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This issue of the NCURA magazine focuses on the anticipated changes under the new Obama Administration. These are extremely difficult times for all universities; private universities are witnessing tremendous losses due to decreasing value of their endowments, public universities across the country are facing reductions in state appropriations, and all institutions are challenged to hold the line on tuition increases during these stressful economic times. Amidst this economic "doom and gloom" the change in administration represents new opportunities and some much needed optimism.

The economic stimulus plan identifies areas of growth in research funding and anticipated support for education at all levels. And, the new administration presents opportunities to reexamine an array of research policy decisions in areas such as stem cell research and global warming, and to reduce the burdens of regulatory compliance on research administration.

In my view, the spirit of optimism under the new administration is best captured in the following lines from President Obama's Inaugural Address:

"We will restore science to its rightful place, and wield technology's wonders to raise health care's quality and lower its cost. We will harness the sun and the winds and the soil to fuel our cars and run our factories. And we will transform our schools and colleges and universities to meet the demands of a new age."

These brief remarks underscore both the opportunities for research and the obligations of the academic and scientific community to broaden its impact on society.

The Road Ahead will surely consist of twists and turns that will affect all of us in the research professions. It promises to be an exciting time. Enjoy the ride.

Jerry Pogatshnik
Co-Editor
Happy Anniversary NCURA! The 50th Annual Meeting was the kick off of the Golden Anniversary of the National Council of University Research Administrators. As we look to the year ahead and what NCURA means to all of its members in these times, let’s first reflect on how far we have come. Fifty years ago the organization had less than fifty members and currently we have over 7,000 members. When the organization was first formed, there was no NCURA Magazine (Newsletter), online chats, webinars, neighborhoods, online tutorials, NCURATV nor even one traveling road show. The strength of the organization centered solely on the Annual Meeting and the sessions it offered. Soon it became apparent that not only was the programming beneficial and instrumental in developing the knowledge and skills required to administratively facilitate the research enterprise that was beginning to boom in the educational community but the interpersonal interactions that started to develop would be invaluable. These networking opportunities turned strangers into trusted colleagues and in most cases created long lasting friendships. It has been through these long lasting friendships that we have been mentored by the best in the business and it is through our continuing that mentorship to the next generation that will allow the legacy of NCURA being the number one professional development organization for research administrators to continue. While we all face travel restrictions and other financial impediments, let’s not forget that we have each other, whether it be via a phone call or an email, we still have access to the best and brightest minds in research administration. We count on the face-to-face meetings and we treasure the interaction that that environment provides but we can still survive and even grow during these times because of the solidarity and commitment of the membership. These relationships are a pure gift, something that an uncertain economy cannot deteriorate. For that, we are thankful for the many volunteers and the many hours spent over the last 50 years building this powerful organization made up of a network of expertise and collegiality. It is through the generosity, dedication and commitment of our members that we will forge ahead to continue to provide this excellent service to our members.

In looking ahead, how do we continue to provide this level of professional development opportunities to our members? When discussing what educational programs will be offered throughout the coming year, it was evident that we must acknowledge the constraints that the current economy places on each and every one of us. Therefore, the Professional Development Committee (PDC) will be exploring all avenues, venues and media that NCURA should consider for future deliveries of our programs. In the meantime, I want to let you know the status of some of our current activities and events.

- **PRA IV:** As we examined the programming priorities for the year, we were cognizant of how many of our members would be unable to attend professional development conferences due to institutional travel restrictions in this current environment. After conferring with the Board of Directors and the Regional Leadership, the decision was made not to hold a Pre-Award Administration IV conference this Summer. We are currently exploring alternative ways to deliver pre-award content to our membership and we welcome any suggestions you may have.

- **NCURAS LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE:** We will continue the tradition of holding this important opportunity for National and Regional Leaderships to come together to discuss NCURAs Strategic Plan as well as other topics of interest that help support the growth and vitality of the membership at both levels.

- **NCURATV:** We have already launched our 2009 broadcast series with the January 13th airing of “Audits and the Audit Process.” Coming on March 10th we bring back the never ending need to hear about “Cost Sharing: Why No Good Deed Goes Unpunished.” On June 9th we will offer “F&A Rates for the Non-Accountant” and will air the final program of our series, “Subrecipient Monitoring: Assessing Risk” on September 15th.

- **51ST ANNUAL MEETING:** Our organization began with an Annual Meeting in 1958 and it is no surprise that since then the Annual Meeting has and always will be the cornerstone of who we are and what we will become. Many of our members look forward to the Annual Meeting and call it our NCURA “home.” Vice President-President Elect Dave Richardson and his program committee already have plans for AM51 well underway. It promises to be a strong program with a new venue and new format.

Under our Strategic Plan, our Core Purpose and Mission is, “NCURA serves its members and advances the profession and field of research administration.” As stated in our mission, education and professional development is the core and the heart of the organization. It is the dedication of our members and their willingness to volunteer to share their knowledge that keeps us the vibrant organization that we are. But during these critical times, what is amazing about NCURA is that we have built the number one professional development organization whose fundamental roots center around its members and their willingness to share their valuable knowledge and experiences with each other. The networking channels that we have developed have flourished over the years and will be our saving grace during these times.

**Denise Clark**

Denise Clark serves as Assistant Vice President for Research Administration and Advancement, University of Maryland College Park.

---

**MESSAGE from the NCURA President**
When the 51st Annual Meeting Program Committee met in January to begin work on this year’s meeting, they began by touring the Marriott Wardman Park Hotel – home to this year’s meeting. This newly renovated property signed on to host the 51st Annual Meeting after the Hilton Washington contacted NCURA’s Executive Director, Kathleen Larmett, to notify her that their own scheduled renovation might not be complete in time for the 2009 Annual Meeting.

“The call came in Mid-November as we were still “packing up” the 50th,” said Larmett. “The Hilton staff was truly concerned that their construction delay might cause serious problems for the 51st Annual Meeting. Rather than taking a wait and see attitude, they chose to come to us and give us the choice of waiting or relocating. We chose the proactive approach.” And so the Hilton and NCURA staffs teamed up in a fast-paced search for a new venue. Larmett continued, “Meeting space in Washington, DC, books up years in advance. To find meeting space for a five-day meeting with over 2,000 people for an event that’s less than 12 months out is unheard of.” However, within three weeks, the Marriott Wardman had been identified as a viable solution and NCURA Vice President and Program Committee Chair, Dave Richardson, along with co-chairs Michelle Vazin and Tony Ventimiglia were given a tour and agreed that the Wardman was a good fit for the meeting. Richardson said, “When Kathleen called with the news, that we had lost our annual meeting hotel, I took a deep breath, worried for about five minutes and then released the worry because I knew the NCURA staff would find a great location for our meeting.” Richardson continued, “The hotel has a large number of meeting rooms and they are located on three levels so overcrowding will not be an issue. In addition, there are many sitting areas throughout the property which opens up networking opportunities.”

The other major change, this year, is that of the meeting dates. This year, the meeting will begin with workshops and the opening night banquet on Wednesday, October 21st and will adjourn on Saturday, the 24th.

The Marriott Wardman Park Hotel is located at 2660 Woodley Road, NW, just off Connecticut Avenue and next to the Woodley Park Metro. Watch for the preliminary program announcement and hotel room block opening in late May.

Mark your calendar now for NCURA’s 51st Annual Meeting:

**OCTOBER 21 – 24, 2009**

Marriott Wardman Park Hotel
Washington, DC
Keeping with a recent tradition in presidential transitions, one of President Obama’s first acts was to stop any pending rules and regulations until the new administration has the opportunity to review each proposed rule. A growing, unheralded tradition is a push by departments and agencies to issue new rules and regulations before the arrival of a new administration. Departing administrations have tried to limit the practice.

In June 2008, Josh Bolton, chief of staff to President Bush, tried to rein in the practice by setting deadlines for submission of new rules and regulations to the Office of Management and Budget’s (OMB) Office for Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA). In a memorandum to all departments and agencies, Bolton directed that “except in extraordinary circumstances, regulations to be finalized by [the Bush] Administration should be proposed no later than June 1, 2008, and final regulations should be issued no later than November 1, 2008.” Obviously, extraordinary circumstances do emerge, notably rules or regulations required by statute, but it makes it always interesting to track the regulations issued around (and generally after) the deadline set by an administration. One can only assume it depends on what you mean by “pending.”

For example, on January 15, 2009, the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation (DFAR) Supplement was amended with the addition of fifteen new or modified rules covering issues as broad as Clean Air and Water Act Exemptions, the Law of War Program, the Removal of North Korea from the List of Terrorist Countries, and Whistleblower Protections for Contractor Employees. On the same day – January 15 – the Federal Acquisition Regulation Council issued nine final rules governing the purchase of Commercially Available Off–the–Shelf (COTS) Items, setting New Thresholds for Trade Agreements, requiring Public Disclosure of Justification and Approval Documents for Noncompetitive Contracts, and, one of my personal albatrosses, Combating Trafficking in Persons, among others. The Food and Drug Administration issued rules (Requirements for Submission of Bioequivalence Data) and draft and final guidance (drafts on Standards for Securing the Drug Supply Chain and final guidance on the Regulation of Genetically Engineered Animals among others).

Some rules and regulations issued since the requested November 1, 2008, deadline can assist colleges and universities. On December 1, 2008, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) released new alternative management requirements for generators of hazardous waste applicable to academic laboratories and affiliated research laboratories as Subpart K of 40 CFR 261 & 262, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) regulations. Subpart K is an alternative and is optional for eligible academic entities. These alternative hazardous waste management provisions rely on performance-based standards and the development of a Laboratory Management Plan that ensures “unwanted materials” are appropriately labeled and stored in labs, indentified as hazardous waste by trained environmental health and safety staff, and any identified hazardous waste is regularly
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JERRY POGATSHNIK

Jerry Pogatshnik is the Dean of the Graduate School and Associate Vice President for Research at Eastern Kentucky University, a position he has held since 2005. Prior to coming to EKU, he served for 17 years as a faculty member in the Department of Physics and then Associate Dean of the Graduate School at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville. Jerry was a member of the inaugural class of NCURA's Leadership Development Institute. He has served as chair of the Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions Neighborhood committee and the Neighborhood Programs Committee. He is currently a member of the Professional Development committee and is serving in his third year as a faculty member for the NCURA Fundamentals program.

LYNETTE ARIAS

Lynette Arias recently joined Columbia University as the Associate Vice President for Sponsored Projects Administration. Lynette's career in research administration began in 1988 at the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center and continued with positions at the University of Washington, Legacy Health Systems and most recently 9 years at Oregon Health & Science University (OHSU) in Portland, Oregon. Although focused primarily on post-award matters over the last 9 years, Lynette's background includes experience in both pre and post award grants management as well as involvement at the individual PI support level and departmental as well as central leadership roles.

JAMES CASEY

James Casey is Director of Contracts and Industrial Agreements at The University of Texas at San Antonio. A research administrator since 1994 and NCURA member since 1995, he has been a member of the Wisconsin Bar since 1990. He is currently co-editor of the NCURA Magazine, chair of the International Neighborhood, member of the International Commission, and a member of the Professional Development Committee. Previously he served on the National Board of Directors, as editor of the Research Management Review, and as a member of the Research Management Review editorial board. He is also a co-chair of the International Research Collaborations project sponsored by the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUILR).
DENNIS BARNES spent some 23 years at the University of Virginia as Associate Provost for Research and then as Associate Vice President for Governmental Relations. He took a leave to serve in the Executive Office of President Gerald Ford in 1976 and served as Chief Scientist of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Science from 1980-1983. After leaving U.Va. in 1992 he served 6 years as President of the Southeastern Universities Research Association (SURA), a consortium of 45 universities that managed a Department of Energy nuclear physics accelerator in Virginia and built the high speed network, SURAnet, as part of the NSF’s national high speed network for research and education. He served as Chair of Region III from 1976-78. He was NCURA president in 1980, and was awarded the NCURA Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award in 1996.

CAROL J. BLUM is Director for Research Compliance and Administration at the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR). Before joining COGR in 2001, Carol served Ohio University for ten years as associate vice president for research after three years at the Ohio Board of Regents as director of graduate and special programs. She holds a PhD in history from the University of Cincinnati. She has recently begun exercising the right side of her brain in art classes and continues to volunteer at the Washington Literacy Council and Washington Area (Reproductive Health) Clinic Defense Task Force.

JOHN CARFORA is Executive Director of the Office for Research and Sponsored Projects at Loyola Marymount University, and is considered a leading authority on international research collaborations. He has received numerous awards, including the Distinguished Service Award from the National Council of University Research Administrators in 2007.

JOHN CARUSO. Coming off nearly twenty years in education, he first entered the world of research administration nearly seven years ago when he was hired to develop a comprehensive in-house training program on post-award grants management at Oregon Health & Science University (OHSU) in Portland, Oregon. He has waded considerably deeper into the profession since then, becoming Manager of Information Systems & Campus Relations, working for a time as a financial analyst, and serving as Interim Senior Manager while the Sponsored Projects Administration office was recruiting a new director.

