ONE WORLD connected through research

REFLECTIONS on a career in research administration

& COMMENTS on international collaboration

See page 10
On the Cover:

This Magazine issue highlighting international research administration aligns perfectly with the upcoming October Annual Meeting theme of “One World Connected Through Research.” Many of you know that NCURA has spent the past six years or so building greater collaborations internationally, particularly with our colleagues at EARMA (European Association of Research Managers and Administrators). These partnerships continue to grow, in Europe and elsewhere.

The fascinating aspect of international research administration is that it never grows old. The cultural, economic, political and social differences are often significant; research administrators are called to excellence despite these differences. And for those of us who work with colleagues anywhere in the world, more often than not, we succeed.

You have in front of you another packed issue of NCURA news and information, particularly information relating to the upcoming Annual Meeting. This issue is also significant for the feature articles: the first Magazine article written in a foreign language (Spanish); articles written by colleagues in Australia, Israel, and Qatar; and several articles infused with African and European experiences. Writing from Sweden, former NCURA President Clark McCartney shares his thoughts on his career in research administration and international collaboration in general. The wide diversity of these articles illustrates the kaleidoscope that is international research administration.

It is sincerely hoped that this issue will put you in the mood for the Annual Meeting. So, enjoy it and “think international.”

James Casey
Senior Co-Editor
Science Sessions

We are pleased to announce the return of the NCURA SCIENCE SESSIONS. This year we are fortunate to have recruited four very talented scientists that will share insights into their respective research. We encourage you to attend these special sessions for the passion displayed by these researchers will inspire and remind us of our ultimate aim of supporting the scientist. So, take a break from worrying about how to manage research and stop by and listen to the results of their scientific efforts.

Dr. Peggy Agouris, Professor and Chair, Department of Geography and Geoinformation Science, George Mason University. Dr. Agouris will share her expertise in digital image processing, remote sensing, and geospatial and geotemporal informatics. Join this session to hear the technical aspects of GIS development and in the ways in which GIS can be utilized to support research in a wide variety of disciplines.

This session is scheduled for 10:30 am, Friday, October 23.

Dr. Stephen L. Hansen, Associate Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville. Dr. Hansen specializes in the Civil War and Reconstruction. He will share his scholarly work on our 16th President Abraham Lincoln.

This session is scheduled for 10:30 am, Thursday, October 22.

Dr. Patricia E. Berg, Professor of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Department of Biochemistry, George Washington University, Medical Center. In 2003, a team of researchers lead by Dr. Berg discovered BP1, a gene found activated in sample tissues of breast cancer, acute myeloid leukemia, and prostate cancer. Join this session to learn how BP1 may serve as a significant target for cancer therapy.

This session is scheduled for 1:30 pm, Friday, October 23.

Dr. Francisco Dallmeier, Director, Monitoring and Assessment of Biodiversity Program, Smithsonian Institution. Since 1986, Dr. Dallmeier has directed the Smithsonian’s Monitoring and Assessment of Biodiversity Program. Come hear Dr. Dallmeier discuss the challenges of administering 300 research plots throughout the world and the significant contributions his work has had on conservation biology.

This session is scheduled for 8:30 am, Friday, October 23.
International Issues from the Capital View

E-VERIFY
September 8, 2009 was the effective date for E-Verify, the electronic employment eligibility verification system. Implemented after several delays, it is for federal contractors (not grantees) who are awarded a new contract after September 8, 2009. The contract will include the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) E-Verify clause (73 FR 67704). Contracts for less than $100,000 are exempt as well as those that are for commercially available off-the-shelf items. For contracts above $100,000, the requirement flows down to subcontracts for services or construction valued over $3,000. Contractors are required to enroll in E-Verify within 30 days of the contract award date and begin using the E-Verify system to confirm that all of their new hires and their employees directly working on federal contracts are authorized to legally work in the United States.

In affirming the Administration’s support for E-Verify on July 8, 2009, Department of Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano announced the Department’s intention to rescind the Social Security No-Match Rule, which had not been implemented and since has been blocked by court order, in favor of the more modern and effective E-Verify system.

E-Verify has been on most institutions’ radar screens since then-President George W. Bush amended Executive Order 12989 on June 6, 2008 directing federal agencies to require that federal contractors agree to electronically verify the employment eligibility of their employees. Nonetheless, an institution’s first $100,000 federal contract may come through the sponsored programs office to support research or other sponsored activities. As a contract requirement, the institution will be required to demonstrate that it is meeting this requirement during audits or inspections. As with many national policy requirements like the Clean Air or Drug-Free Workplace policies, compliance will likely fall to another office or unit at the institution, but the sponsored programs office will want to confirm that employees on the contract activity have been verified and that the requirement flows down and is monitored for subrecipients.

EXPORT CONTROLS
Export control regulations as managed by the Department of Commerce and the Department of State continue to plague universities. The recent sentencing of a retired university professor to four years in prison for violating the Arms Export Control Act [22 USC 2778(c)] included the admonition by the judge that the violation caused "harm to the security of the United States" by allowing the foreign national students to work on the contract to produce the technology to be used by the Department of Defense. As with any specific violation, the facts of this case are unique but it should serve as a reminder to investigators and their home institutions that the US will pursue and prosecute export control violations. In this case, the illegal exports related to technical information provided to two foreign students. Despite the investigator’s claim that he didn’t believe that mere research and the results of that research violated the Arms Export Control Act, the judge was not persuaded. It is important to recognize that this case involved apparent knowing violations by the investigator and personal financial interests and was brought against the individual researcher, not the institution. However, it does demonstrate the
importance of universities having an appropriate export compliance program in place.

On August 13, 2009, White House Press Secretary Robert Gibbs announced that “the President extended the authority for Department of Commerce-administered export controls. In addition, the President directed that the National Economic Council (NEC) and National Security Council (NSC) launch a broad-based interagency process for reviewing the overall U.S. export control system, including both the dual-use and defense trade processes. The aim of the review is to consider reforms to the system to enhance the national security, foreign policy, and economic security interests of the United States.”

This NEC/NSC review called for by the President may be in response to a recent review of the export control mechanisms by the Government Accountability Office (GAO). The results of GAO’s review were presented in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and in the publication of that testimony in a report issued in June 2009 entitled “Export Controls: Fundamental Reexamination of System Is Needed to Help Protect Critical Technologies” (GAO-09-767T). GAO calls for a “fundamental reexamination of the current programs and processes” for protecting critical technologies. The report cites poor coordination among the export control enforcement agencies, the Department of State backlog of license applications, and the lack of systematic assessment by both State and Commerce as having created significant vulnerabilities in the export control system. It calls for a fundamental reexamination by both the executive and legislative branches.

Those of you keeping track know that the Department of Commerce, through various reviews and committees, has been assessing the export control regulations for several years, most recently focused in the Department’s Emerging Technologies and Research Advisory Committee (ETRAC). Established in May, 2008, the ETRAC is to provide recommendations to help keep the Commerce Control List current with respect to emerging technologies and research and development activities that have dual-use applications. The establishment of the ETRAC was in response, in part, to a recommendation of the Deemed Export Advisory Committee (DEAC) included in its 2007 report “The Deemed Export Rule in the Era of Globalization. ETRAC” is now developing a report that seems to focus on developing a different methodology for review of the Commerce Control List and clarification of certain definitions in the Export Administration Regulations.

As institutions develop and pursue international collaborations – collaborations critical to advances in science and expanding our understanding of the world in which we live – it is important to keep track of protecting our national interests as well. The tensions that may emerge in reconciling those goals – collaboration and protection – require information and communication across campus.

Helen Keller reminded us that “Security is mostly superstition. It does not exist in nature.... Avoiding danger is no safer in the long run than outright exposure. The fearful are caught as often as the bold.” Don’t be afraid or (maybe) just don’t get caught!

Carol Blum is Director of Research Compliance and Administration at the Council on Governmental Relations.

Advertisement

Q. If a train leaves Boston at 7:04 p.m. traveling west at 80 mph...and a second train departs Kansas City heading east at 4:07 a.m...at what time should you consider obtaining external expert advice for your research support needs? (50 points – answer below)

When you need quality professional assistance in any area of the research enterprise, Richards & Associates can solve your problem. We have decades of university, consulting, NACUBO faculty, and federal government experience (former DCA negotiators) coupled with a “can do” attitude.

✓ F&A Cost Rate Proposal
✓ Composite fringe benefits
✓ Rate negotiation
✓ Space survey including funcitonalization
✓ Effort reporting
✓ Pre-award proposal and award tracking control
✓ Streamlining, quality assurance, policy and procedure development
✓ Reach us for more...

The time is now! Richards and Associates can make your research enterprise train stay on track and run with timely precision. Call us to collect your points!

Richards & Associates
John Richards, Principal

www.richardsandassociates.com
reach.us@richardsandassociates.com
909-214-1523
It is Friday at 4:30 pm and the President’s office confirms the signing ceremony with a university in Mexico—a joint research collaboration including students—scheduling it for next Tuesday in the host country. The Agreement of Cooperation has been bouncing back and forth between lawyers for both institutions. Neither party has yet to find a balanced agreement ready for signature, reviewing and revising the last significant details of the contract.

Tuesday arrives and the signing ceremony, along with the champagne glasses, gift exchanges and media coverage highlighting the bi-national venture, concludes successfully. Behind the scenes and frequently undisclosed to all past, present and future participants lays the arduous and diligent work of a translator who translated the original legal document. From its inception to its modified final version, the translator is quaked by (sometimes unusual) time constraints and perpetual revising and editing.

The importance of translation, although crucial, has often been obscured; however, more and more it is becoming an inevitable necessity.

It is no secret that globalization is an ever-growing fact that affects our world in numerous ways; this is particularly so in research administration. The importance of translating has now moved to the foreground. With the internet at our fingertips, making it effortless to reach a global market, bordering countries are finding themselves bewildered with an array of newfound legal and potential court-destined questions. Contracts, one can say, now take the lead in corporate documentation translations and with more and more international research, accurate contract translation is critical.

Translating legal documents present some challenges: a) lack of guidelines; b) translator experience; c) different legal and judicial systems; and d) responsibilities. These are now considered in turn.

La hora es 16:30, un viernes. La oficina del Rector recién confirmó la firma del convenio con una universidad mexicana programada para el próximo martes, contrato que pretende establecer una colaboración de investigación científica y un programa de intercambio estudiantil. Los abogados hasta ahorita no han concluido con una última versión del acuerdo y continúan cambiando y corrigiendo hasta los más mínimos detalles del contrato.

El siguiente martes se celebró la firma del convenio y los representantes de ambas instituciones se encontraban alzando las copas e intercambiando detallitos mientras los rectores se tomaban fotos para la prensa. Otro avance internacional dentro del mundo académico. Desapercibido por los integrantes de este proceso y detrás de las escenas se encuentra la ardua labor de un traductor. Tomando en cuenta las exigencias de fechas límites, el traductor se somete a cambios de última hora, revisiones múltiples, además de la tarea compleja de traducir documentos legales.

La importancia de un traductor repetitivamente ha quedado en la oscuridad, sin embargo, hoy en día es una necesidad inevitable.

Con el crecimiento y desarrollo del mercado global y el avance de la tecnología permitiendo transacciones mundiales simultáneamente, ha surgido y está en demanda el negocio de traducción, particularmente en el área de la coordinación de investigación.

Las actividades, políticas y normas dentro de las sociedades han puesto en marcha una nueva etapa dentro del bi-nacionalismo. La red de internet facilita y amplía el mercado global y la necesidad de convenios y contratos internacionales, tales que obligan a dos países a reevaluar su sistema judicial dado a cuestiones que nacen de esta relación internacional. Es decir, el mundo está a la consideración de un sistema judicial homogéneo. Esto ha causado un crecimiento dentro del negocio de traducciones, convirtiendo esta práctica como una de las más cotizadas de hoy en día. El origen y la evolución de un país, pleno con sus raíces, cultura e historia, ahora será la clave para entrelazar a dos países y crear relaciones estrechas.

Dado a que la formalidad de traducir permanece en un estado novato, el acto de traducir se enfrenta con varios retos: a) falta de criterio, b) experiencia del traductor, c) diferentes sistemas judiciales, d) obligaciones y responsabilidades.
Lack of Guidelines: To date there are no established guidelines to follow or emulate in this crucial, legal phase. Much like roles in research administration, those in the field of translation and interpretation must rely on continuously acquiring knowledge and keeping their knowledge tank filled. Judicial procedures evolve and change, consequently setting up self-defined, characteristic guidelines. A simple illustration of this could be none other than the contract style format. Should the headings be in bold, capital letters? This is common in Mexican legal contracts. Centered or left aligned? Do you use Roman numerals or Arabic numbers? Contracts in Mexico, for example, tend to center the main topics and display all caps in its opening statement and spell out numbers. Although these are only minor translating issues the translator must assure that the fluidity and clarity of the contract is not compromised. Experience has proven that these seemingly trivial questions are negotiable and can be the subject of compromise.

One particular example (taken from an actual, undisclosed legal document) of these trivial matters is the following:

Que por no serme conocida la compareciente, se identificó con pasaporte mexicano número ocho, nueve, cero, cero, tres, cero, etc.

(I attest to [this person’s] identity who has presented the Mexican passport: number eight, nine, zero, zero, three, zero, etc.)

The legal document denotes the client’s passport number using word numbers as opposed to numerals.

Translator Experience: The translator’s experience and judgment, including their level and depth of understanding of both cultures, sets much of the self-defined guidelines. Ethnolinguistic traces are often unavoidable when translating documents and should not be completely disregarded. Using Mexico as our host country (although applicable to other countries), there is a linguistic aestheticism to be considered. The [Mexican] legal Spanish tends to be expressive and on average 20% lengthier than its English counterpart. Even the novice translator shortly learns that it is unnecessary to translate every single word in order to maintain its genuineness.

Observe the following example:

Texto en inglés:

The grantor of these covenants hereby has the right and lawful authority to sell and convey said property and will defend the same against any lawful claims. [27 palabras]

Traducción literal:

El dueño de estos poderes tiene el derecho y autoridad legal de vender y decidir sobre dicha propiedad y la defenderá igualmente contra cualquier reclamo legal. [26 palabras]
Legal and Judicial Differences: The legislative branch of every country is complex and particular to its geographic area, culture and faith (religious) institutions; each nation addresses their own legal jurisdiction. The most relevant and challenging factor in translating legally binding documents lies within each country’s distinct judicial system. And in fact, there are times where a contract is a reflection of an explanation more so than a translation. For example, the Mexican judicial system does not include a jury panel from a citizen pool. There is no way to translate the concept of a jury other than to explain the equivalent of the process in the host country.

Responsibilities: Although there are some techniques and translation theories that one can follow, translating is like painting a picture; no two resulting translations can be identical. Two of these responsibilities include:

1. Accuracy- Translating is a skill that takes on many holistic challenges but with a common end goal; the new textual creation must respect accuracy, demonstrate adherence to the content source and maintain its functional component.

II. Clarity- Regardless of the translation theories and published conjectures on its methods and techniques, when dealing with contract translations, clarity is the key. Because of the principal role of the [translated] document, the translator must be particularly conscientious of each country’s judicial system, accepting and assuring that both linguistic versions can stand alone and that these contracts play a part in establishing and/or enhancing international collaboration (or transversely, damaging it). Legal translation is part of the bridge that binds the mutual understanding that now defies historical barriers and cultural variances.

Literal translation:
In the general powers to exercise dominating acts, it will suffice that these give each other that character so that the empowered have all the abilities of an owner, including all that is relevant to the property, like doing all types of gestures to defend it. (46 words)

Translation:
The grantor of these covenants hereby has the right and lawful authority to sell and convey said property and will defend the same against any lawful claims. (27 words)

Traducción:
En los poderes generales para ejercer actos de dominio, bastará que se den con ese carácter para que el apoderado tenga todas las facultades de dueño, tanto en lo relativo a los bienes, como para hacer toda clase de gestiones a fin de defenderlos. (44 palabras)

Diferencias de sistemas judiciales. La rama judicial y la legislativa de cada país han sido influenciadas y hasta cierto punto, determinadas por sus creencias religiosas, su zona geográfica, su idioma y su cultura. Este simple dato puede convertirse en el infame reto del traductor. Contemplar un oficio o un contrato no es una tarea de simplemente traducir palabras, sino abarca interpretar leyes que tal vez no existen en el país y pueden llegar a ser categórico en un juicio. En estas circunstancias, el traductor se encuentra autenticando una explicación en vez de traducir. Un claro ejemplo se puede destacar dentro de la definición de un jurado; en Estados Unidos el jurado es un panel compuesto de ciudadanos con el objetivo de declarar inocencia o culpabilidad. La Republica de México no incluye a sus ciudadanos en el proceso judicial y consecuentemente no existe un jurado.

Responsabilidades. Actualmente existen algunas técnicas y teorías de traducción, sin embargo el arte de traducir es como pintar una obra; no existen dos originales idénticos. Traducir es un trabajo que requiere talento, experiencia y conocimiento para enfrentar varios retos y facetas con la finalidad de crear un texto que respete la sustancia y la exactitud de un documento en otro idioma. No existe una fórmula exacta para llevar a cabo una traducción, solo exige exactitud y lucidez.

Exactitud- La tarea de traducir cuya única meta es generar un texto nuevo tiene la obligación de adherirse a la integridad del documento original, no obstante los retos innumerables.

Lucidez- A pesar de las teorías, métodos y técnicas publicadas (para traducir) mantener claridad es vital. La responsabilidad del traductor es mantenerse al tanto de los sistemas judiciales de ambos países y consecuentemente, sus cambios. Muy en particular, el traductor tiene que asegurar que la traducción puede sostenerse por sí mismo como un documento claro y preciso. El traductor tiene que estar consciente de que este tipo de documento establece y declara relaciones bi-nacionales y que de lo contrario, puede lastimar o dañar esa relación. La traducción es el puente que engendra un mutuo entendimiento que sobrepasa culturas, fronteras y barreras.
CONCLUSION

So how does this discussion impact research administration? As multinational research agreements proliferate, research administrators will find that different countries have different views on the importance of research and therefore research administration. Contracts and agreements, however, will continue to be the guiding light in the growing field of credible international research. Consequently, it is incumbent on the research administrator to give the selection of the translator (or translating entity) as much serious consideration as the selection of the researchers themselves. To do otherwise could endanger not only the research project, but the entire relationship between the institutions conducting the research. Furthermore, a poorly translated agreement could lead to legal difficulties in one or both of the participating countries. In short, make sure that the translated versions of founding documents are as solid as the originals by using a knowledgeable, professional translator. Project success may depend on this simple fact.

Brenda Luján is a Grants & Contracts Assistant in the Physics & Astronomy Department at The University of Texas at San Antonio. She interpreted legal documents while employed at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México and for Mexican attorney Dr. Mario Melgar Adalid.

MILESTONES

DAVID RICHARDSON, Pennsylvania State University, has been promoted to Associate Vice President for Research.

CHRISTINA HANSEN, University of California-Irvine, is retiring from her position as Assistant Vice Chancellor of the Office of Research Administration on October 1, 2009.

STEPHANIE WASSERMAN, previously Director of Sponsored Programs at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, is now the Director of Sponsored Programs at Harvard Medical School.

NINO ROSADO, Harvard Medical School, is now the Assistant Director of Sponsored Programs Administration.

COREY GRAVES, previously Grants & Contracts Officer at the University of North Dakota School of Medicine & Health Sciences, is now the Grants Manager in the Division of Cardiology at the University of Minnesota effective September 14, 2009.

CYNTHIA HOPE, Director of the Office for Sponsored Programs within the division of the Office for Research at The University of Alabama, has been named Assistant Vice President for Research at UA.

ROBERT KARRS, previously at Yale School of Medicine, accepted a position as Director of Grant & Contract Administration, Department of Medicine, Duke University Medical Center.
At the 2009 Annual Meeting of the European Association of Research Managers and Administrators (EARMA), a member of EARMA's Executive Committee affectionately introduced you to an attendee as “The Godfather” of international research administration who brought the Europeans and Americans together. Would you care to comment?

