



NCURA *Peer Advisory Service*

supporting research...together™

California State University, San Bernardino

Peer Advisory Service on Research Administration Organizational Structure, Staffing, and Resources

Report Date: November 1, 2018

Site Visit Date: August 20 - 21, 2018

National Council of University Research Administrators

1015 18th Street, NW, Suite 901

Washington, DC 20036

peerreview@ncura.edu

The California State Colleges (CSC) were established as a system with a Board of Trustees and a Chancellor by the Donahoe Higher Education Act of 1960, which followed the recommendations of "A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975." The Donahoe Act assigned different functions to the University of California, the California State Colleges, and the California Community Colleges. The primary function of the State Colleges was to broaden undergraduate and graduate instruction in the liberal arts and sciences, in applied fields, and in the professions; doctoral degrees were authorized if offered jointly with the University of California. In 1972, the system became The California State University and Colleges and, in 1982, the system became The California State University (CSU).

California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) is one of 23 schools in the California State University System. Opened in 1965, the university enrolls more than 20,000 students each year and graduates about 4,000 students annually. CSUSB serves a largely minority student population and a vast number of those students are first-generation college students.

Today, CSUSB offers more than 70 traditional baccalaureate and master's degree programs, education credential and certificate programs, and a doctoral program. In recent years, CSUSB added its first doctorate (educational leadership), an engineering program (computer science and engineering), and M.F.A. programs in creative writing¹ and studio art/design.

California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) is listed among the best colleges and universities in the western United States according to The Princeton Review, Forbes, and U.S. News and World Report in their respective annual rankings.

The Provost and the Associate Provost for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies engaged NCURA to conduct a focused analysis on the research administration organizational model, staffing, and resources available to support research administration.

A copy of the two-day schedule is attached as Appendix B.

Observations Summary

The following observations and suggestions are offered as a result of the site visit and an analysis of brief materials provided in advance. We offer broad

¹ The M.F.A in creative writing is currently on hiatus.

themes, acknowledging that two days is insufficient to offer detailed recommendations about specific strategic initiatives. These themes are not necessarily in order of priority.

The primary mission of the California State University (CSU) system, as established by the State of California, is teaching. In 1982, the California State Colleges became California State Universities, which opened the door for faculty to conduct research. Today, many of the 23 CSU institutions are becoming research-intensive, while others are seeking to accommodate the needs of their faculty to support sponsored activities. CSUSB receives approximately \$27M in external funding per year, which puts them in the middle range of the CSUs.

Teaching is still the primary mission at CSUSB; however, an increasing number of the new faculty hires desire to continue their sponsored activities that they began at former institutions. Senior administrators are trying to accommodate the upward trend in sponsored programs activity. The President and Provost are clearly eager to support the research enterprise. In keeping with this desire, a very experienced Associate Provost for Research and Graduate Studies was recently hired.

The following are some of the major observations from this NCURA Advisory Peer Review that might be impacting the growth in sponsored activities.

Mixed Messaging about the Value of Sponsored Activities

CSUSB's current strategic plan, "Strategic Plan 2015-2020," recognizes the need to support faculty who desire to seek extramural funding. The Plan identifies the need to increase support, increase reassigned time, and increase recognition for faculty who engage in sponsored activities; however, the messaging has been mixed or invisible to the campus community. Although articulated in the Strategic Plan, there has not been much done in these areas. There is no consistent formula or value structure institution-wide for the support of sponsored research. The institution has left it up to the individual Deans and Department Chairs to determine the value of externally funded research and scholarly activities within each department for teaching loads and for promotion and tenure decisions. Not having a clear message about the institutional value and reward system for obtaining sponsored activities has created frustration among some of the faculty who might otherwise be engaged in obtaining outside funding.

If sponsored activities are to be valued and encouraged at CSUSB, senior management must develop a clear value statement and communicate that campus-wide. In addition, real efforts need to be made to implement the goals of the Strategic Plan.

Heavy Teaching Loads and Reassigned Teaching Time

The expected teaching load at CSUSB (3/3/3) for all faculty, regardless of their research and scholarly activity, is typical for a teaching college and for the CSUs. CSUSB is transitioning from a three-quarter system to a two-semester system, which has been perceived by the faculty as adding to the teaching load. The current teaching responsibilities, and pending change to semester system, were mentioned often by faculty as serious impediments to conducting research and sponsored activities at CSUSB.

To address the recommendations of the Strategic Plan, more consideration should be given to developing a formula for reassigning time for faculty interested in pursuing research and scholarly activities. There are many ways to address the impediments of a heavy teaching load and to create a program in which there is equity in the reassignment of time.

Mention was made that CSU faculty are unionized and therefore a blanket reduction in teaching time might not be possible. Other unionized institutions have managed to come to agreements about reassigned time with their unions. (Information about this is provided within the report.) The campus should review such a possibility. Additionally, it would be valuable to ascertain how the other CSUs are managing reassigned time for faculty with sponsored activities.

Organizational Structure at CSUSB

The original Master Plan of the State of California created the California State Colleges solely as teaching institutions and all employees as state employees. Adding outside funding to state monies was a difficult task, partially because of the inflexibility of the use of state monies. As the mandate of the institutions changed to allow for sponsored activities from outside funding organizations, there was a need to establish systems to accommodate the research endeavor. Many of the state universities established outside private foundations (auxiliaries) to manage the sponsored funding for grants and contracts, as well as separate foundations to manage private funding for gifts and donations to the campus.

At CSUSB, there are four auxiliaries, two of which are discussed in this report: the University Enterprises Corporation (UEC), which manages the financial aspects of sponsored activities, and a Philanthropic Foundation, which manages funding from private sources including foundations, corporations, and private organizations.

To show more support for the research endeavors on campus and to create a more efficient organization, CSUSB embarked on a re-organization in 2011. Many of the auxiliary employees who were engaged in the management of sponsored activities in the UEC were moved to the campus and became state employees. In particular, the post-award staff was moved to be under the auspices of Academic Affairs. Although some of the administration functions are currently embedded in campus departments,

there is still a very strong influence by the UEC on these functions. Many of the units are still considered to be, and referred to as, UEC organizations. The 2011 reorganization was made in the best interest of campus; however, the organizational structure today seems to be confusing to most individuals that were interviewed at the site visit.

To clarify the relationships between the campuses and the auxiliaries, the Chancellor's Office issued an Executive Order (1059), "Utilization of Campus Auxiliary Organizations." Issued in 2011, the order identifies how the relationship between a university and its campus auxiliaries should function. This order does not call for the formation of auxiliaries but states that *"The campus, with the approval of the chancellor (or designees), may assign certain functions to campus auxiliary organizations."*

Many of the CSUs accept extramural funding directly into their campus' general ledgers and do not have auxiliary enterprises. Others have auxiliaries specifically to manage research funding and have no other charge. Since having auxiliary enterprises at the CSUs is neither a requirement from the State of California nor a mandate from the CSU Chancellor's Office, and because the current structure at CSUSB is fractured and confusing, a closer look at other models is highly recommended.

Use of Indirect Cost Recovery

Of all the issues discussed at the on-site visit, the recovery and use of indirect costs were among the most controversial. The topic of indirect cost recovery was brought up at almost every meeting. Although most former UEC staff are now stateside employees, the method of support is derived almost in total from the indirect costs collected from sponsored projects. The campus develops an annual cost allocation/cost recovery summary for every state side department that provides support to UEC. UEC then make charges to SPA without any input from any other campus unit, including Academic Research/SPA.

Indirect costs are one of the only sources of unrestricted funds to help foster the needs of the faculty as they try to secure extramural funding. At universities, IDC return is often shared among the administration, the college, the department, and the individual PIs who generated the award. This is also the case at CSUSB; however, since it is almost impossible to determine the accurate amount expended, and so little is remaining after UEC recovers their costs, it has become a campus-wide issue. In addition, there is no clear or written policy regarding the distribution of the IDC return.

Using indirect cost recovery to cover the costs of services for grants and contracts is not an unusual model. However, at CSUSB, neither expenditures made from indirect cost recovery nor the distribution of the remaining indirect costs are transparent to the campus community. There was no financial accounting that could easily be given when asked. Included in the briefing materials was a handwritten note on how the expenditure costs were derived. Based on those numbers, it appears that only a

fraction of the IDC is returned to the university for unrestricted use and that the rest is used to cover UEC costs.

