Research Administration Metrics: Making Your Numbers Tell the Right Story
On the Cover  With tax season just behind us and the FY12 budget looming for many institutions (as well as Congress!), we turn our focus for this issue on metrics.  It is closer to home with information from a salary survey showing how the members of our profession compare with other U.S. workers.  Kristine Kulage presents the story behind the story on her Survey of Sharing F&A Cost Recoveries.  Lauren Robertson and Susan Zipkin offer tips on hiring, training, and developing departmental research administrators, and Laura Magruder discusses retention and turnover.  Erin Bailey and her colleagues present ways to maximize contributions of introverts and extroverts in the workplace, and Brian Sevier and his colleagues share information about the importance of coordination and communication in maximizing financial resources.

Spring is on the mind of our President Judy Fredenberg as she plants the seeds of what NCURA means and encourages each of us to find his or her niche and get involved.

Rebecca Puig shares information on DOD’s electronic document access system; Jessa Albertson provides an in-depth look at U.S. sanctions regulations in the university setting; and Susan Sauer Sloan discusses the future of cybersecurity and its role in protecting valuable intellectual property.

Strategic issues facing public universities are identified by Dan Mote, and recommendations from the Royal Society for strengthening international collaborations and their impact on metrics, with a focus on university-industry collaborations in China.

Many thanks to our authors for their contributions; we hope that you will use the tips and strategies provided in this issue as you wrap up this fiscal year and complete your plans for the next.  We hope you enjoyed the Spring meetings!

Debbie Smith  
NCURA Magazine Co-Editor
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**Introduction**

An ‘Ivory Tower’ enclave isolated from the ‘real world’ was a common, though annoying, characterization of a university when I was a student. But a consequence of being “outside” of society was that universities were largely left alone when deciding how to serve their intrinsic mission to discover, create and disseminate knowledge. Students had to adjust to university rules, and schedules were largely chosen to serve university needs. Under the heading of “be careful of what you wish for,” university responsibilities have broadened steadily over time on both new and old frontiers so that services provided to students, industry, communities, the nation, even internationally – services to society broadly – now rank alongside teaching and research as primary university responsibilities. With the passing of the ivory tower into the historical record and the shifting of public university responsibilities and financial support towards serving societal needs, comes a diminution of imagination inspired study.

**Global Drivers of the University Vision**

Predicting the future is futile. However, Oliver Wendell Holmes advised “The great thing in this world is not so much where we stand, as in what direction we are moving.” He said “in what direction,” and not “where we are moving.” Let’s highlight the ‘global drivers’ of our direction and use them to foretell ‘strategic issues’ which public research universities will face in the next decade.

**Global Driver 1: Accelerating Change**

With our world society experiencing waves of accelerating changes in many different arenas– information, economic, financial, environmental, security, energy, disease, food, and water, to name a few – research universities find themselves standing on the cusp of all these waves and trying to not get “rolled” by them. The dynamism of this new environment necessitates a public university’s strategic vision be re-framed frequently because its underpinning mission and service responsibilities, opportunities and challenges are changing continuously and often significantly. Change cannot be ignored. For instance none of the top-ten U.S. employment opportunities in 2010 existed in 2004, and most of the key strategic issues facing U.S. society today were not primary a decade earlier either. With increasing responsibilities to global societies comes the obligation to recognize and serve their rapidly changing realities. Today, the ivory tower is not visible in the rear view mirror.

Accelerating change results in a shortening time horizon for response whether we speak of business decisions, product life cycles, employment opportunities, disasters, or research opportunities. The connectivity that links talent, markets, finance, manufacturing, research, development, service and education globally has expanded opportunities for industries, universities and individuals alike. There are diminishingly few national companies remaining. And where people earlier migrated at great personal risk to opportunities for a better life, today those with talent can often ‘migrate through cyberspace’ to opportunities. This globally connected society requires the higher education systems that serve it to be strategically global too.

Universities are designed to not change rapidly. University cultures and governance processes slow response to change even while change is accelerating in surrounding society. This reality challenges university leadership to be prescient about change so that the university can be less buffered by it.

**Strategic Issue #1:** The combination of global connectivity and accelerating change will increasingly create abrupt disruptions. Universities must develop the mindset and processes to respond to disruptive change.

**Global Driver 2: Accessible and Inexpensive Global Communications**

Access to nearly instant communications in both the developed and developing worlds is a disruptive technological change that has opened
remarkable opportunities for business, people, government and universities alike. Every young person in the U.S. sends 100 text messages a day; one-third of the world population has fast Internet access, and there are more cellular telephones in the world than there are people. If Facebook were a country, it would be the world’s third largest with 800 million plus users expected in 2011. University networks are among the largest, most open and connected globally. Knowledge and information on them moves freely throughout the world. Communications and networks position Universities to engage on a global footing and many do. But most have not taken full advantage of the available communication capabilities in part because they change so fast.

Strategic Issue #2: More effective use of communication technologies in essentially every aspect of university operation is a primary university challenge and opportunity.

Global Driver 3: Partnerships and Engagement Paradigm

International relationships during the Cold War (1945 to 1990) were characterized by “isolation and control” of information for commercial and military advantages. Innovation Control underpinned national policies that shaped international relations during that period.

However, between 1990 and 2000 in an almost complete reversal in paradigm, innovation control was replaced by innovation creation through “partnerships and engagement” which now underpins global behavior. Communications and globalization after the Cold War made control of innovation no longer possible except in very limited circumstances, so being fast and first in innovation, even for a short period, became the strategy.

Partnerships and engagement to accelerate innovation is the basis of relationships today whether we speak of countries, companies, universities or people. The assembly of talent, resources, and capabilities to accelerate ‘getting things done’ quickly and efficiently are the drivers. Universities must engage, must have impact, and must do it today. Today’s students also want to ‘do it themselves’ or ‘do it together’ and to ‘learn while doing.’ Relevance and substance are tied together for them.

Strategic Issue #3: “Partnerships and engagement” on a global platform will be imbedded in the university vision and will characterize university operations for many if not most of its functions.

Global Driver 4: Globalization

Globalization connects people, industries, universities, and countries well beyond its initial association with business. This connectivity brings unanticipated trickle-up as well as trickle-down values.

Essentially all business is globalized. Business either sees a world without national borders, where markets, talent, finance, manufacturing, research, and development are distributed globally or sees one formed by multinational subsidiary entities each with its own business model and set of masters.

Strategic Issue #4: Universities must prepare students to prosper in global careers, responsibilities and understanding. “Working around the world” for them will be similar to “working around the country” was for students a generation earlier.

Global Driver 5: Expanding Access to Higher Education

Modernization, growth of the middle class, and growing technology-driven economies globally are driving growth in higher education in the developing and developed countries alike. The scale of the global demand for higher education is enormous and will drive the transformation of public higher education. President Obama has set a goal to boast the world’s highest graduation rate by 2025, which requires a 25% graduation rate increase.

Universities will be challenged to make adjustments in many sectors (students, faculty, programs, degrees, locations, facilities, methods, expectations) to satisfy the access-demand pressures. An increasing array of for-profit higher education models serving targeted student needs should be expected. Four year, two year, accelerated, on-line, in-person, mixed on-line and in-person, on-demand, self-paced, “degree credit for life skills,” and “two degrees for the price of one” plans, most offering student convenience and access, will become more common.

Network-access to courses given elsewhere and taken everywhere will be more utilized. Books, as we know them, will steadily be replaced by electronic media because their current cost, even for wealthy countries, is too high and probably not sustainable at scale.

The pressure for open enrollment will increase because the focus is moving to providing higher education opportunity for all a la K-12 education. Opportunities for subject matter certification will continue to expand including: certificates for training professional (multi-disciplinary) master degree programs created for targeted interest groups, and flexible interdisciplinary constructs not leading to degrees. Programs delivered by a university partnership, possibly with non-university groups (like museums and research institutes), will be common.

Strategic Issue #7: Universities will focus on serving defined higher educational niches because of the expanding range of possible missions.