Now for the rest of the “Godfather” story. When former NCURA President Bob Killoren asked me to Chair NCURA’s Commission on International Research Administration and take the lead in establishing meaningful international connections between NCURA and similar professional organizations located abroad, my first communication was to the then President of EARMA, Dr. Frank Heemskerk. I subsequently received an invitation to attend EARMA’s annual meeting in Genova, Italy (2004), and asked Denise Wallen to accompany me; together we were the first “official” NCURA delegation to an EARMA annual meeting. There were subsequent EARMA meetings in Paris, Warsaw, Barcelona (which I had to miss), and now Copenhagen, and through it all I have been able to strengthen old professional relationships and develop new ones. Indeed, I do my utmost to stay in regular communication with senior leaders of similar professional bodies such as INORMS (International Network of Research Management Societies), the Australasian Research Management Society, the Association of Commonwealth Universities, and similar emerging professional groups in Africa, Asia and South America.

Can you say a little more about some initiatives you are working on?

Yes, I am working with an initial group of 15 universities – mostly in, but clearly not limited to, developing countries in Asia, Africa and Central and South America – on ways to link and coordinate administrative and financial aspects of international research collaborations. These are in the early stages, but they are progressing quite nicely. Though not linked to any professional association(s) just yet, it’s very exciting work, and I would be delighted to report on specifics at a later time.

What can you share about your Fulbright Scholar experience in Ireland?

My Fulbright Scholar experience in Ireland – in the areas of higher education and international research administration – was truly a “pot-of-gold” in every respect. I was hosted by Dr. Steve Jerrams at the Dublin Institute of Technology, and our work took us to Queens University (Belfast, Northern Ireland) and Coventry University (England). Later, Steve and I presented with Dr. Alan Solomon (Israel) at EARMA’s annual conference in Copenhagen. I also was able to connect with academic colleagues at Trinity College Dublin, University College Dublin, and both The London School of Economics and Oxford University. In brief, it was a marvelous professional experience, and one that offered a unique opportunity to live, work and make many wonderful friends in Ireland.

What are you reading and do you have some recommendations for the international research administrator’s bookshelf?

There are three items I recommend. First, a report – titled Joint and Double Degree Programs in the Transatlantic Context – published by the Institute of International Education (IIE) and the Freie Universität Berlin (2009) that looks at the landscape of transatlantic degree programs, and further identifies challenges and opportunities of (1) maintaining and expanding existing programs, and/or (2) developing new initiatives. Second, a report of a workshop – titled International Collaborations in Behavioral and Social Sciences – published by the National Academies Press (2008) – looks at those challenges and opportunities inherent in international research collaborations, and how to overcome barriers and maximize the mutual benefits embedded in such initiatives. Third, I always recommend that colleagues read the “international resources” section of NCURAs International Neighborhood, which I created and update yearly. The web address is easy to remember at: http://www.ncura.edu/content/regions_and_neighborhoods/neighborhoods/international/international_resources.php. Wow, my memory still works!

NCURA has been a major player in international research administration over the past six years. What do you see as the emerging opportunities for NCURA on the international level and how can NCURA members continue to cultivate international contacts?

NCURA has been a player in international research administration largely because a small number of its members – with a desire to serve NCURA colleagues – have made international research their professional passion. Looking forward, we need to expand the pool so to speak and bring forward a new generation of colleagues with a demonstrated level-of-skill and expertise in international research administration.
Q What has been your greatest professional satisfaction in being involved in international research administration?

A Two come to mind. First, making strong professional friendships – like those I developed with Wiktor Kurzeja (President of EARMA), Paul Craven (Vice President of EARMA), Dr. Alan Solomon (Israel), Steve Jerrams (Ireland), and Jose Mario Leite (Portugal) to name but a few – and with numerous other fellow research administrators and academic colleagues around the world. Second, when I was recovering from surgery in 2005, I spent most of that period developing all the items which today constitute NCURA’s International Neighborhood website, and my greatest joy was creating from scratch the “International Resources” section of that site. Wherever I travel, I often hear that it is the most comprehensive on-line site for such resources anywhere.

Q Do you have any final suggestions for those NCURA members who are intrigued by international research administration?

A Get involved and maintain a goal to fully develop as broad a range of skills in international research administration as you possibly can. See the profession in its global context, locate yourself in that context, and stay actively involved in the international network of research administrators and managers. On a practical note, there are three specific ways to get involved. First, through NCURA’s International Neighborhood, and specifically by contacting its Chair (Jim Casey). Second, by sharing “international experiences” – or by asking questions – through the International Neighborhood’s popular list serve. Third, by attending national conferences and regional meetings and connecting with presenters and participants at thematic and topical sessions around international research administration. All my very best!

Dr. John M. Carfora is Executive Director of Research and Sponsored Projects at Loyola Marymount University in Los Angeles, and Chair of NCURA’s Commission on International Research Administration.
The University of Southern California (USC)

I then returned to California for family reasons, to continue my legal studies at USC, and I needed a job! By this time the space race was in top gear, spurred on by the Soviet Sputnik satellite launch. The Federal Government accelerated funding, which ultimately resulted in man landing on the moon in 1969. I was then part of the space business as a contracts administrator at Philco Corporation’s Western Development Laboratories in Palo Alto, California. This work really was my first job coordinating professional engineering and program staff with senior corporate management and our government agency clients. Palo Alto was a great place to work; however, in 1965 a job offer came to me from USC to develop and manage a research administration office, including a Medical School campus. I accepted the job offer.

The responsibilities of the office included financial administration, as well as pre- and post-award administration for all sponsored contracts and grants. From the beginning of my USC tenure in June 1965 to retirement in June 1985, my memoirs could fill a book! The first year seemed like I was walking from one fire to the next as the Federal sponsored projects portfolio at USC kept growing to an annual volume of over $100 million during my direction of the sponsored projects office.

As a private university, we had several layers of auditors regularly on campus with responsibilities to their various sponsors and employers to monitor the sponsored accounts. If any disallowances were recommended by audit reports, it was my responsibility to defend the costs accumulated for the particular project because the university as a non-profit corporation did not have contingency funds to replace recovered sponsored funds. Because of the very strict budget/cost monitoring system for sponsored projects, we were able to satisfy all audit disallowances with sponsors and not have any project funds returned during my 20 year tenure at USC.

Many of our sponsored projects were multi-year contracts or grants. NIH and NSF individual research and department projects come to mind along with large special projects such as a DARPA (Defense Advanced Projects Agency, DOD) program for advanced computer hardware development in the School of Engineering as well as an NSF block grant to establish a Department of Materials Science. The School of Medicine’s community project to provide medical services to the Watts district in Los Angeles, after the riot there in 1965, with OEO funding (Office of Economic Opportunity) was quite memorable. There were many other fascinating research and demonstration projects at USC.

International Collaboration

In reference to the international theme of the 2009 NCURA Annual Meeting, I do want to mention several international collaborations involving USC. Choose a continent: Europe, Asia, the Middle East, or Africa. All were involved.

In Europe, USC operated graduate centers for American military personnel in the fields of Education, Public Administration, and International Relations. These activities were conducted under contracts with the U.S. Department of Defense.

In Iran, the School of Public Administration operated demonstration projects funded by the State Department to improve public water and sewage systems as well as pollution control procedures in the capital, Teheran. The School of Public Administration became involved with training programs for the Iranian military until the on-campus activity of the program was disapproved by the Faculty Senate. Some collaboration will not come to fruition due to valid objections by faculty or policy decisions of university senior management.

In the July/August NCURA Magazine issue several impressive articles referred to various legislative, collaborative, and research administration considerations for international projects by U.S. universities. NCURA has had Canadian members for most of its 50 years. Now looking at current NCURA membership, one can note an increase in international members. As quoted in Jim Casey’s International Neighborhood
update in the last issue of the NCURA Magazine: “The world is, indeed, becoming a smaller place and NCURA will remain at the forefront of the internationalization of research administration.”

It may be easier for NCURA to build International bridges with other similar organizations around the world than specific University/Industry collaborations. The bridge(s) will be more difficult to build considering the daunting fact of industry’s collective emphasis on retention of intellectual property rights in research contract and grant agreements.

Some innovative programs of cooperation have been developed to encourage Industry-University collaboration such as the HP Labs program that seems to be successfully developing. Take a look at the July/August NCURA Magazine article by Martina Trucco and Richard Friedrich (pp. 22-23).

Perhaps a good solution to the IP ownership quandary for University/Industry collaborative relationships is answered in the same NCURA Magazine issue by Arundeepr Pradhan in his article entitled “Technology Transfer: Building and Maintaining Relations with Industry.” In other words, think licensing.

I would like to paraphrase the Economist issue of 23 May 09, pg. 88, as follows: “Today when governments from America to Japan are reinventing industrial policy with each off-the-cuff bailout, this study offers some useful reminders. One is that innovation is most likely to occur where there is market demand for it; another is that patents can delay innovation as well as stimulate it; a third is that the benefits of trade cannot be overestimated.” I propose that our Annual Meeting theme of “One World Connected Through Research” suggests including the benefits of trade through international collaboration.

National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA)

My long association with NCURA has been a joy to me for over four decades with remarkable fellowship. I joined NCURA in 1966, my second year at USC as Director of Contracts and Grants. Little did I know that I would be elected Vice President in 1971 for a two year term and then President for 1973 and 1974.

At that time NCURA was basically a Washington, D.C. Annual Meeting organization. We topped over 1200 members attending the 1974 meeting at the Capital Hilton Hotel. If anything can be remembered from my NCURA Administration, our most important change was the establishment of NCURA regions. It was my thinking—along with agreement by the NCURA Board—that with regional organizations we could provide for training courses closer to more members and provide more activities throughout the year than just the annual meeting. The second change was to amend our by-laws to provide for one year terms by the President and Vice-President. This was really a way of also recognizing the great support of our individual institutions for the work that we all do for NCURA without straining our off-campus activities versus our real jobs on-campus. And of course, NCURA finally established the flag in Washington, D.C. with a small national office, with the great help of our beloved Secretary–Treasurer, Julia Jacobsen.

Besides the above changes, it was my thinking that research administrators should have more representation in other Washington university associations that had a voice involving Federal research and sponsored projects. Thus I was, as a research administrator, along with Earl Cilley of Stanford, appointed to Board membership in COGR (NACUBO’s Committee on Government Relations) for a six year term. This event was really recognition that research administration spanned business and academic management. I must recognize several distinguished NCURA Past Presidents who have since served in COGR: Julie Norris and Jane Youngers. They have been fantastic leaders.

In addition to all this sponsored project activity during the past fifty years, intellectual property issues needed an organization to address and represent these issues. Thus, SUPA (Society of University Patent Administrators) was born, and subsequently succeeded by AUTM (Association of University Technology Managers). Earl Freise addressed the history of SUPA in his article in the July/August issue of the NCURA Magazine. One of the first major contributions by SUPA was to support and testify before Congress on the benefits of the Bayh-Dole Bill (eventually PL 95-17, signed into law December 12, 1980 by President Jimmy Carter). As President of SUPA (1975-76) and Chair of the COGR Committee on Patents and Copyrights, it was my privilege to testify before the initial Senate Committee hearing on this bill along with the following NCURA and COGR members: Howard Bremer of WARF, Roger Ditzel of the University of California, Ed MacCordy of Washington University and Nels Reimers of Stanford University.

My working life has been enriched with all the experiences of university life, especially with fellow NCURA colleagues and national office staff. I dedicate this article to the wonderful faculty that I had the privilege to meet, work on behalf of, and have as friends.

As for international collaboration, I am still involved. Living in Sweden each summer for the past two decades has enabled me to interact with many of our European research administration colleagues. This past June I was honored to attend the 10th annual meeting in Copenhagen of EARMA (European Association of Research Managers and Administrators). International research administration remains a fascinating aspect of the profession. Enjoy it whenever possible.

Clark McCartney was President of NCURA in 1973 and 1974. During that time, he served as Executive Director of Contracts and Grants at the University of Southern California.
OVERVIEW

OF THE AUSTRALIAN RESEARCH SCENE

The Australian research environment consists of 38 publicly funded Australian Universities (and 1 privately funded university), two national research organisations (established by statute) – the Commonwealth Scientific and Research Organisation (CSIRO) and the Defence Science and Technology Organisation (DSTO) - numerous medical research institutes, about 50 Cooperative Research Centres, the National ICT Australia Centre of Excellence, and other research organisations.

Research funding comes from a variety of sources and sectors – state and federal government, community, industry and philanthropic. However, for the university sector, the two most significant sources of funding are from the Australian Research Council (ARC) and the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC). These are roughly equivalent to the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and the National Endowment for the Humanities in the U.S.

It is these two Australian funding bodies which Australian universities are generally most obsessed about (these two bodies provide the bulk of research funding under the National Competitive Grants Program). Through their research funding schemes, they provide funding for the direct costs of research (costs of project research staff, other technical staff, project consumables, some travel and some equipment). It does not include the costs of staff already employed by universities – these are contributed as in-kind.

Funding from the ARC, the NHMRC and a select range of other funding bodies is known as Category 1 funding. This funding is very important as it is a key driver for universities receiving additional block funding to support infrastructure costs of research. There are 3 additional categories of funding (called Categories 2-4).

Universities have to report each year to the federal government on research income against all four categories. Through a series of formulas, universities receive funding through the Research Income Block Scheme (at about 20 cents on the research dollar) and the Institutional Grants Scheme (about 10 cents on the research dollar).

So every year, around April-June, research administrators are scurrying around trying to ensure that their research income data is accurate!

HOT ISSUES in Australian University Research Administration

1. Research administrators are busy responding to changes in the Australian policy environment

It’s acronym city in Australia at the moment, and the acronyms seem to change quite regularly – you can be sure that any new government policy initiative will have a new acronym. One of the reasons for the flurry of acronyms was the change of government in late 2007 and the new Labor government (roughly similar to the Democrats) is busy with a reform agenda.

Hot Policy Acronym #1 – ERA: Excellence in Research Australia

At the moment, many if not all Australian universities are grappling with the Excellence in Research Australia initiative which will attempt to assess research quality. Currently, two trials are underway in two discipline areas: Physical, Chemical and Earth Sciences (PCE) and Humanities and Creative Arts (HCA). In a complex coordination exercise that has placed strain on many university research management systems, the trials involve university researchers reporting on the details of Research Indicators to their home institution. These indicators include journal publications, esteem factors (such as editorial responsibilities and membership of learned academies), patents and other applied measures.
Hot Policy Acronym #2 – SRE: Sustainable Research Excellence

While I provided a summary of the current approach to the provision of block research funding for infrastructure support, the Australian Government has also flagged that it wants to implement a new model of research block funding under the banner of the Sustainable Research Excellence initiative. The goal of SRE is to improve funding for the indirect costs of research, which are recognised across the university sector as being under funded. The Australian Government is currently busy consulting on models of operation which are occupying the time of many research administrators.

Hot Policy Acronym #3

Well at the moment, there may not be a third hot acronym, but if anyone can think of a new combination involving research and excellence, please let us know.

2. Research administrators are busy with endless rounds of funding schemes

In the past, the Australian research cycle had peaks and troughs with February to March being the peak period for ARC and NHMRC funding and programs. In recent years, this has been extended out with NHMRC schemes running almost all year round and ARC schemes also having two long peak periods.

For 2009, we have had the normal load plus two Cooperative Research Centre funding rounds (each CRC receives $20-$30M funding), a Bionic Vision Special Research Initiative ($50M funding to the lucky recipient). We also expect an ARC Centre of Excellence Round, and a host of other major research initiatives. This keeps us all honest, but the poor research office staff would like to try and take their leave some time!

3. Research administrators are busy grappling with new research management information systems

Ah, the joys of information technology, which as we all know makes our lives so much easier. This year, we have seen the ARC implement a new research management scheme, which still has a few bugs to iron out, and the NHMRC trial of a new, and yes, different from the ARC, research management system. Sometimes we look offshore at Grants.gov with envy.

4. University researchers and research administrators want to collaborate internationally

Ask any good researcher in your university and they will tell you that they benchmark themselves against their international peers. They want to collaborate with the best in their field, no matter where they are located and they want to publish in the best journals in the world. Australian researchers are no different. It feels like half the time when I try to contact one of our researchers they are on a plane or already overseas. Thank goodness for the internet!

The challenge for our researchers and our institutions is ensuring that our government and institutional policy and funding environment allow this to happen. It is sometimes too easy to fall into the trap of coming across as being from the Research Prevention Office.

In the Australian system, using the Australian Research Council for example, we enter into what is a non-negotiable funding agreement with the ARC for every scheme. This funding agreement binds us, and, in many cases, requires us to enter into secondary agreements with our industry partners and research collaborators as the case may be. This may also include our international research partners. At my institution it is not uncommon to have research partners from the U.S., Europe and Asia on research projects. We ask that our partners respect the Australian funding environment and context and legislative requirements, just as we do when we collaborate on projects where the primary funding and lead research institution is internationally located.

Clearly, there remain challenges, which I think are in part due to the lack of understanding on both sides of the other party’s contextual environment. Sometimes it is challenging enough working out what is going on in your own backyard let alone someone else’s! I hope that in the future, our national research administration societies can continue to act as a conduit for greater research management cooperation. The establishment by NCURA of an International Neighborhood is an excellent example.

5. And last but not least

As I see it, the issue for all research administrators is finding out what’s going on at their institution with their researchers. We need to explain to our people why we need to know about their grand research project before rather than after the fact. We need to know who they are formally and informally collaborating with – we don’t want them going underground and around – we want them to trust and communicate with us.

Dr. Tania Bezzobs is Manager, Research Development in the Research Office at The University of Melbourne, Australia. She is a member of the NCURA International Neighborhood Committee.
COMPLIANCE

Congratulations! Many NCURA member institutions have earned ARRA funded “stimulus” awards and have already submitted their first ARRA spending report. The report details the amount of money received/spent, the project scope/timetable, and the number of jobs created among other things. While this reporting is an administrative process, let’s not forget the compliance aspects.

- Compliance is Job #1 - Hopefully, by now you have posted a notice of the rights and remedies provided under ARRA for whistleblowers. Go to http://www.recovery.gov/sites/default/files/Whistleblower+Poster.pdf for a sample poster notice. The notice lists ARRA related protections which exist in law for various types of recovery funding issues such as mismanagement of an agency grant. Why not use this as an opportunity to communicate other whistleblower protections, such as those pertaining to research billing fraud or research misconduct.

- Stay the Course - The Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board (the Board) is required to establish and maintain a public-facing website to track covered funds. The use of stimulus funds is being highly politicized and debated so we can expect increased public and government scrutiny as well. It is important to continue to be diligent with accurate, timely and transparent reporting.

- Stay Tuned - In August 2009, the Board published a Federal Register notice asking for public comments by October 6, 2009 on ARRA reporting data elements. As a result of this public comment process, it is likely that future quarterly reporting requirements may change, so we will need to be flexible as well.

Finally, check with your Institution to see what internal IRB trainings are available for the research administrators and staff. These presentations make great brown bag events!

Erin Bailey is a member of the Departmental Administration Neighborhood Subcommittee and serves as Grant Manager, Buffalo Center for Social Research, University at Buffalo.

DEPARTMENTAL

Research must be conducted safely and ethically for the system of trust between the public and academic institutions to survive. In order to ensure this, departmental research administrators must follow both local policies and federal regulations that require institutions who receive federal awards to have a research ethics committee review and approve research involving human subjects. For many departmental administrators human subject review is a perplexing portion of the grant approval process. Confusion occurs because much of the information about the review process is possessed by specialists working directly for the Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) who review human subject’s applications and most research administrators or departmental administrators have only infrequent experience with these procedures. Although departmental administrators are not directly responsible for the IRB process, they often work with IRBs to obtain approval for projects before sponsored projects administration offices can process awards. A better understanding of the human subjects review process will allow departmental administrators to facilitate this process while also better protecting the rights and welfare of research participants.

Here are some IRB websites that can assist you with the IRB process:

- Office for Human Research Protection (OHRP) at http://ohrp.hhs.gov/
- Food and Drug Administration http://www.fda.gov/cder/about/smallbiz/humans.htm

The second release was implemented on August 21 and included features like the ability to Add Budget Periods to the Statement of Training Appointment Page; Budget Periods will now be displayed on the Submit to Agency Certification; the Awaiting Paper Signature Option was removed; there were Recovery Act enhancements made; several Commons Demo Enhancements implemented; an Out of Compliance Flag was added in publications; the Commons Help Text was revised; and several eSNAP enhancements were implemented.

