The Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) developed this survey to be able to report to the national research administration community a sense of the administrative resources expended in response to the additional ARRA requirements. In addition, the survey results identify opportunities for improvement should the requirements become mandatory for all federal grants and contracts.

The FDP ARRA Administrative Impact Survey Report

December 5, 2011

ARRA Subcommittee
Research Administration Committee

Survey Purpose

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding provided an unprecedented opportunity for faculty at colleges and universities to receive funding for critical initiatives and novel research areas. These additional funds were accompanied by new administrative requirements. The purpose of this survey was to document the administrative impact of ARRA on each institutional member of the Federal Demonstration Partnership - ranging from the resources needed to track and understand the new ARRA requirements to the amount of time, money and effort needed to ensure that our institutions comply with quarterly reporting ARRA obligations.

These results allow the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) to be able to report to the national research administration community a sense of the administrative resources expended to achieve compliance with these new requirements and to position the FDP to be able to assist with recommendations for how future transparency requirements might best be implemented. The results are also useful as "guideposts" as to what worked efficiently and what could be improved.

Survey and Data Notes

This survey was authored by members of the ARRA Subcommittee of the Research Administration Committee of the FDP, with input from several survey experts. Data included in this survey represents facts and estimates provided from the member institutions via their FDP Administrative Representatives. It must be noted that there were no formal metrics or baselines established at the time ARRA was rolled out. This has the necessary consequence of making some data more definitive (and likely more precise) than other data. For example, data on numbers and dollars of ARRA awards was able to be determined with more precision than estimates of training times. Data adjustments were made when a response was deemed to be an outlier value, or when the respondent provided inconsistent numerical responses. All adjustments made were tracked and are available. A complete copy of the original survey instrument is included.

With Special Thanks to...

The Respondents

The patient and thoughtful work of those who painstakingly responded to this survey is very much appreciated. A complete list of all respondents may be found in Appendix 1 of the full report.

The Report Volunteers

Suzanne Alstadt	University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences	Diana L. Key	Florida State University
Josephine Barnes	Southern Illinois University	Michael Joseph Kusiak	University of California, Office of the President
Valerie A. Blake	Feinstein Institute for Medical Research	Trish Lowney, PhD	Syracuse University
Victoria S. Briscoe	University of Texas Health Science Center - Houston	Judy McSweeney	Harvard University
Gila Budescu, PhD	The Rockefeller University	Suzanne Paulson	University of Minnesota
Meg Cantwell	American Assoc. of State Colleges and Universities	Liz Rulli	University of Notre Dame
Tom Drinane	Dartmouth College	Jo Smith	University of Central Florida
Jennifer Duncan	University of Missouri – Columbia	Jennifer E. Taylor, Ph.D	Vanderbilt University Medical Center
Vonda T. Durrer	University of Virginia	Jane A. Youngers	The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio
Sara L. Judd	University of Southern California		

The Survey Specialists

Jennifer Pelt Wisdom, PhD, MPH	Associate Professor of Clinical Psychology in Psychiatry & FDP Faculty Representative Columbia University and New York State Psychiatric Institute
Frances Lawrenz, PhD	Associate Vice President for Research, and Wallace Professor of Teaching and Learning College of Education and Human Development, University of Minnesota University of Minnesota
John Ross	Independent Expert
David Wright	FDP Executive Director

With thanks,

Susan Ross	**Lynette Arias**	**Pamela A. Webb**
Co-Chair, ARRA Subcommittee	Co-Chair, ARRA Subcommittee	Co-Chair, Research Administration Committee
Executive Director, Office for Sponsored	Associate Vice President, Sponsored	Associate Vice President for Research
Research – Evanston Campus	Projects Administration	Administration
Northwestern University	Columbia University	University of Minnesota
sross@northwestern.edu	la2348@columbia.edu	pwebb@umn.edu

Executive Summary

The purpose of the FDP ARRA Administrative Impact survey was to document the administrative impact of ARRA on each institutional member of the Federal Demonstration Partnership. Conducted electronically between October 11, 2010 and June 23, 2011, the survey was sent to the 119 university, college, hospital and research institute members of the FDP via their respective administrative organizational representatives. Each administrative organizational representative was asked to administer the survey at their institution, obtaining information as needed from other components of the organization. Of the 119 members of the FDP, 100 institutions (84%) responded by the time the survey closed.

ARRA funding brought with it a number of new requirements, the most apparent being the need to report quarterly on the technical progress, financial progress, subaward progress and use of major vendors of each ARRA-funded award, along with reporting jobs created as a result of the funding. ARRA requirements also mandated that ARRA funding be managed distinctly from other federal funding sources, resulting at times in the need to draw down expenses on a project-by-project basis instead of using an aggregated portfolio method available for the rest of an agency's awards. Other impacts included segregation of supplemental funds, performance periods, and activities awarded from the balance of that same project's activities; increased audit activity; and in some cases, requirements for duplicative reporting of data into agency systems.

Levels of ARRA Activity

Collectively, the 100 respondents were prime recipients of 11,501 ARRA-funded awards, for a total dollar value of $7,183,217,320. In addition, these institutions received more than 3,000 first-tier ARRA subawards valued at $940M, issued 2,632 subawards valued at $592M under their ARRA awards, and were responsible for 1,360 vendor agreements that required individual ARRA reporting. The average number of ARRA awards per institutions was 115 awards, valued at $71.8M.

Administrative Cost and Staffing

Respondents were asked to provide the number and cost associated with added staffing, reallocated staffing, and overtime of existing staff to comply with various types of ARRA requirements, including overall ARRA preparation time (review of guidance, development of internal policies and procedures, etc.), proposal submission, award processing, letter of credit draws, collection of outgoing subrecipient or vendor reporting information, quarterly reporting (including subrecipient and vendor reporting), post quarterly reporting corrections, training, design and construction of automated systems, preparation and involvement with local or federal audits, and other (including human and animal subjects and other compliance functions). If an institution was unable to estimate its FTE and cost at this level of detail, they had the option to respond in the aggregate.   Respondents were asked to use their institutional fiscal year[1] to report their information (FY09, FY10, FY11, and FY12 and beyond).

It should be noted that under ARRA regulations, no funding was available to colleges and universities to reimburse them for the cost of complying with ARRA requirements (some other ARRA recipients, such as states, were able to recover some of their costs). Despite this, approximately one third of the institutions did increase staffing to assist with compliance with ARRA requirements, during one or more fiscal years. For those institutions who were able to increase their staffing, the average numbers of staff added were 3.0 – 3.3 FTE during the most active years of ARRA funding. Most of the FTE added were tasked with the quarterly reporting obligations (including subrecipient and vendor reporting), other reasons (including human and animal subjects compliance), and for award processing. Quarterly reporting tasks, including post-quarterly reporting corrections, and the collection of outgoing subrecipient or vendor reporting information, were responsible for 43% of the FTE who were added. While the proposal submission process was extremely intensive in the first few months after ARRA was announced, the rollout of ARRA funding opportunities and tight turnarounds for ARRA proposals occurred so rapidly that many institutions were not able to "ramp up" by adding staff for this purpose. Instead, there was heavy reliance on using existing staff working additional hours, or internal reallocation of existing staff. For example, one institution indicated that, at a peak deadline, they had staff continuously submitting ARRA proposals to Grants.Gov from 6:00 a.m. – 10:00 p.m. Reallocated staff were used most heavily for proposal submission tasks, other tasks (including human and animal subjects compliance), award processing, and overall ARRA preparation tasks (such as review of guidance, development of internal policies and procedures.) A significant number of reallocated staff were also used for quarterly reporting.

The administrative costs reported by respondents totaled $91.7M over the 4 year period, or $7,973 per ARRA award. The figures below include the cost of salary and fringe benefits for the staff involved, or in the case of bonus payments, the actual cost of the bonus. Indirect costs associated with these figures were not included.

---

[1] *Information was collected on the specific dates of each institution's fiscal year in case additional analysis is determined to be beneficial.*

Cost in Millions	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	TOTAL
Cost of Added FTE	$3.7	$6.3	$5.7	$3.4	$19.1
Cost of Reallocated FTE	$19.4	$19.4	$17.6	$8.8	$65.0
Cost of Overtime/Bonus (if provided)	$1.9	$2.1	$2.0	$1.4	$7.4
TOTAL	$25.0	$27.8	$25.3	$13.6	$91.7

Number of FTEs	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	TOTAL
Number of Added FTE	60.5	101.1	105.0	42.2	308.8
Number of Reallocated FTE	256.6	258.6	173.9	154.0	843.1
Overtime/Bonus	21.9	23.1	15.4	12.3	72.7
TOTAL	339.0	382.8	294.3	208.5	1224.6

Only 27% of institutions were able to provide data on overtime or bonus payments. It is unclear whether the 73 respondents that did not provide information did not have overtime or bonuses, or did not track it in a way that allowed for reporting in this area.

A linear correlation should not be assumed to exist between the costs reported here and cost if the ARRA regulations were extended to the entire portfolio of federal awards. Depending on how the regulations were extended, the cost might be significantly lower or higher. Well-designed, integrated electronic systems that marry transparency reporting with existing reporting obligations and are implemented with sufficient advance notice would likely result in cost-effective reporting. Conversely, disparate requirements that change frequently across agencies or which are not integrated with other reporting obligations would be costly.

One significant cost not incurred for most institutions to meet ARRA requirements to date is that of creating enterprise-wide electronic data submission systems for transparency reporting. As mentioned elsewhere in the report, the limited technical capabilities offered in the current ARRA reporting environment, as well as the rapid implementation and the limited population of awards per institution were not conducive to institutions investing in the design and implementation of large scale electronic solutions. For many institutions, automated systems would necessarily be required - and would have to be paid for - if the transparency requirements were extended more broadly.

Impact on Other Administrative Activities

Sixty three percent of institutions responding to the survey indicated that there were other institutional activities that they were not able to perform in the same manner as they had prior to ARRA, due to the need to comply with ARRA requirements. Institutions reported a broad array of impacted activities, with the most commonly cited including delays in turnaround for award acceptance or setup (14% of institutions), delays in drawdowns or billing on non-ARRA awards (12%), and delays in financial reporting on non-ARRA funds (10%). For those institutions who reported that their activities were not impacted by ARRA, several noted that this was because they were able to add additional staff to assist with ARRA, or they were able to arrange for significant amounts of paid or unpaid overtime work.

Training

More than 75% of all institutions offered training in ARRA requirements to their principal investigators, though the duration of that training varied widely – from 30 minutes to more than two hours. Seventy nine percent of institutions reported that their central administrators had access to at least one hour of specialized training, while the availability of training for departmental research administrators and project staff varied significantly.

Although central research administrators participated quite heavily (63%) in available training, the record was more disparate for other groups, including principal investigators. Details about the availability and participation in training are available in the full report.

