

RA service delivery pilot: governance decisions

Report of the governance work group—June 2017

Executive summary

A regional approach to CSS–RA¹ service delivery will be launched as a pilot program in mid–late 2017. In preparation for the pilot’s launch, our work group was asked to identify the governance issues likely to be tested in the pilot, and to recommend decision rights and clear processes for problem escalation and resolution. We identified 19 potential issues, and address five of them in this report:

- Performance management and review for the regional manager
- Decanal differences of opinion about service performance
- Difficult closeouts
- Negotiating budget reductions
- Requests for services or processes outside the current scope

For each issue, we utilized an approach known as RAPID² to identify: who will **recommend** a decision, who needs to **agree**, who will **perform** the work, who should have **input** into the decision, and who will **decide**. Typically, we recommend: (a) broad input, (b) collaborative decision rights (regional manager, regional associate dean, and/or the CSS chief operating officer), and (c) involvement of vice chancellors if/when escalation is needed.³

The RAPID methodology presumes a single decision maker, but our work group often identified two decision makers—reflecting the complexities of our shared governance environment, the campus’ current trust deficit, differing opinions about optimal reporting lines, and a sense that decision–making partnerships are vital to the success of the pilot.

To support the goal of continuous improvement, we also propose a set of evaluation protocols that will enable campus leaders to assess the effectiveness of the RAPIDs and adjust them when warranted.

¹ Campus Shared Services–Research Administration

² RAPID is a tool developed by Bain & Company to clarify decision accountability.

³ Although this decision structure may appear complicated, these RAPIDs were developed for complex decision situations—we anticipate that most operating decisions will be reasonably straightforward, reflecting consensus among the regional manager, the regional associate dean, and/or the CSS chief operating officer.

Operating issues were out of scope for our work—daily operations will be the purview of the regional manager, and the development of operating plans (organizational structure, technology infrastructure, etc.) were assigned to other working groups.

Additional governance issues—whether identified already or arising later—can be addressed using the same RAPID methodology outlined in this report.

1. Background

UC Berkeley is a premier research university, highly rated for the quality and breadth of its research programs and the distinction of its faculty. While there are instances of excellent campus research support, there are also concerns among key stakeholders that research support services have deteriorated due to misaligned organizational structures and processes.⁴

To address these concerns, in Spring 2016 the VCR launched a research administration improvement initiative (RAII). The initiative's goal is to improve UC Berkeley's research support services through three interrelated projects: (1) improving research administration processes end-to-end, (2) improving the campus's organizational culture, and (3) revamping the research administration service delivery model.⁵

The initial step in the service delivery project was the appointment in Fall 2016 of the research administration service delivery (RASD) committee.⁶ The committee recommended exploring a regional approach to CSS-RA service delivery by creating a pilot program to serve the College of Chemistry (CoC) and the L&S division of Mathematical & Physical Sciences (MPS); and, further recommended four working groups to address critical topics prior to launching the pilot:

- Governance
- Faculty-friendly intranet⁷
- PI satisfaction with current service delivery (i.e., a baseline measure)⁸
- Service menu and organizational structure⁹

⁴ These concerns were expressed to the VCR during a series of interviews and focus groups he held during Winter-Spring 2016, and reinforced by results of a survey sent to PIs in February 2017.

⁵ [Progress](#) on all three projects is available on the RAI website

⁶ The RASD committee was empaneled in September 2016, and met in October, November, and December. The committee's membership and charge can be found [here](#).

⁷ Phase II of this project was completed June 1 and a beta version with content should be available to faculty by late July, 2017

⁸ The survey was distributed February 2017; the RAI website hosts the [results](#).

This document is the report of the governance work group (Appendix A). It comprises six sections: background, charge, approach, methodology, recommendations, and next steps. The report also includes eight appendices—perhaps the most salient being Appendices D (RAPID methodology), F (Solomon moments) and H (proposed evaluation processes).

2. Charge to the governance work group

- Identify governance issues to be tested in the pilot
- Define the relative roles and responsibilities of the CSS chief operating officer (COO), the regional associate dean (RAD), the regional manager (RM), and the deans and ORU directors¹⁰
- Recommend decision rights and clear processes for problem escalation/ resolution—including roles for the Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost (EVCP), vice chancellors, deans, CSS COO, RAD, and RM
- Develop a RAPID¹¹ chart—defining who will Recommend, who needs to Agree, who Performs the work, who has Input into the decision, and who Decides—for each of the governance issues to be tested in the pilot

3. Approach

We met five times between March–June 2017. The meeting structure (Appendix B) included pre-work, clear agendas, and facilitation. We benefitted from transparent discussion guidelines (Appendix C), and we used standard methodologies to address our charge (Appendix D) and reach agreement (Appendix E).

We began by anticipating the types of governance issues that might be tested by the regional pilot (Appendix F). We refer to these as “Solomon moments”—thorny situations that require our collective wisdom to resolve justly.

From the initial list of 19 issues, we selected four as most critical to address first¹². For each of these critical issues, we developed a RAPID to illustrate the process by

⁹ Rather than appointing a working group to address services and structure, sponsor Paul Alivisatos instead assigned this work to the CSS COO (Peggy Huston), the regional associate dean for the pilot (Ron Cohen), and the pilot project manager (Heidi Wagner)

¹⁰ This portion of the charge is with respect to governance issues, decisions, and accountabilities—we were not asked to produce job descriptions or related materials.

¹¹ RAPID is a tool to clarify decision accountability, developed by Bain & Company—for an overview see this [HBR article](#); for more detailed descriptions of the RAPID roles see this [Decision Insights](#) paper.

which the issue would be resolved, including any required escalation processes. Pilot leaders can build acceptable solutions to emergent governance problems, building on the principles that guided construction of these RAPIDs.

4. RAPID methodology

The RAPID methodology (Appendix D) is summarized below. RAPID establishes five roles essential to sound decision-making.

The **Recommend** role

- Collaborate with the *Decider* to establish the criteria, required data & information, constraints, etc.
- Gather and synthesize the *Inputs*
- Develop the *Recommendation*
- Should be only one *Recommender*

The **Agree** role

- Ensure consistency with policy, regulation, or law
- Work with *Recommender* to craft an acceptable proposal
- Sign off on key recommendations
- *Agree* role is only required when there are compliance issues to consider

The **Perform** role

- Identify potential implementation issues; ensure the proposal is practical
- Execute the decision
- Handle follow-on decisions
- May be many *Performers*

The **Input** role

- Provide *Input* to the recommendation, based on data, experience, or position
- Provide high quality analytics, logic, and/or influence as appropriate
- May be many people providing *Input*, including from those who *Perform*

The **Decide** role

- Commit the organization to action
- Take responsibility for the *Decision*
- Resolve any impasse in the process
- Should be only one *Decider*; in the unusual case of two *Deciders* the tiebreaking rule should be identified up front

¹² One of the four was later determined to reflect two separate issues; hence, this report presents five total RAPIDs.