Rebecca Puig is the chair of the eRA Neighborhood Subcommittee and serves as Assistant Director, Division of Sponsored Research, University of South Florida.
Virtual Communities of Professional Interest
www.ncura.edu/members/Neighborhoods

PRE-AWARD

Oftentimes, we hear our colleagues in research administration say that no two days are alike in this business. In fact, for many of us the constant change is what maintains our attraction to this field. Every day can bring the possibility of new challenges with changing regulations. This can result in the challenge of keeping up with administrative changes and how to stay compliant. But, more importantly is the issue of how the various research administration offices are keeping morale up within their organization. This is can be key to the success of your organization in getting through these challenging times of increased workloads without the possibility of increasing staff sizes. The Pre-award Administration Neighborhood (PAN) viewed this as a critical topic. We invite you to check out the

On Campus Member Profiles that were posted in August for Pamela Webb, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, Sponsored Projects Administration at the University of Minnesota and Beth Seaton, Director of Sponsored Projects at Western Illinois University at http://www.ncura.edu/content/regions_and_neighborhoods/neighborhoods/pre_award/town_hall.php. Both of them offer their expertise in what they have done during these challenging times and what they have done to help their staff who face being “burned out” due to stress. We can all learn something new from them!

Robyn Remotigue is the chair of the Pre-award Neighborhood Subcommittee and serves as Assistant Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Mississippi State University.

FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION CONFERENCE XI

Adapting
Recovering
Repositioning
Advancing

FRA XI will offer a progressive but practical program that addresses our continuous need for essential financial information while incorporating new subjects, ideas and technology. As reflected in the conference theme, you can expect session content that will reflect the budget challenges presented by the continuing effect of the global economic downturn and the regulatory challenges included in the response most relevant to us, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), while also embracing the ARRA’s optimistic purpose.

The timing for FRA XI will be ideal for us to take a quick breath, assess how we’ve managed the crisis, share experiences and begin developing best practices. The FRA XI program committee is incorporating sessions in every program track that reflect the challenges presented by ARRA, presenting a valuable opportunity for us to look to one another and our federal colleagues for support, information, and ideas for managing stimulus funding. Of course FRA XI will also address many other topics, both new and traditional, helping each of us develop and maintain our foundation of research administration knowledge. The pre-meeting workshop series is also planned in order to offer opportunities for everyone from the newcomer to those administrators looking for something well beyond the basics as well as a full slate of senior level seminars.

This year’s Keynote Session will be presented by Dr. Julia Lane, Program Director, Science of Science and Innovation Policy, National Science Foundation, and Dr. John Voeller, Office of Science and Technology Policy Representative to the STAR (Science and Technology in American’s Recovery) Pilot. They will describe an OSTP and FDP initiative to identify the best means to capture the impact of federal investment in the national research enterprise. This promising initiative includes the development of a successful system to improve our understanding of the cascade of scientific, economic and social value to society generated by scientific research. It does this by partnering with the research community to leverage existing data more efficiently and effectively, thus minimizing reporting burden. This is an exciting opportunity to learn about a future for transparency and accountability that considers all the stake holders, including the research administrator.
Summer has come and gone here in New England and it’s time to focus on fall and winter activities, including the 51st Annual Meeting. Speaking of which, if you plan to attend, please be sure to attend the Region I Business Meeting on Friday, October 23, 2009 at 3:15 PM for a chance to hear what’s going on in the region, learn about volunteer opportunities, and maybe win a raffle prize!

Elections for Region I were held and newly elected are Bethanne Giehl, Chair-Elect, University of Massachusetts Medical School, Kevin Brodrick, Treasurer, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, and Tom Egan, Regionally-Elected Board Member, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Congratulations to all and thanks to all of the candidates who ran in this important election! Thanks, as well, to our nominating committee, consisting of Vivian Holmes, Chair, MIT Broad Institute, Mark Daniel, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Ben Prince, University of Massachusetts Medical School, and Susan Zipkin, Region I Chair-Elect, Brigham & Women’s Hospital.

With the economy the way it is, a decision was made to provide three travel awards to the Annual Meeting this year instead of the usual two awards. Congratulations to the winners of these awards - Heather Dominey, Brown University, Katie Newhall, Marine Biological Laboratory, and Estelle Lang, Brown University. Thanks to Landy Johnson, Awards Committee Chair, Kevin Brodrick, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Eva Faling, Brown University, Tammy Houle, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, and Randi Wasik, University of Massachusetts Medical School, for all their efforts!

With the writing of this article, negotiations are being finalized for the 2010 Region I Spring Meeting, which will be held at the Sheraton Portsmouth Harborside Hotel & Conference Center in Portsmouth, NH, April 25-28, 2010. Thanks to the Region I Site Selection Committee of Christine Bothe, Chair, Dartmouth College, Lee Picard, Brandeis University, and Barbara Richard, Harvard Pilgrim Health Care, for all of their hard work! Please stay tuned for more information about the Spring Meeting later this year.

In Region I, fall is usually accompanied by some terrific educational opportunities for our members and this year is no exception! On September 10, 2009, a one-day "Essentials in Research Administration" workshop will be offered, followed by a one-day "Advanced Topics" workshop on September 17, 2009. On September 24, 2009, the next Research Administrators Discussion Group (RADG) meeting will be held on the pervasive topic of Conflict of Interest. A holiday RADG meeting in December will be announced shortly. Thank you to all of the organizers, presenters, and other volunteers who participate in these educational offerings!

The Region I Mentor Program is now underway thanks to the efforts of Randi Wasik, Chair of the Volunteer and Membership Committee, and her excellent committee. As mentioned previously, this program provides an opportunity for research administrators with less than 5 years experience to "partner" for the year with more experienced research administrators and to grow in the profession. Thanks to the 20 mentors who stepped forward to be matched with the newer research administrators in our region.

And a final note - The Region I Website Redesign Committee has worked diligently over the summer to design the next version of the Region I website. Plans are to have the new website screened by the Region I Advisory Committee before rolling it out to the membership in October. Kudos to Karen Woodward Massey, Chair, Harvard University, Estelle Lang, Brown University, Denise Rouleau, New England School of Acupuncture, and Vishal Sone, University of Massachusetts Boston, for leading the charge in this major undertaking!

See you in DC!

Franc Lemire is the Chair of Region I and serves as the Director of Sponsored Programs at Worcester Polytechnic Institute in sunny Worcester, MA.
included in the roster next year, please be sure to answer our upcoming call for volunteers. We have many opportunities for volunteer participation. Initiatives in progress include a new workgroup that has been tasked with updating our bylaws, recommending updated goals for the strategic plan and documenting the Region’s administrative and operating procedures; and a work group to undertake a full website redesign and regional archiving project.

Soon it will be time for the NCURA Annual Meeting. This year we are teaming up with Region V to host a joint hospitality suite. Make sure you stop by for snacks, drinks and networking with your Region II and V colleagues. Also, please plan to attend our Regional Business Meeting, which will be held at 3:15 pm on Friday, October 23. During our business meeting we will review the proposed updated bylaws and strategic plan and will also announce our officers for 2010. In fact, the Region II election has been launched with an excellent set of candidates. They are Gregory C. Slack, Clarkson University and Martin Williams, William Patterson University for Chair-elect; Patricia Groshon, Drexel University and Mary Holleran, West Virginia University for Treasurer-Elect; and Anne Albina, Johns Hopkins University and Anita Mills, New York University for Secretary. Thanks to each of our candidates for being willing to contribute so much to NCURA.

Finally, the program committee has begun meeting to finalize the arrangements for the 2010 Annual Spring Meeting. Volunteers for participation in the Program Committee are accepted throughout the Fall, so interested persons should contact our 2010 Program Chair Jared Littman or Co-Chair Cheryl Williams. While we are on the topic of the Program Committee and the archival project, there is a fabled binder that existed over the years that provided detailed instructions and handy references on how to run a regional meeting, but seems to have been lost. If anyone happens to know its fate, please let me know. In the meantime, we have been lucky to have a core set of people who assist in program planning each year and we are going to use their collective experience to create an electronic version as part of our archival project.

I am looking forward to seeing you in October!

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

REGION III
Southeast
www.ncuraregioniii.com

Summer is nearly over, faculty and students are returning for another academic year, and Region III is working overtime to prepare for the upcoming 51st Annual Meeting, which will be held from October 21-24 at the Wardman Park Hotel in Washington D.C.

It is not too late to register for this informative and fun Meeting, entitled “One World Connected through Research.” The preliminary program, registration and hotel information are now available online. There are many Region III members presenting workshops, leading sessions and discussion groups. We appreciate the efforts of all our presenters.

If you think the Annual Meeting program looks exciting, wait until you hear about what’s planned for the Region III Hospitality Suite (Suite 6340) this year. Rodney Granec, University of West Alabama, promises something for everyone. The party will be Wednesday, Thursday and Friday (October 21-23) from 8 p.m. to midnight. Activities will be posted on the Region III website soon. Thanks to Rodney and his committee members for putting this together.

Calling all volunteers! Volunteer Coordinator Rick Smiley, East Carolina University, wants you to contact him (smileyr@ecu.edu) if you are interested in any of the volunteer opportunities posted on the Region III website—and there are plenty of opportunities that involve only a small time commitment. The Annual Meeting couldn’t happen without everyone contributing a little bit of their time and energy.

When you see Becky Wakefield, University of Alabama at Birmingham, at the Annual Meeting, please congratulate her on winning the Region III Travel Award. Stephanie Smotherman, Vanderbilt University Medical Center and the Membership and Awards Committee would like to thank all who participated in the nomination process for this regional award. The number and quality of the candidates made it difficult to choose one winner.

Thanks to everyone who submitted nominations to Amanda Green, University of New Orleans and her committee for the upcoming Region III elections. We were looking for a few good volunteers and we think we’ve found them! Elections are scheduled to open Wednesday, September 23 and close on Wednesday, October 7 at 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time. The committee expects to be able to announce the winners on October 23rd at the Region III Business Meeting during the upcoming National Conference. Good luck to all the candidates.

A note on Region III business: while our lower attendance this year at the Region III meeting resulted in less revenue than from recent meetings, we actually managed to make a small profit. Cost saving measures such as posting meeting materials online and printing fewer copies have helped. We appreciate all the Region III members who participated in the Cinco de Mayo Margarita celebration—this revenue contributed to our ability to meet the contractual minimum for food and beverages. We knew we could count on your support! Overall, despite the economic downturn, our region has covered all our expenses for the year and can expect to break even by the year’s end.

Please plan to join us at the 2010 Region III Meeting that will be held April 24-28, 2010 at the historic Peabody Hotel in Memphis, Tennessee. Region III Chair-Elect Jennifer Shambrook, St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital and the Program Committee are hard at work developing an agenda that will make this a meeting to remember. We can’t wait to introduce our Flamingo to the Peabody ducks. We look forward to seeing you there.

Finally, please visit the Region III website, recently updated by our new webmaster Sofia Aymerich, University of Miami, for all the latest Region III information, including archived program materials and a photo album from the latest meeting, as well as information on how you can get involved as a Region III volunteer.

Laura Lethington 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 ➤
Greetings! It’s that time of year. As summer winds down, hints of autumn begin to take its place. Certainly, a busy fall season is around the corner for Region IV. Like many of our regional peers, we just wrapped up our board meeting, and we are in the midst of gearing up for National while planning for our Regional Spring meeting.

Our board recently met in St. Louis, August 6-7, 2009. We discussed many opportunities for members to get the most out of Region IV. Some of the ideas included speaker workshops, recognition for volunteering from both the Region and National offices, and the idea of podcasting sessions at the meeting. We also discussed ideas our members appreciate. For example, we are currently investigating the possibility of funding additional awards and other networking opportunities during regional activities. We are also in the process of revising and editing the administrative procedures to coincide with the By-Laws for the Region. There will be more to report at the national meeting in October.

Speaking of, we are looking forward to seeing all of our NCURA colleagues at the 51st Annual Meeting. This year is sure to be exciting as change is in the air. New places, dates, and sessions await us. As you’ve undoubtedly heard, the new location is the Washington Marriott Wardman Park Hotel. With its historic landmark setting, and generous event space, this metro-area hotel looks to be a terrific venue choice. Keep your eye out for some of the hotel staff dressed as “Red Coats” for any questions related to logistics as you navigate around the hotel.

Meeting attendees will also find themselves traveling to DC earlier in the calendar year than usual. The meeting is set to take place October 21 through 24, with workshops starting on Tuesday, October 20. While the meeting’s format will be similar to years past, attendees will notice shorter session times in the afternoon. Most morning sessions are scheduled for 90 minutes, while early afternoon sessions are scheduled for 75 minutes and late afternoon sessions for 45 minutes. Also, the new “Decompression Sessions” give participants an opportunity to ask lingering questions and to discuss topics more in depth.

Although the wide variety of sessions will keep us busy, there will be time for some fun, too! We are glad to have David Ngo coordinating the Region IV hospitality suite, and Jeff Ritchie organizing the Region IV DC tour. In addition, this year’s NCURA “TGIF” party will be held on Friday night, where we will be celebrating the 70’s funky style. For those of you who like get into the theme of the party, let’s represent Region IV well and wear your polyester pants and flashy accessories!

Finally, after the National Meeting comes the holiday season, and plans step up for our springtime meeting. The 2010 Region IV meeting will be held at the Embassy Suites Omaha - Downtown/Old Market hotel in Nebraska. Christa Johnson, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, is leading the Program Committee along with co-chairs Mary Laura Farnham from the University of Nebraska, Omaha, and Craig Reynolds, University of Michigan. Please make plans now to attend April 25-28.

Just like research administration, the weather will, and sometimes unpredictably, change. However, each change ushers in a new and exciting time for our region. One thing is certain, though, NCURA is always in season!

Jaynee Tolle is Chair of Region IV and is a Senior Grant Administrator at the University of Cincinnati. Natalie Goodwin-Frank is Chair of the Region IV Communications Committee and is the Funding Resources Coordinator at Washington University.

It was a busy summer for our Regional Officers. We kicked off the summer by attending the 2009 Leadership Convention on June 5-6 at the Washington Marriott Wardman Park Hotel. Marianne Woods and I joined officers from the other regions, the national board and national committee chairs to review the National Board and the individual Regions initiatives, to brainstorm on the topics of communication, programming and volunteerism, and to discuss regional best practices. It was a very good meeting and I believe that some of the ideas generated will be very beneficial to the organization as well as the individual members. We also toured the hotel since it will be the location of this year’s Annual Meeting.

Marianne and I traveled to South Padre Island on June 11-12, where we toured hotels for our Spring 2010 meeting. We are currently working on a contract with the Sheraton South Padre Island Hotel to hold our conference on April 25-28, 2010. Details of the conference will be discussed at the National meeting and will be available on our website soon. In late July I traveled to St. Louis to meet with Jamie Caldwell, Steven Geiger and Connie Motoki from Region IV to tour hotels and the city for the joint Spring 2012 meeting. (Unfortunately, Marianne was delayed at the airport and was unable to join us.) We are in the process of narrowing our choices and it will be posted on the website as soon as a decision is made.

The National meeting this year will be held October 21-24 at the Washington Marriott Wardman Park Hotel. We will be sharing Hospitality Suite 1340 with Region II. Please be sure and stop by to see old friends and make new friends.

This winner of the Region V National travel award is Kathryn Schoonover, Director of Research and Sponsored Programs at Northeastern State University in Tahlequah, Oklahoma. Congratulations to Kathryn.

I look forward to seeing you all in October at the NCURA Annual Meeting.

Gail Davis is the Chair of Region V and serves as Director of Contracts and Grant and Proposal Administrator at Lamar University.
As much as I love summer, I love the fall as well—especially this year since NCURA’s 51st Annual Meeting takes place in Washington, DC earlier than usual, Wednesday, October 21st to Saturday, October 24th. The fall colors promise to be dazzling as does the array of workshops and concurrent sessions the planning committee has prepared for your continued professional development. This is perhaps the best way we have to keep abreast of changes and trends in the never-a-dull-moment profession of research administration.

Speaking of the Annual Meeting, four Region VI members have been awarded $750 for travel expenses to attend NCURA’s 51st Annual Meeting. Please join me in congratulating Emily Mangone and Christine Durieux, University of California, San Francisco; Cynthia Wells, University of California, Riverside; and, Mali Stuart, University of Washington. Thank you to the Awards Committee—Ann Pollack, University of California, Los Angeles; Dan Nordquist, Washington State University; Vincent Oragwam, California State University, Bakersfield; Csilla Csaplar, Stanford University; and Kevin Stewart, University of California, Santa Barbara—for your diligence in reviewing applications and selecting this year’s travel awardees.

It’s not too early to begin thinking about the Regions VI and VII 2010 Spring Meeting to be held in April 2010 in Newport Beach, California. Though the leaves are turning colors and winter lies ahead, thoughts of sunny, warm California beaches—and how you can volunteer to help—can warm up many a gray day between now and spring. Chairs-elect Deb Murphy, University of Arizona (Region VII) and Sinh Simmons, University of Washington (Region VI) and your colleagues from Regions VI and VII who volunteered to be on the planning committee are working together to prepare an exciting agenda packed with timely concurrent sessions and helpful workshops. Travel awards will also be available to attend the spring meeting—watch for e-blasts and website updates.

Working diligently on your behalf, members of the Education and Professional Development Committee recently unveiled the "LEAD Me" Program, a Leadership, Education and Development Mentorship Program. “LEAD Me” provides a ten-month shared educational and professional development experience of learning through the exchange of knowledge between members. Participants can enhance or acquire knowledge about oneself relative to career exploration, about development and/or advancement as well as self assessment and skill development to increase one’s contribution to NCURA at the regional and/or national level and the profession. You can learn more about this program on the Region VI website. Please join me in thanking, Linda Patton, California State University, Fullerton, for leading this effort, and for her co-creators Dawn Boatman, Portland State University; Debbie Ann Caulfield, University of California, San Francisco; Rosemary Madnick, Charles Drew University, Cecelia Manoochehr, California Institute of Technology, Joyce Nims, University of Oregon; and Richard Seligman, California Institute of Technology. Their hard work during this unusually “stimulating” season is much appreciated.

At the time I wrote this article, Region VI’s election had just closed and results were not available. But this is a good time and place to acknowledge our gratitude to the members who volunteered to run and to the Nominating Committee led by Ted Mordhorst, University of Washington, and including Dick Seligman, California Institute of Technology and Katherine Ho, Stanford University, for providing us with the opportunity to select Region VI’s leaders for 2011. I look forward to seeing many of you at the 51st Annual Meeting!

Julie Guggino is Chair of Region VI and serves as Associate Director of Research at Central Washington University in Ellensburg, Washington.

I would like to thank our Nomination and Election Committee, Karen Henry, Chair, and committee members Kimberly Page and Carmen Morales, for offering some terrific candidates for our consideration for Chair-Elect, Secretary/Treasurer and Member-At-Large for 2010. Elections are underway and new officers will be announced at our Regional Business Meeting during the 51st Annual Meeting. Thank you also to everyone who agreed to run for office! Your time is very valuable and we truly appreciate your willingness to serve.

Region VII travel awardees are currently making their plans to join research administration colleagues from across the nation in Washington, D.C. on October 21-24, 2009. Our annual conference is an excellent opportunity to network and learn from the variety of workshops and concurrent sessions provided to keep us on top of our profession. Please check http://www.ncura.edu/content/educational_programs/sites/51/program/ for the excellent program on the theme of “One World Connected Through Research.”

Planning is also underway for the Regions VI and VII Spring Meeting to be held April 2010 in Newport Beach, California. Volunteers are being solicited and program planning is progressing. If you have ideas for sessions or would like to assist in any way, please contact Deb Murphy, Chair-Elect of Region VII, Debra.Murphy@asu.edu or Sinh Simmons, Chair-Elect of Region VII, ssimmons@uw.edu. Co-Chairs for our spring meeting. Also, watch for announcements on our Region VII website!