Due to the fact this is a major issue for the campus, the Vice President for Administration and Finance and the Executive Director of the UEC should produce a clear financial accounting of the recovery and expenses. The resulting document should be made readily and widely available. It is also important to develop a campus-wide policy for the IDC return distribution. Samples of institutional policy are offered in the report.

Separate Human Resources (HR) UEC and Campus

The reorganization plan of 2011 called for combining the UEC HR with that of the campus's HR. That part of the plan did not transpire; the UEC continues to maintain a separate and distinct HR. UEC requires all personnel who have any form of payment from external funding to have it managed through the UEC HR. UEC HR has different rules and regulations regarding pay from that of stateside, including a separate and distinct employee handbook.

There are different pay scales and job classifications; student stipends, faculty summer funding, and postdocs and graduate students hired on sponsored funds are all managed with completely different rules from those on campus. There was some discussion about the fact that some individuals might receive two separate payments for a given pay period.

There is neither a State of California nor a Chancellor's Office requirement that could be located requiring separate pay regulations and classifications from monies "managed" by a CSU corporation/foundation. A quick survey of other CSUs, those with corporations and those without, indicated that this is not the practice elsewhere.

It was reported that the UEC HR often made decisions that differ from day-to-day and from individual-to-individual. Many faculty members stated that they lost potential staff and student assistants because of the decisions made by UEC HR. This was a very contentious issue for the faculty and staff and should be reviewed and resolved by senior administration.

Observations by Standard

The following observations and suggestions are offered as a result of the site visit and an analysis of brief materials provided in advance, with the analysis based upon the NCURA Peer Review Standards for Effective Central-Level

Research Administration. The text of the specific Standards utilized in this Advisory Service are provided prior to the discussion of that topic area.

STANDARD for the Research Administration Organization.

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

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

Regular communications occur between sponsored programs areas that reside centrally. Where sufficient research volume and activity warrant, the institution has addressed the research administration infrastructure needs that exist outside the central operations.

Teaching is clearly still the primary mission of CSUSB; however, the current strategic plan, "Strategic Plan 2015-2020," recognizes the need to increase funding and support for faculty and student research activities under Objectives 3 and 4 of Goal 2, "Faculty and Staff Success". Goal 2 of the Plan establishes the following objectives:

- Increase funding, incentives, reassigned time to enhance the support system for research, creative activities, and scholarship by 10% progressively over five years.
- Increase recognition and networking opportunities to enhance the university's reputation for research, creative activities, and scholarship.
- Increase funding and faculty reassigned time to provide more student opportunities for supervised research and creative activities.
 - **Notable Practice: The Strategic Plan for 2015-2020 clearly identifies the need to increase funding and increase faculty reassigned time in order to enhance the infrastructure for increased research, creative activities and scholarship.**

The Strategic Plan identifies the need to increase support; however, the messaging has been mixed or invisible to the campus community. It was clear from the on-site discussions that there is no consistent institution-wide value structure communicated to faculty who desire to conduct sponsored activities. There is no consistent support for this endeavor campus-wide and no consistent value placed on sponsored activities for promotion and tenure. No significant efforts have been made to implement this goal of the Strategic Plan. The institution has left it up to the individual Deans and Department Chairs to determine the value of external funded research and scholarly activities within each department. The lack of a clear message about the institutional value and

reward system has created frustration and some disenfranchised faculty who might otherwise be engaged in obtaining outside funding.

- **Recommendation: The President and/or the Provost should communicate to the entire university community the value of obtaining extramural funding for research, creative activities, and scholarship at CSUSB. This message should come from the most senior members of the university administration and have buy-in from the Deans and Department Chairs in order to create a consistent value and reward structure across the institution and should be supported by specific actions and investments.**

For an institution to change culture from a primarily undergraduate teaching mission to one that includes more concentrated scholarly activities and external funding, there needs to be a continuous dialogue and a visible structure in place for those conversations to take place. The institution does not have any formalized committee structure in which the primary agenda is the conduct and support of the research enterprise. There is a committee under the Academic Senate, the Faculty Professional Development Committee, where the primary focus is the approval of the recipients of the small grants program for the campus. This Committee is not involved with the review of research policy or guidance, nor with the creation of a value structure for research. There is little or no communication between the senior members of the institution and the Academic Senate on issues related to external funding or research policies and guidance.

The on-site interviews did not include members of the Academic Senate, but the Peer Advisor did learn that there appears to be tension between the senior members of the institution and the Senate. This is not unusual in a shared governance community; however, it is vital to communicate with the Senate about any potential actions that would impact the faculty.

- **Recommendation: The Provost and the Associate Provost should work towards having a stronger relationship with the Academic Senate by including representatives from the Senate on any and all committees formed that involve change in teaching loads, increased research funding, and changes in infrastructure with regard to research administration.**

Some institutions have standing meetings with senior administration and Senate members to make sure that the Senate would not impede any potential changes that are required to accommodate the needs of the institution in the conduct of research and scholarly activities.

The President and the Provost both have Cabinet meetings that periodically have the topic of research funding or research administration on the agenda, though it is not a consistent topic of discussion.

Often institutions will create standing research administration advisory committees to offer guidance to the individual who has primary responsibility for the management of the research enterprise. The membership composition may be research faculty, assistant deans with the responsibilities for research, a Senate member, senior members of a finance office, and others engaged in university management. Advisory committees are often charged with bringing concerns regarding the services provided for sponsored activities to the attention of the senior administrators. Such a committee could also be tasked with the development of a research administration strategic plan to determine the concrete steps to achieving the institution's goals. A faculty advisory committee should be established that would report to the Associate Provost for Research and be used as sounding board for that position. Discussions with faculty while on site indicated that many were eager to be part of such a committee.

- **Recommendation: The Associate Provost for Research should consider forming a faculty advisory committee to bring concerns regarding the services provided for research to the attention of that position. This committee should be established as a standing committee and not an ad hoc committee. The Associate Provost for Academic Research, with input from the Provost, should determine the membership.**

Many of the newer faculty at CSUSB who are hired from research-intensive institutions have worked on grants and contracts and arrive with the expectation that they will continue to receive funding for their research. The expected teaching load at CSUSB for all faculty, regardless of their research and scholarly activity, is the same and is typical for teaching colleges broadly and for the CSU system in particular. CSUSB is transitioning from a three-quarter system to a two-semester system, which has been perceived by the faculty as adding extra teaching obligations.

There is a strong sentiment of a heavy teaching load coming with the change to a semester system. This was mentioned often by faculty as a serious impediment to conducting research and sponsored activities at CSUSB. To address the recommendations of the Strategic Plan, consideration should be given to reassigning time for faculty interested in pursuing research and scholarly activities.

Although not included in information provided in the briefing materials or at the on-site visit, the Advisor has subsequently learned that in 2017-2018 the Provost formed a workload task force identifying how reassigned time is provided. Because of the uniqueness in each of the colleges, the colleges formed their own task force to look at how reassigned time is provided. Committees are meeting this year to finalize

reassigned time practices in each of the colleges. Reassigned time for research and other scholarly and creative activities is included as part of the task force recommendations.

There appears to be no written policy at the institutional level that allows for departments to hire new faculty at a reduced teaching load. However, there are many ways to address the impediments of a heavy teaching load and to create a program in which there is equity in the reassignment of time. The Associate Provost for Research should contact other CSU institutions to ascertain what programs they have in place for reassigned time.

- **Recommendation: The Provost and the Associate Provost for Research might consider conducting a survey of the other California State Universities to ascertain how to remove the impediments of a heavy teaching for faculty who want to obtain sponsored research. A plan for a reduction in the teaching load is critical to the success of sponsored activities at CSUSB**
- **Recommendation: CSUSB should establish an institutional policy with specific guidance regarding the reassignment of time for faculty wanting to conduct research and other sponsored activities.**

A study conducted by Academic Affairs Forum looking at “Faculty Workload Policies at Public Universities” might be of interest in this endeavor. The study can be found at:

https://www.uky.edu/ie/sites/www.uky.edu/ie/files/uploads/BP_Faculty%20Workload%20Policies%20at%20Public%20Universities.pdf

An article on this topic from *Inside Higher Ed*, entitled “Less is More,” also discusses the topic of reduced teaching load and reassigned time at primarily teaching institutions. It can be found at:

<https://coache.gse.harvard.edu/news/less-more>

- **Recommendation: While this may require a system-wide action, CSUSB should consider beginning dialogues with the administration and the faculty union about the possibilities of creating differing categories of employment for faculty who want to do more research and less teaching.** At many institutions, there are varying categories and requirements for different academic titles. If this is a conversation at the Chancellor’s Office level, then CSUSB might encourage the dialogue to begin there.