Our work group struggled with the notion of a single Decider within the matrixed organizational model the pilot is designed to test. This struggle may reflect:

- The complexities of our shared governance environment—if so, periodic reviews of the RAPIDs may lead to greater understanding and clarity about the tiebreaking rules proposed here
- A campus trust deficit—if so, periodic reviews of the RAPIDs may lead to more limited Decider roles in the future as the campus climate improves
- Differing opinions about the optimal reporting structure for the regional manager (Appendix G)—if so, periodic evaluation of these RAPIDs may inform organizational decisions as the pilot matures and new centers are established
- A sense that the success of the pilot (and subsequent service delivery centers) demands decision-making partnerships: a collaborative, pro-active, mutually respectful partnership between the RAD and the CSS COO; a RAD who serves as the glue between the many stakeholders; and, a RM who both ensures compliance and manages a staff who are viewed by the units as their allies in accomplishing the essential work of the university.

5. Solomon moments and their RAPIDs

In this section we present five Solomon moments—thorny potential governance issues that require collective wisdom to resolve fairly. Working with actual scenarios helped the group talk through various perspectives and consequences, and reach thoughtful and effective recommendations.

For each Solomon moment we provide: (1) a description of the issue, (2) any assumptions that may have informed our thinking, and (3) the RAPID roles and responsibilities for governance of that issue. Proposed evaluation protocols for each RAPID are found in Appendix H.

5a. Performance management and review for the regional manager

Issue: The deans served by a regional unit hold differing opinions about the performance of the regional manager.

- How are differing opinions mediated?
- What are the roles of the deans and the regional associate dean with respect to the performance management and review process for the regional manager?

Assumptions

- The regional manager has solid line reporting to the CSS chief operating officer (COO), and a dotted line to the regional associate dean (RAD)¹³
- The following have critical insights and should provide Input: RAD, deans/chairs (or designees), CAOs/managers (or designees)

RAPID steps, roles and responsibilities

	Recommend	Agree	Perform	Input	Decide
1. Set annual performance goals	Regional associate dean (RAD)				CSS chief operating officer (COO) ¹⁴ RAD
2. Hold ongoing performance conversations (e.g., quarterly or mid-year check-ins)			CSS COO RAD ¹⁵	RAD Deans, chairs, ORU directors ¹⁶ CAOs, department managers	
3. Prepare and deliver formal performance evaluation of regional manager ¹⁷	RAD ¹⁸		CSS COO RAD	Deans, chairs, ORU directors CAOs, department managers CSS/regional staff	CSS COO RAD ¹⁹

¹³ See Appendix G for differing opinions

¹⁴ Responsible for the performance of all regional managers—provides consistency in setting goals and expectations and in evaluating performance.

¹⁵ Optional; if RAD wishes to participate then s/he and CSS COO should discuss in advance.

¹⁶ Only when there is an ORU in the service center

¹⁷ There is no escalation process in this RAPID, because there is none in the performance review process. Employees who disagree with their manager's review are welcome to add comments.

¹⁸ If regional academic leaders hold differing perspectives about the performance of the regional manager, RAD works to align decanal expectations and/or explore the root causes of the differing perspectives.

5b. Decanal difference of opinion about service performance

Issue: The deans served by a region hold differing opinions about whether service level agreements are being met—i.e., about whether the service performance is satisfactory.

- How are decanal expectations established?
- How are differing opinions mediated?
- What is the escalation process if the differing opinions persist?

Assumption

- Service level agreements (SLAs) are standardized across regions to the extent possible, but customized for specific units when necessary.

RAPID steps, roles and responsibilities

	Recommend	Agree	Perform	Input	Decide
1. Develop service level agreement (SLAs) for the pilot	Regional associate dean (RAD) Regional manager (RM)			Deans, chairs, ORU directors CAOs, dept. managers CSS/regional staff	CSS chief operating officer (COO) RAD ²⁰
2. Manage/monitor expectations within units being served			RAD		
3. Monitor/enforce SLAs across regions ²¹			CSS COO		

¹⁹ In case of disagreement, the view of the CSS COO prevails (solid line reporting relationship). If the disagreement is significant—e.g., the RAD’s letter (see Appendix G) is much more or less supportive—or it persists, the matter escalates to the VCA and VCR.

²⁰ Any disagreements at this decision point are resolved by proceeding to Step 5.

²¹ CSS COO and RAD will develop appropriate metrics to monitor SLA outcomes.

	Recommend	Agree	Perform	Input	Decide
4. Mediate/ resolve disagreements as they arise	RAD RM	Functional owner(s) ²²	RAD ²³ Regional manager (RM) ²⁴	Deans RM	CSS COO RAD ²⁵
5. Escalate/ resolve ongoing disagreements	CSS COO	Functional owner(s) [see footnote 6]		RAD Deans RM	VCR -or- VCA

c. Difficult closeout

Issue: A grant’s closeout is not smooth—for example, there is miscommunication by/with the agency personnel, or a no-cost extension request was denied, or CGA finds that the IDC was set up incorrectly, or the subcontractors have not invoiced timely—resulting in a deficit.

- What is the process for identifying process breakdowns? Correcting them?
- Who bears the financial consequences? What is the escalation process for deciding this?
- What needs to be in place so that this does not occur in the future?

Assumptions

- We believe that all campus leaders need to take an institutional perspective (not just a functional perspective)
- We focused on both problem identification/resolution and process improvement.

²² If the subject of a disagreement is a matter of policy or is specific to a policy—e.g., an HR policy, a business policy such as Travel, etc.—dispute resolution may require Agreement by the functional owner of that policy.

²³ If the resolution is implemented with the deans or decanal units

²⁴ Assumes the resolution is implemented with the regional staff. In future, may also be performed by CSS COO if the issue crosses all regions.

²⁵ Any disagreements at this decision point are resolved by proceeding to Step 5.

RAPID steps, roles and responsibilities

	Recommend	Agree	Perform	Input	Decide
1. Gather information from all relevant parties about what happened ^{26,27}			Regional associate dean (RAD) Regional manager (RM)	PI Dept chairs, managers Dean(s), ORU director(s) CSS chief operating officer (COO) &/or CSS-RA CGA SPO	
2. Report findings; ID differences in perspective; work toward a common understanding			RAD		
3. Obtain agreement about financial responsibilities ²⁸				Those identified in step 2 as responsible ²⁹	RAD ³⁰

²⁶ Investigation may uncover issues or recommended actions that apply across regions and suggest changes to standard practices across the board.

²⁷ Input for this step is dependent on the situation; the Input column presents the most likely pool of Input providers.

²⁸ This step presumes an internal escalation process has already occurred. E.g., ideally, the resolution would be between the PI and the RA; if they cannot agree, it would then go to the department chair and the RA manager. Step 2 as written assumes none of those resolution attempts have succeeded.

²⁹ The input required in this step is to agree to agree to “write a check”—i.e., to agree to accept the proposed financial responsibility. If agreement is not obtained, the process moves on to Step 4.

³⁰ The “Decision” in this case is a summary and agreed upon action resulting from the collective wisdom developed in steps 1 and 2.

