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Admin Essentials: Setting Targets and Evaluating Performance of Grant Professionals

>> KATIE JOHNSON:

Thank you for your your patience.

We'll take as much time as we can make do for this conversation.

This is a roundtable conversation about grant professionals.

We're joined by two lovely people from -- can you say me --

>> JULIE ASSEL: Assel?

>> JULIE ASSEL: I was trying to surreptitiously.

>> KATIE JOHNSON: I apologize.

They are really -- they're grant association approved trainers.

And they have a lot of expertise in the field of grant professionals.

So I want to make sure we have time to talk about what we're supposed to talk about today.

And, so, I'll just say a few kind of expectations.

If you can, turn on your camera, it really helps with these kind of roundtable formats to really engage.

So, I know it's not always possible.

But if you can we'd love to see your faces and mute when you're not speaking to prevent background noise.

This is going to be made available from the recording.

We'd love to know who's in the room and why you're here and what you want to learn.

If you want to go ahead and introduce yourself and say why you're here and why you're hoping to learn -- what you're hoping to learn, we'll get started.

Thank you so much.

>> JULIE ASSEL: I could call on you, right?

If you're not going to talk.

Michelle Moore, I can start because you're right in front of my camera.

>> Michelle: Hi, I'm in Baltimore.

I work at Kimberly Krieger.

I'm a grant manager there.

I'm hoping to learn how to better manage our grants.

>> JULIE ASSEL: How long have you be there, Michelle?

>> Michelle: I just started in December.

But I'm coming from the state of Maryland.

I work for the government and I worked for grants for seven years.

>> JULIE ASSEL: Okay.

>> Michelle: Worked with grants for seven years.

>> JULIE ASSEL: Joe, I'm going to make you next.

>> Joe Stein: I'm also from Kennedy Krieger.

Nice to meet you, Michelle.

Responsible for the medical programs here.

Our training administration program also reports up through medicine.

So they're taking on a lot of training-related grants.

And I'm here just to learn what everybody else knows.

And hopefully be able to translate some of that to -- to what we do here at Kennedy.

>> JULIE ASSEL: Great, thanks.

Caitlyn?

You want to tell us who you are, where you're from, etc.?

>> Caitlyn: I'm the operations manager at the IOU.

I'm new to this role.

Been here since October.

And am hoping to learn whatever it is that you will teach me.

>> JULIE ASSEL: And what did you -- did you have any background in grants?

>> Crate Lin: I worked at IOUCED for a couple of years.

Now I'm on my way back.

So I do have a lot of experience with grants.

>> KATIE JOHNSON: Great.

Christina?

>> Christie Tina: I'm Christina Miller, it's Missouri's UCED.

And I am our coordinator for program development and I've opinion here for about ten years.

And so I've been doing grant writing most of that time.

We've had some shake-ups in leadership and some new staff come on and some really exciting possibilities happening in -- and I was really interested in learning how -- how we benchmark and evaluate what we're doing in grant writing and in program development.

Especially as we're starting to work with some of these newer researchers coming on, trying to build their careers and, you know, what that looks like?

.

>> JULIE ASSEL: I cheered a little bit.

Because she's like -- she's close to where we are.

Both Julie and I are based in the Kansas City metropolitan area.

So it's great to see our hometown -- hometown metropolitan area university participating.

That's great.

Kimberly, you want to go next?

>> Kimberly: Can everybody hear me?

>> Julie: Yes.

>> Kimberly: I'm Kimberly Mills.

I have a weak internet connection.

I apologize for not having my camera on.

But it wouldn't help the audio a great deal.

I'm just here to get a little background information, maybe some new -- new ideas about how to you know beef up our evaluation section for the various different grants we manage at our UCED.

>> JULIE ASSEL: Great, Katie?

Does everybody know you?

>> KATIE JOHNSON: So, I -- I'm from AUCD.

I'm a programs specialist.

And I am really hoping that we can just all connect around the topic as best we can to share resources so I'm interested in learning a little bit about kind of are you -- do you have grant professional positions specifically do that?

Or everybody at your UCED pitching in to write their own grants and funds.

I'm interested in kind of the different people in the room's experience around how grant professionals are being handled at their UCEDs.

And welcome anyone to jump in.

>> JULIE ASSEL: Yeah, so one of our initial questions based upon kind of what Katie told us is -- does anybody have an interest in hiring people who do grants or -- is the reality is all of the people in the room already doing grants and it doesn't matter to them.

I want to stick to the stuff you guys want to know.