Another article from *Inside Higher Ed* examines how CUNY and their professional faculty union reached an agreement on reduced teaching

time for their faculty who want to pursue other activities beside teaching. A quote from the article follows:

The City University of New York and its faculty union, the Professional Staff Congress reached an agreement on restructuring the full-time faculty workload to allow more time for individual work with students, advising, office hours and doing research [...]

Information appears at:

<https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2017/12/11/cuny-faculty-sees-teaching-load-reduction>

As mentioned previously in the Observations section of this report, the original Master Plan of the State of California created the California State Colleges solely as teaching institutions and all employees as state employees. When more campuses took on outside funding opportunities, private foundations were established. At CSUSB, there are two 501(c)(3)s: the University Enterprises Corporation (UEC), which manages the financial aspects of sponsored activities, and a Philanthropic Foundation, which manages funding from private sources including foundations, corporations, and private organizations.

In 2011, a memorandum entitled “Organization Changes to CSUB Foundation” was issued from the then President, Albert Karnig. Based on recommendations made by the President’s Advisory Committee on Efficiency and Effectiveness, the memo outlined several changes to the organization of the CSUSB Foundation and the campus. The following recommendation were made and followed:

- Consolidate the grant and contract functions under the auspices of Academic Affairs;
- Co-locate Pre- and Post-Award Administrative staff in order to create a one-stop shop for faculty and improve customer service;
- Create a separate Philanthropic Foundation;
- Provide accounting service by Campus Auxiliary Accounting Services to the Philanthropic Foundation, as is already performed for CSUSB Foundation for the prior five years;
- Rename the CSUSB Foundation to University Enterprises Corporation (UEC).

The memorandum also recommended that the campus Human Resources office assume the management and oversight of the UEC’s Human Resources Operations. This step was not taken.

- **Notable Practice: The 2011 memorandum issued on “Organization Changes to CSUB Foundation” is a commendable effort to offer a better infrastructure for sponsored activities. It also was a strong**

signal that the most senior members of the institution were engaged in offering solutions to make the campus more efficient for the research community.

- **Notable Practice: Creating a “one-stop shop” for sponsored programs recognized the need to provide efficient and effective service for those seeking extramural funding.**

To accomplish the new reporting structure, the Grant and Contract Post-Award employees of the CSUSB Foundation (UEC) were moved over to the stateside employment system and become state employees. The campus' Auxiliary Financial Systems (AFS) group was already state employees. AFS's role is the management of all the fund accounting functions and payroll for the grants and contracts, as well as for the Philanthropic Foundation and two other auxiliaries. The fund accounting for all external funding including sponsored projects and private gifts are within the university accounting general ledger. These services are “contracted” to the university by both UEC and the Philanthropic Foundation. The auxiliaries pay a fee to the university for managing their ledgers. The amount of the fee is unknown.

Even though all the staff (with the exception of some members of the UEC HR unit) are now stateside employees, the method of support is still derived almost in total from the indirect costs collected from sponsored projects. There was no financial accounting that could easily be given when asked. Included in the briefing materials was a handwritten note on how the costs were derived. Based on those numbers, it appears that only a small fraction of the recovery is returned to the university for unrestricted use. Because this is a major issue for the campus (the topic of indirect cost recovery was brought up at almost every meeting on this site visit), the Vice President for Administration and Finance and the Executive Director of the UEC should consider producing a clear financial accounting of the recovery and expenses and make it readily available.

A quick calculation from the information provided reveals that UEC charges \$104,333 per employee for SPA (Post-Award) employees. For Auxiliary Financial Systems (AFS) indirect are charged \$39,769 per employee and UEC HR recovery is charged \$58,500 per employee.

- **Recommendation: The Vice President for Finance and the Executive Director of the UEC should create a transparent accounting for the IDC recovery, expenditures and return to campus.**

The lack of transparency is creating frustration for those who want to know how the IDC is used and what amount is being returned to campus. Although there is a prescribed formula on how indirect costs are determined by the federal government, the use of the recovered IDC is

completely left up to the discretion of the institution. These funds become unrestricted funds.

The reason that there is so much concern about the return of indirect cost to the campus is that IDC is one of the only sources of unrestricted funds to help foster the needs of the faculty as they try to secure extramural funding. Often, IDC return is shared among the administration, the college, the department, and the individual PIs who generated the award. At CSUSB, this is the case; however, since it is almost impossible to determine the accurate amount, and so little is remaining after UEC recovers their costs, it has become a campus-wide issue. There is no written or established policy about IDC return; each President has been able to determine how much to share with the campus and where that share goes. Even though the funds are incredibly limited, it is important for the institution to develop a return policy that is clear and equitable for all parties.

- **Recommendation:** CSUSB might consider establishing an IDC return distribution policy to be more in line with other institutions. A clearly established and written policy would signal to the colleges, departments, and faculty who generate IDC recovery that the administration is interested in helping to create a more equitable flow of indirect costs.

Examples of other institutions' return policies can be found at:

- Emerson College: <http://www.emerson.edu/academics/academic-services/research-creative-scholarship/compliance/research-policies/overhead-policy>
- Texas Women's University: <https://servicecenter.twu.edu/TDCClient/KB/ArticleDet?ID=42515>
- Oregon State University: <https://osucascades.edu/faculty-handbook/research-excellence/fa-return-policy>

The IDC for campus projects is 47% of MTDC; the effective rate of recovery is 11.72%. This is in the range of the other CSUs, slightly above the system-wide median of 11.53%. A majority of the larger grants to the campus are from agencies that limit the IDC recovery to 8% of total costs. During the site visit, the Peer Advisor heard anecdotally from faculty that they were able to seek waivers easily.

Subsequent to the site visit, information was provided to show that the full "allowable" IDC was recovered 88% of the time. Some of the waivers were used as cost sharing matches. Waivers of IDC are an appropriate approach to meeting mandatory cost share requirements. Many institutions provide waivers on a limited basis. However, any waivers granted are real costs to the institution and should be tightly controlled.

The Peer Advisor was made aware that the college deans approved all IDC waivers. Leaving the determination solely to the discretion of the college deans may not be in the best interest of the campus, especially in light of how important of an issue IDC return is to the campus.

CSUSB does not have any policy or procedures regarding how to obtain a waiver of indirect costs. Often institutions require a formal request and approval from the Provost or Vice President for Finance. Consideration should be given to developing a clear and transparent waiver policy and procedure, and to continue keeping statistics on those that have been granted. This policy should be vetted by a group of stakeholders and posted on the Sponsored Programs website, once approved.

- **Recommendation: The Associate Provost for Research should develop a clear and transparent policy on indirect cost waivers. Indirect cost waivers should not be ad hoc and left up to the discretion of the deans. Additionally, statistics should be gathered on the effective use of waivers.**

Samples of such indirect cost waivers policies can be found at the follow:

- Emory University: <http://www.ogca.emory.edu/documents/policies/fac-waiver.pdf>
- University of Massachusetts: <https://www.umass.edu/research/webform/indirect-cost-waiverreduction-form>
- California State University, Fullerton: http://www.fullerton.edu/doresearch/resource_library/policies/Applications%20and%20Waiver%20of%20Facilities%20and%20Administration%20Policy.pdf

Besides the concern over the low amount of indirect cost recovery return, the Peer Advisor also heard from various faculty members about additional campus units charging for services directly to a sponsored project award. Among the types of charges reported are air-conditioning and room use for events. If these types of facilities expenses are indeed being charged directly to sponsored projects accounts, especially federal grants, then a review of these must take place. The negotiated rate for F&A (indirect cost) includes facilities costs. It is not allowable by federal regulation to charge normally indirect costs as direct costs to an awarded project. Institutions are expected to follow Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). In special circumstances, such charges can be applied, if and when they are approved in advance and are part of the proposal. The Peer Advisor had no way of verifying these charges, but it is incumbent upon the institution to assure that such charges are not being applied.

