Coeus Replacement Detailed Feedback Review

October 23, 2018
Agenda

➢ Background
  ➢ Focus groups + Timeline
➢ Detailed feedback
➢ Discussion
➢ Online Survey
Coeus at Princeton

Almost 2 decades of usage
Approaching end-of-life
Time to look for a new system
Working with many Princeton groups
Coeus Focus Groups & Survey

Focus Groups
- Held 6/29-9/7
- 21 groups: depts, central administration
- 66 people attending

Online Survey
- 9 respondents
- 3 anonymous replies

21 academic depts or centers & 8 central admin depts
- Attended a group and/or filled out the online form

Included seasoned users & new users

2 faculty members from the Task Force on Administrative Workload in Research
Coeus Focus Group Questions

Coeus Likes

#1 item to be improved

Areas of Improvement

Coeus Dislikes

Lots of consistent feedback

Some mixed feedback
Focus Group Intent

➢ Involve you in the process + use your feedback to:
  ➢ Help create list of requirements for the RFP
  ➢ Prioritize key features
  ➢ Understand what processes can be improved
RFP Pieces

- Central and departmental feedback
- Other requirements from
  - ORPA Director
  - Procurement
  - OIT
  - Me
- 92 functional requirements
- 21 non-functional requirements
- 53 open-ended questions
- Several other questions
RFP

- RFP released on 9/26
- 8 vendors invited to respond to the RFP
  - Cayuse, Click, InfoEd, Kuali, iMedRIS, Key, Polus, Streamlyne
- RFP responses were due 10/17

- Also considering PeopleSoft Proposal
  - University owns PS
  - 2012 analysis: PS Proposal does half of what Coeus does
  - Reanalyze what PS Proposal can do
  - Potential to customize PS
Timeline

➡️ Now:
   ➡️ Reviewing RFP responses
   ➡️ Reaching out to other schools
       ➡️ Products they use including PS Proposal
   ➡️ PS Proposal discovery

➡️ November/December
   ➡️ Shortlist vendors
   ➡️ Invite vendors for onsite demos
   ➡️ PS Proposal review
   ➡️ Sandbox

➡️ December
   ➡️ Select product
   ➡️ Develop SAGIT proposal

➡️ January
   ➡️ Submit SAGIT proposal

➡️ February
   ➡️ SAGIT reviews proposal

➡️ March
   ➡️ Start implementation
Expectations

-New proposal system should:
  - Meet as many requirements as possible
    - No system will meet all requirements
  - Be better than Coeus
    - More efficient
    - Modern
    - Serve Princeton well now and 10-20 years into the future

-Some feedback is process oriented
  - Review systems in context of those processes
  - Software can limit or enable business processes
  - Changing systems is an opportunity reopen questions on business process
Let’s review your feedback!

Just stating the feedback (not making decisions).
We want to make sure we heard you and didn’t miss anything.
General Feedback

▷ General Coeus likes
  ▷ Documentation
  ▷ Help Desk
  ▷ Just a few others...

▷ Many, many dislikes
  ▷ Some dislikes are about Coeus, some about the process

▷ Some neutral feedback
  ▷ “It does what it needs to do”
  ▷ “It’s the only proposal software I’ve ever used”
  ▷ “I know how to use it”

▷ Some “Defenders of Coeus”
  ▷ “I like Coeus!”
  ▷ “I don’t understand why people don’t like Coeus”
  ▷ “Coeus is just misunderstood”
Launching

Coeus
- Java + desktop icon issues

New system
- Shouldn’t need Java to launch
User Interface - Look & Feel

Coeus
▷ Old, ugly, gray screens
▷ Too many icons
▷ Too many fields that aren’t used
▷ Unintuitive

New system
▷ Modern
▷ Unused items should be hidden from view
▷ Key fields prominently displayed
▷ Intuitive
Searching

Coeus

- Love searching by a combination of many fields
- Hate having to use the * as the wildcard

