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We are so pleased you are able to join us! The theme is “New Guidance, Renewed Partnerships.” When the Office of Management and Budget announced in December 2013 that they were replacing the eight existing circulars governing federal awards with the new Uniform Guidance, research administrators everywhere began working to gain a better understanding of the new rules. We’ve read and compared the new language to the old circulars, asked questions, offered our comments and suggestions. Throughout this period, we have reached out to our colleagues at the federal agencies, our faculty, campus administrators at all levels of our institutions as well as our colleagues from other institutions. Working together on the UG has reinforced why research administration is such a collaborative profession. At this year’s meeting, we will be sharing our understanding of the UG, asking questions to clarify the sponsors’ implementations, and sharing our ideas on how to continue building on these stronger collaborations going forward.

The program committee has put together a meeting filled with informative workshops, concurrent sessions, senior forums and discussion groups covering nine tracks: Pre-Award, Post-Award, Federal, PUIs, Clinical Research, Compliance, International, Departmental, and Career Skills/Professional Development. There are opportunities to listen and talk to representatives from the Federal agencies and your colleagues from institutions large, small, and in-between from around the world.

AM57 will be offering something new: Office Hours. Oftentimes, participants are asked to find an answer to a specific question while they are at the annual meeting. These sessions will offer participants the opportunity to meet one-on-one with some of NCURA’s subject matter experts for answers and advice on specific questions or issues.

There is plenty more to get excited about at AM57. The keynote speaker this year will be Chuck Todd. Todd previously served as NBC News chief White House correspondent, as well as the host of MSNBC’s The Daily Rundown. Currently, Todd is the host of NBC’s Meet the Press. He will be sharing his perspectives on what’s happening in Washington and what to look forward to in 2016.

There will also be plenty of food, music, entertainment, and fun. Sunday night, plan on joining us for dinner and comedy with the hilarious Jake Johannsen. With forty-four Letterman appearances under his belt (not to mention a handful of Late Night with Conan O’Brien, The Tonight Show with Jay Leno, and Politically Incorrect gigs) Jake is no stranger to performing comedy. Prepare for laughs before going global on Tuesday night and heading to Monte Carlo (OK, the Hilton Ballroom) for food, music, and casino-gaming, with the proceeds benefiting the NCURA Education Scholarship Fund.

The regions will be busy as well offering opportunities for networking throughout the meeting. There will also be a regional competition—get ready to show the world that you have talents beyond meeting proposal deadlines and preparing financial reports! And don’t forget about all of the sites in DC! Summer is a great time to explore the city on your own, with your colleagues, or with your family.

We look forward to having you join us for the best meeting EV-AH!

NCURA 57th Annual Meeting Co-Chairs,

Robert Andresen  Brenda Kavanaugh  Lisa Mosley
University of Wisconsin-Madison  University of Rochester  Arizona State University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thursday, August 1, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:00 – 7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon – 1:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 – 2:45 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 – 3:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 – 3:45 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 – 4:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 – 5:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 – 6:15 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friday, August 2, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:15 am – 5:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 am – 4:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 am – 1:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 5:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:15 – 7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saturday, August 3, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:15 – 7:15 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 am – 5:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 – 8:15 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 10:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 2:45 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 – 2:45 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 – 3:45 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 – 5:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday, August 4, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:15 – 7:15 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 am – 5:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 – 8:15 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 10:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 am – 1:15 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 – 2:15 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 – 2:45 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 – 5:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 – 6:15 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday, August 5, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:15 – 7:15 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 am – 5:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 – 8:15 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 10:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 11:45 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 am – 1:15 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 – 2:15 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 – 2:45 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 – 4:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 – 5:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 – 6:15 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“This program gives new attendees the chance to get some advice on how the meeting may best serve the mentee’s needs, and also gives the mentee someone to share meals, sessions, or events with if the mentee came alone.”

Holly Benze, Johns Hopkins University
ARE YOU NEW TO NCURA CONFERENCES?
REQUEST A MENTOR FOR THE ANNUAL MEETING!

MENTEE EXPERIENCE provides first-time participants or participants who have recently begun attending NCURA meetings an opportunity to enhance their meeting experience by connecting with colleagues and expanding their peer network.

DO YOU HAVE EXPERIENCE YOU WOULD LIKE TO SHARE WITH A NEWCOMER TO THE ANNUAL MEETING?

BECOME A MENTOR

✓ Connect with attendee (via telephone) at least once prior to the meeting to provide information about the conference experience and to answer any questions regarding session offerings, logistics, etc.

✓ Share the meeting experience with the attendee – assist attendee in meeting other members and be available to connect at networking events (receptions, breaks, breakfast, lunch or dinner).

CLICK HERE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE MENTOR PROGRAM AT THE 57TH ANNUAL MEETING.

PLEASE BE SURE TO FILL OUT THE SURVEY BY MONDAY, JULY 27TH
ANNUAL MEETING PROGRAM COMMITTEE

NCURA 2015 Vice President
Robert C. Andresen, University of Wisconsin Madison

Annual Meeting 57 Co-Chairs
Brenda Kavanaugh, University of Rochester
Lisa E. Mosley, Arizona State University

Career Skills/Professional Development
Christa C. Johnson, Colorado State University
Tolise C. Miles, Children’s National Medical Center

Clinical Research/Clinical Trials
Allecia A. Harley, Rush University Medical Center
Tesheia H. Johnson, Yale University

Compliance
Kay Ellis, University of Arizona
Laurianne M. Torres, Duke University

Departmental
Anne Albinak, Johns Hopkins University
Sinnamon A. Tierney, Portland State University

Federal
Jean Feldman, The National Science Foundation
Beth Strausser, The National Science Foundation
Cynthia Hope, The University of Alabama

International
Jesse J. Szeto, National Council of University Research Administrators
John Donovan, Dublin Institute of Technology

Post-Award
Tracey Fraser, Smithsonian Institution
Jeremy Forsberg, The University of Texas at Arlington
Adrienne Larmett, Baker Tilly

Pre-Award
Antoinette Lawson, University of Maryland, College Park
David K. Smelser, University of Tennessee

PUI
Anne Pascucci, Christopher Newport University
Julie Guggino, Central Washington University

Workshops
Glenda A. Bullock, Washington University in St. Louis
Gunta J. Liders, University of Rochester
Georgette Sakamoto, University of Hawaii
THANK YOU to the following sponsors for your generous support!

**NCURA MEMBER SPONSORS**

- Evisions Research Suite
- Huron Education

**NCURA CONTRIBUTING SPONSORS**

- ATTAIN
- BAKER TILLY
- IT WORKS
- JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
- KualiCo

FOLLOW US @NCURA #NCURAAM57
CPE Information for Certified Public Accountants
NCURA is accredited by the National Registry of CPE Sponsors. This program is administered by the National Association of State Boards of Accountancy (NASBA) to sponsor and award Continuing Professional Education Credits (CPEs) to accounting professionals. Certified Public Accountants will need to complete a CPE credit form in order to receive CPE credits. CPE forms are available at the NCURA AM57 Concierge Desk. Forms must be deposited in the CPE boxes located at the NCURA AM57 Concierge desk at the end of the conference. In accordance with the standards of the National Registry of CPE Sponsors, 50 minutes equals 1 CPE. Depending on the sessions and workshops you choose to attend a maximum of 30.5 CPE credits can be issued for NCURA’s AM57 Conference. Field of study available is Specialized Knowledge and Applications (S).

CPE Credits will be available for concurrent sessions, pre-conference workshops and senior level forums. Discussion Groups, Sparks Sessions, Office Hours and the Keynote Address are not eligible for CPE credits.

MAXIMUM CREDITS AVAILABLE:
15.0 CPEs: Conference Only
18.5 CPEs: Conference + 1/2 Day Workshop
22.5 CPEs: Conference + Full Day of Workshops
26.5 CPEs: Conference + 1½ Days of Workshops
30.5 CPEs: Conference + 2 Days of Workshops

Please Note: All Continuing Professional Education Credits (CPEs) will be issued by September 4, 2015.

Registration
Registration is available at www.ncura.edu and is open to any individual engaged in the administration of sponsored programs in a college, university, or teaching hospital. Please Note: Learning objectives for each session will be noted in the conference program. Please consult the session descriptions for program level details. The only prerequisite for meeting attendance is current involvement in university sponsored research programs. There is no advanced preparation required to attend sessions. This conference is a “group-live” offering. For information regarding administrative policies such as complaint resolution and refund, please contact our office at 202-466-3894.

Other Information
NCURA is registered with the National Association of State Boards of Accountancy (NASBA) as a sponsor of continuing professional education on the National Registry of CPE Sponsors. State boards of accountancy have final authority on the acceptance of individual courses for CPE credit. Complaints regarding registered sponsors may be submitted to the National Registry of CPE Sponsors through its website: www.learningmarket.org.

CEU Information for All Participants
NCURA will be offering CEUs for the Annual Meeting and Pre-Conference Workshops. The Continuing Education Unit (CEU) is a nationally recognized unit designed to provide a record of an individual’s continuing education accomplishments. Please note, CEUs are calculated based on the standard formula of 1 CEU = 10 contact hours.

MAXIMUM CREDITS AVAILABLE:
12.5 Hours of Education: Conference Only
15.75 Hours of Education: Conference + 1/2 Day Workshop
19.0 Hours of Education: Conference + Full Day of Workshops
22.25 Hours of Education: Conference + 1½ Days of Workshops
25.5 Hours of Education: Conference + 2 Days of Workshops

Please note: All Continuing Education Units (CEUs) will automatically be sent to all registrants of the conference by September 4, 2015.

Session Definitions
CONCURRENT SESSIONS are formal presentations that have question and answer time built in. These sessions will have anywhere from 30 – 150 participants.

DISCUSSION GROUPS are facilitated sessions that are limited to 30 participants. Instead of formal presentations, the specific topics are discussed, and information is shared by the group’s participants.

PRE-CONFERENCE WORKSHOPS (WS) are presentations, traditionally supported with PowerPoint and handouts that are taught by topic experts in a classroom style setting. These sessions have built in question and answer time and have anywhere from 20 – 70 participants.

SENIOR FORUMS (SF) are intended for experienced participants in senior management positions. Current issues and basics are presumed known. No PowerPoint slides or handouts are used. Agenda topics should be known but discussion should dictate the length and depth of each topic. Session attendance is limited to encourage discussion and active participation by participants. * Please note – The Workshops and the Senior Forums are the only sessions taking place on August 2. There is an additional fee for Workshops and Senior Forums.

SPARK SESSIONS are 15 – 20 minute, high energy, high deliverable offerings that will get right to the “good stuff,” and participants will be able to attend multiple topics in each time slot.

OFFICE HOURS create an opportunity to obtain answers to questions by subject matter experts in a one-on-one setting.

Overview of Session Program Levels/Key
BASIC level sessions assume some fundamental research administration knowledge.

INTERMEDIATE level sessions assume basic knowledge, and the sessions introduce and develop topics that exceed basic knowledge. Sessions focus on building competency.

ADVANCED level sessions assume mastery of the subject and the sessions focus on in-depth knowledge or a broader range of topics. Sessions focus on mastering more difficult and complex scenarios.

OVERVIEW level sessions will provide a general review of a subject area from a broader perspective.

UPDATE level sessions will provide a general review of new developments.
## Full Day Pre-Conference Workshops

**8:15 am – 4:30 pm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 1</td>
<td>The Basics: Pre-Award Fundamentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 2</td>
<td>Post-Award Basics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 3</td>
<td>How to Manage Proposal and Awards – Confessions from a Department Administrator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Half Day Morning Pre-Conference Workshops

**8:15 – 11:45 am**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 5</td>
<td>The Key to Understanding Research Administration and Clinical Trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 6</td>
<td>FAR Basics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 7</td>
<td>Post-Award Management: From Award to Closeout and Everything in Between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 8</td>
<td>Grant Writing Secrets Every Research Administrator Needs to Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 9</td>
<td>IRB, IACUC and COIs: Understanding the Basics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 10</td>
<td>Effort Reporting – Not Just the Basics!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 11</td>
<td>Subawards and Subrecipient Monitoring - UG Basics and A Bit Beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 12</td>
<td>A Team Approach to Developing Competitive Grant Proposals: The Pre-Award Role in Supporting Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 13</td>
<td>The Alphabet Soup of NIH Training and Career Development Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 14</td>
<td>The Dos and Don’ts When Working with Faculty and Funding Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 15</td>
<td>OMB Uniform Guidance: Same, Same – But Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 16</td>
<td>Conscious Leadership: A Management Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 17</td>
<td>Redefining Learning and Development of Research Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 18</td>
<td>PIUs and the Uniform Guidance: Where Are We?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Level Forum 19</td>
<td>Structuring Your Office for Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Level Forum 20</td>
<td>Metrics: You Want What by When? Grant Success, Research Performance Metrics, Forecasting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Half Day Afternoon Pre-Conference Workshops

**1:00 – 4:30 pm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 21</td>
<td>A Comprehensive Overview of Clinical Trials Management and Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 22</td>
<td>Policies: How to Develop and Communicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 23</td>
<td>Export Control Basics: Understanding the Regulations in a University Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 24</td>
<td>Steps and Strategies for Developing Grant Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 25</td>
<td>Boot Camp on the Basics of Contract Drafting and Negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 26</td>
<td>Cost Sharing: Pre-Award to Post-Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 27</td>
<td>Numbers Tell the Story: Development and Management of Budgets for Sponsored Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 28</td>
<td>Trends and Patterns in Federal Audits and Enforcement Actions in Research: Anticipating the Future By Learning from the Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 29</td>
<td>Intellectual Property (IP) Considerations for the Pre-award Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 30</td>
<td>Service Centers, Compliance, and All that Jazz – Financial Management of a Service Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 31</td>
<td>Uniform Guidance – It’s Here, It’s Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 32</td>
<td>Working with International Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 33</td>
<td>An Introduction to Working under U.S. Government Compliance Regulations (for non-U.S. Institutions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 34</td>
<td>Effective Presentations – NCURA Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Level Forum 35</td>
<td>University F&amp;A Rate Proposals – Federal Review and Complex Negotiation Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Level Forum 36</td>
<td>Performance Metrics in Research Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## POST-CONFERENCE WORKSHOP

**Thursday | August 6, 2015**

**8:30 am – 4:30 pm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 37</td>
<td>NIH Workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
workshop 2

**POST-AWARD BASICS**

This workshop will focus on the topics that are most relevant in the day-to-day financial management of sponsored projects. It will also provide an overview of the financial regulatory compliance landscape, with an emphasis on the new Uniform Guidance, 2 CFR, Part 200. Bring your questions, concerns, and your institution’s experience and be willing to participate and share with the group.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

- Participants will learn about post-award administration from beginning to end.
- Participants will gain a basic understanding of the concepts involved in post-award administration.
- Participants will identify ways to manage day-to-day post-award activities.

*David Schmidt*, Assistant Vice President for Research and Economic Development, University of North Dakota

*Roseann Luongo*, Associate Director, Training and Compliance, Harvard University

*W. Scott Erwin, Sr.*, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Texas State University
8:15 am – 4:30 pm ~ Full Day Pre-Conference Workshops

**Workshop 4**

**PROPOSAL REVIEW 101: INTEGRATING REGULATIONS, LAWS, POLICIES, AND BEST PRACTICES**

Newcomers to research administration are often overwhelmed by the sheer volume of information we must know and use in our daily work. The new Uniform Guidance, the old OMB circulars, compliance regulations, state and local regulations, sponsor guidelines, and institutional policies must all be carefully considered as we review proposals and manage awards. We must effectively communicate these various requirements to our faculty, who may not understand their importance or the impact noncompliance could have on their research. This workshop is a pre-award focused step-by-step guide for newcomers to the profession, both in central offices and at the department level, illustrating an efficient and effective way to handle comprehensive pre-award proposal reviews, communicate with faculty, and make sure proposals are ready for submission. Specific points in the process are highlighted to show where the various rules and regulations are involved, and what criteria we should be looking for during pre-award proposal review. We will touch on compliance with sponsor guidelines and applicable regulations, budget preparation, honing the basic skills, and enhancing the research administrator’s professional judgment.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will learn to identify and develop crucial skills for the pre-award research administrator.
- Participants will learn to effectively plan their own professional development related to the crucial skills identified.
- Participants will learn to effectively review proposals for compliance with applicable rules, regulations, laws, and policies.
- Participants will learn to effectively communicate with faculty on policy and regulatory issues.
- Participants will learn to effectively prepare proposals for submission with a minimum of problems or stress.

**Lead presenter**

- **Brigette Pfister**, Director of Sponsored Programs, College of Humanities & Sciences, Virginia Commonwealth University
- **Trisha Southergill**, Grant Support and E-Thesis Manager, Montana Tech of the University of Montana
- **Heather Lennon**, Grant Research Administrator, Virginia Commonwealth University
This workshop is an introduction to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, the policies and procedures which govern how the U.S. Federal Government procures goods and services via contracts. This workshop should be useful for those new to research administration, or perhaps new to contracts.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

- Participants will gain an understanding of the nuances involved in developing and managing a clinical trial budget and project expenses.
- Participants will learn how to manage multifaceted issues that often arise in a negotiation of trial agreements.
- Participants will increase their knowledge in the review of key contract terms and their implications and gain confidence in the negotiation process with sponsors.
- Participants will learn about the complexities of managing clinical trials, study billing processes and how it relates to financial compliance.
- Participants will learn how clinical trials are closed-out and how to manage post-close-out institutional obligations and responsibilities.

Lisa Benson*, Director, Research Administration and Sponsored Programs, Connecticut Children’s Medical Center
Patricia Travis, Associate Director Clinical Research, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine

**Workshop 6**

**FAR BASICS**

This workshop is an introduction to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, the policies and procedures which govern how the U.S. Federal Government procures goods and services via contracts. This workshop should be useful for those new to research administration, or perhaps new to contracts.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:** This workshop will focus primarily on the FAR itself but may touch on important agency specifics regulations such as DFARS provisions that commonly impact research administration.

Robin Riglin*, Associate Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, The Pennsylvania State University
Stacey Bucha, Senior Negotiator, Office of Sponsored Programs, Pennsylvania State University

**Workshop 7**

**POST-AWARD MANAGEMENT: FROM AWARD TO CLOSEOUT AND EVERYTHING IN BETWEEN**

This workshop will feature discussion of the rules, regulations, processes and functions in managing sponsored program awards. Presenters will provide insights from the perspective of the department grant manager as well as from the central post-award office. Discussion will focus on key functions, optimum best practices and potential pitfalls and opportunities throughout the post-award portion of the grant life cycle. Examples of forms, policies and processes will help to guide the discussion.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

- Participants will leave with a baseline of knowledge of key functions in managing sponsored programs.
- Participants will be provided with fundamental guidance in most aspects of post-award management to ensure a comprehensive overview of basic knowledge in this area.

Julie Cole*, Director of Research Costing Compliance, Duke University
Nate Martinez-Waymans, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Duke University
Jennifer Shambrook, Director, University of Central Florida
Workshop 8
GRANT WRITING SECRETS EVERY RESEARCH ADMINISTRATOR NEEDS TO KNOW
Are you new to the world of proposal writing and looking to understand the basics? Are you a practicing grant writer looking to sharpen your skills? Are you a seasoned research administrator exploring ways to add value to the customer service you offer to faculty? In this pre-award workshop, the presenters will share top grant writing secrets that will help increase the overall quality and competitiveness of the proposals you submit. Through a mock proposal review, you will experience the grants process from the sponsor’s point of view, deciding whether or not proposals should be funded. These hands-on and minds-on activities will help you to effectively analyze RFPs, better match institutional needs with sponsor funding priorities, develop persuasive proposals, and avoid common mistakes.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will learn to analyze grant application guidelines.
- Participants will identify sponsor hot buttons.
- Participants will learn to weave persuasive themes throughout proposals.
- Participants will learn to understand the grant review process.
- Participants will learn to identify 3 common grant pitfalls and how to avoid them.

Jeremy Miner*, Director of Grants and Contracts, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire
Kris Monahan, Director of Sponsored Research and Programs, Providence College

Workshop 9
IRB, IACUC AND COIs: UNDERSTANDING THE BASICS
Are you new to the world of compliance and looking to understand the basics? This workshop will provide an introduction to the three primary areas of the compliance landscape: Institutional Review Board (IRB), Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), and Conflicts of Interest (COIs). The interactive workshop will include case studies, discussions, and exercises to help understand the regulations governing these three areas.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will be able to identify how the areas intersect with Research administration and the research enterprise.
- Participants will gain an understanding of common research compliance issues.
- Participants will be able to identify project activities that may require a compliance review.

Rosemary Madnick*, Executive Director, Office of Grants and Contracts Administration, University of Alaska Fairbanks
Andrew Gray, Associate Director, Office of Grants and Contracts Administration, University of Alaska Fairbanks
**Workshop 10**

**EFFORT REPORTING – NOT JUST THE BASICS!**

After an update of what has changed with regard to effort compliance with the Uniform Guidance, we will take the concept of effort through the entire life-cycle of an award. We will work through how to handle the situations that, in theory are anomalies, but in reality, happen all too often (cost transfers, retro pay and excluded wage types, K-awards, etc.). We will share various methods in use, or being tested, for complying with the regulations. Come with your questions and leave with some answers, some ideas, and some new questions to ask when you return to your institution!

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will learn what has changed and what has not, regarding effort, from A-21 to the Uniform Guidance.
- Participants will learn effort issues throughout the lifecycle of an award.
- Participants will learn varying methodologies to meet the regulations.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should have a familiarity with A-21 & Uniform Guidance and a basic understanding of the concepts of effort and key personnel.

*Linda Ward*, Assistant Director, Cost Accounting, University of Maryland, College Park  
*Patricia Holmes*, Research Administrator, Departments of Pathology and Medical Research, University of Maryland, Baltimore

---

**Workshop 11**

**SUBAWARDS AND SUBRECIPIENT MONITORING – UG BASICS AND A BIT BEYOND**

This intermediate level workshop will focus on practical information needed to plan, write and perform day-to-day management of subawards on financial assistance agreements issued under the Uniform Guidance, including understanding where requirements have changed. Basic familiarity with the definition and concept of subawards will be assumed, but detailed knowledge or experience is not expected. Topics covered will include subaward proposal necessities and best practices, subrecipient risk assessments under the UG, and single audit (A-133) review and handling subrecipients who are not subject to A-133. Subrecipient monitoring baseline requirements and options (and when to consider deploying them), invoice management, life-of-subaward monitoring, and closeout will also be discussed.

> continued on next page
Workshop 12
A TEAM APPROACH TO DEVELOPING COMPETITIVE GRANT PROPOSALS: THE PRE-AWARD ROLE IN SUPPORTING SUCCESS

It is common to have a collaborative team approach to developing and writing a competitive proposal. This workshop combines didactic and hands-on activities to explore best practices for proposal development and good grant writing. Participants will team up during the workshop and work together on ideas for possible grant proposals, but you do not need an idea for a project to participate! The focus will be more on the process than the content. Just bring your own brainpower, enthusiasm and experience – and your willingness to join a proposal development team. You will have an interactive opportunity to develop proposal components using good grant writing techniques.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will learn how to develop and evaluate good ideas for proposals.
- Participants will discover how to build an effective team for proposal development.
- Participants will practice creating a proposal development plan.
- Participants will learn some of the techniques of effective proposal writing.
- Participants will work in small teams to develop proposal sections.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should have a working knowledge of the grants and proposal process.

Denise Wallen*, Research Officer and Senior Fellow, University of New Mexico
Joseph McNicholas, Director, Office for Research and Sponsored Projects, Loyola Marymount University
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**Workshop 13**

**THE ALPHABET SOUP OF NIH TRAINING AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT AWARDS**

Part of the stated mission of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) is to “develop, maintain, and renew scientific human and physical resources that will ensure the Nation’s capability to prevent disease.” Ruth L. Kirschstein National Research Service Awards (Kirschstein-NRSA) training grants and fellowships are awarded to support pre-doctoral and post-doctoral research training to help ensure that a diverse and highly trained workforce is available to carry out the Nation’s biomedical, behavioral and clinical research agendas. Institutional Kirschstein-NRSAs (T awards) are awarded to domestic institutions that have the facilities and qualified faculty to provide research training programs in several scientific specialties. Individual Kirschstein-NRSA Fellowships (F awards) are awarded to individuals enrolled in doctoral degree training as well as to promising post-doctoral individuals with the potential to become productive, independent investigators in scientific health-related research fields. Career Development Awards (K awards) are awarded to provide support and “protected time” for an intensive, supervised career development experience leading to research independence. The successful attainment of any one of these NIH training/career development awards is honorable, and the pre- and post-award administrative responsibilities are unique. This workshop will offer an overview of the administration of NIH training and career development awards from proposal preparation to closeout. We will also discuss the use of X-Train, the online interface where authorized users electronically process the required paperwork associated with Kirschstein-NRSA training grants and Fellowships. This workshop is brought to you by the letters F, K, T and X!

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

- Participants will learn the importance of the specialized information included in an Institutional NRSA proposal and where within their institution such information may be acquired.
- Participants will learn how to assist pre-doctoral and post-doctoral trainees with the preparation of their NRSA fellowship proposals.
- Participants will learn the post-award administrative requirements for NIH, NRSA, and K awards.
- Participants will learn how to discuss the nuances of K awards with faculty.
- Participants will learn the basic appointment and termination functions of the X-Train System.

Glenda Bullock*, Director of Research and Business Administration, Washington University in St. Louis

Brenda Kavanaugh, Associate Director, Office of Research and Project Administration, University of Rochester
Workshop 14

THE DOS AND DON'TS WHEN WORKING WITH FACULTY AND FUNDING ORGANIZATIONS

This workshop will provide a unique opportunity for participants to learn and examine the best practices for supporting investigators and facilitating the research and education mission of their institutions. Practical examples will demonstrate approaches that ensure compliance with new and evolving rules and unfunded mandates governing the proper oversight of sponsored research activities. Successful strategies to help investigators identify, secure and later manage research funding will be presented. Guidance and advice for interacting with funding organization Program and Grants Management representatives will also be provided. Striking a balance between ensuring the proper stewardship of third party research funding while supporting the success of our investigators requires research administrators to go the extra yard; this workshop will help you succeed in getting there.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will learn effective communication strategies for faculty, sponsors, and colleagues.
- Participants will learn methods to become an advocate and ally to faculty and avoid being seen as an adversary.
- Participants will learn how to develop a toolbox and working knowledge of best practices for dealing with the many counterparts we engage with as research administrators.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should have a basic knowledge of grants administration, familiarity with major sponsor organizations, and an interest in becoming a more facilitative research administrator.

Anthony Beckman*, Research Administrator, University of Rochester
Walter Goldschmidts, Executive Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory/Watson School of Biology

Workshop 15

OMB UNIFORM GUIDANCE: SAME, SAME – BUT DIFFERENT

How does the consolidation of the OMB Circulars into government-wide Uniform Guidance affect award administration at colleges and universities? Has the “super-circular” made federal award administration “super-confusing”? In reality, when it comes to administering federal assistance awards, some things have changed, but much has stayed the same. This workshop will outline the Uniform Guidance and how it applies to day-to-day award administration. Designed for the newcomer as well as the seasoned research administrator unfamiliar with the Uniform Guidance, this overview will examine the requirements with an emphasis on the “super-important” basics. Come prepared to learn the ins and outs of administrative rules and how the individual federal agencies have incorporated the Guidance into their own administrative requirements.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will gain an understanding of the OMB Uniform Guidance.
- Participants will learn how the federal agencies have implemented the Uniform Guidance.
- Participants will learn how to apply the Guidance to federal award administration.

Gunta Liders*, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, University of Rochester

* Lead presenter
8:15 – 11:45 am ~ Half Day Morning Pre-Conference Workshops

WORKSHOP 16

CONSCIOUS LEADERSHIP: A MANAGEMENT IMPERATIVE

The volume of activity and change that pulses through our organizations and our days is high. The people in our organization can be the hardest part, or the best part of our jobs, depending on the leadership and communication style we bring into our organizations. Our chosen leadership and communication style can also have a direct correlation to our health and personal well-being. The new management imperative, Conscious Leadership, is the most efficient way for an organization to improve, create sustainable success and contribute to the well-being of the team. Conscious leaders are shifting from unconscious attitudes, behaviors and reactions to conscious attitudes, behaviors and reactions. We can break old patterns and build new ones. Join us for this half day workshop to learn techniques and practices that will support you in making the shift to a new way of leading and living.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Participants will learn practices and techniques that can be employed to improve the productivity, sustainability and well-being of ourselves and our staff.
- The workshop will include hands on activities and simulations on:
  - giving and receiving feedback
  - listening practices
  - difficult conversations
  - creating more productive and efficient meetings.
- The workshop will also include an introduction to meditation to bring us to a more responsive, less reactive style.

Katie Plum*, Director of Sponsored Projects, Angelo State University

WORKSHOP 17

REDEFINING LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH ADMINISTRATORS

This workshop will offer an interactive, step by step “how-to” on changing the learning and development of research administrators from central, departmental, and medical perspectives. Tools will be provided for developing solutions that fit your organization.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Participants will learn key points to examining the dynamics and needs of your organization.
- Participants will learn steps for establishing pathways for professional growth.
- Participants will be provided with considerations for evaluating the effectiveness of learning solutions.

Candice Ferguson*, Manager, Research Education and Communications, Georgia Institute of Technology
Kayron Gilstrap, Business Manager II, Georgia State University
Laurianne Torres, Director, Research Administration, Duke University

WORKSHOP 18

PUIs AND THE UNIFORM GUIDANCE: WHERE ARE WE?

By the time AM57 arrives, the new Uniform Guidance (UG) will have been in effect for nearly eight months. Although we have smaller infrastructures and numbers of awards at PUls, we are still required to have policies, procedures, and sufficient internal controls to comply with the UG. The purpose of this workshop is to help participants evaluate their implementation of the UG and assess and address their potential areas of risk.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Participants will learn practical solutions for implementing effective internal controls in a small institution.
- Participants will learn about partnering with other offices on campus to comply with the UG.
- Participants will learn how to assess overall implementation of the Uniform Guidance at their institution.
- Participants will also spend some time discussing the specific additions and exceptions of those federal agencies with whom PUls most often work, including the Department of Education, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Health and Human Services.