Does that make sense?

Does everybody know what role a grant professional should, would, could do?

Because it sounds like some of you do different things?

So I'm going to -- since we're -- we'll do some of this, right?

Raise your hand, either electronically or metaphorically, with your actual hand or whatever.

How many of you in the room actually write grants right mow?

Okay.

-- right now?

Okay.

That tells me something.

And how many of you manage the grants on the back end after they've been awarded.

>> Kimberly: I write and manage also.

>> JULIE ASSEL: Okay.

For those of you who manage the grant, who writes the grant in your office for your center?

>> Kaitlyn: I can jump in.

Where -- I would, in theory be writing grants, I just haven't yet.

But we get a lot of -- we have strong relationships with state agencies so we just get a lot of -- kind of projects that way.

>> JULIE ASSEL: You track the dollars after you get them?

That makes sense.

Michelle, is that similar to where you are as well?

>> Michelle: Our PIs, they do the writing.

I do the management.

>> JULIE ASSEL: How many PIs do you have, for example, Michelle, who are actively doing the grants?

>> Michelle: I would say about ten?

We have about ten PIs.

>> JULIE ASSEL: Christina, you mentioned something earlier about having new leadership, new researchers building their careers.

How many PIs are you -- are you in general working with them?

And how many of them are new?

>> Christina: Yeah, so, we've probably got 15 people that serve as PIs at one time or another.

Some of them on any given grant, somebody may be the PI and somebody may have a different role and in another grant, it might be switched.

We do have several kind of early and mid career researchers who started in the last year and a half or so, and that's just new for me.

Because in the years that I -- in the first years that I was doing grant writing and then moved into my current role kind of coordinating it, we had this very stable kind of set of long-time UCED faculty.

And so one of the things that -- and they kind of knew where their bread and butter was coming from.

What's my specialty.

What are the kind of grants I write?

What's my line of inquiry I'm pursuing.

So, one of the things that we're kind of interested in is how are we benchmarking and evaluating what we're doing as we work with -- still continue to work with those existing folks and people more advanced in their careers.

But how are we working with the younger researchers to find their grant opportunities to figure out the balance between getting their experience, being on somebody else's grant and moving into PI roles on their own grants.

How do we look -- what do we call success?

How do we benchmark and evaluate?

So, from our side of things, I'm the coordinator of program development.

So the PIs do obviously, they do a lot of heavy lifting in terms of the writing.

But I have a very small team that we will work with them to write some sections to co-write some sections, to do a lot of editing and coordinating for all of the pieces.

Then I have nothing to do with post award.

So I don't know anything about any of that.

>> JULIE ASSEL: Do I have the ability to share a screen?

I just wanted to double check.

I want to show you one thing after that.

Just in terms of resources at my fingerprints here, because we didn't know what all of your questions were going to be.

So, the first thing as I think about what all you guys are doing is that you're -- your grant strategies are going to vary.

I'm going to skip because it will vary between you guys.

You think about the different roles you have to start out with.

One of the things that you may not realize exists the grant professional certification institute, which is the credentialing body for grant professionals, managers, writers, coordinators, any of those, grant professionals.

There's credential for this.

Michelle, I'll be super up front with you.

If you're only managing and managing a lot of federal dollars, you may concern them the CGMS, certified grant specialists.

And it's -- it's associated association.

Which is the NGMA -- national grant management association, okay?

So, I think that's one thing to start out with.

But, the reality is if you're doing the full grant life cycle, so, a lot of what Christina was saying a few minutes ago is she doesn't do the post award part, but she does pretty much everything before it, there's a whole list of competencies and skills that the grant professionals with the certification institute, which manages the GPC or grant professional certified, national -- nationally accredited credential.

And I'm going to share my screen, which is -- it's going to be a little messy to start out with.

I have so many resources I want to share with you guys.

I want to -- I love this conversation.

The round table idea is wonderful.

So, you start out with kind of this competency of researching the grants, you know?

Finding good matches, all of those kinds of things.

Helping your organization be really grant ready as a term.

People throw it around all the time.

Without any definition.

Sometimes people say, this talks about some of those things.

And then project design.

Somebody earlier was talking about, you know, working with the new researchers, Christina, and maybe like, you know, maybe you have community partners and you're going to talk a little bit more about how you can be more involved in community situations.

And that real idea of project design or development.

.

And some of that gets into evaluation.

But then, how to write it, construct it, submit it.

What I call the program managing aspect of this, to get things in on time and make sure they talk to each other, whether it's co-written or whether it's written by different people for different sections.