Administrative Burden associated with Quarterly Reports

The survey probed the length of time it took for administrative staff and principal investigators, respectively to create, review and/or validate the expenditures, jobs, and progress portions of a quarterly report.

Ninety seven percent of institutions indicated that their administrative staff was involved in creating, reviewing, and validating expenditure data and jobs data for quarterly reports, and 87% reported that their administrators were involved in either creating or reviewing/validating progress reporting as well. The majority of administrative time was spent on the expenditure and jobs portions

of the reports, with approximately two-thirds of institutions indicating that their administrators spent more than 30 minutes on the expenditure portion and more than 30 minutes on the jobs portions of the report.

As might be expected, Principle Investigators (PIs) were involved in progress reporting at virtually all institutions. Seventy three percent of institutions reported that their PIs were involved in creating the progress report; while another 43% indicated that their PIs were involved in reviewing or validating the report. Since these percentages exceed 100% and some institutions reported that their administrators were also involved in creating progress reports, it is clear that some institutions involved both their PIs and administrators in report creation.

PIs were only rarely involved in creating expenditure data for reports (2%) and infrequently involved in creating jobs data (18%), but about a third were involved in reviewing and validating the data assembled by their administrators.

The amount of time expended by PIs on their quarterly reports varied. Since virtually all PIs were involved in the progress reporting step, that component provides the best understanding of how long the process took[2]. About 26% of institutions reported that their PIs completed their progress reports in an average of 15 minutes or less, while 31% believed the process took 16-31 minutes and 29% believed it took between a half hour and an hour. Only 10% indicated that the process took more than an hour. This averages to 30 minutes per report, or 5,750 hours of Principal Investigator time for the ARRA awards from these 100 institutions[3] per quarterly cycle[4]. These hours represent time that would otherwise have been available to pursue the activities of their projects. While the amount of time is low on a per capita basis (2 hours of PI time per award per year), it would be very high indeed if this requirement were extended to all federal awards held by an institution. It should be noted that these administrative obligations for Principal Investigators are over and above the 42% administrative burden reported by the FDP in its 2007 Faculty Burden survey.

Reporting Formats, Delegation, and Submission Methods

The majority of institutions used the Excel spreadsheet upload method to file their reports with the federal government. Interest in creating or deploying automated approaches within the institution or for report upload was tempered by the lack of mass upload capability in the XML and Excel options. For institutions with large volumes of ARRA awards, the one-report per upload method was extremely time-consuming.

Nearly all institutions (86%) choose not to delegate responsibility to their subrecipients for data entry. It is surmised that the primary reason for this was the need for the prime to still add the subrecipients' jobs data into the prime report (and thus the delegation would not optimize the workflow process). In addition, with the tight turnaround time, retaining as much "control" at the prime as possible to achieve an on-time report (even if it meant more manual data entry) was preferable to having to cope with potential technical issues that subrecipients might face. Many institutions imposed a five-day deadline for subrecipient reporting – which allowed the subrecipient only 5 days to report to the prime recipient, and the prime recipient used the remaining 5 days of the 10 day reporting window to complete their reports.

Ninety percent of institutions submitted their reports directly to the federal government, with most of the remainder submitting to their state government (who in turn assumed responsibility for submitting the reports to the federal government).

It should be noted, however, that 89% of institutions reported encountering reporting burdens above and beyond the quarterly ARRA reporting mandated by Congress, and 48% of all respondents indicated that this additional reporting was in a format different than that required for federal reporting. Respondents indicated that they received requests from five federal agencies – AHRQ, DOE, DOE ARPA-E, NIST, NASA, and HRSA for reports to also be submitted to them directly. AHRQ was mentioned most often in this regard. In addition to these federal agencies, supplemental reporting was most often required by states, and by University system-wide offices. In some cases, prime recipients also required additional reporting from their subrecipients.

Slightly more than half of the institutions in this survey also received State Stabilization Funding. Information about reporting on these funds is included in the main body of the report (see Questions 18 and 19).

---

[2] *Since many institutions did not report the time spent by their PIs on expenditure and jobs portions of quarterly reporting, the additional time spent on these components were not included in the general calculation of overall PI effort. Thus, the figures stated above are understated – though by how much is not known. If, however, all institutions were similar to those who did report these figures, the overall time figure for PI time devoted per report would increase from 30 minutes to 47.7 minutes, or 9,143 hours per reporting cycle for these institutions.*

[3] *Salary cost for principal investigators was not collected, and therefore no cost for the PI portion of the administrative burden has been calculated.*

[4] *5,750 hours represents the calculated time for PI progress reporting if all ARRA awards in the survey were active at a single point in time (11,501 awards). Universities were asked to report their ARRA volume as of 9/30/10, so this should be accurate as a snapshot figure, but would necessarily vary over time as awards began or ended.*

ARRA Guidance Mechanisms

Virtually all respondents used, on at least a quarterly basis, OMB Guidance documents, agency-provided guidance, COGR/FDP Frequently Asked Questions, and the FDP ARRA listserv to help them navigate ARRA compliance. The FDP ARRA listserv, with 476 participants nationally, was the source used most frequently on a monthly basis – likely because it allowed for rapid exchange of new or changing information and quick clarifications from national colleagues also involved in ARRA implementations.

Establishing a standard for a reasonable, minimum amount of lead time for providing new or changed guidance to institutions prior to a reporting deadline would allow the institutions sufficient time to fully understand the changes, disseminate the information within their organization and to subrecipients as needed, properly train the applicable personnel, and make the necessary changes to their systems to accommodate the changes. The latter would be of profound importance if ARRA requirements were extended to the entire range of federal awards.

Recommendations to Reduce or Minimize the Administrative Impact of the ARRA Requirements

Respondents provide numerous thoughtful comments about how to reduce or minimize the administrative impact of the ARRA requirements while continuing to support transparency. The top recommendations were as follows (in rank order):

1) Pre-populate reporting data that is already known to the agencies
2) Increase the lead time to prepare reports by an additional 10 days
3) Ensure that all agencies are defining each data field in an identical way
4) Allow bulk upload of ARRA reports

Other important themes included (unordered list):

5) Consolidate Letter of Credit draws within each agency
6) Allow full subrecipient delegations or disallow it completely
7) Harmonize and reduce reporting requirements
8) Improve and standardize communication of requirements

Pre-population of data would reduce the amount of time needed for report preparation and validation, improve reporting accuracy, and reduce the amount of time needed for discussions about potential reporting errors. This change would positively impact not only award recipients, but agency personnel responsible for data quality, and the public using the results. Increasing the lead time for preparation of reports would allow institutions sufficient time after the official monthly close of their financial systems in which to collect, review, and report the data. Allowing institutions to report officially closed and reviewed data will reduce the number of revised reports in future quarters, allow for increased data integrity, and reduce the need for follow-up actions. Additional time would also allow for the same increased integrity in subrecipient data. Since many institutions need five to seven days to "close their books" for a month just ended, the current common parameters to produce and submit ARRA subaward data to prime recipients within 5 days forces potentially incomplete data to be provided.

Harmonization of requirements and standardization of data elements are key to the ability to create system-to-system data exchanges, and bulk data uploads in other formats. Electronic exchanges would be critical should expansion of the requirements to the full population of federal awards occur. Individual federal agencies should not be allowed to add requirements on top of the standard requirements, nor should they be permitted to mandate separate reporting to their agency. States and local agencies should also not be permitted to require additional reports or added frequency of delivery, but instead should be encouraged to take advantage of data feeds from federal databases. ARRA requirements should be reviewed in light of pre-existing reporting obligations and data "mined" from existing reporting feeds. Where necessary, pre-existing reporting obligations and transparency reporting should be consolidated and duplication eliminated.

Other Thoughts and Recommendations from Respondents

An analysis of the narrative comments respondents contributed yielded a number of important insights into how institutions handled ARRA reporting, the challenges that they encountered, and feedback related to possible future reporting requirements. The willingness of so many respondents to take time to offer their thoughtful reflections further demonstrates the deep commitment and dedication of this unique cohort of federal funding recipients, as well as their concerns about future such reporting requirements.

Organizational solutions described by respondents included high-level commitment within their institutions to support ARRA, broad coordinated meetings across all institutional departments involved in aspects of ARRA, and strong internal integration and

communication.   These types of approaches allowed some institutions to develop internal business practices and automated tools more quickly than others.   It was clear, however, that there were significant administrative impacts and costs nonetheless.

Technical issues focused on the need to simplify the submission process and ensure that federal systems are better able to handle complex and changing reporting obligations. Harmonization of requirements across agencies and within agencies was viewed as key.

A number of respondents specifically identified the unfunded administrative burden of these requirements, and the lack of allocation of federal funds to help defray the administrative costs associated with reporting, or to authorize the use of existing mechanisms (such as increasing the 26% administrative cap on F&A, or permitting direct charging of costs).

Conclusion

The FDP hopes that the results of this survey can be used to help OMB, agency staff, and other key players involved in the development and implementation of transparency requirements better understand the impact of ARRA requirements on University research recipients. In addition, we hope that this report will assist individual respondents in assessing whether their experience with ARRA was similar or dissimilar to their peers, and what they should celebrate as successes, or learn from their peers.   It was clear, both during the survey and in later speaking with respondents that there is a strong commitment to transparency in the use of the valuable research funds provided by federal agencies. What was also clear, however, was that that the mechanics of this transparency are critical. Done well and thoughtfully, and incorporating input from those impacted, transparency requirements can be used as a vehicle to enhance public awareness, increase efficiency, and improve stewardship of federal funding. Done poorly, the addition of these types of requirements on a broad-based scale could easily have a material negative impact on the ability of major research universities to achieve optimal administrative benchmarks, such as quick turnaround times for award establishment or delayed responsiveness to Principal Investigator inquiries; and thereby have a negative impact on the research environment.   The FDP stands prepared to assist in the design, testing, and implementation of transparency requirements that will positively serve the needs of all parties, and improve the national research climate.

Questions about the Executive Summary report or the full report may be sent to David Wright, FDP Executive Director, at dwright@nas.edu

Main Survey

CUMULATIVE AWARDS - ALL INSTITUTIONS	# of Awards	Total Dollar Value
Cumulative prime ARRA awards	11,501	$7,183,217,320
Cumulative pass-through/incoming 1st tier ARRA subawards	3,035	$940,951,884
Cumulative outgoing subawards under ARRA awards	2,632	$592,732,108
Cumulative outgoing vendor agreements requiring individual ARRA reporting	1,360	$289,707,866

RANGE AND AVERAGE OF AWARDS - ALL INTITUTIONS	# of Awards				Total Dollar Value ($ in Millions)			
	Low	High	Sum	Average	Low	High	Sum	Average
Prime ARRA Awards	1	704	11,501	115	$.2	$359.4	$7,183.2	$71.8
Inbound Subawards	0	144	3,035	30	$0	$69.7	$941.0	$9.4
Outbound Subawards	0	153	2,632	26	$0	$61.0	$592.7	$5.9
Vendor Agreements	0	373	1,360	14	$0	$125.8	$289.7	$2.9

Survey respondents received a total of $7.2B awards directly from federal sponsors from the inception of ARRA through September 30th of 2010. The range of prime awards received was $.2M to $359.4M. The average institutional total of ARRA prime awards was $71.8M. The total number of prime ARRA awards received was 11,501, with the range of prime ARRA awards reported spanning a low of 1 to a high of 704. The average number of prime ARRA awards per institution was 115.