Katie Plum*, Director of Sponsored Projects, Angelo State University
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**A Senior Forum 19**

**STRUCTURING YOUR OFFICE FOR SUCCESS**

The functions performed by a research administration office, broadly defined, are essentially the same the world over. As research administrators, we assist our faculty in finding new sources of funding, we ensure our institutional standards remain intact as our researchers submit new requests for funding, and we negotiate and manage awards through their lifecycle, among many other activities. What is different across institutions is how we structure and organizationally manage our offices. This workshop will focus on several organizational structures, how these structures work, and the impact of the various structures operational best practices. Specifically, we will address the benefits, efficiencies, and challenges of the traditional Pre-Award and Post-Award structures along with associated work allocation models, plus look at other functions that have been more clearly defined in recent years, i.e., Research Development and Information Technology functions. We will examine why one structure may work at one institution, but not at another.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will gain an understanding of the various operational structures and how these structures impact best practices.
- Participants will address how physical space, institutional culture, size of operation staff, and/or needs of your institutional researchers influence operational structures.
- Participants will investigate how technology and support services can impact an office structure.
- Participants will share why it is important to review and (possibly) revise your operational structure from time to time.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should be prepared to share your organizational structures as well as your organizational challenges.

David Richardson*, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research and Director of Sponsored Programs, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Dan Nordquist, Assistant Vice President/Director, Office of Grant and Research Development, Washington State University

Patricia Hawk, Director, Sponsored Programs, Oregon State University

**A Senior Forum 20**

**METRICS: YOU WANT WHAT BY WHEN? GRANT SUCCESS RATES, RESEARCH PERFORMANCE METRICS, FORECASTING**

This forum will provide senior research administrators and data managers an opportunity to discuss institutional approaches to metrics and reporting. Among topics discussed will be monitoring grant success rates, forecasting research expenditures, metrics used for proficiency of pre-award operations, use of research performance management tools/visualization packages and staffing for data requests. Demos will be provided by representatives from a public and private university. Participants will be contacted prior to the meeting and will be asked whether they wish to demonstrate any helpful reports, metrics or tools. We hope you will join us for what will be an insightful and interactive forum!

LEARNING OBJECTIVES: Participants will learn how other institutions are developing and using reporting tools and metrics and discuss the pros and cons of various methods of institutional reporting and metrics.

PREREQUISITE: This forum is intended for senior level research administrators in managerial positions.

Govind Narasimhan*, Director of Research Finance, University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center

Catherine Breen, Senior Director, Office for Sponsored Programs, Harvard University
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**Workshop 21**

**A COMPREHENSIVE OVERVIEW OF CLINICAL TRIALS MANAGEMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

This workshop will delve into the elements of successfully conducting clinical trials. It will focus on strategies for building an adequate infrastructure to support all aspects of high quality clinical research. Topics covered will include: establishing processes and work flows to ensure regulatory compliance; financial management of clinical trials; managing sponsored research awards; recruitment and marketing for research studies; and establishing robust quality assurance practices. It will also include best practices for implementing both investigator-initiated and industry sponsored international clinical trials, an in-depth understanding and practical advice for navigating complex issues related to international clinical trials, including key administrative, contractual, financial, and regulatory issues.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

- Participants will determine key elements involved in a robust clinical research enterprise.
- Participants will understand pitfalls to avoid in structuring a Clinical Trials Office.
- Participants will learn how to effectively manage regulatory requirements.
- Participants will learn how to create an infrastructure to support clinical research.
- Participants will learn strategies for implementing and managing international clinical trials.
- Participants will learn tips for increasing efficiency and reducing costs in a Clinical Trials Office.
- Participants will learn how to manage multifaceted issues that arise during negotiation of clinical trial agreements.
- Participants will understand how a trial budget is developed, managed, and how costs are managed.
- Participants will understand the complexities of managing multicenter trials.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should have an advanced level of understanding of clinical trials.

_Tesheia Johnson*, Associate Director of Clinical Research for Yale School of Medicine COO, YCCI, Yale University_

**Workshop 22**

**POLICIES: HOW TO DEVELOP AND COMMUNICATE**

This workshop provides a foundational understanding of the key components of policy development and management. Developing effective policies that can be clearly understood and followed, that address the needs of the many, and that ensure compliance, can be quite challenging. This workshop takes participants through the full process of developing relevant policies, rolling out policies to research communities, and provides strategies for monitoring policies to ensure continued applicability and compliance. Policies are not procedures. Poorly written policies can create negative and unnecessary consequences in an audit. It is critical that those involved in policy development understand the importance of this process.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

- Participants will have an understanding of how to develop an effective policy that meets the needs of the organization.
- Participants will be able to evaluate existing policies to determine if they effectively meet the needs of the organization and if they create an unnecessary risk.
- Participants will have strategies on how to involve others in the policy development process and how to effectively communicate policies through an organization.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should have an advanced level of general and pre- and/or post-award management experience.

_Kerry Peluso*, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, Emory University_  
_James Casey, Jr., Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, American University_
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**Workshop 23**

**EXPORT CONTROL BASICS: UNDERSTANDING THE REGULATIONS IN A UNIVERSITY SETTING**

This workshop is an introduction to the basic concepts associated with the export control regulations and the impact of the regulations on the university community. The participants will learn basic export control terminology, know what regulations and sanctions are involved, and understand how to better identify and manage potential export control risks on their campus. Actual real-world examples, best practices, and resources will be provided to cover the export control review of proposals and awards, the ramifications of hiring non-U.S. employees/ students to work on certain research projects, working with foreign collaborators, measures needed to protect export controlled projects, and the implications of travel or research outside the U.S.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will comprehend the common regulatory terms and concepts pertaining to the export control regulations.
- Participants will be able to identify “red flags” that may indicate the need for additional export assessment of a particular grant, contract, or proposed activity.
- Participants will better understand the impact the export control regulations have on the university community and research, including the hiring of non-U.S. persons to work on certain projects.
- Participants will know how certain project data, information, equipment, and software can be protected while research is being conducted on-campus.
- Participants will understand the export control implications of travel and research outside the U.S.

Kay Ellis*, Director, University Export Control Program, University of Arizona
Michael Miller, Assistant Director, Export Compliance, University of Central Florida
Shannon Woodman, Export Compliance Analyst, University of Arizona

**Workshop 24**

**STEPS AND STRATEGIES FOR DEVELOPING GRANT PROPOSALS**

The purpose of this workshop is to equip participants with the specific knowledge and skills needed to successfully obtain external funding for research and program grants. The workshop will address strategies for preparing a more competitive proposal. Key components of the workshop include identifying optimal funding sources, reviewing the solicitation guidelines, developing a proposal outline, analyzing the key issues and strategies used when coordinating with a proposal team, tips for writing key sections of a proposal narrative, determining costs and special considerations for budget development, typical process and procedures in submitting a proposal, and special considerations based on proposal review process. Participants will have an opportunity to practice new skills, analyze writing samples and interact with workshop facilitators to discuss specific concerns and issues related to project and proposal development.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:** At the completion of the workshop, participants will be able to:
- Use appropriate resources to identify potential funding sponsors.
- Analyze potential funding sponsors to select top funding candidates.
- Review and respond to a sponsor’s grant solicitation.
- Prepare a competitive research proposal.
- Collaborate with other researchers and institutions.
- Develop a research budget.
- Consider feasible performance and evaluation measures

Jo Ann Smith*, Director of the Master of Research Administration, University of Central Florida
Joshua Roney, Research Development Coordinator, University of Central Florida
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**Workshop 25**

**BOOT CAMP ON THE BASICS OF CONTRACT DRAFTING AND NEGOTIATIONS**

Are you new to contract drafting and negotiations? Would you like to learn about the best ways to manage these activities, and about the various contract and grant mechanisms, and the significance each plays in academic research, training and service? This hands-on and interactive workshop will use the example of a corporate research agreement to examine the anatomy of a contract and to demonstrate why we can (or can’t) accept certain provisions. Through this basic step-by-step review of all the elements of a contract and related case studies, participants will have an opportunity to learn how to identify what is and what is not acceptable language, and how to rectify and redraft language to the satisfaction of both parties.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will learn about the various contract and grant mechanisms and how and when to use them.
- Participants will learn about the drafting of an agreement that meets the needs of both parties.
- Participants will learn how to identify the good, the bad, and the ugly language in any type of agreement.

**Marjorie Forster**, Assistant Vice President for Research and Global Health Initiatives, University of Maryland, Baltimore

**Janet Simons**, Director, Research Policy, University of Maryland, Baltimore

---

**Workshop 26**

**COST SHARING: PRE-AWARD TO POST-AWARD**

Cost sharing represents an administratively complex and high-risk business objective. This workshop will explore the many elements of cost sharing, ranging from the pre-award, often strategic decision to engage in cost sharing, to different methods to handle the post-award management of cost sharing, offering the participant a lifecycle view of the topic. There will be a discussion covering more basic concepts such as what constitutes cost sharing at the proposal stage and federal policies and guidelines related to cost sharing. Additionally, this workshop will examine more complicated concepts, including the impacts of cost sharing on an institution, the functional areas cost sharing touches outside of sponsored research (e.g., finance and budget), and the weighing of strategic interests against traditional compliance when entering into a cost share agreement. The workshop will also explore challenges and approaches related to tracking and funding of cost share commitments and effectively using enterprise management systems to help where possible, including a case study examining an institutional change in post-award cost sharing tracking (including evaluation, design, and implementation). The workshop will include activities designed to engage and provide participants with tools to bring back to their own institutions.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will gain an understanding of the different considerations that are taken into account when deciding to cost share and the reasoning behind the decision to engage in voluntary cost sharing.
- Participants will understand the various impacts cost sharing has on an institution, including the compliance, administrative, financial, investigator, and F&A rate impacts.
- Participants will engage in interactive activities exploring case studies and leave with tools for approaching cost sharing at their own institutions.
- Participants will be presented with various approaches to tracking and managing cost share commitments at the post-award stage.

**Kelly Morrison**, Associate Director, Office for Sponsored Research, Northwestern University

**Elizabeth Adams**, Executive Director, Office for Sponsored Research, Northwestern University
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**Workshop 27**

**NUMBERS TELL THE STORY: DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF BUDGETS FOR SPONSORED PROGRAMS**

Budgets are essential components of any sponsored project. They are the financial expression of the statement of work. The ability to develop a budget that directly relates to the proposed work enhances the chances of being funded and can allow for modification flexibility during the execution of the project. Monitoring and managing the budget during the entire lifecycle of the award, while ensuring adherence to sponsor guidelines is paramount to the success of the project.

This workshop will help to hone the skills needed during various phases of the project lifecycle from idea to closeout. We will explore techniques for interpreting the goals of the Investigator, budget development, comparing proposed and actual budgets and monitoring the progress of a project through numbers, analyze real-life situations and discuss potential solutions.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will learn to recognize the importance of relationship-building associated with budget development.
- Participants will develop further understanding of the concepts and strategies relating to budgeting.
- Participants will address the challenges that may be associated with different types of budgets and the risks and consequences involved.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should have previous budgeting experience and bring a laptop armed with Excel.

Shella Batelman*, Senior Research Administrator, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center
Robert Stemple, Director, Research Management & Finance, GeneSys Research Institute
Patricia McNulty, Principal Consultant, Concurrent Research

**Workshop 28**

**TRENDS AND PATTERNS IN FEDERAL AUDITS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS IN RESEARCH: ANTICIPATING THE FUTURE BY LEARNING FROM THE PAST**

Join us for an exhilarating and humorous journey through time as we examine the lessons to be learned from select audits and enforcement actions from the past twenty years. With the emphasis on internal controls under the Uniform Guidance, this workshop can help participants prioritize the areas of focus and investment by reviewing common findings and best practices. We will review some of the more significant federal actions under the False Claims Act, the OIG Work Plans as well as recent NIH and NSF Audits.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will gain an appreciation and understanding of the “red flags” that are the causes of federal enforcement activity.
- Participants will develop a knowledge base of past examples that can better prepare you for the future.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should have familiarity with the common acronyms used in the day-to-day management of federal grants and a sense of humor.

Jeff Seo*, Director of Research Compliance, Harvard Medical School
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**Workshop 29**

**INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY (IP) CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE PRE-AWARD OFFICE**

As the competition for federal and state funding increases, universities are seeking to enhance their interactions with industry to secure a new source of sponsored funding. They endeavor to serve as the R&D arm of existing companies or as the source of new technology for the industries of tomorrow. Industry university relationships often look great on paper and have the potential to benefit both parties in areas beyond sponsored research. In reality, the differing expectations of both parties puts the research administrators in a difficult situation; they are expected to close the deal while negotiating agreements that complying with state and federal regulation that govern not-for-profit entities that grant IP rights and the industry partner expects to maintain complete control of any IP developed through their sponsorship. These two positions appear to be in direct conflict. This workshop focuses on the many challenges facing research administrator who manages intellectual property, negotiates private industrial research agreements, and State and Federal awards.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will learn about intellectual property, copyrights, inventions, and plant varieties.
- Participants will learn research contract negotiating strategies for managing industry IP expectations.
- Participants will hear about the obstacles to colleges and universities prospectively granting intellectual property rights to inventions resulting from sponsored research.

**PREREQUISITE:** This workshop is intended for senior level research administrators.

Gregory Slack*, Director of Research & Technology Transfer, Clarkson University
George McGuire, Bond, Schoeneck & King
Charles Bartunek, Assistant Director, Office of Research Administration, Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University

**Workshop 30**

**SERVICE CENTERS, COMPLIANCE, AND ALL THAT JAZZ – FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT OF A SERVICE CENTER**

University faculty and staff utilize a variety of goods or services to perform their activities. When these goods or services are provided within the university on a recurring basis, these units function as nonprofit businesses and are called recharge or service centers. The cost of providing goods and services are allocated to users, including federally sponsored awards, by establishing billing rates which are applied to the actual usage of services. The rate is designed to recover costs from those users who benefit from the goods or services offered. The complexities of setting up and running a service center, or recharge center, continue to be a challenge for research universities. This workshop will look at considerations when setting up and operating a service center. The workshop will look in-depth at the rate development including components of the budget, the rate base and service center audits. The workshop will incorporate a case study and exercises.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will learn the characteristics of a service center.
- Participants will learn what to budget in the billing rate.
- Participants will learn the different rate bases that can be used to calculate the rate.
- Participants will learn what the audit findings on service centers have been and the risks your institution should manage.

**PREREQUISITE:** The participant should have basic knowledge of financial research administration such as direct, indirect, and unallowable costs.

Jennifer W. Mitchell*, Director of Cost Studies and Effort Reporting, Northwestern University
Zach Belton, Director, Huron Consulting Group
Danel Phelps, Program Financial Analyst, University of Washington
Workshop 31

UNIFORM GUIDANCE – IT’S HERE, IT’S NOW

To deliver on the promise of a 21st-Century government that is more efficient, effective and transparent, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has streamlined the Federal government’s guidance on Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal awards. This streamlining initiative is called the Uniform Guidance and was released on December 26, 2013. In December of 2014, the joint interim final rule was released, implementing for all Federal award-making agencies the Uniform Guidance. This rule is necessary in order to incorporate into regulation and thus bring into effect the Uniform Guidance as required by OMB. The release of the Uniform Guidance and agency implementations impacts existing institutional policies, federal sponsor guidelines, and the terms and conditions expressed in federal awards. This workshop is designed to provide participants important information on the changes incorporated in the Uniform Guidance, how these changes impact research administration policies and procedures, and familiarize them with the Uniform Guidance and agency implementations.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will be provided with an overview of the Uniform Guidance.
- Participants will be provided with a hands-on walk through approach to understanding the structure of the Uniform Guidance.
- Participants will review agency implementations and impacts.
- Participants will highlight and discuss the major impacts on the recipient community.
- Participants will share recipient implementation strategies.
- Participants will explore real life case scenarios related to the Uniform Guidance.
- Participants will exchange implementation tools and training materials.

Denise Clark*, Associate Vice President for Administration and Chief of Staff, Division of Research, University of Maryland, College Park
Timothy Reuter, Director, Post-Award, Office of Sponsored Research, Stanford University
Ann Holmes, Assistant Dean, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, University of Maryland, College Park

Workshop 32

WORKING WITH INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Sometimes it feels like two different forces are pulling us apart on the question of international agreements. Most universities have offices dedicated to promoting international research collaborations. At the same time, most of us have offices warning us about export control violations, foreign travel restrictions, and the contractual challenges associated with non-standard agreements. Our job is to navigate the middle ground, identifying intelligent and responsible ways to pursue meaningful and rewarding relationships with foreign partners.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES: Participants will examine challenges associated with the following:
- Legal issues (export controls and sanction programs, adhering to local regulations, FCPA).
- Reputational issues (inadequate controls on human subjects research, political obstacles).
- Payment issues (exchange rates, taxes, unusual billing practices, risk of non-payment).
- Travel issues (physical safety and insurance, data security).
- Other contractual issues (language issues, publication rights, IP rights, and liability issues as they pertain to international agreements).
- Unique challenges associated with working with certain regions of the world (China, Europe, and the Middle East). Foreign subcontracts present additional risks, including problems associated with assessing financial risk, monitoring performance, and imposing U.S. regulatory requirements in foreign jurisdictions.

John Hanold*, Associate Vice President for Research and Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, The Pennsylvania State University
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**Workshop 33**
AN INTRODUCTION TO WORKING UNDER U.S. GOVERNMENT COMPLIANCE REGULATIONS (FOR NON-U.S. INSTITUTIONS)

Some non-U.S. institutions receive awards directly from the U.S. government, however most non-U.S. institutions that receive U.S. government funds do so via a subaward from a U.S. institution. The U.S. government's expectations are essentially the same regardless of the how the non-U.S. institution receives the funds, but for an institution not accustomed to the U.S. compliance environment these requirements can be daunting.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:** This workshop will introduce participants to various compliance requirements that apply to U.S. government funding. The emphasis will be on institutional readiness for managing U.S. government funds, including areas such as financial management and allowable costs, property management, conflict of interest, human and animal subjects, audit standards, and indirect costs.

David Mayo*, Director of Sponsored Research, California Institute of Technology  
Martin Kirk, Immediate Past President, CAURA, University of British Columbia  
David Richardson, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research and Director of Sponsored Programs, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

**Workshop 34**
EFFECTIVE PRESENTATIONS – NCURA STYLE

This workshop will offer tools to develop engaging, content-rich, audience-specific presentations that thankful participants will applaud. Really! During the course of the year, NCURA members volunteer to be moderators, panelists, trainers, workshop faculty, and discussion leaders at regional and national meetings. Such opportunities allow members to share their knowledge and viewpoints as content experts. Yet the talents required to be successful research administrators often do not include presentation techniques. As a result, developing presentation and communication skills becomes a necessity. NCURA members typically design and present with one or two (or more) colleagues. Collaboration is essential, and such partnerships can be challenging, particularly if the presenters are not from the same institution – let alone the same time zone – and have never before worked together. This “how-to” workshop will:

- Help participants think about designing and delivering effective presentations to adults.
- Discuss the various types of NCURA presentations.
- Clarify the varying roles and duties involved.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:** Participants will learn presentation and training techniques tailored to adult learning and tidbits for presenting in various NCURA venues.

Judy Fredenberg*, Director, Research and Sponsored Programs, University of Montana  
Craig Reynolds, Associate Director, Office of Research and Sponsored Projects, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor  
Diane Barrett, Senior Consultant, Navigator Management Partners

FREE WORKSHOP!
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**Senior Level Forum 35**

**UNIVERSITY F&A RATE PROPOSALS - FEDERAL REVIEW AND COMPLEX NEGOTIATION ISSUES**

F&A rate proposal reviews and rate negotiations with Federal representatives are complex processes and can be intimidating. This senior level forum will discuss the main review areas and the issues frequently raised in the negotiation of rates, including space surveys, the organized research base and the F&A cost pools. More complex issues such as those related to rate projections and the effect of application of Uniform Guidance will also be discussed.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:** Senior level forum participants will gain a more thorough understanding of the Federal F&A review process and the complex issues raised in the negotiation of F&A rates and be better prepared to manage F&A reviews and negotiations with Federal representatives.

**PREREQUISITE:** Senior level forum participants should have experience with, or at least a working knowledge of, long-form university F&A rate proposals.

*Cynthia Hope*, Assistant Vice President for Research and Director, Office for Sponsored Programs, The University of Alabama

*Gary Talesnik*, Special Consultant, BearingPoint, Inc.

---

**Senior Level Forum 36**

**PERFORMANCE METRICS IN RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION**

Performance metrics are a hot topic in research administration. With the use of large enterprise systems to manage sponsored projects, we now have access to information that previously was not available. We can look at data, analyze it, slice it and dice it any way we want. The question is: what do we do once we’ve collected the data? This forum will discuss how to use our data to improve the management of sponsored programs and the people who are actively supporting sponsored programs. This forum will suggest some new approaches to applying data to our everyday tasks and to assist in performance evaluations of research administrators. The University of Wisconsin has created an electronic tool that helps in allocating projects to individual accountants and in managing their portfolios. Duke University has developed a highly sophisticated approach to addressing administrative capabilities across its campus. Bring your own ideas and join this discussion of performance metrics!

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will gain an understanding of useful data collected in research administration.
- Participants will learn new approaches to the application of data in improving the performance levels of research administrators.
- Participants will look at a system for distributing workload and evaluating the performance of research administrators.
- Participants will leave with a shared understanding of performance measures used by the universities participating in the workshop.

**PREREQUISITE:** This forum is intended for senior level administrators.

*Kim Moreland*, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research & Sponsored Programs, University of Wisconsin Madison

*Jim Luther*, Associate Vice President, Finance & Compliance Office, Duke University
**LEADS TALK – SERIOUS ISSUES FOR SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS**

The topics that confront research administration leaders are complex and ever changing. Pressure to respond to an arising issue can come from many sources, including conferences like this, faculty arriving from other places, audit reports, agencies/sponsors, and too many other sources to list.

This will be a forum to discuss unique senior leadership issues and topics that arise in the course of our day-to-day life. They tend to be pressing issues when they arise – some of them will get immediate traction and become institutional priorities to address. Some will simply disappear in a matter of weeks or months never to arise again, hopefully gracefully. Some will linger until they develop institutional momentum to either end discussion or escalate to leadership and tackle the issue.

We are developing a list of approximately 8-10 topics that attendees can research their institutional perspective and be prepared to discuss. Each topic will have a brief background statement, issues section, and options section that will help guide the dialogue at your institution as you prepare for the session. Those topics might include crowd-funding, cloud computing, managing risk around late financial reporting, managing programmatic deadlines under the UG, and managing the single audit under the UG. Also bring your own topics and we will set aside 20 minutes at the end for a grab-bag.

Our focus will be on innovative ways to deal with these issues as they arise. The topics and discussion will be highly managed to benefit the areas of most interest to the participants.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

- Participants will gain an understanding of a broad set of complex issues and how many peers are dealing with them.
- Participants will hear about issues on the horizon at peer institutions that may raise their heads at their own institutions.
- Participants will discuss a shared understanding of the priorities that peers are placing on these issues.
- Participants will hear new approaches to developing momentum on hot topics that are confronting us.

**PREREQUISITES:**

- Participants will receive the list of issues 30 days in advance of the session and are required to review and discuss, as appropriate, with leadership at their institution so that at the session we can have a lively dialogue. Be sure to come prepared.
- Participants should be conversant on a strategic level with the issues.

**Kim Moreland**, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research & Sponsored Programs, University of Wisconsin-Madison

**Jim Luther**, Associate Vice President, Finance & Compliance Office, Duke University

---

**ADVANCED REGISTRATION IS REQUIRED**

8:30 – 10:00 am
8:30 am – Noon

**International**

**HORIZON 2020**

This special workshop is brought to you by BILAT USA 2.0, which aims to strengthen research collaboration between the U.S. and the European Union. If you are new to Horizon 2020, or even if you already know some of the potential opportunities for U.S. researchers, this workshop will provide an introduction to this €80 billion research program funded by the European Commission; and, hands-on training in finding appropriate funding opportunities, registering your institution in the electronic system, and suggestions for resolving common issues in the grant agreement. Finally, like any government grant program, there are restrictions on who can apply and how the money can be spent. This workshop will answer all of these questions as well as provide an opportunity to meet with European research managers who are very experienced in dealing with European Commission grants.

---

**POST-CONFERENCE WORKSHOP**

Thursday | August 6, 2015

8:30 am – 4:30 pm ~ Full Day Post-Conference Workshop

**Workshop 37**

**A DAY WITH NIH**

Wear your favorite tropical shirt (it is summer time!), put on your comfy sandals or loafers, and join NIH experts for a day of smooth sailing through the latest NIH grants process, programs and policies. You may not think of trying to understand the application forms, working in the eRA Commons or navigating the NIH websites as “fun,” but don’t let that stop you from participating in NCURA’s, “A Day with NIH.” NIH Program, Review, and Grants Management officials are offering a laid back day, filled with informative and interactive presentations, guidance, and an array of future NIH contacts for critical points in the grants process!

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

- Participants will gain a better understanding of policies and procedures affecting the NIH grants process from application to post-award.
- Participants will have the opportunity for personal interaction with NIH staff and be able to obtain insight and suggestions for managing research grants in an increasingly complex environment.

**Cynthia Dwyer**, Communications Specialist & Outreach Coordinator, Office of Extramural Research, National Institutes of Health (NIH)
Saturday ~ August 1, 2015

4:00 – 7:00 pm
REGISTRATION
WELCOME LOUNGE

Sunday ~ August 2, 2015

7:15 am – 5:00 pm
REGISTRATION

8:15 am – 4:30 pm
WORKSHOPS (Additional Fee Required)

11:45 am – 1:00 pm
WORKSHOP LUNCHEON FOR FULL DAY SESSION PARTICIPANTS, FACULTY AND EVALUATORS

6:15 – 7:00 pm
RECEPTION

7:00 pm
SUNDAY BANQUET AND ENTERTAINMENT BY JAKE JOHANNSEN
A self-confessed raconteur of weird stories, it’s no wonder that Jake is one of David Letterman’s favorite comics. With forty-four Letterman appearances under his belt (not to mention a handful of Late Night with Conan O’Brien, The Tonight Show with Jay Leno, and Politically Incorrect gigs) Jake is no stranger to late night television. His late night appearances gave Jake the exposure he needed to land his very own HBO comedy special, This’II Take About An Hour. Jake received incredible reviews, strong ratings, and a Cable Ace Award nomination for Best Writing in an Entertainment Special. People Magazine rated the special as one of the “ten best television shows of the year,” and TV Guide named it one of the “50 Funniest Moments of TV.” Jake’s bizarre take on life and his uniquely intelligent style have made him a regular at comedy clubs all over the country!

9:00 pm
REGIONAL HOSPITALITY SUITES OPEN
Tuesday, August 4, 2015
5:00 – 6:00 pm | NCURA Marketplace

6:30 – 7:30 pm | NETWORKING AND REFRESHMENT BREAK

6:00 – 7:00 pm | NCURA MEETING

7:00 – 8:00 pm | VIRTUAL BREAKFAST ROUNDTABLES

8:00 – 9:00 pm | LEARNING ABOUT THE CONSULTING SERVICES OF BAKER TILLY
Adrienne Larmett*, Senior Consultant, Baker Tilly

9:00 – 10:00 pm | SELECT COMMITTEE ON GLOBAL AFFAIRS (SCGA)
Kim Moreland*, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research & Sponsored Programs, University of Wisconsin Madison

10:00 – 11:00 pm | DONT BE ON AN ISLAND: MAXIMIZING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PUI COLLABORATE PAGE
Ryan Dodd*, Director, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville

SAME, BUT DIFFERENT: DISCUSSION ON PRE-AWARD WORKING WITH, OR AS, A DEVELOPMENT OFFICE
Jennifer Harman*, Director of Sponsored Programs and Faculty Research, Nazareth College of Rochester

11:00 – 12:00 pm | TOO MANY JOBS IN TOO LITTLE TIME: INTERNATIONAL APPROACHES TO TIME MANAGEMENT
Susanne Rahner*, Managing Director, Yggdrasil

THE IRB AND COI OFFICE COLLABORATION
Deborah Price*, Manager, Sponsored Programs, Baylor Research Institute

DEALING WITH AGENCY COI POLICIES UNDER THE UNIFORM GUIDANCE
Linda Bucy*, Assistant Vice President Finance and Controls, Virginia Tech

7:30 am – 5:00 pm | AM57 CONCIERGE EXPOSITION 2015

10:00 am – 5:00 pm | NCURA Marketplace

10:00 – 10:30 am | NETWORKING AND REFRESHMENT BREAK

10:30 – 11:30 am | TOO MANY JOBS IN TOO LITTLE TIME: INTERNATIONAL APPROACHES TO TIME MANAGEMENT
Susanne Rahner*, Managing Director, Yggdrasil

THE IRB AND COI OFFICE COLLABORATION
Deborah Price*, Manager, Sponsored Programs, Baylor Research Institute

DEALING WITH AGENCY COI POLICIES UNDER THE UNIFORM GUIDANCE
Linda Bucy*, Assistant Vice President Finance and Controls, Virginia Tech

7:30 am – 5:00 pm | AM57 CONCIERGE EXPOSITION 2015

The content includes several presentations and networking opportunities throughout the day, with a focus on research administration and collaborative approaches.
MASTER'S RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS
Presenters will provide an overview of the curriculum and admission requirements for three graduate level programs in research administration.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will learn about the importance of furthering their education in their profession.
- Participants will learn how furthering their education prepares them for leadership in their chosen profession.

Thomas Wilson*, Assistant Vice President/Senior Research Administration, Rush University Medical Center
Marianne Woods, Academic Program Director, Master of Science in Research Administration, Johns Hopkins University
Jo Ann Smith, Director of the Master of Research Administration, University of Central Florida
Jeff Seo, Executive Director for Research Integrity and Compliance, Harvard Medical School
Jennifer Shambrook, Director, University of Central Florida

BUDGETING FOR CLINICAL TRIALS THAT WORK
Clinical Trials remain a standard endeavor of academic centers. Investigators are interested in participation for the benefit of research programs, patient populations, and networks of colleagues. But the trials can be financially challenging – especially in the finance office that might not have a direct line of sight to trial activity. Join the presentation to talk about financial considerations that present when developing or participating in a clinical trial.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will consider members of the budgeting “team.”
- Participants will identify common clinical trial cost components and financial cost analysis.
- Participants will identify potential challenges when contracting subsites, or participating as one.

Heather Offhaus*, Director, Medical School Grant Review & Analysis, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor
**Clinical Research/Clinical Trials**

**BUILDING AN EFFECTIVE CLINICAL RESEARCH PROGRAM**

This session will describe the various components necessary to build a clinical research program at an academic medical center.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:** After attending this session, participants should be prepared to understand and manage a clinical research operation at a hospital, academic medical center, center or institution.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should have some knowledge of clinical research and clinical trials.