ALAN I. LEshNER is Chief Executive Officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) and Executive Publisher of its journal, Science. Previously Dr. Leshner had been Director of the National Institute on Drug Abuse at the National Institutes of Health (NIH), and Deputy Director and Acting Director of the National Institute of Mental Health. Before that, he held a variety of senior positions at the National Science Foundation. Dr. Leshner began his career at Bucknell University, where he was Professor of Psychology. Dr. Leshner is an elected member (and on the governing Council) of the Institute of Medicine of the National Academies of Science, and a fellow of AAAS, the National Academy of Public Administration, and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He was appointed by the U.S. President to the National Science Board, and is a member of the Advisory Committee to the Director of NIH. He received an A.B. in Psychology from Franklin and Marshall College and M.S. and Ph.D. in Physiological Psychology from Rutgers University. Dr. Leshner has been awarded six honorary Doctor of Science degrees.

CANDYCE LINDSAY is the Assistant Director of Research Administration at Arizona State University. She is responsible for the oversight of the Sponsored Projects Services team and has been with ASU for six years. Candyce has been an active member of NCURA since 2004 when she joined the Pre-Award Neighborhood Committee. Candyce completed the Leadership Development Institute in November of 2008 and has joined the Planning Committee for NCURA’s 51st Annual Meeting. Candyce lives in Tempe, AZ with her husband and two sons.

MARIO R. MEDINA. has spent his entire professional career, for the past 18 years, in Higher Ed. of which almost 15 years have been with the University of Texas on 3 different campuses. His most significant research administration work was with the University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio in the Medical School, where he spent almost 10 years. He is currently working at the University of Texas at San Antonio as The Director of Business Operations for Institute for Economic Development administering federal funding for Economic Development in South Texas.

CHRISTINE PACHECO has been working for the University of New Mexico for 12 years and most recently with the Department of Internal Medicine. She served as the Sr. Contract & Grant Administrator within the Sponsored Projects Services Office at main campus for 3 years. Prior to that, she was the Vice President of Development at a local non-profit in Albuquerque. Her experience there included fundraising, grants writing, and restricted fund monitoring. Prior to that, she was at the UNM Health Sciences Center and served in a number of capacities to include her 3 years experience in the Controller’s Office as a Contract & Grant Administrator. Christine has an Associate of Science in Business Administration from Enterprise State Junior College and a Bachelor of Arts in Business Administration with a minor in Information Systems from New Mexico Highlands University. She has also complete 36 hours towards an MBA at New Mexico Highlands University.

VICKY RATCLIFFE serves as the Training Coordinator for the Office of Sponsored Programs at Virginia Tech. In this role, Vicky manages the Sponsored Programs outreach, education programs, and learning systems. She also is responsible for partnering with stakeholders in the University community to provide the direction, planning, leadership, and overall management of training initiatives. Vicky created and managed the formal training program titled the Virginia Tech Research Administrator Certificate Program and developed an online training matrix for assessing, documenting, and evaluating employee performance. Vicky received a B.S. in Psychology, an MBA from Radford University, and is currently enrolled in the Master’s of Business Administration at Radford University. In this role, she works in the public safety field for 10 years. During that time she became a Department of Criminal Justice Services Certified General Instructor and Field Trainer. Vicky also has four years experience in writing grants and serving as Project Manager on several federal and state funded projects.

NAOMI SCHIRAG is the Associate Vice President for Research Compliance in the Office of the Executive Vice President for Research. She oversees work on issues such as research misconduct, conflict-of-interest and international research compliance, and collaborates closely with other offices across the University to develop integrated approaches to compliance and training. Before joining Columbia in January 2006, Ms. Schrag practiced law for nine years, focusing on regulatory compliance and litigation involving biomedical research, with clients including pharmaceutical companies and not-for-profit organizations. Ms. Schrag also clerked in the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. Ms. Schrag graduated from New York University School of Law in 1995. Before entering law school, she worked on an oral history of the Holocaust for the Museum of Jewish Heritage.

TOM WILSON is the Senior Research Administrator and Assistant Vice President at Rush University Medical Center in Chicago, Illinois. Prior to coming to Rush, Tom Wilson had over 30 years of experience in research administration at the Texas Medical Center in Houston, the Beckman Research Institute of the City of Hope and the University of Arizona. Tom’s responsibilities have included all aspects of pre-award and post-award research administration and he has been a member of National Council of University Research Administrators since 1987. He has served on the NCUA Board of Directors, Executive Committee, as member and Chair of the Nominations Committee, Chair of the Professional Development Committee and is the NCUA representative on the NIH Commons Working Group. Tom has been a frequent presenter at the NCUA annual meeting, regional meetings, and workshops on a variety of topics in research administration and has authored and co-authored a number of NCUA publications. Tom received a B.S. in Accounting from Rutgers University, and a M.B.A. from the University of Arizona.
American science is in the midst of one of the most exciting and challenging times in its history. I often think we are living that purported ancient Chinese curse “May you live in interesting times!”

On the one hand, scientific progress has never been greater. We have seen both rapid incremental advances in every field and many nearly transformative advances, most as a result of the emergence of new technologies that allow us to attack questions we never could ask before. As just one example, in my own field of behavioral neuroscience, who thought 50 years ago that we could look into the brains of living, awake, behaving individuals and watch their minds in action, as we can using modern neuroimaging technologies? These kinds of abilities are transforming our understanding of how brain activity can generate mental activity, and revolutionizing our concepts of phenomena like mental illnesses and addiction.

At the same time that the science is going so well, the economy is in terrible shape, and we are in the fourth year in a row of decreased research funding, when measured in constant dollars. On the optimistic side, President Obama appears to value science greatly, and his early appointments to science leadership positions are superb. His campaign rhetoric included recognition of the need to invest heavily in science and technology to fuel economic growth and solve science-related problems, like climate disruption and energy shortages.

Early indications are that President Obama will at least try to deliver on those promises. The economic stimulus package includes large investments in science, science infrastructure and science education, but there is no way to know yet whether those investments will survive the inevitable negotiations. Moreover, if they do come about, will they be short-lived, one time infusions of money, or can they survive through very constrained budget processes over the next few years and remain in the funding base? We certainly do not want continuing rollercoaster science funding levels as we have seen for the National Institutes of Health (NIH) over the last few years; it disrupts our system badly. Let us hope that we can at least find a stable rate of funding growth that exceeds inflation, even if it does not meet our greatest hopes on a year-by-year basis.

No matter how the funding situation evolves, everyone expects the new President to trigger many dramatic changes in America’s social, economic and political systems. With those changes will come opportunities and challenges for the U.S. science and technology enterprise. We need to work now to ensure that the scientific community is prepared to meet them effectively.

For example, whether long- or short-lived, any large amount of additional funding, though welcome, will inevitably challenge greatly not only the funding agencies that need to dispense and administer the funds but also universities and their research administrators. Proposals will have to be written very rapidly and reviewed pre-submission through greatly streamlined internal processes that still maintain high levels of quality control and accountability. The amount of energy expended in compliance oversight for the myriad regulations and policies surrounding the conduct of research will increase exponentially. And new facilities will have to be planned and built.

As we deal with these pressures, we might also seize the mood of change and reform and attend in a focused way to some long-standing problems impeding the progress of science and technology that go beyond funding levels and their direct consequences. Problems that need addressing are both internal and external to the enterprise.

A major, mostly externally controlled problem is how to maintain the flow around the world of scientists, their students and ideas in the face of real security concerns. The “visa problem” has gotten better in the last few years, but it is by no means resolved. Ambiguous export control regulations and information classification schemes also impede progress unnecessarily. As the new administration is re-committing the country to using science to deal with global problems like climate disruption, energy shortages and environmental degradation, American scientists and policymakers need to be able to draw on the entire world-wide science community. Moreover, American science benefits greatly from progress in other places in the world. We need to increase the pressure on policymakers to find solutions to visa, export control and similar impediments. Our system needs to reflect fully the fact that, in the 21st century, science is truly global in character and that it requires the free flow of people and their ideas.

We should also seize the spirit of “change” and address in a significant way the ever-increasing burden of regulation compliance that surrounds the conduct of science. I argued this point in a recent editorial in Science (Science, 322: 2008, 1609) but it merits mention again here. Over the past decades, the administrative burden on both scientists and the institutions that support them has risen to an untenable level. A 2007 study by the Federal Demonstration Partnership (A Profile of Federal-Grant Administrative Burden among Federal Demonstration Partnership Faculty) reported that 42%
of an average scientist’s research time is devoted to pre- and post-award administrative and regulatory compliance tasks. The most time-consuming of these include too frequent progress-report submissions, complex and inconsistent rules for project-revenue management, and institutional review board (IRB) protocol development and revisions. The need to respond to new post-9/11 security concepts like “dual use research” or “sensitive but unclassified” science has added substantially to the workload. And a great burden is imposed by the variation among the rules propagated by different funding agencies and sponsoring institutions. It would seem appropriate for university research administrators to join the call for significant regulatory reform surrounding the conduct of science, recognizing both the need to satisfy the justified intent of the diverse regulations and policies while at the same time rationalizing and streamlining them.

Finally, the relationship of science to the rest of society has been experiencing significant tension, and there is a central role for universities in addressing scientific issues in the public realm. The health of American science is dependent on public confidence and support, and there are problems within the scientific enterprise that are undermining them. Moreover, as science progresses and at times abuts heavily against issues of core human values — like embryonic stem cell research or teaching evolution versus creationism in public schools -- there is a great need for a new paradigm of science communication with the public, and universities can play a role there as well.

In the first case, we need to do a better job making clear to the public that we are working seriously to address oversight and handling of such issues as scientific misconduct, human subjects concerns, and animal welfare. We need to articulate more clearly that we understand conflict of interest issues and are working intensively to develop better guidelines and enforcement mechanisms. Public confidence depends on the belief that the scientific community can keep its house fully in order. This is difficult to achieve in the face of a public press that relishes any hint of scandal in the ivory towers, but it merits increased energy.

We also need both to increase the extent and change the form of our communications with the rest of society. We need to adopt a public “engagement” model, rather than simply relying on the traditional public “education” or public “understanding” model. I have argued this point in detail elsewhere (e.g., Science 299: 2003, 977; Am. J. Bioethics 5: 2005, 1-2; Chron. Higher Educ., October 13, 2006) but mention it here because I believe universities could be central players in public engagement with science. The traditional approach of trying to educate our way out of contentious science-society controversies is no longer working. In many cases, the public does understand enough of the science to know it does not like what it is revealing, and therefore chooses to disregard or distort the science. And, of course, only scientists are bound by scientific discoveries. Other people can take them or leave them as they choose.

The approach many of us advocate is to forge a dialogue with the public, rather than communicating at or to the public. We need to work to find areas of common ground and ways to move forward while recognizing, respecting and responding to the public’s reasonable concerns. This approach, typically called “public engagement with science,” has taken hold in many places in Europe, Canada, and Asia, and is slowly gathering adherents in the United States as people recognize its benefits. The domain where this strategy has been most visibly successful is the array of issues surrounding the Human Genome Project and subsequent genetic discoveries. Engaging the public in the issues surrounding advances in genetic understanding has helped forestall many potential problems.

Universities have an important leadership role to play in this. They are ideal venues through which to develop public engagement programs, and they should encourage their faculties to participate. Effective public engagement is an acquired skill, so faculty and students will need some training. But it will be worth it. The resultant benefits will be less science-society tension and greater public support of the scientific enterprise.

My bottom line, then, is that in these interesting times, we should exploit the mood of change and opportunity. There are some long overdo systemic changes that need to be made in the American scientific enterprise and how it is regulated and funded. There is much we can do to strengthen the relationship of science to the rest of society. We in the scientific community should take the lead, seize the moment, and ensure we get those changes made.

Alan I. Leshner is the chief executive officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) and executive publisher of Science. Dr. Leshner may be reached at aleshner@aaas.org.
IN the present climate of a new presidential administration, uncertain funding priorities, and increasing regulatory burdens, it is still important for institutions of higher education to establish, expand, and/or strengthen sponsored programs and similar associated offices. Why is this important? It is important because a productive office can generate greater value for its institution, especially at a predominantly undergraduate institution (PUI) or emerging research institution (ERI). The need remains, but the justification for it may change. In other words, these offices are necessary regardless of whether the economy is prosperous or in the doldrums.

As a research administrator, I have established two sponsored program-related offices and expanded a third to full-time status since 2000. The experiences gained during those tenures are priceless in developing a unique perspective on research management. As a result, I offer the following observations and tips to research administrators who have the opportunity to build or nearly build from the ground up.

Observe the Big Picture. It is easy for research administrators to fall into the trap of focusing on the trees and ignoring the forest; this is quite common. Obviously, a prompt and professional level of service to faculty and staff is of paramount importance. Building bridges on campus between previously isolated academic units is another Big Picture item commonly mentioned in developing grants offices. Building two-way relationships with funding agencies is also critically important.

Move beyond the processing mindset. Sure, grants offices, regulatory offices, and contracts offices are on one level processing offices, the efficient movement of paperwork between internal and external offices. But more significantly, such offices are offices of opportunity: opportunity to engage faculty and remove negative impressions; opportunity to develop new ways of doing business; opportunity to find new intellectual opportunities and partnerships. Developing offices of opportunity gives the research administrator the chance to craft, to leave a stamp beyond bureaucratic efficiency. Moving beyond a processing mindset is important regardless of what the official “mission” of the office may be.

