On the Cover  On behalf of the editorial staff at the NCURA Magazine, I’d like to wish everyone in our community a Happy New Year.

On the cover this month is our featured article on the Art of Facilitation by Jeffrey Cufaude. In reading through his article, I was struck by his statement in the opening line that “facilitation is about helping individuals and groups do the right thing right.” It is hard to come up with a better description for our role as research administrators. By expanding and creating knowledge, our faculty are doing “the right thing” to meet the growing challenges of a global society. In many ways, it is our role to assure that they do the “right thing right” whether through assisting them in their responsibilities of research compliance or in guiding them in appropriate fiscal oversight of the funds that we are entrusted to by our sponsors. We hope you enjoy Jeff’s insights as well as those of our other outstanding authors.

We’d also like to extend a special welcome to our new contributing editors this year. Carolyn Elliott-Farino from Kennesaw State University is the new contributing editor for Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions, Craig Reynolds from the University of Michigan will serve as contributing editor for Departmental Research Administration and Randi Wasik from the University of Washington will coordinate the Leadership Tips articles from the 2010 LDI class. This year, the NCURA Magazine is also adding a new section to serve the Pre-Award community and we are delighted that Robyn Remotigue from Mississippi State University will be serving as its contributing editor.

Our thanks to all of our authors and contributing editors for making the NCURA Magazine a success.

Jerry Pogatshnik  NCURA Magazine Co-Editor
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Transforming the Research Administration Process

MAXIMUS and InfoEd International, Inc. are pleased to announce new integration between systems, delivering an optimum software solution for Research Administration compliance and reporting.

This initiative will bring together the robust capabilities of InfoEd’s Enterprise Research Administration Software with MAXIMUS Effort Reporting System, a solution to help central and academic departments comply with increasingly complex federal regulations surrounding effort reporting and managing effort commitments. The combination will enhance ease of use for researchers, staff and administrative users of the MAXIMUS and InfoEd product suites.

Streamline Effort Tracking and Reporting Process

Track and Report Effort from Pre-Award to Close Out

Ease of Use for Researchers, Staff, and Administrators

Ensure Data Integrity

Facilitate Compliance with Federal Regulations

For more information about InfoEd International, Inc.’s research administration software, please visit [www.infoed.org](http://www.infoed.org).

For more information about the MAXIMUS Effort Reporting solutions, please visit [http://www.maximus.com/services/consulting/higher-education/effort-reporting-system-services](http://www.maximus.com/services/consulting/higher-education/effort-reporting-system-services).
Richards and Associates… we make your research enterprise train stay on track and run with timely precision.

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 functionalization
- Effort reporting
- Pre-award proposal and award tracking control
- Streamlining, quality assurance, policy and procedure development
- Reach us for more...

**John Richards, Principal**

[Website: www.richardsandassociates.com]

reach.us@richardsandassociates.com

909-214-1523
A Message from Your President, Judy Fredenberg

University of Montana

Anticipating my NCURA presidency has been a bit like Alice in Wonderland. Before you begin to guess which of our NCURA colleagues I’ve mentally morphed into characters like the Mad Hatter, Cheshire Cat, or Queen of Hearts, let me clarify: I refer only to Alice’s looking glass in this analogy. But instead of a mirror, my transition is better represented by binoculars.

At this time last year, I was beginning a year as vice president and very focused on planning the annual meeting. As a result, this presidential year seemed a long way off, similar to the view when looking through binoculars backwards. Those twelve months zoomed by, the 52nd Annual Meeting is but a memory, and I’ve pivoted the binoculars. Viewed correctly through the eyepiece, images ahead are clearly in focus, sharp, and magnified!

It’s an exciting time to be an NCURA member. With over 7,000 members, NCURA continues to grow; and with that growth comes the challenge of maintaining NCURA’s sense of collegiality and community, fundamental components of NCURA’s culture. In today’s global world, our community now extends across “the pond” and beyond, and strong regions and topical neighborhoods help connect members. NCURA must nurture those existing connections and continue to develop others by welcoming new members, simplifying their affiliation and share, without hesitation, that enthusiasm that strives to be progressive and nimble. NCURA is thriving. Opportunities abound for members to be involved, and that involvement becomes the catalyst for change. With its active and growing global membership, I’m confident that NCURA will not be like Alice’s White Rabbit and “late for a very important date.” Rather, it is through thoughtful and strategic change that NCURA continues to be technologically current and a leader in professional development for university research administrators. I thank you for your continued engagement and, with binoculars in hand, look forward to the year ahead serving NCURA as president.

Collegiality and professional development go hand-in-glove, as stated in our core purpose and mission: “NCURA serves its members and advances the field of research administration through education and professional development programs, the sharing of knowledge and experience, and by fostering a professional, collegial, and respected community.”

Professional development is NCURA’s cornerstone, and we are fortunate to belong to an association that strives to be progressive and nimble. NCURA leaders at all levels are enthused about the profession and share, without hesitation, that enthusiasm and their knowledge. Moreover, these individuals – peppered across the nation – are dedicated to strategically positioning NCURA for success in the decades to come. This positioning is demonstrated through the emphasis we place on maintaining quality professional development opportunities and implementing contemporary delivery mechanisms. Rather than our mantra’s being, “But we’ve always done it this way,” we are willing to try new things to keep current and meaningful. Producing NCURA DVDs, making available webcasts of popular annual meeting sessions, and even the larger-than-life Schedule At a Glance posted at the annual meeting are but a few examples of creative ideas implemented to meet members’ needs in new and unique ways.

Yet we often focus beyond our own needs, as demonstrated by NCURA’s tradition of helping those less fortunate. Following the 52nd Annual Meeting where the Research Administrators Can Take the Heat Cookbook was unveiled and sold, NCURA contributed over $5,200 to Feeding America, the nation’s leading domestic hunger-relief charity.

We live in a consumer society of immediate gratification, with limitless options and opportunities. Consumers are sophisticated, and many demand services and variety of delivery mechanisms. The research community has similarly evolved. Most of our campus policies state that faculty and researchers must route grants and contracts through their offices of sponsored programs (OSPs); as a result, these OSPs are the proverbial “sole source.” Yet even with a corner on the sponsored programs market, we recognize the importance and value of quality customer support and service. Our researchers are knowledgeable and sophisticated, and our support and service must be timely and thorough. While we routinely justify decisions and document appropriately, we now find ourselves part of a national movement toward accountability. Our offices operate in an environment that is more transparent than ever before and, while some offices may be slower to evolve than others, the research enterprise benefits because of our capability to keep abreast of change. Whether we are from large OSPs with significant operating budgets or a one-person shop doing more with less, our affiliation with NCURA contributes to our ability to be good institutional stewards of sponsored programs.

Such evolution is difficult if done without input, support, and encouragement. Academic institutions are notoriously slow to change. For an OSP languishing in tradition, the path to progressive evolution is steep and rocky unless leveled and paved by those who have gone before. NCURA provides that community, that solidarity, and facilitates access to our unique knowledge base. In today’s economy, it is crucial that we be on the lookout for better communication and delivery vehicles. Once identified, NCURA must be prepared to evaluate, cultivate, and implement such efficiencies. To quote John Henry Newman, “To live is to change, and to be perfect is to have changed often.”

References

Continuing, Consolidated, and Lame Duck Portends

By Carol Blum

The New Year begins much like last year for the Federal government – in fact, exactly like last year from a budget perspective. Most Federal denizens agreed the lame-duck Congress would continue the operation of the Federal government under a continuing resolution. And so it came to pass. The House passed a FY 2011 year-long continuing resolution on December 8, 2010 (HR 3082); and, after flirting with a Consolidated Appropriations Act, the Senate countered with a shorter-term resolution continuing Federal operations at FY 2010 levels until March 4, 2011 (SA 4885). The current Congress has deferred final funding decisions to the new Congress in the New Year.

A continuing resolution does just as its title suggests – continues the operation of the Federal government for FY 2011 at FY 2010 funding levels. And, yes, your inherent cynicism and maybe confusion is not misplaced. We are talking about funding levels for the current fiscal year that began on October 1, 2010. The year will be almost half over by March 4, 2011. The “worst-case” scenario will be FY 2010 funding levels for the entire FY 2011 – the original House resolution. It will be interesting to watch the new Congress grapple with funding levels when it convenes in January. The proposed and then abandoned Senate Consolidated Appropriations Act or Omnibus Appropriations would have increased FY 2011 overall discretionary spending by almost 2%—still less than the Administration’s proposed FY 2011 budget. It raised funding levels for the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, and the National Endowment for the Humanities, while leaving science programs at NASA and energy research programs at the Department of Energy with level funding. (Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act)

The Senate-proposed Omnibus Appropriations Act offers a prediction for future regulations if not funding levels. In Title V of the now-defunct Senate proposal addressing funding for the Departments of Labor, Health & Human Services, and Education, the agencies were directed to provide public access to research results in a model consistent with the National Institutes of Health. Section 524 established that “the policy regarding public access to research results established for the National Institutes of Health by section 217 of division F of Public Law 111–8 shall apply to all Departments funded in this Act having more than $100,000,000 in annual expenditures for extramural research.” The affected departments were given the flexibility to “designate other suitable online depositories to be used in lieu of the National Library of Medicine’s PubMed Central.” (Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act).

The language in the proposed Omnibus Act echoes the proposed Federal Research Public Access Act most recently introduced in May, 2010, in the House by Representative Todd Tiahrt (KS). The legislation originated with Senator Joseph Lieberman in June, 2009. Unsuccessful in efforts to pass stand-alone legislation, the continuing interest of Congress is apparent with its inclusion in the Omnibus Act and it may become a part of any new resolution passed next year.

In the waning days of the current session, the Senate passed the America COMPETES Act reauthorization. The Senate approved a three-year reauthorization of the America COMPETES Act (H.R. 5116) on December 17, 2010. The Senate version includes provisions directing the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) to create an interagency public access committee. The committee would “coordinate Federal science agency research and policies related to the dissemination and long-term stewardship of the results of federally supported research, including digital data and peer-reviewed scholarly publications” (HR 5116, §123). Public access to research results will be a part of the future. (Federal Buildings Personnel Training Act of 2010).

Finally, a three-judge panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia heard a final set of oral arguments in December, 2010, on the appeal of the U.S. Department of Justice of U.S. District Court Judge Royce Lambeth’s decision to halt NIH funding of human embryonic stem cell (hESC) research while the underlying case about federal funding of hESC research is considered. While the Appeals Court is under no particular timeline to rule on the question of the preliminary injunction, a ruling likely will be issued between mid-December and mid-January. You’ll remember that the Justice Department appealed the judge’s decision to the Court of Appeals, which issued a stay of Judge Lambeth’s preliminary injunction, allowing the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to continue funding hESC research. Judge Lambeth is expected to allow the Court of Appeals to make a final ruling on the preliminary injunction before he rules on the case.