*Jamie Caldwell*, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research Administration, University of Kansas Medical Center

---

**Compliance**

**PARTNERS IN RESEARCH COMPLIANCE: FOSTERING COOPERATION AND RESULTS WITH INTERNAL AUDIT**

The panel will discuss building effective relationships with internal audit from the internal audit, department/college, and sponsored programs perspectives. The conversation will focus on the role of internal audit and strategies for developing and maintaining successful and mutually beneficial relationships between all parties. Tips for moving your unit towards greater cooperation with internal audit and using your audit reports as a springboard for improved compliance will be shared.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will hear about the institutional role of an internal audit (IA) department: How IA communicates with units; Benefits of an IA; Relationships to external auditors.
- Participants will hear about boundaries: auditor objectivity.
- Participants will know how institutional goals represented by an IA align with departmental, college and central unit goals.
- Participants will learn how to establish and maintain a good working relationship with an IA.
- Participants will learn to proactively manage work to ensure audits run smoothly and how to leverage audit reports to move your unit forward.
- Participants will learn how to encourage faculty and staff to be cooperative and contribute to the healthy audit process.
- Participants will learn how to manage in times of trouble: How to work with an IA when issues arise; How to approach an IA with an issue; How to respond when an IA approaches your unit; Navigating audit disputes.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should be in compliance roles at their institution.

*Andrea Ward Ross*, Assistant Executive Dean for Research, Ohio State University

*Kevin Patton*, Director, Ohio State University

*Karla Gengler-Nowak*, Director, College of Medicine, Ohio State University

*Aimee Nielsen-Link*, Director, Health Sciences Office, Ohio State University
**Agenda**

**Monday | August 3, 2015**

---

### Concurrent Sessions (continued)

#### Departmental

**FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT FOR DRA's**

As we strive to manage our daily departmental tasks and achieve successful post-award funds management, we balance the needs of our faculty, staff, central offices, and sponsors, as well as a myriad of internal and external policies, procedures, deadlines, and demands. In a funding environment with increasingly complex regulations and collaborations, we need to continually educate our staff and ourselves to manage portfolios successfully. This session will examine the department administrator’s role in the post-award life cycle, including tips for successful portfolio management, navigating potential pitfalls, and what we all really need to have in our toolkits.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will gain insight into the department administrator’s role in financial management.
- Participants will learn departmental best practices and techniques to manage research portfolios we can all share.
- Participants will learn to recognize and develop collaborations within their department, PIs, central offices, sponsors, etc. to manage the award process.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should have a basic understanding of post-award research administration.

**Jean Feldman**, Head, Policy Office of Budget, Finance & Award Management, National Science Foundation

---

### Federal

**NSF UPDATE**

This session is a comprehensive review of what is new and developing with the National Science Foundation’s programs, policies, people and budgets. Participants will learn about changes affecting their institution and new programs of interest to their researchers.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will understand upcoming changes to NSF policies and procedures.
- Participants will learn about current and future NSF budgets, agency priorities, and involvement in electronic initiatives including advances with Research.gov.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should come prepared to discuss updates in the NSF.

**Jean Feldman**, Head, Policy Office of Budget, Finance & Award Management, National Science Foundation

---

### International

**TRANSLATING HORIZON 2020 TERMINOLOGY, TERMS, AND CONDITIONS INTO U.S. FEDERAL GRANT LANGUAGE**

In an era of stagnant and reduced U.S. federal grant funding, many U.S. universities are interested in Horizon 2020 (the European Commission’s €80 billion research program). For U.S. research administrators used to U.S. federal grant terminology, it may potentially be confusing and intimidating to be confronted with the unfamiliar terminology, terms, and conditions of Horizon 2020. The aim of this session is to present Horizon 2020 in terms that are understandable for U.S. research administrators who are familiar with U.S. federal grant language. The presenters, who are U.S. research administrators who have successfully applied for and are managing Horizon 2020 grants, will use U.S. federal grant regulations as the reference point to explain key differences that exist in Horizon 2020.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will become aware of how Horizon 2020 grants differ in crucial ways from U.S. federal grants.
- Participants will become familiar with some of the terminology common to Horizon 2020 grants, what they mean, and what their analogs are in U.S. federal terminology.
- Participants will learn best practices and potential solutions that U.S. universities may use to successfully apply for and manage Horizon 2020 grants.

**Jennifer Ponting**, Director, Pre-Award Services, Harvard University

**Ryan Lankton**, Project Representative, Foreign Government Sponsor, University of Michigan
LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will learn tips for determining cost allowability.
- Participants will gain an understanding of why tying the expense to the scope of work is essential.
- Participants will learn how to classify expenses – direct vs. indirect based on their usage.
- Participants will learn how developing good habits will help prepare for an audit when questionable expenses have been charged to your projects.

Glenda Bullock*, Director of Research and Business Administration, Washington University in St. Louis
Raman Paul, Senior Grants Administrator, San Francisco State University

Pre-Award
BUILDING ON YOUR STRENGTHS: ASSESSING INVESTIGATOR NEEDS TO INCREASE RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY AND FUNDING SUCCESS
It’s no secret that competition is everywhere, especially in the Federal funding arena. With competition increasing and research funding decreasing, cultivating a culture of collaboration across campus is more important than ever. This session gives practical tips and advice for assessing and responding to the needs of multi-investigator teams.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will learn to categorize the various types of multi-investigator collaborations and develop strategies for supporting the proposal development efforts of each.
- Participants will learn to identify barriers to collaboration and how to overcome them.
- Participants will learn to recognize the various administrative challenges of large-scale proposal efforts and develop strategies for addressing them.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should have a general understanding of pre-award concepts.

Laurianne Torres*, Director, Research Administration, Duke University
Danielle McElwain, Senior Sponsored Programs Administrator, University of South Carolina

Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI)
IMPLEMENTING THE UNIFORM GUIDANCE AT PUIS: THAT WASN’T SO HARD, WAS IT?
The Uniform Guidance has been called the most significant reform in the regulatory framework for Federal grants in 50 years. Yet the amount of work necessary to implement it may vary significantly, depending on the type of institution, the diversity of its sponsored programs portfolio, and the policies and procedures already in place. This session will provide research administrators from predominantly undergraduate institutions with an opportunity to review those aspects of the UG which required changes to day-to-day business, and which did not.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will be able to assess their progress in implementation of the Uniform Guidance against that of comparable peer institutions.
- Participants will be able to compare and contrast the challenges faced by public and private PUIs.
- Participants will be able to identify best practices for procurement, subrecipient monitoring, internal controls, and other major topics within the Uniform Guidance.
- Participants will be able to identify any aspects of the Uniform Guidance that may require more attention at their institution.

Joseph Tomaras*, Associate Director, Office for External Grants, Bates College
Carolyn Elliott-Farino, Executive Director, Office of Research, Kennesaw State University
Career Skills/Professional Development

LEARN ABOUT THE NEW NCURA RESEARCH PROGRAM AND UPCOMING RFP
The NCURA Research Program is founded on the tenets of NCURA’s core values, with the goal of enhancing research and education programs that increase both public and private support for NCURA. The purpose of the Program is to create opportunities for NCURA members, faculty, and staff to innovate and pursue excellence in developing and sustaining critical partnerships that include, but are not limited to: supporting the data-driven needs of NCURA and the profession; identifying, developing and implementing innovative programs for research and education; and building resources for new partnership programs that support global efforts. Proposed research activities should include the collection/acquisition of new data and/or in-depth analysis of previously existing data. Topical areas can include: public policy issues and research administration (e.g., the impact of the Uniform Code change in policy on the research office and research administration or the impact of export control reform); advancement of technology transfer in research administration and associated challenges and obstacles; analysis of research enterprise models both domestic and global (e.g., models and elements that support success rate of proposal submission and awards - ratio of staff-to-PI; operating budget, training programs, types of staff, incentives; efficacy and impact of education and training programs targeting staff and/or faculty; research enterprise strategic planning models such as preparedness for responding to the anticipated senior management retirements and potential staff shortages; or comparative studies on the use of social media).

Denise Wallen*, Research Officer and Senior Fellow, University of New Mexico
Denise Moody, Director of Research Compliance, Harvard University
Robert Andresen, Director of Research Financial Services, Associate Director, Research and Sponsored Programs, University of Wisconsin Madison
Dennis Paffrath, Assistant Vice President for Sponsored Programs Administration, University of Maryland, Baltimore

Career Skills/Professional Development

MANAGING YOUR ID’S AND PASSWORDS: WHAT’S THE ANSWER?
Have you touted up how many ID’s and passwords you have just at work? I have over 25. How do you keep track? Where do you hide them? Whatever you use to manage them, be it password software, Excel spreadsheet, Post-its or a little black book, join us and come prepared to share and learn.

Cheryl Williams*, Associate Director, University of Rochester
**Clinical Research/Clinical Trials**

**CREATION, IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT OF A CLINICAL TRIAL**

In the increasingly complex world of clinical trials creation-implementation-management-closeout, cooperation is essential in the successful navigation of this process. The stakeholders are the sponsors (industry/government/non-profit), clinical investigators, patients, payers, regulators and our own institutions. Each stakeholder offers a different expertise and/or meets a unique need of the trial. Coordination and management of all stressors is the success to a trial. Substantial time, money, personnel, materials, support systems and clear planning comprise the steps of a successful clinical trial. Throughout the process we have to ensure we are compliant not only with the related IRB, but in how we consent, how we bill and how we report out. This discussion will touch on the various components of a clinical trial, the participants and move toward demonstrating some process and production management tools and techniques to try and reach success for all stakeholders.

Randi Wasik*, Research Administrative Director, Duke University
Denise Snyder, Associate Dean for Clinical Research, Office of Clinical Research (DOCR), Duke University, School of Medicine

**Compliance**

**MANAGING FRAUD WITH PROCUREMENT CARDS**

This discussion will provide information on how to begin an internal audit review of your procurement cards, providing step by step information beginning with whether an audit program is necessary, how to set up an audit plan, documentation, and potential solutions to your findings.

Patricia McDade*, Project Coordinator, Senior Grant Manager, Health Sciences Center, West Virginia University
Kristin Summers, Accountant, West Virginia University

**International**

**CUBA: RESEARCH COLLABORATION AFTER NORMALIZATION AND THE EUROPEAN EXPERIENCE**

Research collaboration between U.S. and Cuban counterparts have been extremely difficult and very restricted in the past 5 decades. That, however, has changed dramatically since the normalization of ties between the two countries since December 2014. While restrictions on research collaboration and travel between the two countries are loosening, the policy and regulatory environments are still unclear. At the same time, European researchers and research administrators have been collaborating with Cuban counterparts consistently for a number of years, and their experience will be able to help guide U.S. and Cuban counterparts in learning how to establish research collaboration and the types of research sectors that have the greatest potential for international collaboration. This discussion will provide insights to U.S. research administrators who are interested and/or already

> continued on next page
10:30 am – Noon | Discussion Groups (continued)

**International**

**CUBA: RESEARCH COLLABORATION AFTER NORMALIZATION AND THE EUROPEAN EXPERIENCE (CONTINUED)**

E involved in establishing or managing research collaboration ties with Cuban counterparts, and it will also highlight the European experience as a way to better understand the Cuban context for global collaboration.

Elizabeth Peloso*, Associate Vice Provost/Associate Vice President, Research Services, University of Pennsylvania
Yolanda Ursa, Director, Innovation Management, Inmark Europa
Suzanne Rivera, Associate Vice President for Research, Case Western Reserve University

**Post-Award**

**TRANSITIONS: FROM EFFORT REPORTING TO PAYROLL CERTIFICATION**

In late 2010, the Department of Health and Human Services and the Office of Naval Research joined with four universities in a pilot test of Payroll Certification as an alternative to traditional effort reporting programs. Although the pilot test continues, much has been learned during the intervening time regarding the transition from one system to the other, as well as on-going support and maintenance of a Payroll Certification program. This discussion group will explore the challenges of transitioning between these two types of systems and the benefits of Payroll Certification as a salary confirmation program.

Bruce Morgan*, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research Administration, University of California-Irvine
Ashley Deihr, Consultant, Baker Tilly

**Pre-Award**

**WHAT IS IT? WHO PROCESSES IT? DETERMINING RESEARCH VS. GIFT VS. SERVICE**

Have you ever received a document for review and weren’t quite sure what the document was or who should process it? Funding mechanism determination is step 1 and critical to maintaining streamlined research administration operations. This discussion will provide participants with best practices for interpreting and reviewing of funding mechanisms. Through real life examples, participants will gain a greater ability to recognize the attributes of funding mechanisms, have a better understanding of how the funding mechanisms differ and learn about the nuanced gray lines that exist between funding mechanisms.

David Schmidt*, Assistant Vice President for Research and Economic Development, University of North Dakota
Brian Korblick, Manager, Huron Consulting Group

*Lead presenter
10:30 am – Noon | Discussion Groups (continued)

**Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI)**

**TURNING RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT INTO PROPOSALS**

There are several approaches one can take to assist faculty in turning their ideas into funded projects. How does one start with a concept or thought and follow the correct steps in order to convince a sponsor to fund their idea? Often, the thought of how to go about this daunting task can be confusing and overwhelming. We’ll discuss which approaches are most successful and why. We look forward to listening to different and unique methods that others have implemented, while sharing our own ideas as well.

*Stacy Riseman*, Director of Sponsored Research, College of the Holy Cross

*Jeremy Miner*, Director of Grants and Contracts, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire

---

**Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI)**

**UNIFORM GUIDANCE ON INTERNAL CONTROLS**

The OMB Uniform Guidance states that “the non-Federal entity must establish and maintain effective internal controls...” Join us for a discussion on the issue of tightening regulations, specific requirements, and audit expectations relating to internal controls. Let’s explore the fundamental concepts behind the definitions, review the standards and limitations, and discuss ways of evaluating internal control systems and their consistency with our organizations’ operation and mission.

*Samantha Westcott*, Manager, Sponsored Projects Team, Childrens Hospital Los Angeles

---

**Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI)**

**SPARKING GRANTSMANSHP ACTIVITY IN THE HUMANITIES**

Do you feel that your College’s/University’s humanities faculty members are often underrepresented in the number of grant applications being submitted each year? This session will include discussion of ideas, tips, and best practices for stimulating grantsmanship activity from faculty in the humanities disciplines. Let’s talk about what has worked, what didn’t, and trends at your university. Please come prepared to share your ideas with colleagues.

*Carly Cummings*, Assistant to the Dean - Research, Mississippi State University

---

10:30 am – Noon | Discussion Group for Senior Level Administrators

**Departmental**

**OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES FACING EMERGING OFFICES OF STRATEGIC RESEARCH INITIATIVES**

Across the country, universities that range from small R&D expenditures to large R&D expenditures are creating or supporting existing research offices of strategic research initiatives to support the development of strategic/large multidisciplinary research proposals, center grants and/or infrastructure grants. These offices often work with senior...

> continued on next page
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10:30 am – Noon | Discussion Group for Senior Level Administrators (continued)

**Departmental**

**OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES FACING EMERGING OFFICES OF STRATEGIC RESEARCH INITIATIVES (CONTINUED)**

leadership to conduct strategic research planning, provide centralized grant writing resources and manage internal seed grant programs. They typically complement existing offices of research administration and development. This discussion will provide an overview of emerging models, the types of services provided, and experiences in working with institutional research administration offices. Discussion will include lessons learned from these offices and a sharing of best practices for those senior administrators looking to develop offices of strategic research initiatives or enhance existing ones. Participants will be encouraged to share experiences at their own campuses during this discussion.

Mary Beth Curtin*, Assistant Vice President for Research, State University of New York at Binghamton
Kevin Dressler, Associate Director of Strategic Initiatives and Proposal Development, The Pennsylvania State University

10:30 am – Noon | Office Hours

Many participants are often tasked by their managers, researchers, and colleagues with finding an answer to a burning question at their institution. With the Office Hours sessions, we are creating an opportunity to obtain answers to those questions by subject matter experts in a one-on-one setting. The expert will be able to share their thoughts and advice directly with the individual. For participants, this is a great opportunity to learn, ask questions, and meet some of NCURA’s esteemed members.

**UNIFORM GUIDANCE**

Kim Moreland*, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research & Sponsored Programs, University of Wisconsin Madison
Sara Bible, Associate Vice Provost for Research, Stanford University

Noon – 1:30 pm
Luncheon and Presentation of Distinguished Service Award Recipients and Joseph Carrabino Award

1:30 – 2:45 pm | Spark Sessions

15 – 20 minute, high energy, high deliverable offerings that will get right to the “good stuff.”

1:30 – 1:50 pm
**SUBMITTING ARTICLES TO THE RMR**

Jo Ann Smith*, Director of the Master of Research Administration, University of Central Florida
Jennifer Shambrook, Director, University of Central Florida

2:00 – 2:20 pm
**MANAGING SUBAWARDS IN THE POST-UNIFORM GUIDANCE ERA**

Joanne Palmer*, OSP Contracts Manager, Office of Sponsored Programs, Texas State University

2:30 – 2:45 pm
**HOW NCURA MEMBERS CAN COLLABORATE ON COLLABORATE! – NCURA’S PROFESSIONAL NETWORKING PLATFORM**

Stephanie Moore*, Community Curator, National Council of University Research Administrators
New Guidance, Renewed Partnerships

Career Skills/Professional Development

**HOW MAY WE SERVE YOU? CHANGING THE FOCUS FROM SERVICE TO PROFESSION**

We, research administrators, pride ourselves in being professionals. We gather to improve ourselves, expand our knowledge base and to promote our profession. Often times, we focus on the service component of our profession with job descriptions seeing “service oriented,” “customer focused,” “client-driven” staff that also happens to know how to deal with the complexities of our industry. While no one wants a team of people unwilling to be helpful, it is our knowledge, experience, and professional skills that our institutions rely upon. Emphasis on professionalism rather than “servicing” might strengthen our position within the institutional hierarchy and consequently enhance our ability to perform at the highest level of excellence with a greater professional satisfaction.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:** This session seeks to continue the discussion on addressing the merits of bringing the professional expertise and the dedication to the field of research administration to the forefront.

**Shella Batelman**, Senior Research Administrator, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center

**Anne Pascucci**, Director, Sponsored Programs, Christopher Newport University

Career Skills/Professional Development

**MANAGING UP, DOWN AND ACROSS**

Facilitating research in an evolving compliance environment requires research administration leaders to garner the support of our senior leadership, rally the troops to ensure a smooth implementation and very often across departmental boundaries. At the same time research administrators have to work effectively with the faculty members whose cooperation, even if reluctant, is absolutely essential if the compliance objectives are going to be achieved. It is rare that we have the full authority to ensure compliance without enlisting the buy-in and assistance from our colleagues in academic units and other administrative units including accounting, human resources, development or international programs to name just a few. It imperative that we enlist input and support in making research happen on our campuses.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will recognize the need for collaboration with multiple departments in ensuring research compliance.
- Participants will consider good practices in cultivating relationships across campus units and among multiple levels that are often impacted by research policies and procedures.
- Participants will identify potential political considerations for involving interested parties in decision making especially when implementing new regulations.

**Susan Sedwick**, Consultant, Attain, LLC

**Richard Seligman**, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, California Institute of Technology

Clinical Research/Clinical Trials

**ERA OF PRECISION MEDICINE AND LEARNING HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS: HOW CAN TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT CLINICAL/TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH?**

As many academic organizations move to advance translational research to achieve personalized medicine, researchers and clinicians must be placed into a position to better manage Information Science and Informatics solutions more than ever before. Given the rapid growth of technology and tsunami of data, we are facing a shortage of fully integrated informatics solutions that integrate, store, and analyze omics and biomedical clinical and research data from diverse sources - mostly generated in-house as well as public consortiums. Today’s academic researcher and

> continued on next page
Compliance

FOSTERING A COMPLIANCE MINDSET

Funding for research comes with many strings attached. As administrators, our job is to help investigators to mind the strings. We comply with federal mandates through sound institutional policy and design compliance programs with least intrusive, low administrative burden. But how do we foster a mindful approach to compliance at our institutions? In this session, we will discuss:

- what makes fostering a compliance mindset challenging.
- strategies to overcome these challenges.
- characteristics of a successful compliance program.
- guiding principles for maintaining a successful compliance program.

Participants will learn about proven methods for fostering a compliance mindset generally and will understand best practices for PhD-granting institutions and medical institutions specifically.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Participants will identify how IT can leverage process and system improvements.
- Participants will gain an understanding of how to plan for maximizing and integrating institutional system to support the academic mission, such as electronic health record, clinical trials management systems, and IRB systems.
- Participants will learn strategies for including compliance, reporting, analytics, and benchmarking.
- Participants will hear about establishing staffing models, roles and training in support of IT to improve research capabilities.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should have intermediate knowledge of translational research.

Sorena Nadaf*, Associate Director, Translational Informatics, and Chief Informatics Officer, Helen Diller Family Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of California, San Francisco

Clinical Research/Clinical Trials

ERA OF PRECISION MEDICINE AND LEARNING HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS: HOW CAN TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT CLINICAL/TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH? (CONTINUED)

Clinician must rely on bio-informaticians and IT specialist directly to perform mundane data management tasks in order to validate simple hypothesis. What is a scalable solution and roadmap to achieve these goals? What is the best way to ensure that the right technology is working for your institution? How do you gauge success? This workshop will cover how to use IT and Informatics to support your institutions research vision, how to use modern technology to drive improvements in both the clinical and research processes, and lessons learned from strategies employed at University of California, San Francisco.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Participants will identify how IT can leverage process and system improvements.
- Participants will gain an understanding of how to plan for maximizing and integrating institutional system to support the academic mission, such as electronic health record, clinical trials management systems, and IRB systems.
- Participants will learn strategies for including compliance, reporting, analytics, and benchmarking.
- Participants will hear about establishing staffing models, roles and training in support of IT to improve research capabilities.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should have intermediate knowledge of translational research.

Sorena Nadaf*, Associate Director, Translational Informatics, and Chief Informatics Officer, Helen Diller Family Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of California, San Francisco
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION BOOT CAMP
This will be an interactive session led by a very experienced departmental administrators who can offer a combined twenty years of experience in the dynamic world of departmental administration. As we struggle daily to support not only managing our awards from cradle to grave, we must also respond to our staff, our faculty, our central offices and a myriad of internal and external requests. Additionally we have to stay abreast of changes from our sponsoring agencies and our own institutions. We will focus not only on the financial and sponsor impacts and interfaces in our daily lives, but also on managing your time, delegating successfully, training, motivating you and your staff, managing meetings, change and teaming. This will be an informative and fun look at what we can do to keep from slowly going insane.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES: Participants will gain helpful insights on how to manage the complex world that we work in so that we are not only successful, but also grow and enjoy this very dynamic job.

Randi Wasik*, Research Administrative Director, Duke University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PROPOSALS: PREPARING FOR THE NEW NORMAL
The U.S. Department of Education educational programming and student support solicitations released since the spring of 2014 have included increased standards for the level of evidence supporting proposed activities and a stronger focus on project evaluation. Understanding these patterns, being able to explain them to potential Principal Investigators, and checking to see that they have been appropriately incorporated into proposals are now an essential skill sets for all grants personnel working with DoED submissions. The presenters will provide information and tools derived from the literature of the applicable disciplines to participants so they may accomplish these necessary tasks.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will learn what the U.S. DoED is seeking in supporting evidence and evaluation.
- Participants will learn how to describe each of the patterns the DoED expects.
- Participants will learn how to recognize when the DoED standards have been met.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should have some familiarity with current U.S. DoED policies.

Michael Preuss*, Grants Consultant, Hanover Research
Paul Tuttle, Director of Proposal Development, Sponsored Programs & Research, North Carolina A&T State University

TRANSATING U.S. FEDERAL GRANT TERMINOLOGY, TERMS, AND CONDITIONS INTO HORIZON 2020 GRANT LANGUAGE
Horizon 2020 (H2020) is the biggest EU Research and Innovation program with nearly € 80 billion of funding available over 7 years (2014 to 2020). H2020 is based on EU policies aimed at securing Europe’s global competitiveness. Funding opportunities under H2020 are set out in multiannual work programs. The programs support excellent science, industrial leadership and research on societal challenges, for example, research projects on ‘Europe in a changing world - Inclusive, innovative and reflective societies’.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will gain knowledge on the structure of H2020.
- Using a successful H2020 proposal, the participants will learn about the different processes leading to the project implementation, the application and evaluation processes as well as the contract preparations.
- Participants will follow the comparison of such processes with processes in the U.S. funding system.
- The knowledge gained should encourage participants to discuss future collaboration and involvement in H2020 proposals and projects.

> continued on next page
1:30 – 2:45 pm | Concurrent Sessions (continued)

International

TRANSLATING U.S. FEDERAL GRANT TERMINOLOGY, TERMS, AND CONDITIONS INTO HORIZON 2020 GRANT LANGUAGE (CONTINUED)
H2020 encourages worldwide participation and organizations, researchers, administrators and experts in the U.S. are involved in H2020 projects. The aim of this session is to exchange experience with H2020 projects and to stimulate future collaboration. Explicit attention will be given to the rules of participation for U.S. organizations and/ or individuals. The session will create the opportunity to discuss objectives and strategies for becoming involved in H2020.

Bettina Uhrig*, Senior Advisor Internationalisation, Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Norwegian Social Research Institute
Vivian Holmes, Director, Sponsored Research Operations, Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard
John Donovan, Chair of EARMA, Head of Research, Dublin Institute of Technology

Post-Award

COST ANALYSIS AND RATE SETTING FOR SERVICE CENTERS—HOW TO DO IT THE RIGHT WAY, AND DO IT ONCE!
Luckily, OMB Uniform Guidance did not impact service centers; however, the compliance requirements still carry forward to perform a cost analysis in order to set rates to break even. This activity is an arduous task for a variety of reasons. Cost accounting is specialized knowledge not commonly required in the day-to-day jobs of most research administrators. Next, many institutions fail to provide the right guidance to help you "connect the dots" between compliance and rate setting. Lastly, many cost analysis models are not comprehensive enough to meet all of your financial compliance and operational needs.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES: Participants will come away with a comprehensive understanding of service center cost analysis principles and rate setting techniques that can be employed at their institutions.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should have a general understanding of Cost Accounting Standards and some familiarity with common types of service centers.

Martin Smith*, Manager, Higher Education and Academic Medical Centers, Attain, LLC
Andres Chan, Director, Office of Financial Analysis, University of Southern California

Pre-Award

LARGE PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT—A MULTI-INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW OF INDUSTRY TRENDS
The Strategic Interdisciplinary Research Office (SIRO) at Penn State University and Huron Consulting Group conducted a benchmarking survey of the top 100 research institutions to collect data on the general staffing, support and productivity characteristics. Findings will be showcased via a panel featuring survey participants who will discuss their methodology and best practices for larger, complex proposal preparation. The survey data is expected to be valuable to institutions currently housing or interested in creating a similar LPO/service unit.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will gain familiarization with various options for organizing large proposal support within institutions.
- Participants will gain awareness of critical support elements that impact large proposal submissions.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should be administrators of Large Proposal Offices (LPOs) responsible for development and submissions of large grants and contracts at academic research institutions or have an interest in establishing one at their respective institution. Experience with large proposal preparation and related issues will be beneficial.

Kevin Dressler*, Associate Director of Strategic Initiatives and Proposal Development, The Pennsylvania State University
L. Eric James, Manager, Huron Consulting Group
Eduardo Serrano, Manager of Research Services, Huron Consulting Group
Fruma Yehiely, Director, Office Of Research Development, Northwestern University
### Concurrent Sessions (continued)

#### Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI)

**Building a Culture of Sponsored Research at a PUI**

Increased pressure to diversify funding streams at institutions of higher education present particular challenges – and opportunities – for sponsored research offices at PUIs to cultivate a campus-wide grants culture often where it likely had not existed or thrived before. Creating a sustainable program requires multiple levels of campus collaborations and commitments, including faculty engagement and buy-in, changing faculty work load expectations, providing monetary support for developing research agendas, and providing advocacy and recognition programs. This session will enable you to learn about workable, practical, results-driven strategies to engage the campus community to foster an inclusive culture that builds toward successful grantsmanship and a vigorous grants culture.

**Learning Objectives:**
- Participants will assess strategies for building and/or enhancing a robust grants culture.
- Participants will consider how a wide range of campus stakeholders at different levels can engage productively and meaningfully in a grants culture.
- Participants will discuss opportunities to expand and increase grants activities through sponsored research office initiatives.

**Lead Presenter:**
- Andrea Moshier*, Director, Sponsored Research, Western Carolina University
- Alison Krauss, Proposal Development Specialist, Western Carolina University
- Kendra Mingo, Director, Office for Faculty Research, Willamette University

#### Career Skills/Professional Development

**Leading Across Generations: The Changing Work Landscape**

For the first time in modern history, the workplace now spans four generations (Traditionalists, Baby Boomers, Generation Xers and the Millennials). The challenge over the next decade will be to attract and retain a workforce as the business continues to tighten and technology continues to advance. Each group has their unique characteristics and attitudes towards work based on experiences. To effectively integrate these diverse generations into the workplace, leaders will need to embrace the changes and create a culture that demonstrates inclusion of this multigenerational workforce. This interactive group discussion encourages participants to ask questions as well as share their own experiences.

**Lead Presenter:**
- Denise Moody*, Director of Research Compliance, Harvard University
- Rosemary Madnick, Executive Director, Office of Grants and Contracts Administration, University of Alaska Fairbanks

#### Clinical Research/Clinical Trials

**Navigating Device Trials Efficiently**

This discussion will focus on unique differences associated with clinical device trials. Topics will range from billing complexities associated with these types of studies to the unique regulatory challenges for the site. Participants will be able to learn from others as to how best to conduct device trials at their sites.

**Lead Presenter:**
- Karen Hartman*, Administrator, Research Compliance, Mayo Clinic
Compliance

RESEARCH MISCONDUCT: BEST PRACTICES TO AVOID, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND SELF-DISCLOSURE (Follow up to Concurrent Session, "Partners in Research Compliance: Fostering Cooperation and Results with Internal Audit, held Monday at 10:30 am)

This is a discussion group following the concurrent discussion discussing building effective relationships with internal audit from the internal audit, department/college, and sponsored programs perspectives. The conversation will focus on the role of internal audit and strategies for developing and maintaining successful and mutually beneficial relationships between all parties. Tips for moving your unit towards greater cooperation with internal audit and using your audit reports as a springboard for improved compliance will be shared.