Reconsider and visualize your office’s role in the university structure. Working with more senior leaders in your areas of the university, visualize a different reality a year from now. Do you want an office which plays an integral part in delivering your university’s research agenda and of which you can be proud? Visualize how to achieve it.

Think strategically and laterally. This is the Big Picture, coupled with the desire to implement on a consistent, vigorous time schedule. It will help you achieve a different role for your office in the university structure. Priorities need to be set, whether they are developing policy and procedure, faculty outreach, or training for other university staff. Thinking strategically also allows for being “creative,” a word not usually associated with research administration.

Communicate. Well. University research administrators need to do a better job at communicating consistently and precisely to internal and external partners. It is no longer enough to do just enough communication between heavy deadlines. One topic that research administration should focus more on is communication between research administrators in a hierarchical structure. With stronger internal communication, job satisfaction increases, and productivity is enhanced.

These conclusions are part of the essence of the two Laws of Communication as outlined by Dr. Richard Schuttler (www.lawsofcomm.com), a project involving this author: 1) Failure of supervisors to communicate with subordinates results in poor employee performance; and 2) Failure of the organization to effectively communicate results in poor organizational performance.

Build technical expertise. Not only is this necessary within your office, it is also necessary at the department level. Central administration must insist that departmental administrators strengthen their expertise. In many cases it is no longer enough to rely on central administration for service and allow departmental administrators to just “get by” or to be inadequately trained.

Create a professional and welcoming office atmosphere. Create an office that constituents will want to visit and staff will want to work in – for its “vibe” as well as its appearance. Be proud of your entrance areas, where the faculty come for meetings or drop paperwork off. Create something beyond that of the normal bureaucratic mindset. Create uniqueness.

Learn from the past. “Those who don’t learn from the past are condemned to repeat it.” We have all heard this phrase, but what does it really mean for research administrators? If you are creating a revamped grants office, listen to what faculty and staff say about the office as it was before. What was good and bad about it? What did it facilitate and what did it prevent? As I have said for a number of years now, create a culture of “yes,” not a culture of “no.”
Instill a mindset of lifelong learning. As leaders in the office, directors and assistant directors should create a culture of lifelong learning in the profession. Any research administrator worth his or her salt knows that staying current in the field is a professional necessity. Falling behind, as measured by professional training, is no longer an option. Professional development programs, such as those offered by NCURA, are an integral component of this observation.

Know when to fit in. Know when to stand out. Research administrators are used to fitting in and knowing their place (as second fiddle to the faculty, in general). But, one thing I have learned after fifteen years within the profession is that it is good to stand out – at appropriate times and in measured doses. Be assertive when necessary – whether on behalf of your institution or your staff. Call it as you see it, but always in a constructive manner. And always be mindful of the Big Picture. This goes to the broader lesson that effective research management is part art, part science.

Share credit. Sharing credit with others is one of retired Gen. Colin Powell’s rules for success, as articulated in a recent issue of Success Magazine (February 2009). In fact, I would go further than that by saying that always give others credit first, then pat yourself on the back. Remember, research administration is a team sport.

Conclusion

In these most interesting of days for our country and for the research administration profession, it is imperative to rethink our profession for the challenges ahead of us. We expect our Washington representatives to change. We elected a new president based upon his promises of change. It is only appropriate that we should change—

to make the profession stronger and more valuable. The question is: Do we have the desire and will to change? An equally important question is: Is bureaucratic inertia too strong to allow for change?

This need to change and think differently is especially true in the area of building offices of opportunity. As a research administrator, stretch your skill set by building such offices. Whether or not you stay in smaller research administration offices, your professional skill set and experience base will be permanently stronger. And that is what I call a win-win situation.

James Casey is Director of Contracts and Industrial Agreements at The University of Texas at San Antonio, co-editor of the NCURA Magazine, and Chair of the International Neighborhood. The author thanks Saveria Dimasi, Director of Legal Services at the University of Melbourne, for her feedback during preparation of this article.
Greetings from Region I! First, I’d like to thank our Immediate Past Chair, Tom Egan, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Secretary, John Harris, Northeastern University, for the terrific work they did for the region in 2009. Luckily, both will continue in their roles as Advisory Committee members as I and our new Secretary, Sara Clabby from Northeastern University, follow in their footsteps. And thank you as well to all of Region I’s many volunteers, including our Officers, Standing Committee members, and Advisory Committee members, who work tirelessly to provide excellent educational, networking, and other offerings for the region.

Many of us are looking forward to the end of winter for obvious reasons. I’m looking forward to it because, in addition to the longer days and warmer temperatures that portend a transformation from white to green, it means we’ll be much closer to holding our Region I Spring Meeting. This year’s meeting will be hosted by the beautiful Grand Summit Hotel at Mount Snow, Vermont from May 3-6, 2009. Kudos to our terrific site committee, consisting of Christine Bothe, Chair, Dartmouth College, Lee Picard, Brandeis University, and Barbara Richard, Harvard Pilgrim Health Care, for their efforts to identify this outstanding venue.

Susan Zipkin, Chair-Elect, Brigham & Women's Hospital, is heading up this year's Spring Meeting program along with co-Chairs Stacy Riseman, Franklin W. Olin College of Engineering and Denise Rouleau, New England School of Acupuncture, and their hard working committee. A full slate of more than 50 workshops, concurrent sessions, discussion groups, and attendee activities is planned, including ample opportunities for newcomers and long timers to learn, network and refresh. We hope you will consider joining us as we head for the mountains to reach the peak of success as research administrators!

As of this writing, other Region I educational initiatives in 2009 include our Research Administrators Discussion Group (RADG) meeting series, the planning for which is well underway, as well as "Essentials in Research Administration" and "Advanced Topics" workshops. The first three RADG meetings of 2009 are scheduled for February, April, and June and promise to offer topics of interest for everyone. Please visit the Region I web site often for the latest updates on all educational offerings!

Speaking of web sites, Region I is currently redesigning its web site to make it more functional and add new features for our members. An ad hoc committee, consisting of Karen Woodward Massey, Chair, Harvard University, Noelle Donahue, MIT, Denise Rouleau, New England School of Acupuncture, and Gary Smith, Massachusetts General Hospital, has created a committee charter to address each phase of the redesign, which we hope to have completed just prior to the NCURA 51st Annual Meeting in October. Stay tuned for updates!

Other regional initiatives for 2009 include further refining the mentor program that saw its debut at last year's Spring Meeting in Brewster, MA, updating Region I’s Strategic Plan, and fine tuning the many volunteer position descriptions that help to define how we conduct regional business. Please feel free to contact me with questions and suggestions for improving your Region I membership experience. I look forward to hearing from you or seeing you at an upcoming event!

Franc Lemire is the Chair of Region I and serves as the Director of Sponsored Programs at Worcester Polytechnic Institution.

What's happening in YOUR Region?
We have an amazing regional Program Committee, chaired by Greg Slack and co-chaired by Jared Littman, which is in the process of finalizing the details for our Spring Meeting at Loews Hotel in Annapolis, Maryland on April 26 – 28, 2009. While I know most (if not all) institutions are experiencing financial strains, compliance and regulatory issues are becoming more complicated and burdensome, and that is even more of a reason for you to make every effort to come see us. With the theme “Navigational Tools for Smooth Sailing in the Seas of Research Administration,” we are focusing on providing knowledge and tools for getting through these tough times.

For the 2010 regional meeting, the votes are in and we will be going to Charleston, West Virginia. With the mountains, rivers and shops, there will be plenty of fun wrapped around what is always a useful and informative meeting. I want to thank the Site Location Committee for doing such an excellent job in identifying and researching several great sites for our meeting.

One last note, Mary Louise mentioned in her last article that the winner of our election for Chair for next year is Joe Sullivan. Joe is currently serving our country in Iraq and is participating via email until his return in May. So, send good thoughts to Joe and look forward to his return in May.

Always feel free to contact me if you are interested in volunteering or have thoughts, needs, or suggestions. I am here for you and all of us should be here for the region!

Alexandra (Alex) McKeown is Chair of Region II and serves as Associate Dean for Research Administration at Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health.

The Spring Region III Meeting will take place at the Marriott Bay Point Resort in Panama City, Florida from May 3-6, 2009—not Mother’s Day weekend this time, but rather during Cinco de Mayo, which commemorates the 1862 Mexican victory over the French army. The conference theme is “Innovative Strategies: The Necessary Tools to Win the Battle.”

The registration form and a draft version of the program will be uploaded to the Region III website in the coming weeks, and we encourage all Region III members to review it. While we are aware of budget cuts and travel freezes across the country, we would like to encourage everyone to attend this wonderful meeting. Members can drive and save airfare costs or minimize travel expenses by choosing to room with colleagues.

During the meeting, Region III will conduct a fundraiser benefiting Shelterbox USA, a non-profit disaster relief organization that provides shelter and tools to families to sustain them immediately following a natural disaster. A representative from Shelterbox USA will make a presentation during the Region III meeting, and members can learn more about the organization at http://www.shelterboxusa.org/. We will have donation cans at the meeting, as well as other fundraising activities.

In keeping with the conference and fundraiser’s shared theme of overcoming adversity, our keynote speaker, Dr. Felicia Coleman of Florida State University will discuss the ecology of fish! Like us, they face the challenges of living in complex environments and social settings, choosing primary real estate, and migrating long distances. She will also discuss her experiences with research policy and research administration.

The conference program will feature topics of interest to research administrators in both pre-award and post-award areas. There will be two full-day workshops, one of which will be a train-the-trainer session offered by Sam Gannon. Participants will hone their training skills, which could benefit them at their institutions and within NCURA. Also on the agenda will be 25 concurrent sessions and 4 discussion groups on a wide range of topics, including regulatory compliance, professional development, departmental research administration, intellectual property, and contracting.

Volunteers are always needed and appreciated. These opportunities do not require a large time commitment and are a great way to get involved and get to know your colleagues. Please visit the Volunteer Opportunities page on the Region III website to learn how you can get involved: http://www.ncuraregioniii.com/volunteers.htm.

Finally, a brief membership update: Region III now has 1,459 members, comprising 21% of the national organization’s membership. Let’s keep growing! Please encourage your colleagues to join and also attend the upcoming Region III meeting. We hope to see you this spring!

Laura Lebeter and Sam Gannon serve as Region III’s Magazine team. Laura is the Director of Proposal Development for the Office of Grants and Contracts at Kennesaw State University. Sam Gannon is the Education and Training Manager for the Office of Grants and Contracts Management at Vanderbilt University Medical Center.

continued on next page ➤
Time to Get Ready for Spring!!
The annual Region IV meeting will take place in Minneapolis, Minnesota from April 26-29, 2009 at the University Radisson Hotel. The theme this year is “Bridging the Gap – A Year for Change in Research Administration.”

The keynote speaker will be Roberto Ballarini, James L. Record Professor and Head of the Department of Civil Engineering at the University of Minnesota. Dr. Ballarini will discuss the investigation of the I-35 bridge collapse which occurred in Minneapolis in 2007 and national implications.

This year's Program Committee is chaired by Jaynee Tolle, University of Cincinnati. Jamie Caldwell, Loyola University and Connie Motoki, Washington University, St. Louis are serving as co-chairs.

The Region IV update will be continually updated with information about the Minneapolis meeting.

Call for Nominations:
Region IV Officers and Board of Directors
Dave Lynch, Mayo Clinic, Chair of the Nominations Committee is seeking candidates for four open positions on the Region IV Board of Directors. The four positions that need to be filled are:

- Chair-Elect - serves a one-year term, beginning immediately after the Spring regional meeting, followed by one year as Region IV Chair and a third year as immediate past Chair.
- At-Large Board Member (2 positions) - each of these individuals will serve a two year term on the Region IV Board.
- Region IV Elected Member to the National Board of Directors – this person will serve a two year term on the National Board of Directors and is invited to serve a concurrent two year term as a member of the Region IV Board of Directors.

The Awards Committee is Seeking Nominees for Regional Awards
David Ngo, University of Wisconsin and the regional Awards Committee are seeking recommendations for the following honors:

- Distinguished Service Award
- The Kevin Reed Outstanding New Professional Award
- Meritorious Contributions Award
- Special Merit and Distinction Award
- Spring Travel Award

Eligibility criteria for these awards as well as for information on nominations and elections can be found on the Region IV website at www.ncuraregioniv.com.

See you in Minneapolis!

Sue Keehn is Chair of Region IV and serves as the Director of the Institutional Review Board at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Region V Spring Meeting
Spring is just around the corner, and Vice-Chair, Gail Davis and her program committee are gearing up for the 2009 regional meeting to be held in San Antonio, April 26-29, at the Westin Riverwalk Hotel. The theme of this year's meeting is “Fiesta: Celebrating and Enhancing Our Roles as Research Administrators.” Gail and her committee have put together an outstanding slate of workshops, sessions, and events. A preliminary schedule and registration for both the hotel and conference is available online at http://www.ncuraregionv.com/spring-meeting09.htm.

The conference room rate is $159. The cut-off date for hotel reservations is April 3, so please register as soon as possible for both the hotel and the meeting! You can also find out more about our host city, San Antonio, by checking out the “Travel Info” section of the site.

