Texas A&M International University
Annual Institutional Effectiveness Review (AIER)

Date Submitted   January 31, 2008

Assessment Period Covered (2007)

Academic Program/AES Unit Office of Grant Resources

Person(s) Preparing Review   Cristina Hernandez, Director

Provide summary of the last cycle's use of results and changes implemented
Last cycle results were used to establish the 2007-2008 unit's objectives. In addition, results were used to revise the strategic plan for the unit, streamline internal processes, communicate and update the OGR web page, and update the Unit Handbook.

Section I: Planning and Implementation

Institutional Mission

Texas A&M International University, a Member of The Texas A&M University System, prepares students for leadership roles in their chosen profession in an increasingly complex, culturally diverse state, national, and global society … Through instruction, faculty and student research, and public service, Texas A&M International University embodies a strategic point of delivery for well-defined programs and services that improve the quality of life for citizens of the border region, the State of Texas, and national and international communities.

Academic Program or Administrative/Educational Support Unit Mission

The Office of Grant Resources (OGR), a unit within the Office of Graduate Studies and Research supports faculty and staff in securing external funds from public and private agencies. Emphasis is placed on securing external funds to achieve the University's priorities. The OGR supports the contract and grant writing activities of the faculty and staff through all stages of the project - from the initial planning through project completion. We encourage faculty and staff to utilize our web site to pursue their research and grant interests, identify funding sources, and learn more about the proposal submission process.

Identify outcomes and the relationship to Strategic Plan

Outcome 1   ☒ **Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?**
Increase participation of faculty and staff in sponsored research and program projects.

Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 1
Goal 2 Research

Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 1
2.2 Increase externally funded research and scholarship.

Identify methods of assessment to be used
OGR's Proposal Log Report (count/tally)

Indicate when assessment will take place
Annual

Criteria/Benchmark
To increase from 63 to 70 the number of faculty and staff participating in sponsored research and sponsored program projects

_____

Outcome 2   ☒ **Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?**
Increase faculty and staff knowledge of the grant development and grant administration processes.

Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 2
Goal 2 Research

Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 2
2.2 Increase externally funded research and scholarship

Identify methods of assessment to be used
Workshop's Attendance Roster and Workshop's Evaluation Forms

Indicate when assessment will take place
Annual

Criteria/Benchmark
Increase from 154 to 158 the number of faculty and staff participating in grant development and grant administration training.

_____

Outcome 3   ☒ **Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?**
Cultivate relationships with governmental and private funding sources.

Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 3
Goal 2 Research

Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 3
2.2 Increase externally funded research and scholarship

Identify methods of assessment to be used
Matrix - Agency/Organization's Contact Log

Indicate when assessment will take place
Annual

Criteria/Benchmark
Increase from 81 to 90 the number of agency contacts.

When (term/date) was assessment conducted?
Outcome 1
Quarterly (December 2006 to August 2007)

Outcome 2
April 2007

Outcome 3
December 2006, August 2007

What were the results attained (raw data)?
Outcome 1
The data collected indicated that for FY 2006-2007 the number of applications submitted was 62. This figure is lower than the previous fiscal year (90) due to the fact that applications submitted to private sources (unless research related) are not longer handled by the Office of Grant Resources. FY 2005-2006 there were a total of 90 applications submitted of which, 31 applications were submitted to private sources. For FY 2006-2007 only three research related applications were submitted to private sources. Although data gathered may give the appearance that there was a decrease in the amount of submissions, this goal was met. Applications submitted to private sources were counted in last year's numbers and if one were to substract those then there was an increase in submissions from 59 to 62.

Data collected for FY 2006-2007 indicated that the number of PI's submitting proposals for FY 2006-2007 was 43 versus 63 for FY 2005-2006. Again, the change factor is related to the fact that previous year report for this category also included the faculty submitting application to private sources.

For FY 2006-2007 there were a total of 30 projects and/or contract agreements awarded totaling $8,796,229 vs. $7,357,332 for FY 2005-2006. This reflects a 16% increase in the amount of funding received from the previous year. It is important to acknowledge that the FY 2005-2006 awarded funds reflects private funding in the amount of $493,636.