	Recommend	Agree	Perform	Input	Decide
4. Escalate disputes that remain unresolved ³¹	RAD			Those identified in step 3 as responsible ³²	EVCP and/or VCA and/or VCR ³³
5. Identify and implement process improvements that will avoid the problem in the future ³⁴	RM	CGA or SPO ³⁵	CSS COO ³⁶ and/or RM and/or RA supervisor(s) and/or CGA and/or SPO	PI SPO CGA CSS COO Regional managers group (RMG)	RAD Other process owner(s), if any—e.g.: CSS COO, CGA, SPO, etc.

d. Negotiating budget reductions

Issue: Budget reductions are being required of all campus units

- How will necessary staffing reductions be identified? Who will participate in this decision? Who will decide?
- How does the region coordinate with the decanal units to ensure the cuts they each propose are not misaligned?
- One decanal unit employs staff who are essential to the smooth functioning of the RA processes. The department is asked to take a budget cut and takes some of it by eliminating staff doing this type of work. Who decides whether and how to deploy resources to compensate?

³¹ This step happens only if/when the RAD is unable to broker a satisfactory resolution among responsible parties.

³² The input required in this step is information that will inform the resolution decision.

³³ Applies only if pilot includes ORUs

³⁴ Process improvements identified in this step may apply across regions and suggest changes to standard practices across the board; and/or they may include improvements within related units (such as SPO or CGA).

³⁵ May require CGA or SPO agreement if there are legal or audit constraints

³⁶ Would likely have a Perform role only if the improvement: (a) is to be standardized across regions and/or (b) requires mediation among perspectives/variations among regions

Assumptions

- Budget management and coordination is shared, and the three units involved—two deans and the regional center—are working collaboratively to ensure that a budget cut taken in one department will not adversely impact the service provided to the whole.
- If the cuts to the region (including the units served) will deteriorate to an unmanageable level, the problem will be referred to the EVCP

RAPID steps, roles and responsibilities

	Recommend	Agree	Perform	Input	Decide
1. Budget planners in both the region and the decanal units meet to discuss their preliminary thoughts about how to take their budget cuts—to ensure cuts under consideration are not misaligned ³⁷	Regional manager (RM) CAO			CSS chief operating officer (COO) RM RAD Deans CAOs Regional managers group (RMG)	
2. Regional service center identifies necessary staffing reductions and potential shifts in work or workload	RM	Central Human Resources (CHR) ³⁸	RM RAD	CSS COO RM CAOs or designees ³⁹ Faculty advisory committee (FAC)	RM RAD ⁴⁰

³⁷ The Input at Step 1 is the conversation; the RM and CAO synthesize the input and recommend how to move forward in their respective organizations.

³⁸ Assist with layoff planning and notices—same footnote throughout column

³⁹ In Mathematical & Physical Sciences the CAO is likely to designate or include the department managers

	Recommend	Agree	Perform	Input	Decide
3. Decanal units (or ORUs) identify necessary staffing reductions and potential shifts in work or workload	CAO or designee(s)	CHR	Deans CAOs Department managers	RAD CAOs Department managers	Deans
4. Budget planners in both the region and the decanal units meet again prior to submitting budgets, to ensure budget submissions are not misaligned ⁴¹	RM CAO			CSS COO RM RAD Deans CAOs RMG	
5. If, despite above efforts, budget cuts <i>are</i> misaligned, examine how to ensure service levels remain at minimal acceptable standards. ⁴²	RM		RAD RM	CSS COO RM Deans &/or designees CAOs &/or designees FAC	RAD ⁴³

⁴⁰ In the unlikely event the RM and RAD cannot reach agreement, the RM's view will carry. Should the difference of opinion persist, the RAD can revisit the issue as the Decider in Step 5, and/or include the relevant observation in his/her annual review of the RM.

⁴¹ The Input at Step 4 is the conversation; the RM and CAO synthesize the input and recommend how to move forward in their respective organizations.

⁴² Alternatives might include, e.g., redistribution of staff workloads, changes/improvements to work processes, funds for temporary staffing at peak intervals, retention of all/some of the targeted staff, etc.

⁴³ This Decision reflects the RAD's role as key liaison between the regional service delivery unit and the academic units being served; if the RAD's decision is not acceptable to either or both parties, the issue is escalated to Step 6.

	Recommend	Agree	Perform	Input	Decide
6. Identify, address and mitigate budget cuts that result in deterioration of service levels below minimal acceptable levels.	RAD		RAD RM CAOs	CSS COO RM Deans &/or designees CAOs &/or designees	EVCP and/or VCA

e. Requests for service or process outside the current scope of services

Issue: One regional service delivery unit desires a process or function that is outside the existing scope of services—e.g., they may wish to enlarge the IT function, modify the portal, or include some transactional functions.⁴⁴

- What is the process for vetting these requests?
- Who decides?
- If there is disagreement about the request, how is it adjudicated?

Assumptions (none)

RAPID steps, roles and responsibilities

	Recommend	Agree	Perform	Input	Decide
1. Develop service level agreements (SLAs) for the pilot ⁴⁵	Regional associate dean (RAD) Regional manager (RM)			Deans, Chairs, ORU directors RM CAOs, department managers	CSS chief operating officer (COO) RAD ⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Readers will notice the similarity between this Solomon moment and an earlier one—the earlier moment focused on disagreements about service *performance*, while this moment focuses on disagreements about service *levels* (activities).

⁴⁵ SLAs are standardized across regions to the extent possible, but customized for specific units when necessary.

⁴⁶ Any disagreements at this decision point are resolved by proceeding to Step 5.

	Recommend	Agree	Perform	Input	Decide
2. Manage/monitor expectations within units being served			RAD		
3. Monitor/enforce SLA within the region ⁴⁷			RM		
4. Vet and approve or deny requests for services outside the scope of the SLA.	RM	Legal ⁴⁸	RM Regional staff	Faculty advisory committee (FAC) ⁴⁹ Deans or designees Department managers Regional managers group (RMG) ⁵⁰ CSS COO	RAD CSS COO
5. Escalate SLA issues that remain unresolved	RAD			RMG CSS COO	VCR -or- VCA ⁵¹

6. Next steps

Once endorsed, this report will be shared with those who have responsibilities for executing the RAPIDS. Once enacted, those with evaluation responsibilities will engage in the evaluation protocols identified in Appendix H. Pilot leaders will develop additional RAPIDS as needed—for Solomon moments already identified but not yet “RAPID-ized” and/or for new issues that arise after the pilot is launched.

⁴⁷ CSS COO and RAD will develop appropriate metrics to monitor SLA outcomes—see RAPID 5b.

⁴⁸ If issue warrants it; else, blank.

⁴⁹ Proposed new group, comprising faculty from throughout the region, appointed by the regional deans—needs to be approved/established by sponsor and/or CSS COO + RAD + RM.

⁵⁰ New group comprising the managers of all regional service delivery centers—needs to be approved/established by CSS COO.

⁵¹ Final authority depends on scope of disputed service—e.g., staffing issues might escalate to VCA, while PI/RA issues might escalate to VCR.