And it wouldn't surprise me if a lot of you probably manage your registration and your grants.gov registration and those things as well.

Again, I pointed out that the GPCI has a grants management component, because it's the full life cycle, this particular credential is, where CPMS focuses on one. There's one competency related to grants management.

But it does talk a lot about whose job is who.

And what are the compliance and what are the valuation of some of these different things.

And as an ethical practice, and -- and ethical practice and then professionalism.

Some of what we're talking about.

And you know, who are you having relationships with in terms of funders, and how are you writing a case.

And all these different competencies that are on here.

Then there's a job description that can be created out of this.

And, I'm again going to share my screen with this, that you can take a look at like what do you do that's on this list.

In terms of researching GRANTSs, you know, guiding your organization's ability to increase the capacity and readiness, kind of all of the way down there.

And what skills do you really need to have.

Those types of things, okay?

So, this is one of the resources that we can make available to you guys.

And you should take -- in my opinion, you should take the job description and see, does my job description reflect what I do, right?

So, this is one component.

To take a look at what then the next kind of question is how do you help a researcher define their target or, you know, all of these -- there's so many questions, Christina, that you really kind of have in this space.

It really depends on what's going on in your community?

For one?

Right?

And Julie can talk a little bit more about this.

But it's the idea of, are you as an entity really supporting the knowledge of what your community needs are around this space?

So that you really know, do you have a -- do you have a good data set?

Locally?

To pull from.

Right?

And all of those components, the community needs, strategic plans, budget needs, all of the components when you have to decide, well, what kind of grant dollars are we going to look for?

Do we want to continue on with that a little bit?

>> JULIE ALSUP: I think another thing that I wanted to continue on what Julie is saying is the grant professional is more than the grant writer.

I think sometimes there's a perception that if you like writing, or if you don't really want to maybe talk to people very much or you can -- you can just write grants.

Because you're a good writer.

I think that being a grant professional requires you to start some conversations within your organization.

So that you have an understanding of how grants live within your organization's overall development strategy.

If they don't, yet, that's part of the questions you ask.

And also, then, how -- how -- for example, grants department, if you're starting a grants department, you might have, you know, there might be other forms of revenue.

And they say if you want to start a grants department.

What do you want grants to do within our department.

And then also, playing the role of facilitator with the PIs or the departments within your organization that interact with the community and say, what role do we play in the larger community?

Because you're going to have to be the one oftentimes to ask those questions of the PI, of who they work with, who they interact with already, and who they want to interact with and work with already to be able to tell the story of the role that you play and how you address the needs and how you know what the needs are in the community.

There were overarching departments such as finance and operations and such.

So, I'm often in the position of asking questions.

To get the information I need and to do so in a way of why I was asking the question.

When it comes to understanding the community needs, a place you can start is some of the formal documents that the organization may have.

Annual report, strategic plan, guiding documents that state your purpose, contracts that you might have.

Just kind of the foundational things. That's the place to start.

But also, just information about what you've done and why more is needed or how that does not address the need completely.

The other point I want to make is the grant professional can't exist in the vacuum within their own agency because when you're writing a grant, many times the questions you you're responding to in a narrative asking you to basically say what you know about the field and what's not being done, or what is being done that you could partner with to do more.

And I see Julie posing some questions in the chat as well.

Another way they might help to get more information on the communities to craft surveys.

Sometimes crafting needs assessment for the people we serve saying what else do you need?

What needs are not being met?

Asking your PIs, surveying your PIs, surveying your existing partners, saying, where are the gaps?

And then serving the community at large.

So, depending on what type of funding you want to do, you can use that data to craft your needs statement.

And, for example, if you're going for perhaps you're looking for additional funding to some of the state funding you get, the bigger -- typically, bigger grants come with bigger collaboration.

So, collaboration requires a, you know, sometimes a community level or a system level understanding of need.

Does anyone have any questions about anything I just said.

>> JULIE ASSEL: Kimberly has some questions.

>> Kimberly: Hi, folks, thank you for that.

So, my question is a little bit more holistic and maybe systematic and historical.

So, what I'm wondering is when did sort of did -- sort of the accrediting bodies, like how recently did they form, and why did they form is the first part of the question.

I mean, I'm a board-certified behavior analyst and I know that just with any sort of credentialing body, there's a group of practitioners who decide it needs to be more professionalized.

So, I'm wondering just the history around the professionalizing of this skill?

First of all, the second question relates to -- there seems to have been two accrediting bodies.