New system

- Want to additionally search by
  - Dollar amount of proposal
  - Sponsor award number (if funded)
- “Contains” search – No wildcards (no * or %)
- Smart Google-like searching “did you mean” or “type ahead”
- Search by keywords – in fields or attachments
Proposal Development

Coeus likes
➤ Copying old proposals in whole or in parts
➤ Defaults home units of PIs
➤ Ability to view submitted proposals
➤ Ability to view all proposal info forever
➤ Allows others to review & edit prior to submission
➤ Recall functionality

New system
➤ Improve ease + increase efficiency
➤ Guided, wizard mode
➤ Sponsor-specific templates
➤ Proposal-type specific templates (simplified view for non-funded)
Proposal Development – New System

- Easy for new users to copy proposals created before dept access was granted
- Proposals should be submitted by sub-dept, as applicable
- Google docs-like collaboration would be ideal
  - More than one person can edit a proposal at a time
  - No proposal locks
Proposal Development - New System

- All investigators + key people should be on one screen
- Verify centers PIs are associated with
- Lead unit should not need to be selected if user has rights in only one unit
- General comments box
- Sponsor deadline date should be mandatory
  - Checkbox for rolling deadline; otherwise deadline date is mandatory
Attachments – New System

- Easier attachment upload
  - Drag and drop or select multiple files at one time instead of uploading one-by-one

- Group attachments by type
  - e.g. all subaward attachments should be grouped together

- Recommendation from faculty members on the Task Force on Administrative Workload in Research committee
  - Ability to submit most of the proposal for internal review and approval by dept/ORPA first and then submit the science at the last minute
New Sponsors – New System

➤ Instead of emailing coeus_help:
  ➤ Ability to add new sponsors
  ➤ Web form to submit new sponsors
**Split Feedback: PI Cert**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should be electronic &amp; inside the system</th>
<th>Paper needs to be an option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• It’s 2018</td>
<td>• PI will not use electronic system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some PIs do not want to sign paper forms</td>
<td>• PI needs help logging onto electronic system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Paper holds up the process</td>
<td>• PI cannot navigate electronic system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If a PI has to sign electronically, it will hold up the process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests the new system should be able to handle a hybrid approach.
Institutional questions - New System

- Institutional questions (YNQ) should be “smart” or “branching”
  - If an answer is yes, then follow-up questions are displayed; otherwise system displays the next question
- Easy way to update and version institutional questions and PI cert questions
- PIs should sign the answers to institutional questions
# Split Feedback: Budget

## Love Coeus Budget
- Auto calculates OH, EB & inflation
- Generates the out years
- Like having the option to use the “red baron” or enter the sponsor cost directly on the line item
- Ability to copy period 1 or all years of a budget and have multiple budget versions
- Coeus is “always right”
- QA check

## Hate Coeus Budget
- Too detailed
- Too difficult
- Hate the “red baron”
- Hard to match Excel budget or sponsor budget templates
- Coeus calculates to the penny; prefer rounded amounts
- Too much duplicate data entry
- PI wants to create or tweak budget in Excel
- Prefer to upload Excel
- Budget should be more like Excel
Budget – New System

- Budget should be displayed + changed in a more cohesive way
- OH, EB, and inflation rate should be more visible and easier to adjust

- Ability to turn off inflation entirely
- Ability to select inflation by budget year instead of FY or vice versa.
- Underrecovery should not be calculated or displayed
Budget – New System

Excel
  - Excel-like data entry in the system
  - Use an Excel template outside the system and upload into the system instead of building the budget in the system
  - Upload Excel budget into system which would fill out budget in the system automatically

- Budget template inside the system instead of selecting budget items
Budget – New System

➤ Export to Excel
  ➤ Preferably with formulas embedded

➤ Export to PDF
  ➤ In summary and detailed formats

➤ Calculations printed on reports and displayed in system
  ➤ Items excluded from the OH base
  ➤ OH base, rate and amount
  ➤ How benefits were calculated
Budget – New System