- **Recommendation: The Associate Provost's staff must assure that additional facilities charges are not made against awarded sponsored projects.** Since the Post-Award staff currently reviews all the charges against sponsored agreements, it is incumbent upon that unit to assure that these charges do not appear against awards.

The University of Louisiana has produced a nice chart of direct vs. indirect costs that are appropriate to charge against sponsored awards. The chart can be found at: <https://vpresearch.louisiana.edu/pre-award/building-your-budget/direct-costs-vs-indirect-costs>

Clarkson University offers a nice document on how to distinguish between direct and indirect charges. It can be found at: <http://internal.clarkson.edu/dor/documents/How%20to%20Distinguish%20Between%20Direct%20and%20Indirect%20Charges.pdf>

The CSU Chancellor's Office ICSUAM Policy Manual Section 1100 on Sponsored Programs Administration has clear information on what are allowable and unallowable charges against sponsored awards. This can be found at: <http://www.calstate.edu/icsuam/documents/Section11000.pdf>

The Chancellor's Office Executive Order 1000 was given as the primary reason these additional facilities charges were now appearing on sponsored awards. Executive Order 1000 outlines the Delegation of Fiscal Authority and Responsibility and has been in effect since 2007. This Advisor has read the Executive Order and cannot determine where the authority for charging extra facilities costs appears in the document. In addition, all sponsored agreements already have indirect costs applied.

- **Recommendation: The Provost and the Vice President for Administration and Finance must jointly review Executive Order 1000 and agree upon the interpretation of directly charging additional costs to projects.** The following paragraph might be the one in question:

CSU policies, standards, and definitions require that the activity establish fees and charges designed to recover its costs, including capital costs (such as depreciation or debt service). These fees are directly related to, although not necessarily equal to, the costs of the goods or services.

- **Recommendation: The Associate Provost Research should survey the other CSUs to determine how the Executive Order 1000 is applied.**

CSUSB Research Leadership

The CSUSB top leaders have long histories of working at institutions of higher education and have held positions of leadership at those institutions. Both the President and the Provost have experience at institutions that have sponsored programs activity.

The President of the institution has been at CSUSB since 2012. He is the university's fourth president since it opened in 1965. Previously, he was president of the College of Staten Island, The City University of New York (CUNY), from 2007 to 2012. From 2001 to 2007, he served in various capacities at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, including Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Student Affairs, and professor of education. Prior to joining Pomona, he was Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students at The City College of New York/CUNY from 1994 to 2001.

The Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs at CSUSB is the senior official responsible for the academic issues, graduate studies, and the research enterprise, including research administration. She was named Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at California State University, San Bernardino in September 2016. She is the first woman in the university's history to lead the division. Prior to joining CSU San Bernardino, she served as deputy provost at California State University, Fullerton since 2014.

Both the President and the Provost are very supportive of increasing the external funding for sponsored activity and have recently hired a new Associate Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies to carry out this mission. At the time of the site visit, the new Associate Provost for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies had been in her position for fewer than six months. She was most recently at CSU Dominguez Hills, where she served as Dean of Graduate Studies and Academic Research. Prior to that, she served in a variety of leadership roles at CSU Fullerton, including five years as Associate Dean of the College of Engineering and Computer Science, three years as WASC accreditation liaison officer, five years as Associate Vice President for Graduate Programs and Research, and one year as Director of Special Projects.

The position of Associate Provost for Research and Graduate Studies consists of the responsibilities for graduate studies and the research enterprise, which includes the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (Pre-Award) and Sponsored Programs Administration (Post-Award). The Associate Provost for Research is a member of the Provost's Cabinet where she sits at the table with the Deans and the Provost during their regularly scheduled meetings.

- **Notable Practice: The faculty and staff interviewed saw the hire of an experience research administrator in this vital position as a positive**

sign that the senior management is supportive of the research and sponsored activities on the campus.

Research Administration Organization

The recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee on Efficiency and Effectiveness that called for the transfer of UEC staff to become stateside staff were made in the best interest of campus; however, the implementation was done with minimal planning. The organizational structure today seems to be confusing to most individuals that were questioned on the site visit.

The pre-award activities for the campus are handled through the Research and Sponsored Programs office (Pre-Award), which is (and always has been) a campus department with state employees. The Director of the office reports directly to the Associate Provost Research. Pre-award activities include preparation of the proposal budgets and budget narratives and the submission of proposals to external sponsors.

The grant and contract unit from the UEC was moved under the Associate Provost for Research and was renamed Sponsored Program Administration (currently called Post-Award). However, during the review, that unit was often referred to as "UEC" by faculty and staff. The fact the Post-Award is still considered by many individuals at CSUSB as "UEC" creates some of the organizational confusion. The Associate Provost should consider a rebranding of the unit to assure that the reporting lines are clear. Combining the two separate units into one department might make some sense.

- **Recommendation: The Associate Provost should consider a rebranding of the SPA Post-Award Unit under her auspices to ensure that campus community clearly understands the reporting relationship to Academic Affairs.** Consideration might be given to combining the two units into one department.

The rebranding should help to eliminate the misimpression that the post-award function is still under the auspices of the UEC.

The Post-Award unit manages most of the administrative duties for all of the sponsored activities at CSUSB. Individual staff members are assigned to individual Principal Investigators (PIs) and essentially manage all of the day-to-day activities for those PIs. The Post-Award unit negotiates the terms and conditions of awards, sets up all the accounts in the PeopleSoft auxiliary accounts, pre-approves all expenditures for every award, handles the bids and the preparation for procurements, calculates the indirect costs on each award, and prepares reports and close out documents. During the on-site visit, the Peer Advisor heard many complaints about the amount mistakes in the PIs accounts; these are being attributed to the Post-Award unit. Some faculty brought copies of ledgers for the Peer Advisor to review. Although financial reports are accessible to the faculty via Common Financial Systems Data Warehouse, they found it difficult to retrieve the data. During discussions with faculty, many reported that they

have to keep their own books on excel spreadsheets and point out to Post-Award the differences.

The responsibilities of research administration offices are typically dependent upon sponsored research volume and institution size. The scope of both the Pre-Award and the Post-Award units' responsibilities extend beyond the typical activities of sponsored programs offices at institutions of CSUSB's size. These activities are not sustainable; should there be even a slight increase in sponsored activities, workload and duties will extend beyond the offices' capacity.

Some of those duties might be better placed in other campus units. A closer look at the functions and duties of the units needs to be accomplished.

- **Recommendation: The Associate Provost for Research should conduct a detailed analysis of the duties of each unit (especially in the Post-Award unit) to determine if the functions that they are currently tasked with performing are appropriate, and necessary, or can be better performed elsewhere in the institution.** Consideration might be given to hiring outside help to perform this analysis.

Examples of areas that could be better-placed elsewhere:

- Post-Award staff negotiates the terms and conditions of award agreements. This task is usually performed in a Pre-Award Office. An award is not accepted until all the terms and conditions are approved.
- Post-Award staff prepares and bids all procurements on sponsored agreements. These activities are usually initiated in a department and managed through a central purchasing department.
- The Pre-Award office determines the proposal budgets, creates the budgets, prepares the budgets, and writes the budget narrative. At most institutions with a similar sponsored volume the proposal development including budgets and narratives are left to the PI or the administrators in the department or schools.

Faculty Center of Excellence/Research Development Faculty Director

CSUSB has a fairly new position of Research Development Faculty Director within the Faculty Center of Excellence. This position reports to the Associate Provost. A faculty member at CSUSB occupies this position. The Faculty Director is fairly new to her position and was not totally clear about her role. Her expectations are that she will assist faculty to develop projects and help secure funding for those projects. Knowledge of this position was greeted well by most of the faculty. Some members of the faculty were not aware of the position or her services, while others stated that they were not inclined to use the Center.

The Associate Provost and the Research Development Faculty Director should clearly identify the duties under this position and announce them to the campus. Having a faculty member hold such a position is a plus in that she is aware of the effort that goes into obtaining and maintaining extramural funding. On the whole, the position was received positively.