So, are both international?

The third part of the question, I mean, you know, like an internationally recognized certification, the third part of the question question is, is one generally perceived, although it's newer, as the better credential.

And the fourth question is, do you think as far as future trends, that it may be this might be required by funders.

Those are all questions running through my head.

Did you get them or --

>> JULIE ASSEL: I got some of them.

I got four of them in the chat.

Yes, they were formed about the same time.

The grant professionals' association, which used to be called American association of grants professionals a long time ago.

And then changed its name.

The credentialing body kind of came up out of that.

And if you know a lot about credentialing, it is, it's a group of professionals saying it needs to be made more to a profession of its own.

That means we meet together with practitioners all over the country.

We need to do a job analysis.

All of those types of things.

I -- I feel very strongly in making sure that everybody knows potential conflict of interest for an ethical perspective.

I actually -- I Sitton credentialing board currently of the GPCI. And I -- I am actually just coming off of a two-year term as President.

So, I just wanted to clear that in advance.

Everybody knows that.

But I can tell you in terms of the history, they started to have them back in 1990, 2000s-ish.

They've done all of the literature review and all of those things, 2005ish.

Then the first exam was offered in 2007.

Then the exam back then was paper and pencil.

Then they went to electroniced and the pandemic last year -- like it's over.

Because of the pandemic last year, you can take it remotely.

Under certain conditions.

So, that's general history of the credential.

I'm going to drop LAING here in the chat that gives it in much more detail.

The reality is that neither of is 100% international, okay?

Mostly because it's based upon mostly -- (indiscernible) mostly U.S. funders, right?

So, the federal OMB guidelines and things like that.

I would tell you that MGMA, CGMS, is absolutely U.S.-based because theirs is all about the -- the those guidelines and things like that.

So, I think by nature, the GPC because it deals with how you converse with funders and relate to people, it has more of an international potential, but isn't an international credentialed per se.

You can be -- you can take the exam from other places across the world, but it's all related to the U.S. kind of mindset.

And -- and how funding really works here in the United States.

Is one considered better?

It all depends on what you consider better.

The -- the GPC is accredited.

The CGMS is not.

So, some people consider that to be better.

As I spoke of with Michelle, you know, just earlier, I think it has though do with what -- what works more for you.

If all you do is post award and all you're doing is federal grants, it's probably the CGMS.

That's coming from somebody who is not a CGMS.

I probably could get it.

And it sit on the GPC board.

But, if I'm somebody who wants to say, I want to show this broad I do all of the things with grants, right?

Then for me, the GPC is a better fit.

Okay?

Question of whether it would be required by funders?

E -- we think, just in terms of trends, that it is more likely that funders would require CGMS first, because that's really more about the management of their dollars after it's awarded.

Both of these entities, and, in fact, so does American grant writers association and the certifying fundraiser executive, CFRI international, they all have ethical codes of conduct.

I'm only going to bring it up because it's so relevant.

We have a series all about ethics.

One of the sections is about the four different ethical codes of conduct, kind of irrelevant to this.

So, if if you're interest in going down that road, you can check that out.

But that gives you kind of a general answer.

To your questions.

>> Kimberly: Yeah, that was excellent.

Thanks so much.

And if you could just share -- I know we're still early in the pod cast, but if you could share all of that with Katie so she can share it with us, all of these resources?

>> KATIE JOHNSON: Yeah.

So after the event, we're going to collect all of the resources that we have in the call.

So happy answering questions.

>> Kimberly: Great.

>> JULIE ASSEL: A big advocate, not just of credentialing, but of associations.

So often grant professionals are doing what they do in isolation, right?

They're the only ones in their organization who does what they do.

Even if there are different PIs, there's just really one person coordinating it.

And nobody knows whether they do it well.

Which kind of brings it back to the idea of how do we benchmark that with know we're good at this?

Or how do we know that we're successful or how do we -- you know, really know that we could be better.

So, there are resources that kind of exist regarding this.

One is actually a grant report that was created by fund it for grant seekers that's metrics in the performance indicators for grant seekers.

There's also a 2019 strategy paper put out by the grant professionals association called designing performance metrics for grant professionals, kind of recommendations from the field.

So, to a certain degree, there's a lot out there, and yet, not.

You know what I mean?

So, again, I'll share my screen and give you a general snapshot here of these grant reports that you might examine.

Everything from how many -- how much money has been awarded to date, how many are submitted?

How many are pending?

Just those basic things.

