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• UT Austin’s Research Management System (RMS) will be retired as part of the transition of legacy applications off the mainframe.

• The Office of the Vice President for Research is overseeing the replacement of RMS with an enhanced electronic Research Administration (eRA) system for managing the components of the academic and research enterprise at UT.

• In addition to RMS, the project scope includes replacing the research support applications for managing Electronic Proposal Submissions, IRB, IACUC, and FCOI records with an integrated suite of pre-award and compliance software tools.

• Post-award scope is being deferred until the implementation of Workday financials, and will continue to integrate with existing financial systems.

• A competitive procurement will result in a vendor selection and phased implementation starting in 2019.

• Compliance Scope: IRB, IACUC, FCOI only
• IBC and Animal Ordering/Lab Management to remain on eProtocol and will be reassessed for inclusion after the initial implementation
CONSIDERATIONS

• On premise hosting vs. Software as a Service (SaaS)
• Open source vs. proprietary
• Support for System to System (S2S) submissions
• Continuous delivery of updates/federal compliance
• Built in reporting tools vs. data warehouse (e.g. Tableau)
• User adoption/barriers to entry
• Customization vs. configuration
• “Best in Breed” as opposed to Single Vendor Solution
• Integration with other University systems, including Workday HR and "DEFINE"

Project Approach

PHASE ONE – PLANNING
• Identify available software solutions (preliminary discovery)
• Evaluate business practices for research administration
• Budget planning and modelling development
• Determine project scope
• Identify and engage stakeholders
• Procurement

PHASE TWO – PHASED IMPLEMENTATION

Pre-Award
• Validation and prototyping
• Data migration
• Training

IRB
• Validation and prototyping
• Data migration
• Training

COI
• Validation and prototyping
• Data migration
• Training

IACUC
• Validation and prototyping
• Data migration
• Training

PHASE THREE – SUPPORT
• Ongoing maintenance
• Ongoing training
• Roadmap updates and planning

2018
2019-2020
2021+
Procurment Timeline

RFQ Issued
Sep 6-21
- Six responses to RFQ; two vendors determined to be qualified for RFP:
  - Huron
  - Kuali

RFP Issued
Nov 16 – Dec 7
- Three responses:
  - Huron SaaS
  - Huron Software-only
  - Kuali SaaS

Vendor Demos
Dec 18-20
- Two vendor demos:
  - Huron
  - Kuali

Final Scoring
Jan 4
- Evaluation Team Recommendation:
  - Huron SaaS
Evaluation Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renee Gonzalez</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President for Research &amp; Director</td>
<td>Office of Sponsored Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coreen Davis</td>
<td>Administrative Research Manager</td>
<td>College of Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Gore</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>College of Pharmacy, Department of Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Lyon Gardner</td>
<td>Associate Vice President for Research</td>
<td>Office of the Vice President for Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Stickler</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President for Research &amp; Director</td>
<td>Office of Research Support and Compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Additional support provided by Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) representing University stakeholder groups
RFP Scoring

Proposal 30% + Demo 70% = Final Score 100%

• Scoring for each section is weighted such that the vendor with the highest score for each section receives 100% of the section value:

\[
\left( \frac{\text{vendor score}}{\text{highest vendor score}} \right) \times \text{percentage}
\]
RFP Results

The evaluation team separately scored the Huron software-only proposal with a score of 55.91.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Team Score</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Weighted Final Score</th>
<th>Evaluation Team Score</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Weighted Final Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Proposal Score</td>
<td>56.13*</td>
<td>53.34 - 59.94</td>
<td>24.15</td>
<td>69.74</td>
<td>65.15 - 75.32</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Demo score</td>
<td>69.13</td>
<td>59.97 - 78.68</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>58.12</td>
<td>49.39 - 70.48</td>
<td>58.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Score (out of 100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RFP Results – Demo Scoring Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Team Score</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Evaluation Team Score</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>14.00 - 18.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>10.00 - 16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Proposal and Award Operation</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>18.00 - 24.67</td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td>12.67 - 23.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Compliance Operation</td>
<td>19.31</td>
<td>15.53 - 22.24</td>
<td>17.61</td>
<td>15.88 - 19.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.13</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>58.12</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# eRA Distribution – Peer Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Huron</th>
<th>Kuali</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University, Bloomington</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Award, IRB, IACUC, COI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>IRB, IACUC</td>
<td>Pre-Award, COI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>IRB, IACUC, COI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University, West Lafayette</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Award, IRB, IACUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>IRB, IACUC, COI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Award, IRB, IACUC, COI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan, Ann Arbor</td>
<td>Pre-Award, IRB, IACUC, COI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota, Twin Cities</td>
<td>IRB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>IRB, IACUC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>IRB, IACUC, COI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center</td>
<td>Pre-Award, IACUC, COI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>Pre-Award, IRB, COI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>Pre-Award, IRB, IACUC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland, College Park and Baltimore</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Award</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### High-Level Solution Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Huron</th>
<th>Kuali</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source Code</strong></td>
<td>Proprietary; Software-only Model Includes SDK</td>
<td>Open Source/Open License</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>User Experience</strong></td>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>Varies Between Modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessibility</strong></td>
<td>Meets WCAG 2.0 Guidelines</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integration Across Modules</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vendor Experience With Workday Integration</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customization</strong></td>
<td>With Software-only Model Only</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>User Community</strong></td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Modules</strong></td>
<td>Safety (IBC), Animal Operations</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hosting</strong></td>
<td>Included With SaaS; Additional Cost For Software-only</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Both solutions meet other minimum EIR requirements outlined in RFP, including security, support, and data exportability.
SaaS vs Software-only

- **SaaS model**
  - Minimal internal IT support needs
  - Always on the latest version of the software
  - Predictable costs
  - Requires that the University has a general willingness to adopt best practices and align business processes with the delivered solutions, without making significant customizations that would prevent upgradability as the solutions evolve and improve

- **Software-only**
  - Extreme flexibility (customization) to match unique business process
  - Control of data
  - Overall lower vendor cost
  - Requires significant internal IT resources

- **SaaS** was the overall recommendation of the RFP evaluation team; however the lack of customization and significant recurring annual costs are drawbacks
Cost
Overall, Huron Solution Best Meets University Requirements

- Preferred solution of evaluation team
- Offers upgrade paths for additional components of the research enterprise (IBC, Animal Ordering)
- Ability to leverage vendor integration experience with Workday HR and Financials
- While Kuali has lower vendor costs, when internal staffing costs are factored in, Huron software-only model is comparable to Kuali

Software-only Model is Preferred Over SaaS

- Huron SaaS was the overall preference of the RFP evaluation team; however the lack of customization and recurring annual costs are significant drawbacks
- Need to confirm that there are no procurement issues with not proceeding with evaluation team’s full recommendation

PI User Experience is Critical to Acceptance

- Solution should not be a barrier to research at UT
- Additional consideration: develop a PI-focused front-end to Huron solution that captures minimal data needed for a proposal

Evaluate Value of On-premise Hosting vs. Vendor Hosting

- While vendor-hosting comes at an additional cost, internal resources will be required to host the software in our own environment
- UT will also be responsible for infrastructure, disaster recovery, and service-level needs (e.g. uptime)