Outcome 2
The data collected indicates that 100 faculty and staff participated in the OGR grant/development training (workshops and one-on-one training). Data also shows that 82 faculty/staff/deans participated in the Grant Administration which included one-on-one monitoring of active grant awards. In addition, at the beginning of the Fall semester, the Grant Development and Grant Administration Handbook was provided to all faculty. OGR staff (3) plus two faculty participated in the NSF training sponsored by NSF in New Mexico, Albuquerque. During FY 2006-2007 a total of 187 faculty/staff/administrator participated in grant development and grant administration training versus 164 for the previous year. This represents a 13 % increase in participation from previous year.

Outcome 3
Data collected shows that 70 Program Officers were contacted during FY 2006-2007. Agency contacts increased by 11.47% from last year's number of 61.

_____

Who (specify names) conducted analysis of data?
Outcome 1
Cristina Hernandez, Director of Grant Resources

Outcome 2
Cristina Hernandez, Director of Grant Resources

Outcome 3
Cristina Hernandez, Director of Grant Resources

_____

When were the results and analysis shared and with whom (department chair, supervisor, staff, external stakeholders)? Submit minutes with data analysis to assessment@tamiu.edu (Please use Minutes Template located on the Project INTEGRATE web page.)
The results and analysis were shared on September 10, 2007 with the following personnel:
Dr. Jeffrey Brown, Dean, Office of Graduate Studies and Research and Dr. Dan R. Jones, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

NOTE: Submit all assessment documentation (i.e., surveys, rubrics, course exams with embedded questions, etc.) to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning.

Use of Results: Indicate whether criteria were met/not met and what changes, if any, have been identified based on the data collected?

Outcome 1
☒ **Met**　☐ **Not Met**
Provide narrative: Although data gathered may give the appearance that there was a decrease in the amount of submissions, this goal was met. Applications submitted to private sources were counted in last years numbers and if one were to substract those then there was an increase in submissions from 59 to 62.

Outcome 2
☒ **Met**　☐ **Not Met**
Provide narrative:

Outcome 3

$\boxtimes$ **Met** $\square$ **Not Met**
Provide narrative:

_____

<u>How have these data-based changes improved your program/unit</u>?
Enter text here

Section III: Programmatic Review

<u>Are resources affected by the changes identified in Section II</u>? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If so, specify the effect(s) using the chart below:

Funding		Physical		Other	
☒	New resources required	☐	New or reallocated space	☐	Primarily faculty/staff time
☒	Reallocation of current funds			☐	University rule/procedure change only
				☐	Other: Enter text here

<u>Provide a narrative description and justification for requested resources (include linkage to Strategic Plan)</u>

Additional resources are needed to support the rapid growth of the Unit and to increase the number of sponsored programs.

1) Operating funds for the OGR Office must be increased to enhance and expand unit activities. Funds are needed in the area of faculty development (grantsmanship) as well as OGR staff development.

2) Additional Personnel are needed to include a compliance officer is needed to support faculty with the programmatic award compliance. Approximately salary - $32,000 with benefits.

2) Increase Travel Funding: It is important to attend professional development workshops as well as to visit federal agencies to cultivate relationships and to discuss possible projects. Approximately $3,000 funds are need to support OGR staff professional development and $3,000 for faculty.

Identify proposed outcomes for the next assessment cycle:
Continuation of present outcome(s) – (Indicate reason for continuation): Continue to increase faculty participation in sponsored programs.
New Outcome(s) – (List outcomes below): Increase the percentage of TAMIU faculty submitting grant proposals by 20%
Modification of present outcome(s) – (Indicate reason for modification): Data has helped to raise the OGR grant development expectations

**** This section to be completed by dean/director/vice-president ****

<u>Are resources requested a priority for the academic program/AES unit?</u>
☐ **Yes**   ☐ **No**
Comments:

Enter text here

If funding, physical or other resources were requested, what is the impact of the budget decisions on the academic program/AES unit?
Enter text here