» Easy removal of unwanted periods or budget items after generation of out years
» Effort should be recorded in the proposal system
» Ability to specify quantity for grad student salary and tuition
  » System automatically calculates the cost based on the current grad student salary and tuition rates
» Personnel salaries should feed from PS HCM
Budget – Proposal Hierarchy

Coeus dislike

• Too time consuming
• Too clunky

New system

• One proposal # with multiple, linked budgets inside
• Or, ability to adjust OH rate by the line item in each budget period
Budget – Cost Sharing

- Cost sharing is a nightmare
  - Entry, display, and distribution of cost sharing too cumbersome
- Hate cost sharing forms
- Cost sharing budgets should be separate from the sponsor budget
- Checkbox for OH calculation on cost sharing
  - Coeus always calculates cost sharing OH even if sponsor does not allow it
Export Control

- PIs don’t understand export control
- Export control definitions are not specific enough + don’t cover the nuances of “equipment” and “shipping”
- Want a checkbox for export control budget items at the proposal stage
## Split Feedback: s2s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please bring s2s back</th>
<th>Never using s2s again</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• It made submission easier</td>
<td>• Clunky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced duplicate data entry</td>
<td>• Didn’t check all sponsor rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Too stressful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NIH Assist &amp; GG Workspace are better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
s2s

- s2s has to be more intuitive, less error prone, and less clunky
- Has to validate against sponsor-specific rules before internal routing
- It has to print all of the attachments
- The attachments have to be in order
- Has to be less stressful to use on deadline day
Notifications

More control over notifications

- Coeus sends too many notifications
- Internal rejections--too many people are notified
  - Prefer GCA “pre-review” to ensure proposal is not internally rejected
- Chairs/Directors do not want to receive Coeus proposal email and do not want to approve proposals
  - Most delegate this responsibility
- Central users only want certain notifications
  - CEFR: only wants industry, foundation notifications and only when the proposal has been approved by ORPA, not when it is initially routed
Analytics/Reporting/Queries/Dashboards

Need a modern, user friendly, visual way to easily review current proposal workload

- Proposals waiting to be routed
- Proposals awaiting your approval, your dept’s approval, or a collaborating dept’s approval
- Proposals stuck in the system + how long
Analytics/Reporting/Queries/Dashboards

- Ability to see their own stats & their dept’s stats
  - Number of proposals you personally submitted in certain timeframes
  - Number of proposals your dept submitted in specific timeframes

- Great reporting & query capabilities
  - Easily run canned reports and export them to Excel and/or PDF for distribution
  - Create and run ad-hoc reports and queries yourself
  - Reports in sponsor formats (e.g. NIH, NSF)
  - Print the entire proposal as a PDF
Persona-Based Views

- Want views customized to your job function or responsibility
  - CEFR: view only proposals that involve industry or foundations; seeing dollar amounts
  - GCAs: view only proposals that need their review or those of other GCAs they are covering
  - Two PI views:
    - simplified PI view for PIs who want the big picture
    - detailed PI view for PIs who want granular detail
  - SRA: Only wants to see funded proposals
  - RIA: Only wants to see proposals that have protocols; search by proposals associated with particular protocol types
  - Export Control: only see proposals that have export control information
- Or, for all groups: a way to search on proposals that they are interested in (e.g. only has protocols, only has export controls, only are funded)
- Simplified views for approvals on mobile approvals
Proposal IDs

- All users expressed there are too many proposal IDs
  - Dept: uses Proposal Development #
  - ORPA: uses Institute Proposal #
  - When a submitted proposal needs to be revised (for budget, congruency, etc) the original PD # is copied. The copy gets a new PD #
  - That PD # is linked to the existing IP #
  - Too complicated and too confusing.
    - Sometimes the wrong PD is linked to an IP which is difficult to correct in the database.
  - Prefer one proposal #.
    - If changes need to be made to the existing #, the same # should be retained. The changes should be tracked as a new version of that one number.
    - Originally submitted proposal budget needs to be retained for reporting purposes.
Proposal statuses