Strategic Issue #8: Demand driven student expansions will create significant budgetary, facility and student qualification challenges for public universities if significant supplemental public support is not provided.

This issue will less affect private universities because their missions do not necessarily respond to access demands.

Global Driver 6: Expanding Opportunities for Talent

As Sir Francis Bacon noted, “knowledge is power,” but in-demand knowledge today is especially powerful. Those possessing in-demand talents are in short supply and are eagerly recruited globally. While unemployment remains high, many employers cannot find the employees they seek. The globalization of people is driven by the demand for talent. Accelerating change necessitates dynamic, accessible and targeted programs to nurture a current workforce. Acquiring current skills is a governing rule for today’s workforce.
Nurturing talent through degree and certificate programs offered in a manner that serves student needs is a direction that universities should follow.

**Strategic Issue #9:** Talent, especially in-demand talent, is the coin of the global realm and a long-term issue. Universities should ensure priority attention to nurturing this talent.

**Strategic Issue #10:** Universities should nurture global talent in leadership, management and “current skills” for professionals across disciplines through targeted degree and certificate programs.

**Global Driver 7:**

**Cost Control**

To state the obvious the total cost of U.S. higher education is high. With the national goal to increase the number of post-secondary education graduates to 55% of high school graduates, and with continuous education of the workforce expected to be the norm for high quality jobs and national competitiveness, the national cost for higher education at current rates becomes very high. Tuition flexibility is limited, and states can be expected to provide even less support per student as they expect more from their higher education systems. With increasing pressure for program access, maintaining program quality becomes the challenge. The ‘buck’ for cost and quality of higher education ultimately ‘stops’ at the public university because it provides the program and services.

Most ideas for cost control are not new but the high total cost of higher education may now make them more attractive. A few of them include: using incentives to shorten the time to degree; using time to degree to better align educational costs and tuition fees; acquiring degree credits through different higher and lower cost educational centers; instituting classes of service with differential costs (like, flying coach class); allowing other educational experiences to be used for degree credit; and expanding use of differential costs by field of study or study formats.

**Strategic Issue #11:** Generally, states, students, and universities share the responsibility for financing public higher education (along with significant federal support) but do so without a compact balancing their responsibilities and allowing for prediction of cost sharing even one year ahead. It is cost sharing without agreement or predictability.

**Global Driver 8:**

**Innovation**

Innovation is widely touted as the answer to almost every “how will we . . . question?” How will we accelerate economic development, create affordable health care, improve sustainability and quality of life, and so on? The answer given is always “through innovation.”

An innovative culture requires strong leadership, embraces institutional agility, commits to high-value deliverables, values disparate talents, adapts to changing circumstances and responds to opportunities.

The world is hungry for innovation which universities, with support of government, are positioned to lead. Universities are natural centers for innovation. They gather talented people, engage in cutting-edge research, have large-scale information and computational systems, connect to local and global communities, engage in instruction and provide services, often with support of government and communities. Students start companies, and sometimes create entirely new lines of business, as occurred with Apple and Google. University services currently include entrepreneur’s residence halls, incubators for start-up companies, international incubators for foreign companies, access to angel and venture funders, technology licensing and commercialization professionals, intellectual property counsel, venture acceleration assistance, business plan counseling and competitions, venture mentors and consultants.

**Strategic Issue #12:** Universities are now poised to create university-wide cultures of innovation that would extend beyond the campus to surrounding communities and beyond them even internationally. This is a major opportunity and challenge awaiting research universities.

**Global Driver 9:**

**Great Global Problems**

The joining of national problems with the great global problems - such as environmental degradation and climate change - is a driver resulting from global connectivity. The National Academy of Engineering’s Grand Challenges have inspired universities across the country to make them a priority focus for education and research. Relief efforts and fund raising after natural disasters, like earthquakes and hurricanes, also reflect this global mega-trend.

No person, country, organization or university is untouched by these great global problem drivers. On the contrary, global connectedness has steeled our linkages to them.

**Strategic Issue #13:** Universities will increasingly engage multi-disciplinary teams on great global problems. These teams are inspired by Competitions, such as the U.S. Department of Energy’s Solar Decathlon; by Service Projects, like those of Engineers Without Borders; by Challenges, like the ‘Grand Challenges’ offered by the U.S. National Academy of Engineering; and by Prizes, like the million-dollar X-Prize for oil spill cleanup, or the more than 30 other major prizes found on www.ideaconnection.com.

These mechanisms of engagement are manifest exemplars of the growing interests of people for hands-on contribution to the great, and other societal problems.

**The Next Generation Leadership Challenge**

The challenge for university leadership is to create a vision for the coming decade that fulfills the university mission while responding to these global drivers and issues.

And while institutional responsibilities will vary from place to place, the large, public research universities will likely confront most of the above-mentioned drivers and issues.

Shaping the university culture so that it can contribute and prosper under these world drivers is the most important and interesting responsibility for university leadership today.
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Spring for many of us means thoughts of gardening and finally seeing long-awaited sunshine and tulips. At NCURA, regional spring meetings are added to this list.

Keeping with spring and gardening, regional meetings offer a variety of professional development opportunities. Many seeds sown and tended at these meetings mature into tall, strong stalks of engagement. The regional meeting “scene” is robust and busy. Taking my agricultural analogy one step further, let me parody the words of Old McDonald: Here a session, there a session, everywhere a session. There are concurrent sessions, discussion groups, meal functions, receptions, small gatherings with detailed conversation, social outings, plenaries, and hospitality suites. This is NCURA.

NCURA is an association of individual members. These members are geographically organized by regions. While we may hear and make distinctions between “regional” and “national,” the reality is we are they, and they are us. Regional activities impact national, and national activities impact regional.

Often it is at a regional meeting that many of us realize we’ve stumbled into a profession rather than a job. Our first NCURA relationships are frequently fostered at our regional meeting with our regional colleagues. Once meeting a few folks and easing into increased involvement, we realize we’ve found a nurturing environment where we’re able to share our office and institutional challenges and learn best practices. This is NCURA.

Like an office water-cooler culture, many conversations occur before or after sessions, during breaks, or over a meal or beverage. Institutional competition is practically nonexistent. Instead, there is an astounding sense of share-and-share-alike, as demonstrated by the number of conversations that include something like, “We’ve written a policy for that; feel free to take all or part of it for your institution. Call me if I can help.” This is NCURA.

Our continued and increased involvement results in the growth of that collegial circle. Soon we are securing input and best practices from colleagues – nay, friends – across the nation. There is intrinsic satisfaction when able to respond to an inquiry by our university president with best practices provided from seven or eight colleagues at institutions sprinkled across the country. This is NCURA.

Involvement at all levels is crucial to NCURA’s vision and success. While NCURA engagement can be viewed as a ladder where the first step represents the region and others lead up to national involvement, a better image may be that of a simple playground merry-go-round. One can gain access at any point during its revolution.

Such is NCURA involvement. It isn’t linear, like a ladder. It’s circular and evermoving, like a merry-go-round. University research administration isn’t a job. It is a profession. NCURA provides opportunities for us to cultivate, tend, and grow our individual professional knowledge and relationships. In addition to the opportunities provided by meetings, online opportunities, telecasts, neighborhoods, and a host of other programming, I’m pleased to announce that the first of NCURA’s on-line Master’s Degree program grant recipients, the University of Central Florida, is opening its virtual doors August 22, 2011.

The implementation of the new degree programs illustrates that NCURA’s strategic plan is alive and well, as detailed in our purpose, values, and major goal:

**NCURA’s Core Purpose**

NCURA serves its members by advancing the field and profession of research administration.

**NCURA’s Core Values**

Integrity  
Excellence  
Inclusiveness  
Collegiality

**Big Audacious Goal (BAG)**

NCURA will be internationally recognized as the preeminent resource for professional development, knowledge and leadership in research administration.

Working to maintain NCURA’s strategic plan as a meaningful, living document is a serious task. It is a visionary and directional map forward, and is vital to the organization’s overall health. Yet it can only remain viable and reach fruition from member involvement. As a result, there is no right way to become more engaged in NCURA. Like hopping on a merry-go-round, there are many ways to get on board. Take one.

