Sponsor Projects Administration – ‘AS IS’
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Please Read First: The issues and pain points identified during the As Is Process Mapping workshop and the Analysis workshop are noted below. The Issue is numbered and its Root Cause Analysis is in red text, preceded by RCA prefix.

1. There isn’t a standard process to submit an ‘intent’
   
   RCA: Departments are allowed to call or email their intent

2. There are several handoffs during the process
   
   RCA: Majority of the process is a manual paper process

3. Information is not stored in the Banner sources system. Has the team investigated Banner Supplemental Data store field option.
   
   RCA: Banner does not allow for free text field.

4. Banner data does not reconcile with the award/project periods
   
   RCA: UofM Business Process and current Banner set-up

5. Break down in communications between Principle Investigator and departmental staff
   
   RCA: Process and procedures are not well defined

6. Approvers do not review the details and just rubber stamp approval
   
   RCA: Approvers aren’t being held accountable

7. Departments continue to use old copies of the form
   
   RCA: Forms are not being returned and require the departments to use correct form

8. Departments do not administer their grants accurately/effectively
   
   RCA: Staff turn over and lack of training available

9. Data entry is duplicated throughout the process by various departments
   
   RCA: There isn’t a research software used by the campus

10. Process does not identify partners
    
    RCA: There isn’t a research software

11. Process does not provide milestone updates
    
    RCA: Process is manual

12. Process does validate compliance
    
    RCA: There isn’t a research software

13. Accurate reporting/data extraction
    
    RCA: Not all the data needed is stored in Banner

14. Notifications are manually created
    
    RCA: Process is paper
Analysis of the ‘AS IS’ process

1. Are all roles essential? Yes

2. What is the number of hand-offs? 10

3. Are any steps automated? No

4. What steps can be eliminated or automated? Using a software the entire process can be automated

5. What tasks consume the greatest amount of time? The Sponsored Program Admin responsibilities

6. Does each task add value? No

7. What steps should be added? None

8. Iterations (how many times is process repeated in a timeframe)?

9. Percentage of errors (forms returned, corrected, contacted person for corrections, etc.)

10. % FTE and/or estimate time takes for each key role in the process.

11. Metrics – identify measurable outcomes What do we expect to save (time, manual steps, paper, unnecessary reviews & approvals).
Note: On revisions some departments do not send form back to faculty for signature.

Penultimate Semester: Contact faculty advisor for names of honors students.

Rejected contracts may go to either rep for re-processing.

Consider for Phase 2 implementation - Put on hold if waiting on Confirmation of final semester enrollment.