I look forward to seeing you in Washington, D.C.!
THE TIME IS RIGHT for a More Strategic Approach to Research Management in Europe: The Lessons Learned are Universal

By Josine Stallinga

To better understand the progress made towards achieving research management excellence in Europe as well as the remaining opportunities and challenges there, Elsevier hosted a roundtable on the subject during EARMA's annual conference at the University of Copenhagen in Denmark this June. The resulting dialogue offers a valuable peek into how research managers (the European equivalent of U.S. research administrators) abroad are navigating the world of international collaboration and funding. The steps they are taking to improve the future of research management within their borders and beyond are significant and the lessons they are learning are universal.

Broadening the Funding Pool

In the wake of the current economic crisis, available national funds have decreased – creating a growing need for researchers to obtain funding from the European Union (EU) and other external sources. However, the process of applying for EU grants is still relatively new and complex, often requiring collaboration with other EU nations. Currently, success rates are less than 25% and further complicating matters is the scarcity of scientific resources research managers are facing – a reality U.S. research administrators are also struggling to overcome.

Unlike in the United States where institutions work under a more unified funding system, the EU is comprised of several independent governing nations. Each country maintains its own funding policies in relation to the EU framework. Researchers rely on their research managers to translate EU policies at their national and institutional levels. The EU communicates with the member nations and the information trickles down through the nations to their institutes. As one roundtable participant pointed out, “The United States is a uniform structure, it’s a uniform culture. Here we have a lot of cultures, we have a lot of different traditions trying to merge together to find their own way.”

Roundtable participants with experience in projects funded by the U.S. and the EU noted that the administrative requirements of the EU are significantly greater. They pointed to a more results-oriented focus in the U.S. on accomplishing scientific objectives as compared to the EU’s labor intensive requirements for justifying even the smallest expenses.

The good news is that the EU is already taking action to help address the complexities of the European funding process. From 2007 through 2013, the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7) is funding EU scientific research and consolidating all research-related EU initiatives under one roof. The ultimate objective of FP7 is to create a formal system of programs which integrates the EU scientific resources, called the European Research Area. Through FP7, the EU hopes to expand its leadership in vital scientific and technology spaces, fuel creativity and excellence in research, grow and strengthen European researchers themselves and enhance EU research innovation.

At the same time, there has been an increase in the importance of funding mechanisms like the European Research Council (ERC) which focuses on more bottom-up funding of individual researchers or small research groups requiring a different management approach and creating a somewhat bifurcated funding market.

With significant changes still underway, there are currently many misconceptions with respect to applying for EU funding and the bureaucracy involved is often overstated. Research managers need to set the record straight and take steps to break existing and developing myths. For example, they must help their institutions realize that national and EU grants are not mutually exclusive, as combining the two may result in better resources, better performance, better outcomes as well as less debt, expenses and losses. They must also work to change the perception of the required reports and papers as “something else the EU wants us to do” about documents that are beneficial to both researcher and institution.

Changing Dynamics: Raising the Research Management Bar

While research managers see EU funding as one of the major challenges they face today, they also recognize that it creates an opportunity for them to enhance their role. In fact, 88% of participants surveyed during the roundtable agreed that the importance and recognition of the research manager’s role has increased over the last five years. Clearly, EU funding is a significant driver behind the increasing stature of the position.

To meet the growing need for EU funding and continue to enhance their role, participants agreed that research managers must acquire new skill sets. In addition to sound application and project management skills, they need to fully understand the verbiage of financial regulations and reporting requirements associated with EU funding and gain an understanding of complex legal documents and legal issues and have a basic knowledge of intellectual property.

The group also noted a shift underway in the perception of research managers from “go between” to “partner.” While still predominantly viewed as the “middle man” communicating between funding bodies and researchers – often seen as being on one side or the other – they are moving towards the role of “facilitator,” working in partnership with both sides to reach compatible goals. By stimulating multi-national collaboration and cross-pollination of research ideas, research managers are securing funding for their institutions and simultaneously helping meet the larger EU research objectives.

Two years ago Janez Potočnik, European Commissioner for Science & Research, opened the European Association of Research Managers and Administrators (EARMA) annual conference saying, “Excellence in science requires excellence in the management of science.” Much has happened since then including further globalization of the research community – both within Europe and beyond – as well as a significant and broad-based economic downturn which has greatly impacted scientific research funding.
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Coeus®, governed by a consortium of member institutions, is a complete life-cycle research administration system that has been in use at major academic institutions for over 12 years. Consortium members work together to develop Coeus® into a preeminent research administration and compliance tool.

Using a secure, centralized database, Coeus® stores all information about proposals and awards, manages conflict of interest disclosures, and contains a robust Institutional Review Board module to facilitate protocol submission, tracking, review and IRB operations management.

For more information contact Stephen Dowdy, Coeus Program Director at info@coeus.org
View Coeus Roadmap to the Future at www.coeus.org
A Departmental View of the World of International Research: One Year Later

By Jennifer Crockett

As departmental research administrators, we are typically involved in almost all aspects of sponsored research – from the initial proposal preparation, management of the award if the proposal is funded, and finally to closeout – but generally from the relatively safe confines of our U.S. offices. In today’s world, however, this is changing and I am one of those who witnessed this change first hand. My job at the Harvard School of Public Health as an International Programs Administrator involved working closely with the people on the ground in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, as well as traveling there to assist in building capacity and sustainable systems. In total, I traveled to Tanzania five times in a thirteen month period, and my trips varied in length from ten days to almost three weeks. I would be exhausted when I left, but it always felt like I should stay just a little longer and do just a little more.

After my first trip to Tanzania, I wasn’t as shell-shocked preparing for my second trip. If you don’t like long flights, this is not for you! I am able to take cat naps but not sleep for long periods of time, so I used the time to catch up on reading and do some work. The nice part about the flight is that it is broken into two segments and generally with an hour so spent in the Amsterdam airport.

I found a great coffee shop, grabbed a snack and then it was time to board the next flight. I learned quickly that you have to go through security for each leg, so I didn’t buy any liquids after my first trip, but found out that you can take an empty water bottle on board and fill it on the plane. I also found the pharmacy in the Amsterdam airport after a trip in which I received several mosquito bites that swelled. The poor pharmacist – I simply told her I was itchy from bug bites and she knew exactly what to give me. I still don’t know what was in that stick of medicine I bought but it did the trick. In my five trips, I was rerouted only once, and my luggage was late only twice.

However, my last trip home was delayed by two days because our plane had mechanical issues. My point in all of this is to learn as much as possible about your environment and always try to be flexible. It may not be the best of circumstances, but it can always be worse!

The two PIs I previously supported had active projects in the Dar es Salaam area of Tanzania, with additional projects in Kampala, Uganda, Bangalore, India, and Sao Paolo, Brasil. The ‘business’ goal of the administration team was to use the lessons learned while building capacity and sustainability in Tanzania and translate them into useful work plans for setting up new operations in other countries and revising operations as needed with existing projects. A key point to keep in mind when working with personnel in developing countries is that the way you work in the U.S. is most likely not the way others work outside the U.S. As Americans we seem driven to get more done in less time so we can move on to another project, and too often this is accomplished by working long hours and sacrificing our personal/work balance. In most other countries however, they work a standard work week (40-50 hours per week) and then go home to their families. They manage to get the work done in a timely fashion, perhaps not in the same time frame or at the same pace we are used to, and still enjoy their personal time. All of the people I’ve encountered have been extremely professional and knowledgeable, and were invested in improving the state of things in-country, regardless if they were native Tanzanians or ex-pats living and working there. One of the first challenges I encountered was realizing the limits in-country with regard to technology access and available training. Part of the capacity building and sustainability work was to bridge this gap by working with the teams on the ground - assisting them in the development of useful tools that they could ‘own’ even after your departure.

We learned to ask questions that could not be answered with either “yes” or “no;” that way we could uncover what was really needed. We kept in mind the cultural differences so we did not offend others. After creating an initial outline, we crafted the work plan with our counterparts through email and regular telephone meetings, and then I followed up on the progress while I was in-country. We found that the most important tool for success is communication, accompanied by flexibility, a penchant for thinking outside the traditional box, and a large amount of understanding. A good example is when there is no power - there is nothing you can do until the power is restored. Your project will most likely stop for that time frame. If you are in-country, you find something else to do; if you are in the U.S., you can either continue your work until your counterparts are back online or find something else to do.

One of the other challenges I encountered while traveling internationally was in maintaining my operations in the U.S. while I was away, especially during staff transitions. During my first eight months on the job I lost four of my key staff due to transition. While I was traveling, I also had to post, interview and hire for those positions. I was finally fully-staffed at the end of August 2008, and then training began. A key element to the people hired into these positions was the ability to multi-task and operate...
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Huron professionals understand the complexities surrounding ARRA and the impact on the Research Enterprise.

We are actively helping institutions respond to the challenges associated with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) by:

- Providing interim management and staff support
- Developing customized reporting tools
- Enhancing effort reporting practices
- Advising on non-traditional grant and contract proposals and awards
- Preparing institutions for increased federal oversight and monitoring
- Evaluating the impact of indirect and direct cost recovery

Huron resolves difficult business issues with creative and practical solutions. Our teams focus on the interaction and support among central and academic units, the mechanisms for providing critical information to faculty, and the regulatory challenges which collectively are at the heart of effective research administration.

For more information contact:

Greg Bedell  
(312) 880-3010  
gbedell@huronconsultinggroup.com

Mary Beth Rudofski  
(312) 880-0534  
mrudofski@huronconsultinggroup.com

Huron Consulting Group helps clients in diverse industries improve performance, comply with complex regulations, resolve disputes, recover from distress, leverage technology, and stimulate growth. The Company teams with its clients to deliver sustainable and measurable results. Huron provides services to a wide variety of both financially sound and distressed organizations, including leading academic institutions, healthcare organizations, Fortune 500 companies, medium-sized businesses, and the law firms that represent these various organizations. Learn more at www.huronconsultinggroup.com.

Experience. Redefined.

1-866-229-8700  
www.huronconsultinggroup.com
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Introduction

In 1996 a new HEI located in the Israeli desert city of Beersheva admitted its first 100 students. Today, SCE has six departments (Software, Electronic, Chemical, Industrial, Civil and Mechanical), 3,700 students, and 100 teachers, of whom half are active researchers. SCE has two campuses on the "periphery" of Israel (cities of Beersheva and Ashdod). SCE is a typical college campus of students, teachers who are active researchers, teachers who are not, and administrators (including those of research). This article posits that the research administrator in an emerging HEI can play a major role in its development, while indicating those features of SCE as an Israeli institution that must be understood in order to do this.

Our discussion is in four parts. We begin by describing the creation of SCE. We then address its mission, realities and challenges. Then we turn to our challenges as SCE research administrators, and what we are doing to meet them.

The Creation of SCE

The creation of "emerging" HEIs is likely due to four factors (E. Hazelkorn, University Research Management, OECD, 2005, Paris):

- **Regional**: College education for specific regions.
- **Democratization**: Erasing social divisions through educational opportunity.
- **Massification**: Responding to rapid population growth.
- **Skill expansion**: Training for special skills.

SCE met these conditions. The Negev Desert, including Beersheva and Ashdod, is located on the "periphery" of Israel (Negev Statistical Yearbook, www.negev.co.il/stats/eng/, downloaded, July 30, 2009).

With a highly heterogeneous population, democratization is particularly relevant. Massification occurred through the near doubling of the population over a few years. The establishment of major hi-tech companies made SCE particularly relevant for skill expansion.

A significant additional factor is that Israel is a young country with an enormously complex history, a rich tradition of innovation and experimentation, and an intense desire to develop the land. The Negev region remains largely underdeveloped and stands as a challenge to the country. The words "college in the Negev" connotes a powerful link between SCE, the Negev region, and its students, 80% of whom originate here.

The SCE mission is to:

"Train engineers at the highest professional level for the industrial needs of Israel, focusing on the Negev."

The mission defines clear objectives for students and teachers. The student is to become an excellent and innovative engineer, living and working in the Negev. Since our interest is long-term, teaching must focus on long-term excellence, adaptable to new technologies over the coming decades. Accordingly, the teacher should be ready and able to support the growth of new industrial enterprise in the region through consulting and related activities. Each part of the "loop" linking teachers, students and Negev development is essential.

The College Mission, Stakeholders and Realities

While the SCE is governed by a board of directors representing industry, academia, etc., it has many stakeholders. The Israeli Government is a stakeholder. The SCE itself receives support from its benefactors. Major stakeholders are its students and staff. SCE is answerable to Beersheva, Ashdod and their local communities, to the Negev community, to Israeli society as a whole, and therefore to the "spirit" of development of the Negev. It is these stakeholders who determine the realities of SCE.

College realities may or may not correlate with its mission. If they do not, then the College may function like an orchestra in the dark, possibly having spots of excellence, but marked by mediocrity.

Many of the realities of SCE are common to many emerging HEIs (E. Hazelkorn, University Research Management, OECD, 2005, Paris). Teachers teach 12 hours per week, researchers are not very experienced, student quality varies widely, the college is far removed from the centers of power, and others. However, the reality of being part of a grand historical event, the rebuilding of this desert region through education and development, is not common. The natural desire to be a major force in education and research is subordinated to the grander aim of employing education, research and development for the betterment of a region of historical grandeur, and the home of our college.

Enter the Research Administrator

By definition "research" is:

An investigation or experimentation aimed at the discovery and interpretation of facts, revision of accepted theories or laws in the light of new facts, or practical application of such new or revised theories or laws.

To promote a research environment in the HEI in which research and research-related activities by teaching staff, research staff and students in accordance with the college mission, play dominant roles.

The people of SCE, students, teachers and staff, constitute a community of scholarship with a commitment to focus on the region housing SCE. The ideal scenario is that they function – not as a hierarchy but rather as a society with a purpose. This is the underlying spirit of the SCE, and this provides the opportunity of the research administrator to make a difference.

The Emerging HEI and the Research Administrator

The SCE research administrator is faced by such challenges as:

- Researcher underperformance
- Research underfunding
- Heavy teaching loads
- Location in peripheral regions
- HEI newness
- Poor level of English

We view the way to overcoming these challenges to be rooted in the SCE mission and the holistic view of the SCE as a community of scholarship. Our office is one that must encourage such actions as undergraduate research (M. Boyd and J. Wesemann, editors, Broadening participation in undergraduate research: fostering excellence and enhancing the impact, CUR, 2009, Washington, D.C.) and link students and faculty in joint research activities to support both the “average student” and the underperforming researcher. The goal that we seek is to be found in the technological challenges facing us in the form of the Negev Desert.

We promote the use of and teaching in English, since low English language ability defines a road to disaster in this technical world. We promote frequent meetings with young researchers coupled with searches for funding sources. We promote interacting with other colleges like ours using available communications tools for all operating levels of SCE, from student research to research performance. Most of all, we promote communications within our small college with frequent reminders about our "mission" and its implications.

The research administrator is in an almost unique position to communicate with every group in the college. We can impact students, curricula and teachers via undergraduate research, and performance of faculty research is our mandate for communication. Applied research is the basis for contact with the outside world – as much as we have the energy to do so. As research administrators we have the opportunity and the mandate to communicate with everyone. With enough strength and time this can be done.

In summary, our actions are guided by a holistic view of SCE, an eagerness to speak with everyone, and an iron devotion to the mission of our College.

Professor Alan Solomnon is Head of the Research Contracts Department and Dean of the Software Engineering Department of the Shamoon College of Engineering (SCE) in Israel. He is responsible for all academic affairs of the department.

Ilana Yamin-Cohen is a staff member of the Research Contracts Department of the Shamoon College of Engineering (SCE) in Israel. Ilana is responsible for all internal and external administrative tasks of the department.

A Departmental View of the World of International Research: One Year Later

somewhat independently since I knew I’d be traveling quite a bit. I firmly believe that I struck gold with each of these hires. Tanzania is seven/eight hours ahead of Boston depending on the time of year, so while you generally work from nine to five in-country, you also end up working each night after dinner with your U.S. team, especially during the first few months of their employment. Not much rest for the weary but it is offset by the great work being done on the ground. It is also good to keep in mind that while a staff change can cause a “bump in the road” it is also a chance to evaluate the work flow, processes, and gaps. A staff change can also be a time for brainstorming and identifying new ways to improve communication and become more effective and efficient, as well as identifying training needs for the staff in both countries.

Overall, my experience working in Tanzania was very positive. I met a lot of great people who are doing great work, and this opportunity definitely broadened my horizons. As U.S. agencies fund more and more international projects, there will be an increasing need for skilled research administrators with some international experience. Are you up for the challenge? If you are at a point in your life where you are able to be away from home for extended periods and want an opportunity to work in other countries, this is the job for you.

Jennifer Crockett is Budget Manager, Research, in the Office of the Provost at Northeastern University.
Restrictive Research Terms: A Continuing Troublesome Situation

by Alexandra A. McKeown

Research is a world-wide affair. Collaboration is the buzzword and our principal investigators cannot afford to work in isolation. Inter-disciplinary. Multidisciplinary. Cross-cutting Science. These are just some of the terms we find when reviewing opportunities for funding. If we are lucky, the output of efforts is well-funded and groundbreaking research.

Groundbreaking research requires, at a minimum, two ingredients – money and expertise. Where does the money come from? The United States Government continues to be the most significant source of funds for research and development in the world. Where does the expertise come from? Researchers spend years developing their knowledge by working with colleagues around the world and applying it across disciplines.

While it is true that the U.S. Government is the largest funder of research and development in the world, often neither the funds nor the resulting information remain within the borders of the United States. Collaborations are easily facilitated with technology. The internet, digital voice and web cameras can provide simple and inexpensive communication tools that allow just the sort of collaboration that our government sponsors encourage. Further, we subcontract with foreign universities and non-profits; we contract with in-country nationals to execute our programs in the field; we share information with our overseas colleagues; we hire foreign nationals to work and teach; and we continue to rely heavily on recruitment of high quality, foreign researchers and students. These global collaborations mean that information is shared with many people, both citizens and non-citizens of the United States. This information sharing has enabled the U.S. to maintain its leadership in developing world-class, cutting edge technologies.

How can the U.S. maintain the lead? Some argue that we must continue to work with the best and the brightest, no matter their physical location, birthplace or citizenship. The counter argument, however, is that in maintaining our lead and assuring protection of our citizens, there is certain information which must be held tightly in order to keep it out of the hands of our enemies and to protect it from our international competitors.

In establishing policies and negotiating agreements addressing the need to freely disseminate information, universities have relied upon the National Security Decision Directive (NSDD) 189, which was issued in the mid-eighties and confirmed by the previous Administration. It states:

“...it is the policy of this Administration that, to the maximum extent possible, the products of fundamental research remain unrestricted. It is also the policy of this Administration that, where the national security requires control, the mechanism for control of information generated during federally-funded fundamental research in science, technology and engineering at colleges, universities and laboratories is classification.”

The basic message of NSDD 189 is that universities should not be forced to accept awards that restrict their ability to share information and expertise with collaborators, whether the sharing takes the form of a collaboration, publication, or simply an email to a colleague.

Unfortunately, the instructions provided through NSDD 189 are not consistently followed, giving rise to conflict and lost opportunities. Universities are left to reconcile an inherent contradiction – they are asked to collaborate, to work with others to develop new and better information and technology that will enable the U.S. to maintain the edge in innovation, but are also asked to withhold information from the foreign students in our laboratories or from collaborators overseas.

The previous Administration addressed both sharing and protecting information in the May 2008 Presidential Memorandum on the Designation and Sharing of Controlled Unclassified Information. The memorandum begins by stating that:

“…the global nature of the threats facing the United States requires that (a) our Nation’s entire network of defenders be able to share information more rapidly so those who must act have the information they need, and (b) the United States Government protect sensitive information, information privacy, and other legal rights of Americans.”

Predicated upon the need to share with our friends and hold back from our enemies and with the understanding that restrictions have been confusing and overused, the memorandum develops a more standardized government-wide framework that encompasses all restrictive terminology, including what had been termed as “Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU)” information, into “a uniform system which seeks to facilitate and enhance the sharing of Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI).”

In the memorandum, CUI is defined as information that does not rise to the level of being considered classified under the standards for National Security Classification under Executive Order 12958, as amended, but is both “pertinent to the national interests of the United States or to the important interests of entities outside the Federal Government and under law or policy requires protection from unauthorized disclosure, special handling safeguards, or prescribed limits on exchange or dissemination.”