In light of the court rulings, Senator Arlen Specter (D-PA) introduced in September, 2010, the Senate version (S 3766) of Representative Diane DeGette’s (D-CO) Stem Cell Research Advancement Act of 2010. As proposed, the Act amends the Public Health Service Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) to conduct and support research that utilizes human stem cells, including human embryonic stem cells. The Act seeks to effectively eliminate the
ambiguous introduced by the Dickey-Wicker Amendment to the HHS appropriations that prohibits the destruction of human embryos with Federal funds. The proposed Act limits such research to stem cells that meet the following requirements: (1) the stem cells were derived from human embryos donated from in vitro fertilization clinics, were created for the purposes of reproductive treatment, and were in excess of the needs of the individuals seeking such treatment; (2) it was determined through consultation with the individuals seeking reproductive treatment that the embryos would never be implanted in a woman and would otherwise be discarded; and (3) the individuals seeking reproductive treatment donated the embryos with written informed consent and received no financial or other inducements. The court rulings will have an effect on the reintroduction of this legislation. (Stem Cell Research Advancement Act of 2010)

We will see a final rule from the Public Health Service addressing Objectivity in Research, a.k.a. NIH’s Financial Conflicts of Interest policy. The agency’s goal is to have the process complete and the final rule issued by the time 2012 appropriation hearings begin in March, 2011. And the gossip you heard is true – the National Science Foundation Office of Inspector General (OIG) sent a survey to a small cohort (nine) of NSF grantees asking questions concerning their compliance with NSF’s financial conflicts of interest policy. The IG reports semiannually on issues; the next report will be available in March. We may see the IG’s assessment of grantee compliance described in that report.

So next year – from a Federal perspective – will be different but the same. As Will Rogers noted, “chaotic action is preferable to orderly inaction.” (Rodgers).
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Preventing Fraud in Spons

How You Can Help

By Raina Rose Tagle, Monica Modi Dalwadi, and Ashley Deihr
Imagine that you are working through a typical day, which may include answering questions from researchers on pre-award and post-award issues, reviewing costs charged to grants, and preparing sponsor reports. But in the midst of this particular day, you’re suddenly asked to join General Counsel, your supervisor, Internal Audit, and a Dean for a confidential meeting. You learn that there has been an allegation of financial research misconduct in an area where you provide support. This allegation could dramatically affect you and your workload. You may be called upon to help gather and interpret data, attend ongoing investigation and status meetings, and even implement and monitor a corrective action plan if issues are discovered. And you’re expected to do all of this on top of your normal job activities!

But wait. What if you could wind back the clock and put a stop to these issues before they occurred? Below we detail some typical areas of fraud, key warning signs of potential fraudulent activity, and what you, as a research administrator, can look for to help mitigate the risk of fraud at your institution.

Of course, it isn’t always possible to catch a fraudster before or at the beginning of a fraud scheme. For that reason, please tune in to the next NCURA Magazine issue for the second part of this two part series on fraud, entitled: How You Can Help: Responding to Allegations of Fraud, where we will describe the phases of a typical fraud investigation and how you can best help at each stage.

Where Fraud Can Occur in Your Institution and How You Can Help to Recognize It

One of the most important things that you can do as a research administrator is simply to be aware of some common signs of fraud. Rarely is there a masked villain or a valiant, shield-donning superhero: the perpetrators and/or the tipsters can be tough to notice. Don’t be surprised if either party is wearing a lab coat and safety goggles. And what constitutes misconduct might also not be what you’re expecting. Committing fraud doesn’t necessarily mean that perpetrators are pilfering dollars directly out of the university’s bank account. Fraudsters at your institution could be violating any one of a myriad of sponsored research regulations, such as Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-21 or Institutional Review Board requirements.

In your position, you can note potential fraud in a number of different ways. A research assistant may raise concerns with you, you may note suspicious charges coming through your office, or you may note behavioral or lifestyle changes that can be indicative of fraud. While all allegations should be considered, there are tell-tale warning signals, both behavioral and documentation-based, that can alert you to fraud at your institution. The following illustrates a continuum of potential fraud warning signs, shown from left to right as least concrete to most concrete.

As you go about your day-to-day activities, be alert for some of these signs in those around you.

What Fraud Is and How It Can Impact Your Institution

The term “fraud” can refer to any false representation of a matter of fact. In the research world, this can take many forms, both financial and nonfinancial. Common types of fraud in research administration and examples of each include:

Types of Fraud  Examples
Inappropriate conflicts of interest........Hiring a brother as a subcontractor against policy
and/or without proper disclosure
Theft ..........................................................Permanently “borrowing” an expensive laptop from
a laboratory
Embezzlement..........................................Using research money to fund personal purchases
Improper use of Federal funds..............Using money from one project to fund another project
that has gone over budget
Inaccurate effort reporting...............Claiming a researcher spent 50% of her effort on a
well-funded project, when in reality she spent much of
that time working on “pet projects”
Falsification of research ......................Recording incorrect data to make the research fit
the thesis

Fraud in the research arena can result in decreased federal funding, lengthy litigation, and ruined reputations and credibility. Learning how you, as a research administrator, can help to recognize and act upon potential fraud schemes can mitigate these risks to your institution and allow you to focus on mission-critical activities.
Some examples of each warning sign are as follows:

Unusual Behavior
✓ Refusing to take vacation
✓ Irritability or defensiveness
✓ Complaining about the institution (e.g., inadequate pay, organizational pressure to obtain funding) to a greater extent than typical
✓ Control issues or an unwillingness to share duties or information

Uncommon Relationships
✓ Close or personal association with a vendor or subcontractor
✓ Unusually close or personal relationship with an employee
✓ Close relationship with a private funding group
✓ Undisclosed conflicts of interest

Motivating Factors for Fraud
✓ High personal debt
✓ Divorce or family problems

Lifestyle Changes
✓ Change in schedule (e.g., arriving early and leaving late when the individual previously worked a steady eight-hour day)
✓ Sudden alteration of or maintaining a standard of living that does not match the individual’s position (e.g., simultaneous purchases of expensive items)

Employee complaints
✓ Bullying behavior by a principal investigator
✓ Claims of unfair pay or uncompensated overtime
✓ Accusations of favoritism

Irregular or Inaccurate Documentation
The most concrete set of signs involves the documentation that you likely review in the course of your work. The following are specific areas where fraud frequently occurs, and some signals that may warn you to dig deeper:

Subcontracts, Independent Contractors, and Consultants
• Executed agreements without workplans, budgets, or budget justifications
• Large payment amounts to individuals, with or without a contract
• Questionable methods of payment (e.g., wiring payments, unusual billing addresses)

• Familial ties or other potential conflicts of interest (e.g., a researcher who subcontracts work to a biotech company he happens to invest in or own)

Procurement Cards, Procurement, and Purchasing
• Purchases of a personal nature
• Changes in spending patterns
• Lack of segregation of duties (e.g., a procurement cardholder is also the reviewer and approver of expenses)
• Lack of documentation or business support for purchases (e.g., missing receipts, copied or scanned documents, handwritten receipts)

Research Subject Payments
(e.g., Petty Cash, Gift Cards)
• Poor documentation of research subject payments (e.g., questionable or missing receipts from subjects, payments made to individuals not otherwise documented as part of the research)
• Subjects paid in cash when standard institutional practice is to pay with gift cards or visa versa
• Large amount of cash on hand with weak physical safeguards
• Petty cash box that does not match log of receipts, or that requires replenishment more frequently than normal

Travel Advances, Travel, and Expense Reimbursements
• Unauthorized travel or deviations in authorized travel plans
• Travel expenses in excess of authorized amounts
• Expenses or activities that violate university policy
• Missing, copied, or handwritten receipts
• Lack of segregation of duties (e.g., the individual traveling is also approving his/her travel and expense reimbursements)

Stipends, Salaries, and “Ghost” Employees (e.g., student, Part Time, and Temporary Workers)
• Wages paid not supported by time sheets
• Hours clocked in excess of agreed or approved work schedules
• Number of workers in excess of budget justification or scope
• Student employees working greater than expected number of hours

• Signs of inaccurate effort reporting (e.g., salary charged not commensurate with research completed per technical reports, 100% of salary charged to sponsored projects when the individual also performs teaching or administrative duties)

You may notice that certain key controls can impact several common areas of fraud. For example, requiring expenses to be well-documented will decrease the opportunity for fraud in your organization. This means that expenses should include original receipts and a clear explanation of the business purpose for the expense. Second, segregation of duties is important in many of these areas. There should be separate personnel completing tasks and performing reviews as described above. Third, conflicts of interest should be evaluated. Researchers who hire, contract to, or receive money from related parties have an inherently greater opportunity to commit fraud by inappropriately dealing with those parties. Of course, not all of these areas will apply to your job position and duties. However, being aware of the warning signs can help you to identify issues in your own job, as well as to see “the big picture” of risk areas at your institution.

No matter what warning sign or signal you see, the most important thing is to speak up when you see something. Know who within your organization you can go to with concerns (e.g., your supervisor, the Compliance Officer, or the Internal Audit department). Or, if you don’t know what else to do, consider calling your institution’s anonymous hotline with the information that you want to share. Escalating issues early can help to prevent a lengthy, costly investigation later. It can also stem abusive or wasteful practices early on and contribute to an ethical culture.

Conclusion
As a research administrator, you are the first line of defense when it comes to identifying and preventing fraud in the sponsored research arena. Understanding the warning signs and key actions that you can take is extremely important to protect your institution and decrease the risk of fraud.
Geoengineering is the intentional modification of the Earth’s climate. Or, in a more expanded definition, it is large-scale manipulation of the Earth’s environment in order to reduce the harmful effects of global warming. There is a lack of consensus on an exact definition, but suffice it to say that it is a complex and controversial subject that has long sounded much like the plot for a sci-fi techno-thriller à la Michael Crichton. But the potentially devastating consequences of climate change are prompting people to consider geoengineering solutions as not so “far-out” or radical anymore, suggesting a need to get ahead of the issues so that we–collectively, as global citizens–understand and can be in a position to address the potential risks and capabilities.

With this in mind, the National Academies’ Government–University–Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR) chose geoengineering as the topic for its Fall members meeting, held October 12-13, 2010, in Washington, DC. The meeting opened with comments made on behalf of the Chairman of the House Science and Technology Committee, emphasizing the complexity of the issue (the Chairman prefers the term “climate engineering”) and the time needed to research the technologies and develop appropriate governance structures. The Committee has held several congressional hearings on the subject and has asked the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) to assess the state of the science and federal involvement in geoengineering activities. It has also started discussing the issue with the UK Parliament.

Guest speakers explained the two distinct geoengineering approaches: (1) carbon dioxide removal (CDR) and (2) solar radiation management (SRM). There are different challenges with each. In simple terms, CDR is slow and expensive but with little risk, whereas SRM is fast and cheap but with high risk. In either case, when intervening in complex large-scale systems, the question of “unintended consequences” looms large.

In addition to the many unknowns, consideration of the various geoengineering options necessarily leads to discussion about the political, moral, social, legal, and ethical issues. As one presenter noted, “the technical and scientific challenges are profound, but the ethical and political challenges are even greater.” That same presenter proposed a checklist of needs for climate engineering management that includes: transparency; international observation, management, and control; clear mechanisms for resolving disputes; and a ban on non-state projects.

The group further considered “the tension around urgency and caution” with respect to geoengineering research, as well as the need for careful governance. While it was emphasized that geoengineering is not an alternative to climate mitigation strategies, it was also made clear that U.S. climate policy needs to include a strategic program to research the full dimensions of geoengineering as an insurance policy to protect the world’s population from the worst effects of global warming. Sound scientific research – in concert with healthy public debate and clear action on emission reductions – can reduce the risks and improve our understanding of geoengineering’s potential capabilities.

For a more expansive recap of the October 2010 GUIRR meeting, please visit www.nas.edu/guirr (see “Past Meetings”). All online presentations are posted with the speakers’ permission.