The cumulative value of pass-through ARRA subawards received by respondents was $941.0M. The range of pass-through ARRA subawards was $0 to $69.7M, with an average amount of $9.4M reported per institution. The number of pass-through ARRA subawards received was 3,035, with a range of 0 to 144, and an average of 30 ARRA pass-through subawards reported per institution.

Cumulative outgoing ARRA subawards reported by respondents totaled $592.7M, with a range of $0 to $61.0M, and an average of $5.9 M per institution. The number of outgoing ARRA subawards totaled 2,632, ranging from 0 to 153, with an average of 26 reported per institution.

The total value of outgoing vendor agreements was $289.7M, with a range of $0 to $125.8M reported, and an average of $2.9M per institution. The total number of vendor agreements reported was 1,360, with a range of 0 to 373, and an average of 14 reported per institution.

2. **How many FTE did your organization ADD specifically to assist with managing ARRA activities?**
Example: If your organization added 1 FTE to assist with quarterly reporting for the 3 years, please add this FTE in each of the FY columns.
- *If your organization reallocated existing FTE to support ARRA, provide information about these FTE in question 4.*
- *If your organization utilized overtime of existing resources to support ARRA, provide this information in question 6.*
- *If you are not able to break out the information by type of activity, please list your information in the total area only.*

Type of Activity	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12 and Beyond	Cumulative Total FTE
Preparation time (Review of guidance, development of internal policies and procedures, internal funding opportunity communication/dissemination, etc.)	3.5	6.6	7.2	4.7	22.0
Proposal submission	6.3	7.8	4.1	0.0	18.2
Award processing	4.0	15.0	15.4	0.5	34.9
Letter of Credit Draw	2.0	2.7	3.1	1.6	9.4
Collection of outgoing subrecipient or vendor reporting information	2.9	4.2	6.8	1.3	15.2
Quarterly reporting (including subrecipient and vendor reporting)	17.5	33.7	32.8	14.4	98.4
Post quarterly reporting corrections	3.5	3.0	8.9	0.4	15.8
Training	2.5	2.2	1.7	1.5	7.9
Design and construction of automated system(s)	1.3	3.7	2.4	1.2	8.6
Preparation and involvement with local or federal audits	0.4	0.5	1.8	0.8	3.5
Other (IRB, IACUC, compliance, etc.)	8.1	12.7	8.8	5.8	35.4
Subtotal FTE broken out by activity	**52.0**	**92.1**	**93.0**	**32.2**	**269.3**
FTE provided only as a lump sum by respondents	8.5	9.0	12.0	10.0	39.5
Differential between detail and sum (for those that provided both)					
TOTAL	**60.5**	**101.1**	**105.0**	**42.2**	**308.8**

Mean	0.6	1.0	1.1	0.4
Mean if response > 0	3.0	3.1	3.3	1.9
Median	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

Some institutions were able to add FTEs in order to manage ARRA activities.

- **A grand total of 308.8 FTE were added or were anticipated being added from the inception of ARRA through FY12 and beyond.** Respondents were given the option of providing a breakdown of the tasks additional FTE were performing, or reporting only a lump sum total.

- **Most FTE were added for Quarterly reporting** (including subrecipient and vendor reporting). The second highest number of FTE were added for "Other (IRB, IACUC, compliance, etc.)", and the third highest number of FTE were added for award processing.

- **The number of responses greater than 0 FTE was 20 for FY09, 33 for FY10, 32 for FY11, and 23 for FY12 and beyond.** The most FTEs added by an institution in one year were 28.0, and for one institution over all years the most FTEs added were 73.7.

The number of added FTE included central office staff for 57% of all respondents. Of all respondents, 7% reported that increased FTE included collegiate or departmental staff. It is recognized that it may not have been possible for respondents to definitively identify increased staffing at distributed levels within their organization.

Type of Activity	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12 and Beyond	Cumulative Total
Preparation time (Review of guidance, development of internal policies and procedures, etc.)	342,856	486,311	443,966	358,432	1,631,565
Proposal submission	291,672	387,728	59,887	0	739,287
Award processing	188,140	467,452	354,171	34,241	1,044,004
Letter of Credit Draw	59,887	119,517	115,205	64,283	358,892
Collection of outgoing subrecipient or vendor reporting information	89,664	199,276	207,920	128,566	625,426
Quarterly reporting (including subrecipient and vendor reporting)	1,223,014	2,339,728	2,359,511	1,291,479	7,213,732
Post quarterly reporting corrections	113,323	129,235	126,078	36,167	404,803
Training	191,014	166,138	125,435	115,628	598,215
Design and construction of automated system(s)	203,070	287,295	264,195	140,449	895,009
Preparation and involvement with local or federal audits	1,428	53,974	92,962	133,853	282,217
Other (IRB, IACUC, compliance, etc.)	536,675	727,926	824,318	182,008	2,270,927
Subtotal $ broken out by activity	3,240,743	5,364,580	4,973,648	2,485,106	16,064,077
$ provided only as a lump sum by respondents	486,103	929,725	1,095,010	893,158	3,403,996
Differential between detail and sum (for those who provided both)	-25,459		-325,500		-350,959
TOTAL	3,701,387	6,294,305	5,743,158	3,378,264	$19,117,114

Mean	37,014	62,943	57,432	33,783
Mean if response > 0	185,069	209,810	198,040	153,558
Median	68,933	91,523	94,684	89,566

In order to manage ARRA activities, institutions spent a total of $19.1M in salary and fringe benefit cost associated with additional FTE that was added or was anticipated being added from the inception of ARRA through FY12 and beyond. Respondents were given the option of providing a breakdown of the costs associated with the tasks being performed by additional FTE, or reporting only a lump sum total of the cost associated with increased FTE. The greatest cost for additional FTE was associated with Quarterly reporting (including subrecipient and vendor reporting); the second greatest cost was for "Other (IRB, IACUC, compliance, etc.)", and the third greatest cost was for preparation time (review of guidance, development of internal policies and procedures, etc.).

The number of responses for any salary and fringe benefit cost incurred for additional FTE greater than 0 FTE was 20 for FY09, 30 for FY10, 29 for FY11, and 22 for FY12 and beyond. The most dollars spent by an institution in one year were $1.9M, and for one institution over all years the most FTEs added were $4.7M. It is important to note that respondents were given the option to report additional FTE, additional cost, or both. Three institutions reported FTE only, none reported cost only, 32 reported both FTE and cost, and 65 reported neither FTE nor cost. Note that cost would be higher if institutions that reported FTE only had reported associated salary and fringe benefit cost for their additional 21.2 FTE. The cost per additional FTE was $66,500. Therefore, one could extrapolate the uncosted additional FTE would increase the reported cost of managing ARRA activity by $1.4M, for a total of $20.5M.

Type of Activity	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12 and Beyond	Cumulative Total
Preparation time (Review of guidance, development of internal policies and procedures, etc.)	33.6	27.3	16.0	15.2	92.1
Proposal submission	55.9	43.4	10.3	9.2	118.8
Award processing	31.2	32.9	22.5	22.0	108.6
Letter of Credit Draw	4.7	5.3	4.9	4.6	19.5
Collection of outgoing subrecipient or vendor reporting information	6.8	8.3	5.8	5.6	26.5
Quarterly reporting (including subrecipient and vendor reporting)	15.7	26.1	21.1	18.4	81.3
Post quarterly reporting corrections	2.9	3.7	3.4	3.2	13.2
Training	19.3	15.7	11.4	10.9	57.3
Design and construction of automated system(s)	20.8	20.9	7.0	4.5	53.2
Preparation and involvement with local or federal audits	5.3	8.0	7.5	7.2	28.0
Other (IRB, IACUC, compliance, etc.)	26.7	27.7	27.5	27.3	109.2
Subtotal FTE broken out by activity	222.9	219.3	137.4	128.1	707.7
FTE provided only as a lump sum by respondents	31.2	36.1	35.3	24.8	127.4
Differential between detail and sum (for those who provided both)	2.5	3.2	1.2	1.0	7.9
TOTAL	**256.6**	**258.6**	**173.9**	**154.0**	**843.1**

Mean	2.6	2.6	1.7	1.6
Mean if response > 0	4.1	3.6	2.7	2.7
Median	1.0	1.1	0.6	0.5

Most institutions reallocated FTE in order to manage ARRA activities, much more so than adding FTEs or utilizing overtime. A grand total of 843.1 FTE were reallocated or were anticipated being reallocated from the inception of ARRA through FY12 and beyond.

Respondents were given the option of providing a breakdown of the tasks reallocated FTE were performing, or reporting only a lump sum total. For those who provided a breakdown, the most FTE were reallocated for proposal submission; the second highest number of FTE were reallocated for "Other (IRB, IACUC, compliance, etc.)"; and the third highest number of FTE were reallocated for award processing.

The number of responses greater than 0 FTE was 63 for FY09, 71 for FY10, 63 for FY11, and 57 for FY12 and beyond. The most FTEs reallocated by an institution in one year were 79, and for one institution over all years, the most FTEs reallocated were 316.