- **Notable Practice: The creation of a position of a Research Development Faculty Director was well received by most individuals that were queried.** This position, if appropriately tasked, can greatly increase the productivity of the faculty seeking and obtaining extramural funding for research and creative activities. It also gives a clear signal that senior management is putting services together to assist and grow the sponsored activities.
- **Recommendation: The Associate Provost and the Faculty Director should clearly outline the tasks to be performed by this position and announce them to the campus community.** There was some uncertainty about the role.

Clarifying the duties and tasks of this position will focus the role for the Faculty Director and the community, which might have the potential for increasing sponsored activities.

University Enterprises Corporation (UEC) and UEC Human Resources

In 2011, the Chancellor's Office issued Executive Order 1059, entitled "Utilization of Campus Auxiliary Organizations." This order identifies how the relationship between a university and its campus auxiliaries should function. This order does not call for the formation of auxiliaries but states that "the campus, with the approval of the chancellor (or designees), may assign certain functions to campus auxiliary organizations."

The University Enterprises Corporation (UEC) is a 501(c)(3) established through an MOU between the university, the corporation, and the system-wide Chancellor's Office. The MOU runs through 2020 "unless terminated." The primary function of the UEC is to act as the fiscal sponsor and applicant for external grants and contracts. The President of the university is delegated the oversight of the corporation by the system-wide Board of Trustees. Under the terms of the MOU, the President has re-delegated the oversight to the university's Chief Financial Officer.

All of the fiscal services and a majority of the UEC personnel that handled those services have been moved to the university and are stateside employees. All accounting is done in the university's financial accounting system (PeopleSoft) in an auxiliary general ledger. The reporting lines for the university employees are not through the Executive Director of the UEC but through the campus units that have absorbed the workload. For example, the Post-Award unit reports to the Associate

Provost for Research; the Auxiliary Financial Services, which includes accounting and payroll for extramural funding, reports up to the AVP of Finance and Administration. Remaining in the UEC are the Executive Director, his Executive Assistant, an office assistant, the Assistant Manager of Business Operations, the Human Resources (HR) unit, and the IT technician.

Although not officially part of the UEC, all the operations that are involved with sponsored activities were often referred to as “UEC,” which causes immense confusion among the research community. The organizational structure, known and understood by those in it, is not clear to anyone else.

The 2011 memorandum “Organization Changes to CSUB Foundation” included the transfer of duties and personnel of the foundation (UEC) HR unit to campus. However, this did not occur. The most concerning thing about not having the HR unit under the auspices of the central campus is that different regulations are being imposed on individuals receiving any income from soft monies. Campus personnel with any outside funding are on separate pay scales and receive separate pay under separate rules governed by UEC HR. Student stipends, faculty summer funding, postdocs, and graduate students hired on sponsored funds are all managed with completely different rules from those on campus payrolls. Many individuals might receive two separate payments for a given pay period. The UEC HR even has a distinct employee handbook.

Of all the issues that were brought to the attention of the Peer Advisor, this was the one that got the most grievances. It was reported that the UEC HR often made decisions that differ from day to day and from individual to individual. The Peer Advisor heard many anecdotal accounts of faculty losing potential staff and student assistants because of “arbitrary” decisions made by UEC HR. Additionally, the timing of HR decisions was another issue brought forward.

Taking into account that all the funds generated by extramural activities are currently managed in the university accounting system, it would make sense to have all pay generated by the university and reimbursed by auxiliary funds. To have everyone governed by the same personnel rules would be essential for efficient management of the research enterprise at CSUSB. There is no State of California Executive Order or Chancellor Office policy that can be located requiring separate pay regulations and classifications from monies “managed” by a CSU corporation/foundation. There needs to be a thorough review of whether this is a requirement of the State of California, from the system-wide Chancellor’s Office, or one that is a UEC requirement.

A quick survey of other CSUs, both those with auxiliary organizations and those without, showed that they use the stateside (CSU-wide) job titles and classifications for staff and students hired on soft money. The Provost and the Vice President for Administration and Finance should do a complete survey of the other CSUs to find out

how the extramural pay is managed at those institutions. This is a huge impediment to the research community and one that was reported to have discouraged some faculty and staff from continuing to seek extramural funding.

- **Recommendation: The Provost and the Vice President for Finance should review where the requirement for separate payrolls, classifications, and regulations stem from. It must be determined whether it is a requirement of the State of California, the Board of Trustees, or the UEC.**
- **Recommendation: The Vice President for Finance should give serious consideration to collapsing UEC HR into the campus HR, especially if having separate HRs is not a requirement from the State of California.**
- **Recommendation: The Vice President for Finance should complete the recommendations of the 2011 Memorandum on “Organization Changes to CSUB Foundation” and transfer the UEC HR personnel to central HR or have the HR functions of sponsored programs be consistent with campus and managed through the campus enterprise.**

One clear voice is essential to maintaining an efficient and effective enterprise for sponsored activities.

CSUSB was one of the first campuses in the system to move corporation employees to the state payroll and to combine the pre- and post-award services. The model is now being taken up at some of the other CSUs. In addition, several of the CSU campuses do not have a foundation or a corporation to manage their sponsored programs. These institutions have been able to have all the funding directly deposited and managed by the university. Bakersfield, Channel Islands, East Bay, Maritime Academy, San Francisco, Sonoma, and Stanislaus all seem to accept sponsored funding directly into the university without an auxiliary. Other CSUs have auxiliary organizations solely dedicated to sponsored programs and extramural funding. Because there is so much confusion and a vast amount of inefficiencies in the current model at CSUSB, it might be beneficial to review the structure and see how it can be improved.

Although the CSUSB and UEC fiscal and HR organizational structures are bifurcated, both organizations roll up to one office, the Vice President for Administration and Finance. Under the terms of the MOU, the Chief Executive Officer (CSU President) is responsible for the oversight for the UEC. This fact makes taking a look at new models for sponsored programs a much easier task. The fiscal responsibility and oversight are already vested in a single place.

The senior administration should continue the work of the prior president by forming a new task force to review the current organizational structure for extramural funding at CSUSB. If there truly is a desire to grow and support faculty and staff with their research, creative activities, and scholarship, now is the opportune time for some change.

- **Recommendation: The President, the Provost and the Vice President for Administration and Finance should form a new task force or ad hoc committee to take a serious look at the current organizational structures at CSUSB that supports sponsored activities.**

There are many problems under the current structure that can be eliminated with the appropriate oversight and management structure. The review should include not just the UEC, but also the AFS accounting for sponsored activities, AFS payroll², and the Pre- and Post-Award units to determine if units are currently housed under the correct organizations.

Philanthropic Foundation (Development)

Another 501(c)(3) established at CSUSB is the Philanthropic Foundation. This organization handles funding from all private sources, such as foundations, corporations, associations, and private donors. The foundation is responsible for accepting all philanthropic and tax-deductible gifts and for managing, investing, and disbursing all funds and endowments raised for the university. The foundation is headed by the Vice President for University Advancement and is run by a Board of Directors, of which the President of the university is a member. The VP for University Advancement reports to the President of the university and also sits on the Board of Directors of the foundation.

There is no directive from the Chancellor's Office for each campus to establish a private foundation to handle the post-award aspects of external funding. If a campus chooses to have a foundation, an MOU between the campus and the foundation must be established in writing and periodically updated.

Private monies, regardless of whether or not they had terms and conditions, and deliverables are managed through the foundation. All proposals are submitted through the foundation and funds managed in an AFS general ledger are set up specifically for the foundation.

Faculty assert that many times they did not even know that a private grant was proposed in their name until an account was established for them. There seems to be no communications with the fundraising arm of the foundation, the Associate Provost for Research, and/or the Deans and Department Chairs. In discussions with the

² Subsequent to the Peer Review site visit, AFS payroll was reorganized to report to the Executive Director of the UEC.

foundation, it seemed that once the fund raising was accomplished, the stewardship of the money was left up to the campus.

It would be a serious risk to the institution and a loss of potential indirect cost revenue if the Philanthropic Foundation administers sponsored activities. The risk to the campus would be that terms and conditions are not known and are not being monitored and thus not being honored. Terms and conditions of many private organizations often call for restrictions and delays on publications and ownership of intellectual property. These terms can create a deemed export control situation. Ignorance of human subjects requirements, conflict of interest requirements, and other regulatory compliance mandates can create potential disallowances for the institution. Many of the private foundations follow the federal government regulations for sponsored programs.