How does the government determine if a project being conducted has the potential...
According to COGR/AAU, the 2004 review restricted on participation of foreign nationals in federally funded research under the export regulations. The 2004 report recommended that (1) publication restrictions, and (2) restrictions on participation by foreign nationals, were restricting publications or foreign national participation that were restricting publications or foreign national participation were not required to be flowed down to universities if the purpose is fundamental research.

While the 2004 COGR/AAU report was well-received, no changes in government policies resulted. In a report issued in October 2007, the National Academies Committee on Science, Technology and Law, through the Committee on a New Government-University Partnership for Science and Security (NAS Committee) documented the issues surrounding the continuing practice of the government including restrictive clauses in federal contracts and grants. The NAS Committee’s report contained a set of 14 specific recommendations. Three of the recommendations were directly relevant to the troublesome clause issue, including Recommendation 3, which was specifically addressed to COGR and AAU and stated that: “The data collected in the 2004 (COGR and AAU) report Restrictions on Research Grants and Contracts, should be updated annually. The report should be expanded to include review of other restrictive clauses and should specifically review the use of the “sensitive but unclassified” (SBU) category.” Discussions among COGR, AAU, and the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) representatives led to a decision to update the 2004 survey, using the same 20 institutions as the 2004 survey base.

The follow-up survey covered the period July 1, 2007 through December 31, 2007 and found 180 total instances of troublesome clauses, as compared with 138 in the previous survey. The frequency of restrictions on publications and foreign nationals were similar in the surveys. The increase found in the new survey was due to new types of restrictions that were not reported in the previous survey. The report, entitled “Restrictions on Research Awards: Troublesome Clauses 2007/2008,” revealed that federal funding agencies have expanded the type of controls imposed in award terms and conditions, and are now including such terms in grants and cooperative agreements in addition to contracts.

As a result of the findings and issues highlighted in the 2007/2008 survey, COGR/AAU recommended the following actions and initiatives:

1. As the largest source of troublesome clauses, the Department of Defense (DOD) should revise the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations Supplement (DFARS) prescription guidance to prevent the DFARS 7000 clause from being used in contracts for university research, either directly or as a flow down from industry contracts. The 2007/2008 report also emphasized the importance of DOD revising its guidance to contracting officers by stipulating that no controls should be imposed on publications or foreign national participation for fundamental research, either in direct awards or sub-awards.

2. DOD should develop a uniform policy that discourages DOD offices and programs from issuing “home-grown” award terms and arbitrary mandates that do not follow DOD policy and should develop appropriate acquisition guidance accordingly.

Both the current and previous surveys highlighted several critical issues that universities and the government must cooperatively address, including:

- Preserving the open research environment, academic freedom and integrity in universities
- Resolving the conflict between the core academic principles of openness and the free flow of information and sponsor-imposed approval over publication
- Reconciling government requirements to approve foreign national participation in funded research projects with university and state policies regarding non-discrimination in campus activities
- Recognizing the adverse effects of protracted negotiations on faculty and students, as well as on the national interest, when universities are forced to “walk away” from government-funded projects (or not compete for them)
- Exploring how to ameliorate issues associated with increased compliance requirements (e.g. implementation and oversight of technology control plans, costs, etc.)
Lessons Learned:
Life After the ARRA
by Kirsten Yehl

For most department administrators at academic institutions, like me, setting up subcontracts with foreign institutions can be a daunting task. Working across international borders requires knowledge of information we do not work with every day. Now, as the economy worsens, we’re seeing an increased amount of foreign collaborations as we search for new funding sources.

Most universities have legal resources specializing in international research administration, and these central offices are a great resource for departmental administrators. In addition to these central resources, department administrators with a strong understanding of the rules and regulations surrounding international research administration will allow for increased communication and greater collaboration for their faculty. An informed and educated administrator is essential to the strategic goals of a department.

As department administrators, where do we start? There is a flood of information on international research collaborations to digest. Piecing through all the data out there, I narrowed down the field to the top three topics all department administrators should be aware of: export controls, intellectual property, and currency valuation. Following is a very brief annotated bibliography of web resources covering these three topics.

**EXPORT CONTROLS – EAR**

If you are subcontracting on your sponsored project overseas, there’s a good chance you are exporting goods. This means you and your institution are officially exporters. You probably have excellent legal representation, but as the project administrator, it is a good idea to understand the types of issues you are likely to encounter. The following resources provide a good introduction to the topic of export control.

**US DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE – BUREAU OF INDUSTRY AND SECURITY**
The Department of Commerce is the government agency responsible for export control in the United States. For a big picture view of how this process is broken down (policy and regulation, licensing, compliance and enforcement) browse through the topics on the main web page. This will give you a good idea of the complexity of export control issues and why you need to work closely with your institutions legal representation on all international subcontracts.


**INTRODUCTION TO COMMERCE DEPARTMENT EXPORT CONTROL**

If you need a quick look at export control, this is an excellent overview. This guide is for the real novice, starting with, “what is an export?” Here you can find links to training opportunities, references for assistance, and advice on the government process.

http://www.bis.doc.gov/licensing/exportingbasics.htm

**EXPORT ADMINISTRATION REGULATIONS DATABASE**

If you already know what you are doing, check out the Export Administration Regulations homepage. Here you can link to the very valuable Export Administration Database. In addition, you will find links to the federal register and Bureau of industry homepage. This is where all the export administration data is held. If you know what you are looking for, come here first.

http://www.access.gpo.gov/bis/index.html

**THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION**
The World Trade Organization (WTO) is the international rulemaking agency dealing with trades of goods and services between nations. Understanding this agency and its policies is essential for both export controls and Intellectual Property (see the following section). On the main page there is a trade topics gateway that allows you to quickly link to trade topics, for example: regional trade agreements, intellectual property, goods, and services. Make sure to explore this website for current topics in international trade.

http://www.wto.org/index.htm
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (WIPO)

WIPO is an agency within the United Nations. This agency is dedicated to managing international IP and promoting the international use of IP for development and growth. Browsing through the information on this website will give you a broad picture of global IP issues, the future of IP, and multiple resources for further education. This is a suggested first stop for those new to Intellectual Property. Make sure to check out the WIPO IP handbook when you visit the site – it is an excellent IP overview.

http://www.wipo.int/portal/index.html.en

INTERNATIONAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY INSTITUTE

This nonprofit based in Washington DC offers a wealth of current happenings and supporting information viewable by topic and region. Here you can find links to Intellectual Property Treaties from both the World Trade Organization and World Intellectual Property Organization. For IP beginners, this site has an excellent FAQ page that walks you through the basics of Intellectual Property. Spend some time at this site and you will have a good grasp of current IP issues.

http://www.iipi.org/index.asp

CURRENCY VALUATION

Can you use float range currency values on grant budgets? How do you account for increased currency valuation on five year budget proposals? This section should help answer these questions:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES – FOREIGN GRANT BUDGETS

Before you jump into a foreign subcontract, make sure you read the grant guidelines carefully. The following link to the NIH guidelines contains a good example of how to budget for foreign currencies. Most granting institutions will not increase funding to account for increased currency value over time. Therefore, your institution is responsible for any valuation difference.

http://grants.nih.gov/grants/foreign/budgets.htm

NCURA INTERNATIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD RESOURCES PAGE

The International Neighborhood has created an incredibly rich resources page that is available to any active NCURA member. The research associations of most countries are listed with a detailed description of related resources. Once you have the list of countries you are working with, stop by this page for easy access to information on these countries.

http://www.ncura.edu/content/regions_and_neighborhoods/neighborhoods/international/international_resources.php

These resources are great places to start as you work with international agencies and institutions. This year’s NCURA Annual Meeting will also provide a vast array of workshops, contributed sessions and discussion forums centered on fostering international collaborations. I hope many of you will be able to take advantage of the opportunities offered at the Annual Meeting.

Kirsten Yehl serves as Research Administrator, Northwestern University.

NCURA DEPARTMENTAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP

There is exciting news for Departmental Research Administrators. NCURA membership and participation show a significant increase in Research Administrators who work at the Departmental level. Thus a traveling workshop was specifically designed for the DRA. From July 13th through July 15th in Boston, NCURA presented the inaugural hotel offering of the newest traveling workshop. It was led by Pat Hawk from Oregon State University and included Brian Squilla from the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, Cindy Hope from the University of Alabama, and Michele Codd from Vanderbilt University.

One of the exceptional features of this workshop is experiential learning. The faculty and developers believe hands-on learning with real examples is more practical for the breadth of the DRA learner. The materials and training are led by the entire faculty as a team and fewer slides are used for training. There are opportunities for the participants to get to know each other and the faculty. As with all workshops, the pertinent topics central to all research administration are addressed including: institutional structure and culture, roles and responsibilities, OMB circulars, agreement types, and the like. For a fresh look at the materials, the topic areas are introduced with humorous skits, games, team building exercises, and other training techniques making this workshop fresh and interesting.

One of the team building exercises includes handling real application requirements for different funding sources. The exercises begin with the application review process and go through to the award process with each team working to resolve problems and answer questions. Participants’ questions and discussions are welcome at all times, providing opportunities for sharing real-world experience based on the activity example. As fellow Departmental Research Administrators, Michele and Brian were adept at speaking to DRA-related issues while Pat and Cindy brought in Central Research Administration perspectives. The activities promote lively interaction between the learners and a cohesive environment, as everyone works together to successfully complete an activity – making the training much like reality.

The learners are also invited to apply their knowledge to the games, mimicking some of television’s favorite game shows. The change of pace evokes a lively, energized experience. As is often the case with real life, responses create discussion about the interpretation of terms or semantic debates. Overall, the games accommodate review and application of knowledge, an opportunity to test skills and answers, and new ways of thinking about how to review broad and detailed materials in a newer format.

While there is no way of eliminating classroom learning on all research administration topics, the experiential learning, games, tools and the use of timely examples from events occurring in Research Administration today augments the participants’ understanding of issues. This experiential learning will lead to many more successful offerings of the DRA Workshop.

Kirsten Yehl serves as Research Administrator, Northwestern University.
Paper submissions have vanished along with the typewriters that we used to prepare them. Instead of pleading with our supervisors for new electric typewriters, we now ask for two monitors so that we can use one screen to read our guidelines and the other to complete the proposals.

We have come a long way since the early 1990’s, transitioning from paper to paperless research proposal submissions. Grants specialists now scan documents, sign proposals electronically and spent countless hours learning new submission platforms and tracking systems to try to manage it all.

The entire research administration process has been converted to doing business electronically (e-business). Processes like completing notifications and requests, which were once done in hard copy and mailed, are now managed online, in seconds. Agencies use to send out brightly colored post cards to notify researchers that their progress reports were past due. Now, automated email messages are sent instead. Lateral files that once stood chock-full of PHS 398 and 2950 forms, now stand empty or are virtually nonexistent in sponsored research offices today. Researchers can logon to websites and complete their forms online or download them to their computer, and do not have to worry about whether or not it is the correct version (most of the time). But whether electronic or hard copy, there is still the potential of losing it. Now, it is lost in more creative places, like cyber space.

Business processes have been streamlined to the point that the submissions can be handled from virtually anywhere in the world; from cradle to grave. Platforms have been developed to provide researchers with an abundance of information at the click of a mouse. Resources range from databases and websites chock-full of information at the click of a cradle to grave. Platforms have been developed to provide researchers with an abundance of information at the click of a mouse. Resources range from databases and websites chock-full of information to the users to ensure smooth, seamless submissions and administration of their grants. Electronic research administrators are often responsible for finding/developing software solutions to help simplify the submission process and project management for the researcher, grants specialists, and post-award specialists. Many build their own solutions to these challenges in-house; some have even successfully marketed them in the research arena.

As the electronic submission process grew, the federal government tried to control the chaos by mandating that one portal be created for all the federal agencies to receive proposal submissions. In theory, the idea was perfect. However, the concept did not catch-on and each of the agencies implemented their own shadow systems.

Federal agencies were hiring programmers, web developers, and web designers to create these websites and to provide online content. Many of the agencies did not have sufficient budget to support the teams of experts needed, so they utilized low-tech methods like forms in portable document format (PDF) that could be completed with Adobe software or provided the user with a Word document to complete and return to the agency as an email attachment. No two submission methods were, nor have they ever been the same!

Often electronic research administration is overlooked by institutions; many electronic research administrators are expected to do their jobs part-time and take on additional duties as a grants specialist or support staff. It is important to remember that without this infrastructure and support, conducting e-business would be much harder. So the next time you walk past your electronic research administrator, or coming rushing into their office for help with a corrupt data file five minutes before the agency deadline, keep in mind what it
Just prior to the release of the 2007/2008 report, DOD issued an internal memorandum on “Contracted Fundamental Research.” The memorandum calls attention to NSDD 189 as the governing policy and indicated that DOD awards for the performance of fundamental research should not contain restrictions on the involvement of foreign researchers or publication restrictions.

All federal research agencies should follow the principles of NSDD 189 in funding research and the relevant federal acquisition regulation provision (FAR 27.404-4(a)) should be incorporated into all unclassified federal research contracts to universities.

The White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB) should issue guidance to federal agencies, perhaps through revisions to Circular A-110 (2 CFR 215), which states that restrictions on publications or participation by foreign nationals are inappropriate for federal agencies to use in university grants and cooperative agreements.

Export control compliance clauses should be used more selectively by federal agencies and prime contractors. Their use should be restricted to situations where the agency or contractor knows it is providing export controlled information to the university and should avoid using such clauses when the research is clearly fundamental in nature and is, therefore, excluded from export control requirements.

The federal government should implement a government-wide, comprehensive training program for contracting officers to address the issues highlighted in the 2007/2008 report.

The NAS Committee recommendation to establish a federal science and security commission to address ongoing shared concerns of the security and academic research communities (such as implementation of NSDD 189) should be followed. A university-government working group also should be established to address current issues, evaluate results and monitor future issues in science and security. The group also should be charged with identifying and implementing ways to work with industry in providing the appropriate flow down terms to universities.

University officials must educate faculty, staff, and administrators about their responsibility to comply with export controls, select agents and other security-related issues.

The FDP, as an organization of university and federal agency members, should use the results of the survey to engage its membership in improving contracting and monitoring restrictions included in assistance awards.

In the 2007/2008 report, COGR/AAU states that implementation of the recommendations could significantly improve what has been found to be an increasingly untenable situation by addressing the federal agencies’ need to balance national security concerns while allowing universities to quickly and effectively navigate the government contracting process. Taking the recommended steps would help avoid lengthy negotiations and reduce the possibility of burdensome restrictions that result in lack of participation by universities in important technological advances.

In June 2008, DOD released a memorandum entitled Contracted Fundamental Research that reaffirmed the principles of NSDD 189. This step represented a very positive development. In discussing the memorandum, COGR/AAU emphasized how critical it will be that all DOD contracting officers uniformly abide by the agency-wide policy and that would have to be accomplished by full training of contracting personnel. Universities have reported some success in defending against troublesome clauses by use of the memorandum, but it is by no means a widely-known policy statement. DOD continues to be the primary source of troublesome clauses, in particular those included as flow down clauses from industry prime contracts. These clauses continue to be one of the most significant obstacles faced by universities, and the issue should be addressed as the COGR/AAU report suggested: by ODDB-issued guidance and the formation of a university-government working group, perhaps convened by a neutral body such as the National Academy.

A year has passed since the results of the 2007/2008 survey were released, and as the new Administration has yet to state its views on these issues, only time will tell whether universities will see improvements in the situation. The extent to which the CUI framework will be followed is unclear. Some effort has been initiated by the Administration for simplifying an overarching and complicated export control system, which is a positive sign. This August, it was announced that an interagency review of the existing system of export controls will be conducted jointly by the National Economic Council and National Security Council. The review will take into consideration reforms that will enhance the national security, foreign policy, and economic security interests of the U.S. in light of the true threats faced today.

Overall, it seems universities have experienced incremental improvements coupled with additional setbacks. COGR, AAU and FDP continue to seek ways to assist in the implementation of the recommendations. I encourage you to revisit the report, which can be found at the COGR website at http://206.151.87.67/docs/COGRAAU/TroublesomeClausesReport.pdf.

Alexandra McKeown, Associate Dean For Research Administration, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health

is that they do for you and for your organization. Their role in the research administration arena is still fairly new, but just as critical as those of the grants specialist or any other sponsored research team member.

Rebecca Puig serves as Assistant Director, Division of Sponsored Research, University of South Florida
Recently, two talented and experienced peers informed me that their services were no longer required at their institutions. Although we often make light of the fact that the growing complexity of research administration provides us with "job security," in difficult budget times, this is obviously not always the case. A frightening and tumultuous economy may make institutions do very strange things. And while it is difficult to imagine how a research administrator with impeccable credentials, a long history of active participation in the community, and knowledge that exceeds many textbooks should end up in this position at a time when federal funding is flowing into university research, the current reality is that these things do occur. It is the goal of this article to assist professionals in, and departing from, Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions, who arguably appear to be the hardest hit by the current financial crisis, to remain connected with the best assets that they have, their peers, as well as inform them of other resources available.

There are many resources designed to assist one in gaining a placement and they vary in cost and effectiveness. Professional consulting firms will re-write and reformat resumes so that they are more striking and stand out among the crowd of other resumes submitted for a single position. You may wish to consider working with a professional search firm that may be able to provide information and access regarding positions that may be less open to the public. Unfortunately, the costs of these services may range from considerable to exorbitant. Facing the grim reality that a paycheck is not forthcoming while bills continue to flow, makes shelling out large sums of money for people to restate who you are on paper and pre-interview on your behalf unrealistic. So what else can you do?

As much as it may pain you to do so, a good place to start is with your home institution. Some institutions have programs that will assist in the design of a strategy for the displaced employee to gain a new, comparable position. If formal programs are not available, your Career Counseling Office can assist you in building your resume and polishing your interviewing skills. They will also be familiar with a wide range of employers with whom your university already has an established relationship. Keep your options open. An experienced research administrator is likely to possess strong skills in writing, editing, grant writing, database management and a wealth of other experiences that are prized by the corporate and non-profit world. Make sure you visit your own human resources office to explore other opportunities that may be available at your institution, particularly if relocation isn’t an attractive option.

If you have not searched for a job in a while, you may not be familiar with the wide range of internet resources that are available at little or no cost. Sites such as LinkedIn provide a place for you to put some personality into your professional history. Posting your education, professional history, personal interests, latest book read, travel plans and PowerPoint presentations for all to see can shed light on your talents and skills. You also have the choice of limiting who sees your profile. LinkedIn lets you tell these peers/friends that you are seeking employment. As you build your connections, you are able to look at your connections’ connections and build on them. There will be people that you didn’t think of, really don’t know but who may be able to help or that are completely unrelated to your search who may end up being an asset. In addition to connections, there are groups. People with specific interests of all sorts have groups on LinkedIn. NCURA has a group, Sponsored Programs Administration, Higher Education Professionals and many others including alumni groups who also may be of assistance in the job hunt. Once you’ve built a network of people who are familiar with your work, ask them to provide you with a short reference. It is very simple and amplifies what you have developed in your professional history section.

When I was seeking employment, my two most useful resources for actual positions were HigherEdJobs.com and the Chronicle for Higher Education. Much like Monster.com, HigherEdJobs.com does a wonderful job of either ad hoc searches by profession or location. They also send weekly email updates of positions that fit your parameters. It is a free service and one that I believe most institutions utilize when seeking to hire employees. The Chronicle for Higher Education is the one resource that I strongly recommend that does have a cost associated. I feel that the publication provides the employed and unemployed with the most important issues of the day in Higher Ed. If one is not working, then the water cooler conversations that would keep you informed, at least at an institutional level, of the issues of the day are no longer available. The Chronicle brings cutting edge topics with expert insights as well as career advice and a listing of positions that institutions feel are important enough to advertise in the Chronicle. It is the whole kit and kaboodle and a tool that I use every week.

Finally, one of the most important resources for the displaced research administrator is access to your peers. If you have been in research administration for any length of time you have undoubtedly accumulated a circle of friends that you sit with each year to continue on page 39.
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An Innovative Online Program for Sponsored Research Professionals

- Earn 18 graduate credits in one year in a specialized academic program.
- Learn from faculty experts in research administration.
- Engage with a cohort of professionals in six 7-week accelerated courses delivered fully online.
- Share knowledge and learning while expanding your network across the country.

