The University of Alabama in Huntsville

Office of Sponsored Programs

Control Self-Assessment

Proposal Submission Process

June 30, 2021

Table of Contents

June 30, 2021

Robert Lindquist
Vice President for Research and Economic Development
University of Alabama in Huntsville
Huntsville, AL 35899

With the assistance of the Office of Internal Audit, we have completed a *Control Self-Assessment (CSA)* project to assess the proposal submission process to determine whether adequate controls exist and operate effectively to address the risks to the University.

The scope of this project was limited to current processes that are administered by the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) that are pertinent to proposal submission process.

We identified opportunities for improvement related to resources and training, and plan the following action plans to improve the operations.
- Collaborate with Human Resources to evaluate the current pay scales of the OSP personnel to determine whether they are competitive to prevent high turnover.
- Collaborate with Office of Proposal Development to develop additional training on locating funding opportunities.

We provide details in the *Methodology and Analysis of Results*, and *Conclusion* sections of this report.

Please contact me at 256-824-2657 or gloria.greene@uah.edu with questions or comments about this report.

Sincerely,

Gloria Greene
Assistant Vice President for Contracts and Grants

Cc: Tharanee Ravindran,
    Director, Office of Internal Audit

Methodology and Analysis of Results

Introduction
The University of Alabama in Huntsville (UAH) is one of America's premier doctoral-granting, research-intensive universities. UAH regularly ranks among the Top 20 Universities in research funded by NASA and by the Department of Defense, and has achieved status in the High Research Activity category by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, placing UAH among a select group of public universities in America. The Office of Sponsored(OSP) Programs provides leadership and expertise in research administration, and is responsible for supporting faculty and staff in effectively seeking, obtaining and managing sponsored funding, and ensuring compliance with applicable regulations.

In order to determine whether the current policies and procedures that are pertinent to proposal submission process are adequate to ensure the proposals submitted by faculty and staff comply with sponsor requirements and regulations to maximize the chances that proposals are successfully selected for award, and free of errors we completed a Control Self-Assessment (*CSA)* with the assistance of the Office of Internal Audit.

The CSA team included the following members: Gloria Greene (Assistant Vice President for Contracts and Grants), Jessica Rodgers (Assistant Director, Office of Sponsored Programs), and Tharanee Ravindran (Director of Office of Internal Audit).

Methodology

The first step of the process involved identifying the risks that are pertinent to the proposal submission process. Once the risks were finalized, the CSA team identified and documented the related controls that exist to address those risks. The next step in the process involved selecting the CSA technique that to be utilized to evaluate each control. The following techniques were employed to perform the self-assessment.
- Team Meeting
- Facilitated Workshop
- Survey

See ***Appendix I*** for the summary of risks, controls and techniques utilized to assess the controls.

I. Team Meeting

Once the risks and the related controls were identified, the CSA team assessed the controls during the team meetings. This involved evaluating adequacy of controls, and determining whether any additional CSA techniques (facilitated workshop and/or survey) should be employed to further assess the controls. The University web-sites, including the ones dedicated for university-wide policies and procedures and OSP, were reviewed during this process. In addition,

internal policies and procedures, and capabilities of Kuali, a platform used for research administration, were assessed.

II.   Facilitated Workshop

The Facilitated Workshop focused on evaluating OSP personnel's:
- Knowledge of relevant policies and procedures, and
- Knowledge of procedures completed to address the risks related to over commitment, conducting business with entities that are listed on restricted party list and located in countries that are embargoed or sanctioned.

In addition, the discussions focused on OSP personnel's assessment of Principal Investigator compliance with policies and procedures relevant to proposal submission process, and availability of resources

The workshop was facilitated by the Assistant Director of Office of Sponsored Programs, and assisted by the Director of Internal Audit. Select individuals were chosen by the facilitator to participate in the workshop. Individuals with different experience levels were selected to fairly represent the population. The participants responded to the questions by show of hands. Each question was discussed in detail as needed.

III.   Survey

The University's online survey tool, Qualtrics, was utilized for disseminating the survey to faculty and staff. The primary purpose of the survey was to assess campus community's knowledge of University policies and procedures pertinent to proposal submission process. In addition, the survey solicited feedback on roles and responsibilities of Office of Proposal Development, adequacy of training, and availability of resources for OSP.