**GUIRR Update: October 2010 Meeting**

**Geoengineering: Contemplating the Issues and the Need for Research**

By Susan Sauer Sloan

Susan Sauer Sloan joined The National Academies on May 27, 2008 as Director of the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR). Sloan got her start in Washington, DC, working as a staff assistant to Representative Timothy E. Wirth (D-CO), U.S. House of Representatives. She holds a bachelor’s degree in biology from the University of Oregon in Eugene.
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The Art of Facilitation: Maximizing Others’ Contributions

By Jeffrey Cufaude

If leadership is about doing the right thing and management is about doing things right, then facilitation is about helping individuals and groups do the right thing right.

Indications are everywhere that we need individuals at all levels of an organization to possess facilitation skills: more work is being completed in cross-functional teams and internal or external partnerships; more decisions are being made collaboratively in consultation with others; and a yearning for greater community in organizations comes at a time when the diversity of perspectives, talents, and cultures present in the workplace is increasing.

Though facilitation might most be associated with a workshop or strategic planning process when an external consultant is hired to facilitate the program or process, it actually is a fundamental skill any individual can master.

The Essence of Facilitation

Facilitation encompasses a wide range of skills and techniques that allow individuals to more effectively accomplish common organizational tasks: leading department or team meetings, managing conflict among colleagues, presenting training workshops and professional development programs, or coaching individuals. The essence of facilitation can be summarized in five major themes.

Facilitation makes connections and helps make meaning. In a fast-paced environment overloaded with information, the need for connections is great: connections between individual people, connections...
between ideas and concepts, connections between projects and mission or vision, etc. When facilitating, individuals are listening for and seeking to make (or help others make) the connections between what is occurring in a conversation and what has occurred in other places or at other times. Effective facilitation involves periodically asking the question, “So how does this discussion connect with others we have been having?”

Facilitators always seek to connect comments made by various individuals in a workshop or meeting; i.e., “How does Bill’s observation relate to what we discussed earlier this morning?” Because facilitation involves deeper and more active listening, a facilitator likely has a greater overall sense of the connections present among disparate threads of conversation. The facilitator must pose questions and use techniques that help group members make these connections, as well as identify the meaning behind what is occurring; “What stands out most for you about the conversations today? What are the relevant implications we need to consider as we move forward?”

Facilitation is providing leadership without taking the reins. Some see facilitators’ as “flipchart patsies,” individuals who stand at the front of the room and merely note on the flipchart what others say. The fact that group members often do not see facilitators taking control of the group is by design, not by accident. Individuals using a facilitative approach provide leadership to the group without actually assuming a more formal leadership role.

When group members (be it in a workshop or a team meeting) do not themselves share ownership of the group and its outcomes, any commitments made are likely to lack sustainability. Too often, individuals abdicate their leadership responsibility to the facilitator. “Oh since Jeffrey is facilitating I don’t need to be concerned with group process, making connections, etc.” In order for groups to realize their full potential, every individual must be concerned with the good of the whole, even if a designated facilitator is assigned that primary responsibility. Because of this, facilitators more often are seen asking rather than telling groups exactly what they need to be doing … helping them move forward rather than directing their movement.

Facilitation balances managing content and process. Individuals using a facilitative approach are concerned both with what the group is discussing or deciding, as well as how they are actually doing it. A decision made without consideration of its impact, the diversity of perspectives possible on the decision, the other alternatives available is a decision that may not be the right one.

Effective facilitation often involves working with group members to establish some shared agreements for how they will have their conversations with each other … the group process aspect of their work. The facilitator then uses these agreements as guidelines for discussions and as evaluation criteria for how well the group actually accomplished its charge: “We’ve made some significant decisions today. When you reflect on the conversations that led to them, how well did we do on the agreements we established earlier?”

Some individuals too quickly dismiss group process as “soft stuff” that keeps groups from the real work of making decisions. In command and control hierarchical organizations, less attention to group process might be acceptable. But in the more collegial environment of most associations, individuals want their perspectives considered and their contributions and ideas solicited and appreciated. As a result, individuals leading groups and teams must share the facilitator’s commitment to appropriately balancing attention to content and process. As the old adage suggests, people are more likely to support what they help create.

Facilitation helps surface unacknowledged or invisible beliefs, thoughts, or patterns. One of the real values of external facilitators is that they help a group identify and discuss the important issues that group members themselves might be unaware of or unwilling to address. While this role can be more difficult for an internal colleague serving as facilitator to play, it is still a necessary one.

Call it what you want—the dead cow on the table, the elephant in the middle of the room, or the skunk smelling up the place—most groups have some issues they need to discuss in order to move forward on key decisions and efforts. Effective facilitation uses gentle (or in some cases forceful) questioning to help bring those issues to the surface: “What are the real issues we have yet to discuss today?”

A common strategy I use is to ask session participants to note anonymously on an index card what they believe most needs to be addressed, but is unlikely to be brought up by anyone during the day’s conversations. I collect and shuffle those cards and then read them all aloud. Doing so gets the issues into the room so participants can now face them without some of the political pressures associated with having actually been the one to bring them up.

Facilitation focuses on building the capacity of individuals and groups to accomplish more on their own, now and in the future. Facilitation is not just about the immediate task, it also is about helping a group or team learn together so that they might be more productive in the future. Similarly, a manager coaching an individual employee is
not focused just on an employee’s immediate need, but with laying a foundation for future strong performance.

This long-term definition of success also helps keep facilitators from assuming too much leadership of a group. Doing so could leave group members unable to manage their future conversations or efforts without the facilitator being involved. To prevent such dependence from developing, effective facilitation requires having individuals and groups debrief their meetings, workshops, and planning sessions to reflect on how they did what they did and what lessons can be learned for their future efforts.

“We’ve had a great day of strategic planning. Let’s take 15 minutes and talk about what we’ve learned about your ability to engage in strategic conversations with each other. What are some lessons worth remembering for your future work together?” Simple questions like these help focus a group’s attention on an area they might otherwise ignore. This reflects the facilitator’s capacity-building commitment.

Making the Commitment to Facilitate

All of us can add the role and lens of a facilitator to our relationships with others. Making a commitment to do so, however, needs to be done thoughtfully. But in choosing to do so, you must do so with authenticity, one of the hallmarks of the full-time facilitator. As the Sufi philosopher Rumi says, “If you are unfaithfully with us, you are causing terrible harm.” Appropriating a few techniques learned in a workshop or from a book without authentically incorporating them into your overall leadership identify will cause them to be seen and experienced as insincere or manipulative.

Any time we choose to alter the “normal” style most individuals would associate with our work, we need to be sensitive to how that change might be perceived and received. If you are viewed by your colleagues as a real “take charge” type of person, shifting to a strong facilitation stance will be seen as a dramatic change, one that could lead them to question your intentions.

Rather than changing overnight, you will be better served by gradually introducing a greater commitment to the essence of facilitation in your regular interactions with others. When you find yourself about to tell someone or a group what to do, pull back a bit and ask a thoughtful question that might help them discover for themselves what most needs to be done. When you feel a conversation is becoming too narrow invite the group to consider alternative perspectives. When you need to coach an employee on a job-specific issue, make sure to probe if other relevant issues are what actually need to be discussed.

Rigid lines between leadership and management are often drawn in the professional literature, almost suggesting that one is right and one is wrong. In reality, organizations need individuals who both do the right thing and are capable of doing things right. Organizations also need individuals who can help individuals and groups do the right things right... the very nature of facilitation. Each of us has the ability to commit to adopting the perspective and making the contributions to a conversation that we might associate with a designated facilitator standing outside the group. If more people choose to add facilitation to their skill set, we are more likely to experience sustainable commitments and successes on behalf of our organizations.

Unsure if you can effectively adopt a facilitative stance as part of your overall leadership repertoire? Perhaps the following advice from Rainer Maria Rilke in Letters to a Young Poet can offer you some guidance: “... your doubt can become a good quality if you train it. It must become knowing ... and the day will come when, instead of being a destroyer, it will become one of your best workers—perhaps the most intelligent of all the ones that are building your life.”

Facilitator Fundamentals

Individuals wanting to become more effective facilitators in their own organizations would look to develop their abilities to do the following:

• Use active listening skills including paraphrasing, summarizing, reflecting, and questioning
• Encourage and generate participative discussion in groups
• Help stimulate creative thinking through use of brainstorming and other idea-generation processes
• Stimulate strategic consideration of alternatives and informed decision-making of appropriate choices
• Manage contrasting perspectives and opinions that might result in conflict among members of a group
• Intervene with individuals and groups without taking total control of the situation
• Design meeting processes to accomplish a wide range of goals and objectives
• Draw out others’ ‘opinions’ in an objective and nonjudgmental manner
• Support teams in various stages of group development
• Help individuals and groups reflect on their experiences and capture relevant learning
• Lead or design inclusive group processes that honor individuals’ different learning and participant styles
• Help shape more powerful and strategic questions for exploration

Jeffrey Cufaude writes, speaks, and consults on various strategic and organizational development issues relevant to associations and the businesses that serve them. He can be reached at jeffrey@ideaarchitects.org. Copyright permission by the author.
NCURA/EARMA International Research Fellowship

By Beth Seaton

In early 2010, NCURA issued a call for NCURA members who wished to be considered as a fellow for the EARMA/NCURA International Research Management Fellowship Beta. EARMA, which stands for the European Association of Research Managers and Administrators, is the professional association for research administrators in the European Union. The purpose of the Fellowship program is to enhance training opportunities for research managers and to enable US and EU research collaboration through exchanges of approximately two weeks for NCURA and EARMA members. The program is intended to bridge the “knowledge gap” between the US and EU funding systems. The Beta stage of the program had no outside funding to support the fellows so selected participants had to obtain financial support from their own institutions or cover the cost themselves.

I am fortunate to report to an Associate Provost who values international experiences, and he agreed that if I were selected, my institution would support my travel expenses. When I learned in April 2010 that I would be going to Portugal, I was ecstatic!

NCURA assisted in selecting an institution that was not only willing to receive and host a fellow, but that also would be a good placement for me. It could not have been a better match. My host, Sheila Vidal, from the Gulbenkian Science Institute (IGC) in Oeiras, Portugal, had served as a fellow at the Illinois Institute of Technology in March 2010, so she was very familiar with the program. Sheila was instrumental in helping me arrange travel and lodging. She served as resource for everything I would need to know about traveling to Portugal—from how to navigate the commute to the IGC from central Lisbon (where I rented an apartment) to suggestions on where to eat and what to see in my free time.

I arrived in Lisbon on a Sunday and began my work at IGC on Monday morning. Sheila had planned a full two weeks for me. I met with over 20 of her colleagues both individually and in group settings. We covered topics such as proposal databases, funding searches, public relations and outreach, financial management, laboratory management, technology transfer and intellectual property, and ethics in research. I toured facilities, attended presentations, and gave presentations to individuals from three different institutions in the Lisbon area. Research administration is a newer field in Portugal than it is the United States, and I think I was able to provide some insight into how their processes might develop in the near future. I learned about Portuguese funding mechanisms and challenges, EU mechanisms, and other European funding opportunities. What I learned most was how similar we all are. We all wish the PIs would complete their proposals sooner, we all struggle with deadlines, and we all have to manage financial and ethical compliance issues.

Since the IGC is an institute that hosts scientists from all over the world, they conduct business in English, making my transition very easy. I did learn enough Portuguese to feel comfortable navigating the city on my own and talking to waiters and shop owners.