5. What was the combined salary and fringe benefit cost (actual or estimated) associated with these reallocated FTE (not counting overtime or bonus pay)?
(Please provide this information related to question 4. If you are not able to break out the information by type of activity, please list your information in the total area)

Type of Activity	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12 and Beyond	Cumulative Total
Preparation time (Review of guidance, development of internal policies and procedures, etc.)	1,981,299	1,443,230	815,117	643,664	4,883,310
Proposal submission	4,952,461	4,336,451	3,649,350	602,742	13,541,004
Award processing	1,659,008	1,893,644	1,463,739	1,413,753	6,430,144
Letter of Credit Draw	222,292	238,990	208,410	188,419	858,111
Collection of outgoing subrecipient or vendor reporting information	357,105	471,158	255,443	252,203	1,335,909
Quarterly reporting (including subrecipient and vendor reporting)	2,412,286	3,225,453	2,786,341	974,858	9,398,938
Post quarterly reporting corrections	197,045	304,474	219,597	149,702	870,818
Training	927,710	745,338	644,531	564,500	2,882,079
Design and construction of automated system(s)	1,131,419	1,215,732	513,280	281,548	3,141,979
Preparation and involvement with local or federal audits	328,227	469,139	474,371	372,735	1,644,472
Other (IRB, IACUC, compliance, etc.)	1,557,990	1,654,545	1,702,269	1,560,452	6,475,256
Subtotal $ broken out by activity	15,726,842	15,998,154	12,732,448	7,004,576	51,462,020
$ provided only as a lump sum by respondents	3,461,189	3,258,674	4,807,978	1,752,180	13,280,021
Differential between detail and sum (for those who provided both)	179,675	112,545	28,131	749	321,100
TOTAL	19,367,706	19,369,373	17,568,557	8,757,505	$65,063,141

Mean	193,677	193,694	175,686	87,575
Mean if response > 0	317,503	289,095	288,009	168,414
Median	76,147	75,830	46,000	36,773

In order to manage ARRA activities, institutions spent a total of $65.1M in salary and fringe benefit cost associated with reallocating FTE from the inception of ARRA through FY12 and beyond. Respondents were given the option of providing a breakdown of the costs associated with the tasks being performed by additional FTE, or reporting only a lump sum total of the cost associated with reallocated FTE. For those who provided a breakdown, the greatest cost for reallocated FTE was associated with proposal submission; the second greatest cost was for Quarterly reporting (including subrecipient and vendor reporting) ; and the third greatest cost was for "Other (IRB, IACUC, compliance, etc.)".

The number of responses for any salary and fringe benefit cost associated with reallocated FTE greater than 0 FTE was 61 for FY09, 67 for FY10, 61 for FY11, and 52 for FY12 and beyond. The most dollars spent by an institution in one year were $5.6M, and for one institution over all years the most dollars associated with reallocated FTEs was $17.4M. It is important to note that respondents were given the option to report reallocated FTE, reallocated-associated costs, or both. Five institutions reported FTE only, none reported cost only, 67 reported both FTE and cost, and 27 reported neither FTE nor cost.[5] Note that cost would be higher if institutions that reported FTE only had reported associated salary and fringe benefit cost for their reallocated 166.3 FTE. The cost per reallocated FTE was $96,100. Therefore, one could extrapolate the uncosted reallocated FTE would increase the reported cost of managing ARRA activity by $16.0M, for a total of $81.1M.

---

[5] Number of responses equals 99 due to one outlier value being coded as a missing response.

6. **If your organization utilized overtime to manage ARRA activities, please quantify these FTE below. [It is recognized that an estimate may be required; please use your best available internal information to derive these numbers. Please include paid or unpaid "overtime" hours as a percentage of total FTE based on the person's typical work week. If no typical work week exists, use 40 hours as a full-time equivalent. In other words, a person working a typical 50 hour work week who devoted 25 hours of additional time would be shown as .5 FTE for overtime effort.**
(If you are not able to break out the information by type of activity, please list your information in the total area only)

Type of Activity	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12 and Beyond	Cumulative Total
Preparation time (Review of guidance, development of internal policies and procedures, etc.)	2.5	1.9	0.6	0.1	5.1
Proposal submission	8.4	2.7	0.2	0.2	11.5
Award processing	3.0	4.5	1.8	0.7	10.0
Letter of Credit Draw	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.8
Collection of outgoing subrecipient or vendor reporting information	0.6	1.0	1.0	0.9	3.5
Quarterly reporting (including subrecipient and vendor reporting)	1.7	2.7	2.2	1.6	8.2
Post quarterly reporting corrections	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.6
Training	0.7	0.5	0.2	0.0	1.4
Design and construction of automated system(s)	0.5	1.1	0.2	0.2	2.0
Preparation and involvement with local or federal audits	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.8
Other (IRB, IACUC, compliance, etc.)	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2
Subtotal FTE broken out by activity	17.9	15.3	6.9	4.0	44.1
FTE provided only as a lump sum by respondents	4.0	7.8	8.5	8.3	28.6
Differential between detail and sum (for those who provided both)					
TOTAL	**21.9**	**23.1**	**15.4**	**12.3**	**72.7**

Mean	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1
Mean if response > 0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9
Median	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.2

Although the opportunity for investigators and institutions to receive valuable ARRA funding was of great benefit, most institutions were not staffed appropriately at the time to manage the extremely large influx of grant proposals into their central grants offices. Many institutions were actually in a position of already being understaffed due to the economic situation in existence at the time. In addition these same offices were also working hard to understand all the new ARRA requirements and ready themselves of these requirements.

Many institutions were not in a position to hire additional staff and needed to utilize current staff, adding additional work hours, some paid and many hours unpaid. Survey respondents were asked to quantify the use of overtime to manage ARRA activities, wherever possible. Of the 100 survey respondents, 25 were able to provide any quantifiable information related to actual overtime tracked or paid.

Survey respondents were specifically requested to provide information related to the amount of FTE expended for overtime work, whether it was paid or unpaid. A total of 72.7 FTE was reported by all respondents as overtime effort towards ARRA duties during the time period covered in the survey. It is unclear whether the 75 respondents that did not provide information for this part of the survey did not have overtime or did track it in a way that allowed for reporting in this area.

7. Of the FTE listed in Question 8, what percentage of these FTE received paid overtime? ___ %

Of the 25 survey respondents that were able to provide information for the amount of overtime FTE, 6 were able to provide information related to the amount of this FTE that was actually paid overtime. Two of the respondents indicated that it was 100%, One respondent indicated the FTE was 89% paid and the remainder of the respondents indicated the FTE were 50% or less paid for their overtime. The low response rate to this question indicates that the large majority of institutions that reported overtime FTE did not include paid overtime but rather unpaid (e.g., for exempt staff) or cost shared effort towards handling ARRA activities.

Type of Activity	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12 and Beyond	Cumulative Total
Preparation time (Review of guidance, development of internal policies and procedures, etc.)	495,000	495,000	495,000	495,000	1,980,000
Proposal submission	589,582	688,165	571,380	38,190	1,887,317
Award processing	32,827	112,495	81,800	40,900	268,022
Letter of Credit Draw	0	0	0	0	0
Collection of outgoing subrecipient or vendor reporting information	55,000	74,100	74,100	74,100	277,300
Quarterly reporting (including subrecipient and vendor reporting)	62,640	95,690	95,900	75,450	329,680
Post quarterly reporting corrections	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	220,000
Training	495,000	495,000	495,000	495,000	1,980,000
Design and construction of automated system(s)	110,000	112,500	110,000	110,000	442,500
Preparation and involvement with local or federal audits	0	0	0	0	0
Other (IRB, IACUC, compliance, etc.)	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal $ broken out by activity	1,895,049	2,127,950	1,978,180	1,383,640	7,384,819
$ provided only as a lump sum by respondents	0	13,950	0	0	13,950
Differential between detail and sum (for those who provided both)					
TOTAL	1,895,049	2,141,900	1,978,180	1,383,640	$7,398,769

Mean	18,950	21,419	19,782	13,836
Mean if response > 0	315,842	267,738	989,090	691,820
Median	33,428	44,785	989,090	691,820

Survey respondents spent close to $7.4M during the period covered by this survey in paid overtime to support ARRA activities. A significant percentage of this overtime cost was dedicated up front to the initial review, preparation and training of staff in order to ensure understanding of ARRA requirements, and also to the support of ARRA proposal submission.

The report authors coded the open-ended responses into the following cohorts:

# of institutions	Code	Reason
24	A	Institutional Delays in Other Work
19	E	No reduction – staff worked harder/longer to achieve work, or sufficient additional FTE were added
7	B	Increased Turnaround Time for Award Acceptance or Setup
6	F	Delays in drawdowns or billing on non-ARRA awards
5	D	Delay in Financial Reporting on Non-ARRA Awards
3	C	Delayed Completion of Award Closeouts
3	I	Delays in IT staff delivering other systems, or increase cost for IT support
1	G	Moved certain responsibilities from central office staff to PIs (increasing their administrative burden)
1	H	Post-award expense allowability reviews reduced

Of the 53 institutions that responded to this question, 51 had responsive answers. Nineteen of the 51 (37%) indicated that there were no activities that were unable to be performed by the organization in the same manner as prior to ARRA, though some pointed out this was because they were able to add additional staff to assist with ARRA, or it involved significant paid or unpaid overtime on the part of existing staff. The remaining 32 (63%) indicated that there were activities that they were not able to perform in the same manner. ARRA work was prioritized and given its due attention, but it seems clear that for many institutions, there were adverse consequences for non-ARRA awards as well as a negative impact on staff morale.

- **Sixty three percent of institutions who responded said that there were activities that they were not able to perform in the same manner as before ARRA, because of the need to divert staff to ARRA-related obligations.**

- **Forty seven percent of institutions (24 of 51) reported institutional delays in their other work that didn't fall into one of the categories shown below**. The range of examples for work that was unable to be performed in the same manner was very broad, and included:
    o delayed implementation of institution's electronic proposal creation and routing module
    o delayed production of research annual report by 4 months
    o design and delivery of a monthly newsletter was reduced by 25% to meet the demands of ARRA reporting
    o other compliance reviews were foregone during the time ARRA reporting was underway
    o delayed data entry into research systems for non-ARRA grants by 5% during the time ARRA reports were being prepared and submitted
    o reduced internal services provided to vendors and departments
    o Issuance of subawards was delayed
    o training and outreach efforts were delayed
    o delayed CQI processes at the institution
    o delayed submission of E-SNAP progress reports
    o diminished mentoring/training of new staff while managers were helping with ARRA reporting
    o 20% reduction in customer service to PIs with their proposals
    o 50% increase in complaints from PIs about service levels
    o routine subrecipient monitoring suffered
    o reduced the ability to disseminate proposal funding opportunity information
    o 3-6 month delay in the submission of the institution's F&A rate proposal
    o reduced attention to aged account receivables

- o   general compliance reviews reduced
- o   quality assurance activities were reduced

- **13.7% of institutions (7 of 51) indicated that there was an increase in turnaround time for award acceptance and/or award setup**

- **11.7% of institutions (6 of 61) indicated that there were delays in drawdowns or billing on non-ARRA awards**

- **9.8% of institutions (5 of 51) indicated that there were delays in financial reporting (on non-ARRA funds).**

Other activities not able to be performed in the same manner included delays in award closeouts, migration of certain responsibilities from central offices to PIs (increasing their administrative burden), delays in IT staff being able to deliver work on other systems as scheduled, or increased IT costs to allow for IT staff to be backfilled, and reduced capacity to perform post-award expense allowability reviews. One institution reported that they had spent tens of thousands of dollars on IT consultants to backfill their own staff who were tasked to help with ARRA work.

