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Organizer 1:  If you would, we would like you to say your name, from where you came, and give us about a 20 or 30-second inclination of what you hope to get from this and what brought you here.

(INTRODUCTIONS ARE MOSTLY INAUDIBLE).

Organizer 1:  Thank you so much, and because I got a chance to meet you yesterday, it is an honor.  I would like those of you who have received funding as community partners to be involved with us at this conference to show your hands.  I would like us to acknowledge our Travel Awardees, because they are very important to this process, and we thank you for being here with us.  This is Jenny's project, so I want to make sure that I acknowledge her for taking this task on as part of the CAGAT Initiative.  She is going to drive the rest of this.

Organizer 2:  I picked up a quote yesterday from Dr. Karim Watson (?) when he asked, "Have we lost the art of conversation," and I wanted to also ask, "Have we developed the gracious art of compensation," and you can quote me on that, too.  So, my objective is we hope that when you leave here, you have a greater sense of efficiency, fairness and sustainability from the different perspective of health research stakeholders.  We hope to give you the frameworks of university mechanisms that can serve community and university partnerships.  Do understand that these groups are part of the AAOC report from 2013-2014 on engagement by the AAOC.  You have the healthcare providers, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ communities, academic researchers and the people who are the forgotten stakeholders.  We are not talking about the community members who are the forgotten stakeholders, which are always the case, but our university administrators as the forgotten stakeholders in the research enterprise.  The history behind this as one of five products out of our CAGAT Imitative, and CAGAT stands for Community Academic Grant Administration Translation.  As a result of my personal experience, inheriting a grant as a Principle Investigator and seeing that the capacity of the community was not fair in compensating the people that they were responsible for compensating in the community, because they were the ones holding the subcontract, that they have run into financial trouble.  We couldn't bring the contract back in at that moment because the way the stipulations were written were that they were the ones who had to pay out to the community.  When they couldn't pay the community partners, guess what happened?  It directly impacted the science.  This was a clear issue of lack of communication and lack of people being at the table, and that is where the CAGAT Initiative started.  Alone me, a group of people collectively brought together university administrators, including the Vice Chancellor for Sponsored Research at the time, and now she is one of the Vice Chancellors for Research ... her team, team members from the community, investigators and business administrators together to try to talk about what are some of the issues for fiscal management in translation of community-engaged research projects.  These are the reasons why we wanted to bring this together, some of those being to clarify the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ administration process, provide tools, streamline the process and ultimately improve study implementation.  The three topic areas that were generated when we had multiple meetings ... and because there were no resources really provided on this, and it was whenever I was actually available, this took longer than it would have because this is something that is not sexy and people don't want to invest in it and you have to find the time to do it, we would have ad hoc meetings after this big, general meeting, and some of those meetings included the community partners.  We presented on this last year on what this looked like.  Communications and expectations were some of the big topic areas of interest on how to improve this, and Jenny is going to talk a lot about this.  This is one of the areas that we have actually tried to tackle.  Training and advising opportunities - so, tool kits for partners and collaborators, check lists for basic requirements that community members understand for grants management, regular standing meetings with the Office of Sponsored Research, which I was having regular meetings, personally, with the Office of Sponsored Research because they bought into it, and we can talk about what that meant, and administrative priorities to simplify the reimbursement procedures, which is exactly what Jenny is going to talk about.  That is what her objective has been in this project.  Also, subcontractor user-friendly language is also part of what we have done with this particular project ... and subcontracts that are complimentary to community partner resources, which is what we hope that this initiative that Jenny worked on will provide.  The products that we have developed as a result of this work ... we have a guide also for the community partners, but we have a guide that is a long thing you can read when you want to go to sleep that has check lists in it for investigators and then one for community partners.  We can send you this link so that you can pull it up, and we strongly recommend that you go there, because there more you click on it, the more we can let NCAT know that this is important.  So, I am not going to give this to you.  You can go there, so then we can count how much interest there is there.  It helps all of us that we go there.  We did webinars with our investigators and we even had the Office of Sponsored Research attend some of these meetings.  These were new Office of Sponsored Research persons who really wanted to understand what this meant to work with our community partners and their subcontracts.  We had eight CTSAs that attended our investigator meeting, which lets you know there is probably a need, and this was our first try to do this.  We had a community workshop with our community members and shared this information, and mind you, we don't present this by ourselves.  Each of these presentations was done with a grant research administrator with us so that she could answer questions that were regulatory that we couldn't answer.  I just did a community in-service two days ago at Yale because they were interested in this, and I talked with their community partners about being fiscally ready, and they found this so useful that we have to go back.  So, that lets you know that there is a need for this.  Jenny is going to present to you how she got to the work that she has done with this request for information, which is a way to get the community partners ready to partner by helping them be fiscally ready and jump through the hoops necessary for the institution to not have to go through the red tape, because they would have gone through that before.  So, have at it.