Analysis of Results

I. Team Meeting

The controls related to the following risks were assessed during team meetings.
- Inadequate and /or outdated policies and procedures.
- Same proposal being funded by multiple agencies.
- Failure to complete required training prior to submission of proposal.
- Failure to comply with export control regulations.
- Commitment of cost share without availability of resources.
- Inability to submit proposals due to errors.
- Submission of proposals to entities in countries that are sanctioned/embargoed.

- Failure to meet the Visa requirements if foreign personnel are included in proposal.
- Failure to have matrices to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of the proposal submission process.

See ***Appendix II*** for details of risks, related controls and the conclusions of the assessment.

Based on the analysis, the CSA team concluded that adequate controls exist to address the risks listed above.

II. Facilitated Workshop

The workshop focused on assessing the following.
- OSP employees' knowledge of:
    - Location of policies on OSP web-site,
    - Kuali, and
    - Procedures pertinent to processing proposals, including review of effort for principal investigators to prevent over commitment and review of sponsor details to ensure that they are not on restricted party list and/or located in countries that are sanctioned or embargoed.
- OSP personnel's assessment of principal investigator compliance with the following requirements.
    - All proposals must go through OSP.
    - Proposals must be approved by all required individuals prior to submitting to the agency.
- Whether the department is adequately staffed and the employees are provided with necessary resources including training.

See ***Appendix III*** for details of the Facilitated Workshop.

Based on the facilitated workshop results, the CSA team identified an opportunity for improvement. A concern was raised by the team members regarding high turnover due to low pay scale.

III. Survey

Two hundred and twenty-one individuals responded to the survey. Even though only thirty-five percent of the individuals who responded have submitted proposal(s) for research funding, around sixty-one percent of the participants were aware that all proposals for external and Office of Vice President for Research and Economic Development funding go through OSP.

The survey also addressed adequacy of training for the campus community, and the responses indicated the need/request for additional training on how to locate funding opportunities. In addition, the survey solicited information to evaluate participants' awareness of policies and procedures pertinent to proposal submission process and location of policies.

Furthermore, the survey included questions related to adequacy and availability of resources. The responses indicate an opportunity for improvement. The participants have raised a concern that there is high turnover in OSP due to low pay scale.

See ***Appendix IV*** for the summary of survey results.

Conclusions

Based on the discussions during the team meetings, facilitated workshop, and the survey results we conclude that the following, once implemented, will help address the opportunities for improvement identified during the self-assessment.

- Collaborate with Human Resources to evaluate the current pay scales of the OSP personnel to determine whether they are competitive to prevent high turnover.
- Collaborate with Office of Proposal Development to develop additional training on locating funding opportunities.

Management Action Plan

Rec. #	Opportunity for Improvement	Plan	Responsible Person	Target Date for Implementation
21-16	Collaborate with Human Resources to evaluate the current pay scales of the OSP personnel to determine whether they are competitive to prevent high turnover.	OSP plans to collaborate with Human Resources to evaluate the current pay scales to determine whether they are competitive to prevent high turnover.	Gloria Greene	12/31/2021
21-17	Collaborate with Office of Proposal Development to develop additional training on locating funding opportunities.	OSP plans to collaborate with Office of Proposal Development to explore the possibility of developing additional training on locating funding opportunities.	Gloria Greene	12/31/2021

Appendix I

Summary of Risks, Controls, and CSA Techniques Utilized		
Risks/Control Matrix		**CSA Approach**
Risks	**Controls**	**Technique**
Lack of policies and procedures / Failure to update policies and procedures, and/or website	*Policies and procedures are published on OSP web-site to provide guidance to the campus community. Policies are reviewed every five years in accordance with University Policy on Policies. In addition, procedures and web-site are updated as needed.*	*Team Meeting / Facilitated Workshop / Survey*
Principal Investigator (PI) submits proposal without going through OSP/University	*University requires that all proposals be submitted through OSP. This is published on University web-site and addressed during trainings. OSP requests the documents that are to be submitted to the agency for review and verifies the budget calculations. A Document Approval Sheet (DAS) with a statement about circumventing OSP is prepared and all documents are routed to the PI, Dean/Chair and Center Director for approval. Depending on circumstances the proposal may be routed to the Vice President for Research and Economic Development for approval.*	*Facilitated Workshop / Survey / Team Meeting*
Proposal is not aligned with department's/UAH's mission and activities	*Proposal and supporting documents will be routed for approval to the following individuals in Kuali prior to submission of the proposal: Principal Investigator, Department Chairman (if proposed by a member of an academic department), Dean or Center Director, Vice President for Research and Economic Development and the Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs. Kuali will allow for a proposal to be submitted without all of the required approvals, however, proposals must be approved by the PI and any cost share commitments will have to be verified and approved by the Dean/Chair or Center Director via email prior to the submission. Kuali will continue the routing for approval even if a proposal is submitted.*	*Facilitated Workshop*
Same proposal submitted to multiple agencies	*Principal Investigators work with the same Contract Administrators which will help identify if same proposal is funded by multiple agencies.*	*Team Meeting*
Over-commitment by principal investigator	*Effort details are entered in Kuali. Reports can be run to identify effort per individual. If over committed, PIs would address it prior to the set-up of new award. OSP will submit any needed requests to the respective agency.*	*Facilitated Workshop*

