ALIAS: “Micro Manager Mickey”
CRIME: Requests instant resources with very little or no notice
- Has an unrealistic expectation of delivery timelines
- Does not give a clear scope of work
- Makes unrealistic requests which quickly spiral into larger tasks
PUNISHMENT: Study Team unable to produce work within short timelines
- Required resources not immediately available
- Work is delivered is not to expected, misinterpretation due to lack of documentation
SPOILS: Study statistics validated by interesting pieces of work
- e.g. submissions or sensitivity journal articles

ALIAS: “Ad hoc Annie”
CRIME: Requests instant resource with very little or no notice
- Has an unrealistic expectation of delivery timelines
- Does not give a clear scope of work
- Makes unrealistic requests which quickly spiral into larger tasks
PUNISHMENT: Study Team unable to produce work within short timelines
- Required resources not immediately available
- Work is delivered is not to expected, misinterpretation due to lack of documentation
SPOILS: Study statistics validated by interesting pieces of work
- e.g. submissions or sensitivity journal articles

ALIAS: “Hands-Off Harry”
CRIME: Does not respond to communications
- Work must be paid for
- “Cry Wolf” situation occurs where actual emergencies are not perceived as genuine
- Relationship between Study Team and Customer is often too weak to become reluctant to communicate with each other
PUNISHMENT: Customer comments on incomplete work
- Made to wait when mistakes highlighted have already been resolved following internal process

ALIAS: “Mind Changing Mo”
CRIME: Makes numerous fast minute requests
- is unwilling to reschedule timelines
- Unacknowledged changes can impact on ability to meet deadlines
- Provides unacknowledged conflicting comments from different departments following review of a deliverable
PUNISHMENT: Over-implies changes to scope of work must be paid for
- Changes agreed methods of analysis once work is underway will increase overall time spent and may affect quality
- Lack of internal communication slows finalization of Statistical Analysis Plan (SAP) and as consolidated views need to be reached

ALIAS: “Ad hoc Annie”
CRIME: Requests instant resources with very little or no notice
- Has an unrealistic expectation of delivery timelines
- Does not give a clear scope of work
- Makes unrealistic requests which quickly spiral into larger tasks
PUNISHMENT: Study Team unable to produce work within short timelines
- Required resources not immediately available
- Work is delivered is not to expected, misinterpretation due to lack of documentation
SPOILS: Study statistics validated by interesting pieces of work
- e.g. submissions or sensitivity journal articles

ALIAS: “Panicking Pete”
CRIME: Tends to oversequest as soon as something is not quite as expected
- Does not think through a situation or check that a mistake has been made before changing something in increments
- Considers everything urgent (this MUST be done this week) even when there is no impact on the overall study
- Seeks to appeal rules or sections unreasonable
PUNISHMENT: Embarrassment of needing to correct an initial judgement
- “Cry Wolf” situation occurs where actual emergencies are not perceived as genuine
- Relationship between Study Team and Customer is often too weak to become reluctant to communicate with each other

ALIAS: “The Perfectionist”
CRIME: Expects that all deliverables will be perfect
- Complains about misunderstandings or a failure to pay for QC procedures but expects no errors
- Has an unrealistic expectation of working with “real” data but assumes there will be no unrecorded partial dates or incorrectly completed diary entries remaining at database lock
PUNISHMENT: Disagreement of quality of deliverables as expectations are unrealistic
- Study Team are unable to meet unrealistic expectations which can lead to low morale
- Tends to make unrealistic changes to the work being carried out (i.e. priority of study and the flexibility around timelines – see below)

ALIAS: “The Perfectionist”
CRIME: Expects that all deliverables will be perfect
- Complains about misunderstandings or a failure to pay for QC procedures but expects no errors
- Has an unrealistic expectation of working with “real” data but assumes there will be no unrecorded partial dates or incorrectly completed diary entries remaining at database lock
PUNISHMENT: Disagreement of quality of deliverables as expectations are unrealistic
- Study Team are unable to meet unrealistic expectations which can lead to low morale
- Tends to make unrealistic changes to the work being carried out (i.e. priority of study and the flexibility around timelines – see below)

SPOILS: Study statistics validated by interesting pieces of work
- e.g. submissions or sensitivity journal articles

PAROLE CONDITIONS:
- At the start-up meeting the whole Study Team should discuss and agree the processes they are expected to follow and any deviations from standard timelines – are these “set in stone”.
- Agree timelines for all deliverables and stick to them. If the timelines have to change, make sure that responsibilities, including the levels of involvement required from all key team members, are stated up front.
- Agree timelines for all deliverables and stick to them. If the timelines have to change, make sure you agree some more!
- Agree a communication method that suits your way of working to ensure progress, setup regular calls or send the Quintiles QandA Tracker to address any questions/issues.

PAROLE CONDITIONS:
- Set up regular calls or send the Quintiles QandA Tracker to address any questions/issue
- Make sure that responsibilities, including the levels of involvement required from all key team members, are stated up front.
- Agree timelines for all deliverables and stick to them. If the timelines have to change, make sure you agree some more!
- Agree a communication method that suits your way of working to ensure progress, setup regular calls or send the Quintiles QandA Tracker to address any questions/issues.

PAROLE CONDITIONS:
- At the start-up meeting the whole Study Team should discuss the processes they are using (this will highlight any “small” changes may take longer than expected)
- Provide consolidated comments in one document (or organise a TC with all key team members to make any final decisions)