Region V Elections
Ty Lane, Chair of the Nominating Committee, put out a call for nominations for the following regional positions:

- Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect
- Secretary
- Region V Elected Member on the National Board of Directors
- 2 Ad Hoc Regional Executive Committee members

The National Office will conduct the election for these positions in early April. When the ballots are sent, please take a minute to review each candidate’s statement summarizing their experience and the justification for their candidacy. Your participation in the voting process is crucial – PLEASE VOTE!!

Travel Awards and Distinguished Services Award
We are accepting requests for travel awards to the spring meeting (2 awarded at $500 each) and nominations for the Region V Distinguished Service Award. Information and nomination forms are posted on the Region V website (http://www.ncuraregionv.com/administration.htm). Contact Kay Ellis at kay.ellis@Austin.utexas.edu if you have any questions.

Promotions and Achievements
Please join me in congratulating Lisa Thompson, Director, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at the University of Tulsa, who accepted a position with Monsanto in St. Louis, Missouri. Lisa, thank you for everything you have done for Region V. You will be missed!
If you know of anyone who has been promoted, changed jobs, or has a noteworthy accomplishment, please email me at kay.ellis@austin.utexas.edu.

Don’t forget to vote and register for the hotel and conference – see you in San Antonio!

Kay Ellis is the Chair of Region V and serves as Associate Director, Export Control Officer, in the Office of Sponsored Projects, University of Texas at Austin.

REGION VI

www.ogrd.wsu.edu/r6ncura

Southwestern art, the feel of beautifully crafted turquoise and silver jewelry, the intriguing art of Georgia O'Keefe—all of this and more plus an outstanding array of professional development opportunities awaits Region VI and VII university research administrators at our joint meeting to be held April 5-8 in Santa Fe, New Mexico. The theme of this year’s meeting is “The Art of Research Administration: Encouraging Creativity in a Time of Change.” Please visit the Regional Meeting website at http://www.ogrd.wsu.edu/r6ncura/regional_meetings.asp to view the short and long versions of the program that this year's program committee has crafted. At this same site you may sign up to help out at the meeting—we know from experience that our volunteers are critical to a successful meeting! Also, please remember to make your room reservations at The La Fonda on the Plaza by calling 800-523-5002. For faxed reservations, the number is 505-954-3599. On-line reservations can be made at http://www.lafondasantafe.com/email-group.html. Be sure to identify yourself as attending the NCURA Spring Conference to get the group rate.

Many Region VI NCURA members will be providing leadership to our region in 2009. Join me in thanking each of them in advance for the fine work I know they’ll do in advancing the goals of our region. The 2009 Regional Advisory Committee members are: Sue Abeles, University of California, Los Angeles; Csilla Csaplar, Stanford University; Maggie Griscavage, University of Alaska, Fairbanks; Julie Guggino, Central Washington University; Anne Hannigan, Stanford University; Nancy Lewis, University of California, Santa Barbara; Rosemary Madnick, Charles R. Drew University of Medicine & Science; Bruce Morgan, University of California, Riverside; Sinh Simmons, University of Washington; and Kimberly Small, Washington State University. The chairs of our regional standing committees are Ann Pollack, University of California, Los Angeles, Awards Committee; Joseph McNicholas, Loyola Marymount University, Membership and Volunteer Committee, and Linda Patton, University of California, Fullerton, Education and Professional Development Committee. In addition, Georgette Sakumoto, University of Hawaii, is our regionally elected member to the National Board of Directors and Katherine Ho, Stanford University, was elected to the National Board of Directors. Mich Pane, Stanford University, serves on the National Professional Development Committee and John Carfora, Loyola Marymount University, is our regional representative to the National Nominating and Leadership Development Committee. Positions yet to be filled include the chair of the Regional Nominating Committee and a position on the Regional Advisory Committee.

Last year’s leaders and volunteers accomplished much—a Strategic Plan was adopted; our by-laws and administrative procedures were revised; two new standing committees, the Membership and Volunteer Committee and the Education and Professional Development Committee, were established; the travel award program was revised and expanded; and the joint Region VI/VII spring meeting in Portland, Oregon was a huge success. The 2009 leaders and volunteers are eager to build on their accomplishments. One of our goals for this year is to expand the region’s education and development programs beyond the spring meeting. Our new Education and Professional Development Committee will spearhead this initiative. Another goal is to address issues and concerns related to the region’s web site. An ad hoc Web Site Committee will lead this initiative. We would also like to continue to ensure sufficient financial resources to meet our region’s emerging professional development needs and strengthen our members’ opportunities for networking and professional growth in the ever-evolving field of research administration.

I encourage you to check out the opportunities to become more involved. Many volunteer opportunities are available—and the more you give the more you gain! To learn more about Region VI activities and the April 5-8 Region VI/VII meeting in Santa Fe, please visit our website at http://www.ogrd.wsu.edu/r6ncura/.

I look forward to seeing you and our Region VII colleagues in Santa Fe this spring!

Julie Guggino is Chair of Region VI and serves as Research and Sponsored Programs Administrator at Central Washington University in Ellensburg, Washington.

REGION VII

ncuraregionvii.unm.edu

As I write my first column as Chair of Region VII, our new President, Barack Obama, has been sworn into office. This is a very exciting time! Change is all around us and Region VII is no exception. We have new officers, new volunteer opportunities and new reasons to come together to learn and grow.

Many members of Region VII are working hard with their Region VI colleagues to finalize workshop and program presentations for our Regions VI & VII Spring Conference to be held April 5-8, 2009 in Santa Fe, New Mexico. “The Art of Research Administration: Encouraging Creativity in a Time of Change” is our theme. We hope you will join us in this beautiful setting to discover new and creative ways to encourage faculty, deal with deadlines and ever changing regulations, renew and refresh through professional development, and do more with less as we struggle with economic challenges. Please visit the Regional Meeting website at: http://www.ogrd.wsu.edu/r6ncura/regional_meetings.asp to take a continued on next page ▶
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look at the long and short versions of this year’s outstanding program. Registration and hotel information is posted on the Region VII website at: http://ncuraregionvii.unm.edu. Make your reservations early to visit the oldest capital city in the United States and take part in the Regional Meeting at the La Fonda on the Plaza!

As the term of some of our officers has come to an end, we would like to thank the outgoing members of the Regional Executive Committee for their leadership: Winnie Ennenga, Chair, Northern Arizona University; Josie Jimenez, Immediate Past Chair, New Mexico State University; and Deb Murphy, Member at Large, Arizona State University. Josie is also stepping down as the regionally-elected Member to the National Board of Directors. We would also like to thank Jackie Hinton for her hard work and service as our Membership and Volunteer Coordinator. Karen Henry, Member at Large, Boise State University, and Kate Green, Secretary/Treasurer, University of New Mexico, will continue for one more year in their respective roles. New officers joining Karen, Kate and me in 2009 are: Winnie Ennenga, Immediate Past Chair; Deb Murphy, Chair-Elect; and Ralph Brown, Member at Large, Colorado School of Mines. Kathi Delehoy, Colorado State University, is the incoming regionally-elected Member to the National Board of Directors and Winnie Ennenga has been chosen as my replacement to the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee. We are very excited to have Christine Pacheco, University of New Mexico, serving this year as our Membership and Volunteer Coordinator. We are also very fortunate to have other members of our region serving on National Committees and on the Board of Directors. Denise Wallen, University of New Mexico, is the Chair of the Professional Development Committee and Judy Fredenberg, University of Montana, is the Chair of the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee. Josie Jimenez is a member of the Professional Development Committee and Bo Bogdanski, Colorado State University, is a member of the Board of Directors. We hope all members will step up, volunteer to take on new responsibilities, and join us in making the Rocky Mountain Region a stronger and more vibrant organization.

I look forward to seeing you in Santa Fe!!!

Dianne Horrocks is Chair of Region VII and serves as Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at Idaho State University.

NCURA Awards Planning Grants

NCURA is pleased to announce that the following 4 institutions received grants from NCURA to study the feasibility of establishing an online masters’ degree program in research administration: Central Michigan University, Rush University Medical Center, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, and the University of Baltimore.

The grants comprise an award of $10,000 each of 7-month’s duration designed to "jump-start" the development of one or more on-line master’s degree programs in research administration by making funds available for up to 4 feasibility studies. NCURA received 10 strong proposals in response to the RFP it issued last October, and the review panel had a difficult time making its final decision. We look forward to the results of the 4 awardee institutions’ efforts.

NCURA would like to express its appreciation to all of the submitting institutions for devoting the time and resources necessary to respond to the RFP, and to the members of the review panel for their hard work and dedication in supporting this project. Early in Summer 2009 NCURA intends to issue a second RFP for up to two awards of $40,000 each for the purpose of funding development of an on-line master’s degree program. It will not be necessary for an institution to have received one of the four planning grants to be eligible to apply to the 2nd RFP.
removed and disposed of as required by EPA regulations. The new Subpart K allows for regular laboratory clean-outs and covers the full range of colleges and universities waste generators - from large to conditionally exempt small quantity generators- as well as affiliated teaching hospitals and research organizations that have a formal written affiliation with a college and/or university. A couple of caveats: Subpart K applies only to laboratory waste. If an institution generates hazardous waste outside the laboratory, that waste still falls under the generator requirements of 40 CFR 262. Depending on the management structure of the institution and the quantities of waste generated in labs versus other uses (cleaning, horticulture, etc.), an institution may choose to continue to manage all its waste under the current generator requirements. And it is important to remember that for those States that are EPA RCRA-authorized states (most states), each state must adopt Subpart K before institutions in that state may switch to Subpart K.

A personal favorite is the implementation on January 15, 2009, of the federal Open Skies agreement provisions which allows federally supported travelers (including grantees and contractors) to use non-US carriers in some cases. As the General Services Administration (GSA) Federal Travel Office notes on its website (www.gsa.gov – following the links through Policies and Regulations to the Federal Travel Regulations [FTR]), in general federally supported travelers are required by the "Fly America Act" to use U.S. flag air carrier service. “However, an exception to this requirement is transportation provided under a bilateral or multilateral air transportation agreement to which the United States Government and the government of a foreign country are parties, and which the Department of Transportation has determined meets the requirements of the Fly America Act.” There are currently three Open Skies agreements – with the European Union, Australia and Switzerland. There are limitations to the use of non-US carriers under an Open Skies agreement notably that the current Open Skies agreements do not apply to Department of Defense-supported activities and the prohibition against non-US carriers if a City-Pairs agreement exists.

The Airfare City-Pair Program is a program limited to federal employees. If the federal government has a city-pair agreement for airfares, travelers cannot use a foreign carriers under Open Skies. Unfortunately, non-federal employees cannot make use of the city-pair agreement to book travel either; it simply serves to limit when a foreign carrier can be used by non-federal employees. Thus, before booking a flight with a non-US carrier under the European Union, Australia or Switzerland Open Skies Agreements, travelers must check the city-pair program (search access is available from the GSA homepage, under Travel Resources). If a city-pair agreement exists, the existing Fly America regulations prevail. If a city-pair agreement does not exist, travelers can book flights with foreign carriers covered by Open Skies. For example, there is no city-pair agreement between Washington, DC and Paris, France. A traveler from Washington DC could consider flights on Air France.

The National Science Foundation (NSF) recently updated its Agency Specific Requirements to the government-wide Research Terms and Conditions (RTCgs) to indicate that the use of a foreign-flag air carrier is permissible under Airline "Open Skies" Agreements between the United States and a foreign government. The NSF revisions were effective January 5, 2009. Other agencies may need to make policy or regulatory changes like NSF to permit Open Skies travel so travelers should check before booking a flight.

Others rules finalized after the requested November 1, 2008, deadline reflect (in part) current practice. For example, on January 15, 2009, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Office for Human Research Protections and the Food and Drug Administration finalized the requirement for the registration of Institutional Review Boards (IRBs). First proposed in 2004, the final rules require any IRB designated by an institution in its Federalwide Assurance (FWA) to register with HHS. In addition to the name, postal and electronic address and phone number for the operating institution and contact person, the registration requires the approximate numbers of all active protocols, HHS-supported protocols and the number of full-time equivalent IRB staff. This rule is effective on July 14, 2009, to allow OHRP and the FDA to complete the development and approval of the electronic registration system. Those institutions holding an FWA have registered their IRBs so this rule adds only new elements to that registration process. The rule for OHRP and the FDA appeared in the January 15, 2009, Federal Register.

Another important topic for research administrators is Combating Trafficking in Persons. The Civilian and Defense Acquisition Regulations Councils (who modify the FARs and DFARs) issued a final rule on January 15, 2009, implementing the provisions of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2003/2005. First proposed in April 2006, a revised interim rule was published in the Federal Register in August 2007. The final rule adopts the interim with some changes, a definition of "forced labor," a reference to the Department of State’s website on Trafficking in Persons and the existence of a Trafficking in Persons awareness program as a mitigating factor in remedies applied if a violation occurs. This rule has been effective as an interim since August 2008; the final revisions are effective as of February 15, 2009.

As the foregoing discussion indicates, not to mention the ongoing activities of the new administration, 2009 is going to be a very busy year for research administrators in keeping up with regulations coming out of Washington.

As this Capital View goes to press, Washington, D.C. is trying to recover from the ceremonies and festivities of President Obama’s inauguration. It was cold but no one seemed to care much. Now the work of governing begins and everyone will care a great deal.

