

RMS' SIX-MONTH PROGRESS REPORT PLAN

JANUARY 2012

1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Introduction
- Timeline
- Purpose of the six-month progress report
- Client satisfaction & quality of work measures
- Internal processes measures
- Costs measures
- Implementation progress measures

INTRODUCTION

- The six-month progress report will measure and evaluate the implementation, operations and performance of 1 RMS team (out of 10 teams total in end-state).
- Six-month progress report audience includes Deans, MSOs, Chairs, Faculty, OECC, OE Faculty Oversight Committee, RMS internal purposes, and the implementation project team.

PURPOSE

- Guide for ensuring successful implementation
- Establishing an accurate record of development as it occurs
- Guide for decision-making in on-going operations
- Benchmark progress toward achievement of goals

TIMELINE

8/15/11- 2/14/12: RMS six-month internal evaluation period



February 2012: Data collection conducted by the project team



March 2012: Data analysis and discussion of conclusions



April 2012: Final progress report distributed to the campus



CLIENT SATISFACTION & QUALITY OF WORK MEASURES

Descriptive or Evaluative Question	Operationalized Measure Description	Data Collection Method	Evaluative Criteria or Performance Measurement Target
What is the quality of proposals developed by RMS?	Percent of submitted proposals rejected by the sponsor due to critical errors within the control of RMS	Team Manager and Contracts & Grants records and Team Manager interview.	Acceptable quality= 0% Unacceptable quality= more than 0%
What is the quality of RMS' work?	Percent of proposals not submitted to sponsor by deadline due to RMS' errors	Team Manager and Contracts & Grants records and Team Manager interview.	Acceptable quality= 0% Unacceptable quality= more than 0%

CLIENT SATISFACTION & QUALITY OF WORK MEASURES, CONT'D

Descriptive or Evaluative Question	Operationalized Measure Description	Data Collection Method	Evaluative Criteria or Performance Measurement Target
<p>How many proposals are sent to the authorized institutional signatory with errors?</p>	<p>Number/percent of proposals returned to proposal developer by proposal reviewer.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Feb 5 deadline proposals, both RMS and C&G record which proposals are returned to administrators by reviewers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compare RMS to C&G results. N/A: Developing baseline data.

CLIENT SATISFACTION & QUALITY OF WORK MEASURES, CONT'D

Descriptive or Evaluative Question	Operationalized Measure Description	Data Collection Method	Evaluative Criteria or Performance Measurement Target
<p>How do Department Manager clients feel about RMS? What was their experience over the six-month Phase 1A period?</p>	<p>Department Manager's self-reported experience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ what was successful ▪ what needs improvement ▪ general attitude towards the RMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.5 hour focus group facilitated by PMO project team during last 2 weeks of Feb 2012 • short Likert scale survey distributed at the start of focus group 	<p>During last 30 minutes of focus group, facilitate to find consensus on most important messages to report in the 6-mth progress report to the community.</p>
<p>How do Post-award Analyst clients feel about RMS? What was their experience over the six-month Phase 1A period?</p>	<p>Post-award Analyst's self-reported experience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ what was successful ▪ what needs improvement ▪ general attitude towards the RMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.5 hour focus group facilitated by PMO project team during last 2 weeks of Feb 2012 • short Likert scale survey distributed at the start of focus group 	<p>During last 30 minutes of focus group, facilitate to find consensus on most important messages to report in the 6-mth progress report to the community.</p>

CLIENT SATISFACTION & QUALITY OF WORK MEASURES, CONT'D

Descriptive or Evaluative Question	Operationalized Measure Description	Data Collection Method	Evaluative Criteria or Performance Measurement Target
<p>What is the average level of satisfaction among faculty clients over the six-month Phase 1A period? And, is that level of satisfaction acceptable?</p>	<p>Faculty clients' post-proposal submission and self-reported satisfaction attitude of RMS pre-award services as measured by on-line survey 5-point Likert scale response to: "Overall I'm satisfied with the pre-award services provided by my RSC."</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribute five times during the six-month Phase 1A period, a "How's My Driving?" on-line survey to faculty that recently submitted proposals via RMS. Pre-Phase 1A period Summer 2011 campus-wide Faculty Pre-award Satisfaction Questionnaire results. 	<p>82% average satisfaction level performance target from the pre-Phase 1A campus-wide satisfaction questionnaire results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acceptable= greater than 82% satisfied Unacceptable= less than 82% satisfied
<p>Did faculty satisfaction levels significantly change over the six month period?</p>	<p>Differences in faculty satisfaction survey responses over the six-month Phase 1A period.</p>		<p>Measure change of average customer satisfaction levels during six-month period.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there patterns of types of customer service issues? Are there patterns of satisfaction levels across departments? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inductive content analysis of open-ended questions to determine patterns in issue types. Frequency distribution of respondents by department. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same issue type repeated by different respondent more than once. Significant department representation is greater than 25% of responses from one department.