Organizer 3:  Okay.  So, we want to consider the puzzle of community engagement - efficiency, fairness and sustainability.  We want it to be sustainable.  We want it to last, so that when the grant ends, the community still has increased capacity.  We want it to be fair.  We want to open this opportunity to a wide range of stakeholders so that we have an ongoing process.  We can have mentoring and we can have new people coming in to benefit from this work because it does increase capacity on the ground for community partners.  We also want it to be efficient.  The university is not a quick ship to turn, so we need to be as efficient as possible on our end.  So, I have put up an array of the many different people ... and we want to be sure that we pay particular attention to populations historically underrepresented in research.  We need to take everyone's perspective into account.  We are going to be speeding because of the time, but raise your hand if you have a comment or a question.

Participant:  I want to make sure I understand.  Are we talking about getting the community partners ready or training our Office of Sponsored Programs?

Organizer 3:  Both.

Participant:  My questions is - do we think there are enough similarities across Office of Sponsored Programs?  I mean, I was just thinking, yeah, we are a private institution and you guys are such a big public institution.

Organizer 3:  There is a distinction between Office of Sponsored Programs and a Business Manager in a department.  Business managers in departments can run things a variety of ways.  Office of Sponsored Research are mandated by the Federal Government to follow regulatory principles, and that is across the board.  So, we are talking about having to meet some of the regulatory guidelines for being fiscally sound that goes across sponsored research programs.  How they choose to do it - some of those things they should do and then there are things they must do.  Did that answer your question?

Participant:  So, there is some variety in your recommendations?

Organizer 3:  There is some variety, and it depends on how an institution is going to implement them.  The regulatory guidelines are the regulatory guidelines, and most institutions have some things that have to be followed for them to be fiscally auditable because the Office of Management and Budget requires that.  So, we don't know what those little idiosyncrasies are, but if we improve communication and have some basic guidelines, that is where are at.  We are just starting to try to field this data nationally across the board.

Participant:  I was going to say - we saw that you have an academic guide as well as a community guide in a recent newsletter that went out.

Participant:  Oh, my God, they put it out there?

Participant:  They put it out there and we are going to put it out through our newsletter.

Organizer 2:  And to follow up on what Phillip asked, some institutions may change some of the things that are in there.  When I went up to Yale and showed her what we were talking about, she said, "These are basically the same principles we would follow at Yale."