But also like what stage are they in and various, you know, what's your win percentage on government grants, on private resources.

You know?

Julie and I were both in a consulting firm.

And we track this as a company.

We track this as an individual.

We track this by state.

We track this by individual grant professional.

We track this by we go it by regional grants, those kinds of things.

And data we can look at by a monthly perspective, right?

This could interesting if you have a bunch that are cramped together and find out, hey, that month we're turning in 17 grants, we're only getting half of them.

Our success rate is higher.

We're not considering applying for 17 in that month.

It's affecting the quality of what we're putting in.

So, those are the things that we might look at.

But, there's -- you know, various task reports.

If you're supervising and trying to see, are people really doing the things that they're supposed to be doing.?

?

Are they doing them in a timely fashion?

Because sometimes we as coordinators really get crunched.

Pause the people give you the information so late.

So if you can flag that PI, always turns their stuff into you late, you can start tracking those types of things.

Are there particular funders or agencies?

I think Christina got your question about where should we be looking at things, resources?

As -- who are your top funders right now for some of these key questions?

And which ones, perhaps, are you not tapping up into pause you just haven't had somebody who is interest in that area.

So, maybe that's -- basically becomes a new funding source for you because somebody creates a new research question.

All the way through, you know, deadline reports, funder summary reports, there's a whole series of things here, right?

So the flip side of this is the strategy paper, which focuses a little bit more on the -- the -- the perspective the grant professional to say, hey, we do more than just write grants, right?

It could be this idea of are you researching new opportunities, building relationships with funders and program officers.

Are you contributing to other aspects like advocacy aspects, you know, building those relationships with federal program officers and community organizations.

Now I have this relationship with this community organization, that means together we can apply for this thing.

So much about it is about the strategy of your particular office.

So, there's a lot of metrics that this is becoming one of my favorites now.

Because it has metrics by area of performance, right?

So grant development performance metrics, grant management and reporting metrics, institutional planning metrics.

Organizational capacity methods.

Resource or capacity metrics.

Relationship building, mentoring and training.

Again, Christina, I know you had so many questions in the beginning.

I refer to them a lot.

You ask a lot of questions.

You get a lot of answers back.

It's new -- are there more experience PIs taking the time to mentor and train the new PIs.

And how do you in essence reward them for that behavior.

If we do that, if we take the time to do that, it strengthens the whole center?

Does that make sense?

So there are all of those types of metrics.

But, there are a variety of other metrics as well.

Julie, you want to talk about some of the other factors that impact success?

If you want, I can share my screen, or you can.

You're muted, sorry?

>> JULIE ASSEL: Yes, that would be great if you can share your screen.

>> JULIE ALSUP: Okay.

So, here you'll see a number some of the things, the possibilities for your success.

The quality of the project, and, you want to give me more of a prompt.

>> JULIE ASSEL: It's not just how you write it.

Is your grant not successful because it's a -- you know, people -- I feel, people say, oh, we just have a bad grant writer or a bad grant professional, no, it's a bad project.

It was slammed together, we didn't develop it.

Or we don't have any track record in this space.

Maybe we need to gather more data.

Recent TRUNDZ are going down anyway.

How are we tracking the trends regarding the different research areas?

Honestly, the competitiveness, right?

You have a challenging amongst yourself.

You're competing against each other in many regards.

Right?

How do I guide the new researchers?

Point out what everybody is doing and what everybody is not doing.

Then you're reducing the competitiveness.

As long as you can find a deep funding pool, right?

>> JULIE ALSUP: So when you think about grant readiness, the types of documents or information that you need to have to be able to apply to something, to make sure that you have a complete and most current support documents for what it is that you're putting in.

That takes departments with financial documents, things like that.

.

Leveraging dollars, right?

So if you're submitting for a grant that may or may not require a match, for example, or other funds, growing the skin in the game for the other funders, they want to see who else is supporting what you have, what you're requesting.

Diverse funding streams, supporting your project is also something that can impact success.

Also, just remember, the people reviewing the grants, yes, they have a rubric for what has to be there.

But then they also are humans with personal preferences, too.

So, having -- having people review -- having a network of peers or colleagues, you know, if you're the only person in the -- in the shop, you might identify a couple of people and say, hey, would you look over my work before I submit it?

Make sure that it's complete?

You know, in our firm, we have a multistep quality process where we have a second reader that's checking for compliance.

Are you answering the questions you they're asking.

Are you making sure, you know, between the PI -- as the PI -- the parts that the PI has written, have they answered the question with the same lens that the funder is asking for?