It’s an exciting time to be an NCURA member, as captured by the upcoming Annual Meeting theme – “Do it Live, Do it Now – Get Involved!” This is NCURA.

---

**Judy Fredenberg is the Director, Research and Sponsored Programs, University of Montana**
One of the great things about the NCURA Annual Meeting is the chance to connect and learn from each other. From our Keynote speaker to Dinner to Dancing, we’ve come up with some great ideas to give everyone the opportunity to Get Involved! Here are a few highlights:

**Keynote - Eric Haseltine** will be our keynote for AM53. He is a great speaker with high energy, a great ability to connect with our audience, good information that everyone can use, and a great story teller. Dr. Haseltine’s background is such that he definitely understands who we are: a neuroscientist; former Vice President of Imaging and head of R&D for Walt Disney’s entire corporation; Associate Director in charge of R&D at the National Security Agency and when Congress created the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, he served as their first CTO (Associate Director, National Intelligence, reporting to the Director) where he oversaw all Science and Technology.

**Welcome Lounge** – This year, we’re offering something new, along the theme of our Welcome Dinner, the informal opportunity to rest your travel weary legs and transition before your first sessions. Come join us in the back of the International Terrace, hang out, and listen to the Chris Vadala Jazz Quartet while reconnecting with friends. We’ll be open 4-7 on Saturday night (same as registration).

**Sunday Night** – a big question asked by many of you. What will we be doing for Sunday Night? Sunday Nights for many of us, growing up, were family meals, so we’ll hold a Sunday Night Welcome Dinner. This will be an informal, family-style setting to re-connect after a year away and a place to make new friends. We will follow dinner with entertainment from the Capitol Steps - a great time to have them return and provide us some levity.

**Tuesday Night** – One more round of applause for the Soul Source and No-Cost Extensions!! Matching that would be a monumental task, so we’ve taken a different approach. We are going to have a D.J., do some dancing, even have some dancing instruction. Dick Seligman and David Mayo, will you be willing to do the Electric Slide, Roger Rabbit, the Cabbage Patch, and the famous Running Man dances for us? As well as a host of other social activities, the evening will also include a fun, optional fund raising activity for those who want to throw the dice. Funds raised will be donated to an important cause. There’s no way around it … this is a “Get Involved” evening.

**DC Metro Lounge** – For all the Region II and Region III research administrators who will be commuting to AM53, we are introducing the “DC Metro Lounge.” Come hang out, put your feet up, enjoy some hospitality, and connect with your DC peeps. Please feel welcome to stop by and enjoy your home away from home right in the DC Hilton.

**REMINDER: NCURA 2011 Team Talent Search** – As a fun part of our “Get Involved” theme, we are searching… searching for NCURA talent. We’ve all heard talk of our Star Researchers - we want to find our Star Research Administrators. We are challenging our NCURA Institutions to Get Involved. Convince your office or institution to put their groove on with a skit, dance, cheer, rap, song, lip sync, or whatever your creativity can muster, please enter our star search competition - see the following website for details. [http://www.ncura.edu/content/educational_programs/sites/53/Team_Talent_Search_Competition.pdf](http://www.ncura.edu/content/educational_programs/sites/53/Team_Talent_Search_Competition.pdf)

We issue both a challenge and an invitation – “Do It LIVE”… “Do It NOW”… “GET INVOLVED”… join us at AM53 to strengthen your skills and build connections with your peers. Our 2011 National Meeting on November 6-9 in Washington D.C. will have everything you need to be professionally developed, and everything you need to enjoy being developed. Let’s make this year the best ever!!
Graduate Programs in Research Administration

An Innovative Online Master’s Degree or Graduate Certificate for Sponsored Research Professionals

- Earn an academic credential in a specialized part-time program:
  - Master of Science in Management with specialization in Research Administration: 2 years, 36 credits
  - Graduate Certificate in Research Administration: 1 year, 18 credits
- Engage with a cohort of professionals in 7-week accelerated courses delivered fully online in an asynchronous format.
- Share knowledge and learning while expanding your professional network across the country.

Emmanuel College’s graduate programs in research administration are an academic opportunity for professionals currently working in sponsored programs. The innovative curriculum addresses critical knowledge areas including finance and accounting, compliance, legal issues and organizational behavior. Online courses, led by faculty experts, extend the reach of these programs beyond the research and health care hub of Boston.
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Graduate and Professional Programs
Now the Topic is Regulatory Reform ... and Financial Reform

By David Kennedy

Carol Blum wrote in the last issue of NCURA Magazine about how regulatory reform has become a hot topic in Washington D.C. President Obama’s Executive Order 13563 triggered this trend, and subsequent directions to federal agencies to develop regulatory programs that are more effective and less burdensome put E.O. 13563 into action.

Financial reform also has gained traction. However, these days when discussing financial reform in Washington, the first thought wanders to the federal budget and the contentious battles over both the FY2011 budget (resolved, finally, and with no government shutdown!) and the FY2012 budget (which, if nothing else, promises to be good theatre). Financial reform in the context of federal research budgets is not a hopeful discussion. While the Obama Administration remains an advocate of investments in research and education, the Washington politics are such that there remain few, if any, sacred cows in the federal budget.

Financial reform, however, considered in a slightly different context may be a more heartening discussion. A number of developments over the past year, as well as new developments that could be on the horizon, may provide some reprieve for the research community.

National Science Foundation (NSF) Policy on Voluntary Committed Cost Sharing

The new NSF policy on Voluntary Committed Cost Sharing was an important gain for the research community. As described in the NSF Grants Policy Guide (Chapter II – Proposal Preparation Instructions, page II-17):

“Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited and Line M on the proposal budget will not be available for use by the proposer … Program Officers may not impose or encourage cost sharing unless such requirements are explicitly included in the program solicitation.”

The initial seed for the policy was planted in an August, 2009, report by the National Science Board (NSB), the governing body for NSF. The NSB report, “Investing in the Future: NSF Cost Sharing Policies for a Robust Federal Research Enterprise,” addressed cost sharing and the financial burden it creates. While not the primary focus of the NSB report, it also called attention to the 26-percent “administrative cap” related to the Facilities & Administrative (F&A) reimbursement process.

The NSF policy on voluntary committed cost sharing takes an important step forward in addressing the unintended financial consequences created by voluntary committed cost sharing. When an institution is compelled to cost share for “competitive” purposes, this is disruptive to the merit-based research enterprise. Adoption of the NSF policy by all funding agencies, while not imminent, would be welcomed by the research community.

Government Accountability Office (GAO) Report on Indirect Costs and the DOD 35-percent Cap

The GAO study entitled, “University Research: Policies for the Reimbursement of Indirect Costs Need to be Updated,” was released in September, 2010, and focused on the F&A reimbursement process. The driver for the study was to look more closely at the Department of Defense (DOD) 35-percent limitation on DOD-funded basic research awards, which was enacted in the FY2007 DOD Appropriations bill. The GAO report included internal DOD administrative recommendations to the Secretary of Defense and three GAO recommendations directed to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB):

“[1] Identify methods to ensure that the rate-setting process is applied consistently at all schools, regardless of which agency [Division of Cost Allocation, Department of Health and Human Services and Office of Naval Research, Department.
of Defense] has rate cognizance ... [2] Clarify the roles and responsibilities of federal agencies ... in accepting applications and reevaluating the eligibility of schools to receive the utility cost adjustment ... [and 3] Reexamine and determine whether reimbursing administrative costs at a maximum rate of 26 percent achieves the appropriate level of cost control and achieves the government’s objective that the federal government bears its fair share of total costs.”

OMB has yet to respond to the GAO recommendations. However, the first two recommendations could yield near-term benefits to the research community. Both more consistency and predictability added to the F&A rate-setting process and extending the utility cost adjustment (a 1.3% increment to the F&A rate) to all research institutions (currently, only 65 schools are eligible) would be desirable outcomes. As the third recommendation, reexamination of the 26 percent cap may not produce a change, but like the NSB recommendation, it keeps a focus on the cap.

