University Faculty Council Meeting Minutes
October 16th, 2018
3:15 - 5:00 p.m.
Jones Room, Woodruff Library

Attended: Douglas Ander, Henry Bayerle, Sarah Blake, Kevin Crowley, Andreas Fitz, Margaret Fleming, Sandra Garraway, Adam Glynn, Jason Hockenberry, Octavian Ioachimescu, Peng Jin, Laura Kimble, Michelle Lampl, Joel LeMon, Ulemu Luhanga, Nicole Morris, Giacomo Negro, Ellen Ott Marshall, John Petros, Nichole Powell, Ani Satz, Jason Schneider, Kendall Soulen, Juliette Stapanian Apkarian, Janice Withycombe

Excused Absences: Carla Berg

Unexcused Absences: Amy Chen, Mathew Klopman, Ruth Parker, Astrid Prinz, Marilynne McKay

Ex Officio Absences: Robert Craig Castellino, Hashem Dezhbakhsh, Elizabeth Downes, Noel Erskine, Jason Hockenberry, Kimberly Jacob Arriola, Andrea Joyner, Jim Nagy, Ruth Parker, Aryeh Stein, Leslie Taylor

Ex-Officio Administration Absences: Timothy Holbrook, Dwight A. McBride, Claire E. Sterk

Guests/Visitors/Correspondents: Kimber Williams

I. Council Meeting Call to Order - The September Faculty Council Meeting was called to order at 3:17 p.m.

II. Presentation on Master Planning Process by Senior Director of Operations for Business and Administration David Payne
Given that most of the Faculty Council members saw the Master Planning presentation given by Robin Morey at the University Senate Meeting, the presentation was geared towards updates and answering the questions of Faculty Council members. To review, the Master Plan is one of the pillars that supports the Strategic Plan. The Office of the EVP for Business and Administration has begun to focus on broad engagement across campus through over 30 engagement sessions and four town halls. The Master Planning survey also has been extended through October. The survey will give a sense of patterns on campus (e.g. dining, transportation, studying, location of the heart of campus). They have an additional website where everyone (faculty students, staff, and the surrounding community) can provide fuller commentary and where events are listed.

They will be launching three primary Faculty Advisory Committees: Faculty Experience (Tim Holbrook & Henry Bayerle), Student Experience (David Clark & Pam Scully), Research Innovation (Deb Bruner & Christa Acampora). Each committee has about 10-12 faculty members representing the different schools and will start meeting in November. Robin Morey or David Payne will return at least once a semester to provide updates (most likely February).

Questions, Comments, and Concerns:

1. The MARTA/Clifton Corridor project is being built into the Master Plan. They are thinking creatively about the funding gap, and all funding may not end up coming from Emory.
2. The survey will be reviewing access to essentials like food for those who are farthest out from central parts of campus. It is intended to recognize that the "heart" of campus may be multiple hubs, depending on who you are and what you do.
3. Member encouraged Payne and Morey to consider Universal Design not only in terms of building space but also the general layout of the campus - Sturm College of Law is a good example. Payne and Morey acknowledge that they have received this feedback from multiple channels and are looking into making it a standard for the University.

III. Overview of Research Administration Services (RAS) - Jason Schneider

A few years back Price Waterhouse Cooper suggested that Emory have a more unified research structure, and so in 2013, RAS was launched. It took until 2016 for all units to be included, but immediately there were issues with customer service, administration and relationships between RAS staff and faculty. Therefore, in January 2016, UFC formed the RAS Task Force to investigate these problems. The Task Force presented its Final Report, which included seven specific recommendations in September of 2016. In March of 2018, the Provost's RAS Improvement Study Working Group (ISWG) also released a report. The question of Dual Reporting Lines was to be addressed by EVP leadership, while all others concerns/recommendations were tracked by RAS Task Force and by another body that was convened. Since April 2018, UFC has been waiting for additional responses and action plans from senior leadership

When the Provost came to UFC in April, he announced plans to hire a consulting firm to see how the concerns brought up by UFC and others could be addressed (taking the RAS Task Force Report into consideration). Since that time, Deb Bruner was appointed Senior Vice President of Research.

Questions, Comments, and Concerns:

1. How was dual reporting going to be different from what came before?
   - Dual Reporting was designed to report to both RAS Central and individual schools that pay for RAS. When the Task Force spoke with school administrators, it was determined to keep Dual Reporting but add that HR reporting should be done within the individual schools versus RAS Central. There is a total of nine individual RAS units, two of them span schools, and the rest serve departments within schools.