The Graduate Certificate in Research Administration is an academic opportunity for professionals currently working in sponsored programs. The innovative curriculum addresses critical knowledge areas including finance and accounting, compliance, legal issues and organizational behavior. Online, instructor-led, asynchronous learning extends the reach of this program beyond the research and health care hub of Boston.
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With my career trajectory having shifted from teaching English to working in Research Administration over a decade ago, I didn’t think I’d ever encounter the challenges of English as a Second Language (ESL) students in the Writing Lab again. My most challenging experience as an English Graduate Teaching Assistant at Southeast Missouri State University was the semester I was assigned to work in the University’s Writing Lab. Although located in the Midwest, the International Student Program at Southeast is relatively large, and the majority of students who came to the Writing Lab for assistance were ESL students. Obtaining my master’s degree while simultaneously trying to assist ESL students with their personal essays and research papers was demanding; I was not trained in the teaching of ESL, and by the end of that semester I knew that was not going to be the focus of my MA in English.

Universities without a student writing center that offers some type of specialized services for ESL students would be almost unheard of in today’s globally diverse academic world. But lately I have found myself asking if there isn’t a similar responsibility for a research-oriented university’s Sponsored Projects Office (SPO) to offer assistance to ESL researchers who are unques-tionably experts in their scientific area but who often still struggle with writing grant applications outside their native language.

**Same Challenges; New Setting**

As Director of the Office of Research Resources at Columbia University School of Nursing, in addition to providing all pre-award services for grant applications for our research faculty, I have prided myself in being able to utilize my educational training by offering “editing services” when time permits. But recently when one of our new junior faculty members, an ESL researcher, was submitting her first grant and requested a read-through for “grammar and flow.” I found that the task before me seemed almost insurmountable. I edited the draft as best as I could, struggling to find the actual scientific plan buried within a fog of passive voice and missing articles. Under these circumstances, I wondered how effective critical reviews of the application by her native English speaking colleagues could possibly be. And what of the NIH review panelists, faced with stacks of grants to pour through? Would they also find themselves so overwhelmed by the confusing writing and unnatural structure that this application would immediately get tossed aside onto the “unscored” pile? And in fact my fears were confirmed when a faculty member and experienced reviewer I spoke to indicated that being discarded unscored would most likely be the end result – she confirmed what all Research Administrators already know: grant applications must not only have terrific science, but must be meticulously well-written to have a chance at funding.

So, what becomes of the curious case of the ESL researcher who has a research proposal with an innovative, highly relevant topic and sound methodology, but poor, unreadable writing?

International faculty members who are ESL researchers make up a growing proportion of American medical and science faculties (1). This trend is likely to escalate as the NIH continues to emphasize interdisciplinary research, encourage minority researchers, and promote international collaborations. University SPOs are uniquely situated to take on this challenge and be pro-active rather than re-active when it comes to offering grant writing assistance for ESL researchers. These researchers may often seek assistance from senior faculty who are native English speakers and serve as mentors. But the level of commitment and amount of one-on-one time that is required from the faculty to help improve grant writing skills is unfeasible based on the typical workload of a senior researcher. In addition, university writing centers and labs that offer writing assistance are more likely to be focused on the academic needs of students rather than the specific writing needs of research faculty. Indeed, writing assistance may be outside the traditional scope of an SPO, but if their core mission is to support faculty research by giving each application the highest probability of funding, this gap presents an important service opportunity for SPOs.

**The Odds of Funding**

As federal funding for research projects becomes tighter, the smaller the success rate becomes, making sustaining research careers difficult for even the best scientists and writers. According to NIH RePORT data, there has been a steep drop off in the success rate for all types of competing research project grants across all institutes during the past decade (2). The average success rate during 1999-2003 was 31%, and during the subsequent 5 years, 2004-2008, the rate decreased to 22%. The success rate in 2008 was a disheartening 21.8%. With odds already stacked against the most experienced and articulate researchers, how much more of a challenge do ESL researchers face in the years ahead?

**The Needs of ESL Researchers**

In 2002, Gibbs et al. conducted a study on the obstacles to publishing success for ESL faculty and fellows at the University of Texas (1). Many of the self-expressed specialized manuscript editing needs of
ESL faculty and fellows can be slightly revised to directly apply to similar grant writing challenges and needs of ESL researchers, including:

- Access to successful grant applications to use as models for structure, thought, organization, and language expression
- Access to translators in their native language to assure their message is expressed clearly
- Access to editors who are experienced in the researcher’s science
- Access to seminars on grant writing focused on the specialized needs of ESL researchers

In addition to basic writing issues, misunderstandings about the scientific review process can occur because of a lack of experience in the native culture. For example, ESL researchers may misinterpret communications with their Project Officers or Grant Management Specialists, or they might misunderstand reviewer comments. This could result in inappropriate responses to reviewer comments in a resubmission application. These multi-layered factors can decrease their funding chances, which can in turn jeopardize their research careers and chances at tenure.

Many ESL researchers seek writing help outside the university system. This includes hiring independent writing consultants who may simply rewrite their grants in “proper English,” but this carries with it the possibility of losing the researcher’s intended meaning in the translation. Contracting a scientific writer might be a temporary “fix” for a particular grant application, but in the long run the ESL researcher’s writing skills have not improved and the problem persists. A long-term solution to the curious case of the ESL researcher may be even more innovative: The SPO Writing Center.

An SPO Writing Center

A model SPO Writing Center would offer services at multiple levels for all faculty members and needs. To start small, though, if it was staffed 1-2 days/week by an ESL-trained educator and writer, it could provide much-needed assistance to this underserved population of scientific researchers. To begin addressing some of the self-expressed needs of the ESL researcher, these ESL staff members would not simply serve as a “ghost writer,” but work one-on-one refining the language and structure in grant proposals alongside the ESL researcher. This collaborative writing and editing method would help model the proper writing and enable them to improve their own writing skills with time and practice. This level of assistance, which is outside the scope of the senior research mentor, could prove to be the weighing factor in the ESL researchers’ ability to obtain the funding needed to permanently establish themselves as a successful member of the university faculty. The writing center could also provide ESL researchers access to a repository of grant writing templates or exemplars for use in modeling the structure of their own grants as well as offer a series of grant writing seminars aimed at the ESL researcher, inviting speakers from the ESL faculty’s scientific and cultural background. On a smaller, department-level scale, my Office of Research Resources currently offers variations on both of these services to all researchers at the School of Nursing, and they have proven to be highly successful and popular among our faculty.

In a quick Internet search, I found several research-intensive universities which offer specialized offices, programs, and workshops with content similar to the SPO Writing Center I have suggested. One example, the Weill Medical College of Cornell University Faculty Assistance Program, offers special services for investigators who are non-native English speakers (3). Three levels of service are available. “Basic Editing Service” is offered free of charge and a professional scientific writer assists with editing, structure and logic of a grant application as well as provides advice regarding the document’s presentation. “Detailed Editing Service” may include rewriting of individual sections of the grant and restructuring of the document to improve flow and presentation of key concepts. “Interactive Editing Services” adds the aspect of grant restructuring and editing based on ongoing conversations between the researcher and the consultant and repeated exchanges of the grant document between parties as it is refined. In this example, the “Interactive” service would not only be the most helpful and cooperative method, but also suggests the beginning of the level of service that an ideal SPO Writing Center would provide.

Financial support and a long-term commitment from Central Administration would obviously need to be secured in order to implement a successful SPO Writing Center. One might even consider applying for outside funding to implement such a project, and even conduct methodological research on it, if an appropriate call exists. The idea of an SPO Writing Center is a tall order in today’s economic climate, but if success rates for ESL researchers were tracked and shown to increase as a direct result, the efforts would pay off at every level – for the individual researcher’s career, for the department funding level, and for the university.

Kristine M. Kulage, MA, serves as Director of the Office of Research Resources at Columbia University School of Nursing.
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NCURA Peer Review of Sponsored Programs Available to Your Institution

With ARRA’s impact being fully felt by sponsored program operations, NCURA recognizes the increasing importance of assessing your program’s operational effectiveness and the institutional support of research infrastructure. The peer review is conducted by research administrators for research administrators. The review compliments the many other NCURA educational opportunities available to your campus and staff by assessing the sponsored program operations and your current and future needs. Areas of assessment include:

- Proposal Services
- Award Acceptance and Initiation
- Award Management
- Research Ethics
- Organizational Structure
- Communications, Outreach, and Education
- Compliance and Risk Assessment

Check out information about the NCURA Peer Review Program at www.ncura.edu to learn more about assessing your operation.

For more information or to schedule a peer review, contact Peggy Lowry at peerreview@ncura.edu or (503) 364-1847.
Mahatma Gandhi said, "Be the change you want to see in the world." What better way to accomplish this, than by choosing to mentor others. Mentoring, as an integral part of leadership, can be particularly effective in achieving change and growth, organizationally and personally.

While in many organizations it is a supervisor’s role to manage and motivate individuals to achieve their performance goals, it is a mentor’s role to build trust, foster collaboration, provide ethical guidance, and foster an understanding of the environment around the mentee. More importantly, a mentor is an advisor, role model, teacher, and advocate and can ultimately become a life-long ally.

Although exemplary leaders use mentoring as a vehicle to lead, anyone can be a mentor. A successful mentoring relationship will help hone communication and leadership skills, bring new insight from different perspectives, and provide a sense of accomplishment.

Whether the mentoring relationship is formal or informal, successful mentors practice certain skills such as active listening, providing guidance, building trust, encouraging others and a consideration of other viewpoints. Mentoring is not only about sharing intellectual capital, it is a vehicle for others to advise, engage, and support. As described in the article “How Coaching and Mentoring Leverage Leadership Talent” by Maynard Brusman, mentors can adopt many styles, but one highly rewarding approach to the mentee is based on a style of inquiry rather than one that is directive or authoritative. One of the roles of a mentor is to challenge the mentee in their thought process thereby allowing them to reach their own conclusions as well as providing a path for self-discovery.

Performing a self-assessment will allow you to better identify and understand your ability to serve as a mentor and simplify the task of identifying a mentee. Some key points to consider include:

- Do you have a desire to share your experience and knowledge with others?
- What are some of your goals for mentoring?
- What are your strengths?
- What type of relationship do you want? Informal, formal, short term, long term?
- What expertise can you offer?
- Do you have the resources to become a mentor?
- How much time can you realistically commit? Weekly, biweekly, monthly?
- How are you going to meet? Face-to-face, e-mails, phone calls, or other medias?

Once you decide to be a mentor, match your skills and needs to the potential settings, opportunities and mentees. It is ok if you do not match perfectly, as long as you have a good rapport and share similar interests. When reaching out to a potential mentee, discuss how you would like to help them as a mentor, making sure to discuss their goals and objectives, assist in resolving problems, and how you will provide guidance to achieve their goals and objectives. While both the mentor and mentee have certain responsibilities for ensuring the success of the relationship, it is important for the mentor to be available to the mentee or the relationship will likely fail.

Besides being knowledgeable and successful in their careers, common characteristics of excellent mentors include the desire to devote time to develop others, the ability to listen and act as a sounding board without being judgmental, provide constructive feedback in a timely manner, the ability to network and be resourceful. As a mentor, one of the most valuable things you can do is to help connect your mentee with people, opportunities, and information that may otherwise be inaccessible to them. Additional mentoring skills of successful mentors include:

- Ability to break the ice
- Build confidence and trust
  - Be available
  - Be supportive
  - Actively listen
  - Keep conversations confidential
- Offer guidance
- Be non-judgmental
- Allow for differing opinions
- Let the mentee make the decisions
- Assist in defining & achieving career goals
- Encourage & challenge mentee to reach goals
- Share experiences, knowledge & best practices
- Maintain an attitude for free and open discussions
- Provide insight and perspective on how to achieve goals
- Open the door by providing new opportunities & introductions

Building an effective mentoring relationship is a process; therefore, establish clear expectations and boundaries to manage the roles and any problems, should they occur. Be clear that the mentee drives the relationship and that it is the mentee who identifies the goals and objectives to be achieved, and communicates them to you, the mentor. In addition, the mentee is responsible for communicating to the mentor whether his or her expectations are being met. ➤
**NCURA Threaded Delivery of Programming: What Does It Mean?**

*By Denise Wallen*

The NCURA Professional Development Committee (PDC) received a charge from Past President David Mayo to review and analyze the membership programming survey results from Fall 2008 and deliver recommendations to the Board of Directors for future programming. PDC Chair Denise Wallen (University of New Mexico) convened a working group comprised of Valera Francis (University of North Carolina at Greensboro), Pat Hawk (Oregon State University), Josie Jimenez (New Mexico State University), Drew Memmott (Mayo Clinic), Michiko Pane (Stanford University), William Ploog (Dartmouth College), and Marc Schiffman (NCURA) to tackle the question. The group ultimately developed a concept of “Threaded Delivery.”

The goal of Threaded Delivery is to bring greater cohesiveness to NCURA programs by offering a more transparent and accessible training path to our constituents. For instance, beginning in 2010 we will anchor professional development opportunities with the long-term strategies for building expertise in select critical areas of research administration. Several threaded topical areas will be identified, and as much as possible, coordinated across several delivery methods during the year. For instance, critical areas could be: departmental research administration; research compliance; and subcontracts.

To start, we will embark on a beta test to include two forthcoming NCURA TV topics as well as “blue-ribbon workshops.” These will each be followed (or threaded) by several chats, podcasts, webinars, recommended readings, as well as archived DVDs. Planned follow up chats in the Neighborhoods will provide more discussion and opportunities for members to exchange best practices. In addition, follow up podcasts will provide an opportunity to hear from other subject matter experts. The NCURA Magazine will solicit articles on threaded topical areas, and the NCURA RMR will solicit an in depth piece on those topics. There will also be threaded offerings using webinars. And, of course, we recognize that NCURA has a wealth of archived materials and resources that are available to our membership – books, micrographs, DVDs. These resources will be clearly identified and grouped within the threaded delivery “menus.” The regions will have the opportunity to leverage their programming on threaded delivery. This will allow the regions to easily respond to their membership needs and requests in an even more targeted fashion.

NCURA will utilize its website to link its threaded program events and outline learning objectives within the broader topical areas so that members can easily identify the content and the level of content for the program. We believe this will make training opportunities easier to access, and easier to adapt to local environments and needs.

The ultimate goal is to provide easy access to a robust path of training choices that you and your university can build upon and integrate into your institution. We recognize in this current time of limited resources it is critical to provide rich and varied opportunities so that you can continue to develop your skills and those of your staff. Everyone will be kept informed of our upcoming threaded delivery beta test and invite you to participate and evaluate our efforts.

Denise Wallen serves as Director, Faculty Research Support Services, University of New Mexico.

---

Circumstances may arise that will not allow you the time to continue mentoring. If this occurs, discuss the situation as soon as possible and preferably in a face-to-face meeting. If your mentee determines to end the mentoring relationship for whatever reason, do not take it personally and remind them that you will be glad to be available to them in the future. Maya Angelou once said, “…people will forget what you said, people will forget what you did, but people will never forget how you made them feel.”

Upon reflection of our experiences as recent graduates of the Leadership Development Institute (LDI), we have learned the value of mentoring and its importance in educating and training. LDI gave us an opportunity to be a mentee and a mentor, interacting with exemplary leaders in our profession and receiving first-hand exposure to the amazing camaraderie that exists within research administration and NCURA. What started out as a highly structured, short-term arrangement has developed into informal long-term relationships and friendships for many individuals. The authors give special thanks to Linda Patton and Tony Lawson, who started out as our LDI ‘advisors’ and became our mentors and friends.

We encourage you to accept the challenge to become a mentor for a period of one year or longer and experience the benefits that will last both you and your mentee. Be prepared to be personally transformed by the relationship. For additional tips and tools, please check out Region VI’s Mentoring Program at [http://www.ogr.d.wsu.edu/r6ncura/announce.asp](http://www.ogr.d.wsu.edu/r6ncura/announce.asp)

Kathy Bir and Rosemary Madnick are graduates of the 2008 LDI, whose class is writing Leadership Tips this year. Managing Editor: Ty Lane.
What Gets Lost in Translation?

By Clifton P. Griffin and James C. Holste

“How did we get here,” you may ask? How is it that a U.S. university research services office is located in the Middle East? Let’s take a look back. In 2003, Texas A&M University established a branch campus in Qatar at the request of the Qatar Foundation for Education, Science and Community Development, chaired by Her Highness Sheikha Mozah Bint Nasser Al Missned. At that time, there was no significant research activity in Qatar. In December 2003, while visiting Texas A&M University to deliver a commencement address, HH Sheikha Mozah announced the intention to establish a national research fund in Qatar. At that time, she introduced the “Well of Knowledge” concept whereby all of the revenues from a specific oil well would be dedicated to this effort. Growing interest in research followed, sometimes behind the scenes, over the next couple of years. In 2006, the Qatar National Research Fund (QNRF), under the auspices of the Qatar Foundation, was launched as the apparatus for funding research in Qatar. Its first peer-reviewed proposal program, the Undergraduate Research Experience Program began in late 2006, and its signature multi-year program, the National Priorities Research Program (NPRP) was implemented in mid-2007. In addition to the QNRF, local industry also was interested in engaging Texas A&M University at Qatar (TAMUQ) to address local technical issues.

With some of the research funding pieces in place, where do we fit into the picture? The beginning of the research office was Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies, Jim Holste. Jim came to Doha as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs when TAMUQ began operations, and after spending over 25 years as a faculty member and administrator in College Station. As academic dean, he worked to promote research and graduate studies before switching to the formal role in 2007. Clifton Griffin became the second office member. His first day at work in Doha was February 6, 2008. He arrived in country with a seven-month pregnant wife, a two-year old son, a Golden Retriever and a psycho cat! He had very little research administration experience having just spent eight years as assistant dean of graduate studies at Texas A&M. We had lots to do, no clear directions and no one to provide much useful advice. Where to start?

Before we can actually start production, it’s important to understand the context and culture in which we are operating. It takes years to develop even a fundamental understanding of this place. While Qatar has come a long way in a short time, there are lots of challenges. Very few nationals have research experience or experience administering a research funding agency. Add to this research in an academic institution, and you really complicate things. There is much talk in the media and government about a “knowledge-based society.” However, there is no clear meaning for this. So, we are learning by doing. For example, there is nothing like helping to educate your funding agency about standard operational processes for research institutions. Very few individuals have experience outside the local business organizational model, which emphasizes micromanagement so that almost every decision requires ratification at a very high level of management. This is of course inconsistent with effective research administration as we know it. Imagine if every budget change request that you have on a research project required input from the CEO of the organization, or that NSF had no people with research university experience. Sound crazy? There’s more!

Many of you are researchers or you understand how research works in the U.S. You may also have some international research experiences. But think of this: even the simplest of tasks such as getting supplies like tubing, glassware, electronics, tools, etc., becomes incredibly complex. There are no readily available supply houses in Qatar and certainly no Home Depots. Of course, don’t even think about trying to ship any of those things from the U.S. to the Middle East. The export control regulations will eat you alive, but more later on that.

Aside from supplies, probably the most difficult challenge to overcome has been the lack of human resources as there are simply very few people available that have any research or technical experience. All of the skilled people have been swallowed up by the industrial companies. This lack of a skilled work force cannot be overstated. It is very difficult to hire research staff with the requisite skills. And, when you can find them, convincing them to come to Doha just isn’t easy.

Being research administrators, you understand the importance and necessity of such concepts as federal regulations, auditing, and compliance, right? Well, imagine a country unfamiliar with any of these concepts and start dangling lots of funding in front of eager faculty! Sounds like a recipe for chaos? At times it is. The country is literally making up the rules as we go along. Customs processes and environmental regulations were unheard of here just a few years ago, but they are taking shape now. This is especially interesting, when you find out as a regular occurrence that a local government process literally just changed….yesterday, and not in a minor way!