As for the DOD 35-percent cap, it is no more! The FY2011 final budget bill (H.R. 1473) passed on April 14, 2011 eliminated the cap language; by virtue of the deletion of the language imposing the cap, the DOD cap should be eliminated for new awards issued by DOD.

National Academies, National Research Council (NRC) “Study on Research Universities”

As described in the last issue of NCURA Magazine, the NRC has been charged to address the top ten actions that research university stakeholders and the nation can take to ensure U.S. global competitiveness. This initiative was started in response to a bipartisan request by Senators Lamar Alexander (R-TN) and Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) and Representatives Bart Gordon (retired) (D-TN) and Ralph Hall (R-TX) for a study focused on the health and competitiveness of our nation’s research universities. Recommendations to minimize regulatory burden, as well as financial burden, at U.S. research institutions may be addressed in the final NRC report and could represent new leverage to advocate for regulatory and financial reform. A final report is expected this summer.

The Role of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and Harmonizing Circular A-21

OMB is central to financial reform initiatives that would help the research community. OMB is the gatekeeper to the “Costing Principles” for grantees from Higher Education, Non-Profit Organizations, and Hospitals (Circular A-21, codified in 2 CFR, Part 220; Circular A-122, codified in 2 CFR, Part 230; and Appendix E to 45 CFR, Part 74; respectively).

Harmonizing Circular A-21 (as well as the non-profit and hospital cost principles) is a call by the research community to OMB, requesting that OMB enforce the consistent application of federal cost principles by federal agencies. For example, an institution’s negotiated F&A research rate, unless statutorily prohibited, should be accepted by all federal funding agencies on all federally sponsored research programs. Arbitrary F&A caps or vague requests for institutional cost sharing lead to additional financial pressures on research institutions and contribute to an unpredictable and unstable regulatory environment. Based on talks between OMB and several Wash-

Ontario-based associations, there is optimism that OMB will initiate actions that promote the harmonization and consistent application of federal costing principles by all federal agencies.

Regulatory and financial reform that impacts the research community in a positive manner requires engagement on diverse fronts, as well as a convergence of events that amount to “being in the right place, at the right time.” Nothing is a sure bet in Washington, but at least for now, the door is ajar to reforms that could have beneficial implications for the research community.
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Tips on Hiring, Training and Developing Departmental Research Administrators

By Lauren Robertson and Susan Zipkin

Hiring a Departmental Research Administrator (DRA) can be a challenge in today’s environment. There is high demand for strong departmental administrators, and if you can not offer a highly competitive salary, you may not have a very big pool of candidates to select from. If you are fortunate enough to attract an experienced DRA, you will still need to get them up to speed on your own institutional systems as well as any departmental shadow systems that you maintain. This article is aimed at those of you who may not have been successful in recruiting the experienced DRA, and must work to develop employees with little or no research administration experience. If you are one who needs to spend more time training your new DRA, do not be discouraged. There are advantages to starting with a blank slate when training a DRA who is not influenced by previous experience.

The first thing to consider is what role the Departmental Research Administrator will play. The DRA is often referred to as the middle person who navigates through the bureaucracy of the institution so that the PI is able to focus on his/her research with minimal disruption. A DRA is someone who facilitates all things administrative and essentially “make things happen,” be it hiring a new research technician, processing purchase orders, or submitting grant proposals. The Departmental Research Administrator is considered the “go to” person for the PI and the institution’s central research administrator.

The first step to building a strong research team within your department is hiring a DRA with the right qualities to complement your existing group and fill any unmet needs. There are several factors to consider when determining the right qualities. For example, how is your department currently structured (e.g., roles split by pre/post award activities, by PI groups, etc.), and the nature of the portfolio for which you are trying to place the DRA (e.g., clinical, corporate, complicated T’s, F’s, K’s and multi project grants, or more standard federal awards). Furthermore, it is essential to consider what the basic technical and non-technical skills are that one needs to be a successful research administrator in your group/institution. There are many responsibilities of a departmental grants administrator that can be learned. Rules and regulations are updated continuously, as are policies, procedures and protocols that must be followed. However, there are certain innate characteristics that cannot be learned or “trained.”

What kinds of characteristics should you look for in an effective DRA? Communication is one of the most important, if not the most important, aspects of research administration. Therefore, individuals with excellent verbal and written communication skills are good candidates for the DRA role. Equally important is one’s ability to work independently with little or no direction, followed by multitasking, flexibility, and a good sense of humor. All are key qualities to look for when interviewing potential candidates. For the most part, persons who possess these qualities can be trained on the technical aspects of research administration. However, training typically does not stop with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circulars and Requests for Applications (RFA’s). In order to ensure success, it is critical to train the new DRA on how to be successful in their interactions with their PI’s, their central research management office, and other administrators with whom they might interact (within and outside of their department).

Examples of best practices for good communication include monthly meetings with PI’s (these can be quarterly for less active PI’s) followed up with a summary of items discussed including action items and timelines, and weekly one-on-one meetings between the DRA and his/her supervisor to review outstanding issues. A log maintained by the DRA of all outstanding issues sorted by action types (e.g., new accounts, set up projections, salary distribution changes, progress reports, accounts ending in 90 days, deficits, etc.) and reviewed weekly until issues are resolved is an excellent tool to keep the DRA on track. Attaching action items for each issue discussed is critical for identifying ownership of responsibilities. Communication is the biggest and most important tool that you have in research administration. Holding regular meetings with the PI and the central research administration office will help to make good grants and contracts management practices as transparent and easy to facilitate as possible.

DRA’s have many competing forces vying for their attention. They are often faced with competing requests and may be unsure how to respond. DRA’s are responsible for meeting the needs of their direct supervisors, PI’s within their group, the department chair, and institutional leadership. Therefore it is critical to mentor a DRA to be tolerant and politically correct. Taking ownership of issues and not attempting to “pass the buck” is important for successful management of research portfolios. Teaching a DRA to be proactive and providing the needed support and tools for them to do their job is also critical.

In order to stay consistent and focused throughout the grants management process, it is important for a department or center to have a mission/vision for its research administration team to follow. This will set the tone for what is expected from everyone in the group. An example would be, “To serve as an efficient, knowledgeable and dependable source of information for PI’s; To be a source of accurate and timely guidance to support PI’s in advancing their research portfolio; To ensure that PI’s are in compliance at all times; To be proactive with financial projections and reviews; To promote a sense of trust and stability for PI’s.”

Regardless of the new DRA’s primary role (pre or post award), it is important to train him or her...
on the entire grant lifecycle. The PI does not want to and often cannot differentiate between pre and post award activities, and the better versed all administrators are the less the PI will be impacted by administrative details. When available, Departmental Research Administrators should always take advantage of any “in house” training that your central research administration office may offer. Such trainings are important to ensure a DRA understands institutional policies and procedures. In addition, it is important to make sure staff are well versed on your departmental systems for monitoring expenses and projecting fund balances.

To assist with the training process, there are many great external resources available, including NCURA’s Departmental Research Administration and Financial Research Administration traveling workshops, as well as NCURA Fundamentals and SPA II. These are great opportunities for intensive training that can supplement the experience of national and regional meeting workshops and concurrent sessions, which are also very important to the development of Departmental Research Administrators.

Another often overlooked informal training tool is Listservs. DRAs should be encouraged to participate on Listservs, which are a great source of exposure to a variety of questions surrounding unusual situations, as well as a variety of “options” for any given situation. All research administrators have access to the Research Administration Listserv administered by Mike Varney (see http://lists.healthresearch.org for details). Members of NCURA can also take advantage of the NCURA Neighborhoods Listservs and websites. NCURA has created a virtual neighborhood for Departmental Administrators, in addition to ones for Compliance, Electronic Research, Financial Research, International, Pre-Award, and Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions. In addition to the Listservs, each of the neighborhoods offer valuable information that is updated frequently on the websites. Each neighborhood website features monthly articles spotlighting a research administrator or topic in “your field” (neighborhood) that can lend a fresh perspective on current issues. NCURA also supports some regional Listservs that can be a great source of information on local and state issues.