Appendix A—participants

Work group members and consulting support

Governance work group

Work group lead: J. Keith Gilles—Dean, College of Natural Resources

Ronald C. Cohen—Associate Dean for Research, College of Chemistry and Division of Mathematical & Physical Sciences

Frances Hellman—Dean, Division of Mathematical & Physical Sciences

Heidi E. Hoffman—Assistant Dean, Finance & Administration, College of Letters & Sciences

Peggy Huston—Chief Operating Officer, Campus Shared Services

Ann Jeffrey—Chief of Staff, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance

Patrick Schlesinger—Assistant Vice Chancellor, Research Administration & Compliance

Suzanne Sutton—Assistant Dean, Finance & Administration, College of Chemistry

Heidi Wagner—Assistant Dean for Administration, School of Social Welfare

Process consultants

Barbara Broque—Director, Organizational Effectiveness & Metrics

Katherine Mitchell—Organization Development Consultant

Appendix B—meeting design

A structured approach to addressing the work

Meeting #1—3/15/17	
Pre-work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work group members met individually with process consultants to: (a) share what they most hoped to accomplish, and (b) identify issues or concerns • Work group members developed a list of likely governance difficulties • Work group lead and consultants finalized meeting agenda
Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of our charge and upcoming work • Tools for effective meetings • Feedback about aspirations and concerns expressed by the participants during the pre-work meetings with consultants • Discussion of Solomon moments • Introduction of the RAPID methodology
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We identified four Solomon moments most critical to address first, and assigned teams to address each using the RAPID methodology

Meeting #2—3/22/17	
Pre-work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teams met to draft RAPID for their assigned Solomon moment • Work group lead and consultants finalized meeting agenda
Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review RAPIDs developed by each team; pose questions; suggest revisions • Use gradients of agreement to determine extent to which we are ready to recommend each RAPID
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We better understood key aspects of the RAPIDs and areas of agreement and disagreement relative to governance issues

Meeting #3—3/30/17	
Pre-work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teams continued to refine their RAPIDs • Work group lead and consultants finalized meeting agenda

Meeting #3—3/30/17	
Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review sponsor guidelines—i.e., what’s in and out of scope for this group • Review RAPIDs with full group [<i>note: we did not get to this agenda item, as discussion of previous item took the full meeting time</i>] • Assess progress toward meeting our charge
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We gained clarity about agreements and disagreements with respect to sponsor’s guidelines, particularly around reporting lines • We developed a preliminary list of items to be included in the final report

Meeting #4—4/24/17	
Pre-work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSS COO, RAD, and consultants discussed co-leadership issues and approaches • Teams met with consultants to further refine RAPIDs • Work group lead and consultants finalized meeting agenda
Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss updated RAPIDs (gallery walk/ poster session) • Assess progress to date • Propose report contents and approach to developing evaluation protocols
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We gained clarity about differences of opinion on Decider roles • We agreed to process for finalizing the RAPIDs, developing the evaluation protocols, and drafting the report

Meeting #5—6/29/17	
Pre-work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership addressed lingering disagreements about reporting lines • RAD and CSS COO addressed remaining concerns • RAD reviewed/discussed proposed changes with RAPID teams • Work group CAOs and consultants reviewed and finalized evaluation protocols • Work group reviewed draft report and provided feedback
Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final gradients of agreement • Final report
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report • Contents for transmittal memo • Celebration!

Appendix C—discussion frameworks

Guiding principles for the work group’s conversations

Rules of the Road—to support open and productive conversations, the work group agreed to:

1. Assume good intentions
2. Listen with the intention to understand
3. Talk openly and respectfully
4. Use the gradients of agreement
5. Consult with others between meetings as needed, but not ascribe positions to people

Pilot project aspirations and guidelines, developed by sponsors VCR Paul Alivisatos and Interim VCAF Scott Bidy, provided a further framework for our conversations

- The pilot will prioritize and support a culture of respect, cooperation, and continuous improvement.
- Faculty will be assigned a primary point of contact on the staff.
- The pilot will explore the scope of an integrated service model.
- The pilot will test a joint-governance, matrix model that encompasses two colleges, the Vice Chancellor for Research and Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance organizations.
- Any proposed movement of staff location during initial phases of pilot must be minimal.
- Budget for operations of the service interface pilot will be consistent with a balanced budget in FY 2020.
- The pilot will test management and service delivery options supporting individual PIs and their teams as well as Department Chairs.

- The pilot is part of an overall strategy that includes improving processes and communication related to research administration.
- A project objective is to develop an administrative structure and service model that can be extended to the full campus. The pilot will test and assess models with this goal in mind.

Appendix D—RAPID methodology

“Great decisions—Not a solo performance”

The RAPID methodology, described in the article that follows, facilitated the work group’s development of clear roles and responsibilities for addressing thorny governance issues.

DECIDE & DELIVER

5

STEPS

to

BREAKTHROUGH

PERFORMANCE

in YOUR

ORGANIZATION



Decision Insights:

Great decisions—Not a solo performance

By Marcia W. Blenko and Jenny Davis-Peccoud

BAIN & COMPANY

Marcia W. Blenko is a partner with Bain & Company and leads the firm's Global Organization practice. Jenny Davis-Peccoud is a practice area senior director for Bain's Global Organization practice.

Copyright © 2011 Bain & Company, Inc. All rights reserved.

Content: Global Editorial

Layout: Global Design

A few years ago, Marcia Blenko and Bain colleague Paul Rogers wrote an article in *Harvard Business Review* called “Who Has the ‘D’?” Its central point: companies that are best at getting things done specify who is responsible for every role in major decisions. Identifying and assigning the key roles—Recommend, Agree, Perform, Input and, of course, Decide—cuts through all the frustrating debates about (for instance) whether finance or a business unit should determine investment levels, and whether marketing or engineering has the final say on a product’s features. The article introduced a decision-rights tool we call RAPID®, which encapsulates all the roles in an easy-to-remember acronym.

But perhaps we should have called the article “Who Has the ‘R’?” or “Who Has the ‘I’?” The reason is that many companies take the original title too literally: they pay close attention to the Decide role but too little attention to the others. As a result, their decision-and-execution processes continue to hit bumps and barriers.

In this article we will try to redress the balance. We’ll look at each of the four supporting roles in detail—what it is, what can go wrong and how to make things right.

The Recommend role

What it is. The R role typically involves 80 percent of the work in a decision. The recommender gathers relevant input and proposes a course of action—sometimes alternative courses, complete with pros and cons. Rs are the quarterbacks of the decision process, coordinating the other roles so that the decision maker’s choices are as clear, simple and timely as possible. If they do their job correctly, R’s will usually see their recommendations accepted by the D.

Getting the R right. Some organizations fail to identify an R, thus forestalling a decision. When one mining company, for example, was expanding into a new region, corporate headquarters was pushing to create an external relations organization to support the new mine. Headquarters assumed the regional vice president (RVP) would develop a recommendation for the new structure. The RVP expected headquarters to do it—after all, it was their idea. The upshot: a big delay, until the responsible executives eventually clarified the R role.