Carol Blum is Director, Research Compliance and Administration, Council on Governmental Relations.
Attesting the NCURA 50th Anniversary meeting was a vivid reminder of how much research administration and NCURA have evolved since I first joined the University of Virginia in the Office of the Associate Provost for Research in 1969; 2 years later I was appointed the APR. Research administration was still in its teething stage – sponsored programs administration was part of the business office. Engineering already had a research administration office, the Medical School generally preferred to manage itself, many departments had little or no experience in cultivating research support, and the informational resources available to share with interested faculty were pretty thin. The role of the Associate Provost for Research was a work in progress – the research faculty expected the office to sternly advocate to the administration, the State Legislature, and the governmental support agencies, the national importance of increased support for research, particularly that which was of personal interest to them.

I returned to U.Va. because I had read about a new NSF-supported Center for the Study of Science, Technology and Public Policy in the School of Law – the thrust was promotion of multidisciplinary research at the University. On a weekend visit to Charlottesville I met the director of the Center and by the end of the day he had invited me to join him. To meet my salary he negotiated part of a position within the Office of the APR. I was intrigued and soon accepted the offer, leaving behind a very satisfactory position in the corporate research center of one of the country’s large aerospace firms. The soon-to-be president of the company and I stayed in touch the rest of his life and he never could figure out why I left what he viewed as a promising future with the company – I never came up with a suitable answer, but the decision I made turned out better than I anticipated.

During the next few years I worked on cultivating an audience in the University and General Assembly for the Office and kept looking for ways to be of service to the administration, the faculty, and the university. On a brief visit to Washington, D.C. in 1976 I had lunch with my old graduate school roommate, who had worked in the White House of President Nixon and was now with President Ford. Over lunch we talked about an issue (now long forgotten) which he suggested I discuss with one of his White House colleagues whom he thought was struggling with a related policy problem. In about a week, I had a job offer, a leave from the University and was arranging for a place to stay within walking distance of the Old Executive Office Building on the White House grounds. I was the Assistant Director for Science, Technology and Space on the Domestic Council (a complementary organization to the National Security Council). In the time that I was there the most pressing issue was “energy independence” – something that we obviously did not achieve.

For the Ford Administration and Research Administration - My Reflections

By Dennis Barnes

...In the time that I was there the most pressing issue was “energy independence” – something that we obviously did not achieve...

EOP was to protect the Nation from the Hill and the Departments, and stamina was almost as important as the ability to be a player.

One of the other issues with which I was involved was the re-establishment of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), which had been disbanded by President Nixon, allegedly because of significant opposition from the academic science establishment to the continuation of the Vietnam War. Congress had passed legislation authorizing the resurrection of the office which President Ford had promised to sign and implement. Guy Stever, then Director of the National Science Foundation – a Republican and former President of Carnegie Mellon University – was appointed Science Advisor to the President and Director of OSTP. His deputy was Phillip Smith, who had been on Stever’s staff at NSF and would also serve with Frank Press, who followed Stever as Science Advisor and later assumed the Presidency of the National Academy of Sciences.

What then followed was a test of wills between OSTP and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for the science budgets. Both OSTP and OMB competed to shape the budgets as submitted by the departments. On balance, OSTP proposed and OMB disposed.
At that time OMB was little known or visited by the academic community – for most universities “Washington” meant the funding agencies – the Hill and the EOP were off limits. My first visit across Pennsylvania Avenue to OMB to seek counsel on a science budget issue was made with some trepidation, well grounded as it turned out. The associate director with whom I met was crusty, questioning and to the point. I soon revealed myself as poorly prepared and unable to answer many questions. With time though I moved up the learning curve to the benefit of both our professional and personal relationships – we have remained great friends for more than 30 years.

1976 was an election year and the contest between President Ford and Governor Jimmy Carter was generally thought to be close. Planning continued in the EOP for a second Ford administration and to my surprise consideration was being bandied about to abolish the OSTP, less than a year after its resurrection. The reason though was not opposition to OSTP’s mission or its susceptibility to the influence of academics, but rather a desire to keep the EOP small and flexible. Whereas OMB and the National Security Council had very broad, multidimensional missions, those in the office responsible for drug enforcement policy and the OSTP were viewed as too narrow for a lean, mean EOP. Whether such a proposal would have been adopted is not clear, but it was rendered moot by the electorate that Fall.

I returned to the University with a much greater appreciation and understanding of the rarefied atmosphere of the White House, where those who want your attention often lead you to believe that you are more intelligent, knowledgeable and influential (even wittier and wiser) than you are.

The value of my White House excursion was not immediately obvious on my return to U.Va. However, I found a receptive audience with some of the higher education associations with which U.Va. was becoming more involved and with representatives of other research universities who were becoming increasingly active in Washington - with the Hill and the EOP, in addition to the longstanding interest in the funding agencies. I had hoped that I brought some useful experience to the discussions, maneuvering, and coalition building that was a part of the university research community’s growing assertion of their needs and aspirations. This was evident with groups with whom I worked: the American Association of Universities (AAU), the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC), the American Council on Education (ACE) and the Council on Governmental Relations (CGR), then a subgroup of the National Association of College and University Business Officers – NACUBO). I don’t list NCURA here because as a member organization it did not lobby on university issues, leaving that role to the associations of senior academic officers, e.g. presidents, medical school deans/vice presidents, and chief financial officers.

There was, however, opportunity for me to bring part of my White House experience to NCURA. When I was Chair of Region III I invited my OMB colleague to our spring meeting on Saint Simons Island off the Georgia coast, and somewhat to my surprise he accepted the invitation. He explained that OMB was slowly opening up to meeting with outside university constituencies, and he was curious about what our group was like and what they might find interesting. We went through the customary dance - with my NCURA colleagues complaining about excess governmental compliance requirements and shortsighted national underinvestment in research, while my OMB friend opined that we were yet another interest group that could never be satisfied until all universities were in the top tier. Fortunately the atmosphere became more hospitable as the session went on and greatly improved after we adjourned to Happy Hour.

Three years later I improbably found myself back in Washington, where I spent 3 years as “chief scientist” for the Science Subcommittee of the U. S. Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation. But that is another story about which I would only say here was as illuminating as my experience in the EOP, except that this time we were protecting the country from the rascals downtown in the White House (and stamina was still almost as critical an asset as ability).

I’m not sure what lessons of my experience might be useful to others in research administration. For my part I learned that there are opportunities in unlikely places and at unexpected times that, with an open mind, the benefit of one’s own experience and luck, can converge to lead one to opportunities that you would never have planned.

Dennis Barnes is a former NCURA president (1980) and holds a Ph.D. in Chemistry from the University of Virginia.
I write this on the eve of the inauguration of President Barack Obama with much optimism about the future of biomedical research in this country. In promising to double government funding for scientific research, President Obama has said “the highest purpose of science is the search for knowledge, truth and a greater understanding of the world around us.”

Previously, the NIH budget was doubled from 1998-2003 and this increase in funding led to major discoveries in biomedical research and patient outcomes. These research discoveries were the stimulus for the formation of startup companies and a boom in the licensing of technology to existing companies. Technology transfer from academia to industry has proven to stimulate the creation of new jobs in this country, and many of our institutions benefited from the transfer of this technology to the marketplace. After the doubling of the NIH budget, funding for biomedical research has been flat and has actually decreased in current dollars, and the Biotechnology Industry has not prospered to the extent that it could have if the doubling of the NIH budget had been followed by incremental increases each year.

During the period that the NIH extramural research budget was doubling, many of our institutions expanded our research facilities through debt financing and now we find it difficult for our investigators to obtain federal funding to perform research in those new facilities. Excellent research hypotheses go unfunded and investigators that have been funded for ten years or more have had to abandon their research space due to the lack of funding. At the same time that it is becoming more difficult to obtain federal funding for research, the general operating funds of our institutions are challenged by double-digit declines in earnings on our endowments (even on the conservatively invested funds). In better financial times, research institutions had become dependent on the earnings from endowments to supplement grants from private and public sponsors. Those same institutions are now faced with having to trim their operating budgets and/or delay capital expenditures to make up for the loss on endowment income. Needless to say, these are challenging times from the financial perspective.

Scientific research has proven to be a sound investment, and should be an integral part in the strengthening of the United States economic infrastructure. The Obama stimulus proposal notes the importance of funding for science in calling for “investing in science, research and technology that will lead to new medical breakthroughs, new discoveries and entire new industries.”

The NIH Roadmap for Medical Research created new opportunities in basic sciences with programs in Structural Biology, Nanomedicine, Bioinformatics, and Computation Biology to name a few initiatives. Even more importantly, the Roadmap took a clinical research program that was floundering and re-engineered it by fostering a direct connection between basic and clinical research through the Translational Research Initiative. Translational research provides the critical pathway from bench to bedside resulting in improvements in patient health and is the engine that drives innovation in clinical healthcare. As of September 2008, thirty-eight academic medical centers have been granted Clinical and Translational Science Awards (CTSA). When fully implemented in 2012, sixty institutions will be linked together in the CTSA national consortium with an overarching goal to energize clinical and translational science.

As we anticipate expansion of the NIH extramural research portfolio during the Obama Administration, let us not abandon the Roadmap for Medical Research and the important work that has been done to strengthen clinical and translational research. We need to...
maintain a critical balance between basic, translational, and clinical research. President Obama has promised to expand health insurance to the uninsured within the United States. While necessary, this expansion will place additional pressures upon the delivery of quality healthcare. In the future, healthcare will be delivered not only through traditional settings, but also through a network of community clinics in inner cities and rural areas. Our health care industry needs to become more efficient in the use of diagnostics and electronic medical record keeping. Cost effective improvements in healthcare delivery will be driven by biomedical and outcomes research. Translational research will provide the avenue to innovation in routine patient care.

I attended a meeting in the spring of 2008 and listened to research administrators speak about the need to look for research funding from foreign government agencies and international companies in response to the dismal outlook for funding of research by the United States Government. Collaborations with foreign institutions and industry partners can be an important part of a balanced research portfolio, but should not be a substitute for our government’s investment in biomedical research. The recession that we are now in the midst of certainly has brought home the reality that we are part of a global economy, but we should not be so eager to write off the Biomedical Research Industry in this country or abandon the idea that funding priorities can change in this country to stimulate scientific research in the public and private sectors. The opportunity exists at the start of the Obama Administration to expand existing programs and create new opportunities for biomedical researchers. It is our job as leaders in the research administration profession to encourage the new administration and Congress to increase funding for science and research through a well balanced stimulus program that will breathe new life into biomedical research in institutions throughout the United States.

How can leaders in research administration make an impact during these important times? First, contact your local congressional representative and senators. Let them know the importance that research plays in your economy at the regional and state levels. Emphasize that biomedical research creates new jobs not just at your institution, but within your community and state. Our representatives in Washington need to have a clear understanding that an investment in research means a strong economy for your state and the United States. Second, invite your congressional representative to visit your campus to see the critical role that grant funds have in your laboratories and clinics. Highlight some of the really important outcomes from research that your faculty are engaged in and what can be done with additional funds in the future. Lastly, have a clear vision at your institution as to what research is strategically important. That vision needs to be clearly communicated to your elected officials in Washington.

These are critically important times in Washington for university research, particularly biomedical research. Individually, universities have a modest impact upon federal research priorities. Collectively, universities have a louder, more important voice. Make that voice count.

Tom Wilson is the Senior Research Administrator and Assistant Vice President at Rush University Medical Center.
With a new administration in Washington that appears more open and supportive of academic science, the research community has reached out, advocating for immediate change on two major and controversial topics.

Reduce Export Controls

On January 8, 2009, the National Academies of Science issued a report that called for immediate executive action to roll back export controls and visa requirements that date back to the Cold War. The report, titled "Beyond ‘Fortress America’: National Security Controls on Science and Technology in a Globalized World,” was authored by a committee co-chaired by John Hennessy, President of Stanford University, and included high-level officials from several other universities, researchers, and representatives from industry.

The Report pointed out that visa controls and "deemed export controls" have made U.S. laboratories and universities less attractive to foreign researchers and have helped drive knowledge-intensive jobs overseas. Although others have similarly called for changes to the export control regime, the authors stated that the Report is unique because it ties together national security, economic globalization, and globalization of science to demonstrate the need for new policy. It then proposes corrective policies that can be enacted quickly by the new President alone, without action by Congress.

As research administrators, we know how frustrating it can be for faculty, graduate students and staff to negotiate potential export and "deemed export" issues. It’s helpful to be able to put these day-to-day difficulties into the context of a larger policy discussion. And sometimes it can be helpful to point out to faculty that advocacy on these issues is taking place at the national level. Link to the report here: http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12567

Increase Funding for Science

On January 9, 2009, an interdisciplinary group of scientists, including 49 Nobel prize winners, signed a letter to then-President-elect Obama and several members of Congress. The letter asked President Obama to consider an immediate increase in funding for scientific research, for two purposes: (1) to create good jobs; and (2) to build American leadership in science, engineering, education and technology.