Overall, I can say that the NCURA/EARMA exchange was a highlight of my 25+ years in the research administration field. I learned so much and made some great friends and connections. I also learned that I want to go back to Lisbon to visit when I can be on vacation and take in more of the history, the sights, the seafood, and the wonderfully delightful Portuguese people. I am greatly indebted to my institution for their support, to the IGC and Sheila Vidal, in particular, for their graciousness and time in hosting me, and to the NCURA and EARMA administrators who made this fellowship possible.

Beth Seaton is the Director of Sponsored Projects Western Illinois University where she has worked for over 20 years. She started her research administration career at Texas A&M University and is a 20-year member of NCURA.
Available February 15, 2011

ABC’S OF THE FEDERAL COST PRINCIPLES

OMB Circulars and other costing principles establish guidelines for determining costs applicable to grants, contracts, and other agreements from governmental agencies to educational institutions (A-21) non-profit organizations (A-122) and hospitals (OASC3). The principles are designed to provide that the federal government bear its fair share of total costs within defined parameters and with some exceptions. As federal audit activity increases and budget challenges face universities and the federal government, it is even more critical that research administrators understand the principles provided by the Circulars in order to appropriately fund research and other sponsored programs.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
• Understand what answers can be found within OMB Circulars A-21 and A-122, and the cost principles applicable to hospitals (OASC3);
• Review key principles related to allocating costs as direct or facilities and administrative costs;
• Review costs examples provided in Section J of A-21;
• Identify agency specific cost principles implementation;
• Connect the theory with application to budgeting and spending.

PROGRAM LEVEL: Basic

TARGET AUDIENCE: Department Administrators, Pre and Post-Award Administrators

MODERATOR: Jane Youngers, Assistant Vice President for Research and Sponsored Programs, The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio

Available April 18, 2011

MANAGING INTERACTIONS AND POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTERESTS WITH UNIVERSITY SPIN-OFFS AND OTHER SMALL BUSINESSES

University interactions with businesses, including university spin-offs and other small businesses, are increasing. These interactions frequently involve grant proposals, including but not limited to SBIR/STTR proposals, related intellectual property agreements, and—not infrequently—conflicts of interest involving faculty, staff, and/or the institution itself. Research Administrators need to understand the challenges related to these interactions and be prepared to address them in order to avoid conflicts of interest and other problems that may arise post-award. This program will address challenges related to interactions with university spin-off companies, such as conflict of interest, effort reporting, and collaborative research projects, including SBIR/STTR proposals; institutional policies and procedures necessary to address these challenges; and methods to mitigate related problems. Intellectual property issues related to spin-off companies and SBIR/STTR proposals in general, as well as related federal regulations and guidelines will also be covered.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
• Understanding of university/industry collaborations as they relate to grant proposals and intellectual property;
• Knowledge of institutional policies and procedures needed to identify and mitigate challenges that arise during these collaborations;
• Knowledge of federal regulations and guidelines related to university-industry collaborations.

PROGRAM LEVEL: Intermediate

TARGET AUDIENCE: Departmental, Intellectual Property, Financial Compliance, Pre-Award, Post-Award, Technology Transfer Administrators

MODERATOR: David Richardson, Associate Vice President for Research, Pennsylvania State University

One of the MOST cost-effective ways to train your staff

DVDs are divided into chapter segments for your training convenience.
**Available July 11, 2011**

**THE FISCAL ASPECTS OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMPLIANCE**

Human Subject Research billing is one of the "hot topics" nationally and is being given more and more attention by the U.S. Attorney's Office. A number of high-profile cases have resulted in multi-million-dollar settlements. Research administrators, who are often involved in negotiating agreements or managing post-award activities related to these human research studies, need to understand the issues involved and be prepared to develop procedures to ensure institutional compliance with applicable laws. This session will provide an overview of laws, regulations, and recent enforcement activity related to billing, discuss recent examples of non-compliance (including settlements), and discuss best practices to ensure compliance. Acceptable agreement language related to this type of billing will also be covered.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- An understanding of the laws related to billing, as well as familiarity with recent examples of non-compliance and resulting settlements;
- An understanding of institutional policies and procedures that should be in place to ensure compliance;
- An understanding of the critical role of budget development and fiscal compliance; and
- An understanding of agreement language related to billing compliance.

**PROGRAM LEVEL:** Intermediate

**TARGET AUDIENCE:** Financial, Billing and Research Compliance, Departmental, Pre-Award, Post-Award Financial Administrators

**MODERATOR:** Jamie Caldwell, Director, Office of Research Services for the Health Sciences, Loyola Medicine, Loyola University Chicago

---

**Available October 11, 2011**

**INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATIONS: NEGOTIATIONS AND COMPLIANCE**

Over the last few years, international collaborations have been on the rise, and many universities that have previously never dealt with foreign partners either as a source of funding or as a collaborator find that their faculty's field of research places them in the forefront of international collaborations. Negotiations with foreign partners can be complex and involve not only being in compliance with US laws but with the laws of the foreign country. Whether you are involved in a complex program with international sites, working with a foreign subrecipient, or simply sending an investigator off to an international meeting, new and changing regulations, security concerns and economic issues need to be addressed. This session is intended to help the university research community understand processes and policies that will support international collaborations and the impact of critical compliance responsibilities including providing essential export control and related information.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**
- Obtain a fundamental understanding of negotiating with foreign entities;
- Obtain a basic understanding of the impact of export control laws on research;
- Understand how your negotiations and federal laws concerning international research affect your faculty's research.

**PROGRAM LEVEL:** Overview

**TARGET AUDIENCE:** Departmental, Pre-Award, Post-Award and Research Compliance Administrators

**MODERATOR:** Denise Wallen, Senior Fellow, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Center for Health Policy, University of New Mexico

---

**ORDER ONLINE AT**

**WWW.NCURA.EDU**

Build a library of NCURA TV workshops that you can use to train all year long.
The cost of the full series (all four workshops) is $2,950. To purchase an individual workshop, the cost is $975.00. Included with the DVD, subscribers will receive a link to the workshop schedule and reference material guide.

CONTACT NAME

TITLE

INSTITUTION

ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

ZIP

PHONE

FAX

E-MAIL

WEB SITE

Total Amount Due: $

Full 2011 Series

- ABC's of the Federal Cost Principles
  Available February 15, 2011
  $975.00

- Managing Interactions and Potential Conflict of Interests with University Spin-Offs and Other Small Businesses
  Available April 18, 2011
  $975.00

- The Fiscal Aspects of Human Subjects Compliance
  Available July 11, 2011
  $975.00

- International Collaborations: Negotiations and Compliance
  Available October 11, 2011
  $975.00

Order the full 2011 series, and save an additional $400!

PAYMENT

A check must accompany this order form. Orders received without payment will not be processed.
Please make check payable in U.S. currency to NCURA and send payment and form to:
NCURA, 1225 19th Street, NW, Suite 850, Washington, DC 20036.

Credit Cards Accepted Exclusively Online
Credit Card payments will not be accepted via fax or mail. If you would like to pay by credit card, you must do it by using the following Online Order option: [http://www.ncura.edu/content/educational_programs/ncura_tv](http://www.ncura.edu/content/educational_programs/ncura_tv)

NCURA TAX ID: 52-172-1115
Is having a “leadership title” the only way to play a leadership role in an organization, to take the lead and make things happen, to carry out a vision? Not necessarily. It is possible to take the lead when one is not “the boss.”

Authority does not necessarily equal the power to make things happen; there are other bases of power. French and Raven (1959) identified five power bases: coercive power, legitimate power, reward power, referent power, and expert power. Legitimate power refers to power derived from a title or a certain position that results in the power to make decisions and to take the lead. Similarly, coercive power is derived from a supervisor’s ability to “force” a subordinate to act in a certain way, and reward power is derived from the ability to offer some kind of reward, such as a salary increase, for desired behavior. In order to exercise these power bases, one must hold a particular position or title that includes with its very nature power over subordinates.

Referent power, however, is derived from trust and respect, from others’ desire to emulate a person’s actions. This person does not have to be a supervisor, just someone whom others respect, like, and want to please. This phenomenon can be seen as “the power of the person” as opposed to the “power of the position.” Even if you are not in a position of authority, you can model the way to inspire others to act as you act and can influence them by being someone they would like to be. Referent power also calls on the power of the network. An individual with referent power has a wide network of individuals who DO have
legitimate power; others realize this fact and take it into consideration when following that person’s lead. For example, we all know many individuals who are active in NCURA and who put referent power to work in getting things done and in taking a leadership role even though they may not be current officers with a title to back them and give them “official” authority.

Expert power is another form of personal power, derived from technical skill and expertise. Others allow the experts to take the lead because of their knowledge and/or technical skills. In NCURA, members often put their expert power to work when taking leadership roles; the title, or the legitimacy, becomes less important than the knowledge. Referent power and expert power demonstrate that “it’s who you know and what you know” that count, more than your title.

While the positional power bases – coercive, reward, and legitimate – guarantee that someone can be a “boss,” they do not guarantee that person can be a leader. A leader does not have to be appointed but can take charge and take the lead through his or her actions, knowledge, skill, and charisma. In fact, Yukl (1991) expanded the power bases to include information, persuasive, and charismatic power, all personal power bases that allow for leadership without a title.

Autonomy

Autonomy in oneself manifests itself as a feeling of empowerment. This begs the question, though, “Can a subordinate empower a superior?” Perhaps the obvious answer is yes, one can provide a sense of comfort or freedom to his or her boss. This might be in the form of protection, by not bothering the boss with trivial matters, in the form of effective prioritization, by recognizing when a problem or issue is too big for the subordinate to handle alone, or by showing expert power and consistently having solutions to technical problems. Another less obvious way of empowering our bosses is to test our own assumptions about what motivates our bosses on a regular basis. It is imperative to have a strong handle on what your boss’s objectives really are. It is simple to assume that a boss always provides all of the information needed in order for a subordinate to carry out a plan or to complete a project in line with or above expectations. However in the real world, this is not always the case. A subordinate should ask questions to clarify what the boss’s objectives truly are. Priorities can change or be hidden. A subordinate might be spinning her wheels trying to get buy-in from various departments when, in actuality, the boss is more concerned about speed of implementation. If she
had asked some probing questions instead of making assumptions, she would have begun the project with a clear understanding of her boss’s objectives.

Additionally, in asking such questions, the subordinate may also discover a flaw or something that the boss has overlooked. Good subordinates not only ask questions, but also confront differences with their bosses. Successful middle managers are able to think independently and to collaborate, relying on referent power—the “who you know” aspect of influence. This skill set will allow an individual to disagree openly when needed. In other words, those effective at managing up DO speak up if something is at odds, for example, with the best interest of their university. Airing out differences is a healthy exercise and is effective when done so assertively, yet constructively, and in a way that takes into account the boss’s objectives and communication style. It may lead to a situation where one saves his boss from a misstep. He may even feel empowered.

**Mastery**

Mastering one’s job is inherently satisfying. People feel better when they satisfy the need to get better at what they do. It is quite obvious that bosses can provide this for subordinates—by allowing staff to participate in professional development activities, such as NCURA, to cross-train, or to take on new projects. But how can a subordinate help a boss achieve mastery? Being in tune with and playing into your boss’s working style will help her feel that time spent with you is valuable and productive. And, a mastered position is surely one that is productive. The HBR article cites Peter Drucker’s classification of bosses in regard to their working styles: those who prefer to listen and those who prefer to talk. Does your boss want an in-person briefing followed up by an email or memo? Or, would she prefer to review and ponder information in an email or report first before discussing it with you? Figuring out how your boss prefers to receive information will help her to feel effective—dare we say masterful—in her interactions with you.