- **Recommendation: The Associate Provost for Research and the VP for Advancement should review the monies being administrated through the foundation to assure that no sponsored project funding is being administered there.** Loss of indirect cost revenue and potential issues with the lack of compliance such as financial conflict of interest, use of human subjects, and export controls could result in major issues for the institution.

These concerns are common among all institutions with development and sponsored projects activities. Clear definitions of gift versus sponsored program are essential, as is an agreed upon structure for which office submits the proposal and/or accepts the award. Definitions of gift versus sponsored project are common at colleges and universities. Many definitions include a range of characteristics of sponsored programs and when any of the characteristics exist the proposal or award is treated as a sponsored project and is managed solely by the research administration office. It is general practice to classify the activity when the proposal is submitted, not at the award stage.

- **Recommendation: The Associate Provost for Research and the Vice President for Advancement should develop and implement definitions and written guidelines on gifts, grants, and contracts and determine which office is responsible for managing what type of award.**

A review of institutional definitions and guidance would provide a number of policies in this endeavor.

- University of California, Irvine
<https://www.research.uci.edu/sponsored-projects/gift-vs-grant/index.html>

- Middle Tennessee State University:
http://www.mtsu.edu/development/docs/Gift_vs_Grant.pdf
- University of California, Berkeley:
<https://vcresearch.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/inline-files/DistinguishBtwnResearchGiftsSponsoredProjects.pdf>
- Oregon State University: <http://oregonstate.edu/research/osp/what-not-sponsored-project> and
<https://research.oregonstate.edu/irb/determination-sponsored-projects-and-gifts>

Clear definitions and better understanding of the difference between these types of awards at the proposal stage will assure that the award will be classified correctly and that the appropriate office will be submitting the proposal and managing the awards.

- **Recommendation: Once development as agreed upon, the definitions for gifts, grants, and contracts should be posted on the websites of all units involved to assure that the campus community is clear about which office is best suited to assisting faculty with proposal submissions.**

With clear definitions and a determination about which office is the appropriate office to manage the proposal process, communication to campus about the responsibilities of each can be clearly articulated.

Many fundraising entities are concerned about the ability to “count” all the monies from private sources through their foundation. The Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) standards allows for a development organization to count in their fundraising efforts all monies from private sources. It also recognizes that many are sponsored agreement and encourages entities to work together to manage these funds. As long as the general ledger does not include the cash in both the foundation accounting and the sponsored programs accounting, each can take credit for the award.

Deans, Department Chairs, Center Directors

In conversations conducted with Deans, Chairs, and PIs, it was clear that most schools and departments do not offer any proposal or award management help to the PIs. Additionally, PIs are overloaded with teaching and other campus responsibilities; therefore, the central research administration units have assumed more and more duties and task vis-à-vis sponsored projects administration.

Earlier in the report, it was recommended that CSUSB’s senior administration re-evaluate the central research administration structure; as this evaluation takes place, it

may be beneficial to determine whether or not more assistance in sponsored projects should be provided at the local levels, in the larger schools and service centers for the smaller ones. The closer these duties are performed to the researcher or project manager, the less likely mistakes will occur. The larger and more affluent schools might consider hiring a sponsored project administrator in the Dean's Offices to assist the faculty with proposal preparation and award management. The smaller schools with less sponsored work could pool their resources to create shared administrative service centers to house shared sponsored project administration support. The faculty who were queried were very supportive of this concept.

- **Recommendation: The Provost might start a conversation about local-level research administration support at cabinet meetings with the Deans. This might include establishing shared service centers for several schools.**

Indirect cost recoveries might help support this effort.

The shared administrative services center is a model that seen among many colleges and universities. The following link identifies some institutions with such models: <https://sharedservices.berkeley.edu/shared-services-elsewhere/>.

An interesting article on shared services can be found on the online publication Educause: <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2011/7/shared-services-and-partnerships-the-keys-to-the-future-of-higher-education>

Roles and Responsibilities

Rules and responsibilities for various administrative functions are posted on CSUSB's websites. On the Academic Affairs' site is an outdated 2004 Executive Order that articulates the various functions and roles for sponsored project administration. The Chancellor's Office's Integrated Policy Manual (ICSUAM), Section 1100 Sponsored Programs Administration, has superseded this Executive Order and the following roles are identified in the manual.

- **"Principal Investigator"** means the individual (whether referred to in the Contract or Grant as a Principal Investigator, Project Director or other similar term) designated by the Sponsored Program Administrator to be responsible for ensuring compliance with the academic, scientific, technical, financial, and administrative aspects and for day-to-day management of the Sponsored Program.
- **"Sponsored Program(s) Administrator"** means the entity (university or auxiliary) designated by the Recipient to administer the Sponsored Program.

The CSU Chancellor's Office ICSUAM Policy Manual, Section 1100 on Sponsored Programs Administration can be found at:

<http://www.calstate.edu/icsuam/documents/Section11000.pdf>

Included in the briefing materials is a document entitled "Administration of Sponsored Programs Activities/FAM 863" dated from 1998. This document assigns some duties to the Director of Research and Sponsored Programs (Pre-Award), the PI, department chair, and the college dean/divisional administrator. This document is also out of date.

Chairs and Deans were unaware of any official document or policy requiring that their positions have certain duties in the performance of sponsored projects administration. Most of those interviewed stated that they often have conversations with individuals prior to the development of proposals but none considered this to be a campus requirement. The Peer Advisor heard that proposals were currently being submitted without the knowledge of the Chair or Dean. It was remarked that some awards have appeared in which reassigned time was included without the Chair or Dean's knowledge. This has created an issue for some of the departments in that they have to find alternative instructors for their courses.

In the past, a paper file with a proposal approval form was circulated through the appropriate administration offices where approval signatures were obtained, though this sometimes occurred after the fact. This created a knowledge base for those positions. However, the paper files and the proposal approval forms are no longer circulated, due to the implementation of an electronic proposal routing system. The university recently adopted Cayuse, a popular software for proposal submissions. During the implementation of Cayuse, routing the proposal for approvals through departments and deans' offices was eliminated. The campus is in the process of correcting the routing process. This will greatly help in assuring the Deans and Chairs review proposals prior to submission.

In order to have a consistent treatment of sponsored activities across the institution, it is imperative that all parties understand their position's role in this endeavor. Many institutions will post a roles and responsibilities matrix for each position that is involved in the proposal and award management process. The Associate Provost along with her staff should survey other institutions to review the roles and responsibilities they assigned to the administration of sponsored activities in an attempt to clarify those at CSUSB.

- **Recommendation: In an attempt to assign specific roles to each administrative position involved in research administration at CSUSB, the Associate Provost along with her staff should survey other research institutions policies.**

- **Recommendation:** The Associate Provost and the Provost should prepare a roles and responsibilities matrix and share it with the Dean and Chairs for their input.

Examples of Roles and Responsibilities matrices can be found at:

- Temple University: <https://research.temple.edu/grants/roles-and-responsibilities>
- Northwestern University: <http://www.researchroles.northwestern.edu/>
- University of Southern California: https://research.usc.edu/files/2017/11/Roles-and-Responsibilities-for-Research-Administration_2017_Final.pdf
- University of Colorado: https://www.colorado.edu/ocg/sites/default/files/attached-files/rr_final_revisions_4-9-15.pdf

STANDARD for Research Administration Staffing and Staff Development.

The institution has invested in and committed to a sufficient number of staff to (1) support the core functions of the research administration operation, with emphasis on sponsored programs administration and (2) meet obligations to sponsors and governmental and locally-mandated regulations.

The institution has an appropriate research administration staffing plan that contains elements of recruitment, retention, professional development, and succession for key positions.

Where sufficient research volume and activity or where operations are decentralized, the institution has unit-level research administrators residing at the department, school/college, or organized research unit level.

A detailed description of the organizational structure of the sponsored programs administration at CSUSB has been described earlier in this report. There are three separate and distinct entities that are all part of the research management process. There are two auxiliary organizations (UEC and the Philanthropic Foundation) and the State funded central administration CSUSB. Although not currently mandated by the Office of the Chancellor or the State of California, CSUSB has chosen to maintain their auxiliary organization for some sponsored project functions.