INTERNAL PROCESSES MEASURES- STAFF SATISFACTION

Descriptive or Evaluative Question	Operationalized Measure Description	Data Collection Method	Evaluative Criteria or Performance Measurement Target
What is the job satisfaction level of RMS Associate RSC?	RMS staff satisfaction overall and with specific components of the RMS model: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ training ▪ workload ▪ operations ▪ team environment ▪ challenges ▪ positives aspects ▪ expectations met ▪ implementation process ▪ resources availability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARSC group interview facilitated by project team; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • short Likert scale survey distributed at the start of focus group 	Exploratory, inductive content analysis of interview responses
What is the job satisfaction level of RMS RSC?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two RSC small focus groups; facilitated by an external Meeting Facilitator; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • short Likert scale survey distributed at the start of focus group 	
What is the job satisfaction level of RMS Team Manager?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interview the Team Mgr facilitated by project team; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • short Likert scale survey distributed at the start of focus group 	
What is the job satisfaction level of RMS Director?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interview the Director facilitated by project team; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • short Likert scale survey distributed at the start of focus group 	
Staff attrition		Number and reason for Phase 1A staff attrition	

INTERNAL PROCESSES MEASURES- PERFORMANCE METRICS

Descriptive or Evaluative Question	Operationalized Measure Description	Data Collection Method	Evaluative Criteria or Performance Measurement Target
Efficiency performance targets	Average annualized number of proposals developed per RSC	Proposal Express and TM records	Compare progress toward end state target: 83 proposals/RSC
Efficiency performance targets	RSC to assigned PI ratios	TM records and proposal express	N/A: monitoring data, not evaluating or targeting a specific goal
Cycle times	RMS internal review and approval time average	Team Managers and other certifiers' estimates via interview questions	Five days or less= good More than 5 days= inadequate
Accountability	Pre-award activity reports sent to each Department client monthly	Count shared drive records	Reports submitted monthly to all departments= good less than monthly= inadequate

INTERNAL PROCESSES MEASURES- TRAINING PROGRAM

Descriptive or Evaluative Question	Operationalized Measure Description	Data Collection Method	Evaluative Criteria or Performance Measurement Target
What were the participants' reactions to the Ph1A and Ph1B Immersion Training Program?	Participant self-reported opinions on training program experience on the last day of program and six months after for Ph1A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-line survey • RSC focus group question 	N/A: monitoring data, not evaluating or targeting a specific goal
Did the participants' pre-award knowledge increase after their participation in the Ph1A and Ph1B Immersion Training Program?	Gains in subject matter knowledge and confidence as evidenced by accurate answers to questions in a learning objectives survey	Learning objectives survey administered on first and last days of Ph1A and Ph1B programs	Increase in knowledge and confidence= adequate Decrease in knowledge and confidence= inadequate
Are Ph1A participants' applying information taught during the Immersion Training Program on-the-job?	Participant on-the-job application of Immersion training curriculum as observed by their Team Managers	Progress report from Team Managers via interview questions	Exploratory, inductive content analysis of responses

COST MEASURES

Descriptive or Evaluative Question	Operationalized Measure Description	Data Collection Method	Evaluative Criteria or Performance Measurement Target
<p>What is the cost per proposal at this point in the implementation process?</p> <p>And, is it on track to meet the end state cost target?</p>	<p>Phase 1A annualized costs of RMS divided by annualized number of proposals developed by RMS</p>	<p>Proposal Express, Proposal Activities report from Team Manager, Weblinks, salary agreements for staff not yet rolled in, other financial records kept by the EVCP</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compare to end state target= \$2,300/proposal • Compared to Ph1A departments' pre-implementation baseline cost per proposal range • If within range= adequate, above range= inadequate

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS MEASURES

Descriptive or Evaluative Question	Operationalized Measure Description	Data Collection Method	Evaluative Criteria or Performance Measurement Target
Implementation schedule	Extent to which implementation is following original schedule	Project team interviews	N/A: monitoring data to understand impacts of scheduling timelines, not evaluating or targeting a specific goal
Implementation environment	List of emergent challenges or unexpected events that occurred during the six-month implementation period and the resulting short-term impacts to the implementation process and the RMS model, and possible speculation on long-term impacts.	Interviews with Director, Team Mgr, Project Team	N/A
Model integrity	Were any of the components of the operations model not implemented?	RSC focus group and TM interview question; project team report	Determine if changes from original model are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planned or natural variations • Vision or implementation failures
	Were any of the components of the operations model not implemented?		
	Any new activities or processes not originally planned in model? short and long term impacts?		