Wielding expert power in your own performance also passes along mastery to your boss. If you consistently handle situations successfully, stay on top of current movements in the field, and openly share and use your knowledge, this gives your boss faith in what you do and empowers her to delegate new tasks to you effectively.

**Purpose**

The last pillar of motivation, according to Pink, is purpose—serving something larger than oneself. Ask any research administrator why she enjoys her job, and you may hear a similar answer. Often, those in research administration are very satisfied knowing that they are helping scholars to advance their careers, and in the process, helping their respective institutions advance their missions in terms of research, service, outreach, etc. General knowledge of “why” research administrators do their jobs helps you understand both your and your boss’s purposes.

On a much smaller scale, understanding how our bosses view their positions will help us to play into their senses of purpose. A clue comes in how your boss makes decisions. HBR points out that some bosses like to be highly involved. Certain bosses do not mind subordinates dropping in with crucial updates—in fact, they want to know the details. Other bosses have perfected the art of delegation and prefer not to be updated as regularly; they only want to know when a significant problem arises. Does your boss want to know about the trees, or does he only want to know if you find a new forest?

On the other hand, understanding the boss is only half of the equation. Self-awareness is a key tool in managing a healthy relationship upward. Reflecting on past experiences is a useful guide in understanding our own interactions with people, particularly with our bosses. Specifically, examining how one handles authority figures may provide some answers about personal purpose and lead to better understanding of the other person’s purpose.

As the HBR article mentions, inherent in a superior-subordinate relationship is the feeling of frustration when subordinates are subject to the outcomes or negative consequences of a boss’s decision. Counter-dependent people may be outwardly resentful toward the boss in such a situation, while over-dependent people may hold in their anger and sink into a passive-aggressive behavior pattern. Most subordinates fall somewhere between these two extremes, but understanding one’s own reactionary tendency may help subordinates not only to predict but also to adjust their behaviors and strategies in interactions with their bosses.

After continual assessment of your boss and yourself, the real management of the relationship can begin. Take into consideration that you do not need “legitimate” power in order to manage up. However, you do need to act mindfully, to ask the right questions, to share your knowledge, and to discover and keep in mind others’ objectives and ultimate purposes. Using Pink’s three tent poles—Autonomy, Mastery, and Purpose—as a framework for your work and your relationship with your boss can result in success as you manage up.

**References:**


Pink, D. (1 Nov. 2010). NCURA’s 52nd Annual Meeting. Lecture in Washington, DC.

*Amanda Snyder, Natalie Goodwin-Frank, and Mary Louise Healy are alumnae of the Leadership Development Institute Class of 2010. Amanda Snyder serves as Assistant Director, Sponsored Programs Administration at the University of Maryland, Baltimore. Natalie Goodwin-Frank serves as Operations and Grants Manager of the Photosynthetic Antenna Research Center (PARC) at Washington University in St. Louis; and, Mary Louise Healy serves as Assistant Vice President for Research at Towson University.*
Research administration (RA) offices at academic medical center campuses come in a wide variety of shapes and sizes. In most cases, a single campus will have multiple schools, departments, divisions, and subdivisions, all of which may have their own dedicated RA office with 1 to 20 staff members or more. Regardless of size or structure, hiring a new staff member inevitably changes the office dynamic. To help make future staff changes as smooth as possible for your office, we present insights to the conversation that I had neglected.

**Director’s Perspective**

After serving as the Director of the Office of Scholarship and Research for over 6 years, directing no one but myself, I was in a position to hire an Administrative Coordinator when our faculty size and funding base had grown significantly. Having never conducted interviews nor served in a supervisory role before, I was filled with doubt. When the initial hire clearly wasn’t performing adequately, my worst fears were realized.

Although the first perception is one of a minimal change, I would argue that expansion from a 1-person to a 2-person office is a more unique and challenging alteration than any other type of expansion. For over 6 years I had been a one-person show, known as the “jack of all pre-award trades” for the School of Nursing. I had adopted a very specific and comfortable work style and had only to adjust occasionally when a new faculty member was hired. I had developed a high level of trust and camaraderie with our long-time faculty members; after years of submitting grants together, they knew what to expect of me, my work style, the timing of deadlines, and, most importantly, the high quality of final grant submissions. When I was given a second chance at having an Administrative Coordinator for the office, I was determined to not only hire the best possible candidate, but also to make sure he or she was set up for success.

**Challenges: Letting Go**

The first challenge was to properly conduct interviews that would clearly identify the best candidate for the position, beginning with screening via phone interviews. At in-person interviews, I asked the right questions, carefully evaluated answers, and conducted on-the-spot tests of candidates’ knowledge. After discussions with references, and knowing that she was seeking a transfer because her grant-funded position was ending, I was confident that Laureen was the right choice. I was determined to orient her to her new job and work environment with the goal of positioning her to succeed.

Once Laureen was on board, the biggest challenge I faced was being willing to “let go” of aspects of my job. It was a bit daunting to hand off tasks to someone and sit back and watch her succeed — or fail. Fortunately, Laureen required minimal training. Still, I feared smothering her and demanding that certain tasks be performed a specific way because that was the way it had always been done. As a first time supervisor, another personal challenge was to balance orienting her to our school while allowing her the freedom to bring her own ideas to the job. As with any new relationship, trust must be developed, and only by giving her a measure of freedom in her daily work were we able to arrive at a position of mutual trust.

After developing mutual trust, winning the confidence and trust of faculty members would be another challenge. One of the earliest strategies I employed was to include Laureen in all meetings with faculty members. These encounters allowed me to show faculty my trust in her work and her contributions to our discussion. This proved successful as she took these meetings as opportunities to demonstrate her own knowledge base, never afraid to speak up and add new insights to the conversation that I had neglected. Once faculty members began to trust her, I let her take the independent lead on certain projects while reassuring them I would be reviewing her work. Because PIs already trusted my and my judgment, witnessing me placing trust in Laureen made it easier for them to trust her as well.

**Successes: In with the New**

My approach to the challenges of bringing a new person into the office has paid off in overall improvements. My willingness to give Laureen the freedom to ease into the position gave her the confidence to invoke change. Her openness about suggestions for changes in standard operating procedures helped me rethink the ways I had been doing things for so long. I began to realize that some of my habits were out dated and there was room for improvements in the work flow of the office. In addition, a second set of eyes to review my work has also proved enormously helpful and improved the quality of work. As Director, I now have time to focus on high-level initiatives such as expanding the services the office provides, improving research grant reporting databases, and expanding faculty research collaborations.

One habit I adopted that has proven extremely helpful in this collaboration is positioning myself as a buffer between Laureen and difficult faculty members. Since PIs are still getting to know her and trust her work style, when challenging or uncomfortable situations arise, I take control of the situation as supervisor. My years of experience with our faculty members have empowered me to accurately assess the situation and make the best decisions, even if they are difficult. I am
Lessons from the First Year

Laureen Pagan

A Corner Contributing Editor of NCURA Magazine.

Kristine M. Kulage is Director, Office of Scholarship and Research, Columbia University School of Nursing and Biomedical Research Coordinator, Office of Scholarship and Research, Columbia University School of Nursing.

I: Lessons from the First Year

Many of which I had not previously encountered. Submitted a wide array of grant applications, learning experience since the School of Nursing. I was chosen for the position and resolved to approach it as a new faculty size. Still, I was excited that I was chosen for industry-funded grants and contracts. We were, in a sense, an island unto ourselves, so I was understandably a little intimidated by the larger faculty. Although I had been working in research administration for 2 years, I was coming from an office where I only worked for 3 very senior PIs whose scope of grant submissions consisted of National Institutes of Health individual research grants (R01s), a program project (P01), and industry-funded grants and contracts. We were, in a sense, an island unto ourselves, so I was understandably a little intimidated by the larger faculty size. Still, I was excited that I was chosen for the position and resolved to approach it as a new learning experience since the School of Nursing submitted a wide array of grant applications, many of which I had not previously encountered.

Challenges:
“The New Kid on the Block”
The first accomplishment I focused on was to gain Kristine’s trust. I knew that she had a bad experience with the previous individual, so I felt even more strongly that I needed to prove myself. One of our first activities was to collaborate on a project so I could demonstrate my work ethic, and I would have an opportunity to demonstrate that I knew what I was doing. This made it easier for Kristine to let go of things she would normally do on her own. Once she had confidence in my ability, I knew that others would see it and would accept me and trust me as well. It is like being the “new kid on the block,” everyone is always a little wary until they get to know you, but it was harder for me since they had a bad experience with the previous person hired.

In addition, I had ideas for updating things to make monitoring and performing tasks easier for everyone. I did not want to unintentionally step on anyone’s toes, so I was very careful about how I approached introducing new ideas. Because Kristine had been solo for many years, another challenge was to convince faculty members that I was not her “assistant,” but her co-worker. This was easy for some people, but for others it is still proving to be a challenge. When I was brought in on meetings with faculty members, I made a concerted effort to join the conversation to show them not only that I knew what I was talking about, but also that I was a team player. It also gave me the opportunity to get to know the faculty, to meet, and to learn their work styles.

Successes: A Matter of Trust
Everyone has a unique way of learning new things; mine is to try something on my own and ask questions when I get stuck. I usually can find an old version of a grant application or progress report to use as guide, a method that is very effective for me. I do not work well with someone standing over me, so I was very happy when I learned this was not Kristine’s style. There were times when working side-by-side was necessary for my training: for example, processing trainee appointments within the eRA Commons xTRAIN system and submitting Health Resources and Services Administration grant applications were a particular challenge since I had no experience with either of them. It was comforting to know that the same challenges I encountered working with these grants Kristine also had experienced, so she was able to guide me and explain best practices.

In the past year, I have gained the trust not only of most faculty members but also of Kristine. She will ask my advice when we are implementing new policies and how I think we can improve on some of the old ones. One of my suggestions helped to streamline the electronic process that we use for submitting applications to our sponsored projects office which saves several steps but still maintains compliance for protocols. When Kristine was ill, I gave an oral presentation in her place, another first for me, and I have taken the lead on many of our upcoming grant submissions. In addition, I am being cross trained on the post-award process, which has added a new facet to my knowledge base and allows me to serve as a back-up when necessary. Finally, I pride myself in trying to highlight the humor in our work since at times it can be stressful when deadlines are hovering over us.

Moving Forward
Even though our first year working together has been a successful one, there is still room for growth. While most faculty have come to trust Laureen’s work, a few are rather hesitant and aren’t afraid to voice their concerns. We will continue to address the concerns of these individuals as a team. In the meantime, our co-authorship of this article is another example of our successful collaboration as co-workers. ■

Kristine M. Kulage is Director, Office of Scholarship and Research, Columbia University School of Nursing and Biomedical Research Coordinator.

Laureen Pagan is Administrative Coordinator, Office of Scholarship and Research, Columbia University School of Nursing.
In a move reverberating throughout the university export control compliance world, the Department of Homeland Security/United States Citizenship & Immigration Service (USCIS) revised the I-129 Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker (work visa application) to require a university to state whether an export license is required for the worker because he or she will have access to export-controlled technology or technical data. The new form, effective December 22, 2010, requires employers filing H-1B, H-1B1, L-1, or O-1A petitions to make attestations concerning deemed exports. Employers will now certify that they have read the relevant EAR and ITAR regulations and certify whether or not an export control license is required for the foreign national prior to granting the visa.