Organizer 3:  I am going to give you a brief run-through of our previous history of stakeholder engagement efforts to try and compensate people equitably.  We have standing community advisory boards representing the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_\_ areas.  Those were dissolved to try a new experiment, an idea.  Some very experienced members from those areas formed a limited liability corporation, because this was a way of ease of compensation.  Instead of hiring people as independent contractors and having to do criminal background checks every time there was a new project, they could be paid directly and quickly.  They have a solid record with researchers.  So, it seemed to make a lot of sense.  Researchers would apply for a $2K voucher that would go directly to this LLC, who would then meet with the researcher with a structured consultation.  There was a vendor rental, a shared dinner, and they would meet and there would be certain followup services.  They would advise the researcher on their community engagement strategies and provide certain followup services.  We learned that this wasn't enough.  It was a small piece, so we are going to keep our relationship with this LLC, but we needed to go much further beyond.  We had about three $2K vouchers in the year that were completed.  The levels of investigator satisfaction were high, some moderate, but we came back to efficiency, fairness and sustainability as we tried to look at - why was there such a low response?  What were we not meeting?  The community partners were very skilled.  It was easy to engage with them, because that hurdle of how long it would take to pay a community partner had been cleared by them establishing a private corporation.  Community and development and the dissemination to an ongoing, increasingly-diverse range of communities was perhaps not as strong.  So, I spoke with Lori and was saying, "We are getting a really low response.  What can we do?  We need to bring in more stakeholders and we need to bring them in now."  Lori said, "We need to get a business perspective on this.  Let's find out from university administrators how they handle fairness, sustainability and efficiency, because university always has to seek contracts from many different firms.  So, we met with Robin \_\_\_\_\_\_, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Research, and Mark Silman (?), the Associate Director of Purchasing Services at UNC Chapel Hill.  Now, Mark handles contractors with companies that are going to come and do construction, fix the air conditioning units.  They have to put out competitive bids.  This is a process by which a vendor can be paid more than $5,000 in a fiscal year, which for a community partner who is going to work on multiple projects, that is a beneficial classification.  And we can do it ahead of the project - we can do this work ahead of time.

Organizer 2:  Robin \_\_\_\_\_ was my contact that was part of the initial CAGAT Initiative.  I built a relationship with her.  She bought into improving efficiencies of the university.  We still maintain a relationship, such that I am now the university representative for the Federal Demonstration Partnership, which is where all of these other federal agencies that pay out ... how we can improve the research enterprise, and there are about 155 institutions that are involved.  So, she has involved me in her world as a result of me reaching out into her world, and now this relationship has allowed us to meet with the Associate Director for Purchasing Services.  There is no way I would have talked with this guy.  I didn't know who to talk to.  That is because of my relationship with her.

Organizer 3:  Thank you.  So, he opened a door to a mechanism that we would not have even known existed where you can set up for a non-employee to be compensated by the university.  So, what we needed to do was put out a bidding process.  We call it a Request for Information.  It is open to individual and organizational health research stakeholders, who would provide references, which we then checked.  We have a rolling response.  Every month we review applications.  Ahead of any engagement with the project, we can go ahead and set them up as university-preferred vendors.  When a research project comes and maybe we need a Latino group to look at our materials and guide us on recruitment, we already have a local Latino community organization set up as a vendor and that organization will handle finding the community partners and community health workers who will review the materials.  We pay them and then they take care of the individual ... (inaudible).

Participant:  (Inaudible)?

Organizer 3:  Actually, what we do is, we are purchasing the consultation from the organization.  We are not asking proof of any employment status.  So, if we weren't going to do it for everyone, we certainly wouldn't do it for one.  So, in order to be compliant with Title VI, it has to be even across the board.  So, unless we want to ask all churches and community-based organizations regardless of their intent, to provide \_\_\_\_\_\_\_, we won't do it.

Participant:  (Inaudible)?

Organizer 3:  It can be a 501(c)(3) or it can be an LLC.  They do need to have a tax ID number.  The organization needs to have that.  So, when we say "health research stakeholders," it is someone who is interested in, or might have a direct involvement in, health research.  This is our definition for those applying.  They just need to have an interest in and potential benefit from, so they need to have a stake in health research, which is essentially all of us.  This is on our website as well.  So, what we did - we then redesigned our $2K voucher program, because we also had a number of requests from researchers to create patient stakeholder boards.  With the patient stakeholder board, you have to get IRB approval if the information they are going to talk about would be sensitive, to work with HIPAA, so it is more of a research study, but it can be done through this mechanism.  We are going to be vetting stakeholders in the fall.  We just launched this in July and August.  We have our first completion of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ information already in.  I want to hear from you all - what financial compensation mechanisms have you used, or have you been the recipient of?