Failure to meet submission deadline (Due Date)	*The due date is entered when a new proposal is created in Kuali. All proposals are due to OSP 5 days prior to Due Date. The proposals will be reviewed within 24 hours of receipt - this is documented in policies and procedures, and published on OSP web-site.*	*Survey*
Failure to meet specific technical, management and cost guidelines	*Contract Administrator reviews for completeness. Dean/Center Director/Other and PI are required to approve in Kuali. When a proposal is submitted to OSP less than 5 working days it is noted in Kuali prior to the approval routing to the Dean/Center Director/Other and PI. In addition, once registered with agency portal (Grants.Gov /Research.Gov/Other), PIs can download the required forms and uploads the forms in Kuali. Once completed and approved, the documentation is uploaded in Agency portal. Kuali can facilitate system-to system proposal submission to portals.*	*Survey*
Failure to complete required training prior to proposal submission	*The Principal Investigators are able to view their training records in Kuali along with the date of completion. The notification process is not automated. However, Office of Sponsored Programs verifies the training and informs the Principal Investigators of out of date training that needs to be completed.*	*Team Meeting*
Failure to address the risks related human or animal subjects	*While creating a new proposal in Kuali, PI is required to select Human/Animal subjects under Compliance Tab if applicable to the research. The proposal will be flagged with a "Compliance" label as Kuali routes it for approvals. If awarded OSP will request a copy of the OEHS paperwork or IRB approval.*	*Survey*
Failure to address the risks related to compliance with Export Control regulatory requirements	*Export Control compliance is reviewed during the proposal process. If the terms and conditions include export control restrictions, the details of export control requirements and the scope of work are provided to Office of Research Security for review. Export Controls training is mandatory, and is tracked in Kuali.*	*Team Meeting*
PI commits to cost share without availability of resources	*If a Principal Investigator commits to cost share, he/she is required to validate, certify and provide funding source information. Cost share information (including the Source Account and amount) entered under budget information / institutional commitments in Kuali. When the proposal is routed for approval, if cost share details were not agreed upon, it will be questioned during the proposal approval process.*	*Team Meeting*
Proposals are not submitted due to errors in proposal submission process	*Kuali has a data validation feature. This will help identify errors/missing information. In addition, the funding agency portal has a validation feature as well.*	*Team Meeting*
Poorly written grant submission does not result in funded research	*Training provided by the University. OSP will recommend the research community to contact Office of Proposal Development if they need assistance with developing the content for their research proposal.*	*Survey*

Submit proposals to entities in foreign countries that are sanctioned/embargoed	*Submitting proposals to foreign countries that are sanctioned/embargoed is not allowed. OSP will check Visual Compliance (DOS website) or work with Research Security if more information is needed to verify the country.*	*Team Meeting / Facilitated Workshop*
Failure to check for Visa and other requirements if foreign personnel are included in the proposal	*OSP verifies that individuals included in the proposal budget are university employees or have the appropriate hire letters from the department. Visa verification is determined by the department and Human Resources. Subcontractor /participant is verified through Office of International Services to ensure compliance. In addition, vetted through Visual Compliance to ensure subcontractor /participant is not on debarred list.*	*Team Meeting*
Failure to have matrices	*Dashboard measures output of proposals, awards, and work load. This includes: number of proposals submitted late, timeliness of proposal submission by departments, average time taken to process proposals, and other. This helps identify the reason for the delay if any.*	*Team Meeting*
Lack of training to campus community	*Face to Face and virtual trainings are made available to the campus community each academic year. Available trainings include: Kuali/ proposal budget preparation / Grants.Gov (Assist)/ Research.Gov (Fast Lane) / How to submit a proposal/ Export Control / RCR Training. Starting this year, the following trainings will be provided annually: working with OSP and Sub-contracting.*	*Survey*
Lack of training for OSP personnel (Internal Training)	*On-boarding training is required for new personnel for at least the first 6 to 8 days. Face to Face and Virtual training is planned each year throughout the year. OSP personnel are also encouraged to participate in the campus wide trainings as well. If deficiencies are found, then additional mandatory training is provided.*	*Facilitated Workshop*
Lack of Staff/Resources	*Personnel - Per discussions adequate personnel available / Technology - Adequate resources available. OSP recently implemented Kuali. Other Resources - Materials shared through shared Server.*	*Survey / Facilitated Workshop*

