns exist (e.g., fulfill mission, responsiveness, serve constituents, employ best practices, approp controls/policies, ability to measure). |
| Of the Recipient Organizations            |      |             |              |                                                                     | 3. Applicable standards are desirable, can be established, and have practical application. |
|                                           |      |             |              |                                                                     | 4. Expectations are important.                                               |

<p>| Taylor                                 | 2011 | NCURA       | Opinion, recommend | Notes five areas to consider from Stauffer (1977), that internal or external assessment is possible, and that her org. has done both and learned from both. |                                                                     |
| Saha, Ahmed &amp; Hanumandla             | 2011 | RMR         | Case studies       | Study of improvement to sponsored programs at three different organizations (health dept, acad med care ctr, large healthcare provider), used quant variables as measures; CONCL: expectation of improvement leads to improvement. | 1. Infrastructure and corporate culture are key elements in sponsored programs success. |
| Flood                                  | 2008 | NGMA        | Descriptive        | Standards for evaluation of pre-award grant practices.            | 2. Common concerns exist (e.g., fulfill mission, responsiveness, serve constituents, employ best practices, approp controls/policies, ability to measure). |
|                                        |      |             |              |                                                                     | 3. Applicable standards are desirable, can be established, and have practical application. |
|                                        |      |             |              |                                                                     | 4. Expectations are important.                                               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Content Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Key Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>NGMA</td>
<td>Opinion, recommend</td>
<td>“Why grant management standards for recipients is...worthy of consideration and implementation.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsen</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>Opinion, recommend</td>
<td>Discusses pattern for planning a review of a SPO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Of the Funding Organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Content Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Key Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kestenbaum, Hooker &amp; Straight</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>NGMA</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Analysis tool “designed to improve quality, timeliness, productivity, and responsiveness of funders.”</td>
<td>1. Authors believe that compiling analytical tools to measure and evaluate funder characteristics is possible and desirable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight &amp; Kestenbaum</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>NGMA</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Process developed by the Logistics Management Institute to review grant management in government departments.</td>
<td>2. Multiple evaluative processes have been developed in respect to funders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMPUTING RETURN ON INVESTMENT/VALUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Content Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Key Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uttam &amp; Venugopal</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>RMR</td>
<td>Proof of concept</td>
<td>Means of predicting and quantifying the ROI potential of various sponsored projects.</td>
<td>1. ROI is important but it needs to be based on institutional goals and characteristics (U &amp; V include this).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kordal &amp; Guice</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>RMR</td>
<td>Quant anal</td>
<td>Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM) annual U.S. Licensing Activity Survey data for 2007.</td>
<td>2. ROI, since it is mission-related, is not easily compared across institutions except in simplistic ways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Influences of Sponsored Program/Research Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LeBlanc, Jackson &amp; Wright</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>RMR Survey</td>
<td>Notes differences in view of SP/res. between junior faculty, chairs, and deans at CSU Chico.</td>
<td>1. Uniformity or at least predominance in messaging is important (institutional culture consideration).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Boyer & Cockriel                 | 1998 | SRA Survey  | Faculty at AAU institutions surveyed regarding factors that motivate and hinder faculty in their pursuit of grants – different levels of faculty have different views (248 usable/370; balanced sample). | 2. Some inducements/barriers are critical paths (stat sign for all grps).  
3. Fairly consistent lists of inducements/barriers. |
| Dooley                           | 1995 | RMR Survey  | TX A & M SOE tenure-track faculty (56 usable/108), inducements/barriers to SP activity (only descriptive as small sample). |                                                                                            |
| Monahan & Fortune                | 1995 | RMR Survey  | 163 in 42 states + DC responded of 466 in 50 states approached (90% confidence level); 33 variables seen as inducements in other studies, predictive relationships calculated. |                                                                                            |
| Stahler & Tash                   | 1992 | RMR Survey  | 18 of 30 top research institutions, respondents were top research officers, inducements/barriers to SP activity (only descriptive as small sample). |                                                                                            |

### Describe Enterprise/Make Recommendations Based on Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Kirby & Waugaman                 | 2006 | SRA Survey  | 2002 national SRA survey of pre-award and post-award workload, staffing, and practices. | 1. Organizational structure is important to effectiveness and efficiency.  
2. Organizational structures vary even among highly effective institutions. |
| Ebong                            | 1999 | SRA Descriptive | Four-category faculty ranking model portraying funding history for faculty and facilitating departmental comparison. |                                                                                            |
### Measuring Institutional Grant Capacity: Present Context and Key Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker &amp; Wohlpart</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>RMR</td>
<td>Survey (national)</td>
<td>University Chief Research Officers in July 1996 - survey re: characteristics of research administration; levels of funding and funding sources, office activities, facilities and staff resources, etc. (276 forms with 80 responses but those 80 conducted 25% of R &amp; D in US).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>RMR</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>General concepts to consider if planning to evaluate a pre-award office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hays</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>RMR</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Critiques a variety of organizational patterns for OSPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley &amp; Sellers</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>RMR</td>
<td>Lit. Review</td>
<td>Tabulates the recommendations made regarding improving management of federally sponsored research in all readily identifiable reports issued since 1980; says the most frequently reiterated recommendations have not been formally or widely implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughlin &amp; Sigerstad</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>RMR</td>
<td>Survey (NSF res. ctrs.)</td>
<td>128 persons at 31 NSF engineering research centers surveyed w/ 42 persons from 21 institutions responding, sought to ID res. admin. role for creating supportive environment for sponsored programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishler</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>RMR</td>
<td>Case study (UMKC)</td>
<td>Long-term factors and strategies utilized to promote the acquisition of external monies during two distinct but consecutive five-year phases in the history of an institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishler</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>RMR</td>
<td>Lit. Review</td>
<td>Resources and processes recommended for transition from a teaching-focused environ to an IHE placing more emphasis on external funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Putting best practice into place is difficult in a large and dynamic environment like an IHE and OSP influence is limited.

4. Understanding faculty, their roles, commitments, practices, and preferences is important.

5. Fairly consistent lists of best practice recommendations have existed for several decades.