Andrea Ward Ross*, Assistant Executive Dean for Research, Ohio State University

Departmental

CROWD FUNDING PLANS FOR YOUR RESEARCHERS

As Scientists prepare their traditional funding proposals, they have alternate opportunities which they need to consider in crowdfunding. Sites such as Petridish, RocketHub, Fundly, Microryza, Indiegogo, Thinkable, LabCures, SciFund Challenge, and Walacea are closing the gap for small, time-constricted projects. The European Crowdfunding Network has established its own special “Science Work Group.” Public benefit is a strict component of awards in the EU and crowdfunding is a predictable expression of that tradition. As research has become increasingly complex, an intellectual divide has arisen between citizens and the projects their tax dollars fund. Projects such as Horizon 2020 and DCent are working hard to bring projects back to the everyday experiences of citizens. Crowdfunding becomes an important vehicle, as Didier Schmitt explains, to “reconnect science to society.”

The reunion between the people and research has a more tangible connection however, in the role of research operations. The work of research operatives is something the community can relate to, bridging the gap between difficult complexities and the everyday. If the work of research administrators is explained and included in these requests for crowdfunding, much needed resources can be allotted to the supporting office while increasing the project’s mass appeal.

Cynthia Bellas*, Executive Director, Research Suite Strategy, Evisions, Inc.
Jesse Null, Surgery Research Manager, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center
AGENDA
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1:30 – 2:45 pm | Discussion Groups (continued)

**Departmental**

**ORGANIZATIONAL Restructuring AND THE IMPACT ON RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION**

In this discussion, we will share and discuss ways to effectively navigate the waves of change when your organization goes through a restructuring process. So much of what happens on campus directly or indirectly impacts the community that supports research, whether at the departmental level or in a central office. Finding the right balance during these times of restructuring is critical to keeping operations flowing and your departments and faculty sufficiently supported. Come join the discussion and share your experiences and tips for successfully surviving an organizational change in structure while maintaining your various work relationships and providing critical support to the research community.

*Michelle Vazin*, Director, Office of Contracts and Grants, Vanderbilt University

**Federal**

**UNIVERSITY UNIFORM GUIDANCE IMPLEMENTATION: WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?**

Universities, federal agencies and professional organizations spent 2015 interpreting and implementing the vast array of regulatory revisions in the Uniform Guidance. This discussion group will briefly review what we’ve learned to date about the interpretations and how we have implemented the bulk of the Uniform Guidance. However, it isn’t over yet! Are you ready for the future? There are several significant issues such as procurement standards, compensation—personal services, conflicts of interest policies, project closeout: 90 or 120 days, and internal controls that research administrators are still trying to understand and implement. We will examine the current status of these and other topics that participants bring to the table, and how to address these substantial issues in the near term and beyond. Please send your questions and issues to Sara Bible at sbible@stanford.edu prior to the session.

*Sara Bible*, Associate Vice Provost for Research, Stanford University

**International**

**SAME SAME, BUT DIFFERENT: LEARNING FROM RESEARCH SUPPORT IN OTHER COUNTRIES**

As universities become more internationally focused, the prospect of working more closely with institutions in other countries occurs on an increasingly frequent basis. But how do you go about it? Traditionally research collaborations are seen as the life-blood of international activity, but what about research support collaborations? We will explore ways in which Offices for Research and Sponsored Programs

> continued on next page
International

SAME SAME, BUT DIFFERENT: LEARNING FROM RESEARCH SUPPORT IN OTHER COUNTRIES (CONTINUED)
in different countries can work together for mutual benefit, learning from each other and becoming a trusted resource for information about the wider world. Ultimately, of course, the aim is to better support the university and its faculty in their international research endeavors.

Simon Kerridge*, Director of Research Services, Chair of ARMA, University of Kent
Judy Fredenberg, Director, Research and Sponsored Programs, University of Montana

Post-Award

EMERGING AUDIT TRENDS: NSF DATA ANALYTICS AUDITS
The OIGs of federal agencies have recently increased their focus on compliance and efficiency of operations of institutions of higher education. As a result, OIGs are more frequently performing audits of college and universities’ programs to review compliance and to identify cost recovery opportunities for these federal agencies. NSF and DHHS have both demonstrated this trend through their increased interest in auditing higher education institutions for compliance and cost recovery opportunities. The NSF OIG developed a specific practice to enhance visibility into how federal funds are spent by awardees by using data analytics.

Adrienne Larmett*, Senior Consultant, Baker Tilly

Pre-Award

HOW TO VALUE IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS IN A GRANT PROPOSAL
How do you determine the fair market value of an in-kind contribution? Generally, just the agreed-upon amount is an insufficient means for valuation. You also have to consider whether or not the market is open and unrestricted. Are the parties knowledgeable? Are the parties dealing at arm’s length and fully informed? In this discussion, we will find how to value the most common types of in-kind contributions and why it is important to do this during the proposal phase rather than after it is awarded.

Pamela Valentine*, Director, Research Support Services, University of Memphis

Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI)

SMOOTHING AND SOOTHING THE ROAD TO SUCCESSFUL COLLABORATIONS AT PUIs
Collaboration is a key to a PUIs efforts to expand its reach, build partnerships and establish credibility. Research administrators at PUIs play a vital role by advising project directors and investigators as they establish partnerships while making sure that sponsor requirements are met and administrative arrangements are effective. This discussion group will allow participants to share their lessons learned from the good and not-so-good-in-hindsight advice they have given as well as their “current best practices” that make for a good trip.

Martin Williams*, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, William Paterson University
Compliance

LEGAL AND PRACTICAL PITFALLS IN CONDUCTING RESEARCH MISCONDUCT PROCEEDINGS AND HOW TO AVOID THEM

Research misconduct proceedings at academic and medical institutions are becoming more frequent and more adversarial. What were once often informally managed faculty peer reviews have become lightning rods for litigation. Respondents are more frequently engaging their own legal counsel as soon as the allegations are levied, requiring institutions to manage not only the inquiry and investigation of the allegations, but also the associated pre-litigation dance with respondent’s counsel. The high stakes of these proceedings has complicated the work of institutional review committees, Research Integrity Officers, Deciding Officials, and others charged with managing the review of the evidence. Every step of the review of allegations (assessment, inquiry, investigation, coordination with the government, coordination with other collaborating institutions, drafting of committee reports, etc.) is an opportunity for institutions either to demonstrate their diligence and adherence to the required process, or to fall short in ways that may haunt them during subsequent litigation with the respondent. Furthermore, institutions must manage interactions with legal counsel to the respondent delicately, to ensure that the misconduct proceedings are not hijacked by the threat of litigation and related concerns.

2:45 – 3:00 pm | Networking and Refreshment Break

3:00 – 3:45 pm | Regional Business Meetings

3:45 – 4:00 pm | Networking and Refreshment Break

4:00 – 5:00 pm | Spark Sessions

15 – 20 minute, high energy, high deliverable offerings that will get right to the “good stuff.”

4:00 – 4:20 pm
WRITING FOR NCURA MAGAZINE

Toni Shaklee*, Assistant Vice President For Research, Oklahoma State University
Kris Monahan, Director of Sponsored Research and Programs, Providence College

4:30 – 4:50 pm
THE PURPOSE DRIVEN RESEARCH ADMINISTRATOR

Sue Kelch*, Senior Financial Specialist, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor
Nicole Nichols, Financial Manager of Operations, Dept of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Washington University in St. Louis
LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Participants will hear a brief summary of the history of research administration and provide reasons for why so many of its members come into the field from other backgrounds.
- Participants will be provided tools and resources that can be used to make the transition less daunting.
- Participants will discuss potential career paths in the field.
- Participants will discuss the future of research administration (emerging as a solid, recognized field).

Tanya Blackwell*, Contracting Officer, Georgia Institute of Technology

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Participants will be able to describe what the FDA and NIH agencies are expecting to see in a CAPA.
- Participants will be able to identify the root causes of the deficiencies noted and describe them in a way that helps you, rather than hurts you.
- Participants will communicate how to “push back” without being argumentative.
- Participants will recognize document formats that are comprehensive and complete.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should have a basic understanding of clinical trials and the regulatory context.

Allecia Harley*, AVP of Research Affairs and Clinical Trials Administration, Rush University Medical Center
Crista Brawley, Research Director, Cancer Clinical Trials, Rush University Medical Center

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Participants will learn the basic premise behind the regulations and what the goal is of the regulations.
- Participants will understand the difference between the EAR and the ITAR.
- Participants will identify the potential resources available to research administrators.

Michael Miller*, Assistant Director, Export Compliance, University of Central Florida
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**RCR LESSONS LEARNED: WHAT INSTITUTIONS AREN’T DOING**
This session will look at the core areas of RCR and what many institutions are doing to support RCR. Data will be presented based on what the research indicates related to institutional efforts to promote RCR—impact, gaps, and need for improvement.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will be able to identify current efforts in promoting RCR by institutions.
- Participants will be able to describe the impact of institutional RCR efforts.
- Participants will discuss areas and strategies for improvement for institutions addressing RCR.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants will be encouraged to share and describe effective measures being used at their institutions.

*Jo Ann Smith*, Director of the Master of Research Administration, University of Central Florida

---

**MANAGING PARALLEL INTERNAL INVESTIGATIONS OF RESEARCH-RELATED NONCOMPLIANCE OR MISCONDUCT**
When an event of research-related misconduct or noncompliance occurs at an institution, this often sparks a number of different internal investigations involving various institutional bodies and officials, including not only research administrators, the IRB, and the research misconduct office or Research Integrity Officer, but also other bodies and officials such as the Compliance Officer, the Privacy Officer, human resources, medical staff peer review committees, etc. In general, each of these institutional bodies and officials will be subject to different legal and operational requirements, and these requirements often conflict. In order for the institution to effectively manage parallel internal investigations, it is important that these institutional bodies and officials work together and coordinate with one another. This topic is especially important for research administrators because research administrators are likely to be the personnel who first learn of the noncompliance or misconduct and possibly serve as “air traffic controller” for the parallel internal investigations. It is thus critical that research administrators understand how the various requirements to which these institutional bodies and officials can conflict and understand best practices for managing parallel internal investigations.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will identify the various institutional bodies and officials and policies that may be triggered by an event of research-related misconduct or noncompliance, including IRB serious or continuing noncompliance investigations, research misconduct proceedings, HIPAA privacy or security breach determinations, human resources investigations, and medical staff peer reviews, among others.
- This session will help research administrators recognize the ways in which the requirements and standards applicable to different institutional bodies and officials and processes may overlap or be in tension.
- Participants will discuss appropriate roles for individuals and oversight committees involved in these processes.
- Participants will hear strategies and best practices for coordinating multiple investigations in a way that maximizes efficiency, but also maintains the integrity of the various processes.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should be familiar with basic concepts of research noncompliance. Prior experience dealing with incidents of noncompliance is recommended.

*Andrew Rusczek*, Counsel, Verrill Dana
*Megan Kasimatis Singleton*, Associate Director, Human Research Protections, University of Pennsylvania
### Concurrent Sessions (continued)

#### Federal

**NIST/NOAA UPDATE**

This session will identify and describe the various types of research and development funding opportunities from the U.S. Department of Commerce National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and provide participants with an understanding of available assistance funding from these two government agencies. Participants will learn about what is new and developing with NIST and NOAA programs, policies, people and budgets, and learn about programs of interest to their researchers.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will be better able to identify the various types of funding opportunities from NIST and NOAA and describe the characteristics of available assistance funding from these two government agencies.
- Participants will understand what NIST and NOAA funding opportunities are intended to accomplish.
- Participants will learn about current and future NIST and NOAA budgets and agency priorities.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should come prepared to discuss updates from NIST and NOAA.

**Philip Hoffman**, Protected Species National Program Coordinator, NMFS Office of Protected Resources, NOAA

**Dianne Poster**, Special Assistant to the Principal Deputy; National Institute of Standards and Technology

#### Federal

**DATA ACT**

**Ron Splittgerber**, Director, Research Services, Colorado State University

#### International

**SEEING IN THE DARK: UTILIZING METRICS TO INFORM GLOBAL COLLABORATION POTENTIAL**

Major research universities, such as those represented by Universitas 21 (leading global network of 25 research-intensive universities in 16 different countries) are using data tools and metrics such as Elsevier’s scival to identify the research competencies and uncover existing and potential areas of global research collaboration. In fact, managing and expanding global partnerships without such a tool is like walking in the dark.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will examine how scival and other tools like it can be used to identify an institution’s research strengths and then locate peer/potential partners where there is a good fit for future collaboration.
- Specific case studies from among the U21 member institutions will be provided to demonstrate the utility of such a tool.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should be senior level administrators.

**Martin Kirk**, Immediate Past President, CAURA, University of British Columbia
B Post-Award

UNIFORM GUIDANCE AND OTHER HOT TOPICS
Now that we are 8 months into the UG, what have we learned? Any lessons learned on how our institutions implemented the UG are helpful. We will also discuss other hot topics from current findings in audits to what institutions are doing with Effort Reporting.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will learn how other institutions are dealing with the UG.
- Participants will learn about current hot topics.
- Participants will share what we have learned from agencies since the implementation.

PREREQUISITE: Previous knowledge of the Circulars and a working knowledge of the Uniform Guidance is recommended for participants.

Timothy Reuter*, Director, Post-Award, Office of Sponsored Research, Stanford University
Denise Clark, Associate Vice President for Administration and Chief of Staff, Division of Research, University of Maryland, College Park
Ann Holmes, Assistant Dean, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, University of Maryland, College Park

A Pre-Award

EXPLORING THE ALPHABET SOUP OF NON-MONETARY AGREEMENTS: CDA, CA, DUA, MOU, MTA, TA, VSA
Are you interested in learning the best use of, and appropriate terms for, the alphabet soup of non-monetary agreements? If you are then this is the session for you. Many agreements needed to facilitate research do not involve a monetary award, but the terms and conditions of these agreements are critical in ensuring that an institution’s, and its faculty’s, rights are protected. The main objectives of this session are to first introduce participants to these agreements and to their use and characteristics. Second, we want to explain why it is important for you as a research administrator to understand the importance and significance of putting these types of agreements in place at your institution. We will explore how these agreements can protect you, your institution and faculty, particularly in the areas of intellectual property, data ownership, liability, and material transfers. In addition, we will discuss the circumstances under which institutions may want to expand their collaboration with other entities and outline the types of agreements that should be used in those situations.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will better understand the meaning behind the acronyms and characteristics of each agreement.
- Participants will recognize circumstances in which non-monetary agreements are needed and identify the most appropriate type of agreement to use.
- Participants will identify key issues to be considered when drafting and negotiating the different types of agreements.

Marjorie Forster*, Assistant Vice President for Research and Global Health Initiatives, University of Maryland, Baltimore
Linda Learned, Associate Director, Awards, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Amanda Miller, Manager, Contracts, The University of Texas at Dallas
Janet Simons, Director, Research Policy, University of Maryland, Baltimore
**AGENDA**

**Monday | August 3, 2015**

---

4:00 – 5:00 pm  |  Concurrent Sessions (continued)

**Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI)**

**OFFICE OF SPONSORED PROGRAMS AS A RESOURCE RATHER THAN A MONEY MAKER**

If you have ever had to defend your office or position to an administrator who thinks a sponsored programs office should be classified as a revenue generating unit and that you (personally) should “bring in enough indirect to pay your salary,” you are not alone. This session enumerates all the services sponsored programs offices provide and compares them to services provided by other campus units. Research administrators are campus resources not “money makers.”

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

- Participants will be able to state at least three reasons why a sponsored programs office is different from a development office.
- Participants will be able to use language that is persuasive (but not defensive) to define the value of their office to a person who has never worked in our field.

**Margaret Austin**, Associate Director, Center for Policy Research, Syracuse University

**Jennifer Rudes**, Director, Sponsored Programs Pre-award Services, The Research Foundation of State University of New York Upstate Medical University

**Jason Wagoner**, Director of Research and Sponsored Programs, Illinois State University

---

4:00 – 5:00 pm  |  Discussion Groups

**Career Skills/Professional Development**

**STRENGTHENING THE CORE: BUILDING AND MAINTAINING WORK RELATIONSHIPS**

In this discussion, we will share and discuss ways to build and maintain work relationships, providing different perspectives to help you strengthen your department, school, or central office from the inside out. Methods discussed will include team building activities, communication activities, and ways to create a positive work environment. This discussion is geared toward all levels.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

- Participants will be able to state at least three reasons why a sponsored programs office is different from a development office.
- Participants will be able to use language that is persuasive (but not defensive) to define the value of their office to a person who has never worked in our field.

**Pamela Napier**, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Agnes Scott College

---

**Clinical Research/Clinical Trials**

**WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW ABOUT THE IRB AND HUMAN SUBJECTS PROTECTIONS**

This discussion group will focus on use of human subjects in clinical research. It will include a discussion of working with the IRB and regulations such as HIPPA and Data Management and other issues affecting the protection of human beings used in research.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

- Participants will be able to state at least three reasons why a sponsored programs office is different from a development office.
- Participants will be able to use language that is persuasive (but not defensive) to define the value of their office to a person who has never worked in our field.

**Marianne Woods**, Academic Program Director, Master of Science in Research Administration, Johns Hopkins University

---
Compliance

MINDING THE STRINGS WITHOUT GETTING TANGLED
(Follow-up to concurrent session, “Fostering a Compliance Mindset,” held Monday at 1:30 pm)
With regulatory requirements increasingly accompanying research awards, it is difficult to mind the strings attached to funding for research. Compliance with federal mandates is even more challenging, however, when a compliance program intersects with sponsored programs business processes. We will discuss strategies for designing low-burden administrative procedures that meet regulatory delineated compliance requirements while considering the impact on proposal submission and/or award setup processes. Share best practices with your peers, ask specific questions about your compliance areas, and learn strategies for aligning your institution with federal mandates without holding up proposals or expenditure of award funds.

Matt Richter*, Compliance Manager, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Departmental

HELPFUL TIPS FOR GETTING THE PROPOSAL OUT THE DOOR
How do you give them, your department approver, school approver, your central office and ultimately your sponsor, what they want? This discussion will share best practices for getting a quality product out the door in sufficient time to meet the submission deadline, while adhering to all the sponsor’s requirements. Specific topics to be discussed include proposal preparation, the central office technical review, approval and submission processes, and how to incentivize investigators to submit their applications in a timely manner.

Danielle Brown*, Manager, Sponsored Programs Administration, University of Maryland, Baltimore

Federal

COLLABORATING WITH DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY LABORATORIES: WHY AND HOW
The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) laboratories represent a significant national resource and research infrastructure, and engagement with them—in areas of collaborative research, joint appointments, user facilities and technology transfer—present strategically valuable opportunities for each party. Additionally, the federal government is increasingly establishing programs that provide high-value opportunities for universities and DOE labs (and in some cases industry as well) to partner. These partnerships are building blocks for regional, national and global economic development. This discussion will briefly introduce the seventeen Department of Energy laboratories, and offer a review of the agreement.

> continued on next page
Setting Up Shop: Best Practices and Lessons Learned from Organizing & Managing a National Research Administrators’ Association

The Canadian Association of Research Administrators (CARA) has been active for more than 40 years. A volunteer organization, CARA has grown to almost 1,000 members at all levels across the research administration spectrum. Members have seen an evolution around research administration including changes regarding: compliance regulations; accountability; demand for demonstrable outcomes; metrics; monitoring and evaluation; and reporting. Within the Canadian system as a whole, programs such as the Canada Research Chairs (CRC), Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI), Canada First Research Excellence Fund (CFREF) to name just a few, have fundamentally changed research and research administration in the country. As a result, the role of the research administrative professional has also undergone significant change. In 2013/14, CARA undertook a detailed survey of its members regarding their role, educational background, career plans, and views of the profession. CARA provides a national voice for research administrators in Canada. Our professional organization’s strength is in its diversity and comprehensive approach to research administration. We provides a critical interface between all stakeholders in the management of the research enterprise. This discussion will provide an overview of CARA’s work, results of the members’ survey, and information on what changes CARA anticipates in the future.

Deborah Zornes*, Director, Research Services, Office of Research, Royal Roads University
Zygmunt Krasinski, Director and National Contact Point for Research Programmes of the EU, Institute of Fundamental Technological Research, Poland
Olaf Svenningsen, Head of Research Support Office/Chair of DARMA, University of Southern Denmark
### Discussion Groups (continued)

#### Post-Award

**IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW FINANCIAL SYSTEMS**

James Reisert*, AVP Financial Operations, Medstar Health Research Institute

#### Pre-Award

**DATA MANAGEMENT AND THE DMP (DATA MANAGEMENT PLANNING) TOOL**

Tricia Callahan*, Director, Proposal Development, Miami University

Explore the University of California Curation Center’s free, online DMP (Data Management Planning) tool and get your investigators thinking about their data: how it is stored, who manages it, and who has access to it. Participants will receive a hands-on demonstration of the DMP tool and work through a data management template to use at their own institutions.

**SUPPORTING FACULTY: PERSPECTIVES FROM THE SCHOOL AND CENTRAL LEVELS**

Robyn Remotigue*, Research Manager, School of Public Health, University of North Texas Health Science Center at Fort Worth

Anthony Ventimiglia, Associate Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Auburn University

Research Administrators support faculty in myriad ways. However, depending on your “proximity” to the faculty, this support may be more global rather than personal. This interactive discussion group will focus on sharing best practices in faculty support – both from a school (or local) level and from efforts underway at a “central” level – in the hopes of providing stellar support, with the overarching goal of advancing the extramural endeavors of our institutions.

**TRANSITIONING FROM AN R1 TO A PUI**

Teri Herberger*, Director of Sponsored Programs, Salisbury University

Research administration is research administration wherever you go, right? Well, like most RA questions, the answer is, “It depends.” Research administration issues can be very different depending on the university’s size and culture. In this discussion, we’ll discuss the major differences encountered when moving between extremes in research administration and offer tips and advice for dealing with the culture shock.
4:00 – 5:00 pm | Discussion Group for Senior Level Administrators

**Clinical Research/Clinical Trials**

**CLINICAL TRIAL BILLING: SOLUTIONS TO A COMPLEX PROBLEM**

What makes clinical trials research billing so complex? How could an error impact patients and their families, as well as the institution performing the research? What are the benefits to preparing an accurate budget before a clinical trial begins? This discussion will provide an overview of the importance of proper financial management for clinical trials. A case study will be presented that details how The Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia works with principal investigators, research teams and hospital administrators in areas of research pricing, budgeting, registration, billing, and sponsor invoicing to ensure accuracy and regulatory compliance. Learn about the systems and procedures in place at CHOP that support each step in this multifaceted and challenging billing process.

**Mitch Appleson**, Director, Clinical Trials Financial Management, The Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia

4:00 – 5:00 pm | Office Hours

Many participants are often tasked by their managers, researchers, and colleagues with finding an answer to a burning question at their institution. With the Office Hours sessions, we are creating an opportunity to obtain answers to those questions by subject matter experts in a one-on-one setting. The expert will be able to share their thoughts and advice directly with the individual. For participants, this is a great opportunity to learn, ask questions, and meet some of NCURA’s esteemed members.

**EXPORT CONTROLS**

**Kay Ellis**, Director, University Export Control Program, University of Arizona

**Elizabeth Peloso**, Associate Vice Provost/Associate Vice President, Research Services, University of Pennsylvania

6:00 pm | Monday Evening Dine Arounds

9:00 pm | Regional Hospitality Suites Open
6:15 – 7:15 am
NCURA FITNESS

7:30 am – 5:00 pm
AM57 CONCIERGE
EXPOSITION 2015
NCURA MARKETPLACE

7:30 – 8:15 am
CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST AND
BREAKFAST ROUNDTABLES
LEARN ABOUT THE CONSULTING SERVICES OF BAKER TILLY
Adrienne Larnett*, Senior Consultant, Baker Tilly
GLOBAL SUBCOMMITTEE
Janet Simons*, Director, Research Policy, University of Maryland, Baltimore
TIPS AND TRICKS FOR DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATORS
Randi Wasik*, Research Administrative Director, Duke University

8:30 – 10:00 am | Spark Sessions

15 – 20 minute, high energy, high deliverable offerings that will get right to the “good stuff.”

8:30 – 8:50 am
SHIFTING TO A CENTRALIZED MODEL FOR DEPARTMENTAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION
Jennifer Cory*, Director of Research, Pediatrics, Stanford University
Gareth Evans, Research Finance Manager, Stanford University

9:00 – 9:20 am
ARTISTIC LEADERSHIP
Beth Kroger*, Chief of Operations - JILA, University of Colorado at Boulder

8:30 – 10:00 am | Concurrent Sessions

Career Skills/Professional Development

LEARNING TO MANAGE ONESELF - A CRITICAL STEP TO SUCCESS
To be a good manager one must learn to effectively maximize the performance of a team, but if you are not prioritizing your own workload, that becomes unreachable. Failing to be a successful self-manager runs the risk of losing valuable people, and decreasing the motivation of your existing staff. How can one lead others with self-management skills? In this session, we will explore key components to self-management and why it is critical to our professional development. We will cover vital areas such as stress management, conflict resolution, organizational cultures, self-awareness, channeling your creative self for problem solving, and other aspects of self-management.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will learn how to reach goals and contribute to the success of their organization by understanding what their roles, responsibilities and keys to good management are.
- Participants will be provided with tools and techniques that can be used in their day-to-day routine.

Tolise Miles*, Senior Grants and Contracts Specialist, Children’s National Medical Center
Lisa Mosley, Executive Director, Research Operations, Arizona State University
Vivian Holmes, Director, Sponsored Research Operations, Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard
Samantha Westcott, Manager, Sponsored Projects Team, Children’s Hospital Los Angeles
Clinical Research/Clinical Trials

DECREASING STUDY START-UP TIMES (TIME TO ACTIVATION)
Over the past decade, the U.S. National Cancer Institute transformed all of its major clinical trials groups into research networks supported by a common infrastructure. This included the development of: electronic patient registration and regulatory support systems, structured processes to speed study prioritization and trial activation, common clinical trials data management software, and national centralized IRBs for early and late phase adult and pediatric trials, as well as for cancer control and health services research studies. These efforts have led to the consolidation of the number of cooperative groups in the new early and late-phase trial networks, and a shared, more efficient approach to tumor tissue acquisition and the support of correlative/translational studies associated with network-wide trials. Following this major restructuring, the time to trial initiation for phase 3 studies has decreased by almost 50%. Finally, the network focus of the new infrastructure has facilitated the development of several national trials testing the principles of precision oncology to select treatment by matching specific targeted therapies to the genomic abnormalities occurring in the tumors of individual patients, with the specific goal of evaluating this new approach to oncologic therapeutics.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will understand the obstacles to rapid activation and completion of national cancer clinical trials supported by the U.S. National Cancer Institute.
- Participants will become familiar with new approaches taken by the NCI to decrease clinical trial activation times.
- Participants will understand the benefits of centralized human subjects research committees.
- Participants will review the process of scientific clinical trial prioritization initiated by the NCI.

James Doroshov*, Deputy Director for Clinical and Translational Research, National Institutes of Health

Compliance

WHERE IS THE OVERSIGHT?
This session provides an overview of the current areas within human subject, animal subject and bio-material research where there is currently no federal oversight.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will be provided an overview of the major categories of human and animal research without federal regulatory protection for the subjects.
- Participants will discuss some of the latest examples of research studies that did not go through process, such as the Facebook manipulation study.
- Participants will outline specific approaches institutions through policies can take to ensure a level of protection does occur regardless of the current regulations.

Ross Hickey*, Assistant Provost, University of Southern Maine
NEW MODELS FOR RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION – TWO CASE STUDIES

Representatives from Emory University and The George Washington University will share and discuss their experiences as they transitioned from a traditional model for research administration support to a shared services model for research administration. Early in 2013, Emory began to roll out service center units to support research throughout the university as the institution moved from having hundreds of separate departments handling research administration tasks to a world where they will eventually have only ten service center units to provide these same services. At GW’s Milken Institute School of Public Health, the Office of the Dean piloted a hybrid shared service model for the school in the summer of 2013, to support seven departments in pre-award administration. This model addressed staffing issues and the need to provide high-level and equitable support for all PIs. Topics discussed will include planning, change management, training, and challenges faced.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will have an understanding about new models for research administration support both at the university and school level.
- Participants will have an understanding of the process to move from a traditional research administration support model to a service center unit model at Emory, and a hybrid model of traditional and shared services at GW.
- Participants will have an understanding of the challenges faced during this process, how they were addressed, and the trade offs and benefits of the models.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should have experience in research administration and an understanding of general organizational structures for the administration of research.

Kerry Peluso*, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, Emory University
Laura Davis, Senior Research Operations Director, George Washington University

PROPOSAL SUBMISSIONS: SURVIVAL TECHNIQUES AND TIPS

This session will review proposal submission considerations for research administrators and tips and techniques for getting the proposal out the door. Focus will be on survival when dealing with last minute offenders and submitting proposals. What is the minimum information you need to get the proposal rolling? What tasks do you need to give the faculty researcher? Identification of strategies for getting the proposal out of the door with limited time will also be included.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will learn how to identify practical techniques for proposal development and submission based on the time allowed.
- Participants will gain an understanding of how to prioritize proposal development tasks and identify potential road blocks to successful proposal submission.

Margaret Austin*, Associate Director, Center for Policy Research, Syracuse University
Jennifer Rudes, Director, Sponsored Programs Pre-award Services, The Research Foundation of State University of New York Upstate Medical University
Jason Wagoner, Director of Research and Sponsored Programs, Illinois State University
**AGENDA**

Tuesday | August 4, 2015

---

**8:30 – 10:00 am | Concurrent Sessions (continued)**

**Departmental**

**RESEARCH ADMINISTRATORS – OPPOSING TEAMS?**

Those with a functional job title of “Research Administrator” in an academic institution work in different venues with different responsibilities. Some work in academic departments, shoulder to shoulder with Principal Investigators. Others work in central offices representing the Institution. Regardless of the venue or individual job responsibilities, research administrators throughout the Institution are charged with taking the necessary steps to ensure a successful research project, concept to closeout from an administrative perspective. This session will investigate how research administrators, regardless of their role in the process, can align their efforts to work together toward a common goal.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will understand the perspectives of departmental research administrators.
- Participants will understand the perspectives of the central office(s) research administrators
- Participants will learn to identify the common areas.
- Participants will learn to compromise to manage the problems.

*Brenda Kavanaugh*, Associate Director, Office of Research and Project Administration, University of Rochester

*Nathan Youngblood*, Research Administrator, Northwestern University

---

**Federal**

**NIH UPDATE**

This session is a comprehensive review of what is new and being developed within the National Institute of Health’s (NIH) programs, policies, and budgets. Participants will learn about the newest updates to NIH’s budget and compliance initiatives and how their respective institutions will be affected. Upon completion of the presentation, participants will have the opportunity to ask questions about the new and existing policies and procedures.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will learn about NIH budget priorities.
- Participants will learn about the evolution of new policies and compliance initiatives.
- Participants will gain insight into current issues at NIH.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should come with a basic knowledge of NIH.