We are also beginning to see the development of accredited academic programs that offer masters level degrees and/or certificates in research administration. For example, Emmanuel College offers a graduate certificate and a Master of Science in Management with specialization in Research Administration. These professionally relevant courses taught by faculty experts are offered at the college’s Boston campus or can be taken entirely online. Also, NCURA awarded an Implementation Grant for a Master’s Degree in University Research Administration to both the University of Central Florida and Rush University Medical Center, and these two institutions are planning to enroll students in their graduate programs in the near future.

Research is evolving and policies are constantly changing, so there is a never ending need for training. Encouraging and supporting staff at all levels to access external resources and stay educated is very important. Although focusing efforts on training new staff is critical, it is also important to remember that in order to stay compliant there is always a need for training opportunities. Training helps to keep your staff engaged and empowers them to make decisions and act independently. Not only will you thank yourself for keeping your staff current, but your staff and your PI’s will thank you.

Lauren Robertson, MHA, MSM, Administrative Manager of Research, Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women’s Hospital began her research administration career at Children’s Hospital Boston in 2005. Lauren is a graduate of the Emmanuel College, Master of Science in Management with specialization in Research Administration.

Susan Zipkin, MBA, CRA, Director, Radiology Research Finance, Brigham and Women’s Hospital began her research administration career at Boston University Medical School in 1984. Susan is a graduate of NCURA’s Leadership Development Institute and the Brigham and Women’s Leadership Competencies for Managers program. Susan is currently serving her term as Immediate Past Chair of Region I.
Research Administration Metrics:

Making Your Numbers Tell the Right Story

By Martin Smith and Andres Chan
Introduction

Numbers alone have little to no meaning unless they are evaluated in a proper context. Does 4% mean more or less than 87%? If the context is change in F&A cost recovery and 4% represents an overall increase and 87% represents a decline in awards with no F&A recovery, then they are both meaningful in a positive way. The number $0.00 could mean something negative if it represents a zero dollar growth in research, but could mean something more significant if it represents a variance between a research dollar goal and actual research dollars brought in. Numbers are objective in that they have a finite value; however, when or how we assign a context to those numbers may place more subjectivity on their relevance.

We want to introduce you to how we stumbled on how a statistical revolution in professional baseball called Sabermetrics, which is generally defined as “the search for objective knowledge about baseball”1 and “the mathematical and statistical analysis of baseball.”2 What does this mean? Very simply put, it means numbers of home runs or strikeouts alone do not determine whether your favorite star player is better or worse than my star player. To illustrate will require us to digress from research administration just a little to share a story we hope many of you can relate to.

We worked together at a consulting firm and when traveling to the home office outside of Chicago, we would often meet up for dinner and talk about something other than research administration—but of course, not for long. Martin is from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania—home of the Philadelphia Phillies and Andres is from Los Angeles, California—home of the Los Angeles Dodgers. Both teams are not natural rivals being on separate coasts in different divisions. However, the summer of 2008 was a good baseball year for both the Phillies and Dodgers. That year, Andres’ Dodgers acquired Manny Ramirez, a future Hall of Famer with great statistics, while Martin’s Phillies acquired Matt Stairs, somewhat of a journeyman player at the end of his career with far less stellar statistics. It turned out that the celebrated acquisition of Ramirez helped the Dodgers make the playoffs. However, the Phillies also made the playoffs and with the help of Stairs in a key playoff game against the Dodgers propelled the Phillies to an unlikely win en route to the World Series.3 During that series, the Phillies’ Stairs had only 1 at bat, where he hit a homerun that drove in 2 runs.3 Meanwhile, Ramirez had 15 at bats, with 7 hits, 2 home runs, scored 4 runs, and batted in 7 runs.4 Who had the better series? From a numbers standpoint, it was the Dodger’s Ramirez. Using the more objective Sabermetrics criteria, it was the Phillies’ Stairs with his sole at bat in one game during the series that made a more significant impact.

How does this relate to research administration? Well, if your institution recruits a renowned, well-funded faculty member will it mean your research base will be more fruitful than had it recruited 3 junior faculty members in promising areas of science? How about from a compliance standpoint; would a cost transfer performed 12 days after the original transaction occurred be more compliant than a cost transfer performed 89 days after the original transaction occurred? What if the 12-day cost transfer happened 45 days after the award ended, which would have meant the original transaction also posted after the award ended.

The purpose of this article will help you think about using Sabermetrics techniques to analyze different types of research administration metrics for more objective and subsequently meaningful results. Using a secondary variance analysis will be a key component to achieving more meaningful analysis from those metrics.

Performance Metrics

A common question asked this time of year as institutions that close on June 30th are completing performance reviews, self-assessments, and analyzing whether goals were met will ask “how did we do?” This is a simple yet oftentimes difficult question to answer. If you work in a Post-Award office, you know you submitted numerous invoices, drew-down from letters of credit, processed more cost transfers than you would have preferred, and engaged in countless debates that usually begin with “well, it depends…” but still struggle with what are good performance metrics?

Performance metrics should be captured to identify areas of concern to build improvement in those areas. For example, if your accounts receivables are aging well over 180 days then your institution may be interested in creating performance metrics to manage its way into improved accounts receivable numbers. Creating a simple schedule (see Table 1) to breakdown the A/R portfolio could provide some meaningful, objective information to start analyzing why the collections are taking so long for cash to come in.

In this example, the Average Days Outstanding metric is only 55 days where $3.5M of the $31M portfolio is outstanding. The outstanding amount represents 11.29% of the portfolio ($3.5M / $31M). The anomaly in this case that is driving the higher Average Days Outstanding metric seems to be related to State and Local Government sponsors.

Another metric to use for a Secondary Variance Analysis would be Days Variance from Mean. This is the variance between the Average Days Outstanding for each sponsor type (Table 1, last column) compared to the weighted Average Days Outstanding for the entire portfolio (55 days). This secondary variance analysis will tell you a different story to help you fine-tune your analysis.

In this second case, your federal sponsors are paying you 30 days better than average, with industry sponsors coming in next at 13 days better than the average for your portfolio. Management could respond by focusing collection efforts on

---

2 Chen, Albert, Stairs’ home run moves Phillies within a victory of World Series, Sports Illustrated, October 14, 2008, found online at http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/2008/writers/albert_chen/10/14/phillies.dodgers.game4/.
3 Matt Stairs’ career playoff statistics found online at http://www.baseball-reference.com/players/k/stairma01.shtml
4 Manny Ramirez’s career playoff statistics found online at http://www.baseball-reference.com/players/ramisma02.shtml

---

Table 1: Sample Performance Metrics to Analyze Accounts Receivable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor Type</th>
<th>Award Expenditures</th>
<th>Collected</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Average Days Outstanding</th>
<th>Days Variance from Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$14,500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Local</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Sponsors</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$31,000,000</td>
<td>$27,500,000</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the state and local government sponsors and foundation sponsors to improve the overall metrics. This analysis, with subsequent prescribed actions to improve collections, may translate into an improved cash position for your institution.

Performance metrics could be used for anything ranging from award set-ups, to close-outs, to analyzing number of transactions processed. Adding a secondary variance analysis, similar to the last column in Table 1, will enhance the analysis. Also, preparing this type of table for a series of periods (e.g. months in a fiscal year, or fiscal year over fiscal year) will add a trend dimension where improvement can be tracked over time. If the numbers spike up in one fiscal year, that could have corresponded with a system enhancement or some other major obstacle that delayed invoicing and skewed the numbers. Be sure to bring in outside factors when analyzing the metrics so your results tell a proper story.

Compliance Metrics

Mitigating financial compliance risks is simple to do when transactions are analyzed using proper metrics, including a secondary variance analysis. Any auditor can tell you there are numerous ways to find financial transactions that stick out so much that you should be able to catch them before your auditors do. Approaches range from analyzing spending patterns on different types of awards to looking at content-specific metrics for effort reporting, cost transfers, and direct-charging of administrative costs.