Participant:  Invoice.

Organizer 3:  An invoice for services.

Participant:  For stakeholders that we know we are going to be compensating on a regular basis, we get direct deposits for them.  We get them in the direct deposit system so we don't have to give them checks that go directly into their checking account.  It has been a miracle to do that.

Organizer 3:  This is where there may be the mechanism for that.  Some institutions won't do that unless they have vetted them.  That is a varied thing across institutions, but it is an awesome thing if it can occur.

Participant:  I have worked with University Council and they have agreed to a community-friendly consulting agreement, and it is now in community-friendly language because even I could not understand ... (inaudible).

Participant:  We work with the local public health institute who acts as our partner and sponsor for our community engagement core, and we essentially provide a big chunk of our budget for community engagement to them every year, and they take care of all the community payments, and they also provide technical assistance.  So, not only are we making it easy to compensate our community partners, but we are also providing some skill-building in terms of how to work with the federal grant, how to work with a bureaucracy like university.  So, we are trying to make it easy but still provide the background in skill-building for ... (inaudible).

Organizer 2:  Do you send all of your community partners through this service?

Participant:  Uh-huh.

Participant:  We have, not just community partners, for different research projects, but we kind of deal with ... (inaudible).  So, for our patient ambassadors that work through our \_\_\_\_\_\_, we do employment as university staff, which has its benefits and its drawbacks.

Participant:  (Inaudible).

Participant:  We have done exactly that.  We have had that same issue where they have not wanted the threshold piece and created a mechanism just like you mentioned, and some of them want to give back ... like, some of the churches will give it back to the church.

Participant:  And there haven't been any concerns as well as having to track that compensation?

Participant:  Yeah.  So, the \_\_\_\_\_\_ are absolutely tracked and reported on.  It is just different than ... (inaudible).

Participant:  (Inaudible).

Participant:  We have to demonstrate that we gave it to a real person with a social security number.

Participant:  (Inaudible).

Participant:  Working at the university, for us, there are so many different types of funding that we needed to do, and it was based on whether you had a grant from this place or whether it was a gift card to somebody.  It is humongous in terms of the type of funding you need to be able to deliver to the partner, and the time restraint that is put on those dollars within the university, getting them out to the community in a timely manner ... like, if you plant a garden in the spring, you can't wait until the winter to get the funding.  So, it was so varied, and it may be simpler to do it the way you are doing it just to try to make sure the funding can get to the community.  To come up with some type of plan to show it works with this, this, this and this would be good.

Participant:  I am just wanting to make another point.  So, we make sure they are universal, so we are not requiring our stakeholders to buy things at a specific place like Amazon or whatever, and then it also ... (inaudible).  So, the full amount is the actual value.

Organizer 2:  I will make one more comment.  I know we are talking about the different mechanisms, and this was just an example, and we are going to talk about this RFI in particular.  The different ... this is where when you are having a subcontractor, particularly a subrecipient who is getting dollars, this is where the indirects become really important, because you don't have to report out the indirects on how you are spending that money.  You do have to report out the directs that are coming from the feds, because you have to lay out how you are spending that money.  Even with some of the CTSAs, there are certain people that ... (inaudible).  Jenny has not written until the last grant we wrote.  She is still part of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_, but it allows the flexibility to talk about the funding versus what has to be reported out.  I am on the grant.  Whatever is allocated for me, we have to report out on.  It doesn't make her less valuable.  It means that our Chief Operating Office now has more flexibility to move money around in a way that is necessary.  You may want to consider that.  If your community partners have an F&A rate, it makes it better.  Just so you also know, if they don't have one, as of December 26, 2014, with the uniform guidance, they can get a 10% indirect rate off of that, if they don't not have one, without going through the approval process.  It is off the bat 10% if they do not have an F&A rate.  You want to do that if they don't have one, because it takes a long time to establish an F&A rate, but they at least can get 10%, and what they do with what 10% is what they do with that 10%.  That is why I am bringing this up.