Other organizations have too many recommenders. A media company we worked with

gave all of its editorial units an R on content, which led to recurrent bottlenecks. It solved the problem when it assigned one person to integrate the inputs, set priorities and recommend tradeoffs. Even two Rs is too many. If a business unit prepares a full-scale case recommending an acquisition while finance prepares a recommendation against it, the CEO will have to get to the bottom of both views, and the decision will take longer than it should.

To succeed, a company needs to specify the right recommender for each key decision and ensure that those individuals set decisions up for success. R’s can start by sitting down with decision makers to establish the parameters for the decision, the form of the recommendation and the level of rigor required. They can then clarify decision roles and processes and map out a series of meetings to gather the necessary input and signoffs. A large technology company tries to capture these best practices by arming every R with a checklist of issues to consider, such as “Who should be consulted to develop a complete recommendation?” and “What is the right tradeoff between rigor and speed for the recommendation?”

Great decisions—Not a solo performance

R is for Recommend	
Key responsibilities	Skills and character traits required
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish criteria and required facts upfront • Gather inputs • Synthesize analysis • Develop the recommendation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective process management • Compelling presentation skills • Good listening skills • The ability to assemble multiple viewpoints, do logical analysis, and make tradeoffs • Trusted by the decision maker • Trusted by those offering input

The Input role

What it is. People who offer input into a recommendation provide necessary information and points of view. They help the recommender assess whatever tradeoffs the decision may require. When decisions are based primarily on analytics, people in the I role provide the statistics and interpretations. Another I job is helping to think through the implications of the decision, such as risks and implementation challenges. Note, however, that the I role is strictly advisory. Recommenders should consider all input, but they don't have to reflect every point of view in the final recommendation.

Getting the I right. Ideally, the I group includes everyone with relevant data, expertise or experience. It should also include people who will be responsible for implementation, along with individuals in parts of the organization affected by the decision. Including these folks ensures that downstream issues are considered, thus improving decision quality and speeding buy-in. Serving as an I is a big responsibility, and people in most high-performing organizations earn the right to influence a decision by providing credible, high-quality analytics and logic.

What can go wrong? Companies with inclusive cultures often put too many people in an I role. Dozens of unnecessary people in meetings clog the process without improving decision quality.

And sometimes senior executives get involved in topics that are best delegated. A consumer products company we're familiar with developed a process to ensure that top leaders focused only on major innovations. That was a wise move, but unfortunately the company never spelled out which decisions required their input. Soon the executives found themselves arguing about matters such as the height of the letters on product packages rather than focusing on more important issues.

Other companies, however, don't have enough people in an I role and don't get the specific input they need. At a pharmaceutical company, the drug-development decision process included input relating to scientific and medical factors but didn't include sufficient input about payers' willingness to cover the drug. As a result, the company found itself investing in pharmaceuticals that insurers were unlikely to pay for.

Best-practice companies not only define the right Input roles; they also ensure that the designated individuals can provide high-quality input on a timely basis. A retailer, for instance, realized it needed better input into decisions regarding what products to stock and at what price points. So the company created a set of standard templates that allowed assistant brand managers to provide the necessary analysis. That helped their supervisors, the brand managers, to make better decisions and to make them faster.

I is for Input	
Key responsibilities	Skills and character traits required
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide input based on data, experience or position • Ensure input is clearly heard—bring high quality analytics and logic to bear and use influence appropriately 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to data, strong analytic skills • Ability to provide input in clear fashion, e.g., not too detailed, with relevant insights clearly highlighted • Ability to influence—make sure people understand importance of input • Willingness to argue points firmly but accept the outcome if final decision differs

Great decisions—Not a solo performance

The Agree role

What it is. Unlike the I, the A is a form of input that can't be ignored. If the person holding an A doesn't agree, the recommendation must be modified. The classic example of an A is a legal or regulatory signoff, but in fact, many situations lend themselves to A-type approval. A safety executive may need to sign off on a change in work processes. A brand manager may have to agree that a given decision won't hurt the brand. Risk management and finance functions often play an A role to ensure that decisions fit the company's overall risk profile and budget constraints.

Getting the A right. Since too many people in the A role creates gridlock—everyone can say no, no one can say yes—top-performing companies set a high bar for who should have an A. Many decisions require no A at all. Others may need only one or two. Agreement should always be part of developing the recommendation—that is, it should come *before* the decision, not after it. Ideally, the recommender and the A work things out between themselves, with the R amending the proposal until the A is satisfied and the A providing constructive suggestions for creating a feasible proposal.

It's important to specify not just the A role but the scope to which the A applies. At a medical device company, the group responsible for regulatory compliance had to sign off on the company's marketing brochures. Regulatory managers reached the point where they were exercising their A on every aspect of the brochures, including the colors. That made little sense, and it meant that every brochure took too long to produce. When the company reassigned decision rights, it gave regulatory an A role only on the text of a brochure to be sure it was compliant with federal regulations.

Companies run into other sorts of A-related difficulties as well. Some recommendations may be missing an essential A—and when the absence is discovered, the decision has to be revisited. Some people in the A role may wait for the decision rather than weighing in on the recommendation;

when they finally slap down their veto card, they undermine the decision maker's authority and cause further delay. Occasionally a company will assign an A to a senior executive just because that individual "should have a chance to weigh in." But that confuses the I role with the A.

Leading companies typically reduce the need for constant signoffs by providing guidelines to their businesses. Only if a decision goes outside the guidelines does it require an approval from someone in an A role. Take a retail bank that for years had run a cumbersome process to create direct mail campaigns. Every mailing required approvals from Finance (on the financial assumptions) and Risk (on the mailing's loss rate projections). Even identical campaigns required a reexamination of these assumptions and projections. The company saved a great deal of time and frustration when it began providing guidelines for the mailings. Now, marketing managers could make their own decisions about mailings as long as they stayed with the guidelines. Mailings outside of the guidelines, such as a new offer or a mailing to a new population, continued to require scrutiny and approval by Finance and Risk.

There are times, of course, when a recommender feels that the A is constraining the recommendation too much and proceeds with the recommendation, highlighting the A's concerns. A telecommunications company, for instance, decided to launch

A is for Agree	
Key responsibilities	Skills and character traits required
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sign off on key recommendations to ensure consistency with company policies or regulatory compliance • Work with recommender to achieve mutually satisfactory proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expertise and broad view of relevant field, e.g., legal requirements or brand consistency • Negotiating abilities • Creativity and openness to working with recommenders to find alternative feasible solutions • Discipline to focus only on content within scope of their A

Great decisions—Not a solo performance

a worldwide standard for contracts for select global customers. But every local legal office in the company assumed it had an A and effectively blocked the decision. To break through, the company acknowledged the concerns but said that the decision might go forward anyway. In effect, the decision maker was prepared to take the risks that the local legal offices had flagged.

When a company begins to specify decision roles, many people who thought they had A responsibilities will be redefined into the I role. This may feel like a demotion, so it’s important that everyone understand both the merits of an A role and the importance of an I role. Leaders need to reinforce the significant benefits to decision making when A and I roles are properly defined.