So, how do you operate in this culture? How do you follow the ever-changing rules and help faculty and researchers acquire funds for research and actually conduct that research? First, you cannot assume that the standard, “the way we have always done it,” or “the guidelines and regulations say that we must…” will suffice here. Collectively, the two of us have spent over 50 years at U.S. public research institutions. We are accustomed to and understand the necessity for the rules. To get things done in Qatar, we often must improvise to make things work while not violating laws. For example, to get anywhere, you must build relationships, and not the ones that occur over a video conference. The locals are rather “old school” in that they expect “face to face” time and want to know, rightly so, that we are committed to a long-term stay in Qatar. They have had lots of experiences with folks that are here just for the money. We go to meetings, have tea, talk for an hour and twenty-five minutes about family, dust storms, architects, and anything else but business. Then, we have five minutes of business talk. And, this “talk” is usually with a person who cannot and will not make any decisions. Rather, he will brief his bosses and get back to you.
sooner, Inshallah. In other words, if it’s God’s will. You see, when “negotiating” in the Arab world, they are talking to us and we are talking to them, but it’s not easy to translate. We don’t understand why they don’t trust us. After all, we are Texas A&M, and we have been doing this for a long time! They don’t understand why we don’t just do it the way they want. Forget your silly rules and laws; simply do the work that we are paying you to do! It’s our money, so we can make the rules.

Another challenge is that, although TAMU-Q is a branch campus located in Doha, the legal organization doing the contracting for research resides in Texas. We must sort out the “do’s and don’ts” with the “help” of our colleagues in Texas, while trying to explain to our potential sponsors in Qatar why the State of Texas has anything to do with this transaction. It is like being a lonely ship getting shot at from both sides of the sea. Some of our friends in Texas, at times, suddenly want to tell us how it’s going to be, which is understandable, since they are legally bound and responsible. Add to that the local business practices, for which nothing seems to be final and where some have characterized the signing of a contract as an agreement to begin serious negotiations. But, unless you live in Doha, you cannot possibly understand. There are more shades of gray than you can imagine. We are not referring to the heat and dust, either.

Given the complexities and cultures, how have things gone the last couple of years? You be the judge. We currently have over 70 active research projects representing a total commitment of more than $50M. We manage every aspect of research administration, with help from our Texas colleagues. The office has grown to a whopping five people, and we are about to start a master’s program which we will have to administer. What else? We have hired over 60 research staff, and commissioned 32 research labs, set up all research safety operations....simple things like that. It’s not bragging, but there is a real sense of pride when you begin with nothing and compare it to now. Our group is larger too; we have Lesley, Engy, Eric, and Donna to help manage the madness!

We meant to get back to export control. Is that important? Why...yes, we have several folks working here from THOSE countries, and we certainly DO want to ship THAT to HERE! Not to mention, that there also are faculty that want to travel everywhere and talk about everything. We will have to save this topic for a future article because we are still sorting out how to follow the U.S. federal laws while we are operating in the Middle East. It does help keep life interesting.

Our point? As we say about many aspects of life in Doha, research administration here is a great paradox. There is more than adequate financial resources, but little infrastructure or experienced human resources. To be successful requires persistence, patience, open-mindedness and an ability to laugh at yourself. As a State of Texas branch campus, we must follow two sets of rules which often conflict, and there is no blueprint or beaten path to follow. It’s exciting, fun and maddening all at the same time.

What’s next? Only the sands of time will tell...and we have plenty of sand. This is a work in progress and we have much to learn. As Einstein said, "If we knew what it was we were doing, it would not be called research, would it?"

Clifton Griffin is Director of Research and Graduate Studies Services at Texas A&M University at Qatar. James Holste is Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies at Texas A&M University at Qatar.

PUIcorner continued

see Sole Source and the No Cost Extensions. NCURA Colleagues, such as alumni of the Leadership Development Institute, volunteers on panels, discussion groups and those involved in the governance of their regional or national committees, form a network of informal peers that can keep us in touch with the community of research administrators. There are location specific groups, for example, the RI Networking Group and the Virginia Career Network that can put you in touch with the people to know when seeking a job. Any friend you’ve made, met, or mentored can be an invaluable resource to you as you look for new opportunities.

So if confronted with the situation that my two, again very talented, experienced, and knowledgeable friends were, be proactive. Ask your institution what resources they will make available to you. Keep in mind, that you are a seasoned professional and so the guidance you receive should not be the same as that provided to a new graduate. Join LinkedIn and look for your friends, people you think might be helpful, just tell them your circumstance and ask them to join your network. Join groups that sound like a good fit and then check who the members are. You will find a wealth of well connected and well placed people are in these groups and are willing to help if they can. Sometimes, just having them as a connection is helpful. Add your LinkedIn profile website to your resume. It is a way of getting more references to a would be employer and gives a well rounded snapshot of you...as well as a picture if you choose. Sign up for HigherEdJobs.com and please make the investment for a subscription or go to your library and read The Chronicle for Higher Education. Keep informed and don’t hesitate to ask your friends if they are aware of any opportunities. We are a rare breed who are always willing to help our peers. That is the best part of being a Research Administrator.

Anne M. Pascucci is the chair of the PUI Neighborhood Subcommittee and serves as Director, Office of Sponsored Programs and Grants Management, Radford University.

continued
As a former biomedical research scientist and long-time grants administrator for a large private philanthropic organization, I’ve monitored the progress of high impact, experimental grant programs at liberal arts colleges and research universities throughout the United States. Even those less productive grant programs were still useful in contributing new knowledge, if only contributing a negative data point. With an investment of $787 billion, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act) must succeed if we are to preserve and create new jobs, spur significant scientific progress in two years (a relatively short amount of time for research), and jumpstart the economy. This is a hefty challenge for both recipients and providers of grants and contracts, as well as those that administer sponsored research programs. This article examines both the immediate and long-term opportunities and challenges that impact the success of this investment, particularly in biomedical and engineering research.

From the National Science Foundation (NSF) to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), approximately 26 federal agencies receiving recovery funds have formalized plans and guidelines on more than 269 programs and projects being made available through stimulus funding. Updated weekly financial and activity reports by funding agencies are available on the Recovery.gov site. New ARRA-related information is also frequently updated and released via the numerous agency websites, funding alert emails and newsletters, and RSS feeds. Subscribe to the new Grants.gov Blog or Grants.gov RSS feed for current Recovery Act grant opportunities or search at FedBizOpps.gov for additional Recovery notices and awards.

Providing and keeping up with the ever increasing flow of current Recovery-related information, however, has been a challenge for both granting agencies and grant seekers. As a result, many institutions such as Duke University have developed their own Recovery websites with detailed grant opportunities and timelines which may be useful for smaller institutions with limited sponsored research program staff and resources to compile such time sensitive information. Most federal agencies have posted “Frequently Asked Questions” and updated information on Recovery award eligibility, formatting requirements, deadlines, award terms, and much more on their Recovery sites to distribute the information on RFAs and RFPs efficiently and quickly.

Approximately $59 billion in Recovery Act funding has been appropriated to improve health and human services in communities across America. A component of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the National Institutes of Health (NIH), which includes 27 Institutes and Centers, was entrusted with $10.4 billion, including $8.2 billion in extramural funding through September 2010. The funds will support recent peer reviewed highly meritorious R01s that can be achieved in less than two years; new research applications; supplements to current grants; new activities such the NIH Challenge Grants and Grand Opportunities; and as appropriate, new funding mechanisms. In addition, $1 billion will be allocated to the National Center for Research Resources (NCRR) for extramural construction/repairs of NIH-funded research institutions. A total of $300 million will be allocated for shared instrumentation/extramural equipment. Approximately $500 million will be used for intramural repair and construction and improvement of NIH facilities and buildings. $300 million for extramural equipment, and $400 million for comparative effectiveness research.

NIH’s new Challenge Grant Program, with $200 million in funding, is designed to advance new areas of scientific research or challenges in 15 broad areas, including behavioral change and prevention, bioethics, clinical research and trials, genomics, health disparities, regenerative medicine, STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) education, and translational science. Challenge grants are limited to $500K for up to two years. As of June 8, 2009, NIH announced that it received 20,000 applications for Challenge Grants which were received by the April 27, 2009 deadline.

To handle the influx of Challenge Grant applications, NIH’s Center for Scientific Review (CSR) will organize a two–stage peer review process utilizing 18,000 scientists with expertise in specialized topics, with applications reviewed in more than 30 study sections. CSR typically receives 80,000 applications annually that are peer reviewed by more than 17,000 scientists which meet three times annually. Priority scores and summary statements were to be available in August 2009 with grant awards issued by September 30, 2009. NIH expects to fund approximately 200 grants through the Office of the Director and another 200 grants through the various Institutes and Centers.

The NIH Grand Opportunity (nicknamed “GO”) grants will provide support for exceptionally creative projects that address major biomedical challenges. The GO grants will include high impact, well defined, large scale projects that address scientific areas such as Alzheimer’s, community-based research, or nanotechnology. Budgets for GO grants must exceed $500K for a project period of two years. Following peer review, summary
statements will be available via NIH's eRA Commons with funding issued by September 30, 2009.

To accommodate the influx of new grant applications, NIH is initiating new efforts to simplify the review process. A new, 9-point scoring system will be used for Recovery applications. Administrative supplement applications, including Summer Research Supplements, are not peer-reviewed; however, each of NIH’s Institutes and Centers has an established process for reviewing administrative supplements. NIH is among the many Federal agencies currently seeking to fill positions for contract officers, grants management specialists, scientific review officers, and health science administrators to award and management grants and contracts. Some positions are being filled under term appointments (e.g., 13 months, in one year increments, not to exceed four years) depending on programmatic needs.

USAJobs.gov, enables users to search for federal job opportunities as a result of Recovery Act funding. The newly designed site allows the user to search by federal agency, U.S. location, or occupation, in addition to other advanced search features. To streamline and standardize the Federal hiring process, which can be bureaucratic and time consuming, Peter Orszag, director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and John Berry, the director of the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), recently announced major hiring reform over the next six months. By streamlining Federal job vacancy announcements, providing more timely applicant communication, and engaging hiring managers, as presented in OPM’s End-to End (E2E) Hiring Roadmap, released last year, will provide a new approach to Federal hiring reform. The Department of Labor’s CareerOneStop also provides many useful tools for job seekers as a means for attracting and recruiting a broader pool of highly qualified candidates.

Financial and program reporting requirement for ARRA awards will be at an unprecedented level. According to OMB, “Both PIs and universities will have additional reporting requirements, and we can expect mandatory quarterly reports for progress, job reporting, and spending.” As of August 17, 2009, ARRA grantees and Federal Agencies can preregister at FederalReporting.gov as part of their reporting responsibilities. The online recipient reporting tool for Recovery Act funds is to be available on October 1, 2009 for submission of the quarterly report due October 10, 2009. Initial reports will be publicly available on October 11 at recovery.gov. See www.federalreporting.gov for more information.

According to NIH, “The impact [of the Recovery Act] is expected to extend beyond the immediate scientists who will receive funds, to allied health workers, technicians, students, trade workers and others who will receive the leveraged benefits. We understand that to accomplish the goals of the Recovery and Reinvestment Act, it will take the help of the entire scientific community. Beyond the immediate economic stimulus, the long-term impact from the science funded by the Recovery Act will have a positive impact upon the health of the nation for years to come.”

To achieve the goals of the Recovery Act, it will really take a village, including university research administrators, the grant making and scientific communities, to ensure success of the Recovery Act. Continued dialogue among members of the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) and the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR), among others, will play an important and unique role in increasing efficiency and reducing administrative responsibilities that come along with Recovery dollars. Only time will tell if the juice is worth the squeeze.

Achieving a More Strategic Role

Roundtable participants discussed changes that will allow them to take a more strategic approach to research management in the future. From an organizational perspective, when asked the extent to which the group agreed with the following statement, “Europe should follow in the footsteps of the U.S. in developing research management departments/offices within their institutes,” 64% of the research managers agreed.

Participants also suggested that the growing need for a diverse set of skills could be better met through a “support team” approach as it is somewhat unreasonable to expect one person to identify and stay up-to-date on all funding sources and their requirements while managing contracts, intellectual property and financial reports. They agreed that building support teams with individuals from a wide variety of backgrounds and areas of expertise will allow research managers to focus on setting and reaching strategic funding goals.

Other steps suggested were additional conferences to allow for the exchange of knowledge and experience as well as training sessions, particularly as each new framework requires a new management approach. The group also pointed to a growing need for standardized training across Europe for research and project managers and the establishment of national certification programs to ensure that individuals are qualified to join the research management team.

Lessons Along the Way

The current dichotomy and complexity of funding combined with limited resources forces decisions to be made regarding which sources research managers choose to target and thus where the institutions will build their knowledge. This requires a thorough understanding of true research strengths. Research managers must be involved in identifying these competencies if they are to improve application approval rates and give direction for long-term research strategies that maximize competency-related collaboration and funding opportunities.

While the changing dynamics pose significant challenges, research managers in Europe see an opportunity to play a more significant role in the research process. In addition to fulfilling the operational tasks associated with facilitating funding, they are beginning to manage research partnerships beyond the traditional boundaries of nation or subject area and are poised to become more integral to setting the research agenda for their institutions.

By identifying effective collaborators and managing large multidisciplinary projects, as well as offering well-informed guidance for increasing research funding and driving innovation, research managers can reinforce their position and thereby strengthen the European research arena. As European research managers make the journey to a more strategic role, the lessons learned are equally valuable on both sides of the Atlantic.

Josine Stallings is a product manager with Elsevier’s Academic and Government group. A Dutch native, she is temporarily based in New York to support the U.S. launch of SciVal Funding.

Maria Koszalka is a consultant to the Northrop Grumman Corporation and is a core member of the International Research Collaborations project at the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR). She has graduate degrees in both the biological sciences and business and has worked in philanthropy, private industry, and the Federal government advancing research for more than 20 years.
Jim Casey’s article in the February/March issue of the NCURA Magazine, “Observations on Building Offices of Opportunity,” developed some very important thoughts for considering the research administration office. His article articulated what management should consider either in a reorganization or evaluation of the research administration office environment. His salient points are to provide a framework of what is necessary for the proper operation of any support function within an institution.

Jim talked about the overall office and the people involved as a group. I would like to turn attention to the research administrator (RA) as an individual; the individual who is a member of that group of administrators in an office or organizational environment. These RAs must accept the results of any organizational decisions and will either believe in or distrust the decision depending on past or current leadership practices. Further, if there are no pending changes, the RA is constantly observing management’s actions or inactions and therefore the RA periodically redefines their own activities within the organizational structure.

The concept of considering the individual RA is one that may be neglected, misunderstood or not considered in the university environment. I make these observations based on my membership in NCURA for over fifteen years and the number of RAs from across the country who have questioned their place in the research enterprise and who have either praised or criticized leadership for personal and professional development decisions that have a direct effect on their job satisfaction.

Furthermore, NCURA has invested in six Leadership and Development Institute (LDI) classes with some sixty graduates, with the current class of eight looking to develop and hone their leadership skills. I have met numerous other NCURA members who have manifested leadership through their involvement in NCURA activities or who have developed a personal reputation for leadership within their institutions. Many LDI graduates have written articles regarding development of leadership in past issues of the NCURA Magazine but none of these articles to my recollection have been directed at the recipient of leadership.

I developed the matrix below as a way to consider leadership both from the leader’s and the RA’s point of view. On which side of the matrix has leadership acted and the RA reacted at your institution? I would think that both the leader and the RA want to be on the left for job satisfaction. Do leaders believe their research administration functions are essential and important AND does the RA act as if they believe they are essential and important? Notice that the matrix focuses on the RA not the Principal Investigator (PI). Unquestionably the PI is the hub of the research enterprise and rightfully so. However, when leadership considers the importance of the support for that PI, leadership creates a golden opportunity to enhance the reputation for excellence for their institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership which continues to</th>
<th>When the RA senses that</th>
<th>The RA will resort to being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on the RA being:</td>
<td>The RA demonstrating:</td>
<td>leadership acts or is perceived to act:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respected</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>With Indifference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciated</td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>With Disregard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed</td>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>By Suppressing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Looking for culpability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Accepting outmoded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>As misinformed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result is the RA will identify with being essential and important to the organization. The result is the RA sees themselves as undervalued and discounted within the organization.
Funding provided by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) provided some interesting opportunities to analyze leadership. With ARRA funding, accountability is the watchword. Much of the responsibility for that accountability will be required from the institution through both the PI and other support functions within that institution. People working within those support functions must consider themselves essential and important if the institution is to adequately and honestly address accountability. Leadership as defined on the left side of the matrix is key to motivating those who need to provide information supporting ARRA funding.

Research administration is a support function. Support functions are often considered an unwarranted bureaucracy, a required additional step, a burden against perceived efficiency or an unavoidable nuisance by the very people who are being supported. Even under more usual circumstances, some end users refuse to see the importance of that support function but support functions can be even less appreciated at times of increased need and high anxiety such as the stress developed by the ARRA funding. ARRA funding requires high-quality leadership which shores up support functions. Many institutions have looked at ARRA funding as the panacea, the way to get through the current economic crisis. However, looking at funding as primary without adequate regard for the long-term consequences of obtaining that funding could result in short as well as long-term negative effects. How leadership handles ARRA with respect to the support functions could very well define how the RA will react to leadership in the future.

When leadership acts in the positive, the RA reacts in the positive as illustrated in the matrix above. When leadership doesn’t act or worse, acts negatively, the RA turns to negative action. The primary responsibility is on the leader, not the RA. I hear RAs say that they are not treated as professionals, not acknowledged as experts, not allowed to express opinions, not involved in decisions. If an organization believes it is working toward Jim Casey's observations and building the office of opportunity and yet the RA or the RA community tends toward activities that resemble the right side of the matrix, the problem is not within the RA community but with leadership actions.

A reasoned response to ARRA funding requires a rational approach to circumstances which in the past have not been experienced in research administration. Leadership has the opportunity to shine. Many organizations have looked beyond the funding alone and took a strategic look at increased opportunities, increased proposals and increased infrastructure thereby developing plans to deal with the anticipated results. Some even increased their communication efforts, making leadership more visible, by providing multiple opportunities for all within the institution including the RA to hear and understand the developed strategic plan. Some institutions took less deliberate steps or no strategic plan was publicized. The resultant increased stress and workload manifested the RAs reactions on either or both sides of the matrix depending on leadership. It was the RA reacting to leadership. The RA defines themselves as essential and important or undervalued or discounted depending on how leadership responded to ARRA funding within their institution.

An interesting side effect of the ARRA funding has been the additional administrative requirements. At the very time the federal government is dangling the ARRA funding with all the resultant reporting requirements, institutions though organizations like COGR and the FDP are asking for the administrative burden to be reduced. PIs are saying they are overburdened but in all my conversations with fellow RAs, I have not heard of a single PI who has declined to submit a proposal (with a potential success rate lower than average according to some at the agencies) because of the administrative burden (although I’m sure some have considered the additional administrative burden in their decision to submit or not submit). Further, I have heard RAs tell of newly created additional reporting requirements from within the institution, from the governor's office, the legislator, the Board, the System, the Chancellor and even the Vice President. Hypothesizing that most RA offices have not increased their full time employee (FTE) numbers based on ARRA, the additional proposal volume and the added reporting will put added stress on the RA. Here is another place leadership should address the needs of the RA.

People want and expect to be led with thoughtful and competent leadership. This is a very difficult time in research administration considering the economy and added pressure of ARRA funding. High-quality leadership is necessary for sanity and productivity. Has leadership applied some of these ideas to validate their leadership actions and have the results been an essential and important research administration function? RAs will have an opportunity to assess how they are being led and will consequently react to that leadership.

Dr. Alan Leshner's article “Science in Interesting Times,” also in the February/March issue of the NGURA Magazine, states this is an exciting time for research. I believe that his article is right on target. Dr. Leshner states, “... we should exploit the mood of change and opportunity...we in the scientific community should take the lead, seize the moment, and ensure we get those changes made.” “Take the lead” is a dynamic activity. What better place to start than within our own community by making sure that all RAs recognize, understand, and believe that RA functions are essential and important to the research enterprise within their institutions?