Now as research administrators, we are well aware of how important sponsored research is for developing scientific leadership, especially to our young investigators. But we may not think about the impact of the research enterprise on the broader economy. The letter explained that research funding supports salaries for lab workers at all levels and purchases of supplies and equipment (much of them from small American businesses). The letter also pointed out that "funding for science and engineering creates good jobs throughout the local community: Families USA has estimated, for example, that each $1 billion of NIH research grant funding creates over 15,000 jobs with an average wage of $52,000/year and generates $2.21 billion of new business activity, a much better "multiplier" than many other proposed parts of the stimulus package."

This is a good reminder for research administrators – the work we support not only impacts our immediate research communities but the broader community as well. In the current environment, where businesses small and large seem to be in jeopardy, those Small Business Act clauses in our grants and contracts have a whole new meaning. You can see a copy of the letter at http://www.columbia.edu/cu/news/09/01/nobelletter.pdf.

Both of these publications illustrate the high hopes that many in the research community have of the new administration. The response, of course, remains to be seen. But the outreach illustrates how change in the White House is inspiring the research community to seek even more change, to benefit the research enterprise.

Naomi Schrag is the Associate Vice President for Research Compliance in the Office of the Executive Vice President for Research at Columbia University in the City of New York.
Although in an era of Electronic Research Administration (eRA), little attention has been given to using e-Portfolios as a professional development tool for Research Administrators. E-Portfolios are ideal for tracking, documenting, evaluating, and assessing employee performance over a period of time. The Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) at Virginia Tech determined that a need for an e-Portfolio was evident when the existing training program for new employees was not working effectively in documenting and evaluating the employee’s performance over time. The previous training consisted of a checklist of core areas that the mentor would go through with the employee, however there was no documented measurement of the employee’s performance and often this checklist was abandoned as the mentor and employee became consumed with daily tasks. To mitigate these issues OSP embarked on creating a Professional Development e-Portfolio for their Post Award staff.

The benefits of using the matrix tool as a Professional Development e-Portfolio are multi-faceted. The most critical benefit is that it serves as a learning record that provides actual evidence of individual achievement and performance. Employees are provided a combination of instructional resources ranging from websites, print, and training videos on a specific topic and are required to perform or demonstrate their understanding of the information presented through various assessments. This “chunking” of information into organized lessons provides for a more holistic approach than the checklist approach of the previous training program. Most of these resources are electronically linked into the matrix allowing for easy access to documents within Scholar and eliminates the need to update new material in more than one.

continued on next page ➤

---

**Exhibit 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Award Administrator Professional Development e-Portfolio</th>
<th>Phase I (1-2 months)</th>
<th>Phase II (2-3 months)</th>
<th>Phase III (3-4 months)</th>
<th>Phase IV (4-6 months)</th>
<th>Phase V (6 months-1 yr.)</th>
<th>Phase VI (1 yr. +)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to the Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation (Cell 1: Checklists, Cell 2: Responsibility Matrix)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Duties &amp; Responsibilities (Cell 1: Portfolio Assignments, Cell 2: Customer Service)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of Sponsored Programs (Cell 1: Online Modules, Cell 2: Responsibility Matrix)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Award Prior to Banner Entry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Proofing/Administrative Fee Funds/Institutional Allowance Funds (Cell 1: Overhead)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
location. In addition, the tasks require real-life, work-related skills that are directly applicable to the job duties of the employee resulting in high knowledge transfer. Once the employee is satisfied that they have completed the lesson they can submit any evidence of completion into the cell, complete an evaluation, and submit the lesson to their assigned mentor for evaluation. The mentor can review and evaluate the employee’s performance and certify the completion of the learning objectives for the lesson.

The matrix also provides the employee and mentor with a visual representation of the employee’s progress over a period of time and serves as a reference beyond the initial training period. The matrix provides four different modalities which are distinguished by different colors of the designers choosing. For the Post Award Administrator e-Portfolio, green indicates a lesson ready for completion, yellow indicates a lesson ready to be evaluated, red indicates a lesson completed, and gray is a locked cell (see Exhibit 1). This visual representation of the employee’s progress will assist the mentors and supervisors with the monitoring the timeliness and overall progress of training. Once the entire matrix is completed the employee will continue to have access to the matrix indefinitely to use as a resource in conducting their daily duties. The practicality and usefulness of the matrix goes beyond new employees as our seasoned employees will use the matrix as a reference as well. The matrix author controls the permissions and is able to control who can view and evaluate the each individual employee’s matrix, therefore, eliminating unauthorized individuals accessing confidential training records.

As OSP moves forward with the use of the matrix as a professional development tool, we recognize that due to the nature of the research administration field that the content of the matrix will undoubtedly change. One of the important features of the matrix is its flexibility which allows existing material to be changed and new material can be added to existing cells. In addition, locked cells or in our case empty cells can be changed to ready mode and new material can be added into the cell. The matrix provides the flexibility that is critical to research administration.

The matrix allows for the employee to have some autonomy in their training during times when the mentor is unable to provide intense direct training due to other responsibilities. Often new employees are eager to learn and are dependent upon the mentor to direct every activity. Meanwhile the mentor is often continuing to manage their normal duties while being given the additional responsibility of mentoring a new employee. Managing these dual responsibilities is a delicate balance between providing quality training and maintaining daily business operations. The lessons in the matrix are design so that employee is provided with sufficient guidance to proceed with minimal direction from the mentor subsequently reducing the time the mentor spends explaining every minute detail of each lesson. Once the employee completes a lesson, he/she while waiting for the mentor to review and evaluate that lesson can move onto the next lesson provided the completion of the lesson is not a prerequisite for continuing to the next lesson. The structure of the lessons does not however relieve the mentor of providing guidance and intense one-on-one training. It is the responsibility of the mentor to provide support, review, and evaluate employee performance and development. The first lesson of the matrix clearly identifies the roles and responsibilities of the supervisor, mentor, and employee in the completion of the lessons.

The intent of an e-Portfolio in an academic setting can easily translate into an effective training tool for nonacademic purposes. Scholar offers the flexibility and electronic tools needed to provide a comprehensive training program in various business settings beyond academia. Using e-Portfolio’s in the professional development of staff should be examined more closely as an effective method for evaluating and documenting employee performance.

Vicky Ratcliffe serves as Training Coordinator at Virginia Tech.
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The timing could not be more perfect to develop research administration workload measurements as research administrators weather the less than ideal economic storm. There will be an increasing tension between their institutions on one hand facing reductions in funding due to loss in endowments, reductions in enrollment, or cuts in state appropriations, while on the other hand preparing themselves for a federal stimulus package directed at increasing research activities. The idea of measuring what research operations do, and measuring their efficiency, is critical as research administration budgets remain intact or grow to accommodate additional workload related to increases in federal awards. The fact that research administration expenditures continue at their current levels or are increased, in the current retraction economy, will not go unnoticed by those experiencing reductions in operations. The time is now to develop research administration performance indicators to communicate to the campus community the abundance and complexity of work, help set operational priorities, and assist in steering in a downward economy.

The work of research administration is sometimes not well understood. Many times its processes seem as not in line with the rest of the institution. As research administrators know, this has much to do with the federal regulations or other sponsor requirements that govern the management and custodianship of the external dollars. The resulting impact is that research administrators may spend a significant portion of their time explaining or clarifying the external requirements placed on their institution and the differences from other campus operations. This means that as budget reductions begin to impact the rest of the campus, these differences will become even more pronounced as the funding for research administration remain stable or increased resulting from growth in external funding. Already, there may be a renewed appreciation for the continuity of external funding under the current fiscal climate. However, that appreciation may be primarily from the researchers and not from everyone else on campus undergoing reductions to operations. The questions will be asked as to what work is it that research administration does and why is it that they are continuing at current levels and perhaps recruiting additional personnel. The talk of additional federal funding coming to universities may not always be sufficient to repel discussions about reductions in research administration, let alone justify increases in staffing or other operating expenditures, such as travel to research training or conferences.

There is a clear advantage that research administration has from others on campus in communicating its work efforts to sustain or increase operational budgets. The clear advantage is its abundance of data. Most research administrators may only need to take a peek outside their door or pop their heads above their cubicles to see that there are many daily processes and systems of research administration that are repetitive, easily measurable, yet critical in nature. Data is collected for almost everything that is done. The abundance of opportunities can be found in pre-award operations, post-award financial activities, the technology transfer office, and also in the management of research facilities. This is particularly true for the management of research protocols by Institutional Review Boards (IRB) or by Clinical Research Management Offices. The abundance of data even extends to those in university development foundations.

The specificity of data is also there. In the case of pre-award operations, there is data related to applications, awards, contracts, subcontracts, and amendments. In addition, depending on the organization, this can extend to progress reports, and clinical trial agreements. Each of these areas then has a potential subset of data that can be managed and tracked (see attached sample for pre-award workload indicators).

Each and every type of support operations under research administration also needs to be mindful of collecting data related to the number of times they come in contact and deliver services to its researchers. The drive to both greater customer service and greater compliance and accountability dictates that research administration track the number of times that it touches the faculty from an internal service objective and the number of times that training is delivered from an external compliance objective.

The work of research administrators is both complex and abundant and needs to be communicated on a regular basis. First, administrators need to begin with whatever data is already known and collected since much is already there. In many cases this data is not seen by anyone else other than perhaps the Dean or Vice President for Research. Second, the data needs to be made available to the rest of the campus community to achieve a greater transparency to the work of research administration. Third, the data indicators should be limited at first and additional indicators should be added after aligned with operational priorities. Administrators need to be selective as to their workload...
measurements and use those that both help tell a story, assist in setting staff priorities, and help them achieve strategic objectives. Fourth, the sharing of information should be approached using channels of communication already available and done in such a way that it fits the culture of the organization. The name “performance measurements” should be avoided if “performance indicators” will achieve the intended goals. Perhaps “workload activities” rather than “performance indicators” will work best with staff. On the other hand, the faculty may prefer the reference to “metrics” since it is a term commonly used. Another potential name may be “performance dashboard” since it seems to be a current popular tool. Fifth, the use of technology should be understated at the beginning and advantage should be taken of what is already available on campus and will not represent additional costs. Lastly, the data should be collected either on a monthly or quarterly basis and serve in the development on an annual report so that it serves multiple goals.

The bottom line is that research administrators need to gather the data and tell their stories so others on campus can see that much is being done with less and less resources and that additional workload requires additional resources. A particular tool to tell this story is the use of “performance dashboards.” The concept of a “performance dashboard” has been popular since the 1980’s but did not catch the attention of nonprofit organizations and government until this decade. Dashboards were originally intended to help executives in large corporations “drive” their companies from up top by leveraging tons of data and converting to key performance indicators in a condensed view. The concept of data gathering and selection of indicators is the same. However, the leveraging of this concept and the specific tool can assist research administrators focus on this particular initiative by taking advantage of work already done by others in harnessing data into a single management tool.

A recurring theme is that research administrators need to collect data to better communicate the work done in research administration. However, as data indicators are selected, data consistently gathered, its presentation simplified through a “performance dashboard” or other means, the exercise should be expanded to not only tell a story but also serve as a compass and guide to research operations. The current climate in research administration requires that administrators react quickly to correct deficiencies, look in all directions and explore all sources to optimize performance, all along while refueling in mid air and at the same time keeping an eye on their dashboard. The utility of the dashboard is that it keeps recurring and new efforts focused on those things that are important to research operations and connect staff under a common strategy and goals that guide the daily work of serving the principal investigators, meeting the expectations of the university, and staying current with the requirements of our sponsors… all along adding transparency to the work of research administration.

Benjamin Figueroa serves as Associate Vice President for Research Administration, Office of Research Advancement and Administration, Children’s Hospital Los Angeles

### Pre-Award Support Services Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FOR THE MONTH OF</strong></th>
<th><strong>TOTALS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPLICATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Applications In Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Applications Submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar Amount of Applications Submitted</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AWARDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Applications Awarded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar Amount of Applications Awarded</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLINICAL TRIAL AGREEMENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Trial Agreements In Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Trial Agreements In Negotiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Trial Agreements Executed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTRACTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts In Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts In Negotiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts Executed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-CONTRACTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Contracts In Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Contracts Executed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMENDMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendments In Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendments Issued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRESS REPORTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Reports In Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Reports Submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI/Dept Admin Meetings Conducted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainings Conducted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developed by Kelvin Kelley, Pre-Award Support Services Administrator, Children’s Hospital Los Angeles
Stewart D. Friedman’s article, “Managing Yourself – Be a Better Leader, Have a Richer Life,” contains a number of insightful ideas and proven solutions for how to be a leader in all aspects of our lives. Friedman reasons that we can and should all work to be excellent leaders within the four realms of our lives: work, home, community and self. Integrating the four different parts of life, versus giving up one or more parts to have success in another, is how you can make sustainable changes. This is what he terms as the “four-wins” and leads to “Total Leadership.” “Total” because it involves the whole person and “Leadership” because it involves creating sustainable change to benefit you AND the most important people in your life.

To rack up four-way wins, consider what is important to you and what you would like to accomplish in the long run. Consider the most important people (“key stakeholders”) and the expectations you have of one another. Then, create a basic outline of small changes that will help you achieve the bigger picture. The bigger picture will affect all four realms (work, home, community, self) in a positive way and the smaller steps will guide you in pursuing your best leadership self. It sounds simple enough, but how do we achieve fulfillment by developing short-term changes?