The Perform role

What it is. The P role defines who is accountable for implementation. Best-practice companies typically define P’s and gather input from them early in the process. That lets the P’s flag implementation issues and encourages them to buy in to the decision they will be executing. In situations where the P is not known early, companies need to assign a P promptly once a decision is made to ensure a timely transition to the execution phase.

Getting the P right. Sometimes the P is never defined, so a decision is never implemented. A beverage company, for instance, decided to relocate its IT center of excellence to a European city. But no one was assigned the P, so no one began looking for office space, figuring out how to consolidate current IT operations with the new center and so on. When a new CIO came on board, she reopened the entire decision, which meant that the company, in effect, had to make the same decision twice.

Once a major decision is made and moved into execution, of course, it will likely involve a set of significant follow-on decisions. Implementation

P is for Perform	
Key responsibilities	Skills and character traits required
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flag potential implementation issues early and ensure decision is practical • Execute decision as intended • Handle follow-on decisions with rigor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent execution skills • Ability to think creatively through roadblocks and come up with solutions • Ability to drive follow-on implementation decisions at pace • Practical outlook • Good team player; willing to execute even if he or she doesn’t agree with decision

teams need to apply the same rigor and RAPID-style analysis to these execution-related decisions that they applied to the original one.

Decisions: A team sport

Specifying the individual who is responsible for a major decision—assigning the D—is obviously critical to good decision making. But it is less than half the story. D’s can’t do their job without great recommendations, insightful input and the right signoffs. A robust recommendation with the right input, cleared with folks who have to agree, makes for a fast, high-quality decision. And a decision obviously has no effect unless someone—the P—is accountable for executing it.

Companies that are best at decisions turn in better financial performance, and it’s not hard to see why. People know their roles. Decisions move smoothly from recommendation to execution. The organization hums. Assigning all these roles, training people to understand their responsibilities and following through to ensure appropriate behaviors all require a concerted effort. But they hold the key to high performance.

Appendix E—gradients of agreement

A group decision method to support clear, sustainable decisions

Why use the Gradients of Agreement?

When group members are asked whether or not they support a particular decision, it is often unclear what each individual’s “yes” or “no” actually means. Is someone who says, “Yes” enthusiastically supporting the decision? Or simply hoping that the meeting will end soon? Are participants who say “no” trying to communicate that they can’t live with the decision? Or would minor adjustments help them become more enthusiastic supporters?

A decision continuum, such as the gradients of agreement, allows individuals to register specific responses to a proposal—both before and after discussions. It also allows the chair or discussion leader to determine if there is *enough* support (rather than unanimous support) to move forward.⁵²

Gradients of Agreement Decision Continuum

1	2	3	4
Start over	I support this proposal with major changes	I support this proposal with minor changes	I fully support this proposal

Three steps to using the gradients of agreement during a meeting

1. Develop a proposal

After determining that there has been sufficient discussion, the chair, agenda item leader, or member of the group can ask for or suggest a short proposal (one-two sentences) describing the group’s intended response to the issue being discussed. The proposal can be modified so that it reflects the group’s

⁵²Adapted by Katherine Mitchell for the University of California with permission from Community at Work. *The Facilitator’s Guide to Participatory Decision Making*, Sam Kaner, et al., Jossey-Bass, 2014 (3rd edition).

thinking. Write the proposal for everyone to see.

Proposal: _____

2. Ask each person to indicate his/her level of agreement with the proposal

The chair or agenda item leader should restate the proposal, then go around the table so that each individual can indicate his/her level of agreement with the proposal. Allow the entire group to see the distribution of responses in one place, and help the leader determine if there is enough support for the proposal to move forward, by visually recording each person's level of support. Record responses on an enlargement of the gradients or distribute dots to each individual for multiple proposals.

Ask anyone who indicated a "1" or "2" what could help move them up one level of agreement on the continuum (sometimes these are easy adaptations to make).

3. Determine if there is *sufficient* support to move forward

It is very unusual to have unanimous support where everyone indicates "4." The Gradients of Agreement allows a range of support to exist and a group to move forward on a proposal. The decision maker or discussion leader decides whether:

- there is enough agreement to formalize the decision (a majority of "3" and "4" responses to the proposal), or
- there is not enough agreement to make a decision and the group should continue to discuss the issue.

Appendix F—Solomon moments

Governance issues requiring collective wisdom to resolve

1) **Human resources examples**

- a) The current regional manager resigns.
 - i) Who contributes to reviewing the position, developing a new position description, and interviewing candidates?
 - ii) Who makes the hiring decision?
- b) The deans served by a regional unit hold differing opinions about the performance of the regional manager, or about whether service level agreements are being met.
 - i) How are decanal expectations established?
 - ii) How are differing opinions mediated?
 - iii) What is the escalation process if the differing opinions persist?
 - iv) What are the roles of the deans and the regional faculty liaison with respect to the performance management and review process for the regional manager?
- c) An employee has missed repeated HR deadlines—e.g., faculty have not been kept informed of grant terms and university policy that affect project staffing, layoffs have not been timely, etc.
 - i) Who is responsible for identifying this performance problem? Addressing it?
 - ii) Who contributes to an RA's performance review?
 - iii) What is the escalation process if the PI feels the performance issues have not been adequately addressed?
 - iv) What needs to be in place so that this does not occur in the future?

2) Risk/liability examples

- a) The regional manager has received complaints of possible research misconduct.
 - i) Who is responsible for adjudicating this complaint?
 - ii) What is the escalation process?
- b) Four months before a grant ends, the RA alerts the PI to a cost overrun of \$50,000 in lab equipment. Upon further investigation, the lab's equipment order went over budget 18 months before; and, the budget was insufficient to meet the equipment needs in any event.
 - i) Who is responsible for paying for the overrun?
 - ii) What needs to be in place so that this does not occur in the future?
 - iii) At what point in the process are the chair and dean informed?
- c) A proposal is submitted timely to the regional RA; but, it is submitted late to the sponsoring agency and is rejected.
 - i) Who is responsible for reviewing what happened?
 - ii) What are the consequences if it turns out the RA was responsible? SPO was responsible? The PI was responsible? There are multiple people responsible?
 - iii) What needs to be in place so that this does not occur in the future?
- d) A grant's closeout is not smooth—for example, there is miscommunication by/with the agency personnel, or a no-cost extension request was denied, or CGA finds that the IDC was set up incorrectly, or the subcontractors have not invoiced timely—resulting in a deficit.
 - i) What is the process for identifying process breakdowns? Correcting them?
 - ii) Who bears the financial consequences? What is the escalation process for deciding this?
 - iii) What needs to be in place so that this does not occur in the future?