10. How much training time (if conducted) on average, did each of your ARRA-involved individuals receive to help them comply with ARRA requirements?
(Please include time devoted to formal classroom or on-line instruction, plus estimated time used to review web or other distributed materials)

	Not Offered	Not Able to Quantify	< 15 Min	15 - 30 Min	31-59 Min	1 - 2 Hrs	> 2 Hrs	Did Not Answer	Total
PI	19	10	10	15	13	19	9	5	100
Other Project Staff	24	19	7	8	4	18	14	6	100
Dept. Admin	21	14	3	11	5	18	21	7	100
Central Admin	9	5	1	4	1	15	64	1	100

Training regarding the novel ARRA requirements varied significantly across participating institutions and across different cohorts of ARRA-involved individuals. Institutions were asked to consider training broadly, including not only time devoted to formal classroom or on-line instruction, but also estimated time used to review web-based or other distributed materials.

- **Seventy nine percent of institutions reported that their central research administrators received one hour or more of specialized training in the novel ARRA requirements.** Since many centralized sponsored projects offices served as the information resource for their campuses on the ARRA requirements, some of these administrators were likely also providing the training to their colleagues and to their campuses.

- **More than 75% of institutions offered training to their principal investigators in ARRA requirements; the duration of that training varied widely.** Sixty six percent of institutions (N=66) reported that they both offered training to principal investigators and could quantify its duration (an additional 10% indicated that they offered training but that it was not possible for them to quantify the duration). Among those 66 institutions who offered training and could quantify it, 38% (25 institutions) offered training that lasted 30 minutes or less, while 20% (13 institutions) offered training between 31-59 minutes, and 42% (28 institutions) offered training that was one hour or more.

- **The availability of training for other involved individuals, such as departmental research administrators or project staff varied significantly, but when it was offered, it tended to be one hour or longer.** Fifty eight percent of institutions conducted quantifiable amounts of training for their departmental administrators. Among those, 67% (39 institutions) reported that their departmental administrators received training lasting at least one hour. For those institutions able to quantify training for other project staff, 63% offered training that was an hour or longer.

	Don't Know	None	< 25%	25% - 49%	50% - 74%	> 75%	Did Not Answer	Total
Principal Investigators	18	15	16	6	7	28	10	100
Other Project Staff	25	18	13	8	6	17	13	100
Departmental Administrators	14	16	9	7	12	27	15	100
Central Administrators	6	13	8	2	6	57	8	100

Institutions were asked to describe training participants by their respective roles relative to ARRA funding. The degree to which ARRA-involved individuals participated in the ARRA-related training offered by participating institutions differed considerably as a function of the individual's role in the institution and in the ARRA process.

 Overall, survey respondents reported nearly two-thirds (63%) of those in central administration who were engaged in ARRA activities participated in the related training that organizations offered. **Particularly striking, given the rates of participation of other groups, was that more than half of reporting institutions (57%) reported that over 75% of those in ARRA relevant central administration roles participated.** By contrast, fewer than 30% of institutions reported that any of the other three groups had participated in training at a 75% or greater rate. Another 6% of institutions reported that central administrators attended training at 50-74% participation rates.

As noted, participation rates by ARRA-involved individuals in the other three groups on which institutions reported training activity were significantly lower than for those in central administration. Only 28% and 27% of institutions reported that 75% or more of ARRA-involved principal investigators or departmental administrators, respectively, participated in the ARRA related training. Inclusion of institutions reporting that 50-74% of principal investigators and departmental administrators participated in the training still resulted in less than 40% of all institutions reporting that half or more of such individuals came to the training offered. In addition, 12% of institutions reported that 50-74% of departmental administrators participated in training while 7% of institutions reported that principal investigators participated in training at a similar rate.

Not surprisingly, individuals in the "other project staff" category were least likely to be reported as participating in training at high rates. Only 23% of the institutions reported that at least 50% of those ARRA-involved "other project staff" participated in training offered at their institution. Further, this was the group for which the least information was available. Twenty-five percent (25%) of the institutions reported they did not know the participation rate for this group and another 15 institutions did not respond to this question for this group.

Given the central role of principal investigators in the ARRA process, it is worth noting that nearly a third (31%) of the institutions reported that 25% or less of ARRA-involved principal investigators participated in ARRA-related training, with 15% reporting that no principal investigators attended training. Further, 28% of institutions either reported they did not know (18%), or simply did not report (10%) the rate of participation of principal investigators in ARRA-related training.

	#	%
Expenditures-Create Reports	77	77%
Expenditures – Review/Validate	84	84%
Expenditures - Not involved in either step	3	3%
Jobs – Create Reports	77	77%
Jobs – Review/Validate	84	84%
Jobs - Not involved in either step	3	3%
Progress – Create Reports	44	44%
Progress – Review/Validate	73	73%
Progress – Not involved in either step	13	13%

	0-15 min	16-30 min	31-60 min	>60 min	No Answer	Total
Expenditures	13	21	17	45	4	100
Jobs	13	18	21	43	5	100
Progress	28	16	8	37	11	100

Institutions were asked to indicate their administrative staff's involvement with creating, reviewing, and validating three sections of their ARRA quarterly reports: expenditures, jobs, and progress.

- **Of the 100 institutions responding, 97% indicated that their administrative staff is responsible for creating, reviewing, and/or validating both expenditure reports and job reports. Eighty seven percent of responding institutions indicated that their administrative staff is responsible for creating, reviewing, and/or validating progress reports.**

- **Estimates of the time spent by administrative staff to create, review, and/or validate each section of the quarterly report vary significantly**, with nearly half of all respondents estimating more than an hour per section of the report each quarter.

- **Sixty five percent** (62 of 96 institutions responding) spent more than 30 minutes on each expenditure report each quarter; **67%** (64 of 95 institutions responding) spent more than 30 minutes on each job report each quarter; and **50%** (45 of 89 institutions responding) spent more than 30 minutes on each progress report each quarter.

- **Up to 87% (83 of 95 institutions responding) reflected requiring 30-60 minutes or more *per report* produced for jobs reporting alone.** Providing jobs information has proven an administrative challenge, and responses reflect this process is as time-consuming as expenditure reporting alone. Seventy seven percent of institutions report administrative creation/collection of jobs reports, with 45% (43 of 95 institutions responding) exceeding 60 minutes for each report. Three percent responded with no administrative involvement in this reporting.

- **More than 44% of institutions' administrative staff created progress reports to meet ARRA requirements; while a significant number, 73%, performed additional roles of reviewing and validating progress reports.** The administrative staff time spent per progress report was nearly evenly divided between under 30 minutes (49% of 89 institutions responding) versus over 30 minutes (51% of 89 institutions responding). Some of these administrators were likely involved in the Expenditures and Jobs Reporting in addition to the Progress Reports. Although Researchers typically prepare progress reports directly to sponsors for non-ARRA awards, the additional time spent here is directly related to

the complexities and limitations of the reporting tools and the necessary assistance by research administrators to ensure proper reporting within the data element.

Additional Notes

Variability in Time Required for Reporting:
Variability in the time required for all aspects of reporting may be due to the division of labor assigned to the tasks, the nature of institutions' systems available to generate and manage data, and the complexity of an institution's award profile. For example, institutions with high volumes of subawards or large vendor purchases would likely require more time for jobs reporting. In general, more administrative effort is required for large awards (e.g., program project grants), as well as award transfers and closeouts.

Tight Reporting Time Frame:
Expenditure reporting is challenging for many institutions due to the short time frame allowed (10 days) for report submission. It is common practice for many institutions' accounting systems to close 6 or 7 days after month-end, at times impeding timely receipt of subcontractor reports. In many cases the short time frame between the close of an accounting period and the ARRA report deadline leads to reports being entered close to the deadline, thereby creating exceptionally heavy demand on FederalReporting.gov, slower system response time, and increased staff time required for submitting reports. Finally, the short time frame also leads to additional work for some institutions, with more adjustments needing to be made later in the reporting period.

Expenditure Reporting:
The complexity of expenditure reporting and review involves much more than simply running automated reports. Detailed analysis is required, especially in identifying purchases with multiple payments that exceed $25,000, and having to provide a count of expenses < $25,000. Also note that expenditure reporting does not include the additional time needed to draw down certain ARRA funds. For example, the draw for ARRA awards issued by the National Institutes of Health is done by individual project (or group of projects if a program project grant), rather than the usual process of drawing down funds on a lump sum basis.

Economic Climate:
It would be difficult to sustain the increased level of effort required for ARRA reporting, given limited funding and resources available to many institutions. Many institutions are not able to dedicate additional staffing and electronic systems resources to ARRA reporting needs, in part due to the relatively short term nature of ARRA funding. Rather, ARRA administrative responsibilities have been assigned to staff who are already over-extended as a result of staffing cutbacks necessitated by the U.S. economic recession that began in December 2007 and continues through the present.

State Requirements:
Many state institutions are required to report data associated with ARRA awards to state agencies, greatly increasing time and effort spent providing ARRA reports. State reporting requirements often differ from federal requirements, demanding additional institutional administrative effort. For example, state agencies may require jobs data reported as hours rather than the standard FTE presentation. While this survey only measures the impact of reporting at the federal level, the additional effort required to meet state requirements is significant for some institutions and is an important factor in the overall impact of federal transparency reporting requirements.

13. For each quarterly reporting cycle what is your best estimate of the length of time it takes your PI's (on average) to create, review and/or validate their section of quarterly ARRA reports:

	#	%
Expenditures-Create Reports	2	2%
Expenditures – Review/Validate	32	32%
Expenditures - Not involved in either step	62	62%
Jobs – Create Reports	18	18%
Jobs – Review/Validate	35	35%
Jobs - Not involved in either step	45	45%
Progress – Create Reports	72	72%
Progress – Review/Validate	43	43%
Progress – Not involved in either step	1	1%

	0-15 min	16-30 min	31-60 min	>60 min	No Answer	Total
Expenditures	29	7	4	2	58	100
Jobs	31	12	13	1	43	100
Progress	26	31	29	10	4	100

Institutions were asked to estimate Principal Investigators' involvement in three areas of ARRA quarterly reporting – expenditures, jobs, and progress. They were to identify whether PI's were involved (i) in creating or (ii) in reviewing and/or validating the information, or (iii) not involved in that area; as well as to provide estimates of the total time when the PIs were involved in expenditures, jobs or progress reporting.

- **Of the three areas, PIs were most engaged in progress reporting, with 72% of institutions reporting that PIs were involved in creating the report, and 43% involved in reviewing or validating reports**. Only one institution (1 %) reported that their PIs were not involved in progress reporting. When PIs were involved in progress reporting, institutions estimated that 26% spent 15 minutes or less; 31% spent between 16 – 30 minutes; 29% spent between 31 – 60 minutes; and 10% spent one hour or more per quarter.

- Four percent of institutions did not report a time estimate on task.

- Principals Investigators were also substantially involved in jobs reporting, with 18% involved in creating and 35% involved in reviewing or validating information. However, 45% percent of institutions reported that their PIs were not involved in jobs reporting.