Although the impact of the new required certification on academia is yet to be felt, most export control management personnel consider it to be burdensome without providing a clear benefit to national security. Another concern is the considerable increase in the time it takes university staff to complete the Form I-129 and the export control review of the scope of employment of the foreign national. Further, this requirement could have an impact on overall processing time for visa applications, and discourage international scientists from working in the United States (Berdahl and DeCrappeo, 2010, and Brady, 2010).

Most university export control officers and their International Departments are now in the middle of implementing procedures to transition some of the I-129 review into Export Control offices. Many of my colleagues are using PI questionnaires, routing petitions by department, telephone interviews, and other forms of outreach to the requesting department and PI. The bottom line is the necessity of employing extreme due diligence in an export control license determination which is a complex, technical process; and the penalties for not obtaining a license when one is required are very substantial.

References

Robin Witherspoon is the Export Control Officer and Facility Security Officer at The University of Tennessee at Knoxville. She holds a Bachelor of Arts in English and a Master’s degree in Education from the University of Tennessee. Ms. Witherspoon has been with the University for eleven years. Prior to joining UTK, she served as a Paralegal in law firms in North Carolina and Tennessee. As Export Control Officer, Ms. Witherspoon implemented the first export control compliance program at UTK, is the point of contact for all export control issues, and is a delegated empowered official.
Submissions to the March/April issue of NCURA Magazine must be submitted by February 4, 2011.

NCURA Magazine Wants YOU!

NCURA Magazine welcomes original submissions related to any aspect of research administration. The core categories for contribution are listed below. For submissions to any of these sections, authors are invited to email the contributing editors whose names and email addresses are listed with their respective sections.

Back Row, from left to right, Tom Wilson, Jerry Pogatshnik, Sarah Aldemeyer,
Front Row, from left to right, Kathleen Larmett, Jim Casey, and Debbie Smith.

NCURA Magazine’s New Contributing Editors

Robyn Remotigue is Assistant Director of Sponsored Programs Administration at Mississippi State University. She has been in the field of Research Administration for more than 16 years. Robyn recently served as Chair of the Neighborhood Program Committee as well as a member of the Professional Development Committee. She also served as member and chair of the Preaward Neighborhood Subcommittee. She is a 2010 graduate of the Leadership Development Institute. Currently, she is active in Region III serving as Volunteer Coordinator. Her hobbies include gardening, running and playing tennis.

Craig Reynolds is Chief Administrator of the Department of Biological Chemistry at the University of Michigan Medical School and has been a member of NCURA since 1997. In addition to being a regular workshop and concurrent session presenter, he has served NCURA as 52nd Annual Meeting Program Co-Chair, 2010 Region IV Annual Meeting Program Co-Chair, and a member-at-large on the Region IV Board of Directors. He is a graduate of the NCURA Leadership Development Institute class of 2007. Prior to arriving at the University of Michigan in 2009, Craig was a Research and Program Officer in the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at Central Michigan University for 11 years. During 1999-2000, he held a temporary assignment as Information Assistant/Program Manager in the Office of the Assistant Director for Computer and Information Science and Engineering at the National Science Foundation, and from 1991 to 1997 was administrator of the General Robotics and Active Sensory Perception Laboratory at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia.

Randi Wasik is a research administrator for the Department of Biochemistry at the University of Washington and is the Contributing Editor for the LDI class of 2010. She previously worked as a departmental administrator at the University of Massachusetts Medical School and Massachusetts General Hospital’s Cancer Center. She also served in the central pre award office at Harvard Medical School and the central post award office at Boston University. She received her BFA in Music Performance from Carnegie-Mellon University and MBA from Texas Christian University.
Compliance Watch

Export Control Reform

Have you ever heard some variation of the saying “If you don’t vote, you don’t get to complain”? Well the same is true of proposed regulatory changes! The Administration is moving ahead with its efforts to update and reform the U.S. export control regulations and processes. Significant changes are anticipated from the Departments of State, Commerce and Treasury. Some proposed rules are already open for public comment, but many more are expected in the coming months.

Unfortunately, but understandably, the impact that proposed changes may have on university research isn’t at top of the priority list for the people driving the reform initiative. This reality makes it all the more important for us to take advantage of open comment periods to make our voices heard especially as research programs involving university-industry partnerships and international collaborations become more prevalent.

Information about the National Export Initiative is available at http://www.export.gov/nei/index.asp.

To keep up-to-date on proposed regulatory changes consider regularly checking the Federal Register (http://www.gpoaccess.gov/fr/) or the Regulations.gov website (http://www.regulations.gov). Some search hints: use the keyword “export”; select Bureau of Industry & Security (BIS), Department of State (DOS) and Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC); and narrow the range of “posted dates”.

Please make time in your busy schedules to read the proposals, discuss the potential impacts with researchers, and then, most importantly, submit your comments!

Kelly Hochstetler is the chair of the Compliance Neighborhood Committee and serves as Director, Office of Export Controls, at the University of Virginia.

Departmental Research Administration Watch

Grants, Contracts, and Cooperative Agreements

The role of a Departmental Research Administrator is to serve as a consultant and resource for faculty to turn to regarding policies, procedures, and transactions for their research. In order to provide the proper oversight and direction the departmental administrator must know if the financial assistance is a grant, a contract, or a cooperative agreement. Being able to identify the different types of agreements will define what regulations must be followed for the appropriateness of the expenditure, the sponsor guidelines, and post-award administration. A brief summary of the three are:

**Grant:** A federal grant is an award of financial assistance from a federal agency for the conduct of research or other program as outlined in an approved proposal. Components of the proposal will often include a scope of work, a budget, a budget justification, and a specific timeline for carrying out the proposed activities. A grant is used when the awarding office will not have any substantial involvement with the recipient during the period of funding. Sponsors usually award grants for the purpose of supporting scientific research.

**Contract:** A contract is for procurement of a product or service with specific obligations outlined by the sponsor and the recipient. With a contract, the research and the methods for conducting such research are detailed within the contract. There are expectations by the sponsor to complete the scope of work during a period of time outlined in the contract, provide deliverables and a final report. A contract would be used when the arrangement would benefit the sponsor by achieving expected outcomes.

**Cooperative Agreement:** A cooperative agreement would be used when there would be substantial Federal scientific or program involvement. The term “substantial” would mean the scientific or program staff from the sponsoring agency will assist, guide, coordinate, or participate in project activities.

Understanding the difference between the three types of agreements will allow departmental research administrators to educate their faculty on cost principles, administrative regulations and appropriate expenditures.

Additional information can be found at the following websites:

http://www.grants.gov/aboutgrants/grants.jsp

http://grants.nih.gov/grants/glossary.htm

Erin Bailey is the chair of the Departmental Research Administration Neighborhood and serves as Senior Research Administrator and Grant Manager, Buffalo Center for Social Research, University at Buffalo.

eRA Watch

The Electronic Research Administration Neighborhood will continue to light your way through the maze of federal and sponsor systems in 2011. Here is some of the latest news in our neighborhood:

**Frazzled by FFATA?**

If you missed the GSA’s Office of Government-wide Policy training webinar for prime awardees in October that introduced the FFATA Subaward Reporting System (www.fsrs.gov) reporting tool, not to worry. This webinar is now available online at http://www.usaspending.gov/news and will clear up some of the confusion.
In addition to a system overview, the webinar defines user roles, addresses the basic data flow and introduces reporting functionality for new subaward grants and executive compensation.

A learning module demonstrating the capabilities of the FSRS tool for reporting Federal contract subawards is also available at www.fsrs.gov under “FSRS contractor demonstration.”

**Dept of Justice Introduces New Grant Payment Request System**

The Department of Justice is upgrading its payment request system for grantees of the Offices of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), Violence against Women (OVW), and Justice Programs (OJP). The former system PAPRS (Phone Activated Payment Request System) was recently upgraded to a web-based payment request system called GPRS (Grant Payment Request System).

According to the DOJ, grantees now have “the ability to perform online draw down requests utilizing a secure OJP website. GPRS has many new features that will enhance the grantee’s ability to manage awards.

Institutions will need to list a Financial Point of Contact (FPOC) in the DOJ’s Grants Management System (GMS) to use GPRS. Login to the GMS system and select Manage Users on the top left menu to create your FPOC. For more information, please see http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/Default.asp?Item=739

For all of the news, please visit us at http://www.ncura.edu/content/regions_and_neighborhoods/neighborhoods/index.php

**Pre-Award Watch**

We are looking forward to an exciting year in 2011. Our goal is that you will use the Pre-Award Neighborhood (PAN) as a destination to find important information on a variety of topics. The PAN will continue to evolve to meet needs of its members. As part of NCURA’s “treaded delivery” theme, our neighborhood will be linking current programs and topics into our existing resources. This approach will provide research administrators with the tools geared toward their different experience levels. We are encouraging everyone to sign-up to get valuable resources for pre-award administrators.

Candyce Lindsay (Arizona State) has rotated off the committee as one of the members. The PAN committee would like to thank Candyce for her service and dedication to the neighborhood.

The PAN committee will continue to be chaired by Rosemary Madnick (Los Angeles Biomedical Research Institute). The remaining committee members are Denise Moody (Princeton), Deborah Price (Baylor Research Institute), Kevin Stewart (UC, Santa Barbara), and Jane Tolbert (Quintiles). In addition, the Committee welcomes its newest members, Debra Alexander (Georgia Southern University), Shelly Berry-Hebb (Texas A&M Research Foundation), Sharon Martin (Cedars-Sinai Medical Center), and Andre Walker (University of Chicago).

Rosemary Madnick *is the chair of the Pre-Award Neighborhood. She serves as Assistant Vice President for Research Administration at Los Angeles Biomedical Research Institute.*

**International Watch**

As we embark on a new year we all need to remain current on the updates, changes and opportunities that impact international research administration issues. The International Neighborhood website provides you with valuable links, resources, and articles to help you in your endeavors.

We know there are many valuable resources and we would like to hear from you if you have any to share with your colleagues. We are looking for appropriate templates, and training materials that you would like to post and share, or favorite websites both domestic and international.

Please consider joining the International Neighborhood by joining the International Neighborhood listserv. You will receive a confirmation and you will become part of a larger network of international research administrators. We look forward to seeing you!!!

Denise Wallen *is the chair of the International Neighborhood and serves as Senior Fellow, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Center for Health Policy at University of New Mexico.*

**Big Things Happening for PUI’s with NCURA**

The 53rd Annual Meeting will again have a PUI Track! The PUI Community is very grateful to Joseph McNicholas, Director of Research and Sponsored Projects at Loyola Marymount for taking on the responsibility of creating a great comeback for this track.

Other folks to be thanked were all of the PUI presenters at AM52 as well as the PUI Neighborhood Committee who does a terrific job of keeping the website and listserv vibrant and useful. The WONDERFUL team consists of Katie Plum of Angelo State University, Carolyn Elliott-Farino of Kennesaw State University, Fran Jeffries of Wheaton College, Kris Monahan of Wellesley College, John Falconer of University of Nebraska at Kearney, Linda Mason of Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, Pamela Napier of Western Kentucky University, Sally Southwick of Northern State University, Robert Holm of Butler University, Vincent Oragwam of California State University-Bakersfield, Joseph McNicholas of Loyola Marymount University, and Anne Pascucci of Bridgewater State University.