While on site the organizational structure for the UEC did not include the Payroll department employees. The Advisor subsequently learned about this reorganization after the on-site visit. The current staffing within the UEC includes the Executive Director and the following thirteen employees (all of these position report to the Executive Director and most are UEC employees):

- Executive Director – UEC employee
- Executive Assistant – UEC employee
- Office Assistant – UEC employee
- IT Technician – CSUSB employee
- Assistant Manager Business Operations – UEC employee
- Director of Human Resources (HR) – CSUSB employee
- Three staff members in HR—one position is currently vacant – CSUSB employees
- Payroll Supervisor – CSUSB employee³
- Four payroll staff – CSUSB employees³

The Philanthropic Foundation is led by the Vice President of Advancement, who is also the Executive Director of the foundation. There is an entire Development division whose staff is responsible for private fundraising. Some of this fundraising has included grants and contracts that are rightly classified as sponsored projects.

On the Stateside at CSUSB there are four units: Auxiliary Accounting Services; Auxiliary Payroll Services both under the AVP for Finance; and Pre- and Post-Award units under the auspices of the Associate Provost for Academic Research.

The Auxiliary Financial Services (AFS) has 13 employees, as follows:

- Director of AFS
- An Accountant
- An Accounting Tech
- Accounting Supervisor
- Four staff under the Accounting Supervisor

Academic Research under the Associate Provost has 13 employees. The Research Compliance Office (one employee), although under this organization, was not a part of this review. Additionally, the Associate Provost has an Administrative Assistant.

Research and Sponsored Programs (Pre-Award)

- Director
- Office Manager

³ At the time of the site visit, the payroll office was part of Auxiliary Financial Services and reported to the CSUSB AVP of Finance. The office has since been moved to report to the UEC Executive Director.

- Two Grant Officers – one is vacant

Sponsored Programs Administration (Post-Award)

- Director
- Five staff – one is vacant

Faculty Center of Excellence

- Research Development Faculty Director

The Schools and Departments do not have personnel who are specifically assigned to assist the faculty in their research endeavors. A recommendation has already been made to have the Colleges consider adding such personnel.

In order to clearly understand whether or not the staffing is adequate in these organizations, it is critical to understand in detail what each of these units do on a day-to-day basis. Because this review did not go into the particular processes and procedures within any department, no determination can be made.

If the institution decides to re-evaluate the current model of sponsored administration at CSUSB, then all units, duties, and staffing levels within each unit need to be analyzed during this process. Even if the current model remains, a closer look at the duties of each should take place.

- **Recommendation: Once CSUSB determines the appropriate organization model for the institution, a thorough review of the duties and assignments of all units involved in the administration of sponsored research should take place.**

A thorough review and possible reshuffling of duties within units and between units is the only way to determine whether or not there is adequate staffing to handle the appropriate workload.

Consideration should be given to having an outside individual or company conduct these reviews. Outside assistance can mitigate concerns that individuals might have about objectivity in the process.

Neither Academic Research nor the UEC appear to have any succession planning or career ladder opportunities for their staffs. There does not appear to be many professional development opportunities offered to sponsored administration staff. There is some opportunity for staff to attend professional meetings and system-wide meetings.

There is no formalized training in Pre-Award, nor does there seem to be any desk manuals for new employees. New employees in Post-Award have thorough one-on-one training sessions with the Director of that unit and a senior staff member. No new employee training was identified for any other unit.

Training and professional development are essential for all research administrators; the field is constantly changing with the ever-increasing regulations from the funding agencies, as well as the federal and state governments. Professional development creates networks of colleagues who share best practices, policies, and different models of operation. The university needs to extend significant training to all staff involved in sponsored projects, which might be accomplished through a variety of professional development offerings.

- **Recommendation: CSUSB should invest in the professional development of sponsored programs staff to assist them in increasing their proficiency in their fields.** Such training can be obtained from professional organizations, such as NCURA. The NCURA Fundamentals of Sponsored Projects Administration workshop offers a professional development program that can be tailored to a specific campus if the need is there. In addition, attendance at targeted subject matter meetings, such as the NCURA Financial Research Administration (FRA) annual conference, might be beneficial as well.

To remain current and compliant in an ever changing and dynamic climate of sponsored research, education in regulatory areas, and in responsible conduct and administration of research, is critical for research faculty and staff across the university and its colleges. Such education must cover institutional policies and procedures, technology systems and tools, compliance issues, special risk areas, and other research resources.

At CSUSB, no formalized education exists for the faculty or research staff. There needs to be some educational opportunities to learn about regulatory and research administrative issues and to assure that the institution is in compliance with the mandated requirements. With the recent creation of the position of Research Development Faculty Director, more structured training opportunities for faculty are being developed.

- **Recommendation: As research volume grows in the future, Academic Affairs should consider developing and implementing several educational programs for PIs and research staff.**

The institution already licenses CITI Program – Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative and might make that more readily available to the campus community.

STANDARD for Resources to Support Research Administration.

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

The budgeting process at CSUSB seems to be somewhat fractured. Even though this was not a part of the conversation on site, information about the budgeting process was offered after the site visit.

As discussed, many of the individuals that were once part of the UEC and have moved to organizations within the university are still paid for by indirect cost recovery. In these cases, the Executive Director of the UEC determines the entire budget for those units without input from the supervising unit. The budget amount identified for Sponsored Programs Administration (SPA) is almost \$2M. However, only \$591,000 is identified for the post-award office staff salaries. There is a \$9,000 budget for travel and \$4,000 for professional development and training of all "UEC" staff, not just Academic Research staff. Although attempts have been made to disaggregate the budget and allow the supervising units to have a say in the amounts provided, this has not happened to-date. In contrast, organizations that have always had stateside employees have their budgets determined within the university budgeting process and are consulted about their needs. For the Academic Affairs units (i.e., Pre- and Post-award), this creates a dichotomy. In an attempt to make the budgeting process equitable, it should be reviewed at the same time the institution reviews its organizational structure.

Central Information Technology Services (ITS) maintains information on the age and service records of all campus computers. They are responsible to make recommendations for replacement and do so on a regular basis. There were no issues regarding this topic.

The Pre-Award unit has just implemented the Cayuse proposal submission system and has the use of InfoEd for conducting funding searches. There were some concerns expressed about the way the campus utilizes the technology. This has already been discussed in the report.

It was reported that there is adequate space for the all units involved in the administration of the sponsored programs on campus. However, if the staffing level grows in any unit then a closer look at the housing arrangements needs to be made.

There are no specific recommendations for this standard at this time.

Appendix A: Peer Programs Bios



CSU San Bernardino
Reviewer/Advisor Bios

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

Joyce Freedman, PEER ADVISOR

Number of Years in Research Administration: 38

Institutions: University of California, San Francisco, University of California, Berkeley, University of Chicago, Stanford University, Mills College, University of Southern California, California State University, Northridge (CSUN)

Joyce Freedman has served in senior roles in research administration at private and public universities, an academic medical center and a DOE national laboratory. Joyce has worked recently with a small liberal arts college and well as a large research university. At Mills College, Joyce was hired to set up an infrastructure for research administration, which included establishing pre and post award offices (SPO and Grant and Contract Accounting) writing research policies and procedures, as well as creating data systems for proposal and award tracking. She also helped implement the research accounting module in the financial system. At USC, Joyce worked with the Vice President for Research and Executive Director of the Department of Contracts and Grants to implement new systems and procedures, and to help reorganize the department. Current client is CSUN working with the Office of Research and Sponsored Program (ORSP) and the Associate Vice President of Research.

Joyce has been working in research administration for over thirty years; serving as Assistant Vice Chancellor and Assistant Vice President for Research at three major research institutions, as well as director of sponsored projects offices and Associate Comptroller for Restricted Funds. She served as the Director of the Sponsored Projects Office and the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research at UC Berkeley for over 10 years. In that role, she ran the grant and contract office, the animal care office, the human subjects office, the financial conflict of interest committee, and the postdoc and visiting scholar services. At UCSF, Joyce served as Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research. UCSF is a mostly a medical and health sciences campus with large NIH funding. At UCSF, Joyce was responsible for the day-to-day activities of the Department of Grants and Contracts, the Conflict of Interest Committee, the Department of Industry Contracts and for the implementation of a new proposal tracking system and Cayuse (a system to system database for proposal submission). Joyce was also called upon to serve on many committees for the Office of the President, for example, Joyce helped design and implement the system wide Effort Reporting System.