The process that Friedman describes involves thinking, writing and talking about your values and vision, clarifying what is important to you as a leader, spouse, parent, community member, etc. and then determining how your actions and decisions impact your primary stakeholders. He suggests designing mini experiments that are tried for a fixed period of time and evaluated by you and your stakeholders. To help you craft experiments for your own situation, Friedman provides additional tools, success stories and linked information on his website at http://www.totalleadership.org/. To be practical, he suggests narrowing down your first list to only two or three possibilities that are tried for short periods of time. Stretch and challenge yourself, but avoid creating experiments that are too daunting and over which you have little control to make adjustments as you move along.

Just as creativity, curiosity, controls and adaptability (and even fortuitous mistakes) are involved with the success of many research projects, so will be the case with many of the small experiments you might choose to undertake. If the experiment is not going well, you can stop and make adjustments. If it is going well, then you’ve just scored a win! Over a period of time, you find that you are spending your time and energy on the people and activities that you’ve deliberately named as your priorities. Other bonuses in the process are your growth as a leader in all realms of your life, and the support of those around you (those key stakeholders, again), all without excessive risk.

Is your experiment having the impact that you envisioned, or will you have to regroup in order to focus on reaching your desired outcome? In designing an experiment, you must chose to reflect on what will have the most impact and ultimately benefit you in a positive manner, both professionally and personally. Friedman’s Total Leadership concept describes successful experiments as those that combine components of nine categories:

1. Tracking and Reflecting: journal habits, thoughts, and feelings for reflection and to assess your progress. Examples: record the times that you provide positive feedback to your employees or colleagues, record the number of times you exercised during the week, your feelings about how you may have handled yourself in requesting assistance from your team, or your plan for an upcoming project.

2. Planning and Organizing: develop a plan to better utilize your time. Examples: develop a shared schedule for a team project, pre-plan your meals and work-week on Sunday, or utilize a daily planner/PDA for all activities.
3 Rejuvenating and Restoring: set aside time to rejuvenate by focusing on your mind, body and spirit. Examples: take time to participate in a fun activity (group sport, yoga, reading, or hobby), quit unhealthy habits (smoking, drinking to excess, or watching too much television), take a daily 20-minute walk on campus, or take a vacation.

4 Appreciating and Caring: develop relationships and compassion for others in order to respect and understand the whole person. Examples: encourage coworkers to sign up for an aerobics class as a group, volunteer in your community, help a colleague work on an area of concern within your university or schedule a retreat for your team.

5 Focusing and Concentrating: stay psychologically focused and physically present for those who matter most in your life. Prioritize, organize, and take action on requests so that your important stakeholders feel appreciated and understood. Examples: honor your commitments by sticking to your scheduled meeting times, set aside time to return calls and emails, turn off your PDA while at home, or schedule time daily for an open door to address issues that arise.

6 Revealing and Engaging: encourage communication by sharing more of yourself with others and make yourself available to hear others’ concerns. Your values will be better understood and you will gain explicit support from your stakeholders if you are understood as a person. Examples: mentor a junior staff member, share your vision with your team, or have weekly discussions with your spouse about spirituality.

7 Time Shifting and “Re-placing”: think outside of the box by adjusting your schedule to fit in desired activities while increasing efficiency. Examples: request a flexible work schedule, work remotely, or take a class during your lunch hour.

8 Delegating and Developing: reallocate, reduce, or completely eliminate activities to free up time, work smarter, develop skills in yourself and others, and increase trust. Examples: hire an assistant, a work-study student, or delegate tasks to other employees.

9 Exploring and Venturing: implement steps and participate in activities toward a new job, more challenging work, or other activities that align your work, home, community, and self with your core values and aspirations. Examples: re-evaluate your current job and take steps toward job enrichment (becoming a subject matter expert, cross-train others), obtain a mentor or perhaps consider a new job or career, volunteer within your NCURA region, or join your children, family and/or friends to engage in the activity of your choice on National Service Day.

As you begin to consider areas within the four domains of your life that you would like to improve, realize that your experiments are works in progress. Measuring improvement and continuously reassessing your experiment will help improve your leadership skills. Friedman’s assessment tool will also enable you to reassess as your life changes and your commitments change.

Quoting Barack Obama in his speech on November 4, 2008:

“And above all, I will ask you to join in the work of remaking this nation the only way it’s been done in America for 221 years – block by block, brick by brick, calloused hand by calloused hand.”

This fundamentally represents Friedman’s “Total Leadership” concept. As a leader of change, you often have to take small steps and continually reassess and make further changes in order to overcome big obstacles and to witness benefits for the good of all. Small experiments are the small steps toward fulfilling the goals in all realms of your life.

Christine Pacheco serves as Sr. Contract & Grant Administrator, Department of Internal Medicine - Office of Research, University of New Mexico and 2008 alumn of the Leadership Development Institute.

Resources related to this topic:


Total Leadership Resources to include links to obtaining Steward D. Friedman’s book, his teaching tools and the 4-Way View chart, can be found at http://www.totalleadership.org/.

“We gain strength, courage and confidence by each experience in which we really stop to look fear in the face...we must do that which we think we cannot.”

Eleanor Roosevelt

Have you ever considered how you can be a part of the NCURA family and increase your leadership ability at the same time? Perhaps you are considering volunteering for your region? Maybe you also want to develop your professional skill set to benefit your institution at the same time? As a proud and recent graduate of NCURA’s Leadership Development Institute (LDI), I must say that the LDI is one of the most outstanding resources available through NCURA to assist you in meeting those goals. NCURA has provided this opportunity for professional growth to more than 70 graduates since its inception in 2003.

LDI uses the “5 Practices of Exemplary Leadership” (Kouzes and Posner) as the foundation for the curriculum.

The class connects most months via conference calls or web-enabled chats. We meet face-to-face in the late spring at the historic Belmont Conference Center near Baltimore and in a final retreat in DC. The year of work, learning and self discovery culminates with graduation at NCURA’s Annual Conference. Each month, we complete 4 hours of thought-provoking homework assignments, which are shared through a SharePoint LDI site. The homework includes a leadership project that each of us designs, specific to the needs of our institutions.
We apply the “5 Practices of Exemplary Leadership” and all that we are learning about leadership to our projects, which, in turn, directly benefit our institutions. My project was to create a new employee guide that would address the unit’s need for a tool for all new employees to help them become familiar with the university generally and the working actions of the sponsored office specifically. As the new employee guide that I developed with my colleagues is piloted in my office, I continue my leadership learning journey.

Included in the monthly homework are articles from the Harvard Business Review (HBR) and other publications, which reinforce the leadership practice that is the focus for that month. A favorite for many of us is the HBR article, “Who’s Got the Monkey”, which challenged us to “Enable Others to Act” by delegating more effectively. Each month, we also had an assignment of ‘inner work’ to help us become more reflective about ourselves as emerging leaders.

In preparation for the first retreat we took the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). The knowledge we gained proved to be extremely revealing, as we discovered how our types affected those with whom we work. The MBTI helped the class members communicate more effectively and better manage ourselves, as well as our work. As Ty Lane, LDI Class of 2008, states, “Knowing my own MBTI type has increased my self-awareness. I better understand my emotions/needs and manage myself for optimum energy and enthusiasm.” Monthly MBTI homework assignments enable us to apply what we have learned directly to our workplaces.

During the final retreat, all the tools and lessons come to a culmination with the presentation of our leadership projects. Our investment of time and the commitment by our employers yields a high rate of return for each of us, our institutions and NCURA. The “5 Practices of Exemplary Leadership” are demonstrated as the projects are presented to our Advisors and N&LD C members. We left refreshed and eager to return to our institutions and apply all the leadership skills that we learned to our work and to NCURA.

The next steps for the Class of 2008 are to move our individual leadership projects forward at our home institutions and to seek opportunities to volunteer at NCURA, applying the many leadership lessons we learned through LDI. Our class agreed that we will take the baton from the LDI Class of 2007 and continue to write the “Leadership Tips” column for the NCURA magazine. For, as LDI 2008 graduates Tammy Custer and Ty Lane wrote in one of our homework assignments, “Leadership is the activity of influencing and collaborating with people to achieve a mutually agreed upon goal.”

The LDI left a never-ending effect on each of us, both personally and professionally. Reflecting and learning more about each leadership practice provided us with substantial growth, in addition to greater awareness of the vast opportunities NCURA provides for our continuing leadership journeys. We now feel better equipped and eager to give back to the association and our profession by volunteering at NCURA. As Pam Whittlett, NCURA Past President and member of the LDI Leadership Team stated, “A leader is someone who has a vision, is committed to it, and can motivate people to believe in them enough to want to follow him/her to achieve that goal or vision.” The LDI program can help any research administrator become a more effective leader, both on their campus and in their profession.

NCURA’s Leadership Development Institute (LDI) is now accepting applications. Applications and additional information can be found at http://www.ncura.edu/content/educational_programs/online/ldi/ldi2010.pdf. The deadline for completed applications is May 26, 2009.

Candyce C. Lindsay, 2008 LDI Graduate, is Assistant Director of Research Administration at Arizona State University.
If you were one of the 1,681 of NCURA's 7,000 members who completed the Career Planning survey in August 2008, you may also have been at that time part of the 10% who stated they had plans to retire within five years. Of course, with the current state of our economy, were we to send out this same survey, today, the responses might be very different. However, though some members will extend their research administration career longer than anticipated in August, others may not and the data collected from this survey shows a number of institutions are not preparing to pass the baton to a fresh generation of leaders.

The survey, conducted for NCURA by Sector Intelligence, focused on four key questions:

1. How many members are within five years of retirement and what specific responsibilities do they perform for their institution/organization?
2. Are institutions/organizations prepared, or preparing for a shifting workforce as the “Boomers” leave?
3. Are younger members looking to advance their research administration career?
4. How can NCURA serve its retiring members and what is their desire to remain connected?

Of the remaining 90% who were not planning to retire within the next five years, 60% responded that they wished to seek career advancement and 23% were uncertain.

However, 82% (almost 800) of those who would like to move up the career ladder responded that there is no formal training program for career advancement at their institution. And 71% of this same group reported there was not even an informal program (including mentoring for career advancement) at their institution. 13% of respondents noted that their institution did have formal training programs and 22% had informal programs.

When this group was asked how likely it was, based on their institution’s structure and staffing, they would be able to advance as desired, 54% reporting said “somewhat likely” with only 26% reporting they felt it was “very likely.” When looking at the 54% of research administrators who wanted career advancement but felt it was only “somewhat likely” along with the 23% who were not sure if they wished for advancement, one cannot help but wonder if the lack of formal career training programs is connected to this uncertainty.

When reviewing what members reported about their institutions, one is led to speculate that clear, definable succession planning is not the norm at many institutions. Only 8% reported that a plan to address their retirement was in place. Fewer than half (45%) who have set a date for retirement reported that they had discussed their retirement with a supervisor or that their supervisor is aware of their retirement, and with 55% reporting that their supervisor is not aware of their plan to retire. The lack
...A number of institutions are not preparing to pass the baton...

Institutions in general do not appear to have made clear plans for succession per retirees. Awareness between intended retiree and supervisor:

- Aware - developed plan: 8%
- Aware - discussed but no plan: 10%
- Aware - not discussed plan: 17%
- Not aware: 55%

Members appear to seek career advancement but appear to lack substantial career assistance at their institutions:

Does your institution have a formal training program for career advancement? Yes, 13%

Does your institution have an informal training program such as mentoring for career advancement? Yes, 22%

of planning takes on real significance when 51% of those planning retirement state their leaving will cause a moderate impact on their institution and with 18% reporting a significant impact. Of those planning retirement within 5 years, 53% are directors and managers. When asked if, to their knowledge, their institution had any succession planning in place, 76% said either “not yet” or they “didn’t know.”

The forth question of the survey brought some surprises when a significant portion of respondents reported they wish to remain involved in NCURA programs after retirement. 57% of respondents would like to continue attending regional meetings and 34% stated they wished to teach NCURA workshops. 58% wish to serve as an NCURA endorsed consultant. These are encouraging numbers.

As NCURA Immediate Past President David Mayo stated in the December/January issue of this magazine, “The results [of the survey] were surprising and in some ways disturbing.” It is hoped that institutions will soon become aware they need to begin offering management and leadership training to their emerging leaders before the first wave of “Boomers” start leaving campus. NCURA’s Professional Development Committee will need to look at ways to assist members who cannot find this type of training at their institution. And the good news? NCURA will soon have a new volunteer workforce made up of experienced research administrators who will be ready and waiting for assignments. NCURA’s challenge will be to develop rewarding and enjoyable assignments for this group of emeritus members. Plans are already underway.
DEPARTMENTAL

Pick up any newspaper and you will see headlines highlighting the current economic situation. These articles tell of bankruptcies, budget cuts, layoffs, and hiring freezes. In some way or another each of us has been impacted by this downturn. Join your colleagues on April 15th from 2-3 pm EDT for the online chat Dealing with Budget Woes. Featured experts are John Case, Vice President for Finance and Administration/Chief Financial Officer, University of Akron and Michele Codd, Assistant Director, Vanderbilt Institute for Software Integrated Systems. Take advantage of shared expertise to help deal with challenges like: What can a DA do when the funds for a position or program are no longer available? What can a DA do when faced with a decreasing workforce and budget and increasing demands? What can a DA do when travel budgets are tight and meeting attendance is limited?