Vincent “Bo” Bogdanski is Assistant Director of Sponsored Programs at Colorado State University. He has been in his current position for three years. Prior to moving to Colorado, he worked in a similar position at the University of Utah for 13 years. He is active in NGURA as a workshop facilitator, speaker in sessions and as a member of various committees. He is currently on the faculty for SPA II. Bo is a retired Air Force Lieutenant Colonel and federal contracting officer.
This year the NCURA Nominating and Leadership Development Committee selected five long-time NCURA members to receive the Distinguished Service Award. This award, established in 2001, recognizes members who have made sustained and distinctive contributions to the organization.

The 2009 Award recipients are:

**JAMES J. CASEY, JR.**, Director of Contracts and Industrial Agreements, The University of Texas at San Antonio. Jim has served as Co-Editor of the NCURA Magazine for two years and is presently Senior Co-Editor. In 2010 he will serve as the first Senior Editor. Jim is also Chair of the International Neighborhood and is a member of the Commission on International Research Administration and the Professional Development Committee. Since 2004 he has been on the Editorial Board for the NCURA/ASIS publication Report on Research Compliance. He has served as Editor of NCURA’s Journal Research Management Review and was a member of its Editorial Review Board. He participated in the 2006, 2007 and 2009 Leadership Conventions and served on the Professional Development Committee and NCURA’s Board of Directors. Jim was a NCURA delegate to the GUIRR University-Industry Partnership Project. He has published many articles and chapters benefiting the profession and has presented numerous times at the regional, national, and international levels.

**DAVID MAYO**, Director of Sponsored Research, California Institute of Technology. David is the Immediate Past President of NCURA having served as President in 2008. He currently serves on the NCURA Board of Directors, is part of the leadership team for this year’s Leadership Development Institute (LDI), and is a member of the Working Group on the EARMAC/NCURA International Research Management Fellowship Program. In addition, David serves as a Peer Reviewer and as Ex-officio member on the Nominating & Leadership Development Committee. David has both chaired and has been a member of Annual Meeting Program Committees, and he is well known as a moderator, discussion group leader and presenter for regional and national meetings and conferences. NCURA TV, and both the on-line Primer on Subawards and also Federal Contracting. In addition, David has served as workshop faculty and Faculty Team Coordinator for the Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration Workshop and served as Evaluator for the Departmental Research Administration Workshop beta. He has served on the Professional Development Committee and also as an NCURA Magazine contributor. David has served as Chair of Region VI where his committee service includes the Regional Advisory Committee and the Nominating Committee.

**GEORGETTE SAKUMOTO**, Administrative Officer, Office of Administrative Services, University of Hawaii. Georgette currently serves on NCURA’s Board of Directors. She also has been a participant in the 2005, 2007 and 2009 Leadership Conventions, has contributed articles to the NCURA Magazine, has served as an LDI Advisor and she has served on many national committees including the Membership Committee, Budget and Finance Committee and the Minority Participation Task Force. Additionally, Georgette has served as Secretary/Treasurer, Chair Elect and Chair of Region VI. She has chaired the regional Meeting Program Committee and the Nominations Committee and has served on the regional Advisory Committee, Meeting Site Selection and Program Committee, and Travel Award Committee. Additionally, Georgette has presented at numerous NCURA regional and national meetings and conferences.

**PAMELA WEBB**, Associate Vice President for Research, University of Minnesota. Pamela’s NCURA service includes membership on the 50th Annual Meeting Program Committee as Workshop Coordinator and also served as workshop faculty and moderator for the 50th Annual Meeting. Pamela served as NCURA’s Secretary (2000–2001) and has served on the Board of Directors, the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee and the ERA Committee. She was Co-Chair of NCURA’s ERA III Conference and has presented at numerous national and regional meetings and conferences. Pamela was a participant in the 2008 Senior Summit and currently serves as an NCURA Peer Reviewer.

**PAMELA WHITLOCK**, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs (retired), University of North Carolina at Wilmington. Pam served as NCURA’s President (2007) and currently serves as Vice Chair/Chair Elect of the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee. She also serves as an LDI Leader and Advisor, is a member of the 51st Annual Meeting Program Committee, and was a participant in the 2009 Leadership Convention. Pam chaired the FRA VI Program Committee, is a past member of the Professional Development Committee and has served on the Board of Directors. In addition, Pam has served on the Finance Committee, the Research Administrators Professional and Institutional Development Task Force, and she was Chair of both the Board of Directors Task Force on Analysis of On-Line Training and also the Outstanding Member Selection Committee. Pam has been an NCURA Magazine contributor and a Fundamentals workshop faculty member. She has participated in many NCURA TV programs and is a frequent presenter, workshop faculty, moderator and evaluator at national and regional meetings and conferences. Pam currently serves as an NCURA Peer Reviewer. She also serves on the Region III Professional Development Committee. She is a past Region III Chair and also Region III Secretary/Treasurer. She has served on the Region III Executive Committee and has served as Chair of the Region III Bylaws Committee.

Each recipient of the Distinguished Service Award has made a great contribution to NCURA in countless ways over the years. This is a summary of their service as their contributions are too great to list.

---

**THE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARDEES WILL BE RECOGNIZED AT THE 51ST ANNUAL MEETING DURING THE RECOGNITION LUNCHEON ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2009.**
Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award

MARIANNE WOODS, Senior Associate Vice President for Research Administration, the University of Texas at San Antonio, is the sixteenth recipient of the NCURA award for Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration – NCURA's most prestigious award recognizing significant contributions to the profession of Research Administration, as evidenced in ways such as publications, presentations, teaching, mentoring, and service to one's home institution/organization or outside organizations.

This award coincides with Marianne's 30th anniversary in research administration and is a tribute to the many accomplishments spanning her career, from California State University, Fullerton in 1979, to California State University, Long Beach; the University of Texas at Dallas; the University of Texas at Arlington; the University of Alabama, and, in 2007, to the University of Texas at San Antonio.

Marianne is known throughout the research administration community for her vast knowledge, leadership, and her strong commitment to mentorship. Debbie Newton, University of Tulsa says "The first workshop I ever conducted was at the insistence of Dr. Woods. Since that time, I have continued to participate in teaching and training our new NCURA members. I am aware of many others who she 'cajoled' into taking that first step to becoming an active NCURA member. As a result, she has created new mentors who will follow in her footsteps, both through teaching/training and through following her example of volunteering to serve as officers, on committees, or to assist at the registration desk. It would be impossible to quantify those who she has touched and who have, in turn, reached out to others."

Marianne's contribution to research administration includes her service not only to NCURA, but also to other organizations such as COGR, UIDP, FDP, Technology Transfer Association, to name a few. Colleague Kim Moreland, University of Wisconsin-Madison, says "She’s done it all. The sheer range of work she’s performed for those groups reveals her commitment to the profession and to the breadth of her specialty areas. We can find few individuals who are as experienced with technology transfer, export controls, staff development, strategic planning and plain old, every day, wear-you-out research administration. All this has been accomplished with enormous energy, integrity, and joy."

Dr. Keith McDowell, Vice Chancellor for Research and Technology Transfer, The University of Texas System says "Dr. Woods is a national asset who has contributed significantly to the success of NCURA. I could easily write several more pages detailing the enormous contributions of Dr. Woods to all of us. I can think of no better person to win the NCURA Outstanding Achievement Award in Research Administration."

Dr. Robert Gracy, Vice President for Research, at the University of Texas at San Antonio, adds "Her service contributions to the profession are legend. Marianne's extensive experience in research administration coupled with both the Ph.D. and J.D. degrees give her unique qualifications. This coupled with her honest, engaging, delightful and energetic personality make her a huge asset to the profession and to any campus. Her great sense of humor is also a major asset when dealing with difficult problems."

A member since 1983, Marianne has served NCURA in many ways through the years. She currently serves as an LD1 Advisor and as a Departmental Research Administration Workshop faculty. Previous service includes Co-Editor of the NCURA Newsletter (now Magazine), member of the Professional Development Committee, Fundamentals faculty, and member of many Program Committees and Task Forces. In addition, Marianne is a well-known presenter at national and regional meetings and conferences. Marianne was a recipient of the first NCURA Distinguished Service Award in 2002 and, that same year, she also received the Region V Distinguished Service Award. Marianne currently serves as Region V Chair Elect and will become Chair mid-year 2010. Kim Moreland adds "She has worked tirelessly and enthusiastically for NCURA and the profession, and her contributions will be welcomed for many more years."

David Richardson, Pennsylvania State University, and NCURA Vice President/President Elect wrote "I've been blessed to have served alongside Marianne on several national committees, as co-editors of the NCURA Newsletter, and on numerous NCURA workshops and concurrent sessions. I'm always impressed by her positive demeanor, professionalism, and sensibility that she brings to the vocation. I believe her greatest contribution to the profession of research administration has been her unbridled support for mentoring and educating new and existing members alike. Many of us in the profession have called upon Marianne from time to time to solicit her advice or to seek solutions to a particular problem. She is always willing to counsel her fellow administrators and is benevolent with her time. Her spirit for teaching and nurturing manifests itself every time she is in front of her fellow research administrators."

Susan Wyatt Sedwick, University of Texas at Austin, wrote "I have been fortunate to have served as a co-presenter, panelist and faculty with Dr. Woods on multiple occasions and I am always amazed at the depth and breadth of her knowledge. She is the quintessential colleague who is always, and I mean without exception, eager to assist others and to share her knowledge and guidance. She has mentored many of the emerging leaders in NCURA and approaches every challenge with energy, careful thought and a sense of humor."

Reflecting upon Marianne’s employment at the University of Alabama, Cindy Hope says "I use the tools she gave me to build on the foundation she created, continuing the development of an efficient, effective and responsive office for research administration."

Cheryl-Lee Howard, Johns Hopkins University, and 2008 recipient of the Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration award adds "Marianne has mentored an amazing number of staff in her various roles and offices. She has not just taught beginners in numerous Fundamentals Workshops, but has instilled a sense of excitement for the skills as they were learned. She has cultivated opportunities for novices to mingle with seasoned veterans. She has shown by example, Role Model, Mentor, Educator, Leader, Author, Editor, Manager, Friend and Comedienne – now that's Outstanding!"

On her award, Marianne shares with us "Research Administration is my passion. I am humbled at being selected to receive this award. Many wonderful people, however, helped me to become the research administrator I am today. I thank them, including the numerous people in NCURA that I have had the privilege of working with, for their guidance and wisdom."

THE AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENT IN RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION WILL BE PRESENTED ON THURSDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 22, 2009 AT THE 51ST ANNUAL MEETING KEYNOTE ADDRESS.
DR. TANIA BEZZOBS is Manager, Research Development in the Research Office at The University of Melbourne, Australia. She has oversight of central university pre- and post-award administration of research grants and research contracts. She holds a PhD, MIP Law and MBA, and has extensive experience in the university and government sectors. She is a member of NCURA and sits on the International Neighborhood Committee.

BO BOGDANSKI is Assistant Director of Sponsored Programs at Colorado State University. He has been in his current position for three years. Prior to moving to Colorado, he worked in a similar position at the University of Utah for 13 years. He is active in NCURA as workshop facilitator, speaker in sessions and as a member of various committees. He is currently on the faculty for SPA II. Bo is a retired Air Force Lieutenant Colonel and federal contracting officer.

JENNIFER CROCKETT, BS, MBA, is currently the Budget Manager for the Vice Provost of Research at Northeastern University, and recently spent eighteen months as the International Programs Administrator in the Department of Nutrition at the Harvard School of Public Health in Boston, MA. With close to twenty years experience working in higher education, primarily in the New England area, and nearly ten years experience in sponsored research administration and management, her work has involved managing the financial, personnel, and operational aspects of sponsored projects including working closely with subrecipient partner institutions in developing countries to build capacity and sustainability. Jennifer has been a member of the National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA) since 1996.

CLIFTON GRIFFIN is the Director of Research and Graduate Studies Services at Texas A&M University at Qatar. Prior to this appointment, he served for almost ten years in research and graduate studies at Texas A&M University’s main campus. Most of this time (8 years) was spent serving as assistant dean and ombudsperson for graduate education. In his current position, Clifton is responsible for facilitating all aspects of pre-award, post-award and compliance, along with overseeing research staff hiring, research laboratory management and graduate studies administration. Clifton received a B.S. in Environmental Science and M.S in Biology from Delta State University and his Ph.D. in Wildlife Science from Texas A&M University.

JIM HOLSTE is the Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies at Texas A&M University at Qatar. He is responsible for developing research and graduate studies programs at the Qatar campus. He moved to Qatar when the branch campus was established in 2003 as the founding Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and assumed his current position in 2007. Before coming to Qatar, he served for nearly thirty years at the College Station campus as a chemical engineering faculty member, and in a variety of administrative posts in the Texas Engineering Experiment Station and Texas A&M University’s Office of Graduate Studies. Dwight Look College of Engineering, College of Science, and Department of Chemical Engineering. Jim received a B.S. in Physical Science Education from Concordia Teachers College (Nebraska), and a Ph.D. in Physics from Iowa State University.
MARIA KOZALKA is a consultant to the Northrop Grumman Corporation and is a core member of the International Research Collaborations project at the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIR), a subunit of the National Academies. As a Senior Program Officer for the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, a leading private supporter of basic biomedical research and science education, she managed a $700 million national science grants program at more than 240 colleges and universities throughout the United States. She has graduate degrees in both the biological sciences and business and has worked in philanthropy, private industry, and the Federal government advancing research for more than 20 years.

KRISTINE M. KULAGE, MA, has served as Director of the Office of Research Resources at Columbia University School of Nursing for the past 6 years. She has been working in research administration since 1996 and has been a member of NCURA since 2007. This year she is presenting her 2nd Case Study at the NCURA National Meeting, “Establishing an Office of Research Resources at the School or Departmental Level.”

BRENDA LUJAN, originally from El Paso, Texas, obtained her undergraduate degree in Humanities and Fine Arts from the University of Houston and a dual Master’s Degree in Human Resources and Business Management from Webster University. Ms. Lujan has worked closely with academic and political dignitaries from both the United States and Mexico and has over 10 years of translation experience. She currently works as the Grants & Contracts Assistant in the Physics & Astronomy Department at The University of Texas at San Antonio.

ROSEMARY MADNICK is currently the Director of Grants, Contracts and Compliance for Charles Drew University of Medicine and Science. She has been with the University since 2003. During her career, which includes three plus years at the University of California, San Diego where she worked in the Department of Radiology as a Grants Administrator and eventually was the Director of Operations for the Owen Clinic. She also worked for a number of years as a Research Administrator for Los Angeles County/Department of Health Services, HIV Epidemiology Program managing all aspects of their research including grants management. Rosemary is a graduate of the 2008 class of NCURA’s Leadership Development Institute. She is active in NCURA’s VI, in which, she is active member of the Regional Advisory Committee, Education and Professional Development Committee and Membership and Volunteer Committee. On the national level, she is a member of the Pre-Award Neighborhood Committee and the National Professional Development Committee.

CLARK MCCARTNEY is a native Californian, completed Fresno High School, then traveled across the U.S. to Cambridge and matriculated at Harvard University. He completed his required military service and returned to graduate study at the University of Southern California Law School. He has worked in government (U.S. House of Representatives), private industry, and higher education. He served as NCURA President in 1973 and 1974. Retired now, he lives in Palm Springs, CA and spends summers at his cottage in Sweden.

ALEXANDRA MCKEOWN is Associate Dean for Research Administration at the Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg School of Public Health and Chair of Region II. She has been a member of NCURA since 1990 and has served as workshop faculty, moderator and speaker at the regional and national levels. She is a member of the Contracts and Intellectual Property Committee of the Council on Governmental Relations and the Executive Committee of the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) and Co-Chairs both the FDP Contracts Task Force and Research Compliance Committee. Prior to joining the School of Public Health, she was the Assistant Vice President for Research Administration and Advancement at the University of Maryland. She holds a B.A. from Towson University, an M.B.A. from Johns Hopkins University and a J.D. from the University of Baltimore, and is a member of the Maryland State Bar.

REBECCA PUIG is Assistant Director of the Division of Sponsored Research at the University of South Florida (USF) in Tampa, where she is responsible for electronic research administration, proposal development, and editing of the Office of Research & Innovations’ newsletter and magazine. Rebecca is currently pursuing a master’s degree in Entrepreneurship in Applied Technologies at the University of South Florida, where she received her B.S. in Business Management. She has been a member of NCURA since 2001 and has served as both a committee member and now chair of the ERA Neighborhood. She is an active member in Region III, where she served as editor for the Region’s newsletter, webmaster, and a member of the Membership & Awards committee. Rebecca will be serving as contributing editor and author for NCURA Magazine’s eRA Corner.

ALAN SOLOMON was granted the Ph.D. Degree in Mathematics from New York University (NYU) in 1963. He then taught at NYU until 1967 and later Tel Aviv University. Moving to Ben Gurion University in 1970 he served as head of the Mathematics Department from 1974-76. From 1978-87 he served as head of the Mathematics Research Section of Oak Ridge National Laboratory. From 1987-96 he served as General Manager of a high-tech startup before moving to the (now) Shamoon College of Engineering (SCE) in Israel. His research interests include heat transfer modeling, and research environment development for emerging HEI’s.

JOSINE STALLINGA is a product manager with Elsevier’s Academic and Government group. Her responsibilities include the development of the new Scival Funding solution which helps optimize the grant seeking process. Ms. Stallinga holds a M.A. in business economics with a minor in American Studies from the University of Amsterdam. As a Dutch native, she is temporarily based in New York to support the U.S. launch of Scival Funding.

ILANA YAMIN-COHEN was granted the B.A. Degree in Personnel Management from Ben Gurion University. She has many years of experience in supervision and management in private industry, and since 2006 is responsible for administrative and faculty interaction activities of the Research Contract Department of the Shamoon College of Engineering (SCE). Her research interests are focused on motivation of underperforming researchers and research environment development for emerging HEI’s.

KIRSTEN YEHL is the Administrator for both The Institute for Healthcare Studies and General Internal Medicine Academic Programs at Northwestern University, Feinberg School of Medicine, in Chicago. She holds a B.A. in Communication Studies and a masters in Library and Information Sciences. She is committed to the continued progression of research administration as a respected and aspiring career path for higher education professionals. When she’s not working, you can find Kirsten gardening, cooking, and adventuring with her husband and two children.
The key to maximizing your award chances

SciVal Funding is the most comprehensive online funding intelligence source available. It supports you through every stage of the pre-award process by identifying the most worthwhile funding opportunities based on pre-populated profiles. It also gives you access to award history information and the hard facts you need to help shape and strengthen your proposals.

See how SciVal Funding can help you find focus, create impact and open up new opportunities at The NCURA 51st Annual Meeting, Booth #103.

Alternatively, be one of the first to pre-register for a FREE 30-day trial at www.unlockthepromise.com/funding

It makes sense, whichever way you look at it.
NCURA Calendar of Events

ONLINE TUTORIALS
NEW AND IMPROVED!
A Primer on Subawards,
7 week program ..........................Next session: October 5 – November 20, 2009

FUNDAMENTALS OF SPONSORED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION
Washington, DC ..............................................September 28-30, 2009
Houston, TX .........................................................December 2-4, 2009

SPONSORED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION II WORKSHOPS
Philadelphia, PA ..............................................September 28-30, 2009
Houston, TX .........................................................December 2-4, 2009

NEW! DEPARTMENTAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOPS
Houston, TX .........................................................December 2-4, 2009

FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOPS
Boston, MA .........................................................December 2-4, 2009

2010 NCURA TV SATELLITE BROADCAST SERIES
Managing Financial Requirement of Awards ............................January 26, 2010
Critical Issues for the Department Administrator ........................March 23, 2010
Non-Financial Research Compliance .........................................June 15, 2010
Negotiating Federal Contracts and Pass-Through Awards ...........September 21, 2010

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

NEXT ISSUE: DECEMBER 2009
DEADLINES:
Submission of Articles: November 16, 2009
Space Reservation for Ads: November 16, 2009
Submission of Ads: November 23, 2009
Re-considering your choice of research systems?

Look, the grass *is* greener...

better, smarter, faster, and less expensive too!

Judge for yourself—

Pre-Conference Sneak Previews

**Wednesday, October 14**

sign up online at www.ideate.com

or

visit us at the NCURA Annual Meeting

Booths 306/308

IDEATE™

Smart Systems for Brilliant People™