Typical award spending may look like the graph in Figure 1 (see below), where expenditures are slow to start as new staff come on board and project work then increases as the project ramps up. However, if award spending occurs so late into the project this may be a red flag that is indicative of other project risks (see Figure 2 below). Plotting these trends is very simple to do using award expenditure data by high-level object code categories. A program such as Microsoft Excel will allow you to create charts with ease. Similar to the discussion earlier, be sure to choose multiple periods of time (e.g. fiscal months) to ensure reliable trending data.

Some other tips and tricks to use when analyzing spending patterns include:
1. Prepare Common-Size Statements by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Transaction Date</th>
<th>Month-End Date</th>
<th>Cost Transfer Date</th>
<th># Days from Transaction Month-End Date</th>
<th>Timely Cost Transfer</th>
<th>Award End-Date</th>
<th>Days from Award End-Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/15/10</td>
<td>10/31/10</td>
<td>11/20/10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; 90 Days</td>
<td>10/31/10</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11/05/10</td>
<td>11/30/10</td>
<td>12/20/10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>&lt; 90 Days</td>
<td>06/30/11</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>07/17/10</td>
<td>07/31/10</td>
<td>11/20/10</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>&gt; 90 Days</td>
<td>05/31/11</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>09/19/10</td>
<td>09/30/10</td>
<td>12/15/10</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>&lt; 90 Days</td>
<td>10/31/10</td>
<td>(45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12/01/10</td>
<td>12/31/10</td>
<td>12/20/10</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>&lt; 90 Days</td>
<td>07/31/11</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>08/19/10</td>
<td>08/31/10</td>
<td>12/20/10</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>&gt; 90 Days</td>
<td>09/15/10</td>
<td>(96)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
representing each MTDC or TDC Category as a percentage of TDC; compare variances between different awards
2. Exclude unique awards that will skew data (training grants, equipment grants, and multisite cooperative agreements)
3. Perform analysis by sponsor types and group by award types for similar awards to compare to one another
4. Never jump to conclusions—find the trends and ask the question of the PI and/or Department Administrator to learn the story behind the trend

Another good financial compliance area to deploy objective metrics would be with evaluating cost transfers. As we mentioned earlier, there appears to be a focus on the timeliness of the cost transfer (i.e. within 90 days); however, competing circumstances may be ignored. Consider whether other underlying circumstances are driving the reason for the cost transfer.

Questions to ask include:
1) Was the award being charged set-up late?
2) Should a pre-award spending account have been established?
3) Is the award that will be debited ending soon?
4) Was the transaction initially denied, charged to another award, and now coming back for a second chance via cost transfer?
5) Is the award that will be credited overspent?

Assume your institution defines cost transfer discovery-date as the month-end date from when a transaction occurs. Using timeliness criteria alone may make many institutions more comfortable to approve cost transfers when occur within 90 days of month-end of the original charge. Using data presented in Table 2, this would mean transactions #1, 2, 4 & 5 would be acceptable and transactions #3 & 6 would be risky. Bringing in a secondary variance for criteria such as Days from Award End-Date provides another dimension where transactions #1 and 4 would be just as risky as those where the timeliness standard was used alone.

There are other criteria that could be pulled into your metrics to tell different stories. For example, adding a column to know whether the principal investigator (PI) approved the original transaction would be helpful to establish how allocability of the original charge was determined. The best part about constructing objective metrics and associated secondary variances is that there are multiple approaches without a wrong way to do it.

Looking at direct charging of salaries is another area where we can use these types of analyses. Normally one would focus their activities to job titles containing the more common administrative functions. Those with keywords of administration, administrator, clerical, admin staff, etc. While those job titles should be included in your routine analysis there are others that may need a closer look at. While job titles vary by institution, look for those where you believe additional review may be needed.

In Table 3 for instance, there is a series of “Program” title codes. While most of the salaries for these job titles are paid by non-sponsored funds, additional focus should be made to the individuals being paid from sponsored funds. Depending on how many individuals fall into that category, you may choose to sample all or some transaction, and conduct interviews with the staff to determine their actual duties. You may discover the individuals who are paid from sponsored funds are actually performing administrative duties such as proposal preparation, grant management and other administrative functions. If these employees are paid 100% by sponsored funds and the accounts do not meet the criteria of a “Major Project” then you may have a compliance risk.

Conclusion

Whichever approach your institution takes to performance metrics—be sure to analyze whether your numbers are telling the right story. This can be accomplished through a variety of approaches including using more objective criteria, considering other circumstances, or calculating a secondary variance. Remember the numbers only tell enough of a story to send you down a better path to ask the right questions in order to resolve performance issues or mitigate financial compliance risks. Diligence in the follow-up actions to those metrics will yield the best results.

Martin Smith recently joined The George Washington University as the Associate Director for Strategy and Compliance, in the Office of Grant and Contract Accounting Services. Martin earned an M.B.A. in Finance from La Salle University, and a B.B.A. in Accounting from Temple University. Martin has 9 years of research administration experience working directly for higher education institutions in financial compliance, finance, and post-award roles; and as a consultant performing compliance risk assessments and effort reporting system implementations.

Andres Chan is a Senior Manager at the Office of Financial Analysis at the University of Southern California. He has over 11 years of experience in post award administration with primary focus on Indirect Costs, Space Studies, Recharge Centers and A-21 compliance issues. He has also worked as a consultant for 2 years with MAXIMUS where he was responsible for preparing and negotiating F&A proposals along with numerous costs analyses projects including space surveys, along with compliance and cost reviews of Recharge Centers. Prior to that, he worked for 7 years at the California Institute of Technology under similar roles.
After returning to our respective home institutions, we both breathed a sigh of relief that our work was done, the conference was over, and according to our colleagues, a big success. The weather in San Diego was beautiful, and all of the speakers made it without a hitch (including our federal representatives – no government shut-down!). With over 700 in attendance, the conference offered 20 workshops and over 100 sessions to support the theme “Looking Forward Strategically: Balancing Collaboration, Problem-Solving and Accountability.”

One of our favorite moments was the opening session’s premiere of “Law and Auditor.” Featuring actor/comedian Paul Mercurio, this series of video clips presented scenarios with an auditor interviewing a central research administrator, a departmental administrator, and a faculty member. It was great fun to share some laughs and experiences with all of our colleagues. Many thanks to Vivian Holmes for introducing the clips and facilitating the discussion. If you were not able to attend the conference or you would like to watch the videos again, the clips are now available on the NCURA website in the Members section. The ending may surprise you!

The concurrent sessions and discussion groups covered the gamut of financial research administration. With sessions such as “Federal Representatives Roundtable,” “Improving Research Administration Effectiveness,” and even “Implementing Crazy Ideas,” it was hard to choose which one to attend. There was a great deal of information shared and opportunities to ask questions of each other. We both learned so much from hearing how our colleagues handle the same issues we are trying to resolve. The handout link is still active for attendees, so feel free to check back for copies of the materials presented during the conference.

Special thanks to the FRA 12 Program Committee, the workshop faculty, the session speakers, the discussion group leaders, the volunteers, and the NCURA staff for helping us put together an outstanding program! It’s never too early to start planning for next year, so mark your calendars now for FRA 13. It will be held March 26-28, 2012 at the Walt Disney World Swan and Dolphin Resort in Orlando, Florida. See you there!
Kay Ellis and Bob Andresen served as Co-Chairs of FRA 12. Kay is the Export Controls Officer at University of Arizona; Bob is the Assistant Director, Post-Award Services, Research & Sponsored Programs, at University of Wisconsin-Madison.
As research administrators, we think about money all the time. How can we get more money for our research? How much money are we cost sharing? How much money have we spent this year? How much money have we received in awards? How much money is left for a no cost extension? Money, money, money! But that is OPM – other people’s money. Let’s take a moment to think about the money you are paid for securing, managing, accounting for, or reporting on OPM. How are we doing individually and as a profession?