- When PIs were involved in jobs reporting, it was estimated that 31% spent between 0 – 15 minutes; 12% spent 16 - 30 minutes; 13% spent between 31 – 60 minutes; and 1% more than sixty minutes per quarter. Forty-three percent of institutions reported no time on this task, consistent with the report of PI non-involvement (45%).

- Principal Investigators were least involved in the expenditure reporting. Only 2% were involved in creating and 32% in reviewing and/or validating expenditure reports; the majority of institutions, 62%, reported that their PIs were not involved in either step for expenditure reporting. When PIs were involved in expenditure reporting, it was estimated that 29% spent 0 – 15 minutes; 7% spent between 16 - 30 minutes; 4% spent 31 – 60 minutes; and 2% more than 1 hour per quarter. Fifty-eight percent of institutions reported no time on this task, largely consistent with the 62% of PI non-involvement.

These results suggest that PIs are engaged in areas most closely associated with their expertise and primary responsibilities. This is indicated by both the degree of involvement and time spent on task; PIs are most involved in progress reports, then jobs, and lastly expenditure reports.

Of the 195 responses on estimated time spent on each of the three tasks the majority (44%) indicated that the overall average time to perform any one of the three tasks was 15 minutes or less; 26% estimated 16 to 30 minutes; and 24% between 31-60 minutes on each task. The remaining 6% estimated more than 1 hour was spent on each reporting task. **As an additional note of context --time spent on each reporting task could vary widely depending on the nature of the funded project, for example a project with multiple subcontracting agencies to support job creation would take significantly more time to create a quarterly progress report than a research activity taking place in a single laboratory with two graduate students.**

14. What reporting method did your organization utilize to submit its ARRA reports?

	#	%
Excel Spreadsheet Upload	58	58%
XML Data File Transfer	15	15%
On-Line Data Entry via a Web Browser	21	21%
Other (specify)	5	5%
No Answer	1	1%

Other methods used (by those who answered "other"):
Started w/ Excel Upload and subsequently switched to on-line data entry
On line application to gather data/have PIs report to us; (Cont #22)
Used state required web application
Excel upload for delegated subs; xml for prime awards
Mix of excel upload and on-line data entry via browser

The number of ARRA awards made to an institution is the primary driver for the type of reporting method used. Some institutions originally chose one method and subsequently changed methods due to challenges with technology and the very short reporting deadlines.

- **Fifty eight percent of institutions submitted the mandatory quarterly reports via the Excel Spreadsheet upload method.**

- **Fifteen percent of institutions submitted the mandatory quarterly reports via the XML Data File Transfer method.**

While the spreadsheet upload and XML Data File Transfer methods are the most commonly used methods, neither is ideal as the Federal Reporting System allows upload of only one Excel Spreadsheet or XML Data File Transfer at a time. For institutions with a large number of ARRA awards this one-at-a time upload process needlessly prolongs reporting.

- **Twenty one percent of institutions submitted the mandatory quarterly reports via on-line data entry method.**

- **Five percent of institutions submitted the mandatory quarterly reports via other methods.**

A small number of institutions are required to report directly to their state administration (see question #16). Some organizations chose to use a mix of methods to avoid the performance challenges seen in the past with FederalReporting.gov and used multiple methods to meet the very short reporting deadline.

15. Did your organization delegate reporting responsibilities to its subrecipients?

Response	#
Yes	12
No	86
No Answer	2

- **86% of institutions did not delegate the reporting responsibilities to its subrecipients.**
  Anecdotal evidence would suggest that this is primarily due to two reasons: one, the prime institution had other reporting data elements to add to the subrecipient data; and two, the short turnaround time to submit ARRA reports. Institutions didn't want to risk late reports due to subrecipient delays.

- **12% of institutions did delegate the reporting responsibilities to their subrecipients.**

16. For the mandatory quarterly reporting, does your organization report its ARRA information:

Method Used	#
Directly to the Federal Government	90
Directly to State Government, which then reports to the Federal Government	6
Other (specify)	3
No Answer	1

The majority of participating institutions submitted their mandatory quarterly reporting of ARRA information directly to the Federal Government, while some institutions were required to submit to their State or a combination of State and Federal submissions.

- **90% of respondents to the survey (N=90) submitted their quarterly reports directly to the Federal Government**.

- **6% of institutions (N=6) submitted their quarterly reports directly to their State Government.** In these cases the State Government was responsible for then submitting the reports to the Federal Government.

- **3% of respondents (N=3) reported that they submitted their ARRA quarterly information directly to both their State and the Federal Government.** It is unclear if this was a requirement for these institutions of all ARRA awards, or if some reports were submitted to the State and others to the Federal Government depending on award origination.

17. Was your organization required to prepare and/or submit ARRA reporting to other entities in addition to its quarterly federal reporting obligations?
(Please check all situations that apply to your organization)

	#	%
To State – in same format as Federal reporting requirements	14	14%
To State – in different format than Federal reporting requirements	31	31%
To System-wide office – in same format as Federal reporting requirements	6	6%
To System-wide office – in different format than Federal reporting requirements	17	17%
Other (specify)	24	24%

#	Specifics for "Other":
4	**Non-federal primes**
2	**Post information in different formats online**
2	**HRSA**
1	**DOE-ARPA-E**
3	**DOE**
4	**AHRQ**
2	**NIST**
2	**State and State auditors**
1	**Internal to VP Research**
1	**NASA**
1	**University system**

- **Eighty nine percent of survey participants reported encountering reporting burdens above and beyond the quarterly ARRA reporting mandated by Congress.**

- **Forty eight percent of all respondents reported that this additional reporting was in a format different from that required for Federal reporting.**

In the Other section of the question, twenty respondents identified some of the reasons they had to file additional ARRA reports. Topping the list, six Federal agencies accounted for fifteen instances of additional reporting. Four sources of additional reporting burden were the research institutions themselves, either by mandating additional reports from subrecipients or in the form of internal data gathering.

Three observations can be made about these responses. First, the intense scrutiny surrounding the ARRA program became a self-perpetuating cycle within which many participants created meta levels of reporting to ensure that mandates were met. Second, in the limited time available and given the constraints of the situation, resources were not available to design reporting systems that were consistent and that utilized already available data (and data formats) for local record keeping. Finally, in some cases, as the saying goes, "We have met the enemy and they are us." As personnel were stretched to the limit meeting reporting deadlines, some institutions decided that the cure for an abundance of reporting was – more reporting.

18. Did your organization receive ARRA State Stabilization Funds?

	#	%
Yes	52	52%
No	47	47%
No Answer	1	1%

The ARRA State Stabilization program is administered by the U.S. Department of Education and directly awarded to the States to help stabilize State and local budgets in order to minimize and avoid reductions in education and other essential services. In exchange the States committed to advancing essential education reform in four areas:

(1) Making improvements in teacher effectiveness and in the equitable distribution of qualified teachers for all students particularly students who are most in need;
(2) Establishing pre-K-to-college-and-career data systems that track progress and foster continuous improvement;
(3) Making progress toward rigorous college- and career-ready standards and high-quality assessments that are valid and reliable for all students, including limited English proficient students and students with disabilities; and
(4) Providing targeted, intensive support and effective interventions for the lowest-performing schools.

- **Fifty two percent of survey respondents answered in the affirmative, a ratio that is not surprising given that 54% of the FDP membership is made up of public educational institutions.**

19. If your organization received ARRA State Stabilization Funds, are there different rules for expending these funds than for other ARRA funds?

	#	%
Yes	36	36%
No	15	15%
N/A	49	49%

In April 2009, the U.S. Department of Education issued guidance on The State Fiscal Stabilization Program. The guidance outlined DOE's interpretation of the ARRA regulations; the intent of the guidance was to clarify the rules and not impose additional regulations beyond those provided in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Institutions were asked to evaluate their overall ARRA reporting experiences and determine if they encountered differences in the reporting requirements for their State Stabilization Program funding compared to the rules they had to follow to report on ARRA funding from other agencies.

- **Thirty six percent reported there were differences between the rules promulgated by ARRA State Stabilization Fund and the rules they had to follow to report on other ARRA funding**

- **Fifteen percent of the institutions reported that there were no differences in the rules**.

- **Forty nine percent of the respondents reported that the state stabilization funding requirement was not applicable to their institutions.**

Guidance	Monthly	Quarterly	Annually	Total Used
OMB Guidance Documents	46	50	2	98
COGR/FDP FAQs	50	47	1	98
Agency Provided Guidance	46	54	0	100
FDP ARRA Listserv	60	31	1	92
Other (specify)				20

Summary of resources identified as "Other" by respondents:

Resource	# of Institutions
Professional listservs (e.g, RESADM-L)	4
Federal Reporting.Gov	2
NCURA Webinars/Mtgs	1
State Guidance	5
Other institutions	3
Government webinars	1
Consulting firms	2
Agency Provided Guidance (specific examples cited)	3

The desire and commitment of institutions to fully understand and comply with ARRA reporting requirements coupled with the need to develop internal procedures and/or systems in a very short timeframe contributed to intensive usage of many different resources.

As the results above indicate, virtually all respondents used, on at least a quarterly basis, the core resources identified by the survey as having been available. These included the OMB Guidance documents; agency-provided guidance; the COGR/FDP frequently asked questions, and the FDP ARRA listserv. The FDP ARRA listserv, with 476 participants nationally, was the source most frequently used on at least a monthly basis, possibly because it allowed for rapid exchange of new or changing information, or quick clarifications from national colleagues similarly involved in ARRA implementations.

Twenty institutions provided information about additional resources that they used beyond these core sources. As noted above, other professional listservs (primarily RESADM-L), guidance provided by their states, or information gleaned from other institutions (websites, presentations, colleagues, etc.) were the most commonly cited.

21. Below is a list of recommendations to reduce or minimize the administrative impact of the ARRA requirements. Please indicate the level of impact to your organization if each recommendation were adopted.

	Major	Medium	Minor	Not Important	NA	Total
Allow bulk upload of ARRA reports	53	18	14	13	2	100
Ensure that all agencies are defining each data field in an identical way	61	25	11	3		100
Increase lead time to prepare report by an additional 10 days	62	27	9	2		100
Increase lead time to prepare report by an additional 20 days	45	24	25	9		103
Consolidate Letter of Credit draws within each agency	25	33	26	16		100
Pre-populate reporting data that is already known by the federal agencies	76	13	8	2	1	100
Prohibit delegation of subaward reporting	14	21	39	25	1	100
Allow delegation of subaward reporting of both expenditures and jobs data	15	22	39	22	2	100
Other (please specify)						31

The report authors coded the open-ended "other" responses into the following cohorts:

# of institutions	Comment Summary
11	Harmonization of requirements (among federal agencies and also between fed and state)
10	Reduction of reporting requirements (content & frequency)
8	Increase lead time on guidance/requirement changes
8	Increase lead time to prepare reports
4	Streamline and standardize communications from agencies to institutions
3	Pre-populate data from federal agency systems
1	Expand federal agency tools (such as NIH Readiness Tool)
2	Improve technical capabilities of fedreporting.gov

The survey respondents reported a broad administrative impact of the ARRA requirements spanning across procedural, technical, and organizational areas of their institutions.