Her experience includes: The day-to-day management of research administration programs and offices: pre-award; industry contracts; research and gift accounting; compliance offices and



National Council of University Research Administrators
1015 18th Street NW, Suite 901 | Washington, DC 20036
peerreview@ncura.edu | <http://www.ncura.edu>
Peer Assistance by Research Administrators for Research Administrators

committees. She has had institutional responsibility for research compliance programs: export controls; effort reporting; conflict of interest; has implemented databases for research administration; cost sharing; effort reporting and research accounting; and had the oversight for the management of human subjects, animal care and conflict of interest programs.

Joyce has been a member of NCURA for over 25 years; served as chair of the western region; served on the Board of Directors and the Executive Committee; co-editor of the Newsletter for Biomedical; co-program chair for a summer conference; faculty on a national video conference and a webinar; speaker at regional and national NCURA meetings, as well as SRA, CASE and NACURA conferences. Joyce attended COGR meetings while at Chicago, Berkeley and UCSF and was an original member of the FDP steering committee while at Chicago.

NCURA Staff Assisting with this Engagement

Kris A. Monahan

Number of Years in Research Administration: 16

Institutions: Bridgewater State University, Wellesley College, Providence College

Kris Monahan established a sponsored research office at Providence College in 2011. Prior to Providence College, she led pre-award activities at one of the largest gender-focused research-and-action organizations in the world, Wellesley Centers for Women at Wellesley College. She also served as assistant then interim director of sponsored programs at a comprehensive state university in Massachusetts, Bridgewater State University.

With an MPA and Ph.D. in education policy, Kris is keenly skilled in understanding complex business processes, teaching, learning, and education administration. Her career has focused on developing training programs, services and communication related to pre- and post-award research administration. She has effectively developed policies and standard operating procedures for colleges/universities. She has experience working directly with faculty on proposal development to working with the highest level of institutional administration on strategic plans and college-wide research initiatives and policies. She has experience with the administration of three different Institutional Review Boards, has led the establishment of an inaugural Indirect Cost Rate Agreement and developed course-release policies.

Having presented more than 50 concurrent sessions and discussion groups at regional and national meetings of NCURA, Kris is well known for her focus on supporting research development, growth, and faculty service. She served as co-editor of the NCURA Magazine 2013-2016, has served on the NCURA Board of Directors, is the NCURA Region I New England Immediate Past Chair and been on numerous regional and national committees bringing her extensive perspective to activities, services, and programs of NCURA and in support of the profession of research administration. She co-authored two NCURA published micrographs: *Establishing and Managing an Office of Sponsored Programs at Non-Research Intensive Colleges and Universities*, 3rd ed. (2014) and *The Role of Research Administration*, 3rd ed. (2014).

Appendix B: Site Visit Itinerary

NCURA Targeted Peer Review Itinerary: California State University San Bernardino

Location: Administration Building, Room 103

Sunday: August 19th, Dinner reservations at Mission Inn with Dorota Huizinga. She will pick up Joyce at approximately 5:30pm from the Doubletree.

Day 1: August 20

Dorota Huizinga will pick Joyce up from the Doubletree Monday morning ~7:30am.

Time	Meeting Schedule & Participants
8-9	<u>Entrance Meeting</u> : Dorota Huizinga, Associate Provost for Research & Dean of Graduate Studies 8:30am Shari McMahan, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs will join Entrance Meeting
9-9:15	<i>Executive Session</i>
9:15-10	Ron Fremont, Vice President Advancement Annya Dixon, Director of Corporate & Foundation Relations
10-10:30	President Tomás D. Morales
10:30-10:45	<i>Executive Session</i>
10:45-11:30	<u>Faculty/PI Session</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mike Stull, Chair of Management; Executive Director, Inland Empire Center for Entrepreneurship, College of Business & Public Admin. • Tony Coulson, Professor of Information & Decision Sciences, Director, Cybersecurity Center, College of Business & Public Admin. • Carolyn Eggleston, Professor Emeritus, Correctional Education, College of Education, Founder & former Executive Director, Cal State Reentry Initiative* • Mark Agars, Professor of Psychology, Director of Institute for Child Development & Family Relations, College of Social & Behavioral Sciences • Annie Buckley, Associate Professor of Art, Director, Community-based Art/Prison Arts Collective, College of Arts & Letters* <i>*video or conference phone line</i>
11:30-12	Cynthia Crawford, Research Development Faculty Fellow, Professor of Psychology (she served as Interim Assoc. Provost for Research, 2017-2018)
12-1	<i>Lunch & Executive Session</i>
1-1:45	Diane Trujillo, Director Sponsored Programs Administration (post-award)
1:45-2	<i>Executive Session</i>
2-2:45	Doug Freer, Vice President, Finance and Administration
2:45-3:30	<u>Sponsored Programs Staff</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cathleen Lucas-Browne, Senior Grant Development Officer (pre-award) • Tanya Valery, Sponsored Programs Office Manager (pre-award) • Julie Wessel, Senior Research Administrator (post-award) • Yolanda Meyer, Research Administrator (post-award) • Jennifer Tuioti, Research Administrator (post-award)
3:30-4	<i>Executive Session</i>
4-4:45	Rachel Weiss, Director Research & Sponsored Programs (pre-award)

Rachel Weiss will return Joyce to the Doubletree end of day Monday.

Day 2: August 21

Rachel will pick up Joyce at approx. 7:30am.

Time	Meeting Schedule & Participants
8-8:45	<u>Faculty/PI Session</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brian Heisterkamp, Professor of Communication Studies, College of Arts & Letters* • Ryan Keating, Assistant Professor of History, College of Arts & Letters • Summer Steele, Director, CSUSB Gear Up, Office of Pre-College Programs, Division of Student Affairs • Dalia Hernandez, Director, Upward Bound Programs, Office of Pre-College Programs, Division of Student Affairs *video or conference phone line
8:45-9:30	<u>Academic Deans</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rafik Mohamed, Dean, College of Social & Behavioral Sciences • Pam Schram, Associate Dean, College of Social & Behavioral Sciences • Jay Fiene, Professor Educational Leadership & Technology (Dean Emeritus), College of Education • Lee De León, Budget Analyst, College of Business & Public Admin. (delegate for Dean Lawrence Rose)
9:30-10	Jeffrey Thompson, Professor of Biology & first Associate Provost of Research
10-10:30	Sastry Pantula, Dean College of Natural Sciences (began July 25 th) Sally McGill, Professor of Geological Sciences, Interim Associate Dean, College of Natural Sciences
10:30-11	<u>Executive Session</u>
11-Noon	<u>Faculty/PI Session</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kimberley Cousins, Chair of Chemistry & Biochemistry, College of Natural Sciences • Tim Usher, Professor of Physics, College of Natural Sciences • Boykin Witherspoon, Executive Director CSU Water Resources Policy Initiative (statewide affinity group) • Barb Sirotnik, Professor of Information & Decision Sciences, Director Institute of Applied Research, College of Business & Public Admin. (CSUSB's longest funded researcher—30+ years! UEC Board Member)
Noon-1	<u>Lunch & Executive Session</u>
1-1:45	John Griffin, Executive Director, University Enterprises Corporation (fiscal auxilliary)
1:45-2:15	<u>Administrator & Faculty/PI Session</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ruyeling Chuang, Interim Dean, College of Arts & Letters • Connie McReynolds, Professor of Special Education, Rehabilitation & Counseling, Director Institute for Evaluation & Assessment, College of Education
2:15-2:45	<u>UEC Staff</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Christia Williams, Director, Human Resources • Siska Purnawan, Payroll Supervisor
2:45-4	Open call-back & <u>Executive Session: prep for exit meeting</u>
4-5	Exit Meeting: Shari McMahan, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; Dorota Huizinga, Associate Provost for Research

Super Shuttle will pick up outside the Administration Building and take Joyce to ONT.