Research Administration Salaries

The 2010 Research Administrators Stress Perception Survey (2010 RASPerS) collected salary information from over 1,138 research administrators across the country. The data from the survey showed that about 80% of research administrators have annual salaries of over $50,000. As shown in Table 1, 40% of research administrators earn within the range of $50,000 to $74,999 per year. Fewer than 3% earn less than $35,000 and almost 18% earn over $100,000 as research administrators. How does this compare with similar professions?

Comparison with other U.S. workers

Salary data from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) give us some benchmarks with which to compare ourselves. The BLS reported the median annual earnings of all U.S. fulltime workers at $38,740. For those of you for whom it’s been a while since your last statistics course, the median means that half of all workers make higher than that amount and half of all workers make lower than that amount.

The 2010 RASPerS data show where we fall within five salary ranges, rather than actual salary amounts for each individual. From the RASPerS data we can see that at least 2.6% are in a salary range that is lower than the U.S. median of $38.7K. There were 18.0% reporting their earnings were in the $35-49.9K range. Of those, we can assume some would be over and some would be under the national median of $38.7K. Assuming a normal bell-shaped distribution within the $35-49.9K salary range would support the likelihood that since $38.7K falls well below the midpoint of the $35-49.9K range, more than half of the 18.0% in that $35-49.9K range are above the $38.7K point. But even putting statistical probability aside, we can clearly see that 79.4% are in salary ranges that earn $50K or more. So we can say with certainty that as a group, research administrators earn well above the U.S. median income.

Education

The 2009 U.S. Census (Educational Attainment) reports that only 29% of the U.S. has completed a college degree of bachelor’s or higher. We know from both the Research Administrator Survey (Roberts & House, 2006) and the 2010 RASPerS that research administrators are far above average when it comes to education. The 2010 RASPerS data shows 89% of research administrators have achieved bachelor’s or higher. U.S. Census data over the years consistently shows higher educational achievement is associated with higher average earnings. The BLS reports the median for all workers with a bachelor’s degree or higher is $60,216. This can be broken down a little further to show the median for those with bachelor’s only as being at $54,288 and for those with an advanced degree as being at $71,136. Again, looking at our salary ranges in Figure 1, we find 40% are in the same range of the median salaries for those with higher education degrees, and another 39.4% earning salaries in the two higher ranges. With that, I believe we can feel comfortable with our salaries being in line with our educational levels.
Another characteristic which we might use to view our salaries is the area of responsibility. While 29% may have college degrees, all degreeed occupations do not have the same earning power. The BLS reports those in management, business, and financial operations occupations generally earn more than those in sales or professional occupations. The median income for management, business and financial operations occupations is $59,748; for sales is $33,124; and for professional occupations is $52,520. Again, looking back at Table 1, we see that most research administrators are in salary ranges that either meet or exceed the median salaries for those in management, business and financial operations.

Gender considerations

The salaries discussed above consider the median or mean earnings of all workers. One cannot consider salary without bearing in mind the gender bias that is still alive and well in the workplace today. This is an especially important factor when discussing an occupational group that is comprised of a population that is about 80% female with a reported gender bias present (Shambrook, Roberts & Triscari, 2010.) The U.S. Census Bureau reports the ratio for women’s earnings to men’s earnings was 78.2%. Stated in monetary terms, for every dollar a man earns, a woman in a similar situation will earn about 78 cents. Table 2 shows the median earnings for men, for women and what we should expect to see for the 80/20 female/male

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Salary</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$35,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$100,000</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor's degree</th>
<th>Advanced degree</th>
<th>Management, business, and financial operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All workers</td>
<td>$54,288</td>
<td>$71,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male workers</td>
<td>$63,284</td>
<td>$80,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female workers</td>
<td>$47,268</td>
<td>$62,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA gender adjusted</td>
<td>$50,471</td>
<td>$65,718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor's degree</th>
<th>Advanced degree</th>
<th>Management, business, and financial operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All workers</td>
<td>$54,288</td>
<td>$71,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male workers</td>
<td>$63,284</td>
<td>$80,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female workers</td>
<td>$47,268</td>
<td>$62,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA gender adjusted</td>
<td>$50,471</td>
<td>$65,718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mix found in research administration when adjusted for gender.

When comparing the salaries reported in the 2010 RASPerS with the median salaries reported by the BLS, it can be said that, as a profession, research administrators appear to be earning at or above the median salary range for our educational level and area of responsibility even before adjusting for gender.

RA Roles

Research administrators perform different primary functions. Table 3 illustrates the responses to the 2010 RASPerS question: “What is your primary role in research administration?” segregated by salary range. Research administrators working in pre-award and post-award have a significantly higher likelihood of being in the lower salary ranges than those serving as departmental administrators, research ethics and compliance or other roles. Those in research ethics and compliance and “other” RA roles are represented with greater percentages in the two highest salary ranges. Department administrators had 41.4% in the highest two salary ranges. Those in pure pre- or post-award each had around 30% in the highest two ranges.

Benefits

Employee benefits vary from institution to institution, but we do have one measure of employee benefits that was collected in the 2010 RASPerS: health insurance. Just prior to data collection for the 2010 RASPerS, the 2009 American Community Survey reported that 20.6% of the total U.S. civilian population between the ages of 18 and 64 years old did not have health insurance. For those employed full time, the number dropped to 13.4% uninsured. Only 6.4% of those with a bachelor’s degree or higher were without health insurance. The 2010 RASPerS showed that only less than one percent of research administrators were uninsured. Of the 1,126 research administrators responding to the question about health insurance status, 99.5% indicated they had health insurance.

So, how are we doing?

Looking at all of this together, whether looking at comparisons with all occupations, or by educational attainment, and even when accounting for gender bias, it looks like we are doing quite well as a profession. Our salaries tend to be above the median when compared against all occupations, or against those with similar educational attainment. Our salaries appear to be higher that would be expected considering our gender composition of 80% female. Additionally, we have benefits that are significantly better than the national norm. All that, and we get to participate in a profession that helps move the body of knowledge forward for the benefit of the quality of life for all mankind. For me, I’ll feel some satisfaction in that, then turn my attention back to OPM.

References:


BLS, Usual Weekly Earnings of Wage and Salary Workers, 3rd Quarter 2010.

2009 ACS Health Insurance Coverage Status, U.S. Census Bureau.

2009 ACS Educational Attainment, U.S. Census Bureau.


Dr. Jennifer Shambrook serves as Director of the Grant & Contract Management Office at St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital. She is keenly interested in research administration as an emerging occupation and is the author of the 2007 and 2010 RASPerS.
Like most of you in research administration, I constantly dread the latest e-mail announcement that one of our teammates is leaving our office and our field. It happens too often. While we are happy for their future plans, our thoughts tend to focus on who will take on their duties, how long will the interview process take, and when will we find time to train the new employee.

The focus of my MPA Professional Paper was on career ladders as a method to reduce turnover in sponsored programs offices. I wanted to share some of the information I found with you and also open a discussion about this issue. Several of the sources I used examined why people stay instead of the more studied issue of why people leave. This made me wonder why those of us who have been doing this for a while continue within research administration. I also wanted to learn more about what we can do as managers to improve employee retention.

Employee turnover or retention in research administration has been an issue for many years. It is becoming more of a problem as the information needed to become a successful administrator continues to grow and become more complex. Our jobs often require a greater level of experience and confidence as the learning curve becomes steeper and gray areas increase.

As research administrator positions turn over, providing good support to departments and faculty members becomes more difficult. Remaining administrators are often over-burdened with additional work and training duties. They may become less engaged and start to look for new opportunities. This can lead to multiple administrators leaving at once. I personally refer to this as the snowball effect.

Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, and Erez examined job embeddedness (2001, pp. 1102-1121). Job embeddedness is the sum of all internal and external components that influence an individual to remain at his or her current job, or to leave that job. Understanding these components allows managers to influence them in positive ways that will help their employees feel more attached to the organization. Mitchell et al., argue that by measuring job embeddedness as a causal indicator, an organization can predict turnover (2001, pp. 1102).