Participant:  Can that be on an invoice, or does that have to just be for the sub-award?  How would they claim that?

Organizer 2:  When you write the grant, you automatically get to write in 10%, because that is decided by the OMB.  The Office of Management and Budget, they are the ones that approved that.  You don't have to go through any process.

Participant:  You can't do that retrospective?  This has to be written in?

Organizer 2:  Correct.  Now, those who are ready and they are already establishing their expenses, you want to help them get to the point where they are establish their own F&A rate, because 10% means nothing in some cases, but it is better than nothing.  But getting them to what their real F&A rate may be, like 20-30%, they can do what they want with that 20-30%.

Organizer 1:  And so many don't understand what they can count into that.

Organizer 2:  Right.

Participant:  What is really helpful is that 10% of whatever percent it is will help keep us out of trouble because we are not tempted to move money to take care of this or that.

Participant:  (Inaudible).

Participant:  Yeah.  We know to encourage our investigators on small-scale grants - do not be the lead on that.  Why would you do that?  (Inaudible).

Participant:  We have a community partner who is like 42%.  He has all the papers and stuff.

Participant:  In your world, you can qualify that, but in the nonprofit world, with donors and foundations, you could absolutely never get away with that.  It's a double standard.

Participant:  That is the different between federal dollars and foundation dollars.

Participant:  Question for clarification.  F&A - what does that stand for?  And you said smaller scale, what is your threshold in terms of smaller?

Participant:  I wouldn't say we have an official one, but it will be anywhere under 250.  I would encourage you to find a community partner that has infrastructure.

Organizer 2:  And F&A, that means anything indirect - that means keeping the lights on or whatever you need to do to ...

Participant:  Depreciation?  Everything like that?

Organizer 2:  Everyone goes under that.  It is not the function of the specific project.  It is the function of the organization to support the project.  Any other questions?  Has this been helpful.  Okay, great.

Organizer 3:  So, we also want to recognize our community partners.  I have put up several strategies that we have used with community partners.  Does anyone have any others?  Certainly, co-authorship on publications is always helpful, bringing them to conferences ...

Participant:  Drew has faculty.

Organizer 3:  Community faculty.

Participant:  Community partners that are faculty.

Participant:  Ours are actually research team members.  They are embedded in it.  They are helping with the qualitative analysis.  They are helping with the focus groups or interviews.  They are part of the team.

Participant:  (Inaudible).

Organizer 3:  That is something we have used a lot of times for the health field.  So, we have preceptors for nursing and social work and others who aren't paid, but they do get university library access.  That is done through IT.  We can get them a code and a password, and that is tremendous, because they have access to academic publications.

Participant:  It is like a light switch.  When you have a student that goes away from the meeting, the light goes off, but anyone who is affiliated with us, and go through whatever the hoops are, they have access, and that is huge for community members who want to look and see what is out there ... but above and beyond open access, which is what we should be pushing for, is open access journals and publishing and high-quality open access journals.

Participant:  (Inaudible).

Participant:  We train some of our community partners to be community grant reviewers.

Organizer 2:  We have community that are on the university's IRB, not just the project.

Participant: What about consulting agreements or fellowships, like offering a fellowship or consulting agreement?

Organizer 2:  We had that with the "Scholars."  You want to talk about it?

Organizer 3:  That was before my time.

Organizer 2:  Yeah.  It was before my time, too.  We have some members who are part of the LLC, and prior to that, they were a part of CABS (?).  We put them through a rigorous training program, and they were called "Scholars."  They then were trained as researchers and went after their own little grants, partnered with us or not, and got that.  So, we call them "Scholars," and we just don't have the program anymore.  But I think you are not just talking about money coming from some external source, but them being consultants.

Participant:  Just like we procure consultants when we need expertise from an organization that we don't have.