IV. Update on Research Administration Services - Todd Sherer and Deb Bruner

Deb Bruner Remarks: Deb was on the original RAS Task Force and therefore is aware of the points of pain of RAS and the difficulties faculty face with RAS. The McKenzie evaluators seemed to

really listen to faculty and the RAS Task Force. Simultaneously, RAS became the focal point for lots of faculty issues that were not actually RAS issues. Please, keep this in mind when reading the McKenzie report. Major takeaways: - Emory has a systems problem (as opposed to people problem – most people like their RAS administrators). She is focused on helping to resolve faculty pains while keeping in mind that RAS administration just went through restructuring. She asks for patience in this restructuring process. The office will be having many meetings about what is the mission of RAS at Emory. She wants Emory to be (like Amazon) a Premier world customer-centric research support service. Therefore, faculty will be engaged in ways never done before. Faculty at all levels of the university will be involved in the shaping of the future of RAS. Deb will be continuing her own research and therefore using RAS services. Faculty should feel comfortable emailing Deb with RAS issues. A better system for logging complaints is needed, and there is much to do but with this position. Emory has shown the will and desire to deal with these issues. RAS has more resources now, and their goal is to use them wisely with your advice. She is happy to come back next semester to share the office's vision and goals.

Todd Sherer Remarks:
The current RAS plan is at a macro level, and the department is still working on execution of the details. This is the plan as agreed on by EVPs and shared with Sherer in late August. Todd hasn't been a part of the RAS process but has heard quite a bit about issues over last two months.

Five and a half years ago, first RAS units were launched (April 2013), and it took three years for remaining RAS units to be rolled out. Immediately there were complaints. In January 2016, the UFC convened the RAS Task Force, which produced a report with seven recommendations in September of 2016. In March of 2017, Interim Provost Zola created the RAS Improvement Study Working Group that released their report in March 2018. In June of 2018, Provost McBride hired McKinsey to do a RAS study. The plan presented today takes all of the important studies and recommendations into consideration. Emory had $734 million in awards value this year, i.e., Emory is heading towards a billion dollars in awards value.

RAS Successes & Strengths:
- Budget continues to grow
- Most faculty have strong relationships with pre- and post-award staff.
- University post-award compliance has improved.
- Faculty are very engaged in improving research administration.

Ongoing RAS Issues:
- Culture of blame with no end-to-end accountability
- Faculty spend a lot of time on activities that do not require their expertise.
- McKinsey report looked at entire grant life cycle (not just the RAS). Within the entire grant life cycle, there are a lot of inefficiencies.
- Systems are very fragmented, opaque, and difficult to use

Five Areas that Must be Addressed to Improve RAS Functioning:

- Governance - Align groups under a single executive leader accountable for the success of research administration

- Faculty Engagement - Assign faculty to a dedicated RAS single point of contact and increase co-location to deepen personal relationships
- Human Capital - Increase RAS capacity and capabilities to address faculty concerns and improve RAS satisfaction. We know we need more people, and we need to focus on training people.
- Process Improvement - Employ a data-driven approach to streamline the process and foster continuous improvement
- Transparency - Provide transparency and visibility for faculty and staff across the award lifecycle

Ten Actions to Take Going Across These Five Areas:
(Many of these will need to be addressed from multiple angles.)

- Align all research administration offices under a single leader with a proven track record of success
- Establish dual reporting (central RAS, schools) for key RAS personnel and ensure faculty can provide formal feedback into RAS performance reviews
- Provide faculty with a RAS "navigator" to guide them through the end-to-end award process
- Increase co-location for RAS staff to help strengthen personal relationships between faculty and staff
- Increase RAS capacity, leveraging a "tiger team," to improve responsiveness to faculty
- Create and launch a standardized onboarding and training curricula for all RAS staff
- Begin measuring and tracking metrics that matter most to faculty
- Implement high priority process improvements to address major pain points (e.g., sub-award setup, financial reporting)
- Invest in a back-end workflow tool to help staff manage and track proposals through the award lifecycle
- Implement a faculty-facing tool to enable faculty and their team to easily track proposals through the award lifecycle

From Now until December 2018:

- Hire new executive leaders in RAS and ORA
- Hire a strategy and operations "tiger team" to
    - Identify and begin measuring metrics that matter most to faculty
    - Implement high priority process improvements
- Integrate FGC into ORA, aligning all research administration offices under the new VP for Research Administration
- Begin rolling out a new feedback and performance review system for faculty
- Increase co-location of RAS staff in departments
- Pilot navigator model in two to three RAS units
- Begin increasing RAS capacity through the hiring of additional staff

January 2019 and After:

- Tiger team to identify and act on key process improvement opportunities and develop standardized RAS curriculum
- Continue pilot of navigator model and roll-out to additional one to two units
- Invest and roll-out a back-end workflow tool to improve grant tracking and develop a faculty-facing tracking tool