- **Procedural:** The data shows that the impact of the procedural items would be of medium to major importance: 86% reported that the lack of harmonization and of consistent requirements across agencies had a medium to major impact; 89% would like to increase lead time for report preparations by an additional ten to 20 days; 58% of the respondents view a consolidated letter of credit as a major or at least medium concern. These four areas were reported to be of the most importance to the respondents.

- **Technical:** Responses to technical features of the federal reporting system indicate that pre-population and bulk uploading of reports would also have medium to major impact on ARRA reporting (89% and 71% respectively). Both features were reported as fairly important.

- *Organizational:* Responses to the delegation impact items appear to reflect wide variation between institutions and likely indicate differences in internal operating procedures and applications.

Of the 100 respondents to this question, 31 included additional narrative comments about their concerns and challenges, further illuminating the quantitative data in a meaningful manner. The number of comments indicates the high level of commitment and care that characterizes the respondent population.

Major themes in the comments highlight the need for harmonization and reduction of reporting requirements, increases in lead time in guidance being issued to recipients as well as for preparation of reports, streamlining and standardization of communications from agencies to institutions, pre-populating data from federal systems, expanding agency tools and improving FederalReporting.gov technical capabilities.

The feedback from survey respondents indicate that harmonization of requirements applies not only among federal agencies but also between federal, state and local government agencies. Individual federal agencies should not be allowed to add requirements on top of the standard requirements and state and local agencies should also not be allowed to require additional reports or added frequency of submitted information.

Changes in reporting requirements should include reducing: frequency of reporting; descriptive text, number of overall data elements - jobs and vendor information in particular and additional requests for information from agencies after required data has been submitted.

Increasing the lead time of providing guidance to institutions prior to a reporting deadline would allow the institutions sufficient time to fully understand the changes, disseminate the information within their organization, properly train the applicable personnel as well as make the necessary changes to their systems to accommodate the changes in guidance. Increasing the lead time for preparation of reports would allow institutions sufficient time after the official monthly close of their financial systems in which to collect, review and report the data. Allowing institutions to report officially closed and reviewed data will reduce the amount of revised reports in future quarters, allow for increased integrity of the data and reduce the amount of back and forth between agencies and institutions related to follow up questions. Additional time would also allow for the same increased integrity in subrecipient data collected and reported.

Streamlining and standardizing communications from agencies to institutions would be valuable. Agencies should communicate with one primary office or individual at the institution related to reporting and reduce the amount of reminders sent out as well as unnecessary contacts for items such as spelling out the acronym of a university.

Many technical changes would improve the reporting process overall. Federal agencies should pre-populate all available data elements and allow bulk upload of the data that is required but not already available in the federal agency systems. Increased functionality of the federal reporting system should be implemented including enhanced printing and sorting capabilities and displaying more useful information in the system and automated emails such as the recipient account number.

Additional improvements that are requested by survey respondents include the use of standard templates and tools for collecting pass through information; ensuring the federal agencies always indicate ARRA funding on award notices; and providing for a process to not hold the institution responsible for errors or late reporting due to issues at the federal agency.

22. Is there any other information that you would like to share with us related to the ARRA oversight work conducted by your organization?

The report authors coded the open-ended responses into the following cohorts:

# of institutions	Comment Summary
9	Survey data related
9	Administrative cost challenges
5	Impacts of unclear and/or frequently changing federal guidance
3	Internal Collaboration/Communication
3	Technical issues and usability of fedreporting.gov

An analysis of the narrative comments respondents contributed yielded a number of important insights into how institutions handled ARRA reporting, the challenges that they encountered and feedback related to possible future reporting requirements.

In addition to a set of responses specially related to their institutions' data included in the survey, respondents provided detailed feedback that focused on internal organizational solutions, technical specifics about experiences with fedreporting.gov, and external factors that impact burden and compliance. The willingness of so many respondents to take the time to offer their thoughtful reflections further demonstrates the deep commitment and dedication of this unique cohort as well as their concerns about future such reporting requirements.

- *Organizational* solutions cited included broad coordinated meetings across all institutional departments involved in aspects of ARRA reporting and increased research enterprise integration and communication. Institutions' collaborative efforts enabled them to quickly develop internal systems and automated tools as well as reporting mechanisms to respond to quickly developing and ever-changing requirements. Comments did, however, make it clear that there were significant administrative impacts and costs associated with these efforts.

- *Technical* issues encountered as well as ideas discussed in the comments highlight the need to simplify the submission process and ensure federal systems are better able to handle such complex and frequently changing reporting requirements. Ensuring that requirements are harmonized throughout the federal agencies and at all levels within agencies was a key point in these responses.

- Comments regarding *external factors* addressed the lack of allocation of federal funds to help defray administrative costs associated with reporting, increasing the 26% administrative cap of negotiated F&A agreements, and allowing direct charging to enable and sustain additional reporting. The unfunded administrative burden of these requirements was evident in a significant number of respondents' comments.

Appendix 1: Institutions Completing the Survey

1. Arizona State University
2. Boston University
3. Bradley University
4. Brown University
5. California Institute of Technology
6. California State University, Sacramento
7. Charles Drew University of Medicine and Science
8. Children's Hospital of Philadelphia
9. Columbia University
10. Dana Farber Cancer Institute
11. Dartmouth College
12. Duke University
13. Emory University
14. Feinstein Institute for Medical Research
15. Florida Atlantic University
16. Florida International University
17. Florida State University
18. Geisinger Health System
19. George Mason University
20. Georgia Institute of Technology
21. Harvard University
22. Indiana University
23. Institute for Systems Biology
24. Iowa State University
25. Jackson Laboratory
26. Kent State University
27. Massachusetts Institute of Technology
28. Medical College of Georgia
29. Medical University of South Carolina
30. Michigan State University
31. Michigan Technological University
32. Mississippi State University
33. Morgan State University
34. Nevada System of Higher Education
35. New York University, Washington Square
36. Northeastern University
37. Northwestern University
38. Ohio State University
39. Oregon Health & Science University
40. Partners Healthcare Systems
41. Pennsylvania State University
42. Purdue University
43. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
44. Research Foundation for the State University of New York
45. Rockefeller University
46. Schepens Eye Research Institute
47. Southern Illinois University Edwardsville
48. St. Jude Children's Research Hospital
49. Stanford University
50. Syracuse University
51. Temple University
52. Texas A&M Research Foundation
53. Texas Engineering Experiment Station
54. University of Alabama
55. University of Alabama, Birmingham
56. University of Alaska, Fairbanks
57. University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences
58. University of California, Div. of Agriculture & Natural Resources
59. University of California, Los Angeles
60. University of California, San Francisco
61. University of California, Santa Barbara
62. University of California, Merced
63. University of Central Florida
64. University of Chicago
65. University of Delaware
66. University of Florida
67. University of Georgia
68. University of Hawaii
69. University of Illinois at Chicago
70. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
71. University of Iowa
72. University of Kansas
73. University of Kentucky
74. University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science
75. University of Maryland
76. University of Miami
77. University of Michigan
78. University of Minnesota
79. University of Missouri, Columbia
80. University of Nebraska
81. University of New Mexico
82. University of North Carolina Wilmington
83. University of North Dakota
84. University of North Texas
85. University of Notre Dame
86. University of Oklahoma
87. University of Pennsylvania
88. University of Rochester
89. University of South Alabama
90. University of South Florida
91. University of Southern California
92. University of Texas Health Science Center, Houston
93. University of Texas, Austin
94. University of Texas, San Antonio
95. University of Virginia
96. University of Washington
97. University of Wisconsin, Madison
98. Vanderbilt University
99. Washington University
100. Wayne State University

Appendix 2: The Survey

FDP ARRA Administrative Impact Survey

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding has provided an unprecedented opportunity for our faculty to receive funding for critical initiatives and novel research areas – an opportunity for which we have all been very appreciative.   ARRA has, of course, also been accompanied by novel administrative requirements.   The purpose of this survey is to document the impact <u>administratively</u> of ARRA on each of our organizations – ranging from the resources needed to track and understand the new ARRA requirements to the amount of time, money and effort needed to ensure that our institutions are compliant with quarterly reporting and other ARRA obligations.

The outcome of this survey is expected to allow the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) to be able to report to the national research administration community a sense of the administrative resources expended thus far, and to position the FDP to be able to extrapolate what it might cost organizations should the ARRA reporting requirements become required at some future time for all federal grants and contracts.   Your assistance in the thoughtful and careful completion of this survey will be of great value. We thank you in advance for your participation in this important initiative.   Please note that while we may release the names of all organizations that have completed this survey, the results for any individual organization will not be released.

Please enter your organization information:

Organization Name:	
Person completing survey:	
Title:	
Phone #:	
Email:	

What is your organization's fiscal year? *(mm/dd)* __ /__ - __ /__

Does your organization include a medical school? ○ Yes ○ No

Is your organization a member of? *(Please select all that apply)*   ○   FDP   ○   AASCU   ○   Not Sure

1.   **Please complete the following related to the ARRA funding to your organization:**

	# of Awards	Total Dollar Value
Cumulative **prime** ARRA awards obligated to your organization as of 9/30/2010? (whether or not still active)		
Cumulative **pass-through/incoming 1st tier** ARRA subawards obligated to your organization as of 9/30/2010? (whether or not still active)		
Cumulative **outgoing subawards** under ARRA awards obligated to your organization as of 9/30/2010? (whether or not still active)		
Cumulative **outgoing vendor agreements** requiring individual ARRA reporting, obligated as of 9/30/2010 (whether or not still active)		

2. **How many FTE did your organization ADD specifically to assist with managing ARRA activities?**
   Example: If your organization added 1 FTE to assist with quarterly reporting for the 3 years, please add this FTE in each of the FY columns.
   - *If your organization reallocated existing FTE to support ARRA, provide information about these FTE in question 4.*
   - *If your organization utilized overtime of existing resources to support ARRA, provide this information in question 6.*
   - *If you are not able to break out the information by type of activity, please list your information in the total area only.*

Type of Activity	# of FTE			
	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12 and Beyond
Preparation time (Review of guidance, development of internal policies and procedures, internal funding opportunity communication/dissemination, etc.)				
Proposal submission				
Award processing				
Letter of Credit Draw				
Collection of outgoing subrecipient or vendor reporting information				
Quarterly reporting (including subrecipient and vendor reporting)				
Post quarterly reporting corrections				
Training				
Design and construction of automated system(s)				
Preparation and involvement with local or federal audits				
Other (IRB, IACUC, compliance, etc.)				
TOTAL				