Organizer 2:  That was exactly what they did.  They were actually going for the fees of payment in consultant roles, but we don't have an infrastructure that pays the consultant as part of the institution, which is what I am hearing you say.  It is not just paying for a particular project, but it being a part of the infrastructure, and we don't have that anymore.  But that's a really good point.

Participant:  We also have a program we do where we train people ... (inaudible) ... together with a faculty mentor.  That is another major incentive for them.  Then, after that, their organization is provided $1,500 to compensate them for their time.

Organizer 3:  Yes, so all these ways that we can recognize that this is a very valuable role.

Participant:  I just want to say that we shouldn't forget to acknowledge the administrative directors and leadership ... (inaudible), but those who really stick with you and try to help you figure out how to make it work in a way that is compliant, but also community-friendly and sensitive to the project.  That is really a very special benefit to have if you have that in your organization.  We really try to make sure we acknowledge that in our institution.  It makes a huge difference.

Organizer 3:  It is opening the doors of communication on both sides, and keeping them open.  So, the more we build our compensation skillset and capacity, this can lead to better mentoring roles and more experienced partners.  Building our fiscal efficiency, as well as our fairness, opening up the stakeholder opportunity on an ongoing basis every month, to new people who are interested in health research.  So, now we have a group activity.  We have a worksheet, which has lists of four groups of health research stakeholders.  I think we can take five minutes.  We wanted to look at efficiency, fairness and sustainability for each group.  You can work at your table, but if you can have a discussion to come up with some definitions that you think each group would have for efficiency ... what is efficient for an academic researcher may not be efficient for a community agency, but each one would have their own needs that define efficiency, fairness and sustainability.  Take five minutes and then we will have presentations from each table.

(DISCUSSION AMONG TABLES)

Organizer 2:  The instructions are for you to give what you think would be the definition of efficiency for each one of these different stakeholders.  What is the definition of fairness, what you think it to be, and what you think it would mean to be sustainable, what sustainability would mean for the different stakeholders in the left column.  Does that make sense, everybody?

Participant:  (Inaudible).

So, this take do the healthcare providers, academic researchers at this table, you guys do the research grant administrators, and then you do the university administrators at your table.  That was a smart idea.

Organizer 2:  We are going to go back and get started, everybody.  We know that you are having rich conversations, and we are very happy about that, but we want to go ahead and get started because we know we want you to get back at 11:15.  So, why don't we start with your table, here.

Participant:  We had several categories - 1) Not impacting the mission; 2) Don't have to wait for money to come in; 3) Covers the true costs; 4) Easy to understand processes that don't take a lot of time to do; 5) Low reporting burden (both efficiency and sustainability).

Participant:  Maybe for that very top one, not impacting the mission, but maybe what we really mean is not interfering with the mission.

Organizer 2:  My colleagues that travel with me for the \_\_\_\_\_\_ project, she was giving the example of being a sub-awardee, and then the other person was talking about being a sub of the sub, and her point was - when you are trying to chase the dollars, you end up losing your mission.  So, it is really hard to stick with that, but it is really important.

Organizer 3:  Now we have investigators and project managers in research.

Participant:  So, for efficiency, we said:  1) To establish a protocol and process for payments so you don't have to reinvent the wheel every single time you are doing the same thing you did a week ago.  There should be a process in line.  For fairness, include money for community stakeholders.  I think we are assuming that is a given because we are preaching to the choir in here, but that is not a given in academia to include money for community stakeholders.  And for sustainability, create an institutional standard that everybody can point to.

Participant:  Policy.

Participant:  Yes.  I came across a citation that said that the number of administrators in the world of research have something like quadrupled in the last two decades compared to the number of faculty.  I will find it and send it to you, but think of how much that increases the layers of bureaucracy.

Organizer 2:  That is our first action besides mine.  That is your action item.  Anything else?

Participant:  I think the idea about the protocol that came up was that "counter-efficiency," so our middle ground was just something in writing, like a check list or some kind of one-pager of something that allows for consistency and transparency and clarity that could help facilitate the processes involved for all parties.  Having that in writing helps the community folks as well as the administrators, so let's establish those policies.