We hope you will join us for this chat. Sign up by emailing chat@ncura.edu with the subject line “Budget Woes.” The 2009 DAN Committee solicits your help to provide information, tools, and resources that are current and valuable. Committee members are:
LaJauna Ellis, Georgia Institute of Technology
Erin Bailey, SUNY Buffalo
Stephen Block, Syracuse University
Wayne Brown, Rutgers University
Mieko Dunn, University of Florida
Lisa Gentry, University of Arizona
Carol Martin, Mississippi State University
Michelle Quire, University of Florida – IFAS
Jaynee Tolle, University of Cincinnati
Kirsten Yehl, Northwestern University

Visit the DAN site and give us feedback to ensure that this resource is all it should be. Help us help you!

LaJauna Ellis is Chair of the Departmental Administration Neighborhood Committee and serves as Program Manager, School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology

eRA

The American Heart Association has a new online system for submissions named Grants@Heart (https://research.americanheart.org). Instructions are imbedded in the system rather than a manual. Registration is required.

Grants.gov will continue email notifications of opportunities and modifications. It previously announced a January 31 cut-off date. The goal is to move to an RSS feed but some users still want email. Grants.gov says it transmits >650,000 emails per night updating applicants of grant opportunities and/or modifications. This consumes significant system power and may interfere with submissions. For more on the RSS feed including a tutorial, please see the links in the eRA Neighborhood.


NIH has begun its transition to Adobe grant application forms from the PureEdge-based forms. Most funding opportunities and forms have been posted. Those for most small business (R41, R42, R43, R44) and conference (R13/U13) applications are due in early February. To verify you’ve downloaded the correct forms, look for AD OBE-FORM S in the Competition ID on the Download page.

Beginning with the February 12, 2009 submission date, NIH Research Career Development Award Programs (K awards) are transitioning to electronic submission for all except the K12s. And rather than limited budget information, applicants will be required to send the SF424(R&R) Detailed Budget with the initial application submission.

Ever wondered which NSF programs are limited submissions? Wonder no more. See http://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_sro.jsp

For more information and links regarding the above, please visit NCURAs eRA Neighborhood.

Terri M. Hall is a member of the eRA Neighborhood Committee and serves as Director, Electronic Research Administration, Associate Director, Pre-Award Administration, Office of Research at University of Notre Dame
FRA

We hope that all of you who attended the FRA X Conference came away with fresh ideas and renewed vigor for handling the difficult issues we face daily in financial research administration. We hope you were also able to expand your network of peers. If you have the need for a new policy, don’t reinvent the wheel! Check out the Financial Research Administration Neighborhood website for links to other institution’s policies, procedures and forms.

A recently settled audit focused on two areas of concern to all of us: cost transfers and reporting of effort on summer salary. The auditors claimed cost transfers were used to “spend down” funds near the end of the grant period, citing the costs were not allocable to the grants audited. The auditors also claimed that effort relating to summer salary was not based on a distribution of actual effort, and so were also not allocable to the grants. For more detail, see the link on the Financial Research Neighborhood’s library website under “Audit.”

Linda Ward is the Chair of the FRA Neighborhood Committee and serves as Grant Accounting Manager, Children’s Hospitals and Clinics of Minnesota

INTERNATIONAL

I have a lot of good news to report on the international front. First, Jim Casey, co-editor of the NCURA Magazine and Chair of the International Neighborhood, recently published University-Industry Partnerships: Contracting, Communication, Education and Leadership as part of a report published by the Queensland University of Technology entitled Legal Strategies for Streamlining Collaboration in an e-Research World. The report is available for downloading at: http://eprints.qut.edu.au/17149/1/c17149.pdf.

Second, two new members have been added to NCURA’s Commission on International Research Administration: Dr. Paul Craven and Dr. Ian McMahon. Paul Craven is Head of the Joint Research Office at St George’s, University of London, as well as Vice President of the European Association of Research Managers and Administrators (EARMa). Ian McMahon is currently Director of the Research Office at the Australian National University (ANU) as well as President of the Australasian Research Management Society (ARMS), which represents Australian and New Zealand research managers and administrators.

Finally, several new members have joined the International Neighborhood Committee since the beginning of 2009, and we extend a hearty welcome to: Tania Bezzobs, University of Melbourne, Australia; Cynthia Carr, Loyola Marymount University; Jennifer Crockett, Harvard University; David McGinnis, Montana State University-Billings; and Makiko Takahashi, Tohoku University, Japan.

John M. Carfora is Executive Director, Office for Research and Sponsored Projects at Loyola Marymount University, as well as Chair of NCURA’s Commission on International Research Administration and a member of NCURA’s International Neighborhood Committee.

PRE-AWARD

What does the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) mean for the pre-award administrator? As a pre-award administrator, subrecipient information exceeding $25,000 can be collected using the following elements:

(A) the name of the entity receiving the award;
(B) the amount of the award;
(C) information on the award including transaction type, funding agency, the North American Industry Classification System code or Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number (where applicable), program source, and an award title descriptive of the purpose of each funding action;
(D) the location of the entity receiving the award and the primary location of performance under the award, including the city, State, congressional district, and country;
(E) a unique identifier of the entity receiving the award and of the parent entity of the recipient, should the entity be owned by another entity; and
(F) any other relevant information specified by the Office of Management and Budget.

Stay tuned to PAN link for information and templates on FFATA: http://www.ncura.edu/content/regions_and_neighborhoods/neighborhoods/pre_award/index.php

Rosemary Madnick is a member of the Pre-award Neighborhood Committee and serves as Director, Office of Grants, Contracts and Compliance, Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science
Get involved... Stay involved.

2009 Call for Officer and Board Nominations

Vice-President/President Elect
Secretary
Treasurer-Elect
At-Large Members of the Board of Directors

by Judy Fredenberg

The Nominating and Leadership Development Committee is pleased to present the opportunity for all members of NCURA to nominate (or self-nominate) candidates to serve as the next leaders for our organization. We urge you to consider individuals for the following important positions:

- Vice-President/President Elect
- Secretary
- Treasurer-Elect
- Two At-Large Board Members

NCURA provides many opportunities to volunteer within our professional organization – currently at a membership that exceeds 7000! By expanding your involvement, you are afforded a wealth of enriching experiences. Being active and involved in NCURA can be as simple as considering whom to nominate for these positions, and then making that nomination. In addition, if you are interested in these positions and would like to submit your name for consideration, we are waiting to hear from you.

Terms of these positions will begin on January 1, 2010. Please email nominations to: nominations@ncura.edu.

All nominations and supporting materials from the nominees must be received electronically on or before May 22, 2009.

For a detailed description of the current responsibilities of these positions, please visit: http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/opportunities/

2009 NCURA Awards: Nominations Being Accepted

Recognizing the contributions of our colleagues is one of the highest honors we can bestow. Additionally, nurturing diversity expands the energy and creativity of our membership and builds a stronger volunteer organization. Now is the time to acknowledge an extraordinary mentor, collaborator, or friend, and identify a candidate for the minority travel award. The awards below encourage you to go to your computer and nominate your colleagues for any of the three awards to be given each year at the Annual Meeting and/or to apply for a minority travel award to the Annual Meeting. Don’t hesitate – do it now!

**Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration**
This award is given annually to an individual who has made a significant contribution to the profession of research administration.
*Deadline for nominations: May 29, 2009*

**Distinguished Service Award**
This award is given to up to five individuals who have made significant contributions to NCURA.
*Deadline for nominations: May 29, 2009*

**Joseph Carrabino Award**
This award is given to a federal employee who has made a significant contribution to research administration, either through a singular innovation or by a lifetime of service.
*Deadline for nominations: May 29, 2009*

**Catherine Core Minority Travel Award**
This program supports travel-related costs to the NCURA Annual Meeting for up to four individuals from under-represented groups who would not otherwise be able to attend this conference.
*Deadline for applications: May 29, 2009*

For more information on these awards, please visit http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/awards/index.php

Judy Fredenberg is the Chair of the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee and serves as the Executive Director of Federal Relations, University of Montana.

FRA X Co-chair Jane Youngers, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio; NCURA Executive Director, Kathleen Larmett; FRA X Keynote Speaker, Economist, Gene Stanaland; FRA X Co-chair Cathy Snyder, Vanderbilt University; and NCURA President, Denise Clark, University of Maryland College Park. Watch for a look-back and photos of of this special anniversary conference – Financial Research Administration X, February 9-11, 2009, La Quinta, CA, in the next issue of the NCURA Magazine.
NCURATV'S JANUARY PROGRAM, AUDITS AND THE AUDIT PROCESS, IS NOW AVAILABLE ON DVD!

Our January broadcast shared critical information with educational institutions around the country. Program panelists included David Mayo, Director, Sponsored Research, California Institute of Technology; Denise Clark, Assistant Vice President for Research Administration and Advancement, University of Maryland, College Park; Tom Cooley, CFO & Director, Office of Budget, Finance and Award Management, NSF; and Lillie Ryans-Culclager, Director, Engineering Research Administration, Stanford University.

Please join our panel of experts as the 2009 Broadcast Workshop Series continues:

aired March 10, 2009
Order your DVD today!

COST SHARING: WHY NO GOOD DEED GOES UNPUNISHED

Moderator: Kim Moreland, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research Administration, University of Wisconsin - Madison
Panel: Richard Seligman, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, California Institute of Technology; Stephen Hansen, Associate Provost for Research and Dean, Graduate School, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville; Tracey Fraser, Senior Director of Cost Studies and Financial Compliance, California Institute of Technology

June 9, 2009

F&A RATES FOR THE NON-ACCOUNTANT

Moderator: Gunta Liders, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, University of Rochester
Panel: Jerry Fife, Associate Vice Chancellor for Business Services and Research Finance, Vanderbilt University; Ann Holmes, Assistant Dean, Finance & Administration, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, University of Maryland, College Park; Jane Youngers, Assistant Vice President for Research and Sponsored Programs, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio

September 15, 2009

SUBRECIPIENT MONITORING: ASSESSING RISK

Moderator: Rob Barbret, Director of Sponsored Programs, Controller's Office, University of Michigan
Panel: Pamela Webb, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, Sponsored Projects Administration, University of Minnesota; Bruce Morgan, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research, Office of Research, University of California, Riverside; Samantha Westcott, Grant Manager, Division of Biology, California Institute of Technology

Register your institution today to receive these important programs via live digital satellite or DVD. The complete series is available for purchase at a discounted rate. Individual programs can also be purchased. Registration and program information can be found at http://www.ncura.edu/content/educational_programs/ncura_tv/ or by following the NCURATV links on our homepage, www.ncura.edu.

Don’t miss this opportunity to bring training directly to your institution and to add a valuable resource to your professional development library.
POINT. CLICK. DONE.

GRANT, FINANCIAL AND HR MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE YOU'LL LOVE TO USE.

It's every organization's worst nightmare. Buy the high-priced, high-end software. End up with a complicated, high-priced, high-end lemon that no one on your staff wants to use.

FROM HIGH ANXIETY TO HIGH FIVES.

Enter IT Works, where high-end software has a low-end price, and is as easy to use as it is powerful. In fact, IT Works software is so simple to learn that the people who buy it actually end up using it. How amazing is that?


See it now at itworks-inc.com.
NCURA Calendar of Events

ONLINE TUTORIALS
A Primer on Clinical Trials.
7 week program ..................................Next session: April 6-May 22, 2009
A Primer On Federal Contracting.
8 week program ..................................Next session: April 6-May 29, 2009
(additional dates available for both Online Tutorials, visit the website for details.)

FUNDAMENTALS OF SPONSORED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION
Chicago, IL.................................................May 27-29, 2009
Philadelphia, PA..............................August 3-5, 2009

SPONSORED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION II WORKSHOPS
Chicago, IL.................................................May 27-29, 2009
New York, NY (NYU) .........................September 14-16, 2009

FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOPS
Philadelphia, PA..............................August 3-5, 2009

2009 NCURA TV DIGITAL SATELLITE BROADCAST SERIES
Audits and the Audit Process (DVD Available) ...aired January 13, 2009
Cost Sharing: Why No Good Deed Goes
Unpunished (DVD Available) ......................aired March 10, 2009
F&A Rates for the Non-Accountant .............June 9, 2009
Subrecipient Monitoring: Assessing Risk ........September 15, 2009

ONLINE CHATS
Navigating the Latest Electronic Submission Platforms ......................March 18, 2:00-3:00 pm EDT
Strategies for Dealing with Budget Woes ......April 15, 2:00-3:00 pm EDT
Training & Education ................................May 20, 2:00-3:00 pm EDT
Integrating Pre & Post Award Offices ..........June 17, 2:00-3:00 pm EDT

2009 REGIONAL MEETINGS
Region I: Mount Snow, VT .................May 3-6, 2009
Region II: Annapolis, MD ...............April 26-29, 2009
Region III: Panama City, FL ............May 3-6, 2009
Region IV: Minneapolis, MN ..........April 26-29, 2009
Region V: San Antonio, TX ..........April 26-29, 2009
Regions VI/VII: Santa Fe, NM ..........April 5-8, 2009

ANNUAL MEETING

For further details and updates visit our events calendar at www.ncura.edu