Appendix II

Summary of Team Meeting Results		
Risks	**Controls**	**Self-Assessment Conclusion**
Lack of policies and procedures / Failure to update policies and procedures, and/or website	*Policies and procedures are published on OSP web-site to provide guidance to the campus community. Policies are reviewed every five years in accordance with University Policy on Policies. In addition, procedures and web-site are updated as needed.*	*All policies have been updated, and currently, pending approval.*
Same proposal submitted to multiple agencies	*Principal Investigators work with the same Contract Administrators which will help identify if same proposal is funded by multiple agencies.*	*The team concludes that the controls are adequate to prevent same proposal being submitted to multiple agencies.*
Failure to complete required training prior to proposal submission	*The Principal Investigators are able to view their training records in Kuali along with the date of completion. The notification process is not automated. However, OSP verifies the training, and informs the Principal Investigators of out of date training that needs to be completed.*	*The team concludes that the controls are adequate to ensure required training is completed prior to proposal submission.*
Failure to address the risks related to compliance with Export Control regulatory requirements	*Export Control compliance is reviewed during the proposal process. If the terms and conditions include export control restrictions, the details of export control requirements and the scope of work are provided to Office of Research Security for review. Export Controls training is mandatory, and is tracked in Kuali.*	*The team concludes that the controls are adequate to ensure compliance with export control regulatory requirements.*
PI commits to cost share without availability of resources	*If a Principal Investigator commits to cost share, he/she is required to validate, certify and provide funding source information. Cost share information (including the Source Account and amount) entered under budget information / institutional commitments in Kuali. When the proposal is routed for approval, if cost share details were not agreed upon, it will be questioned during the proposal approval process.*	*The team concludes that the controls are adequate to ensure costs share commitments are processed in accordance with University policies.*
Proposals are not submitted due to errors in proposal submission process	*Kuali has a data validation feature. This will help identify errors/missing information. In addition, the funding agency portal has a validation feature as well.*	*The team concludes that the controls are adequate to ensure proposals are free of errors.*

Submit proposals to entities in foreign countries that are sanctioned/embargoed	*Submitting proposals to foreign countries that are sanctioned/embargoed is not allowed. OSP will check Visual Compliance (DOS website) or work with Research Security if more information is needed to verify the country.*	*The team concludes that the controls are adequate to prevent submission of proposals to entities that are in foreign countries that are sanctioned /embargoed.*
Failure to check for Visa and other requirements if foreign personnel are included in the proposal	*OSP verifies that individuals included in the proposal budget are university employees or have the appropriate hire letters from the department. Visa verification is determined by the department and Human Resources. Subcontractor /participant is verified through Office of International Services to ensure compliance. In addition, vetted through Visual Compliance to ensure subcontractor /participant is not on debarred list.*	*The team concludes that the controls are adequate to ensure Visa and other requirements are met if foreign personnel are included in the proposal.*
Failure to have matrices	*Dashboard measures output of proposals, awards, and work load. This includes: number of proposals submitted late, timeliness of proposal submission by departments, average time taken to process proposals, and other. This helps identify the reason for the delay if any.*	*The team concludes that adequate matrices exist to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of the process.*