*Michelle Bulls*, Director of the Office of Policy for Extramural Research Administration, OPERA, National Institutes of Health

---

**Federal**

**DR. MARK LIVE: CANDID CONVERSATIONS WITH NSF AND NIH PROGRAM DIRECTORS AND A GRANTS MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST**

This session is an imitation of Larry King Live show called Dr. Mark Live. As a former NHLBI program director and now having working as a research administrator for a few years now I see many questions that come up on NCURA list serves that should really be addressed to the funding agencies. Larry King was known for asking “soft” questions in comparison to other interviewers, which allowed him to reach guests who would be averse to interviewing on “tough” talk shows. His reputation for asking easy, open-ended questions made him attractive to important figures who want to state their position while avoiding being challenged on contentious topics. Dr. Mark will use

*continued on next page*
Federal

DR. MARK LIVE: CANDID CONVERSATIONS WITH NSF AND NIH PROGRAM DIRECTORS AND A GRANTS MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST (CONTINUED)

The same style to interview the NIH and NSF officers. The interview questions to the panelist will be developed by polling NCURA list serves for information research administrators would like to know as well as working with the panelist on information and ways our PIs and colleagues can utilize the services available at NIH and NSF. In addition, the conversation will also acquaint the audience with the officers on a lighter side with some humorous stories the officers will share and some “softer” questions Dr. Mark will ask. The audience will also be able to text messages to Dr. Mark during the session. The purpose of this session is: 1) have an open conversations with NIH and NSF officials and highlight why it is important to contact a Program Officer and Grants Specialist, 2) the audience will learn insights about when they should contact a Program Officer or the Grants Specialist and how they can assist research administrators and our PIs, and 3) experience a lighter side of the life of a NIH and NSF official.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will become familiar with the NIH & NSF procedures for contacting Program Officers and Grants Specialist and the best ways to communicate with them.
- Participants will understand the role and importance of communicating with their NIH & NSF grant officials.
- Participants will learn key areas that are imperative for their PIs to communicate with their NIH & NSF Program Officials.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should be aware of current NIH and NSF policies.

Mark Roltsch*, Executive Director of ARSP, St. Mary’s University

International

STATS & SUSHI: A KURA PERSPECTIVE ON VISUALIZING DATA TO SUPPORT STRATEGIC RESEARCH PLANNING

Data relating to research support is varying and abundant. To grasp what is really important, we’ll examine techniques of purpose-oriented visualization, combining key pieces of data in time series. Including an overview of the activities of Kyoto University’s Office of Research Administration (KURA), this session will explore creative use of data as part of a strategic approach to research planning.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will understand the essence of purpose-oriented data analysis along time series.
- Participants will learn varying needs-based visualization techniques for analysis results.
- Participants will combine key building blocks of analysis information to support strategic planning.

David Kornhauser*, Senior URA, Kyoto University KURA
Daichi Kohimoto, URA, Kyoto University KURA

Post-Award

POST-AWARD MANAGEMENT OF SPONSORED PROJECTS

This session, specifically targeted for those new to central or departmental post-award administration, will provide a high level overview of basic post-award functions and tasks (processing cost transfers, documenting committed cost share, monitoring sub-recipients, identifying costs or transactions that might require prior approval, etc.). We’ll share some tips for proactive life cycle management of awards, including how to recognize potential red flags, some techniques for identifying and managing higher risk activities or transactions, and when to ask more questions.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will learn basic post-award functions.
- Participants will be able to proactively identify and manage, potential problem or risk areas.
- Participants will hear tips and techniques for proactive lifecycle award management.

Tracey Fraser*, Director of Sponsored Projects, Smithsonian Institution
Patricia Hawk, Director, Sponsored Programs, Oregon State University
THE FAR AND FEDERAL CONTRACTING

This session will take participants deeper into the intricacies of federal contracting to examine issues that come into play after the contract has been executed by the institution. Topics covered will include: applicability of the Uniform Guidance to contracts; often overlooked reporting and prior approval requirements; dealing with stop-work and termination; and contract disputes.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will be able to explain when the Uniform Guidance applies to federal contracts;
- Participants will be able to identify various types of reporting and prior approval requirements;
- Participants will be able to describe a contractor’s rights and obligations in the event of stop-work or early termination;
- Participants will be able to explain a contractor’s rights and obligations during a contract dispute.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should have a solid understanding of the FAR and of federal contracting principles in order to achieve the full benefits of participation in this session.

David Mayo*, Director of Sponsored Research, California Institute of Technology
John W. Hanold, Associate Vice President for Research and Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, The Pennsylvania State University

IS MY INSTITUTION READY FOR AN ELECTRONIC SYSTEM?

There are many considerations when contemplating a new electronic grants management system. When is the timing right? Do I need outside help? What does my RFP need to include? What are my internal IT requirements? How much time and resources might it need? When do I communicate with whom? What can I expect? Come learn from a panel of PUIs who have recently implemented an electronic system for the first time and what they learned in the process.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will discuss an overview of the process.
- Participants will learn pitfalls to avoid.
- Participants will learn how to access your institution’s readiness.
- Participants will discuss what to consider when writing an RFP.
- Participants will learn what realistic timelines you can expect.

Diane Barrett*, Senior Consultant, Navigator Management Partners
Dawn Boatman, Director, Sponsored Projects Administration, Portland State University
Deborah Shaver, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, University of Idaho

Career Skills/Professional Development

PATHWAYS TO CONSULTING: LOOKING AT TIMING AND APPROACHES

As university research administrators, we have more creative control of our careers than we may recognize. Consulting can take several forms and evolve in uniquely individual circumstances. Discussion group leaders have all been full-time university research administrators in the past and have become consultants or independent contractors at different stages of life and career. Please anticipate a casual and candid discussion about the various approaches to consulting and our own observations about the timing of these choices.

Cindy White*, University Research Administration, Consultant
Evan Roberts, Senior Consultant, Attain, LLC
Pam Whitlock, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, University of North Carolina at Wilmington (Emeritus)
Clinical Research/Clinical Trials

**HOW TO ENGAGE HEALTHCARE LEADERSHIP IN THE RESEARCH ENTERPRISE**

Decreased federal research funding and increased emphasis on translational research has dramatically changed the landscape today. Critical to this transformation are healthcare leaders (physicians, hospital/practice plan leaders, payers, etc.) who have eye on the bottom line and towards the future of healthcare under Obamacare, especially as it relates to gaining market share of both physicians and patients. Engaging healthcare leadership by Universities in a productive and synergistic ways will be essential in ensuring the future of university-based research and its financing.

**Lead presenter**

Matthew Lester*, Associate Dean, Administration and Finance, University of Arizona, College of Medicine
Leah Guidry, Managing Director, Huron Consulting Group
Jodi Ogden, Associate Vice President, University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston

Compliance

**ACCENTUATE THE POSITIVE: CUSTOMER SERVICES IN THE AGE OF INCREASED COMPLIANCE OVERSIGHT**

In the immortal words of Arlen and Mercer: “You’ve got to accentuate the positive, eliminate the negative, and latch on to the affirmative …” Everyone knows we have to stay in compliance. And everyone knows that we have to provide excellent customer service. What if you are asked to make a purchase that will push you so far out of compliance that you can hear the auditors laughing diabolically? So, are compliance and customer service mutually exclusive? Not in our world. The service we provide to our customers is to help them do their research and that means to stay in compliance. And that is a positive and empowering thought.

**Lead presenter**

Elena Semyonova-Smith*, Grants Officer, University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc.

Departmental

**COMPLIANCE OVERSIGHT ON THE DEPARTMENTAL LEVEL IN THE AGE OF THE UNIFORM GUIDANCE**

In the age of the Uniformed Guidance, compliance on the department level is more challenging and complex. Because departmental research administrators are the first line of defense for compliance for their organizations, it is important that DRAs fully understand the importance of compliance monitoring in every aspect of their research operation. This discussion will center around compliance related challenges for the DRA while offering practical solutions to common concerns.

**Lead presenter**

Derick Jones*, Program Manager, Institute for Translational Genomics and Population Sciences, Los Angeles Biomedical Research Institute
8:30 – 10:00 am | Discussion Groups (continued)

**International**

**GLOBAL COLLABORATIONS: BUILDING & SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATIONS**
This discussion group will provide a venue for sharing best practices, lessons learned and raising questions about international collaborations. The end goal will be to identify strategies and increase our pool of networking opportunities.

Janet Simons*, Director, Research Policy, University of Maryland, Baltimore
Thomas Wilson, Assistant Vice President/Senior Research Administrator, Rush University Medical Center
Bruno Woeran, Special Advisor, EU Research Programmes Manager, LUT - Lappeenranta University of Technology

**Career Skills/Professional Development**

**INTERVIEWING FOR SUCCESS**
How can you set yourself apart from the rest of the applicants so that your interview is the most successful? This discussion will center on job search, resume presentation, cover letter content, and preparing for the actual interview for your next research administration job opportunity.

Beth Seaton*, Consultant
Christa Johnson, Vice President for Research, Colorado State University

**Post-Award**

**UG IMPLEMENTATION: APPROACHES AND LESSONS LEARNED - INCLUDING ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL, COMPUTING, AND PUBLICATION COSTS**
Now that December 26, 2014 has come and gone, how have our institutions reacted to this new guidance? Did the journey up to this point help us learn more about our institutions’ strengths and weaknesses? Let’s take some time to discuss some of the ways we’ve tackled these new requirements and the innovative ways we have addressed this new era in research administration.

Andres Chan*, Director, Office of Financial Analysis, University of Southern California
Michael Legrand, Director, Costing Policy & Analysis, University of California-Davis

**Pre-Award**

**EXPEDITING AND COMPLETING THE APPLICATION**
This discussion covers techniques to facilitate the grant application process for preparation and submission of the grant application. The goal is to understand what the reviewer wants and needs to evaluate a successful application. Faculty who write better applications have a higher probability of getting funded rather than those who write copious applications with a ‘shot-gun’ approach to getting funded. We will begin with sample application summaries and show how those summaries can be used in planning the layout of the grant application. The coordination of information placement within the grant application is important for the reviewer to comprehend the project. Often reviewers look for information in only one part of the application. If the information is not found in a particular spot it must be missing. This severely impacts the final score of the application.

Sandra Justice*, Research Administrator, University of South Florida
8:30 – 10:00 am | Discussion Groups (continued)

**Pre-Award**

**USING METRICS AND DATA ANALYSIS IN PRE-AWARD**

With unprecedented competition for awards resulting in departments and sponsored projects offices alike being more overworked than usual, the idea of formulating a quantitative response to the question “What exactly is keeping you so busy?” is likely low on our list of priorities. However, capturing accurate metrics, both with respect to volume and performance, can serve as a valuable tool for myriad reasons, not the least of which with respect to proper allocation of resources to ensure as efficient a workforce as possible. Our panelists will describe the methodology and rationale for data-gathering activities currently in use, including examples from their own institutions, and facilitate discussion regarding how valuable these activities may be in any given pre-award office.

Charles Bartunek*, Senior Contracts Associate, Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University
Kevin Cook, Director, Huron Consulting Group
Trisha Southergill, Grant Support and E-Thesis Manager, Montana Tech of the University of Montana

**Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI)**

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION BEYOND THE UNIVERSITY**

Community outreach and engagement are often some of the many responsibilities we bear at PUIs. Sometimes, these roles involve providing direct services to organizations outside our institutions. In other cases, we may be called upon to provide professional development in the form of proposal writing and/or grant management classes. In this discussion group, we will discuss and share best practices in developing and sustaining community based service and education in sponsored program development and management.

Katie Plum*, Director of Sponsored Projects, Angelo State University

**Post-Award**

**IS MY TRAINING EFFECTIVE?**

Have you ever conducted a training session and wondered just how effective your teaching will be to the participants? Have you ever wondered if the participants will utilize this training in their day-to-day activities? Training sessions are a necessity, yet they are demanding to both the presenter/conductor and participants. We will focus on assisting users in determining if their training sessions add value to their targeted audience. This discussion will also assist attendees in determining if and what training sessions they should attend.

Rashonda Harris*, Senior Consultant, Attain
Albana Cejne, Associate Director, Research Accounting Services, Temple University
Many participants are often tasked by their managers, researchers, and colleagues with finding an answer to a burning question at their institution. With the Office Hours sessions, we are creating an opportunity to obtain answers to those questions by subject matter experts in a one-on-one setting. The expert will be able to share their thoughts and advice directly with the individual. For participants, this is a great opportunity to learn, ask questions, and meet some of NCURA’s esteemed members.

EFFECT REPORTING

Jennifer W. Mitchell*, Director of Cost Studies and Effort Reporting, Northwestern University
Jeremy Forsberg, Assistant Vice President of Research, The University of Texas at Arlington

10:00 – 10:30 am | Networking and Refreshment Break

10:30 – 11:45 am | Spark Sessions

10:30 – 10:50 am
INNOVATIONS IN RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT
Dianne Nagy*, Grant Proposal Specialist, South Dakota University

11:00 – 11:20 am
WATCH OUT FOR FLYING OBJECTS! – ENABLING UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM OPERATIONS AT A PUBLIC RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
Dan Nordquist*, Assistant Vice President/Director, Office of Grant and Research Development, Washington State University

11:30 – 11:45 am
FROM AN IDEA TO A PLAN: A QUICK AND EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS FOR A GRANT PROJECT PLAN
Michael Preuss*, Grant Consultant, Hanover Research

10:30 – 11:45 am | Concurrent Sessions

Career Skills/Professional Development

LEARNING OBJECTIVES: Participants will learn how three institutions:
- Used surveys and collection tools to understand and improve client experiences.
- Promoted collaborative efforts by obtaining, reviewing, and communicating feedback.
- Used metrics and client feedback to support assessment, management planning, and process improvements.

Twila Reighley*, Assistant Vice President for Research & Graduate Studies, Michigan State University
W. Scott Erwin, Sr., Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Texas State University
Craig Reynolds, Associate Director, Office of Research and Sponsored Projects, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor
Clinical Research/Clinical Trials

ENGAGING YOUR COMMUNITY AND PATIENTS IN CLINICAL RESEARCH

Community and patient engagement has become a requirement in conducting clinical research today. This session will discuss strategies for engaging the community and patients; barriers to participation; methods to enable engagement; and key elements of successful programs. It will also cover historical challenges and new insights as well as the latest technologies in the area.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Participants will focus on gaining an understanding of the elements of a successful program.
- Participants will learn how to create a community and/or patient engagement strategy and plan.
- Participants will have a better understanding of the complexities of developing and sustaining relationships.
- Participants will learn how to avoid common mistakes.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should have an advanced level of understanding of clinical trials. This session will build on best practices.

Tesheia Johnson*, Associate Director of Clinical Research for Yale School of Medicine COO, YCCI, Yale University

Compliance

EXPORT CONTROL REFORM: HOW DOES IT WORK?

Export control reform has arrived. In major changes to International Traffic in Arms (ITAR) and Export Administration Regulations (EAR), the Department of Commerce and State have coordinated their regulatory rulemaking in an effort to place “higher fences around fewer items.” The government has moved many items off of the United States Munitions List (USML) and on to new sections of the Commerce Control List (CCL). To do this, the USML is being completely overhauled, and changed to a “positive,” specification-based list. The CCL is being expanded to accommodate items moving off the USML, with special rules for control of those items moved to the CCL. The Department of Energy has initiated its own export control regulations. Some of these changes may require modification of contracts in order to prevent items from being unintentionally swept up onto the munitions list or to preserve fundamental research. In this session, we will address how these changes affect contracts and grants administration and suggest strategies for ensuring that your institutions remain in compliance with the new rules and preserves fundamental research. Using case studies, we will pay particular attention to implementing export reform in Department of Defense (DoD) funded agreements, exploring Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations (DFAR) and guidance (e.g., DFARs 252.204-7000 & 7012, 252-225-7048), and applicable DoD policies and grant guidance.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES: Key take-aways for participants will include:

- What export reform is, what has been changed, and what remains to be done.
- How export reform can affect research administration in higher education.
- Explore some examples of implementing export reform at institutions of higher education.
- Learn how to implement new export control-related contract terms in DoD and other contracts.

PREREQUISITE: Participants must have basic knowledge of export controls.

Elizabeth Peloso*, Associate Vice Provost/Associate Vice President, Research Services, University of Pennsylvania
AGENDA
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10:30 – 11:45 am | Concurrent Sessions (continued)

**Departmental**

**BUDGETING 101**
This beginner level session will begin by addressing budget building from an overview standpoint, and then will move into a deep look at categories, distinguishing of similar items, and tying back to the budget justification. Bring your math skills, and your strangest scenarios as we will look at real-life examples.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will learn to review and build a budget.
- Participants will also learn how to avoid some common errors and ensure that budget categories are used appropriately.

**Lindsey Demeritt**, Assistant Manager, Sponsored Projects Team, Children's Hospital Los Angeles

---

**Federal**

**NSF PROPOSAL PREP: THE GOOD, THE BAD, AND THE UGLY**
This session will provide everything you need to know about preparing and submitting a proposal to the National Science Foundation. Learn about the different types of funding opportunities that NSF employs, where to find the relevant policies governing proposal preparation, merit review, and special guidelines for other topical areas such as conference proposals and RAPID and EAGER proposals.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will understand what to look for in an NSF funding announcement.
- Participants will know what is required as part of an NSF proposal.

**Jean Feldman**, Head, Policy Office of Budget, Finance & Award Management, National Science Foundation

**Michelle Bulls**, Director of the Office of Policy for Extramural Research Administration, OPERA, National Institutes of Health

---

**Federal**

**SciEnCV UPDATE**
Science Experts Network Curriculum Vitae (SciEncv) is a new electronic system that helps researchers assemble the professional information needed for participation in federally funded research. SciEncv gathers and compiles information on expertise, employment, education, and professional accomplishments. Researchers can use SciEncv to create and maintain biosketches that are submitted with grant applications and annual reports. SciEncv allows researchers to describe and highlight their scientific contributions in their own words.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will become familiar with how the SciEncv portal:
  - Eliminates the need to repeatedly enter biosketch information.
  - Reduces the administrative burden associated with federal grant submission and reporting requirements.
  - Provides access to a researcher-claimed data repository with information on expertise, employment, education, and professional accomplishments.
  - Allows researchers to describe their scientific contributions in their own language.
  - How data from NIH and NSF is able to pre-populate biosketch information.

**Ron Splittgerber**, Director, Research Services, Colorado State University

**Lori Ann Schultz**, Director for Research Advancement, University of Arizona

**Neil M. Thakur**, Special Assistant to the NIH Deputy Director for Extramural Research, National Institutes of Health

**Bart Trawick**, Literature Resources Lead, National Institutes of Health

---

**Departmental**

**BUdGETING 101**
This beginner level session will begin by addressing budget building from an overview standpoint, and then will move into a deep look at categories, distinguishing of similar items, and tying back to the budget justification. Bring your math skills, and your strangest scenarios as we will look at real-life examples.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will learn to review and build a budget.
- Participants will also learn how to avoid some common errors and ensure that budget categories are used appropriately.

**Lindsey Demeritt**, Assistant Manager, Sponsored Projects Team, Children's Hospital Los Angeles

---

**Federal**

**NSF PROPOSAL PREP: THE GOOD, THE BAD, AND THE UGLY**
This session will provide everything you need to know about preparing and submitting a proposal to the National Science Foundation. Learn about the different types of funding opportunities that NSF employs, where to find the relevant policies governing proposal preparation, merit review, and special guidelines for other topical areas such as conference proposals and RAPID and EAGER proposals.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will understand what to look for in an NSF funding announcement.
- Participants will know what is required as part of an NSF proposal.

**Jean Feldman**, Head, Policy Office of Budget, Finance & Award Management, National Science Foundation

**Michelle Bulls**, Director of the Office of Policy for Extramural Research Administration, OPERA, National Institutes of Health

---

**Federal**

**SciEnCV UPDATE**
Science Experts Network Curriculum Vitae (SciEncv) is a new electronic system that helps researchers assemble the professional information needed for participation in federally funded research. SciEncv gathers and compiles information on expertise, employment, education, and professional accomplishments. Researchers can use SciEncv to create and maintain biosketches that are submitted with grant applications and annual reports. SciEncv allows researchers to describe and highlight their scientific contributions in their own words.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will become familiar with how the SciEncv portal:
  - Eliminates the need to repeatedly enter biosketch information.
  - Reduces the administrative burden associated with federal grant submission and reporting requirements.
  - Provides access to a researcher-claimed data repository with information on expertise, employment, education, and professional accomplishments.
  - Allows researchers to describe their scientific contributions in their own language.
  - How data from NIH and NSF is able to pre-populate biosketch information.

**Ron Splittgerber**, Director, Research Services, Colorado State University

**Lori Ann Schultz**, Director for Research Advancement, University of Arizona

**Neil M. Thakur**, Special Assistant to the NIH Deputy Director for Extramural Research, National Institutes of Health

**Bart Trawick**, Literature Resources Lead, National Institutes of Health
EGGS IN MORE THAN ONE BASKET: HOW CAN A U.S. UNIVERSITY DIVERSIFY ITS FUNDING SOURCES TO INCLUDE NON-U.S. FUNDERS?

In an era of stagnant and even shrinking U.S. federal research budgets, a number of U.S. universities have begun diversifying away from the almost total dependence on U.S. federal grants for the majority of their sponsored research budgets. One important aspect of this diversification has included non-U.S. funding agencies, including both governmental and private sources. Because U.S. universities are quite used to U.S. federal grant rules and regulations, there are a number of key differences that they should be aware of in working with non-U.S. funding agencies. Also, because there are so many different types of sources, it can be confusing for U.S. research administrators to identify the priority sources of funding most appropriate for their campuses.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will learn how other U.S. universities successfully diversified their funding sources to include non-U.S. funding agencies
- Participants will gain a greater understanding of the potential differences and issues that may arise in dealing with non-U.S. funding agencies for the first time
- Participants will be become aware of best practices that other U.S. universities have implemented in the course of applying for and managing grants from non-U.S. funding agencies

Shandra White*, Director, Research Enhancement, George Washington University
Jennifer Ponting, Director, Pre-Award Services, Harvard University

STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES (SOPs) AND BILATERAL SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENTS FOR RESEARCH ADMINISTRATIONS

This session is to help Central Office, Shared Services or Departmental Administrators to develop Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and bilateral Service Level Agreements. This course will show how organizations gain efficiencies when they engage in a coordinated, methodical approach to policies and procedures. We will provide practical tools. These tools will help you and your team to define a more orderly and predictable workflow and give you a better direction for developing training. In addition, creating Service Level Agreements between central research administration offices and schools, department and institutes helps to maintain an understanding between groups and helps to reduce or eliminate the “us vs. them” mentality that can exist in institutions.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES: Participants will be provided with practical tools to develop:
- Definitions
- List of Potential SOPs
- Framework
- Sample SOP Templates
- Assessment Tool

PREREQUISITE: This session is intended for central office, shared services or departmental administrators.

Tomas Pereira*, Manager, PricewaterhouseCoopers, LLP
F. John Case, Sr. Vice President for Operations and Chief Financial Officer, Morehouse School of Medicine

UNDERSTANDING THE “WHY” BEHIND UNIVERSITY CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS

There is nothing new about a University’s stance on publication, indemnification, intellectual property, in contractual negotiations - but do you understand the “why” behind this stance? This session will take a fundamental look at public universities and reasons behind why certain contractual terms are problematic.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES: Participants will gain an understanding of a public university's structure and the considerations behind the policies.

Amanda Miller*, Manager, Contracts, The University of Texas at Dallas
Marjorie Forster, Assistant Vice President for Research and Global Health Initiatives, University of Maryland, Baltimore
Clinical Research/Clinical Trials

CLINICAL RESEARCH COMPLIANCE PROGRAMS

The purpose of a clinical research compliance program is multifaceted. To protect human research participants, investigators and study staff must be trained in the principles of safe, effective and compliant clinical research. Clinical research compliance must be comprehensive and integrated with other elements of the research community. Academic medicine also promotes excellence through identifying and implementing best practices. Systems and procedures support these practices. Some institutions are going beyond the minimum requirements with start-up meetings, periodic reviews, audit preparedness training and study closeout are just a few of the many examples. Please join us to learn about these and other ways to improve clinical research compliance.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Participants will discuss sections of the Uniform Guidance with potential for the most impact on institutions.
- Participants will learn a strategy for identifying the areas that need change at your institution.
- Participants will learn the six steps in a well-disciplined change implementation plan.

David Lynch*, Executive Director, Office of Sponsored Research, Northwestern University
Ronald Polizzi, Associate Director, Contracts Office of Research Administration, Thomas Jefferson University
### Compliance

**CHANGING COMPLIANCE LANDSCAPE POST UG IMPLEMENTATION**

This discussion group will center around our experiences, positive and otherwise, with changes made to comply with Uniform Guidance. The discussion will be led by a panel of administrators who will share their experiences. Participants are encouraged to bring their own experiences and to share them with the group.

#### Lead presenters:
- **Patrick Green**, Executive Assistant Director, Office of Contract and Research Administration, Vanderbilt University
- **Julie Cole**, Director of Research Costing Compliance, Duke University
- **Linda Learned**, Associate Director, Office of Sponsored Programs and Research Administration, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

### Departmental

**LET'S COLLABORATE! HOW TO GET PEOPLE TO THE TABLE**

Large-scale collaborative proposals are becoming more common in the current funding environment. What role do departmental (school/center/college) administrators play in the process? How do you identify faculty to participate in the application? How do you recruit faculty to be interested in participating in the development of the actual application? When the proposal is funded, how do you keep the faculty involved as core members or mentors? Commitment is needed and oftentimes, departmental administrators are involved in this area. Come share your ideas and best practices. In addition, the discussion leaders will also be sharing some of their best practices and what has worked for them in their center/department.

#### Lead presenters:
- **Gai Doran**, Center Assistant Director, Administration, Center for Interdisciplinary Research on AIDS, Yale University
- **Robyn Remotigue**, Research Manager, School of Public Health, University of North Texas Health Science Center at Fort Worth

### Federal

**UPDATE ON ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN TASK FORCE**

A number of reports have addressed the issue of rising administrative burden resulting from the accretion of regulations, policies and guidance governing federally funded research. This discussion will review previous reports, current initiatives and ongoing activities related to this topic.

#### Lead presenter:
- **Lisa Nichols**, Policy Analyst, Council on Governmental Relations
### Discussion Groups (continued)

#### International

**CHANGE MANAGEMENT ON A GLOBAL SCALE**
Research administrators never rest! The global funding landscape is changing constantly and this requires changes in our daily work, processes and structures. How do we deal with this in an effective way? How do we bring all staff members on board and up-to-date? How do we train them? How do we identify fields of importance? How do you convince your leadership of the importance of the change and how to justify it, are there special indicators? Some changes require the approval of top level university leadership, the board and/or might require additional money. This discussion will cover these issues.

- **Agatha Keller***, Co-Director EU GrantsAccess, ETH Zurich, University of Zurich
- **Denise Wallen**, Research Officer and Senior Fellow, University of New Mexico

#### Post-Award

**MANAGING LARGE PROGRAM PROJECTS**
The focus of this discussion group will be on the challenges of managing large research programs such as service centers and large, complex research grants from the central office to the department level.

- **Jennifer Rosa***, Administrative Director of Research, CCCR, Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia
- **Rashonda Harris**, Senior Consultant, Attain

#### Pre-Award

**BUILDING ON YOUR STRENGTHS: ASSESSING INVESTIGATOR NEEDS TO INCREASE RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY AND FUNDING SUCCESS** (Follow-up to concurrent session, “Building on Your Strengths: Assessing Investigator Needs to Increase Research Productivity and Funding Success,” held Monday at 10:30 am)
Come hear what your colleagues do to assess and fill the needs of multi-investigator research teams. Plan to engage in tangible idea generation that you can take back and implement at your institution.

- **Laurianne Torres***, Director, Research Administration, Duke University
Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI)

THE PUI TWIST ON INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS: A DIFFERENT DYNAMIC
What drives the “getting it done” success of the PUIs research administration enterprise as a small or single-staffed office? Is it the authority of the office or the research administrator’s “personality capital” and ability to effectively navigate institutional politics? With less process and infrastructure than the larger institutions, we explore the huge impact of the RA’s personality and people skills as they relate to institutional culture and disciplinary subculture, collegiality, and mid-level leadership in higher education. This discussion group provides a forum for our tales “from the trenches,” which are our greatest collective asset. Come share with fellow research administrators in this interactive and reflective discussion. You’ll leave with refreshed ideas, contacts and a smile.

Christine Hempowicz*, Director, Office of Sponsored Research and Programs, University of Bridgeport
Sabine Dillingham, Director of Research and Sponsored Programs, St. Mary’s College of Maryland

Post-Award

Using LEAN SIX SIGMA TO IMPROVE BUSINESS PROCESS AND GO PAPERLESS
This senior level discussion will include a short, formal presentation followed by a group discussion. The short presentation will focus on how to apply the laws of Lean Six Sigma in any sponsored research environment, lessons we’ve learned using six sigma, teamwork, compassion, and the all right metrics. Lean Six Sigma has changed the way we do business, broken down barriers between central departments and between central and departmental administrators. The team has taken three departments paperless. Morale and teamwork have never been higher. It’s helped everyone see how their effort contributes to the overall mission of our research administration. In addition, going paperless provided the obvious benefit of saving paper, decreasing the expenses associated with the paper process by 50% immediately.

Garrett Steed*, Contracting Officer, University of Colorado-Boulder
Steve Sheldon, Senior Manager, Proposal Development, University of Colorado
AGENDA
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11:45 am – 1:15 pm | Luncheon and Volunteer Recognition

1:15 – 2:15 pm | Spark Sessions

15 – 20 minute, high energy, high deliverable offerings that will get right to the “good stuff.”

1:15 – 1:35 pm
FENG SHUI - MYTH AND REALITY

Shella Batelman*, Senior Research Administrator, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center

1:40 – 1:55 pm
WHAT'S MY SOCIAL FINGER-PRINT?

Rashonda Harris*, Senior Consultant, Attain

2:00 – 2:15 pm
THE DOMINO EFFECT: HOW PRE-AWARD ADMINISTRATION FACILITATES COMPLIANT AND EFFICIENT POST-AWARD MANAGEMENT

Bess Jensen*, Senior Business Analyst, Vivantech

11:45 am – 1:15 pm | Luncheon and Volunteer Recognition

1:15 – 2:15 pm | Concurrent Sessions

Career Skills/Professional Development

NOT ON TWITTER AND LINKED IN YET? BRING YOUR PHONE/TABLET OR COMPUTER AND YOU WILL BE BY THE END OF THIS SESSION!

