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Overall satisfaction

I'm satisfied with my current pre-award services.

2013  (n = 1,341)  
Strongly disagree (1) 7%  
2  16%  
3  32%  
4  25%  
Strongly agree (5) 21%  

2014 (n = 832)  
Strongly disagree 6%  
Disagree 14%  
Neutral 18%  
Agree 36%  
Strongly agree 27%  

2
Samples in survey data analyses 2013 vs. 2014

• 2013 first-ever evaluation conducted as exploratory research.
  – All staff and faculty surveyed.

• 2014 evaluation of current users
  – Convenience sample extracted from current database and listservs

• Completed surveys only
  – Some people started the survey but did not submit
### Who responded to survey? 2014/2013

#### How would you describe your role?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014 Count</th>
<th>2013 Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other staff/administrator</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-doc</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff researcher</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic non-faculty</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### How many years have you worked at UCSF?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-12</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 or more</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### In the last 12 months, have you been involved in submitting any proposals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall satisfaction by role and year using 3-point satisfaction scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-doc</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Negative: 14.1%, 23.6%, 5.1%
- Neutral: 25.3%, 27.6%
- Positive: 60.7%, 48.8%, 89.6%, 70.4%
RMS specific quality ratings
Year-to-year score change - Faculty & Post-Doc

Rate the quality of the following RMS pre-award services:

- Understanding funding: 0.36
- Establishing timeline: 0.28
- Meeting deadlines: 0.32
- Communicating progress: 0.28
- Budget communications: 0.34
- Complete application: 0.31
- Submission...: 0.31
- Materials without errors: 0.29
- Value for cost: 0.17

Positive score increase
RMS specific quality ratings - 2014

Rate the quality of the following RMS pre-award services:

- Notification of award finalization: 3.57
- Communicating award/subaward progress: 3.29
- Issuing subawards timely: 3.22
- Processing awards timely: 3.6
GBC specific quality ratings - 2014

Rate the quality of the following GBC services:

- Notifying when finalized: 2.99
- Accounting for PI interests: 3.09
- Facilitating communications: 3
- Communicating progress: 2.8
- Issuing subcontracts: 2.77
- Processing awards: 2.9
- Understanding requirements: 3.14

Categories: Poor, Fair, Good, V good, Excellent
## GBC specific quality ratings - 2014

Rate the quality of the following GBC services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processing materials accurately</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of submission</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitting complete application</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising budget problems</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting deadlines</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing submission timeline</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Development Office (RDO) knowledge and use

Have you heard about RDO?  
(N = 754)  
- Yes: 59% (446)  
- No: 41% (308)

Have you used RDO services?  
(N = 308)  
- Yes: 47% (146)  
- No: 53% (162)
RDO specific quality ratings - 2014

- Pivot Funding opportunity training (n=33) 3.64
- Overall Interaction (n=148) 3.89
- Building Teams (BTIR) (n=30) 3.2
- Resource Allocation Program (RAP) (n=113) 4.04
- Limited Submission Program (LSP) (n=91) 3.8
- Large multi-investigator project (LGDP) (n=74) 3.66

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
# Recommendations for improvement from survey comments

| Personnel | • Hire more staff, reduce workload and turnover  
| • Hire more dedicated & qualified staff with customer service orientation  
| • Uniform training on budget preparation |
| Communication | • More face-to-face with PIs  
| • More consistent & timely communication & responsiveness between RMS, PIs, assistants, department managers, post-award analysts, GBC  
| • System to track proposal status & submission & to issue alerts when bottlenecks occur  
| • Improve awareness of RDO and services offered |
| Services | • Support building one-on-one relationships & maintain consistency of RSC assignments  
| • Understand needs of departments & PIs  
| • Standard forms & process across RSCs & teams  
| • Reduce extra work required on customer side |
| Structure & Process | • Improve computer systems and software |
## Recommendations for improvement from survey comments - again

| Staffing adjustments                                      | • hire additional staff, adjust workloads, improve training  
|                                                          | • encourage personalized service through working relationships, RSC continuity, and face-to-face contact  
|                                                          | • periodic check-ins with involved parties, unit heads and team managers  
| Tailor the “Service Level Agreement”                     | • review and clarify the SLA with stakeholders  
|                                                          | • define roles and responsibilities, develop additional agreements, ensure mutual needs are addressed  
|                                                          | • balance [standardization](#) with appropriate [customization](#)  
| Structural enhancements and change                       | • provide additional targeted services where needed  
|                                                          | • improve IT systems, alerts, templates  
|                                                          | • transparency with campus community about organizational changes and timelines  