**SOP: Donna Andle presented**

**Goal** – Map current processes for grant-related work

- **To Do** – Create checklists, SOPs, training for new processes – originally the checklists and training were scheduled to be at the beginning, but because of the nature of the work they’ll need to be done after the processes are changed (“we are taking the engine apart, but still flying at the same time”)

**Activities accomplished in the 30-60 day period**

- Good progress on development of checklist for new PI/new funding – show if possible
- Draft of travel presentation
- Continue to map HR process

---

**IFA: Randi Shapiro presented**

**Goal** – Put information about how to do things on internal site

- **To Do** – “we need to use the same language/terms/vocab across groups (admin/faculty)
- There’s a lot of overlap between SOP/IFA – how do we address that?
- SOP is “nuts and bolts”, IFA is translating important information for different stakeholders – IFA is focused on facilitating information flow between staff and faculty

**Activities accomplished in the 30-60 day period**

- Shared Services web review from Med School and Arts and Sciences
  - Realigned the language and approaches (Big Buckets) in determining steps from both the PI and Staff perspective
- Will have presentation from Directors of both Admin Services team - developing questions regarding: metrics, adoption and use by faculty, researchers, staff, most popular features, requirements for training and maintenance
- Reviewed intranet with a focus specifically on layout, functionality, links
- Developed and submitted web pages to Paul Keyes to upload to the Faculty Research section of the intranet; Team, Goals, Reports

- Feedback from Dean: how do we communicate all the information to Faculty; through website, trainings, staff attend cluster meetings to update them on policies, intra net updated and ongoing communication draws the community to use it. How can policy be implemented if there is no consequence for the non-adopters? What are the repercussions for faculty who don’t support the approach? Further discussion is needed on this topic. Could there be a monetary implication; if you follow the protocol things will go smoothly – if not, there will be delays in reimbursement (logical consequences). If faculty understood the process and the rationale they may be more supportive of the activity. Faculty will come to meetings if they understand what tools are available to them.

---

**The Plan – Roberta Hilton presented**

**Goal** – looking for structure to allow more efficient flow

- Focused on the rework arrows
- **To do** – What are financial managers at the research centers doing? What are their jobs like? What’s the purpose of the fiscal role? Do the administrative structures support that?
- The Plan members asked some center directors – what if instead of individual financial managers there was a centralized-ish team? How could it be a more flexible pool/team?
- It would be good/helpful to have a more quantitative image of their work
  - Does a $50k grant require more work than a $10M grant? How do we address that?
  - Develop a 2-page version of each of the significant policies:
    - Travel, HR, Cost-sharing, Honoraria, Food
• Look at research staffing structure/levels at other UW schools/colleges and other Education programs

**Activities accomplished in the 30-60 day period**

- Have identified policy points that need to be addresses; e.g. travel
- Andy interview PI’s about centralized vs decentralized Admin Services team

**NEXT STEPS - Karen Matheson presented**

In the next 30 days each of the work groups will continue to work on the tasks identified during the initial launch. Additionally we will focus on:

**Metrics:**
- staffing based on UW and peer institution review
- establish baseline for future data comparison
- re-assess metrics defined from the initial launch, do they need to be adjusted?

**Tom requested at the 30 day report to prepare the following items for the 60 day report: Leslie will present**

- Recommendations of likely resource needs
- Identify faculty-retreat agenda regarding this project

**Resource Request - Leslie Herrenkohl presented**

In terms of resource needs, we have initially identified allocations of both temporary and permanent funding to implement the recommendations of this group.

1.0 FTE – temporary funding and .5 FTE permanent for technical support for database development, shared services site, and other on-line efficiencies.

2.0 FTE – permanent funding for faculty and fiscal support within the Miller Admin Services team

Dean – the 1.5 temporary positions are clear – we need to support the tech infrastructure. The two permanent positions need further definition in relation to clarifying the two new positions that were created on the faculty research support team. Onboarding of grants is a pain point – can we support that effort with a generalist who can help with project launch(s)? Some discussion about finance tasks and operation tasks – how does that work. Agreed that a pilot might be in order with temporary funds to add personnel that could help with the ongoing tension of project start. Regardless of the size of the grant – they all require PI time that could be better spent focusing on the work of the contract to build in more efficiency. All agree a pilot with temporary funds was the right approach.

**Develop plan for faculty retreat: Carol Davis presented**

- What does this group want to present
- how much time on the agenda
- Overview of what has been accomplished to date:
- Implementation of recommendations from the Budget, Planning and Resources Committee of Faculty Council

Dean discussion: Time has been reserved on the agenda to discuss the work of this group – in a rotating station approach. We may need to renegotiate more time on the agenda with the entire group so we can best use staff time to present on the work of the process improvement team.