Social media is as common a communication tool now as email and fax machines. If you have felt overwhelmed by how to use it or even if you should use it, then this session is for you! Bring your device and by the end of this session you will have a Twitter and LinkedIn Account and will get the basics of how you can use these in your professional and personal life.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Participants will understand how to search for what you need (@ signs and # hashtags).
- Participants will “pull” information from agencies, nonprofit and industry.
- Participants will “push” information out to your constituents and campus.
- Participants will search specific keywords for targeted searches.

Stephanie Moore*, Community Curator, National Council of University Research Administrators
Concurrent Sessions (continued)

**Clinical Research/Clinical Trials**

**HOT TOPICS IN CLINICAL RESEARCH REGULATION**

Jan Hewett*, Regulatory Counsel, FDA

**Compliance**

**CORE RESEARCH FACILITIES & SERVICE CENTERS FOR THE NEW ADMINISTRATOR**

Service Centers are common fixtures at most universities, ranging from very basic core facilities to more complex specialized service facilities with federal funding. This session will explore the fundamentals of all service centers and will identify the common operating and compliance issues associated with these facilities, including detail on how to operate, set rates and manage compliance concerns.

David Ngo*, Assistant Vice President, Sponsored Programs Administration, Office of Sponsored Programs, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

- Participants will discuss definitions of various types of service centers.
- Participants will discuss components of rates and the process for setting rates.
- Participants will discuss billing and other operational considerations.
- Participants will discuss policy considerations and landmark audits.

**Departmental**

**THE INS AND OUTS OF PI TRANSFERS: A DEPARTMENTAL PERSPECTIVE**

This session will describe the transfer process from both the incoming and outgoing institution’s perspectives. Content will include compliance issues, logistical issues, and working with your institutional official to ensure the process goes smoothly. In addition, we will briefly touch on what to cover during the faculty onboarding process.

Jennifer Cory*, Director of Research, Pediatrics, Stanford University
Holly Osborne, Manager, Pre-Award Services, California State University

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

- Participants will learn how to understand the compliance, financial and logistical issues that commonly come up during a transfer.
- Participants will understand how to work with a new faculty member.
- Participants will understand how to facilitate the process as a departmental research administrator.

**Federal**

**PUBLIC ACCESS UPDATE**

Representatives from DOE, NASA, NIH, and NSF will discuss their agencies’ plans to increase public access to the results of Federally funded research. Their presentations will address the following: What is the requirement?; What’s the current status of the initiative at an agency?;

> continued on next page
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**Federal**

PUBLIC ACCESS UPDATE (CONTINUED)
How do we see these systems phasing in (for those that aren’t up and running yet) or evolving functions or capabilities?; What should institutions do to prepare?; What are the next steps or ways that institutions and individuals can contribute to the discussion?

*Amy Friedlander*, Staff Associate, National Science Foundation

*Gale Allen*, Deputy Chief Scientist, NASA

*Brian Hitson*, Director, Office of Science and Technical Information, Office of Science, U.S. Department of Energy

*J.P. Kim*, SBIR/STTR Program Manager & Data Policy Officer, National Institutes of Health

*Neil Thakur*, Special assistant to the NIH Deputy Director for Extramural Research, National Institutes of Health

**International**

INSIGHTS AND LESSONS IN INCREASING AND MANAGING HORIZON 2020 PROJECTS: THE CASE STUDY OF AALTO UNIVERSITY
EU funding in Aalto has increased 80% in five years. Aalto had 160 projects in FP7 from which 23 were coordinated ones. Furthermore, Aalto has already been quite successful in the first Horizon 2020 calls. This session gives insight into the researcher-oriented working approach of the grant advisors and project managers. Experiences and the best practices of the EU framework programs, especially management and administration of Horizon 2020, will be shared with the participants. Session includes discussion on experiences of U.S. collaboration in EU framework projects.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will learn how to organize post-award services, managerial and administrative know-how, and to enhance the cooperation with the services and the scientists.
- Participants will learn practical experiences in managing and administering the EU framework projects.

*Marja-Leena Markkula*, Head of Post-Award Services, Aalto University

**International**

WHAT ARE THE RISKS TO A NON-U.S. INSTITUTION OF ACCEPTING A SUBCONTRACT OF U.S. FEDERAL FUNDS?
An increasing number of universities outside the U.S. have collaborated with U.S. partners in recent years. One of the common ways of strengthening that collaboration has been for the non-U.S. university to accept a subgrant or subcontract of U.S. federal funds from the U.S. partner. Doing so means that all of the terms and conditions of the original grant are also passed on to the non-U.S. institution. Some of these terms and conditions are confusing, non-applicable, or perhaps even illegal for the non-U.S. institution to abide by. How, then, can a non-U.S. institution abide by these U.S. terms and conditions in the context of its own grant administration system and regulations? The speakers represent two institutions located outside the U.S. that have had extensive experience in dealing with these questions.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will identify which U.S. federal grant terms and conditions may be potentially problematic for non-U.S. institutions.
- Participants will learn potential solutions for resolving problematic terms and conditions for non-U.S. institutions.
- Participants will gain an understanding of best practices that other non-U.S. institutions have instituted in order to be compliant with both U.S. federal terms and conditions and their own policies.

*Laura Plant Fuentes*, U.S. Grants Coordinator, Karolinska Institutet

*Tiina Berg*, Senior Research Funding Advisor, University of Helsinki
New Guidance, Renewed Partnerships

**Post-Award**

**“GARBAGE IN—GARBAGE OUT”: NAVIGATING THROUGH BAD DATA TO PERFORM COMMON GRANT ACCOUNTING TASKS**

Grant Accounting introduces numerous complexities not found in everyday general accounting operations. The invoicing, accounts receivable, reporting and closeout processes are all impacted by timely transactions and sometimes bad data—either converted or without needed details to reconcile. This session will explore common issues impacting proper grant accounting practices and provide useful solutions that can be deployed at your institution.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will learn to identify key issues impacting proper grant accounting operations.
- Participants will learn solutions to manage common data issues impeding grant accounting operations.
- Participants will learn best practices to manage grant accounts with converted data.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should be in accounting roles at their institutions.

Ann Saputelli*, Manager, Attain, LLC
Deston Halverson, Senior Manager, Higher Education and Academic Medical Centers, Attain, LLC

**Pre-Award**

**SUCCESSFULLY MANAGING AN INDUSTRY SPONSORED PORTFOLIO**

With the decline in federal funding, schools are looking to the commercial sector to pick up the slack. This session will share the best practices and tools to develop, manage, and succeed with an industry funded portfolio.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will learn the challenges in accepting industry funding and share the best practices for contracting with industry.

**PREREQUISITE:** This session is intended for senior level research administrators.

Robin Beach*, Assistant Director, Award Administration, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Anthony Boccanfuso, President, The University Industry Demonstration Partnership
J. Mark Nolan, Director, IT and Economic Development, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

**Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI)**

**BREAKING THROUGH TO FACULTY IN THE HUMANITIES: A NOVEL APPROACH**

To counter the myth that “there is no funding in the humanities,” sponsored projects offices at PUIs publish lengthy lists of grant and fellowship opportunities for faculty who wish to produce a major piece of scholarly work. While helpful, these lists in themselves often do not yield the desired results, namely more proposal submissions. In this concurrent session we will explore a novel approach to breaking through to humanities faculty, helping them to see that grant writing isn’t just for scientists. We will delve into the commonalities between writing persuasive grant proposals and successful book proposals—including learning insider secrets from a grant program officer, seasoned book editor, and veteran publisher—which you can share with your faculty to stimulate more grants and publications. Join your colleagues in a lively discussion of outreach efforts, individual struggles and key breakthroughs with humanities faculty.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will gain insights on connecting with humanities faculty.
- Participants will recognize similarities and differences between grant and book proposals.
- Participants will learn insider secrets from sponsors and publishers to share with faculty.

Jeremy Miner*, Director of Grants and Contracts, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire
Tricia Callahan, Director, Proposal Development, Miami University
Compliance

COMPENSATING STUDY PARTICIPANTS

Every organization participating in human subjects research is responsible for ensuring that remunerations offered to participants is fair and not an undue inducement to participate. Remuneration includes the transfer of anything of value, in cash or in kind. This session will focus on the federal regulations and best practices around compensating or paying human subject participants for consenting to clinical research activities.

Govind Narasimhan*, Director of Research Finance, University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center
Mary Veazie, Director, Clinical Research Finance, University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center

Clinical Research/Clinical Trials

ENSURING LEGALLY-EFFECTIVE INFORMED CONSENT IN RESEARCH

Despite several decades of increasing focus and attention on obtaining informed consent from volunteers who decide to participate in biomedical or social behavioral research studies, noncompliance with informed consent requirements remains one of the most common findings during audits. The failure to obtain legally-effective consent includes deficiencies or omissions of the required elements of consent, to problems with the consent process, and problems with the documentation of consent. This discussion will provide a comprehensive presentation of the federal regulatory requirements for informed consent and some of the common considerations of state law. This discussion will also provide a discussion of common challenges to obtain legally-effective consent and solutions to overcome such challenges. This discussion is appropriate for investigators, researchers, research coordinators, IRB administrators, and compliance officers/staff.

George Gasparis*, President, The PEER Consulting Group

Career Skills/Professional Development

“THAT’S NOT WHAT I MEANT TO SAY,” TAILORING YOUR COMMUNICATIONS FOR THE DESIRED RESULT

Words are only words... but words have meanings, just as do gestures and emoticons and barely audible sighs. Join us for an interactive discussion on the medium and the meaning. We’ll discuss the everyday choices we make, often subconsciously, about how, what, and when to communicate. When is email the right medium? How is a phone conversation different from an in-person one and why does it matter? What do our communication choices say about us? With a little conscious thought and planning, your communications can work for you and help you to achieve the results you want and need.

Mary Louise Healy*, Associate Director, Research Administration, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, Johns Hopkins University
Joan Kanner, Assistant Director of Research Administration, Johns Hopkins University

Mary Louise Healy*, Associate Director, Research Administration, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, Johns Hopkins University
Joan Kanner, Assistant Director of Research Administration, Johns Hopkins University

Mary Louise Healy*, Associate Director, Research Administration, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, Johns Hopkins University
Joan Kanner, Assistant Director of Research Administration, Johns Hopkins University
1:15 – 2:15 pm | Discussion Groups (continued)

Compliance

BEST PRACTICES FOR RCR TRAINING PROGRAMS
What steps can you take to develop an effective educational program in the responsible conduct of research (RCR) for your faculty, staff and students? What specific topics should be included and how will content be designed and delivered? How can subject matter experts be recruited and how will trainee participation be documented? Discussion will include "what works" and "what has not worked" as well as recommendations regarding outreach strategies, records management, and certification.

Tony Onofrietti*, Director, Research Education, University of Utah

Departmental

WE'RE PLAYING IN THE SAME SANDBOX: COLLABORATING ACROSS CAMPUSES SO EVERYONE WINS
How many times has this scenario played out: A departmental administrator hangs up the phone in frustration after a conversation with the central office. Sighing heavily, she says to herself, “I am so irritated by that central office-why are they always second-guessing my judgment? I have worked on this proposal for three solid weeks with Dr. Superstar, and now they want us to change everything. This always happens when we have to work with them.” On the other end of the conversation, the central office administrator is equally perplexed and exasperated by the situation. “Why do the departmental administrators always push decisions off on me?” he wonders aloud to the coffee pot. “They constantly put controversial things in their proposals and then their attitude seems to be, ‘I’ll let central make this decision’ or ‘I’ll put this in here and if central doesn’t like it, they can deal with it.’” Both individuals have good reason to be frustrated, but they also share the responsibility for finding a solution to this ongoing problem. In this discussion, we’ll focus on (and practice) some techniques for finding mutually beneficial solutions to issues we all face.

Glenda Bullock*, Director of Research and Business Administration, Washington University in St. Louis
Stacey Wade, Sponsored Programs Administrator, University of Tennessee

Federal

NSF GRADUATE RESEARCH FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM: UPDATES FOR CAMPUS ADMINISTRATORS
This discussion will provide an overview of the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship Program, and describe recent updates in program management and fellowship policies. Panel members include NSF program staff and a campus administrator. The overview of the fellowship program will include the grant award features that are unique, as well as the grantee perspective on fellowship administration and policies. Time will be included for Q&A with panelists and among audience members.

Joerg Schlatterer*, Program Director, Division of Graduate Education, National Science Foundation
Criselda Cruz, Financial Management Analyst, GRFP, National Science Foundation
Anthony Ventimiglia, Associate Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Auburn University
1:15 – 2:15 pm | Discussion Groups (continued)

International

VOLUNTEERING - STRENGTHEN YOUR PERSONAL PROFILE AND INCREASE YOUR VISIBILITY WITHIN NCURA AND YOUR INSTITUTION

Volunteering is a long tradition within NCURA. The organization could not survive without its volunteers. However, the perception of volunteering is different in every country. Why bother being a volunteer? What is the personal merit, and how can this investment be turned into a profit, not only for you as person and as a research administrator, but also for your institution? Learn to understand what volunteering means within NCURA and why you are committing.

Eva Bjorndal*, Team Leader Post-Contract and Financial Compliance, Karolinska Institutet

Post-Award

MONITORING INTERNATIONAL SPONSORED RESEARCH – FINANCIAL RISK MANAGEMENT AT FOREIGN INSTITUTIONS

This discussion group will focus on financial risks that are common to foreign institutions receiving U.S. federal funding. No project is completely risk free, but which financial risks may be necessary to accept? And which risks should be avoided at any costs? Do you have the right internal controls and policies in place in order to identify and mitigate financial risks? Welcome to what we are hoping to be a very interactive discussion!

Eva Bjorndal*, Team Leader Post-Contract and Financial Compliance, Karolinska Institutet

Pre-Award

PRE-AWARD SHARED SERVICES MODEL: SUPPORTING THE NON-TRADITIONALLY FUNDED ACADEMIC UNITS

Learn about this new service model recently launched by the University of Illinois! We’ve created a Pre-Award Shared Services (PASS) position to provide a hybrid model of proposal assistance for faculty who have limited departmental support. The PASS model is the result of a collaborative effort between the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and the vested Colleges to meet the specific pre-award needs of Arts, Humanities, and Social Science faculty. Integrated into the centralized Proposal Submission team, our PASS Coordinator works directly with faculty to locate external funding opportunities or interdisciplinary projects, assist with the preparation of proposals and budgets, and provide customized tools that encourage the pursuit of external funding in these disciplines.

Kathy Dams*, Assistant Director, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Agatha Keller*, Co-Director EU GrantsAccess, ETH Zurich, University of Zurich
Denise Wallen, Research Officer and Senior Fellow, University of New Mexico
Georgette Sakumoto, Administrative Officer, Office of Research Service, University of Hawaii
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Eva Bjorndal*, Team Leader Post-Contract and Financial Compliance, Karolinska Institutet

MONITORING INTERNATIONAL SPONSORED RESEARCH – FINANCIAL RISK MANAGEMENT AT FOREIGN INSTITUTIONS
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### NEW GUIDANCE, RENEWED PARTNERSHIPS

#### Tuesday | August 4, 2015

**AGENDA**

**1:15 – 2:15 pm | Discussion Groups (continued)**

**Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINKEDIN AND OTHER SOCIAL MEDIA AS PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT TOOLS</th>
<th>Anne Pascucci*, Director, Sponsored Programs, Christopher Newport University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This will be a discussion about trends in social media aiding OSPs to be a more robust resource in the development proposals. Connections, sponsor program officers, collaborators, reference materials, latest articles, crowd sourcing are all elements of this growing aspect of RD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1:15 – 2:15 pm | Discussion Group for Senior Level Administrators**

**A Federal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSF HIGHER EDUCATION R&amp;D SURVEY UPDATE</th>
<th>Ronda Britt*, Survey Statistician, National Science Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This discussion will provide an overview of the latest trends in higher education R&amp;D spending and personnel, using data from the National Science Foundation’s FY 2013 Higher Education R&amp;D Survey of over 900 research-performing universities and colleges. It will also provide an update on upcoming changes to the survey such as the planned revisions to the fields of research. Finally, it will include statistics from a joint analysis with the Survey of Science and Engineering Research Facilities, a survey measuring research square footage at universities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1:15 – 2:15 pm | Office Hours**

Many participants are often tasked by their managers, researchers, and colleagues with finding an answer to a burning question at their institution. With the Office Hours sessions, we are creating an opportunity to obtain answers to those questions by subject matter experts in a one-on-one setting. The expert will be able to share their thoughts and advice directly with the individual. For participants, this is a great opportunity to learn, ask questions, and meet some of NCURA’s esteemed members.

**SUBAWARDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jennifer Barron, Director, Office of Research Administration, Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg School of Public Health Pamela Webb, Associate Vice President for Research, University of Minnesota</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
THE PRESENTER’S TOOLBOX: USING YOUR VOICE AND TECHNOLOGY TO BUILD A GREAT PRESENTATION

The elements of a typical presentation are a) the content and b) the delivery, with technology playing an important role in both. This session will break down the two key components by providing tools to equip the novice or experienced presenter to communicate more effectively in a variety of situations, from regular meetings to large presentations. In addition, there will be demonstrations of the latest technology available that will enhance your presentation. We will also address common presenter missteps and the importance of preparation.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Participants will learn how to engage listeners with their speaking voice, including volume, diction, tone, speed, and humor.
- Participants will learn how body language can affect both the audience and the presenter.
- Participants will learn about projectors, presentation software, microphones, remotes, pointers, real-time surveys, and other common presentation tools.

Michael McGough*, Grants Coordinator, University of Georgia
Mary Louise Healy, Associate Director, Research Administration, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, Johns Hopkins University
### Clinical Research/Clinical Trials

**RECRUITING AND RETAINING RESEARCH NURSES**

This session will explore challenges and strategies related to engagement of nurses in research including a discussion of research nurses’ roles and responsibilities, research nurse career development through internships, training and professional certification; and financial viability, compensation, and staffing.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will explore different types of settings and models for engaging nurses in clinical research with considerations for financial viability and staffing.
- Participants will discuss strategies to foster nurses’ career development and education in clinical research.
- Participants will learn about a matrix for supporting research nurse career development through advancement and compensation.
- Presenters will facilitate a discussion of challenges, barriers, and traditional and innovative solutions to engaging nurses in clinical research.

Royce Sampson*, Chief Operations Officer, South Carolina Clinical & Translational Research Institute (SCTR), Medical University of South Carolina
Karen Packard, Administrator/Nurse Manager, South Carolina Clinical & Translational Research Institute (SCTR), Medical University of South Carolina
Clare Tyson, Medical University of South Carolina, Program Manager, South Carolina Clinical & Translational Research Institute (SCTR)

---

### Compliance

**FINANCIAL RISK MANAGEMENT AT FOREIGN INSTITUTIONS**

This session will focus on financial risks that are common to foreign institutions receiving U.S. federal funding. No project is completely risk free, but which financial risks may be necessary to accept? And which risks should be avoided at any costs? Do you have the right internal controls and policies in place in order to identify and mitigate financial risks? This session will focus on the most common financial risks, some of them specific to academic medical centers and others more general, and will be based on the panel’s own experience from Foreign Organization System Reviews (FOS).

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will learn about financial risks that foreign institutions often face when receiving U.S. federal funding.
- Participants will learn about Foreign Organization Reviews (FOS).

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should be at a foreign institution.

Eva Bjorndal*, Team Leader Post-Contract and Financial Compliance, Karolinska Institutet
2:45 – 3:45 pm | Concurrent Sessions (continued)

Departmental

SUCCESSFUL SUBCONTRACT MANAGEMENT FOR THE DEPARTMENTAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATOR
This session will cover what the department administrator needs to know and do to manage out-going subcontracts for the life of the project: from proposal to award through the noncompeting budget years to closeout.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will understand what happens (or should happen) through the life-cycle of a subcontract.
- Participants will learn best practices for facilitating proposal approval and issuing of the subcontract within your institution’s administrative processes.
- Participants will discuss successful and less stressful fiscal management of subcontracts.
- Participants will understand the department’s role and responsibilities in good subcontract monitoring for compliance.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should be experienced departmental administrators.

Jeanne Galvin-Clarke*, Manager, Sponsored Programs Administration, University of Maryland, Baltimore

APPLICATIONS OF LEAN AND SIX SIGMA PRINCIPLES TO POST-AWARD MANAGEMENT OF SPONSORED PROJECTS
Lean and Six Sigma Principles are strategies to improve efficiency and quality and are often thought of as applied to the manufacturing world. However, in an age of increasing compliance with the post-award management of sponsored projects, we should learn to apply these principles to improve financial processes, decrease errors, and improve quality of work. If these principles are becoming more and more prevalent in their application to healthcare, it would follow that they be applied to the financial arm of medical research, to promote greater effectiveness and efficiency in compliance, reconciliation and monitoring of awards.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will be provided an introduction and overview of Lean and Six Sigma Principles.
- Participants will hear a brief overview of the NIH Roadmap for Clinical Research.
- Participants will be provided an overview of Clinical Translational Research and Developing Relationships and Teams of Basic Science Administrators, Clinic Managers, Clinical Research Administrators, and Sponsored Research/Finance.
- Participants will discuss a case study on Applying Principles to Clinical and Translational Research (protocol development, enrollment).
- Participants will learn to apply Principles to Financial Management of Sponsored Awards: Discuss Areas of Focus, Including Cost-Transfers Management, Sub Recipient Monitoring, Monthly Reconciliation, and Discuss with Participants Process Assessment Leading to Improvement Strategies.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should have a basic understanding of clinical trial management, post-award financials, and clinical translational research.

Jennifer Foley*, Assistant Director of Finance and Administration, Georgetown University Medical Center
**RESEARCH TERMS AND CONDITIONS**
This session will describe changes to the Research Terms and Conditions resulting from implementation of the Uniform Guidance. Participants will gain an understanding of the differences between the Research Terms modeled after A-110 versus what they will find with the Uniform Guidance.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:** Participants will gain an understanding of the new Research Terms and Conditions.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should come with some knowledge of previous research terms and conditions.

Michelle Bulls*, Director of the Office of Policy for Extramural Research Administration, OPERA, National Institutes of Health
Jean Feldman, Head, Policy Office of Budget, Finance & Award Management, National Science Foundation

**UPDATE ON FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES AT THE NEA, NEH, AND IMLS**
Representatives of the National Endowment for the Arts, National Endowment for the Humanities, and Institute for Museum and Library Services will describe current grant initiatives at the cultural agencies and answer questions about programs and grant management.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:** Participants will gain a greater awareness of grant opportunities at the cultural agencies.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should be aware of current NEA, NEH, and IMLS policies.

Carrie Holbo*, Grant Management Specialist, NEA

**CORPORATE FOUNDATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS: EXPANDING THE GLOBAL RESEARCH PORTFOLIO**
This session will focus on understanding types of research funding organizations that are often unfamiliar to many university research administrators: corporate foundations and international organizations. Corporate foundations have specific cultures and metrics that are very different from national or federal funding agencies, and the method for identifying potential projects, submitting proposals, and managing grants tend to reflect a different set of priorities. International organizations also have different priorities and processes, and their aims are very often application-based and versatile, based on the needs of developing countries, and / or not so easily subsumed into the practices of typical university research offices. The panelists will provide insights into how these types of organizations operate, their expectations and requirements for their university partners, and tips for establishing contacts and relationships with these organizations.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will gain an understanding of the perspectives and priorities of corporate foundations and international organizations.
- Participants will gain the ability to identify key differences between these types of organizations versus more typical government funding agencies.
- Participants will gain an understanding of best practices in working with corporate foundations and international organizations.
- Participants will gain the ability to discern one’s institutional readiness to work more closely with corporate foundations and international organizations.

Najib Abusalbim*, Corporate University Relations Manager, Schlumberger Limited
Roseline Chapel, President, Schlumberger Information Solutions
Pre-Award
FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES: BEST PRACTICES FOR IDENTIFYING, DISSEMINATING, AND TRACKING
In today’s digital world, there are many ways for pre-award research grant administrators to find grant opportunities and disseminate them to specific faculty members. From manually searching through Grants.gov and FedConnect to purchasing automated software systems such as MyWebGrants and Grant Search Engine, there are many ways to find grants. But what are the best options for grant offices that serve only one small department, or serve an

> continued on next page

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will discuss regulations on subrecipient monitoring (FFATA, UG)
- Participants will explore the flow of information from proposal development through closing.
- Participants will discuss risk assessment & mitigation.
- Participants will learn about managing a subrecipient.
- Participants will be able to react when things go awry.

PREREQUISITE: Having a moderate understanding of research administration and subrecipient monitoring is helpful for participants. The focus will be for an intermediate audience with the encouragement of discussion. However, beginners are welcome and encouraged to participate.

Joanne Palmer*, OSP Contracts Manager, Texas State University
Ruth Boardman, Associate Director of Audit and Compliance, Grants and Contracts Office, University of Illinois University at Urbana-Champaign

Post-Award
SUBRECIPIENT MONITORING EXPANDING WITH THE NEW UNIFORM GUIDANCE
Subrecipient monitoring concerns have resurfaced over the years. Due diligence to the funder, following regulations, supporting successful research activities and maintaining relationships are some of the core concerns surrounding subrecipient monitoring. The new OMB Uniform Guidance provides more guidelines and expectations of subrecipient monitoring. This session will discuss current concerns surrounding subrecipient monitoring including: PI involvement; developing a subaward; risk assessment and management; as well as implementation of new procedures embracing the Uniform Guidance.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will discuss regulations on subrecipient monitoring (FFATA, UG)
- Participants will explore the flow of information from proposal development through closing.
- Participants will discuss risk assessment & mitigation.
- Participants will learn about managing a subrecipient.
- Participants will be able to react when things go awry.

PREREQUISITE: Having a moderate understanding of research administration and subrecipient monitoring is helpful for participants. The focus will be for an intermediate audience with the encouragement of discussion. However, beginners are welcome and encouraged to participate.

Elena Semyonova-Smith*, Grants Officer, University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc.
Anita Abel, Assistant Director, Research Administration, Post-award Services, University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc.

Post-Award
SEE NO EVIL, HEAR NO EVIL ... SPEAK NOT OF COST TRANSFERS
What is a cost transfer? What can cause it? What can it result in? How do we document it properly. And if you do not want to talk of cost transfers – how do we prevent them? These are the questions this session will address.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will gain understanding of the definition of cost transfers; their most common causes and ways to prevent them.
- It is an interactive session, so participants will be asked to discuss the examples and give suggestions, as well as bring their own examples for discussion.

Elena Semyonova-Smith*, Grants Officer, University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc.
Anita Abel, Assistant Director, Research Administration, Post-award Services, University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc.
Pre-Award

FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES: BEST PRACTICES FOR IDENTIFYING, DISSEMINATING, AND TRACKING (CONTINUED)

entire college or university? Do we need to know each faculty member's research in order to find the right opportunities? How do we distribute grant opportunities that faculty will read? And how can we track deadlines and streamline reminder processes without wasting valuable time? This concurrent session goes beyond identifying and learning how to use the most popular grant search engines and software tools. By focusing on the best practices of grant searching and dissemination, research administrators will learn effective ways to reduce the amount of time they spend searching and to streamline research tasks.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will be able to determine the types of searching and dissemination strategies that work best for their institution.
- Participants will understand the importance of tracking deadlines to organize future grant searches.
- Participants will be able to implement specific strategies to save time, increase efficiency, and reduce frustration.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should have a basic knowledge of research grant opportunities and how to search for them.

Theresa Caban*, Senior Contract & Grant Administrator, Kaiser Foundation Research
Andrew Gray, Associate Director, Office of Grants and Contracts Administration, University of Alaska Fairbanks

Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI)

PREPARING YOUR OFFICE FOR CHANGE

Regardless of whether you are looking at Uniform Guidance changes, increased priority or expectation for extramural funding, or lack of administrative support for sponsored programs, we need a strong organizational backbone to respond to and accommodate change. There are many organizational models found at PUIs and each carries some strengths and challenges. Using these various organizational models, this session will discuss how to forge partnerships that will strengthen your operation, and that will establish a framework to insure that sponsored programs operations can be effective. Techniques for creating and forging partnerships, as well as an awareness to sensitivities and political aspects, will be part of the discussion. Participants to this session will leave with an approach for conducting a strategic analysis of their institution as well as how to develop an action plan and communication strategy for that will create a solid backbone to accommodate change.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will gain an understanding of strengths and challenges for differing organizational models.
- Participants will explore techniques to strengthen partnerships across their institution.
- Participants will develop an understanding of sensitivities and an awareness of political aspects when creating or strengthening partnerships.
- Participants will understand the basics of conducting a strategic analysis of their institution.
- Participants will learn how to develop an action plan and communication strategy.

Peggy S. Lowry*, Director, NCURA Peer Programs, National Council of University Research Administrators

Career Skills/Professional Development

CAN WE TALK? DEVELOPING PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH PIs

Creating collaborative partnerships with our faculty, scientific and/or program teams is essential for our success. Specific terms that are part and parcel of every profession often create obstacles to effective communication and building healthy professional relationships. This discussion is designed to identify
> continued on next page
When research involves multi-site studies, institutions face special IRB challenges. Some institutions establish relationships whereby they rely on each other (or a third party) to take on IRB oversight responsibilities, hence the term “IRB reliance”. Whether your institution is serving as the IRB of record, or you are ceding IRB review and oversight, you must address many complicated issues. Come prepared to discuss your institution’s policies, practices, challenges, and successes regarding IRB reliance.

Jennifer Rodis*, Policy and Planning Analyst, University of Wisconsin Madison
Discussion Groups (continued)

Compliance

HOW TO MANAGE FULBRIGHT SCHOLARS (CONTINUED)
Peter VanDerwater*, Director of Outreach, Fulbright Scholar Program

professionals, artists and others representing traditional as well as developing disciplines are supported each year. Fulbright continues to innovate and encourage research through a number of new flexible and multi-country program models. This discussion will focus on new initiatives within the Fulbright Scholar Program, as well as share best practices for how to better leverage and engage with the program at your institution.

Departmental

FOUR THINGS A RESEARCH ADMINISTRATOR CAN DO RIGHT NOW TO FIX THEIR DEPARTMENT
Anne Albinak*, Senior Administrative Manager, Whiting School of Engineering, Johns Hopkins University

This discussion group will cover strategies that will assist the department administrator with the day-to-day administrative and financial processes. We’ll focus on short-term and long term objectives that will create a win-win for the department and help to improve the relationship with central administration. The participants will learn effective techniques that will help them better manage their research empire.