Appendix III

Summary of Facilitated Workshop Results				
Questions	**Yes**	**No**	**N/A***	**Comments**
Policies and Procedures				
Are you aware of the location of policies on the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) web-site?	6			All team members were aware of the location of policies.
				Follow-up Questions
				How often do you refer to the policies for information? The responses varied from couple of times a week to monthly. The team members mainly refer to the web-site to provide information to Principal Investigators (PI), and answer inquiries.
				Do you feel the policies are easily accessible? Team members stated that the web-site set-up makes is easy to search for policies by typing in the keywords.
				Conclusion: *The CSA team concludes that OSP personnel are aware of the location of policies.*
Process				
Have you had PI's submit proposals without going through OSP?	1	4	1	Only one team member had instances where the PIs submitted proposals without going through OSP.
				Follow-up Questions
				Does it happen often? The individual stated that it happens two to three times a year.
				Is it mostly newer PIs or seasoned PIs? Based on the discussion, it is both.
				Do you see a pattern? The individual stated that even though he/she had the opportunity to be the Contract Administrator for several departments, the issue was mainly prevalent in College of Engineering.
				Conclusion: *The CSA team concludes that there are no systematic issues, and the existing controls will address the concern.*
Have there been instances where the proposals were submitted prior to being approved by all required individuals?	4	1	1	Four out of five team members to whom this questions is applicable stated that there has been instances where proposals were submitted prior to being approved by all required individuals.
				Follow-up Questions

				Is there a pattern within certain departments or with the same PI's? All individuals stated that they have mainly experienced this with certain PIs who are associated with Research Centers. In those instances, the proposals were forwarded to OSP two or three days prior to the due date. This results in not having enough time to obtain all required approvals prior to submission of proposals to agency. If that happens the approvals are obtained post submission.
				Is it newer PIs or seasoned PIs? The team members stated that they mostly noticed it with experienced PIs. They also stated that more often it is due to the Budget Analyst not having all required information available to assist with the process.
				Conclusion: *Additional discussions indicate that proposals are submitted without all required signatures to prevent missing the deadlines. As long as the PI has signed it, the proposal will be submitted to the agency, and rest of the signatures will be obtained post-submission. Hence the CSA team did not elevate this as an opportunity for improvement.*
Is effort reviewed when processing awards to ensure PIs and other Senior Personnel are not over committed?	5		1	*Not common in subcontracts.*
				Conclusion: *No issues noted.*
Do you know how to find effort information?	6			All team members stated that they know how to locate this information in Kuali. However, the following concern was shared: Kuali pulls the information for all awards including the awards that have ended. The team discussed the possible solution of sorting the data by date, and excluding the awards that are no longer active.
				Conclusion: *No issues noted.*
When processing proposals, do you review the sponsors to determine whether they are located in foreign countries that are sanctioned or embargoed?	2	4		Team members stated that it is rare that they come across awards from foreign countries. If it a pass-through federal award it is safe to assume that the government has done the vetting to ensure the risks are addressed. If the funding is from unfamiliar commercial entities, they are reviewed to ensure the entities are not on restricted entity list. Note: The team stated that they rarely come across many foreign subcontracts.
				Follow-up Questions
				Is checking to make sure whether or not a company is in a foreign country that is sanctioned or embargoed part of the normal process? For subcontracts, it is reviewed to ensure the entity is not on restricted entity/party list. In addition, the entity will be reviewed to ensure it is not delinquent. For proposals, it is not part of the regular process. It is only reviewed if it is a new commercial entity.
				Conclusion: *No issues noted.*
Were you aware of the requirement that the University should not accept awards from entities that are on the restricted entity/party list?	6			All team members were aware of this requirement.
				Conclusion: *No issues noted.*

Resources				
Do you believe you receive adequate training?	6			All team members stated that they receive adequate training.
				Conclusion: *No issues noted.*
Have you requested additional internal training?	4	2		Team members stated that they received training as requested.
Do you believe that OSP is adequately staffed?	2	4		The reason for "no" answers is that currently there are two vacancies.
				Follow-up Questions
				Once the vacant positions are filled, will OSP be adequately staffed? The team stated that once the vacant positions are filled the office will be fully staffed. However, a concern exist that there is high turnover in OSP, thus resulting in need for taking on additional responsibilities.
				What is the cause of the high turnover? One of the main reasons is the pay scale. Higher Education Industry pays less than private sector. Some individuals are motivated by pay. in addition, the positions at the Colleges pay the same salary while the work load is less. However, the team members shared the benefits of being part of the Higher Education Industry, including good work-life balance, personal development, free tuition, and other. Even though the department was able to raise the salary levels, it may not be considered adequate.
				Conclusion: *A concern was raised: high turnover due to low pay scale compared to the private sector. The CSA team elevated this as an opportunity for improvement.*
Do you believe we have adequate resources?	6			All team members stated that they believe that the department has adequate resources.
				Follow-up Questions
				Are there any resources you need to do your job? The team members stated that they have the resources, including multiple monitors, that they need.
				Conclusion: *No issues noted.*

* One of the Facilitated Workshop team member administers sub-contracts. Therefore, some of the questions may not be applicable to this individual. In those instances, the response is marked as not applicable.