We are also fortunate to announce Carolyn Elliott-Farino as the new contributing editor on behalf of Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions for the NCURA Magazine.

If you have questions or suggestions, please feel free to contact anyone of these PUI representatives.

Anne Pascucci *is the chair of the PUI Neighborhood Committee and serves as Director, Grants and Sponsored Projects, Bridgewater State University*
Kay Ellis, at the University of Texas at Austin, has accepted the position of Export Controls Officer at the University of Arizona

Amanda Snyder is now Assistant Director of Sponsored Programs Administration, at the University of Maryland, Baltimore Office of Research and Development

2011 Call for Officer and Board Nominations

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

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

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

NCURA provides many opportunities to volunteer within our professional organization – currently at a membership that exceeds 7000! By expanding your involvement, you are afforded a wealth of enriching experiences. Being active and involved in NCURA can be as simple as considering whom to nominate for these positions, and then making that nomination – or self-nomination. We are waiting to hear from you.

For a detailed description of the current responsibilities of these positions, please visit

http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/opportunities/.

Terms of these positions will begin on January 1, 2012.

For information on this year’s required nomination materials for each position, please visit

http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/current_calls.php.

Complete nomination materials are due May 20, 2011 to nominations@ncura.edu.
2011 NCURA Awards- Call for Nominations

Recognizing the contributions of our colleagues is one of the highest honors we can bestow. Additionally, nurturing diversity expands the energy and creativity of our membership and builds a stronger volunteer organization. Now is the time to acknowledge an extraordinary mentor, collaborator, or friend, and also identify a candidate for the minority travel award.

**Joseph F. Carrabino Award**

This award is given to a current, or former, federal employee who has made a significant contribution to research administration, either through a single project, activity, or innovation, or by a lifetime of service. **Deadline for nominations: May 25, 2011**

**Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration**

This award is given annually to an individual who has made 1) noteworthy contributions to NCURA, and 2) significant contributions to the profession of Research Administration. [Note: Current National Officers and NCURA Standing Committee (FMC, NLDC and PDC) Chairs and Vice Chairs are ineligible for nomination for this award.] **Deadline for nominations: May 25, 2011**

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

---

**Director - Office of Academic Research and Sponsored Projects**

The qualifications for the position are as follows: Master's degree required, doctorate strongly preferred. 3-5 years successful management-level experience in sponsored program administration in an academic environment, and a demonstrated record of achievement in obtaining and administering grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements; familiarity with electronic research administration; extensive knowledge of federal, state, and private funding sources; broad experience working with faculty and professional academic staff across disciplines and schools; familiarity with curricular programs impacting academics; ability to work with professional staff and others in the management of grant awards and in preparation of quality proposals; thorough knowledge of federal circulars (especially A-21, A-110, and FAR), and experience working with the regulations, procedures, and policies of key federal agencies (NIH, NSF, DoD, and ED). Experience with federal compliance regulations, especially IRB-HS, Research Integrity, and Intellectual Property. Demonstrated ability to work with external funding sources from federal program officers to foundation staff. Grant subcontracting experience is desired.

The successful candidate will demonstrate the following personal attributes: Strong oral and written communication skills. Highly organized, proactive, capable of working independently, yet able to work in a team and establish rapport with a range of constituents across the campus. Ability to work in a deadline-oriented environment and with strict deadlines, to manage multiple priorities while remaining poised under pressure in order to facilitate the submission of quality proposals.

Founded in 1852 and operated by the Society of Mary, St. Mary’s University is a Hispanic Serving Institution. Salary is commensurate with qualifications and experience and is accompanied by a strong benefits package. All qualified applicants are welcome; minorities and women are encouraged to apply.

Applicants should submit a letter of application addressing the above responsibilities and qualifications (please highlight evidence of currency in field), curriculum vitae/resume, and contact information for three references to: Dr. Winston F. Erevelles, Chair, Search Committee – Director, Office of Academic Research and Sponsored Projects, St. Mary’s University, One Camino Santa Maria, San Antonio, TX, 78228-8511. Electronic submission of applications is encouraged, however, incomplete applications may not be considered. Review of applications will begin immediately and will continue until a suitable candidate is identified. **St. Mary’s University is an Equal Opportunity Employer.**

---

For more information and a detailed listing of this opportunity, visit the university web site at [http://www.stmarytx.edu/hr/?go=jobs_2column](http://www.stmarytx.edu/hr/?go=jobs_2column) or contact the search committee chair at werevelles@stmarytx.edu or 210-436-3996. View the departmental website at [http://academicgrants.stmarytx.edu/](http://academicgrants.stmarytx.edu/).
REGION I
New England
http://web.mit.edu/osp/www/ncura

It was great to see so many Region I members at the National Meeting; we had 178 Region I attendees, including 54 new members. I would like to thank the Region I Cheerleaders, and Patriots and everyone who participated in the tailgate competitions. I am proud to say that Region I took 2nd place in the cheerleading competition. Please see Region I website for photos.

After I mentioned passing the baton to Bethanne Giehl, Region I chair for 2011, in my last article, I realized that I had one more article to write. I am writing this article with an eye toward the future, looking forward to a new year and new leadership for Region I, and hopefully many new faces volunteering. Bethanne has been very busy getting her cabinet in order, and has already selected some of her Chairs for Region I standing committees, however anyone who is interested in becoming more involved should go to the Region I website www.ncuraregion1.org and review the position descriptions, and consider volunteering to be on a standing committee, or to assist at the spring meeting. There are plenty of opportunities to get involved, and volunteering for your region is very rewarding.

Pat Fitzgerald, Region I Chair Elect for 2011, is Chairing the Spring Meeting. The meeting will be held at the beautiful Omni Hotel in New Haven Connecticut, May 15-18, 2011. Pat has already reached out to many Region I members to participate on the program committee and they will be reaching out to Region I members who are subject matter experts to participate in the program. If you or someone you know of is a great presenter, please be sure to get in touch with Pat or one of his committee members who will try to make a match with the Program.

Region I also has a new Treasurer Elect for 2011, Carlo Eracleo and a new Secretary, Estelle Lang. Carlo and Estelle will begin their terms on January 1, 2011.

A call for nominations for the FRA conference Travel Awards, which will be held March 4-6 in San Diego, CA, should be out by the time you are reading this article. You can find the application on the Region I website. Please self nominate or nominate a colleague. A call for nominations for the spring meeting will follow and the Region I recognition awards will be out soon too. You can start working on your nominations at any time, the forms are on the website, so keep in mind deserving colleagues that you might like to nominate.

Look forward to many opportunities for professional development right here in Region I in 2011. The curriculum committee is exploring some new workshops as well as gearing up for a new year of RADG meetings. If you have suggestions for topics for an upcoming meeting please email region1@ncuraregion1.org.

And last but not least, I would like to thank everyone who has volunteered this year and participated in making Region I such a great Region to be a part of. I wish everyone a very happy and healthy New Year!

Susan Zipkin is Immediate Past Chair of Region I and serves as the Director of Research Finance, Radiology Research, at Brigham & Women’s Hospital.

REGION II
Mid-Atlantic
www.ncuraregionii.org

Happy New Year! I resolve: I will accomplish everything I hope to do at work, at home, and for NCURA; I will have time for a vacation and feel secure enough to leave my cell phone off; and I will stop daydreaming and fantasizing about what the adventure of my life should be like. Even though all those are already broken, I am sure the one I didn’t mention that will hold true: Getting to the Region II Spring Meeting to see all my friends, soak in that great New York state-of-mind and the ambiance of Brooklyn, and to engage in great professional development opportunities.

Setting Our Sights on the New World of Research Administration, May 1 to 3, 2011

Hotel: We will be meeting in the New York Marriott at the Brooklyn Bridge, 333 Adams Street, Brooklyn, NY.

Workshops: (1) Demystifying Allowability, Allocability, Reasonableness and Consistency at the Transactional Level for the Department Administrator will be an in-depth study that focuses on understanding and applying tests for allowability, allocability, reasonableness and consistency using case studies with specific reference to OMB circulars to be presented by Denise Clark, University of Maryland College Park, and Brian Squilla, University of Pennsylvania. (2) OMB Circular Foundations: A-21 and A-122, the Cost Principles; A-110, the Administrative Principles; and A-133, the Audit Principles will focus on the basics with examples and tips on interpreting these seemingly complex rules to be presented by Ann Holmes, University of Maryland College Park, and Betty Farberman, New York University. (3) Federal Training Grants: From Application Development to Close-Out will focus on strategies for successful submission, monitoring, and close-out of federal (NIH, HRSA and NSF) training grants to be presented by Walter Goldschmidts, Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, Kristine Kulage, Columbia University in the City of New York, Sue Porterfield, Johns Hopkins University, and Ruth Torres, Columbia University in the City of New York. (4) Managing Intellectual Property focuses on the many challenges facing the research administrator who manages intellectual property, negotiates private industrial re-
search agreements and state and federal awards to be presented by Gregory C. Slack, Ph.D., Director of Research and Technology Transfer, Clarkson University, and George R. McGuire, Chairman Intellectual Property and Technology Practice Group, Bond, Schoeneck & King, PLLC, Syracuse, NY.

Plenary Keynote Speaker: Claude M. Steele, Ph.D., Provost, Columbia University, will talk about his new book, *Whistling Vivaldi: And Other Clues to How Stereotypes Affect Us (Issues of Our Time)*, a new study of cultural stereotypes that shows how, even in the absence of explicit racism, negative stereotypes can continue to pervade American life and have far-reaching influences on our behavior.

Concurrent Sessions and Discussion Groups will be identified as Pre-Award, Post-Award, Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI), Departmental, Federal, and General, and will also be identified as appropriate for beginner, intermediate and senior levels of experience. Some of the sessions that have already been selected include such topics as: *Details and the Big Picture: Blending Personalities to Building Successful Research Administration Teams; Working With Foundations and Foundation Relations; Sponsored Project Financial Reports for Faculty: How to Make and Distribute Tools that the Faculty Will Actually Use; Building An Outreach/Broader Impacts Section in Your NSF Proposal; Finding and Winning Federal Contracts; Managing Time/Effort Reporting at PUI’s, Developing an RCR Program at a Small Institute, and Export Control - Will the Nightmare Ever End?*

Information will be sent in early February concerning the program, the hotel, and the other events and activities that will go along with the Spring Meeting.

Nominations for the Region II Spring Meeting Travel Awards are due by March 1. Recipients will receive $500 toward their travel expenses, will be introduced during the Business Meeting, and will be required to provide a report on their experience. Nominees must be research administrators from Region II, cannot have previously attended a Spring Meeting, and demonstrate their financial need for the award. To submit a nomination for yourself or a colleague, complete and submit the application form that is on our website (http://ncuraregioniii.org/) along with a letter of support from the applicant’s supervisor.

Nominations for the Region II Distinguished Service Awards are also due by March 1. Two individuals who have demonstrated their commitment to NCURA through service and leadership to the Region will be recognized at the 2011 Spring Meeting. Candidates must be current NCURA members. To nominate a colleague, submit a letter of nomination detailing the nominee’s sustained and significant contributions to NCURA and two letters of support from individuals familiar with the nominee’s efforts for NCURA. Nominations should be sent to my attention at williamsms@wpunj.edu.