3) Resource examples

- a) It is time for the annual budget request.
 - i) Who drafts the request and who has to approve?
 - ii) Who will be responsible for the financial management of the organization's portfolio?
 - iii) Who is responsible for managing/projecting funds managed by the regional center?
 - iv) Who coordinates with the faculty for annual budget projections/ CalPlanning?
- b) Budget reductions are being required of all campus units
 - i) How will necessary staffing reductions be identified? Who will participate in this decision? Who will decide?
 - ii) How does the region coordinate with the decanal units to ensure the cuts they each propose are not misaligned?
 - iii) One decanal unit employs staff that are essential to the smooth functioning of the RA processes. The department is asked to take a budget cut and takes some of it by eliminating staff doing this type of work. Who decides whether and how to deploy resources to compensate?
- c) Administrative needs change over time.
 - i) Who assesses the needs of the academic units on an ongoing basis and determines who is responsible to provide services to meet those needs?
 - ii) What authority will the regional manager have for reconfiguring workload, reassigning staff, changing processes, codifying procedures, implementing policy, etc.?
 - iii) Who will assess the Pilot's test cases? When? Using what processes and/or metrics?

4) Standardization examples

- a) One regional service delivery unit desires a process or function that is outside the existing scope of services—e.g., they may wish to enlarge the IT function, modify the portal, or include some transactional functions (such as payroll).
 - i) What is the process for vetting these requests?
 - ii) Who decides?
 - iii) If there is disagreement about the request, how is it adjudicated?
- b) A difference of opinion arises about whether a project (e.g., a conference) is "in scope" and therefore the region is responsible, or out of scope and therefore subject to recharge or the work is just refused.
 - i) What is the process for mediating this difference of opinion
 - ii) Who decides?
 - iii) If the difference of opinion persists, what is the escalation process for resolving it?
- c) Different regional units offer differing levels of faculty support—for example, one unit may assist with a broader array of academic personnel activity, visa services, etc.
 - i) Who establishes the baseline?
 - ii) How do we ensure all faculty will receive equitable levels of support if service gaps arise—especially between units that are well resourced (and can fill the gaps internally) and those that are not?
- d) A non-research unit (e.g., Government Relations, Athletics) receives a grant and wants research administrative services.
 - i) Who decides if CSS is responsible to provide services and, if so, which region is responsible?

5) Miscellaneous examples

- a) How will unit academic/admin leads continue to have input on administrative services ongoing?
- b) Is there an expectation that the Regional faculty director role will be similar to the Associate Dean for ERSO, including delegated approval for certain types of academic research appointments?
- c) What are the expectations for the term of appointment for the Regional faculty director?
 - i) How will the succession process work?
 - ii) Who will participate in selection?
 - iii) Who will decide?
- d) Who defines what programs are served—for example CalTeach or a Dean's office?
- e) What will be the role of the Service Directors?

Appendix G—reporting considerations

Differing opinions about organizational structure

The project guidelines and aspirations (Appendix C) include:

The pilot will test a joint-governance, matrixed model that encompasses two colleges, the Vice Chancellor for Research, and the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance organizations⁵³.

The work group considered two proposals for testing matrixed reporting within the pilot, using the *gradients of agreement* (Appendix E) to ascertain the level of support for each. Each received sufficient support to move forward, though support for the second was somewhat stronger.

Proposal #1: The regional manager (RM) will have a solid line ⁵⁴ to the CSS chief operating officer (COO) and a dotted line ⁵⁵ to the regional associate dean (RAD); leaders will evaluate the success of this reporting structure as part of the overall pilot assessment.	
I fully support this proposal	3
I support this proposal with minor modifications	1
I support this proposal with major modifications	5
We should start over	0
Proposal #2: The RM will have a solid reporting line to the CSS COO and a solid reporting line to the RAD; leaders will evaluate the success of this reporting structure as part of the overall pilot assessment.	
I fully support this proposal	3
I support this proposal with minor modifications	6
I support this proposal with major modifications	0
We should start over	0

Following the gradient “voting”, group members shared the key issues/concerns behind their thinking.

⁵³ Subsequent to issuance of these guidelines, the campus reorganized the VCAF position; the new structure comprises the Vice Chancellor, Administration and the Vice Chancellor, Finance.

⁵⁴ Solid line manager = person with authority to make day-to-day assignments, and ultimate responsibility to hire, promote, discipline, and terminate

⁵⁵ Dotted line manager = person with authority to make day-to-day assignments, assess work quality, and advise on decisions about hiring, promotion, discipline, and termination

	Arguments in favor	Arguments against
<p>Proposal 1: The regional manager (RM) will have a solid line to the CSS chief operating officer (COO) and a dotted line to the regional associate dean (RAD); leaders will evaluate the success of this reporting structure as part of the overall pilot assessment.</p>	<p>Minimizes staff disruption because it's more similar to the status quo</p> <p>Facilitates calibration of RM performance across regions, since COO has insight into, and responsibility for, the performance of all RMs</p> <p>Facilitates coordination and standardization of work across regions, since the COO is the primary coordinating authority</p> <p>Empowers RAD to assign work to RM, and to collect and provide substantive input and guidance re: RM performance</p>	<p>Status quo is viewed as not working; pilot should take a different approach</p> <p>Decanal units may feel they have insufficient voice about RM performance and service quality</p> <p>In shared governance, many issues require two decision-makers (Ds); a dotted line appears to make academic Ds secondary to administrative Ds</p> <p>Depending on number of eventual delivery centers, may result in unwieldy span of control for CSS COO</p>
<p>Proposal 2: The RM will have a solid reporting line to the CSS COO and a solid reporting line to the RAD; leaders will evaluate the success of this reporting structure as part of the overall pilot assessment.</p>	<p>Better aligns RA knowledge workers with the academic units where the research happens— facilitates departmental/decanal decision processes; feels more familiar to PIs; more likely to engage the deans</p> <p>Reflects the well received 2011 shared services initiative report—which recommended dual reporting to the COO and a Dean; and, mirrors ERSO, which is considered an effective model</p> <p>May better position the RAD to address/ensure service quality, since RAD has links to both faculty and RM</p>	<p>Expands the number of things being “tested” by the pilot, which may complicate/muddy the pilot evaluation</p> <p>In case of ongoing disagreements between COO and RAD, RM may feel caught between her/his two bosses</p> <p>No escalation/resolution option exists in the case that the COO and RAD disagree about RM performance—if they cannot agree, RM’s performance appraisal may need to be reviewed at the VC level, which is not a standard practice</p>

Although both proposals received support, proposal 2 had the stronger support—and proposal 1 perhaps had insufficient support to enable us to make a decision, indicating

that the group should continue to discuss the issue. Because we were ultimately unable to reach consensus, the question was elevated to EVCP Carol Christ and Vice Chancellors Paul Alivisatos, Scott Bidy, and Rosemarie Rae. After careful deliberation, the four reached consensus in favor of the solid-dotted reporting line—the RM will have a solid line to the CSS COO and a dotted line to the RAD. They reasoned:

- Two solid reporting lines is a bad HR practice. It is unclear, lends itself to exacerbating misunderstandings, and is not easy for employees to work with when they do not know who is responsible for the evaluation of their performance.
- It is in the best interests of the campus as whole for the regional service manager cohort to work together with the center to avoid having the processes and practice in one region diverge so completely from the others that it will impose extra costs on the whole.