Federal

THE PERILS AND PITFALLS OF STARTUP RELATIONSHIP
Susan Sedwick*, Consultant, Attain, LLC
Douglas Backman, Director, Compliance, University of Central Florida

Dealing with small startups can be a challenge when most startups are one person shops, but the hurdles get even more complicated when your university researchers are affiliated with the startup as an owner or advisor. These startups are often led by individuals with little or no research administration experience who are not familiar with the complexities associated SBIR/STTR programs, a frequent source of funding. This discussion will share some effective practices for managing the inherent conflicts of interest that seem to plague many of these projects.

International

EUROPEAN RESEARCH CAREERS: THE MARIE SKLODOWSKA-CURIE ACTIONS WITHIN HORIZON 2020
> continued on next page
### International

#### CROWDFUNDING 102: HOW TO MAKE IT WORK FOR YOUR INSTITUTION
No longer a brand new phenomenon, crowdfunding has become a popular mechanism to raise funds to support a wide range of projects that typically fall outside the usual funding channels, such as: fine arts projects, new technology development, capital projects, and student research. Using the power of crowdfunding, one can generate widespread support and gather many small donations to support individual project goals, as well as institutional goals. Crowdfunding, therefore, not only holds tremendous potential to access untapped funding sources, but also engages the public in higher education. This more “democratic” form of research support raises many questions for university administrators wondering how to best facilitate such projects on their campuses. Individual researchers may initiate their own projects, while institutions may want more control over the use of their brand. Funds management and donor relations acquire new dimensions in this arena, and the work of generating widespread social media interest in these projects is not for amateurs. This discussion will raise questions related to the logistics of centrally managing crowdfunding projects on campus as well as potential issues that may arise. It will also explore different institutional models and what makes a successful project.

- **Patience Graybill**, Research Administrator, Pre-Award, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville
- **Natasha Chopp**, Research Development & Marketing Manager, Michigan Technological University

---

#### EUROPEAN RESEARCH CAREERS: THE MARIE SKLODOWSKA-CURIE ACTIONS WITHIN HORIZON 2020 (CONTINUED)
prior the arrival of a researcher, during his/her stay and afterwards? What are the obligations of an institution, and what of the researchers? What are the most common pitfalls and how best to prevent them? This discussion will cover these questions and more.

- **Annika Glauner**, Senior Scientific Advisor and Group Leader Knowledge Transfer, ETH Zurich / University of Zurich
- **Viktoria Bodnarova**, Regional Representative, EURAXESS Links North America

---

#### Post-Award

#### MAKING ANALYTICS WORK FOR YOU: SURVIVE AND THRIVE
More auditors are using analytics to look for fraud, waste, and abuse. This discussion will discuss what analytic audits are; approaches to managing analytic audits; and ways to use the analytics to manage your award portfolios. Learn from two institutions who’ve undergone various types of analytic audits and from your colleagues on the best practices to survive and thrive with analytics.

- **Mark Sweet**, Director of eRA, Research & Sponsored Programs, University of Wisconsin Madison
- **Stephanie Gray**, Director, Division of Sponsored Research, University of Florida

---

### Pre-Award

#### CROWDFUNDING 102: HOW TO MAKE IT WORK FOR YOUR INSTITUTION
No longer a brand new phenomenon, crowdfunding has become a popular mechanism to raise funds to support a wide range of projects that typically fall outside the usual funding channels, such as: fine arts projects, new technology development, capital projects, and student research. Using the power of crowdfunding, one can generate widespread support and gather many small donations to support individual project goals, as well as institutional goals. Crowdfunding, therefore, not only holds tremendous potential to access untapped funding sources, but also engages the public in higher education. This more “democratic” form of research support raises many questions for university administrators wondering how to best facilitate such projects on their campuses. Individual researchers may initiate their own projects, while institutions may want more control over the use of their brand. Funds management and donor relations acquire new dimensions in this arena, and the work of generating widespread social media interest in these projects is not for amateurs. This discussion will raise questions related to the logistics of centrally managing crowdfunding projects on campus as well as potential issues that may arise. It will also explore different institutional models and what makes a successful project.
SURPRISE! YOU’RE HAVING AN NSF DESK REVIEW. IS YOUR INSTITUTION READY?
The title of this discussion group is something all of us would like to hear, right? Most likely not. However, there is a chance that you may receive a call or an email indicating that you are about to have a desk review. Are you ready for that call? As they say in Boy Scouts… Be Prepared!
Come and learn about one predominantly undergraduate institution’s desk review experience and what you can do to be prepared. If you had an NSF desk review, please come and share your experience and suggestions with the group.

2:45 – 3:45 pm | Office Hours

Many participants are often tasked by their managers, researchers, and colleagues with finding an answer to a burning question at their institution. With the Office Hours sessions, we are creating an opportunity to obtain answers to those questions by subject matter experts in a one-on-one setting. The expert will be able to share their thoughts and advice directly with the individual. For participants, this is a great opportunity to learn, ask questions, and meet some of NCURA’s esteemed members.

CLINICAL RESEARCH MANAGEMENT

3:45 – 4:00 pm | Networking and Refreshment Break

4:00 – 5:00 pm | Spark Sessions

15 – 20 minute, high energy, high deliverable offerings that will get right to the “good stuff.”

4:00 – 4:20 pm
PREPARING FOR THE BONFIRE: CREATING A PAPERLESS OFFICE

Noah Congelliere*, Training & Development Specialist, University of Southern California

Jeri Muniz, Executive Director, Contracts and Grants, The University of Southern California

4:30 – 4:50 pm
SECRETS TO BEING A GOOD BOSS

Robyn Remotigue*, Research Manager, School of Public Health, University of North Texas Health Science Center at Fort Worth

Jeffrey Werner*, Director, Grants and Sponsored Projects, Kutztown University of Pennsylvania

Allecia Harley*, Associate Vice President of Research Affairs and Clinical Trials Administration, Rush University Medical Center

Jamie Caldwell, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research Administration, University of Kansas Medical Center
### Concurrent Sessions

#### Career Skills/Professional Development

**THE LEAD ME PROGRAM: DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING A LEADERSHIP PROGRAM AS AN EXAMPLE**
This session will discuss leadership development at the regional level, how to start and maintain an effective program using the Combined Regions VI and VII’s LeadMe program as an example.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:** Participants will gain successful tools for leadership program implementation.

*Derick Jones*, Program Manager, Institute for Translational Genomics and Population Sciences, Los Angeles Biomedical Research Institute

---

**IMPLEMENTING A CERTIFIED RESEARCH ADMINISTRATORS PROGRAM**
This session will describe how a formal training program was developed. This includes the process of developing the objectives of the certification program, the development of the course content, and the process for managing and evaluating a large and complex training program.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will learn how to establish a training program.
- Participants will learn how to manage a training program.

*Karen Thomas*, Assistant Director, Award Administration Training, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

---

**THE LEAD mE PROGRAM: DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING A LEADERSHIP PROGRAM AS AN EXAMPLE**

**HOW TO WRITE A GRANT FOR CLINICAL RESEARCH**
The trend toward an increasing number of NIH clinical trial RFAs points to a growing need to be able to write these grant applications. Clinical trial grants have a number of elements that differ from lab-based projects. This session will provide an understanding of the requirements for a clinical trial grant application, including developing a budget, evaluating recruitment and marketing needs, negotiating with other sites, developing a management plan, determining whether a Data and Safety Monitoring Board is required, and developing plans for data coordination. It will also cover the differences between industry and NIH RFAs so that attendees will gain the insight to draft the best possible grant proposals in support of research faculty.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will gain an understanding of the elements of a clinical trial grant application.
- Participants will learn how to create a management strategy and plan.
- Participants will gain an understanding of the complexities of managing multiple sites.
- Participants will learn to avoid common mistakes in clinical trial grant applications.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should have an advanced level of understanding of clinical trials. This session will build on standard operating procedures and best practices.

*Tesheia Johnson*, Associate Director of Clinical Research for Yale School of Medicine COO, YCCI, Yale University
RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION ACCORDING TO DR. SHELDON COOPER

“The Big Bang Theory” is one of the most successful shows on television, and while the general public finds the show to be hilarious, those of us in research administration understand the comedy on a deeper level. That level is what we call reality. The antics of Drs. Cooper, Hofstadter, Koothrappali, and Mr. Wolowitz have made us all cringe on numerous occasions. From inappropriate use of government property to poor stewardship of sponsor funds, this session will highlight many of their on screen policy violations and incidents of noncompliance while also examining the actual, real life regulations involved.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES: This session will:
- Highlight the on screen scenarios that are related to research administration.
- Explain the real world policy and regulation violations committed.
- Examine the long term consequences should these violations take place within our institutions.

PREREQUISITE: In order to make the connection to the regulation violations presented, attendees should have an understanding of a wide base of research administration topics, such as cost principals and compliance areas.

David Smelser*, Assistant Director of Sponsored Programs, University of Tennessee
Justo Torres, Director, Office of Contracts and Grants, North Carolina State University
Anthony Ventimiglia, Associate Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Auburn University

EXPORT CONTROLS WHEN YOU’RE NOT IN CHARGE

Do you get intimidated by export control terminology such as ITAR, EAR, OFAC, ECCN, deemed exports, etc? Do you interact on a daily basis with faculty, but just hearing the term “export controls” from your central research administration office terrifies you? This session focuses on the day-in-the-life scenarios department administrators might encounter but aren’t aware how they relate to export controls. We will provide basic tools and knowledge on export controls which the department administrator can take back with them and immediately use. This session will be very interactive with Q&A discussions and case studies. Participants are encouraged to ask questions and provide real-life scenarios for open discussion.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will understand the basic principles of export control regulations.
- Participants will learn how the department can help your export control office.
- Participants will identify key “red flags” during the proposal and award stages.

Denise Moody*, Director of Research Compliance, Harvard University
David Ngo, Assistant Vice President, Sponsored Programs Administration, Office of Sponsored Programs, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas

NSF OIG AUDIT UPDATE AND DATA ANALYTICS

This presentation will cover NSF OIG audit planning, approaches, communication, and automated technologies for NSF operational and grant oversight. The material will also cover the use of data analytics and government-wide topics being addressed in the Federal audit community.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will be able to describe the NSF OIG approach to operational and grant oversight.
- Participants will be able to assess the use of data analytics.
- Participants will be able to identify current topics being addressed in the Federal audit community.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should be familiar with current NSF policies.

Brett Baker*, Assistant Inspector General for Audit, NSF-OIG
**International**

**FOREIGN IRB CONSIDERATIONS: LESSONS LEARNED FROM THOSE WHO’VE GONE BEFORE**

Scientific research is increasingly international. Researchers are traveling long distances to work with the best colleagues in their fields. With this comes an increasingly complex level of issues to facilitate inter-institutional research collaborations. An investigator planning on conducting human subject research outside the United States needs to consider not only the requirements of the U.S. institutional review board but that of the foreign site. In spring 2014, I interviewed twelve researchers who have navigated foreign institutional review boards in order to conduct HIV/AIDS prevention research. These researchers were MPH students, junior and mid-level career faculty, as well as highly experienced senior researchers.

Their work, beginning in 2001 to the present, was conducted in settings that included China, Ecuador, Haiti, India, Kenya, Liberia, Malaysia, Peru, Russia, Rwanda, South Africa, Ukraine and Vietnam. This session will present the “lessons learned” that they shared, with the intention of informing research administrators who may find themselves advising researchers who are planning an international research project.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

- Participants will appreciate the challenges of conducting human subjects research in an international setting, including:
  - The importance of consulting colleagues already established in the chosen setting.
  - Creative solutions where no foreign IRB exists.
  - Time considerations that might delay the research.
  - Unforeseen costs that need to be budgeted.
  - Cultural competency of your institution’s IRB/Culture of the foreign IRB.
  - Significant events (political/health) in the chosen setting that may delay the research.
  - Understanding local laws.

**Gai Doran**, Center Assistant Director, Administration, Center for Interdisciplinary Research on AIDS, Yale University

---

**Post-Award**

**AUDIT FINDINGS AND CORRECTIVE ACTION**

Sponsors fund universities, colleges, hospitals, and non-profit organizations to conduct research and advance science. Research funding from sponsors requires all recipients to follow regulations, guidelines, sponsor rules, and best practices. With these rules come audit findings from A-133 audits, direct cost audits, and sponsor priority areas for compliance reviews. This session will discuss how to prepare for an audit, the audit methodology, recent audit findings and corrective actions, while providing an opportunity for attendees to bring their own examples and questions relating to audits on our campuses. The session will be interactive, and discussion is encouraged to provide guidance to all attendees.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

- Participants will learn to fully understand the audit process and how to prepare the institution for any audit.
- Participants will be aware of recent audit findings and the appropriate corrective actions.

**PREREQUISITE:** Attendees should have a basic understanding of grant audits (A-133, OIG, internal audit).

**Keith Graff**, Grants Management Practice Leader, PricewaterhouseCoopers, LLP
### Concurrent Sessions (continued)

**Post-Award**

**POST-AWARD ELECTRONIC TOOLS**
Research administration is becoming more and more electronic, opening up a world of possibilities related to managing and tracking compliance, workload, and tasks with automated tools. We'll look at a variety of homegrown electronic tools designed to work with enterprise resource planning systems, leveraging data to create efficiencies. These tools relate to workload management, closeout strategies and data analytics.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will understand what kind of data is useful as you look at workload management.
- Participants will learn how systems can assist with closeout processes.
- Participants will learn how systems can support data analytics audits.
- Participants will preview examples of tools used at some of the top research institutes.
- Participants will learn about what contributes to a successful development process.

**Bonniejean Zitske**, Managing Officer, Research and Sponsored Programs, University of Wisconsin Madison

---

**Pre-Award**

**PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICER VS. PEER REVIEWER: HOW TO HELP PIs WHEN YOU ARE NOT A SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT**
Proposal development professionals face unique challenges in working with faculty and their proposals, particularly in assessing and editing their proposal drafts. Sometimes we need to prove the “value” that our position brings, or give advice on how to strengthen a proposal without having a clue about the science being discussed. This interactive session will discuss strategies to help you establish trust with faculty, provide objective feedback, understand the basics of a scientific area, and demonstrate your value to the grant process. Bring your questions and best practices to share!

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will learn to establish trust and credibility with PIs when you don’t know their exact science.
- Participants will be able to give PIs feedback on their proposal setup and writing without critiquing the science.
- Participants will be able to demonstrate the value of their experience and role to faculty.

**Debra Weinstein**, Assistant Director Institute for Bioscience & Biotechnology Research (IBBB), University of Maryland, College Park

---

**Pre-Award**

**SUPPORTING SINGLE INVESTIGATOR AND SMALL-TEAM PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT**
The increasing demand for single investigator and small-team proposal development support services. Different types of institutions at different levels are finding how to best address this demand. This session will provide an overview on approaches taken by different institutions.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will learn how different institutions/units support single-investigator, early career, and/or small-team proposal development.
- Participants will learn different factors to consider when developing a single-investigator, early career, and/or small-team proposal development manager program/position.

**Samuel Rodriguez-Flecha**, Single Investigator Proposal Manager, Faculty Research Development Coordinator, Washington State University
**Lucien Finley**, Assistant Director, Sponsored Projects, The University of Texas at Dallas
**Maureen Pelham**, Director, Research Development, Florida International University
**Career Skills/Professional Development**

**BECOMING A CATALYST: THE IMPORTANCE OF MENTORING**

As a research administrator, the majority of learning takes place on the job, where knowledge is put to use and theory turned into practice. We believe in the apprenticeship approach to development, in which each consultant is expected to have both a willingness to learn and an ability to mentor. On the learning side, this means being comfortable taking on tasks and responsibilities you have not performed before, or working on an unprecedented researcher’s problem. As a mentor, you are not only responsible for your own development, but for the development of your colleagues as well. In such an environment, open and honest feedback is critical to everyone’s development. Within our institutions, we are working hard to develop a culture that values and fosters this. This discussion group is about thinking differently and creatively about current and future services by better anticipating evolving researchers’ needs and processes plus by tapping the collective intelligence of the NCURA network.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

- Participants will gain insights into the often complex relationship between research administration and development offices.
- Participants will learn how to navigate toward a more effective working relationship by gaining an understanding of financial and other issues that are most important to customers and to stakeholders in each office.

**Lead presenter**

Annika Glauner*, Senior Scientific Advisor and Group Leader Knowledge Transfer, ETH Zurich / University of Zurich

Susanne Rahner*, Managing Director, Yggdrasil

---

**SPONSORED PROGRAMS AND DEVELOPMENT WORKING TOGETHER**

In small institutions, sponsored programs activity is often handled by people in the development office, and if not, there is sometimes a tug-of-war between the two offices to determine who gets to “count” an award. This session will cover a variety of topics essential to understanding the many interactions that take place between research administrators and development offices. Starting with a discussion of the differences between award types – gifts, grants, and contracts – we will look at the most common financial and legal implications that need to be considered when working with our advancement colleagues. This will be an interactive session aimed at answering questions and sharing information.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

- Participants will gain insights into the often complex relationship between research administration and development offices.
- Participants will learn how to navigate toward a more effective working relationship by gaining an understanding of financial and other issues that are most important to customers and to stakeholders in each office.

**Lead presenter**

Pamela Napier*, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Agnes Scott College

---

**Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI)**

**SPONSORED PROGRAMS AND DEVELOPMENT WORKING TOGETHER**

In small institutions, sponsored programs activity is often handled by people in the development office, and if not, there is sometimes a tug-of-war between the two offices to determine who gets to “count” an award. This session will cover a variety of topics essential to understanding the many interactions that take place between research administrators and development offices. Starting with a discussion of the differences between award types – gifts, grants, and contracts – we will look at the most common financial and legal implications that need to be considered when working with our advancement colleagues. This will be an interactive session aimed at answering questions and sharing information.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

- Participants will gain insights into the often complex relationship between research administration and development offices.
- Participants will learn how to navigate toward a more effective working relationship by gaining an understanding of financial and other issues that are most important to customers and to stakeholders in each office.

**Lead presenter**

Pamela Napier*, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Agnes Scott College
Clinical Research/Clinical Trials

USING TECHNOLOGY TO SUPPORT CLINICAL RESEARCH
Participants will share and discuss their clinical research technology integration needs, success to date and frustrations with creating systems and linking data (e.g., study and subject registries, subject scheduling, IRB, contracting, patient care, budgeting, invoicing and billing compliance). Participants will hear solutions and lessons learned by others in clinical research data and systems integration with respect to IT systems, organizational structure and resources. This discussion group is intended for intermediate and higher level individuals who are experienced and responsible for some part of clinical research coordination and/or administration.

Michael Amey*, Associate Dean, Research Administration, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine

CLARIFYING THE ROLE OF THE STUDY COORDINATOR: NURSE, PROJECT MANAGER, DATA ENTRY CLERK, AND MORE
Developing and maintaining an exemplary research team is essential to the success of a quality clinical research program. Staff is one of the most important, albeit expensive, components of a successful research program. Although investigators appreciate the research team’s value, they are often uncertain about how to properly develop and manage the team. This session will outline the knowledge and skills inherent in the various study roles to create an effective clinical research program to conduct quality clinical trials.

Ashley Baker-Lee*, Senior Vice President, Research Operations, City of Hope

Compliance

WHO OWNS THE DATA?
This will be a discussion of rules, regulations, and best practices related to the management, sharing, and storage of data.

Andrew Mahler*, HIPAA Privacy Officer, University of Arizona

Departmental

UNIFORM GUIDANCE: HOW TO COMMUNICATE THE CHANGES TO YOUR PI
The changes are made, you’ve updated policies and procedures and discussed the 2 CFR 200 until you probably can’t take it anymore. Now you need to communicate the changes to the campus community — especially the faculty. In this discussion group, we will confer around successes in communication of the changes based on the Uniform Guidance and some setbacks and challenges in the process. We welcome all levels of research administrators from all along the spectrum and are hoping for a lively discussion to ensure that participants will come back with some helpful guidance and advice for addressing the changes both now and in the future.

Samantha Westcott*, Manager, Sponsored Projects Team, Children’s Hospital Los Angeles
Melissa Waver, Senior Sponsored Projects Officer, Office of Research, University of California, Santa Barbara
4:00 – 5:00 pm | Discussion Groups (continued)

**Federal**

PUBLIC ACCESS UPDATE (Follow-up to concurrent session, “Public Access Update,” held Tuesday at 1:15 pm)
This is a follow-up discussion to the concurrent session on the public access initiatives being rolled out by various Federal agencies. During this discussion, we will discuss what we have learned from the panel, share experiences in managing compliance with public access policies at the institution level, and examine faculty administrative burden.

Stephanie Scott*, Communications and Outreach Director, Office of Sponsored Projects, Columbia University

**International**

HOW TO MAKE THE RUN OF THE HOUSE – INTERNAL CONSULTING SERVICES TO FOSTER INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM PARTICIPATION
The aim of the discussion group is to showcase and exchange good practices on how to foster the in-house consulting of research groups for international program participation. Presenters will show ideas and actions which have worked and have been implemented successfully.

Bruno Woeran*, Special Advisor, EU Research Programmes Manager, Lappeenranta University of Technology

Tiina Berg, Senior Research Funding Advisor, University of Helsinki

**Post-Award**

LET’S TALK ABOUT PROGRAM INCOME
This discussion will focus on Program Income and its effects on sponsored programs. We will include such topics as: accounting treatments and methodologies, Uniform Guidance effects, unique methods of generating program income and other areas of interest.

W. Scott Erwin, Sr.*, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Texas State University

**Pre-Award**

LET’S START IN THE MIDDLE: REVISITING THE PRE-AWARD PROCESSES
Research administration is constantly evolving due to updated governmental and sponsor regulations coupled with institutional change. What we learned last month is no longer useful today. This discussion will cover the pre-award process from the middle to the end, introduce best practices to pre-award research administrators and encourage attendees to share their experiences. Budget development topics such as allowable, allocable, consistent and reasonable costs, subcontracts vs. purchase of service, and OMB Circulars in addition to methods for effective proposal review and communication with faculty, compliance and much more will be presented.

Dominic Esposito*, Director of Grants Administration, Manhattan College

Tolise Miles, Senior Grants and Contracts Specialist, Children’s National Medical Center
4:00 – 5:00 pm | Discussion Groups (continued)

Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI)

EXPERIENCING THE NCURA PEER REVIEW, THE ROAD MAP AND BEYOND
The NCURA Peer Review Program offers institutions the opportunity to have nationally recognized research administrators perform a thorough review of their sponsored projects operations. What is it like to go through the process? What happens after the review is completed? This discussion group will focus on the experience from the institution’s perspective and offer ideas for using the results to create a road map for improving the sponsored programs area at your institution.

Dorothy Johnson*, Accounting Manager, Grants, Bucknell University
Carol Burdsal, Assistant Provost for Research, Bucknell University

4:00 – 5:00 pm | Discussion Group for Senior Level Administrators

Career Skills/Professional Development
WORK/LIFE BALANCE IN RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION
This discussion group will go over some strategies on balancing work and life when working in research administration, especially during those busy times around submitting proposals, and handling all the other tasks and assignments. It will be aimed primarily at departmental and those smaller divisional and central offices, that typically have fewer people and resources.

Aaron Crandall*, Research Manager, University of Wisconsin Madison

4:00 – 5:00 pm | Office Hours

Many participants are often tasked by their managers, researchers, and colleagues with finding an answer to a burning question at their institution. With the Office Hours sessions, we are creating an opportunity to obtain answers to those questions by subject matter experts in a one-on-one setting. The expert will be able to share their thoughts and advice directly with the individual. For participants, this is a great opportunity to learn, ask questions, and meet some of NCURA’s esteemed members.

FEDERAL CONTRACTING

David Mayo*, Director of Sponsored Research, California Institute of Technology
John Hanold, Associate Vice President for Research and Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, The Pennsylvania State University

7:00 pm – 11:00 pm | Tuesday Night Event

This year, we’re going global with a fun summer evening along the French Riviera. In addition to food, wine, music, dancing and activities for the kids, enjoy Monte Carlo casino-gaming (with proceeds going to the NCURA Education Scholarship Fund), with a French café spot for those who prefer quieter spaces.

In keeping with the theme, there will be a live celebration of the Cannes Film Festival, with regional presentations of their favorite movie musical number. We’re looking forward to a fun night!

9:00 pm | Regional Hospitality Suites Open
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7:30 am – Noon
AM57 CONCierge

7:30 – 8:15 am
ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING AND CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST

7:30 – 11:00 am
NCURA MARKETPLACE

8:30 – 10:00 am | Spark Sessions

15 – 20 minute, high energy, high deliverable offerings that will get right to the “good stuff.”

8:30 – 8:50 am
DEVELOPING STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES (SOPs)
Keith Graff*, Grants Management Practice Leader, PricewaterhouseCoopers, LLP
Tomas Pereira, Manager, PricewaterhouseCoopers, LLP

9:00 – 9:20 am
SUBRECIPIENTS AND NEW UNIFORM GUIDANCE
Anita Mills*, Senior Solutions Consultant, Evisions

9:30 – 9:50 am
MEASURING GRANT CAPACITY AND READINESS
Michael Preuss*, Grant Consultant, Hanover Research

8:30 – 10:00 am | Concurrent Sessions

O Career Skills/Professional Development

BUILDING YOUR CAREER IN RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION/CAREER TRANSITIONS
As you make decisions about your career path, what are some of the important elements to consider as you are building your expertise in research administration? What skills do we gain by working at different types of institutions (research, medical, PUI) and in different roles (central, departmental, financial, pre-award)? How can we most effectively present those when a new opportunity arises? Career choices we make early in our professional lives can affect how we are positioned to respond to opportunities that may come along later. In this session two senior research administrators will lead a presentation and a discussion that will help participants position themselves for career transitions in the field and provide participants with insights on the most marketable skills that hiring managers seek.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
◆ Participants will build a good resume for the field of research administration, positioning themselves for career transitions.
◆ Participants will understand what hiring supervisors look for in good research administration professionals.
◆ Participants will learn to build and use a good research administration network.

Beth Seaton*, Consultant
Christa Johnson, Vice President for Research, Colorado State University

A Clinical Research/Clinical Trials

CLINICALTRIALS.GOV AND CHANGES IN THE GUIDANCE
This session will examine the history of the ClinicalTrials.gov, an overview of the legislation, registration and reporting requirements, penalties for noncompliance, proposed changes to ClinicalTrials.gov requirements, implementation challenges, and the future direction of this initiative. The session will
> continued on next page
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**Clinical Research/Clinical Trials**

**CLINICALTRIALS.GOV AND CHANGES IN THE GUIDANCE (CONTINUED)**
include data on submission to ClinicalTrials.gov and publication data on institutions around the country. Participants will hear tips related to registering studies, reporting adverse events and submitting results, as well as a discussion of key issues in the Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act (FDAAA) related to ClinicalTrials.gov.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will gain an understanding of the legislation pertaining to ClinicalTrials.gov.
- Participants will gain an understanding of which studies should be registered and reported on ClinicalTrials.gov.
- Participants will gain an understanding of the reporting requirements and the penalties of noncompliance.
- Participants will gain an understanding of what the future holds for ClinicalTrials.gov.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should have an advanced level of understanding of clinical trials.

Deborah Zarin*, Director of ClinicalTrials.gov, NLM

---

**Compliance**

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST - FUNDAMENTALS OF IDENTIFICATION AND MANAGEMENT**
Conflicts of interest arise when there is an actual or perceived divergence between individual interests and institutional duties. Conflicts can arise in many areas of higher education, including but not limited to: academic decisions, hiring and supervision, outside commitments, procurement, and sponsored research. This session will provide a broad definition for “conflicts of interest,” will provide a general overview of the different types of conflicts that arise in higher education, and will demonstrate the application of an effective conflict management process.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:** Participants will gain an understanding of how to identify the types of conflicts that arise in higher education, how to apply a holistic and consistent conflict management process, and who should be involved in that process.

Vin Lacovara*, Compliance and Privacy Officer, The Catholic University of America

---

**Departmental**

**TACKLING THE ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN ON THE RESEARCH ENTERPRISE: ONE AMC’S PLAN**
The high level of administrative burden on research investigators at AMCs and research universities is a very real problem. A recent survey by the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) reported that research investigators spend 42% of their time on administrative activities. Most institutions blame external sponsors and regulating agencies for this problem. But, how much of the burden is created by our own institutions as a result of setting up inefficient processes that are onerous or confusing to the end-user? How often do organizations look at their existing policies and processes to see if they have become outdated or could be streamlined? Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH) took the bold step to look inward and drive down the administrative burden for their researchers by creating a Continuous Research Operations (CROI) program. The approach was to create an

> continued on next page
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**Departmental**

TACKLING THE ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN ON THE RESEARCH ENTERPRISE: ONE AMC’S PLAN (CONTINUED)

idea-driven organization. Unlike Six-Sigma that is top-down and driven by management, an idea-driven organization relies on the concept that small ideas by front-line employees can collectively lead to big impacts.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES: The session will focus on the background, implementation plan, and results to date of the MGH CROI Program.

Gary Smith*, Senior Administrative Director - MGH Research, Massachusetts General Hospital

**Federal**

WASHINGTON UPDATE

There is always something going on in Washington that affects research and sponsored programs at colleges and universities - whether it’s political curiosity, legislative mischief, or unrelenting regulatory expansion. This session will provide an update and analysis of the latest developments.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES: Participants will be updated on current issues impacting research under consideration by the Administration and Congress.

Lisa Nichols*, Policy Analyst, Council on Governmental Relations

**Federal**

USDA/NIFA UPDATE

The National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) is an agency within the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). Congress created NIFA through the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008. NIFA replaced the former Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES), which had been in existence since 1994. The Office of Grants and Financial Management (OGFM) supports NIFA’s

> continued on next page
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### 8:30 – 10:00 am | Concurrent Sessions (continued)

#### Federal

**USDA/NIFA UPDATE (CONTINUED)**

Mission of advancing food and agricultural science by administering grants, cooperative agreements, and other federal financial assistance with policy, funding, and oversight.