Sometimes when the writer is in the midst of what they're writing, they may read the question that they're responding to in a certain way.

And that may or may not be exactly what was answering.

And sometimes it's nice to have the second reader to have the additional perspective saying, well, actually they were asking you about the system.

They weren't asking you about your project -- you need to go -- you need to go bigger in this area.

Wards are being given.

You know?

If there's several that are being given, you know, I don't know how scientific it is.

But we see less than ten awards offered, that's a flag to say, you should have a conversation with the program officer to go, make sure that you don't already know whose those are going to.

And just knowing where -- this goes back to the communities.

Knowing how big of a player you are in the pond, to know if you are really eligible for those opportunities that have few -- where they're only getting a couple, okay?

And the extent to which you can show through strong letters of support, through funders who are involved?

And the extent in which you can demonstrate a part of this is important.

So letters of support.

Strength of the letters of support, I think, are all important, you know, things that you should -- that you can look at as well.

>> KATIE JOHNSON: Thank you, Michelle, for joining.

I want to say we got a late start, so people do need to go, that is okay.

If Julie and Julie, I don't know if you can stay.

I know also our captioner might also have to go.

But we may be able to go a few minutes over for those who can stay.

And just thank you for everyone's patience as we -- as we dealt with this.

So if you need to go, feel free.

>> Michelle: Thank you.

>> JULIE ASSEL: Okay.

So, one of the other like big questions that people asked, Katie, was kind of this idea of evaluation.

How do we evaluate whether -- whether -- it kind of goes back to this idea of success rate.

But it is the idea that, you know, what's a normal success rate.

What's a normal return on investment?

You know, what can we really expect?

And the yield is higher on government grants.

But the reality is it's so incredibly competitive or they're giving fewer grants at a time that it can be much more challenging to get them.

Because they're not from your area, right?

We will tell you that like the last formal study in this area specific to grant professionals was related to a foundation in corporation study in 1996.

The corporations never really impacted federal, right?

The other challenge that the federal government will say in terms of their numbers is, you know, that so many of -- there's resubmissions and on the research side, it skews the data about effectiveness versus how many grants do we get versus how many do we actually award?

But, anecdotally, if you talk to grant professionals, they will tell you that there's kind of a return on investment of ten-to-one, if you're applying at the federal level.

So, hey, it might cost, you know, $10,000, $50,000 to write one, but then we get a $450,000 award.

Right?

Obviously, you're not going to get them all.

And the amount of -- you know, if you're an in house grant writer, it's going to be different too, right?

Because how much money, quote/unquote you're investing as you set up your grant office.

The other thing to think about is several people in here were relatively new. There's a general industry standard that takes really three years to get up and going, right?

So, if you think about those new -- the new researchers, same kind of thing, right?

Three years of really trying to do things and, you know, sometimes succeeding, sometimes not.

But building up their own research dollars.

So, somewhat being supported under other people's grants.

But also, having their own grants accounts for a variety of relationships, research opportunities, those types of things.

I'm a big fan of, you know, what kind of other resources are out there.

So, there's a couple of -- a couple of grant stations that puts out the state of grant seeking with a variety of other organizations, so there's some links and we'll make sure that Katie has those for your research page.

But, you know, ultimately, you have to take a look at what's your internal cost?

Right?

So, not just the PI's time, but, Christina, your time and the finance people's time and people like Michelle's time, she does postaward and take a look at all of those people's time and what does that cost?

And should you respectfully, do we need another Christina?

Because she has to manage -- what, did you say ten PIs.

Well, if you want to have another five PIs, that might not fit in Christina's life, right?

But, so knowing what that ROI is, what those costs are, and I can tell you, you know, as you think about all of the costs, you know, these are kind of your typical grant office expenses, right?

Don't forget the dos and conferences in education.

That's how people grow.

Right?

Printing costs.

We don't worry about it anymore, but we need to worry about it a lot.

It used to be a huge aspect.

Nowadays it may be a telephone or internet feed.

Or maybe I have a business Sr. Month so I need to have a consultant come in here for a couple of months or build the research and sit down with our PIs and go through the questions with them. So there's a variety of reasons that you may have those components as well.

The reality is there's so much of this.

-- another one I can't help but look at is, you know, what's the turn of rate in your grant professionals, right?

Are people learning things and leaving.

Are you compensating them well enough?

So, there's components about, are they successful, because they really know this.

If you take a look at the success rate by years in the field, you can see it goes up.

(Have a good day)