Do these figures include   ____   Central office(s)
(Select all that apply)   ____   Collegiate or department (distributed)
                                          ____   Other, Please specify   _____

4. **What was the combined salary and fringe benefit cost (actual or estimated) associated with these added FTE?**
   (Please provide this information related to question 2. If you are unable to break out the information by type of activity, please list your information in the total area only)

Type of Activity	Costs of FTE			
	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12 and Beyond
Preparation time (Review of guidance, development of internal policies and procedures, etc.)				
Proposal submission				
Award processing				
Letter of Credit Draw				
Collection of outgoing subrecipient or vendor reporting information				
Quarterly reporting (including subrecipient and vendor reporting)				
Post quarterly reporting corrections				
Training				
Design and construction of automated				

system(s)				
Preparation and involvement with local or federal audits				
Other (IRB, IACUC, compliance, etc.)				
TOTAL				

10. **If you reallocated FTE from other duties to manage ARRA activities, please quantify these FTE below. It is recognized that an estimate may be required; please use your best available internal information to derive these numbers.**
(If you are not able to break out the information by type of activity, please list your information in the total area only)

	# of FTE			
Type of Activity	**FY09**	**FY10**	**FY11**	**FY12 and Beyond**
Preparation time (Review of guidance, development of internal policies and procedures, etc.)				
Proposal submission				
Award processing				
Letter of Credit Draw				
Collection of outgoing subrecipient or vendor reporting information				
Quarterly reporting (including subrecipient and vendor reporting)				
Post quarterly reporting corrections				
Training				
Design and construction of automated system(s)				
Preparation and involvement with local or federal audits				
Other (IRB, IACUC, compliance, etc.)				
TOTAL				

11. **What was the combined salary and fringe benefit cost (actual or estimated) associated with these reallocated FTE (not counting overtime or bonus pay)?**
(Please provide this information related to question 4. If you are not able to break out the information by type of activity, please list your information in the total area)

	Costs of FTE			
Type of Activity	**FY09**	**FY10**	**FY11**	**FY12 and Beyond**
Preparation time (Review of guidance, development of internal policies and procedures, etc.)				
Proposal submission				
Award processing				
Letter of Credit Draw				
Collection of outgoing subrecipient or vendor reporting information				
Quarterly reporting (including subrecipient and vendor reporting)				
Post quarterly reporting corrections				
Training				
Design and construction of automated system(s)				
Preparation and involvement with local or				

federal audits				
Other (IRB, IACUC, compliance, etc.)				
TOTAL				

12. **If your organization utilized overtime to manage ARRA activities, please quantify these FTE below. It is recognized that an estimate may be required; please use your best available internal information to derive these numbers. Please include paid or unpaid "overtime" hours as a percentage of total FTE based on the person's typical work week. If no typical work week exists, use 40 hours as a full-time equivalent. In other words, a person working a typical 50 hour work week who devoted 25 hours of additional time would be shown as .5 FTE for overtime effort.** *(Please provide this information related to question 4. If you are not able to break out the information by type of activity, please list your information in the total area only)*

	# of FTE			
Type of Activity	**FY09**	**FY10**	**FY11**	**FY12 and Beyond**
Preparation time (Review of guidance, development of internal policies and procedures, etc.)				
Proposal submission				
Award processing				
Letter of Credit Draw				
Collection of outgoing subrecipient or vendor reporting information				
Quarterly reporting (including subrecipient and vendor reporting)				
Post quarterly reporting corrections				
Training				
Design and construction of automated system(s)				
Preparation and involvement with local or federal audits				
Other (IRB, IACUC, compliance, etc.)				
TOTAL				

7. **Of the FTE listed in Question 6, what percentage of these FTE received paid overtime? ___%**

8. **If your organization utilized overtime or bonus payment of existing staff to support ARRA activities, what was the combined salary and fringe benefit cost (actual or estimated) or the bonus amount?** *(Please provide this information related to question 4. If you are not able to break out the information by type of activity, please list your information in the total area)*

	Costs of FTE			
Type of Activity	**FY09**	**FY10**	**FY11**	**FY12 and Beyond**
Preparation time (Review of guidance, development of internal policies and procedures, etc.)				
Proposal submission				
Award processing				
Letter of Credit Draw				
Collection of outgoing subrecipient or vendor reporting information				
Quarterly reporting (including subrecipient and vendor reporting)				
Post quarterly reporting corrections				
Training				
Design and construction of automated				

system(s)				
Preparation and involvement with local or federal audits				
Other (IRB, IACUC, compliance, etc.)				
TOTAL				

9. **Were there activities not able to be performed by your organization in the same manner as prior to ARRA due to this diversion of duties?**
(Please describe these activities and quantify as much as possible. For example, "the Organization's percentage of on-time financial reports slipped by 10% because central post-award staff were conducting quarterly ARRA reporting" instead of "financial reporting was slowed down.")

10. **How much training time (if conducted) on average, did each of your ARRA-involved individuals receive overall to help them comply with ARRA requirements?**
(Please include time devoted to formal classroom or on-line instruction, plus estimated time used to review web or other distributed materials)

Principal Investigators: ○not offered ○not able to quantify ○< 15 minutes ○15-30 minutes ○31 -59 minutes ○1-2 hours ○> 2 hours
Other Project staff: ○not offered ○not able to quantify ○< 15 minutes ○15-30 minutes ○31 -59 minutes ○1-2 hours ○> 2 hours
Departmental administrators: ○not offered ○not able to quantify ○< 15 minutes ○15-30 minutes ○31 -59 minutes ○1-2 hours ○> 2 hours
Central administrators: ○not offered ○not able to quantify ○< 15 minutes ○15-30 minutes ○31 -59 minutes ○1-2 hours ○> 2 hours

11. **Please estimate what percentage of ARRA-involved individuals took the ARRA related training offered by your institution?**

Principal Investigators: ○don't know ○none ○< 25% ○25-49% ○50-75% ○more than 75%
Other Project staff: ○don't know ○none ○< 25% ○25-49% ○50-75% ○more than 75%
Departmental administrators: ○don't know ○none ○< 25% ○25-49% ○50-75% ○more than 75%
Central administrators: ○don't know ○none ○< 25% ○25-49% ○50-75% ○more than 75%

12. **For each quarterly reporting cycle what is your best estimate of the length of time it takes your administrative staff on average, to create, review and/or validate their section of each quarterly ARRA report:**

Please select the option(s) that best fit the actions required of the Administrators at your institution.

	Create Reports	Review and/or Validate Reports	Not Involved in Either Step	Total Time Estimate (in minutes)
Expenditures	○	○	○	○ 0 – 15 ○ 16 - 30 ○ 31-60 ○ > 60
Jobs	○	○	○	○ 0 – 15 ○ 16 - 30 ○ 31-60 ○ > 60
Progress	○	○	○	○ 0 – 15 ○ 16 - 30 ○ 31-60 ○ > 60

13. **For each quarterly reporting cycle what is your best estimate of the length of time it takes your PI's (on average) to create, review and/or validate their section of each quarterly ARRA report:**

Please select the option(s) that best fit the actions required of the PI's at your organization.

	Create Reports	Review and/or Validate Reports	Not Involved in Either Step	Total Time Estimate (in minutes)
Expenditures	○	○	○	○ 0 – 15 ○ 16 - 30 ○ 31-60 ○ > 60
Jobs	○	○	○	○ 0 – 15 ○ 16 - 30 ○ 31-60 ○ > 60
Progress	○	○	○	○ 0 – 15 ○ 16 - 30 ○ 31-60 ○ > 60

14. **What reporting method did your organization utilize to submit its ARRA reports?**

   ○ **Excel Spreadsheet Upload**
   ○ **XML Data File Transfer**
   ○ **On-Line Data Entry Via a Web Browser**
   ○ **Other, Please specify _____**

15. **Did your organization delegate reporting responsibilities to its subrecipients?**

   ○ **Yes**
   ○ **No**

16. **For the mandatory quarterly reporting, does your organization report it's ARRA information:**

   ○ **Directly to Federal Government**
   ○ **Directly to State Government, which then reports to the Federal Government**
   ○ **Other, Please specify _____**

17. **Was your organization required to prepare and/or submit ARRA reporting to other entities in addition to its quarterly federal reporting obligations?**
   (Please check all situations that apply to your organization)

   ○ **To State – in same format as Federal reporting requirements**
   ○ **To State – in different format than Federal reporting requirements**
   ○ **To System-wide office – in same format as Federal reporting requirements**
   ○ **To System-wide office – in different format than Federal reporting requirements**
   ○ **Other, Please specify _____**

18. **Did your organization receive ARRA State Stabilization Funds?**

   ○ **Yes**
   ○ **No**

19. **If your organization received ARRA State Stabilization Funds, are there different rules for expending these funds than for other ARRA funds?**

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Not Applicable

20. **How often did your organization utilize the following ARRA guidance mechanisms?**

- ○ **OMB Guidance Documents**   ○ Monthly ○ Quarterly ○ Annually ○ Did not use
- ○ **COGR/FDP FAQ's**   ○ Monthly ○ Quarterly ○ Annually ○ Did not use
- ○ **Agency Provided Guidance**   ○ Monthly ○ Quarterly ○ Annually ○ Did not use
- ○ **FDP ARRA Listserv**   ○ Monthly ○ Quarterly ○ Annually ○ Did not use
- ○ **Other. Please specify** _____
- ○ **Other. Please specify** _____

21. **Below is a list of recommendations to reduce or minimize the administrative impact of the ARRA requirements. Please indicate the level of impact to your organization if each recommendation were adopted.**

Allow bulk upload of ARRA reports   ○Major ○Medium ○Minor ○ Not Important

Ensure that all agencies are defining each data field in an identical way (e.g., special formatting requirements for Grant Numbers, etc.)   ○Major ○Medium ○Minor ○ Not Important

Increase lead time to prepare report by an additional 10 days (e.g., report due 20 days after quarter end instead of 10)   ○Major ○Medium ○Minor ○ Not Important

Increase lead time to prepare report by an additional 20 days (e.g., report due 30 days after quarter end instead of 10)   ○Major ○Medium ○Minor ○ Not Important

Consolidate Letter of Credit draws within each agency   ○Major ○Medium ○Minor ○ Not Important

Pre-populate reporting data that is already known by the federal agencies   ○Major ○Medium ○Minor ○ Not Important

Prohibit delegation of subaward reporting   ○Major ○Medium ○Minor ○ Not Important

Allow delegation of subaward reporting of both expenditures and jobs data   ○Major ○Medium ○Minor ○ Not Important

Other. Please specify recommendations to reduce or minimize the administrative impact of the ARRA requirements, providing an impact assessment of "Major, Medium, Minor, Not Important" for each suggested item.

22. Is there any other information that you would like to share with us related to the ARRA oversight work conducted by your organization?

Thank you for your participation in this survey!