Appendix IV

Summary of Survey Results					
Survey Questions	**Yes**		**No**		**Comments**
	Count	%	Count	%	
Have you submitted a proposal with the OSP?	77	35%	143	65%	221 participants. Around 35% of participants have submitted proposal(s). The survey was sent to non-research personnel as well to assess the awareness of OSP's role. Around 61% of individuals were aware that all proposals for external and OVPRED funding go through the OSP. Number of participants who have submitted a proposal without going through OSP is low. Based on the explanation from the participants for noncompliance we conclude that the current process is effective.
Are you aware that all proposals for external and OVPRED funding go through the Office of Sponsored Programs?	135	61%	86	39%	
Have you ever submitted a proposal without going through OSP?	11	5%	205	95%	
Have you received adequate training in proposal development?	62	32%	129	68%	Majority of the individuals have stated that they have not attended the training because it is not applicable to them. Some participants have not attended due to lack of time. Some have indicated that they do not attend since they already know how to write proposals. Based on the responses and the fact that the survey was sent to non-research personnel the CSA team did not see any concerns. In addition, the team discussed the following: availability of online training and frequent campus-wide communication regarding availability of training. Based on these discussions the CSA team concluded that adequate training is provided.
Have you attended the proposal development training offered by OSP?	51	26%	144	74%	
Have you attended any of the trainings provided by OSP?	59	37%	99	63%	Around 38 % of the participants suggested additional training in the following areas: College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences related funding, Kuali, Banner, Basics in contracts and grants, Writing NIH grant proposals, Budget, Agency Specific proposal requirements, how to find grants, Availability of training, Research policies, Proposal Development and Submission. The CSA Team discussed the request from participants for additional training. Most of the categories of training requested are already provided and/or outside the scope of OSP activities. However, the CSA team concluded that one of the areas that can be improved is additional training on finding contracts and grants opportunities/OSP plans to work with OPD to address the training requirements.
Would you like to see additional training?	64	38%	104	62%	

Question	Yes		No		Comments
Are you aware of the policy that all proposals are due to OSP 5 days prior to the due date?	87	54%	75	46%	Considering the total number of the survey participants who have submitted proposals the number of participants who answered "yes" seem reasonable. Based on comments from participants the "no" answers were due to non-applicability.
Do you submit proposals within the 5 day policy?	70	46%	81	54%	
Are you aware of the location of OSP policies on the UAH website?	89	57%	66	43%	Considering the participation of non-research personnel in the survey the numbers seem reasonable. Comments from participants indicate that they would like to see additional information on the following: Hourly wages for student employees, Checklists detailing allowable costs for different agencies, Policies, and Kuali. The additional information requested by participants are either outside the scope of OSP activities, or the information is already available on OSP web-site. CSA team concluded that there is no need for additional actions.
Have you ever navigated the OSP web site?	78	51%	74	49%	
If yes, were you able to find the information you were looking for on the website?	67	86%	11	14%	
Do you review and approve your Department or Center's proposals?	33	21%	121	79%	The results do not indicate any control deficiencies.
If yes, have you ever insisted that proposals that do not meet specific technical, management and cost guidelines be submitted?	4	12%	29	88%	
If yes, have those proposals ever been awarded?	2	67%	1	33%	
Are your aware of the requirements for utilizing human and animal subjects in research ?	85	59%	59	41%	While only 26 individuals work on research that involves Human and Animal subjects, 85 individuals answered "yes' stating that they were aware of the requirements.
Does your research involve Human or animal subjects?	26	18%	119	82%	
If yes, have you submitted your application to the IRB or the IACUC committee?	23	92%	2	8%	
Do you believe OSP is adequately staffed?	64	54%	55	46%	Slightly above 50% answered that OSP is adequately staffed. One of the major concern shared by the participants is high turnover due to low pay scale. The CSA team elevated this as one of the opportunities for improvement.
Do you believe OSP has the appropriate resources?	70	61%	44	39%	