- There are too many statuses
  - PD terminal status: Submitted
  - IP terminal status: Declined or Funded
  - Want one status for the proposal overall

- Abandoned proposals
  - Proposal submitted into routing but will never be submitted to sponsor
  - Need way to change the status of these proposals to “abandoned”
Integration

› Miss having proposals and awards in one system
› Want better integration with other systems
  › RIA, FCOI & Prime
  › Want to see key pieces of information from other systems in the new proposal system
    › ...without leaving the new proposal system
    › View RIA protocol information without leaving the proposal system
    › View sponsor award documents, PS Award IDs, PS Project IDs and Sponsor Award Number without leaving the proposal system
› Want to see all proposals & their budgets linked to one award
  › Example: new award + 2 supplements are funding an award
  › Want to see the sum of all those proposal budgets
Awarded Proposals

› Need better congruency review process that does not involve copying their original proposal, uploading the congruency letter, and routing it again
Awarded Proposals

▸ Want more control over how proposals that are awarded for less than the original proposed amount are handled
  ▸ Some proposals are prorated to match the budgets
  ▸ Others are redone in Coeus budget to match the awarded amount + rerouted as preaward revision
  ▸ Some budgets are in Excel spreadsheets (instead of going back to Coeus)
Subawards

Dept wants more streamlined subaward process
  Dept uploads subaward docs at proposal stage
  Dept has to send all subaward docs in a separate email at the award stage

Depts would like a subaward email template to send to subawardees to collect the needed information at proposal stage
Declined Proposals

Dept users would like to mark proposals as declined by themselves as they hear from the sponsor
  - Only ORPA marks proposals as declined now

System should batch decline proposals where no sponsor response is received after a configurable timeframe
  - e.g. 2 years
Current and Pending

- Declined proposals are on the Current and Pending too long
- Pending section should include proposal type
- Effort should print
- Discretionary funds should print
- Need an option to exclude expired awards
- Current section should include direct costs
Pre-Prime Award + Subaward
Pre-eRIA IRB

Central and Dept users still look up pre-Prime award and subaward info
- Not every award + subaward was converted to PS at Prime go-live
- For converted awards + subawards, attachments were not moved into Prime

RIA users still look up pre-eRIA IRB info
- Not every protocol was converted to InfoEd at eRIA go-live
Princeton Process Questions for the New System

› Is there a better process for congruency review?
› Should PIs sign the institutional questions in addition to the PI Cert?
› Should signing the institutional questions and PI Cert have a hybrid paper and electronic approach?
› What is the best way to handle entering budgets in the system? By spreadsheet upload or by detailed data entry? How detailed?
› Should salaries feed from PS HR to the proposal budget?
› Should effort be recorded in the proposal system?
Princeton Process Questions for the New System

▶ Is there a better process for cost sharing?
▶ Should s2s be used with the new system?
▶ How many and what kinds of notifications should the system send?
▶ What is the best way to update proposal budgets for proposals awarded for less than the proposed amount without losing the history of the original proposed amount (which is important for reporting purposes)?
▶ Should dept users be able to mark proposals as declined?
▶ How can subaward process be streamlined?
▶ What to do with pre-Prime award + subaward and pre-eRIA IRB info?
Thank you for your feedback!
Naming Suggestions

What should the Coeus Replacement Project and Coeus successor be called?

- Submit your suggestions via the Online Survey!
- We’ll collect suggestions and review them
- First suggestion
  - TRAX: Tiger Research Administration eXcellence
Discussion & Online Survey

› Discussion
› Slides on the Coeus Home Page
› Online Survey
Discussion

▷ Is there any piece of feedback we missed?
  ▷ Or maybe something you thought of after the focus group?

▷ Is there anything you feel was misstated?

▷ How can we best engage the community with demos and sandboxes?

▷ Anything else you’d like to mention?

▷ Naming Suggestions
Online Survey

› To be released this afternoon
Thank you!