Organizer 2:  I will say in the back of the CAGAT guide, there is a huge check list at the back of that.  Each Office of Sponsored Research has a site.  They may not have a check list, so that is something we definitely need to work on, but I just wanted to let you know that CAGAT does have that, a check list, at the back of it.

Organizer 3:  Anything else from this group?  Now the research grant administrators.

Participant:  So, we also agreed with the importance of standard operating procedures and establishing a template would be really helpful.  We were saying to try to put yourselves in their shoes and imagine what they are going through.  It is an important thing for us to remember.  We talked about the importance of being clear on our invoices, so like, putting things in explicitly, really clarifying ... (inaudible).  We were talking about sometimes we all just want things now, but we need to be a little bit more strategic about everything not having to be expedited, trying to think about what really does and doesn't.  We discussed the possibility of trying to batch things that are similar, so instead of one invoice coming from this and one from this, trying to group them together.  Then we discussed a little bit about, generally speaking, one or two points of contact would be ... (inaudible).

Participant:  Yeah, and having those personal connections with the finance manager or the administrator so they can kind of understand the work we do.  A community member could get on the phone and call the President's office and say, "I haven't been paid for two months," and that can really hurt us.  It is just showing them how important our work is.

Organizer 2:  A lot of these would go across the board.

Participant:  I have been asking my institution for over five years, I want like a "barrier buster" group.  I call it that, but it would be groups of community partners, academics, so faculty and staff, all getting together talking about the work that we do and how to reduce barriers for community partners to be equitable partners, because we all know this but we don't share it.  Some people are trying to figure it out, like you guys, but at our own institutions, we need to share this information.

Organizer 3:  University administrators?

Participant:  So, some of the things we went over as university administrators are, as far as efficiency, having some sort of clear communication.  That is very important.  It may be a little tedious but it is important to have that documentation.  Also, just an outline process and plan up front of how you want to do things, and making sure that process is clear, consistent and stays in line with federal requirements and guidelines, and then making sure that information is shared.  (Inaudible) ... making sure that process is a little more automated could decrease some of the inefficiency as far as someone receiving documents from this person versus another person ... just having a central location ... (inaudible).  Then, just making sure whatever process if implemented, that it is sustainable ... (inaudible).

Participant:  I have one question about this.  When I brought this up to my administrator, she made a comment, "There is one reason why we won't write out processes.  They change all the time.  It has pissed off one of my investigators.  It has pissed off a community person.  I am the one who gets stuck with the bag."  This was one of the centers I was working with.  I want people to change their processes all the time.  Who is going to man changing the documentation on this?

Participant:  But that is your job!  If you don't like your job, get a new job!  For me, across the board, you have to be open, honest and transparent.  People appreciate that.  I have apologized profusely.  I have sent it up the chain of command and copied this community person so that they can see I am elevating it to the best of my ability.  People want to be treated with respect and dignity, so I don't care where you fall in this chain of command.  It is just being open and honest and transparent.

Organizer 2:  You are telling me to do this, and I am manning 20 grants for which half the investigators do not tell their community partners this, and you are telling me to add this to my list of stuff to do?  I can't do that.  She said, "I don't make the big money.  I am up here managing all these people."

Participant:  I would say, "Then I will partner with you to advocate for changes in the process."

Organizer 3:  I just received a time signal from the door.  We all have different perspectives on this, and chaos is merely order waiting to be deciphered.  We are community engagement specialists, and we can figure this out.  Thank you all.

Participant:  I am not making this up.  I literally just got a text that said, "Community investigator compensation cleared - hallelujah ... approximately 11 hours per month, $1250 stipend quarterly."

(Clapping).

Organizer 1:  We hope this has been engaging.  We know we all have things that we actually do, and hopefully the engagement with each other has been very useful.  We will write this up and share this with everybody, because this is not for us to just do, but to say - what are we going to do next?