How Faculty Can Engage in the Process:

- If you are in a navigator pilot, work closely with your RAS director to facilitate a smooth transition
- Provide real-time feedback to RAS leadership and your RAS support staff on performance
- Provide annual or bi-annual feedback to RAS managers through a short discussion about your navigator's performance
- Participate in interviews for hiring directors, managers, and navigators in your RAS unit
- Be patient as we roll out these changes and continue to provide feedback on areas that need improvement to your Research Dean or the Office of Research Administration's Faculty Advisory Board

Questions, Comments, and Concerns:
  1. A lot of the focus seems to be on architecture and system components; have you looked at culture of the system?
     - Todd - Breaking down silos is all about changing culture. This means hiring staff that recognize they are in a providing role and checking to see if we are expressing the culture we are looking for in our job descriptions.
  2. Plan seems weighted heavily towards the staff. How does this reduce the amount of time faculty spend on RAS tasks?
     - Todd - We need more people and better trained people. We are working to come up with metrics that matter to you - that help you get your work done. We need to create tools that allow for greater transparency, e.g., a quick answer to where your grant is in the process.
  3. Can you give us any more specific time frame for the execution of some of these activities?
     - Todd - Between now and the end of the calendar year we will hire a Tiger Team, hire RAS units that will pilot the new system, and create a Faculty Advisory Board. Not all of these positions will be filled by the end of the year but some of them should be filled.
  4. Do we have any data about grants faculty do not go after because our system is so messy and difficult?
     - Deb – No but for example we know we do not go after T-32s. It is painful writing a training grant for doctoral and postdoctoral positions, but these are critical to raising Emory to eminence. Northwestern has an office dedicated to T-32s. There is not a lot of reward for the faculty who do T-32s, and it is a lot of work, but they are essential. T-32s are therefore a high priority.
     - Tamara - Anecdotally, there are small grants people in the College were interested in, but when they would be in touch with RAS the process seemed too cumbersome, and they therefore did not apply.
  5. In the meantime, are there specific guidelines we can share with faculty who may be experiencing issues – where do they go?

- Todd - Continue to expect that we should do be doing our jobs. There should be a fast-lane that already exists, but if something becomes a problem then let Todd Sherer know.
- Deb – In IT, you are able to put in a ticket and follow it. In RAS, we have no system like that, but we are looking to create something like it. For example, how will faculty interact with the Advisory Board and feed them issues that will come to the Office of Research Administration (ORA)? Some should come from this body, and the advisory board can bring up issues that can get in to the queue for continuous review. The Advisory Board will review Siloed Operating Procedure (SOP) and ask for real-time methodical reviews of the process to see if the process works for the customer.

6. How or will honoring dual reporting be different? The main power has not gone to individual schools – it now rests with ORA. Concerning not just RAS but the entire grant process – is there any hope to break down siloes, streamline the process? Does it have to be as complex as it is?
- Todd - We will keep it dual. Central RAS and the schools will work together to make hiring and firing decisions. EVPs have made it clear that it is important to keep it dual.

7. Did McKinsey provide analysis of how this will be profitable going forward?
- Deb - Indirect cost recovery is 33% on average. Every research grant costs the University. Universities engage in research because that is our mission. The Return on Investment (ROI) is not financial but intellectual capital.

8. Has an optimal staffing ratio been established?
- Tamara – Over the last six months grants and their staffing needs have been tracked here to see what kind of staff should be provided but do not know what the analysis is.
- Todd – We could benchmark against peers, but each system is different. If we increase the number of RAS staff, the ratio of staff to faculty will go down.
- Deb - We also need to look at the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) and the Institutional Review Board (IRB). We would like to apply supply chain management to ORA and bring in a consultant to help put systems in place across ORA.

9. How will the composition of the Advisory Board be established and when?
- Just put Global Task Force together and went to the Deans
- Have not gotten to how to populate the ORA Advisory Board, but we want input from UFC. We want high users, people from every school at all levels of faculty. We want the positions to be time-limited.

Will be back in April to give a substantive update on ORA.

V. Approval of Consent Agenda - The agenda including the 2018-2019 Faculty Council Roster, Learning Outcomes Committee Roster, Policy Committee Roster, and September 2018 University Faculty Council Meeting Minutes (all available prior to the meeting in the University Faculty Council O365 Group) were approved.

VI. Executive Session - Faculty Council members continued to discuss research administration services. The discussion focused on 1) leadership accountability, 2) broadening the definition of research, and 3) supporting Emory faculty in engaging in scholarship and taking advantage of existing support services, including CFDE and the Office of Sponsored Programs.