Maria Koszalka*, Division Director, Policy and Oversight Division, Office of Grants and Financial Assistance Management (OGFM), National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA), USDA  
Lisa Scott-Morring, Branch Chief, Policy Branch, Policy and Oversight Division, OGFM, NIFA, USDA

#### International

**INTERNATIONAL PROJECTS: COMPLIANCE WITH THE NEW OMB UNIFORM GUIDANCE IN CROSS-BORDER PROJECTS**

This session focuses on how the Uniform Guidance will affect financial and administrative compliance in federally funded foreign projects and collaborations. For example, unique costs in international projects include, among others, foreign housing and living expenses, value added taxes, consular and visa fees, currency fluctuation, relocation, security, and severance payments to foreign nationals. The session will include opportunity for questions from, discussion with, and sharing of experiences by the audience.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES: Participants will appreciate how the Uniform Guidance may influence the financial and administrative management of transnational projects.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should have familiarity with foreign projects or subrecipients

William Ferreira*, Partner, Hogan Lovells, LLP  
Marta Thompson, Associate, Hogan Lovells, LLP

#### Post-Award

**CLOSEOUTS AND METRICS**

The timely closeout of a sponsored project is important because it’s the last step to ensuring all award requirements have been met. Delaying the closeout of an award could pose audit risk to an institution. This session will demonstrate how to build simple reports using Excel to evaluate the timeliness of award closeouts.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES: Participants will learn how to build three simple reports to evaluate the timeliness of award closeouts.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should be knowledgeable at using Excel Pivot Tables.

Tara Seaton*, Associate Director, Award Management, Arizona State University  
Danielle Silvas, Grant & Contract Officer, Arizona State University

#### Pre-Award

**COLLABORATIVE NEGOTIATIONS: THERE REALLY IS STRENGTH IN NUMBERS**

Today’s scientific problems require multidisciplinary partnerships crossing disciplines and often through inter-institutional cooperation. This convergence requires a new model for negotiating prime and sometime parallel awards to take into consideration the cultural differences across cooperating institutions which may arise between public and private institutions. This session will follow a couple of examples of working together to negotiate terms that are...> continued on next page
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8:30 – 10:00 am | Concurrent Sessions (continued)

**Pre-Award**

COLLABORATIVE NEGOTIATIONS: THERE REALLY IS STRENGTH IN NUMBERS (CONTINUED)
mutually acceptable to all parties, collaborators or subawardees, in a much more efficient manner. Two case studies will be used as examples of how the process can work.

PREREQUISITE: Prior experience negotiating complex and inter-institutional contracts would be appropriate.

Susan Sedwick*, Consultant, Attain, LLC
Debbie Newton, Director of Research and Sponsored Programs, The University of Tulsa
Linda Learned, Associate Director, Awards, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

**Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI)**

BUILDING RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH TRAINING PROGRAMS AT PUIs
Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) training programs are required of institutions receiving funding for certain types of grants from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Science Foundation (NSF). Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions (PUI) often have unique challenges in contrast to larger higher education research universities in complying with these regulations. What strategies can the research administrator apply to design effective RCR education plans? What policies will enhance the “culture of compliance” at the PUI? In this highly interactive session, different institutional perspectives and best practices for developing, implementing and documenting effective RCR training programs and policies for faculty, staff and students at PUIs will be presented.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will gain an understanding of a variety of proven techniques for delivering effective responsible conduct of research (RCR) training programs and policies at PUIs.
- Participants will learn how to design an effective RCR training plan utilizing different instructional methods to enhance teaching and learning effectiveness.

Tony Onofrietti*, Director, Research Education, University of Utah
Dominic Esposito, Director of Grants Administration, Manhattan College

**Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI)**

TAMING THE BEAST: HOW A PUI CAN BUILD AND IMPLEMENT A SUCCESSFUL EXPORT CONTROL PROGRAM
This session will review a case study describing how Illinois State University, a PUI, designed and implemented an export control program with buy-in from both the administration and faculty.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will learn how to get buy-in from key partners: faculty and administration.
- Participants will be able to identify/secure resources.
- Participants will learn to develop an export control education/awareness program.
- Participants will learn to develop a survey tool.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should have basic/intermediate knowledge of export control issues.

Janet Goucher*, Assistant Director of Research, Illinois State University
Cory Abernathy, Intellectual Property & Export Control Officer, Illinois State University
### Career Skills/Professional Development

**GETTING TO YES: CONFLICT RESOLUTION TIPS FOR RESEARCH ADMINISTRATORS**  
This discussion will serve as a platform for colleagues to discuss and share ways of “getting to yes” when it comes to conflict resolution. The panel will share their insights and tips that have been established within their departments for getting through conflict creatively. Participants are encouraged to bring their ideas, tips, and tools for “getting to yes,” and we encourage you to share what you learn with your colleagues.

**STRENGTHENING CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS WITH INDUSTRY**  
Ever wanted to pull your hair out when hearing "Our lawyers have a new template"? This discussion group will center on tips and trades available to avoid long, drawn out negotiations that start with the same stiff, all-but-unusable agreement and end up with a furious, frustrated investigator. From establishing a friendly, collegial relationship with your counterpart, to making clear and concise arguments, our discussion will focus on ways to cut negotiation time down and make your job just a little bit easier.

**COMPLIANCE CRISIS: WHAT DO YOU DO WHEN SOMETHING HAS ALREADY GONE WRONG?**  
Despite rigorous policies and clear written procedures, compliance crises do arise from time to time. Your policy and procedures may be violated at any time, either knowingly or unknowingly, putting you in the midst of a crisis. Who do you consult, what do you do, and when do you do it? This discussion will examine the steps that can be taken to get through an immediate crisis and to ensure future compliance, illustrating those steps with case studies.

**THE DRA: THE CHALLENGES OF BEING MULTIFACETED**  
This discussion group is geared toward the departmental administrator who wears multiple hats other than research project management. Many DRA are responsible for vast aspects of their departmental operational management. This discussion group will explore this complexity and identify some key challenges and hurdles associated with this multifaceted role.

### Clinical Research/Clinical Trials

**STREAMLINING CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS WITH INDUSTRY**  
Ever wanted to pull your hair out when hearing “Our lawyers have a new template”? This discussion group will center on tips and trades available to avoid long, drawn out negotiations that start with the same stiff, all-but-unusable agreement and end up with a furious, frustrated investigator. From establishing a friendly, collegial relationship with your counterpart, to making clear and concise arguments, our discussion will focus on ways to cut negotiation time down and make your job just a little bit easier.

### Compliance

**Mary Louise Healy**, Associate Director, Research Administration, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, Johns Hopkins University  
**Cindy Holstein**, Administrator, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, Johns Hopkins University

**David Hawkins**, Associate Director, Office of Sponsored Projects, University of Texas at Austin

**Samantha Aleshire**, Grant Management Officer, University of Alaska Fairbanks

### Departmental

**Derick Jones**, Program Manager, Institute for Translational Genomics and Population Sciences, Los Angeles Biomedical Research Institute

### New Guidance, Renewed Partnerships
**SHARED SERVICES MODEL**
Many institutions are joining together to enter into shared services. This discussion group will focus on multiple institutions in the University of Texas System that joined together to implement PeopleSoft.

**FDP UPDATE**
The Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) is an association of federal U.S. agencies, academic research institutions, with administrative, faculty and technical representation, and research policy organizations that work to streamline the administration of federally sponsored research. FDP members of all sectors cooperate in identifying, testing, and implementing new, more effective ways of managing federal research grants with the goal of improving the productivity of research without compromising its stewardship. The overarching goal of the FDP is to reduce the administrative burdens for the faculty who are carrying out federally funded research so that they can spend more time doing research. This discussion will be led by FDP Executive Committee leadership, who will provide a brief summary of highlights from the past 25+ years and current and planned initiatives followed by questions and open discussion.

**DISRUPTIVE INNOVATION AHEAD!**
Scientific research is getting more diverse, more networked, more impactful, more popular and more money from more sources for more areas of interest than ever before. Not only do individual researchers increasingly cooperate on projects across countries, entire research agencies are also collaborating worldwide. Taxpayer-funded teams of scientists now tweet findings in a more transparent effort to share and show what return the public may be gaining from its annually over 1 trillion dollar investment. That investment is equally divided between the United States, Asia and Europe. Today scientists converge with interests outside their discipline, and link their findings to the public, through open social links that unlock access and relevance. Thus the global spread of information networks broadens scientific access for billions. What are the consequences for R&D, for innovation and for funding bodies? What are options for actions? Where are the pitfalls and challenges for research managers and administrators?

**Leading Presenters**

- **Marianne Woods***, Academic Program Director, Master of Science in Research Administration, Johns Hopkins University
- **Jeremy Forsberg**, Assistant Vice President of Research, The University of Texas at Arlington
- **Cynthia Hope***, Assistant Vice President for Research and Director, Office for Sponsored Programs, The University of Alabama
- **Richard Seligman**, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, California Institute of Technology
- **Marianne Woods***, Academic Program Director, Master of Science in Research Administration, Johns Hopkins University
- **Jeremy Forsberg**, Assistant Vice President of Research, The University of Texas at Arlington
- **Cynthia Hope***, Assistant Vice President for Research and Director, Office for Sponsored Programs, The University of Alabama
- **Richard Seligman**, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, California Institute of Technology
- **Anika Glauner***, Senior Scientific Advisor and Group Leader Knowledge Transfer, ETH Zurich / University of Zurich
- **Bryony Wakefield**, Director, Research Unit, The University of Melbourne
- **Eva Bjorndal**, Team Leader, Post-Contract and Financial Compliance, Karolinska Institutet
Post-Award

COST SHARING IN THE ERA OF THE UNIFORM GUIDANCE
This discussion will focus on whether cost sharing even exists as a concept anymore, whether organizations have updated their policies to reflect the position in the UG, what pre-award offices do in practice if and when a PI insists on offering voluntary committed cost sharing, and whether anyone has experiences they are willing to share on how to document or quantify volunteer services, or other in-kind costs.

Mary Schmiedel*, Associate Dean for Research Administration & Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Georgetown University

Pre-Award

PUSHING MORE PAPER OUT THE DOOR: WHAT STRATEGIES WORK AND FOR WHOM?
Conventional wisdom says that the way to win more awards is to get researchers writing more proposals. Thus, pushing more paper out the door has become a priority for most offices of research. Strategies range from grant writing workshops to internal funding programs to full blown grant writing institutes. But what works in one institutional environment may not work in another. This discussion group will feature an open exchange of ideas and strategies that have proven successful, together with lessons learned and critical factors for success.

Robert Porter*, Owner, Grant-Winners Seminars

Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI)

COMPLIANCE AT YOUR PUI: WHAT TO FOCUS ON FIRST
Do you feel like you are the only one at your institution who cares about export controls and financial conflicts of interest? Or RCR? Or animal subjects? Do you suspect compliance overall could be strengthened at your institution? Join your PUI colleagues for a frank discussion about which area of compliance at your institution most needs your attention now and learn how others focus their energies and resources to strengthen compliance at their predominately undergraduate institutions.

Julie Guggino*, Director, Research & Sponsored Programs, Central Washington University
Penny Miceli, Director of Sponsored Projects and Research, Keene State College
8:30 – 10:00 am | Discussion Group for Senior Level Administrators

**Career Skills/Professional Development**

**CULTIVATING RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION TALENT**

Training and experience are two of the most valuable attributes for success in research administration. So how do non-profit educational institutions attract and retain high-caliber individuals? From hiring the right mix of experience and trainee level staff to providing insights into building team cultures that nourish and support, we will discuss our experience with hiring, training, and promoting research administration professionals.

Megan Dietrich*, Team Lead - Gates, Stanford University
Deborah Green Michael, Engineering Research Administration - Team Lead, Stanford University
Blanca Rebuelta, Finance Services Manager, Stanford University

8:30 – 10:00 am | Senior Level Discussion

**LET’S TALK – SERIOUS ISSUES FOR SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS**

Kim Moreland*, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research & Sponsored Programs, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Kim Luther, Associate Vice President, Finance & Compliance Office, Duke University

8:30 – 10:00 am | Office Hours

Many participants are often tasked by their managers, researchers, and colleagues with finding an answer to a burning question at their institution. With the Office Hours sessions, we are creating an opportunity to obtain answers to those questions by subject matter experts in a one-on-one setting. The expert will be able to share their thoughts and advice directly with the individual. For participants, this is a great opportunity to learn, ask questions, and meet some of NCURA’s esteemed members.

**AUDITING**

Michelle Vazin*, Director, Office of Contracts and Grants, Vanderbilt University
Timothy Reuter, Stanford University, Director, Post-Award, Office of Sponsored Research
Human Universals are behavioral or cognitive traits that are shared by all human beings. A few examples of such traits are collective decision making, planning, statuses and roles, division of labor, weapons, healing. Thinking in terms of these universal traits can help us develop strategies for reducing conflict and building productive relationships among departmental administration, the central office, and PIs.

Laura Letbetter*, Contracting Officer, Georgia Institute of Technology

Learning Objectives:
- Participants will be able to explain what human universals are and how they apply to research administration.
- Participants will be able to identify at least three human universals that are sources of conflict in the research administration environment.
- Participants will be able to list at least three strategies for reducing conflict and building productive relationships across campus.

Clinical Research/Clinical Trials

Program Evaluation for Clinical Research
This session will focus on a holistic view of the critical metrics in managing a clinical research program. We will explore the use of metrics within a balanced scorecard framework and go beyond traditional metrics.

Rebecca Moen*, Program Manager, CTSA, Duke University

Learning Objectives:
- Participants will understand why metrics are important.
- Participants will be able to identify metrics critical to program evaluation.
- Participants will learn to identify ways to improve your clinical research program through metrics.
**Clinical Research/Clinical Trials**

**HOW TO PREPARE FOR AN FDA AUDIT**
This session will provide a general overview of FDA audit activities at the clinical research site; describe common FDA audit findings; discuss how best to prevent non-compliance at your site; and, share a case example of audit coordination resources and support at an academic medical center.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:** Participants will learn about the FDA audit activities and how to best prepare for an FDA audit.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should be in managerial positions at their institutions.

**Karen Hartman**, Administrator, Research Compliance, Mayo Clinic

---

**Compliance**

**PARTNERING WITH FOUNDATIONS: APPROACHES TO NEGOTIATING TERMS AND CONDITIONS IN FOUNDATION AGREEMENTS**
Research agreements with foundations have grown increasingly complex. Often there are extensive intellectual property requirements, which can cause delays for sponsored research offices. Universities must grapple with issues such as IP ownership, march-in rights, license terms, and royalty-sharing, which may conflict with university policy and/or business practices. Many universities and some national organizations, including FasterCures, have attempted to bring together foundations and universities to engage in a conversation about the best ways to ensure the translation of intellectual property to the marketplace. Join seasoned research administrators, contracts negotiators, and foundation representatives in a review of national trends, approaches for negotiation with foundations, and strategies for success.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will review current trends in research agreements with foundations, in particular in the area of biomedical research.
- Participants will review current agreement templates under development with FasterCures.
- Participants will understand the recent challenges faced by both universities and foundations in negotiating research agreements, in particular with respect to intellectual property terms.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should be familiar with contracting terms and conditions in research agreements.

**Christa Johnson***, Vice President for Research, Colorado State University

**Melanie Roewe**, Director, Clinical Trials Contracts, Washington University in St. Louis

**Marisa Mayer**, Chief Legal Officer, Crohn’s & Colitis Foundation of America

---

**Compliance**

**SUCCESSFULLY MANAGING THE NSF OIG DATA ANALYTICS AUDIT**
All audits present significant challenges, but when the NSF OIG letter arrives, that is the time to start preparing. This session provides practical tips and advice for successfully completing a large audit like the NSF OIG Data Analytics Audit in the face of competing priorities and already overburdened staff. This session will help highlight the “hot topics” and outline an approach that helps to position your University for the best possible outcome.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will be provided with practical knowledge for audit planning and management.
- Participants will hear tips for controlling and managing the massive amount of data over a long-term period.
- Participants will have insight on working with the contracted audit firm, NSF OIG and the eventual audit resolution.
- Participants will explore information on how to communicate with the campus and the principle investigators.

**PREREQUISITE:** Participants should have a basic understanding of federally sponsored awards and audits.

**Ruth Boardman***, Associate Director of Audit and Compliance, Grants and Contracts Office, University of Illinois University at Urbana-Champaign
THE FUTURE IS NOW FOR THE UNIFORM GUIDANCE FOR GRANTS

On December 26, 2013, the Office of Management and Budget issued final guidance on federal grants: 2 CFR 200. On December 19, 2014, 28 Federal agencies codified the guidance in their own regulation sections of the CFR. The new guidance – a sweeping consolidation of decades of OMB circulars, guidance, and the "common rule" on grants management – replace ALL the current OMB Grant Circulars and will have a profound impact on how grants are awarded, administered and audited. So say goodbye to your Old Circulars A-21, A-110 and A-133 and come listen to OMB at this session.

This session will include a brief history, a summary of the process used to develop the Uniform Guidance and a high level assessment of how the guidance will impact your institution, including Single Audits. It will also discuss the Frequently Asked Questions regarding the implementation.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will gain insight into the development of the Uniform Guidance.
- Participants will understand the highlights of key changes in grant requirements.
- Participants will learn about the potential impact on institution grant management systems.
- Participants will know the timelines for implementation and effective dates.

PREREQUISITE: This session is intended for administrators overseeing federal compliance.

Gil Tran*, Technical Manager, Office of Management and Budget

FROM PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT TO CLOSEOUT: A TEAM-BASED APPROACH TO RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Institutions often separate research administration into functions, such as proposal development, pre-award, and post-award, with staff responding to faculty as they walk in the door and/or working with faculty based on the funding agency of the grant. That approach leaves faculty potentially working with a new set of research administrators each time they submit a proposal. This session will present a team-based model for research administration, where faculty have a set cadre of professionals, based on college, to assist them with their research proposals, from proposal development to grant closeout. It also helps research administrators, who have a set portfolio of colleges, to better tailor funding opportunities and agency requirements to their faculty's needs.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
- Participants will learn about an innovative model for research administration.
- Participants will gain insights into establishing a team-based approach at their institution and whether the model is a good fit for them/their faculty.

PREREQUISITE: Knowledge of the workings of research administration offices is helpful when attending this session.

Malia Schwartz*, Proposal Developer, University of Rhode Island
Karen Markin, Director of Research Development, University of Rhode Island
Winifred Nwangwu, Director of Sponsored Projects Administration, University of Rhode Island

NIH PROPOSAL PREP

This session will provide an overview of how to prepare NIH proposals, process JIT’s, and considerations for accepting awards. Participants will be exposed to the SF424 Grants.gov proposal package, the SF424 Application Guide for NIH and other PHS Agencies, and will learn key differences between different NIH funding mechanisms. In addition, we will cover the NIH Just-in-Time process and identify important items to consider when accepting awards.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES: Participants will be updated on current NIH guidelines.

PREREQUISITE: Participants should have experience with proposal writing.

Michelle Bulls*, Director of the Office of Policy for Extramural Research Administration, OPERA, National Institutes of Health
An International Perspective on Public Impact and Engagement

Institutions of higher education are under pressure to convince the public about the value of university research and to document how their activities engage external constituents and contribute to the common good. Federal funders of academic research increasingly require projects to include indicators of public impact and contribution to society. Governments around the world seek to capitalize on research and innovation as drivers of economic and social well-being. Many in the scientific community struggle to address the calls for greater public accountability and engagement, finding it burdensome or beyond their purview. Research development professionals around the globe are stepping up to provide the necessary support and cultivate the skills and networks required. This session will bring together a panel of research administrators from multiple countries, including representation from the UK, U.S., and EU. Panelists will share both an overview of the policies and procedures that shape this issue in their home countries, and specific strategies implemented at representative institutions. The discussion will be framed around the continuum of engagement and impact, ranging from informal education, through influencing public policy, to technology transfer.

Learning Objectives:
- Participants will be able to compare and contrast how public impact and engagement is addressed in different countries.
- Participants will identify strategies to help PIs broaden the impact of their research.

Dianne Nagy*, Grant Proposal Specialist, South Dakota University

Facilities & Administrative (F&A) Rates and the Uniform Guidance

Almost every research institution must engage in the process of negotiating federal F&A rates. Each organization faces unique challenges in preparing, submitting and negotiating F&A rates. As we go through this process, many of us often wonder if we’ve done everything we can do within the constraints of federal regulations in order to maximize our institution’s negotiated F&A rate and resulting F&A cost recovery. In this session, we will discuss strategies that may be employed to maximize F&A cost recovery, both in the preparation of your F&A rate proposal as well as during the subsequent rate negotiation and budgeting of F&A costs on grants and contracts. Participants will be encouraged to share their experiences concerning the F&A rate process. We will discuss the impact that the new Uniform Guidance will have on preparing and negotiating F&A rates and what participants are doing with these changes and what they really mean and how they impact F&A.

Learning Objectives:
- Participants will identify what an indirect cost rate is, its importance and the various types of costs recovered through the F&A rate.
- Participants will explore different types of rates and how they impact recovery and understand the process for preparing, submitting and negotiating the rate proposal.
- Participants will understand the impact the Uniform Guidance will have on the F&A rate preparation and negotiation process and cost recovery.

Alex Weekes*, Principal, ML Weekes & Company, PC
**RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION: BLACK, WHITE, & WHOLE LOT OF GRAY**

This session will focus on identifying and addressing issues in research administration when research administrators know it is not always black and white – a lot of times it is gray. Pre-award can be a lot of gray and post-award is black and white. Or is it? Find out how to tell when to hold the line or when to massage the requests made of you. This session will demonstrate best practices of pre- and post-award decisions. When is it okay to say “yes” and when do you really need to say “no,” determining the best way to handle various research processes – do you say yes, no or maybe?

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will learn to help departmental and central research administrators know when to hold the line.
- Participants will understand the difference between recommended and required.
- Participants will learn explore ways to make sure you are considering all angles.

**PREREQUISITE:** This session is intended for research administrators in managerial positions.

Jennifer Rudes*, Director of Research Administration, Sponsored Programs Office, State University of New York Upstate Medical University
Margaret Austin, Associate Director, Center for Policy Research, Syracuse University
Jason Wagoner, Director of Research and Sponsored Programs, Illinois State University

---

**Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI)**

**VETTING PROPOSALS TO SUBMIT**

In this session, we will discuss the reasons why and the ways a PUI and a research institute have attempted to manage the issues of program sustainability, realistic grant implementation, and maintaining the integrity of the institutional mission by implementing a process to vet proposals.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will gain an understanding of how vetting differs from a standard proposal review and approval.
- Participants will gain an understanding of vetting models from two different types of institutions.
- Participants will learn techniques to implement a vetting process.

Tammy Freeman*, Grants Specialist, Truckee Meadows Community College
Jennifer Laporte, Manager, Morgridge Institute for Research

---

**Career Skills/Professional Development**

**LINKEDIN: BUILDING YOUR PROFESSIONAL PROFILE FOR PROSPECTIVE OPPORTUNITIES**

This will be a discussion about how LinkedIn and other social media can be used as tools to grow your professional profile and reputation. Bring your ideas, experiences, and questions to this discussion group on how to build your professional personality on social media.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Participants will learn to help departmental and central research administrators know when to hold the line.
- Participants will understand the difference between recommended and required.
- Participants will learn explore ways to make sure you are considering all angles.

Anne Pascucci*, Director, Sponsored Programs, Christopher Newport University
10:30 am – Noon | Discussion Groups (continued)

**Career Skills/Professional Development**

**MOVING UP AND OUT: ADVANCING YOUR CAREER TO THE NEXT LEVEL**
This panel of research administrators took the next step in their careers and moved on to other institutions – some quite different from the places they were at before. Making the conscience decision to move to another institution to advance your career is complex and sensitive. This discussion will provide you with three real-world examples who all took opportunities to move to other institutions that were vastly different from their old positions and how each are making the transition work for them.

Jeanne Viviani*, Contracts & Grants Manager, Florida Polytechnic University
Rosemary Madnick, Executive Director, Office of Grants and Contracts Administration, University of Alaska Fairbanks
Robyn Remotigue, Research Manager, School of Public Health, University of North Texas Health Science Center at Fort Worth

**Clinical Research/Clinical Trials**

**CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND MENTORING NEW CLINICAL RESEARCH PROFESSIONALS**
People that are new to the industry need special training and mentoring to be effective in their role. More seasoned individuals may need special support to make it to the next level. This session will discuss the ways you can provide support to help make team members more successful and to capitalize on your investment. We all want a well trained workforce that is loyal to the institution and helps us to recruit additional talent.

Allecia Harley*, Assistant Vice President of Research Affairs and Clinical Trials Administration, Rush University Medical Center

**Compliance**

**HOW THE COMPLIANCE OFFICE INTERACTS WITH THE PRE- AND POST-AWARD OFFICES**
There are as many ways for Compliance Offices to interact with Pre- and Post-Award Offices as there are institutions attending the NCURA Annual Meeting! This discussion group will cover topics around making those interactions timely, effective, and educational for all involved. We’ll discuss pre- and post-award workflow as it relates to compliance activities, and effective ways to engage compliance at the right time. Bring your ideas and questions!

Lori Ann Schultz*, Director for Research Advancement, University of Arizona
Compliance

**SUBRECIPIENT RISK ASSESSMENTS**
The Uniform Guidance requires our institutions to “evaluate each subrecipient’s risk of noncompliance with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the subaward for purposes of determining the appropriate subrecipient monitoring…” What information should your institution gather to evaluate a subrecipient’s risk? How and when should the information be collected? Once you have the information, what do you do with it?

During this discussion group, let’s look at some existing tools and talk about process. Some institutions have created their own risk assessment tools, and FDP also has developed a risk assessment questionnaire. Come prepared to discuss how we as institutions are operationalizing this requirement and to share your challenges, as well as your successes.

**International**

**SCIENCE FOR PEACE: GLOBAL FELLOWSHIPS & GLOBAL UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS**
Research collaboration has been an instrument for promoting global collaboration and cementing diplomatic ties. In fact, as a number of studies and large scientific publication databases have shown, cross-border research tends to result in higher-caliber output as measured by journal citations and intellectual property development. Often, these partnerships and funding mechanisms do not come from the “traditional” funding agencies, and thus may by overlooked by research administrators and researchers alike. However, what is clear is that cross-border fellowships and research collaborations are a growing part of the research enterprise and are an important aspect in fostering greater collaboration and / or providing technical assistance. This discussion will focus on a number of prominent examples and themes represented by these types of granting mechanisms, how they can be found, and how successful they have been in establishing sustainable global research partnerships.

Jennifer Rodis*, University of Wisconsin Madison
Policy and Planning Analyst
Robert Gratzl, Managing Officer, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Lori Mason*, Project Director, Iraq University Linkages Program, IREX / USA
Laurens Ayvazian, Director, US-Russia Social Expertise Exchange and US-Russia University Partnership Program, Eurasia Foundation
Alison Corbett, Education Programme Manager, British Council
10:30 am – Noon | Discussion Groups (continued)

Post-Award

**PURCHASING/PROCUREMENT**
This discussion will cover the new Uniform Guidance Procurement Standards and their effect on recipient operations. The discussion will focus on general procurement standards; methods of procurement (eg., $3,000 purchasing threshold); contract cost & price analysis; subrecipient purchasing requirements; materials, supplies and computing device requirements; and, other important standards affecting procurement under the new Uniform Guidance.

**Douglas Backman**, Director, Compliance, University of Central Florida

Pre-Award

**PROJECT MANAGEMENT: TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES FOR THE PRE-AWARD ADMINISTRATOR**
Managing a project can be daunting. Every project is unique in terms of the problems that arise, the priorities and the resources assigned to it, the environment in which it operates, and the research administrator’s attitude and style used to guide and control the project activities. This discussion will serve as a platform for colleagues to discuss and share insights regarding project management techniques that can be applied to projects and situations back home.

**Andrew Gray**, Associate Director, Office of Grants and Contracts Administration, University of Alaska Fairbanks

**Samantha Aleshire**, Grant Management Officer, University of Alaska Fairbanks

Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI)

**PUI RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION: BLENDING THE BALANCE BETWEEN RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION, PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT AND POST-AWARD ADMINISTRATION**
Sponsored research offices at PUIs generally are responsible for both research development (RD) and research administration (RA) which is a tall order that requires a mix of effective advocacy and administration. What are the best approaches to ‘getting this balance right,’ and what kind of professional experience and training prepare us for this multi-faceted challenge? Join this discussion group to learn how three PUIs tackle this balancing act on facilitating faculty advocacy and collaboration, while providing all essential pre-and post-award management. Attendees are encouraged to share what infrastructure in support of RD and RA is in place at their respective institutions and come prepared to pose questions that help us illuminate best practices and lessons learned.

**Sabine Dillingham**, Director of Research and Sponsored Programs, St. Mary’s College of Maryland

**Albina Mikhaylova**, Assistant Director, Research Development, University of North Florida

**Joseph McNicholas**, Director, Office for Research and Sponsored Projects, Loyola Marymount University

**Douglas Backman**, Director, Compliance, University of Central Florida

**Andrew Gray**, Associate Director, Office of Grants and Contracts Administration, University of Alaska Fairbanks

**Samantha Aleshire**, Grant Management Officer, University of Alaska Fairbanks

**Sabine Dillingham**, Director of Research and Sponsored Programs, St. Mary’s College of Maryland

**Albina Mikhaylova**, Assistant Director, Research Development, University of North Florida

**Joseph McNicholas**, Director, Office for Research and Sponsored Projects, Loyola Marymount University
10:30 am – Noon | Discussion Group for Senior Level Administrators

**Pre-Award**

**COACHING RESEARCHERS TO WRITE SUCCESSFUL GRANT PROPOSALS**

Grants specialists are often called upon to edit grant proposals or even to coach researchers on good writing techniques. To be effective in this role, one must be comfortable with basic guidelines for style and format, as well as the actual content of a strong proposal. This discussion group will focus on common weaknesses we encounter with proposals that are brought to us, and the strategies we employ to correct them. Core topics include: Techniques to gain confidence and trust with PIs, defining the editor’s role, how to write a persuasive “sales pitch” for the proposal, and ways to get rid of some bad habits of academic writing. By the end of the discussion, participants will be more confident of their ability to help researchers obtain funding in an increasingly competitive environment.

10:30 am – Noon | Office Hours

Many participants are often tasked by their managers, researchers, and colleagues with finding an answer to a burning question at their institution. With the Office Hours sessions, we are creating an opportunity to obtain answers to those questions by subject matter experts in a one-on-one setting. The expert will be able to share their thoughts and advice directly with the individual. For participants, this is a great opportunity to learn, ask questions, and meet some of NCURA’s esteemed members.

**PRE-AWARD**

**10:30 am – Noon | Office Hours**

**Craig Reynolds**, *Associate Director, Office of Research and Sponsored Projects, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor*

**Amanda Snyder**, *Associate Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, University of Washington*

Noon | Conference Adjourns