Martin Williams is Chair of Region II and serves as Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at William Paterson University.

REGION III southeast

With the darkest days of the year upon us, it is nice to know we have the upcoming Region III Spring Meeting on the Isle of Palms to look forward to. Plans for the upcoming meeting, which will be held May 1-4 at the Wild Dunes Resort on the beautiful Isle of Palms, outside Charleston, South Carolina are already underway. Make plans to join us there, since we are “One Beachin’ Region.” Thanks to everyone who responded to our call for presentation proposals!

The Program Committee, led by Chair-Elect Rick Smiley (East Carolina University) is busy at work lining up workshops, concurrent sessions and discussion groups that will address everyone’s learning needs. The proposed programming for the concurrent sessions includes a pre-award track, a post-award track, a departmental track, a track for Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions, a general track (cross-cutting topics), and a professional development track. In the coming weeks, check the Events page for a draft schedule and other updates.

Also, when you go to the Events page on the NCURA Region III web site to access the link to make your reservation online, you will notice that Wild Dunes Resort’s usual policy is to require a one- night deposit in order to confirm a reservation. Please note that this policy does not apply to our group. You will guarantee your reservation with your credit card in the usual manner, but the one-night deposit will not be charged.

If you have never volunteered for the spring meeting, then Volunteer Coordinator Robyn Remotigue (Mississippi State University) challenges you to make this YOUR year to volunteer. Volunteering is a great way to meet people throughout the region and build your network of friends and colleagues in the area of research administration. Remember, the success of the regional meeting depends on contributions from many volunteers. So, contact Robyn Remotigue (Robyn@spa.msstate.edu) to find out how you can volunteer at our spring meeting. Whatever amount of time you are able to contribute is valued and appreciated. You will be glad that you got involved!

Paige Robinson (Vanderbilt University Medical Center), chair of the Membership and Awards Committee, wants to remind you to be on the lookout for the call for travel award nominations for the spring meeting, which you should expect in early February.

Finally, if you need a good laugh to brighten up your day, check out this video, which documents how your Region swept the regional cheer and mascot competition at the annual meeting: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xDC00LTPaJU

We look forward to seeing you this spring!

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

Martin Williams is Chair of Region II and serves as Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at William Paterson University.
Dear NCURA Region IV Friends:

As time passes, it seems to become more and more difficult to find that perfect work/life balance. For NCURA members this means also finding time to fit in our professional development opportunities.

Luckily, our Region IV Spring meeting is just around the corner: mark your calendars for the upcoming Region IV Spring Meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, April 16-20, 2011! David Ngo, your Region IV Chair Elect, has been working hard planning many exciting sessions and activities at the upcoming meeting. Please contact David at dvngo@rsp.wisc.edu if you are interested in volunteering for Spring Meeting activities. Look for announcements coming soon!

Remember that Region IV has some important initiatives this year. If you are interested in getting involved in Region IV, these are some great opportunities to volunteer:

**Task Force on Website Improvement:** this task force will conduct an assessment of the functionality and navigation of the current Region IV website, make recommendations to the Board for both a new architecture for the Region IV website (new outline, navigation and list of where content should reside) and recommendations for a new design template. Contact: Kirsten Yehl, Northwestern University, k-yehl@northwestern.edu

**Task Force on Position Descriptions:** this task force will be writing and reviewing thorough volunteer position descriptions for the Region – to be housed on the new website. Contact: Jeffrey Ritchie, Aurora Health Care, jeffrey.ritchie@aurora.org

**Task Force on a new Region IV Mentoring Program:** this Task Force will be looking into the feasibility of creating a new Region IV mentoring program. This group will make recommendations on a potential structure, funding mechanism, and application and review processes as we explore this exciting new venture. Contact: Jaynee Tolle, University of Cincinnati, or Kirsten Yehl, Northwestern University, k-yehl@northwestern.edu.

I hope everyone stays warm this winter—and hope to see you in April at the Spring Meeting.

**Christa Johnson** is Chair of Region IV and serves as the Associate Dean for the Office of Research and Projects at the Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville.

Region V had a record high of 175 members attending the NCURA National Meeting in November. Out of this number 45 were new members. Thank you to all members who attended the national meeting and a heartfelt welcome to new members.

Congratulations to Govind Narasimhan, University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, who graduated from NCURA’s 2010 Leadership Development Institute.

Region V is happy to share with all of NCURA the National Business Meeting Raffle Winners who received gifts associated with our upcoming regional meeting. Congratulations to all the winners, including those who received NCURA gear. We’ll be seeing y’all in April at the Regional Meeting.

**Free Suite Upgrade at Regional Meeting** - Elaine Pearson, University of Houston Downtown

**Free 1 night Weekend Stay** - Betty Redd, The University of Texas: MD Anderson Cancer Center

**Free Registration at Regional Meeting** - Janice Roberts, Baylor College of Medicine

Region V reminds members that our regional website is a wonderful place for schools to post open positions and for candidates to look for new and exciting opportunities in our member institutions. Special congratulations to Joanne Palmer from the Office of Sponsored Programs at Texas State University – San Marcos. Joanne was recently awarded her certificate from AGA as a Certified Government Financial Manager.

**Remember to Save the Date:** The Region V Regional Meeting will be held this year in Houston, Texas at the Magnolia Hotel. The meeting will be from April 17-20, 2010. Jeremy Forsberg from the University of Texas at Arlington is chair-elect and will be the program chair for the meeting. If you have a particular session or workshop you would like to conduct, please contact Jeremy at J.Forsberg@uta.edu.

**Charlene Miller** On a sad note, our heart goes out to the family and friends of Charlene Miller, Assistant Vice President for Research Services at Texas A&M University. Charlene died November 23, 2010, in a plane crash in Destin, Florida, where she and her family were spending the Thanksgiving holidays. Charlene was known to many of us in Region V and we will miss her.

**Marianne Woods** is Chair of Region V and serves as the Senior Associate Vice President for Research Administration at the University of Texas at San Antonio.
Tradition dictates that every 365 days, you should try to kick bad habits and start your life anew. So have you sat down with a cup of coffee, a paper and a pen, to reflect: What kinds of New Year’s Resolutions should I make for myself this January 1st?

If your resolutions included learning something new, volunteering to help others, or growing professionally and personally, this year’s NCURA Region VI/VII Meeting is the meeting to attend! This year we are heading to Denver, Colorado, April 3-6, 2011. The theme is “Climbing the Heights of Research Administration” and there is nothing like the venue of the Mile High City to make this meeting perfect for professional development, volunteering and networking with colleagues.

The program committee has been hard at work developing a variety of interesting workshops, concurrent sessions and discussion groups for achieving your New Year’s Resolutions. Watch for announcements and visit the Regional Meeting web site at http://www.ogrd.wsu.edu/r6ncura/ for news and updates. Volunteers are always needed and appreciated, so if you would like to get involved, please contact me directly at jeri.muniz@usc.edu.

Since this is my first Regional Corner article, I want to thank those volunteers who are making 2011 a great year for our region. The 2011 Regional Advisory Committee members are: Sinh Simmons, Joseph McNicholas, Michiko Pane, Leisa Rodriguez, Charles Greer, and Georgette Sakamoto. In addition to the Advisory Committee, the chairs and volunteers of our standing committees will also play an important role in achieving our goals this year.

I would be remiss if I didn’t close with words of thanks and appreciation to the 2010 Regional Officers, Sinh Simmons, Chair, Maggie Griscavage, Secretary, and Csilla Csaplár, Treasurer for their outstanding service. The successes of the last year are a direct result of their collective efforts, creativity, and commitment to our Region.

To every member of Region VI, I challenge you to volunteer and participate in our regional meetings and activities! Whether you are new to NCURA or are a long standing member, please consider volunteering to support our region – you won’t be disappointed!

Be sure to visit the Region VI website for updated meeting information! Happy New Year and let’s work together to achieve those New Year’s Resolutions!

Jeri Muniz is Chair of Region VI and serves as Executive Director for the Department of Contracts and Grants at the University of Southern California.
Learn and discuss what it takes to be a successful financial research administrator! With over 100 Educational Sessions and 20 Pre-conference Workshops, there's something for all administrators!

Tracks include:

✓ Audit & Financial Compliance
✓ F&A/Costing
✓ Federal
✓ Post-Award
✓ Clinical Research/Hospitals
✓ Policy & Research Management
✓ Special Interest/Hot Topics

REGISTER TODAY!
Go to http://www.ncura.edu/content/educational_programs/sites/fra12/

LOOKING FORWARD STRATEGICALLY:

Balancing Collaboration, Problem-Solving, and Accountability

MARCH 4 – 6, 2011
Manchester Grand Hyatt
San Diego, California
EFFORT CERTIFICATION AND REPORTING JUST GOT AFFORDABLE.

It’s Web based. It’s compatible with your pre-award, accounting and payroll systems. It’s powerful and easy to use. But what makes Effort Administrator™ truly unique is it’s price.

Effort Administrator™ makes it easy for faculty and research scientists to certify their own effort for sponsored research and hard money. Reports compare budget to actual effort, cost sharing, and more. And it’s a fraction of the cost of any comparable system on the market today.

Thanks to IT Works innovation, Effort Certification and Reporting is practically effortless. And very, very affordable.

See it now at [itworks-inc.com](http://itworks-inc.com)

819.232.5332 | sales@itworks-inc.com | itworks-inc.com
ONLINE TUTORIALS
A Primer on Clinical Trials – 7 week program
A Primer on Subawards – 8 week program
A Primer on Federal Contracting – 7 week program
Visit the website for Enrollment Periods

FUNDAMENTALS OF SPONSORED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP
January 31 – February 2, 2011 ...............San Francisco, CA
February 23-25, 2011 ......................New Orleans, LA
March 23-25, 2011 ...........................San Antonio, TX

DEPARTMENTAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP
February 23-25, 2011 ..............................New Orleans, LA
March 23-25, 2011 ..............................San Antonio, TX

SPONSORED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION LEVEL II WORKSHOP
January 31 – February 2, 2011 ...............San Francisco, CA

REGIONAL MEETINGS
REGION I (New England) May 15-18, 2011, New Haven, CT
REGION II (Mid-Atlantic) May 1-3, 2011, New York, NY
REGION III (Southeastern) May 1-4, 2011, Isle of Palms, SC
REGION IV (Mid-America) April 16-20, 2011, Cleveland, OH
REGION V (Southwestern) April 17-20, 2011, Houston, TX
REGION VI / VII (Western/Rocky Mountain) April 3-6, 2011, Denver, CO

2011 NCURA TV WORKSHOP SERIES
ABC's of the Federal Cost Principles .............................................Available February 15, 2011
Managing Interactions and Potential Conflict of Interests with University Spin-Offs and Other Small Businesses ..........Available April 18, 2011
International Collaborations: Negotiations and Compliance ...............Available October 11, 2011

FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION 12 CONFERENCE

NCURA ANNUAL MEETING
53rd Annual Meeting, Washington Hilton
Washington, DC ..............................................November 6 – 9, 2011

THE DEADLINES FOR MARCH/APRIL, 2011 ISSUE ARE:
Submission of Articles to Contributing Editors ....February 4, 2011
Submission of Articles to Co-editors ................February 11, 2011
Submission of Advertisements ...........................February 11, 2011
Additional information for authors can be found at:
http://www.ncura.edu/content/news/newsletter/index.php

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