The four also recognized, however, that the regional service manager must gain the trust of the faculty in the region by delivering services that are widely judged by the faculty of the region to be responsive and effective, and within the constraints imposed by our available campus resources. To that end, VCR Alivisatos mandates that a letter from the RAD, assessing the performance of the regional service manager, should be an essential component of the annual performance evaluation of the regional service manager. Anything less than a strong letter should be clear grounds for remedial action.

Appendix H—evaluation procedures

Assessment tools to support continuous improvement

To be most useful, the RAPIDs need to be “living documents”—i.e., their effectiveness needs to be evaluated on a regular basis, and any RAPID should be modified if the evaluation warrants.

Of course, governance is broader than suggested by the examples in this report, and therefore evaluation of the governance structure should not be limited to evaluating the effectiveness of the RAPIDs we developed—for example, one test would be whether a suitable RAPID can be constructed for a situation not included in our example set; another evaluation might be the overall frequency of instances that are escalated to the vice chancellor level.

This appendix focuses on evaluating the RAPIDs we developed for our sample governance issues. For each RAPID presented in this report, we propose the following evaluation protocols, specifying (a) **who** will be responsible for assessing effectiveness, (b) **when** the assessment will be conducted, and (c) **how** the evaluation will be conducted. We also propose specific evaluation **details** (likert-scaled⁵⁶ and open-ended questions).

1. Performance management and review for the regional manager

Who: CSS chief operating officer (COO) and regional associate dean (RAD)

When: within one month following completion of the regional manager’s performance review

How: an evaluation sent to all Input providers; and, a set of discussion questions for the CSS COO and RAD.

Details: The survey to Input providers will include both 5-point Likert scaled questions and open-ended questions.

⁵⁶ Unless otherwise noted, the suggested Likert scale is: agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, disagree.

Scaled

- I am familiar with the regional manager’s responsibilities
- During the year, I voiced concern to the RAD or CSS COO about the RM’s performance (Yes/No)
- On the issue(s) about which I voiced concern, the RM’s performance improved noticeably⁵⁷
- I was invited to provide feedback on the FY18 performance of the regional manager (Yes/No)

Open ended

- What worked well?
- What could we improve?

Based on the survey results from Input providers and their own experiences with the review process, the CSS COO and RAD will discuss the effectiveness of the RAPID:

- Did we receive the input we needed to conduct an informed review of the regional manager’s FY18 performance? If not, what should we change in the current FY review cycle?
- Is there any action we need to take in the current performance review cycle to address what we learned from Input providers’ survey results?

2. Decadal difference of opinion about service performance

Who: CSS COO and RAD

When: at the conclusion of the fall, spring, and summer terms

How: an evaluation sent to all Input providers; and, a set of discussion questions for the CSS COO and RAD

Details: The survey to Input providers will include both 5–point Likert scaled questions and open–ended questions

⁵⁷ Asked only of those who answered “yes” to the preceding question

Scaled

- I was invited to participate in development of the region's service level agreement (SLA) (Yes/No)
- I understand why the SLA decisions were made (even if I disagree)
- During the past 4 months, I raised concerns about service quality (Yes/No)
- My concerns were addressed successfully by the RAD, RM, or CSS COO⁵⁸
- My concerns were addressed successfully through escalation to the VCR or VCA⁵⁹

Open ended

- If you have comments about the service quality in the region, please enter them here

Based on the survey results from Input providers and their own experiences with the review process, the CSS COO and RAD will discuss the effectiveness of the RAPID:

- Is there any action we need to take to address what we learned from Input providers' survey results? If so: identify what, who, when.

3. Difficult closeout

Who: CSS COO and RAD (steps 4 and 5 only)⁶⁰

When: for every instance, at the conclusion of Step 4. If the issue requires escalation, evaluate again at the conclusion of Step 5.

How: an evaluation sent to all Input providers; and, a set of discussion questions for the CSS COO and RAD.

Details: The survey to Input providers will include both 5-point Likert scaled questions and open-ended questions.

⁵⁸ Asked only of those who had raised concerns

⁵⁹ Asked only of those who disagree that their concerns were addressed successfully by the RAD, RM, or CSS COO

⁶⁰ For Step 6 process improvements: each improvement team will develop its own evaluation protocol as part of the process improvement work

Scaled

- I participated in the review of what happened with the closeout of [Grant name] (Yes/No)
- The review process was comprehensive
- The review process was transparent
- The review process was fair
- The findings were communicated thoughtfully
- Financial responsibility was assigned equitably

Open ended

- What worked well about this review process?
- What could we do differently next time?

Based on the survey results from Input providers and their own experiences with the review process, the CSS COO and RAD will discuss the effectiveness of the RAPID:

- Did we receive the information we needed to make a fair determination of responsibility? If not, why? How can we improve this in the future?
- Did we reach a common understanding about what happened? If not, why not? What would have helped us reach consensus?
- Is there any action we need to take to address what we learned from Input providers' survey results? If so: what, who, when.

4. Negotiating budget reductions

Who: RAD and regional manager (RM)

When: Within one month of budget submission. If Step 6 is invoked, evaluate again following its conclusion

How: an evaluation sent to all Input providers; and, a set of discussion questions for the RAD and RM

Details: The survey to Input providers will include both 5-point Likert scaled questions and open-ended questions.

Scaled

- I was invited to provide data, information, perspectives, or other input for the region's FY19 budget submission (Yes/No)
- I believe my input was heard by those who developed the region's FY19 budget submission
- I understand why FY19 budget decisions were made (even if I disagree with some of them)

Open ended

- What worked well about this year's budget process?
- What could we do differently next time?

Based on the survey results from Input providers and their own experiences with the review process, the RAD and RM will discuss the effectiveness of the RAPID:

- Did we receive the information we needed to submit a well-informed FY19 budget request? If not, why? What should we change in next year's budget cycle?
- Do the survey results suggest the need for any actions? If so: what, who, when?

5. Requests for service or process outside the current scope of services

Who: CSS COO and RAD

When: at the conclusion of each instance

How: an evaluation sent to all Input providers; and, a set of discussion questions for the CSS COO and RAD

Details: The survey to Input providers will include both 5-point Likert scaled questions and open-ended questions.

Scaled

- I understand the provisions in our regional service level agreement (SLA)— i.e., I know what services the region should provide
- I believe the regional manager enforces the SLA effectively
- I believe the regional manager enforces the SLA consistently
- During the past 12 months, I requested one or more services be added to our SLA (Yes/No)
- I understand the reasons for the decision about my request (even if I disagree)⁶¹

Open ended

- If you have additional comments about the region's SLA, please enter them here
- How might we have approached your request differently?⁶²
- What would have helped you better understand the reasons for the decision?⁶³

Based on the survey results from Input providers and their own experiences with the review process, the CSS COO and RAD will discuss the effectiveness of the RAPID:

- Do the survey results, or our own experiences, suggest the need for any actions? If so: what, who, when?

⁶¹ Asked only of those who responded “yes” to the preceding question

⁶² Asked only of those who responded “yes” to having made a request

⁶³ Asked only of those who responded 4 (somewhat disagree) or 5 (disagree) to the final question