The components of job embeddedness they examined are links, fit, and sacrifice. They see links as the important relationships that workers have with the environment around them, including family, friends, and co-workers. There are pressures from these linkages to continue to work. Leaving a position could diminish these links or reduce them entirely (Mitchell et al., 2001, pp. 1104-1105). Fit is related to how well a person’s values fit within the goals and culture of the organization, as well as the community as a whole. A good fit may result in an increased attachment to the organization (Mitchell et al., 2001, pp. 1104-1105).

Finally, sacrifice is made up of the costs and loss of benefits beyond money that are associated with leaving a job. One may have to give up interesting projects and co-workers. If the benefits of leaving are greater than the benefits of staying, turnover is likely. Keeping employees engaged and excited about their work could improve retention (Mitchell, et al., 2001, pp. 1104-1105).

Although it would be difficult to measure every employee’s embeddedness level, being aware of these components gives managers the opportunity to address related issues and encourage attachment. Links could be strengthened by social activities at work such as monthly birthday celebrations and recognition of life events like wedding showers or employment anniversaries. Fit could be increased by evaluating administrators’ strengths and focusing their efforts in areas that interest them when available. Providing access to training and mentoring may also be beneficial to increasing one’s fit. Reducing sacrifice may include educating staff about long term employment benefits or introducing a career ladder with clear steps for advancement.

Oscar Grusky also studied a related concept of employee commitment (1966, pp. 488-503). In
his article, “Career Mobility and Organizational Commitment,” Grusky hypothesized that “(1) the greater the rewards received, the greater the degree of the person’s commitment, and (2) the greater the obstacles the person has to overcome in order to obtain the organization’s rewards, the greater his commitment. (Grusky, 1966, p. 488)”

Grusky studied four areas of commitment. These included seniority, identification with the company, attitude toward management, and general satisfaction. His conclusions revealed that the first hypothesis above was not supported, but the second hypothesis was supported (Grusky, 1966, p. 488).

These studies were applicable to research administration because they address the issue of why people stay and provide opportunities to encourage administrators to stay beyond pay increase or flex time that are often unavailable. It seems that it is not always what a person gets out of a job, but what they have personally invested that creates commitment to the organization.

Long-term research administrators may stay because we have personally invested in the field of research administration. This investment may be in the form of advanced training, certification, or internal office processes and involvement. As managers, we should provide opportunities for our new employees to become more engaged with research administration. They need to see it as a career and not simply a job at the university.

Research administrators and management must often be reactive to retention issues, and have difficulty creating proactive solutions. Some research administration organizations may have developed specific programs to curb turnover, but there is no one fix for every situation. Ways of analyzing and reducing turnover vary within professions, but good comparisons, such as with teachers and nurses, are available.

Continuing to share experiences with each other through such organizations as NCURA will also help universities to see what each are doing and adapt models to their needs. The future for sponsored research is busy, but bright, if research administration managers can be proactive in their efforts to retain administrators. 
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Factors for Successful R&D Collaborations Between Chinese Universities and Multinational Companies

By Ma Jun

Introduction

Globalization in the world today is increasingly important from both scientific and economic perspectives. Due to the limited available research resources in today’s world, commercialization by industry of the results from university research is an important instrument both for leverage of research resources and to promote the application of research results for societal benefit. In line with dynamic and rapid growth in China, more and more multinational companies are choosing to carry out their business in China. Therefore, international R&D collaboration between Chinese universities and multinational companies is increasingly becoming a gateway for public society to benefit from international production. As the top comprehensive, research-oriented and open university in China, Tsinghua plays a leading role in university-multinational industry R&D collaborations. The questions of how to effectively make use of the resources of the two parties and of how to best manage the collaboration so that a successful university-industry partnership can be established are the first concerns when a collaborative project is initiated. In the following sections several business, economic and legal factors are discussed—those that have been studied and identified over a number of years that help to guarantee a win-win relationship in university-industry R&D collaborations.

Topic Selection

A key point is that the university should be widely involved as part of the governing body for the project at an early stage in the discussion process in order to decide which topics are worth developing. These discussions can be carried out via a combination of face-to-face meetings, telephone meetings, written communications, and electronic mail. As part of this process, three elements are identified that should be considered:

(i) The needs of industry. For companies, university-industry R&D collaboration is not pure research but is a market-driven and value-added cooperation. Access to ideas in multiple markets, responsiveness to local needs and to Chinese governmental policy, and obtaining profit from the collaboration are all important potential objectives for a company. In this case topic selection should reflect the needs and benefits for the company;

(ii) Technology advancement. University professors are experienced at finding technological challenges and are interested in conducting leading-edge research, while companies are often at the forefront of technological innovation. A good research project must therefore encompass an advanced technological study in order to stimulate the research interests of scientists involved in the project. Without the early engagement of university scientists in the topic selection process and in setting up a purchase order for topics coming from industry, both parties may end up regretting later finding out that the research direction is wrong or that the research is not in the university’s interest or that it cannot satisfy the requirements from industry; and

(iii) Research capacity. It should be made clear in a R&D contract that university scientists will only undertake work that lies within their capabilities and meets the mission requirements of the university. The university should be careful not to accept work that is related to a company’s objective but is outside the R&D scope of the university, such as public relation work or other non-scientific work. An example can be given for a project solely sponsored by a multinational company. Here the university rejected a provision in the project contract drafted by the company that required the university to do some PR work towards adoption into Chinese industry standards of the research results and the relevant intellectual property rights deriving from the project, on the grounds that such activities are beyond the scope of R&D efforts.

Economic Factors

Within economic factors there are aspects both of costs and benefits. Here we only address issues relating to costs, and address economic benefits in the subsequent section on intellectual property (IP). The university and the company should work out a comprehensive and thorough research plan. This plan should clearly define the scope and targets of the project, and set forth the R&D activities expected to be conducted by each party. It should also consider the costs that could be incurred, evaluate the amount of investment acceptable to both the university and the company, and calculate a complete budget for the project. Both sides should also decide how to deal with situations where the actual costs and expenses of the research exceed the agreed budget due to unexpected difficulties in the process of research, as this is an inherent risk for any important and cutting-edge R&D project. The costs to be considered mainly include material costs, manpower and engineering costs. University scientists have experience in attacking technological problems and conducting challenging research but may neglect some business related issues due to their lack of experience in business and cost accounting. One example is that of a project where a professor from a university tendered to conduct an engineering problem diagnosis during which researchers from the university had to work at a construction site in a foreign country. As a result of failing to estimate costs correctly and to calculate all possible expenses at construction site in the bid price, the university researchers could barely cover the costs for carrying out the work.

Intellectual Property

This is one of the legal issues of most concern in any R&D contract for the university. For a company, obtaining a valuable IP asset to maximize business profits is often a main objective for col-
laboration with a university. However, IP is also very important to the university, as many world-leading companies choose Chinese universities as partners because of their pre-existing technologies. Moreover IP is a source for further research development within the university so that it can continuously provide essential innovation services throughout society. For a company-sponsored project, the IP rights to be provided to each party under the project contract are generally divided into two categories: IP that already exists or is created before the project is started, or IP that is created independently from the project is defined as background IP, and belongs to the party who created the IP. Any IP created under the project is defined as foreground IP. As far as Tsinghua University’s IP strategy is concerned, in collaboration projects with multinational companies, the ownership of foreground IP is in principle allocated between the parties concerned on a case by case basis according to their respective contribution in creating the specific foreground IP.

There are several possibilities for dealing with foreground IP in our practice: (i) The IP belongs to the university and the company can utilize the IP by payment of a royalty, which is used to stimulate the university’s innovation spectrum. This principle will normally be used in projects where the university has more than one funding source, or where the university makes the most contribution to the project IP. (ii) The IP is co-owned by the concerned parties. This is commonly used when the university works jointly with industry to conduct the research work. However, there are still some practical problems relating to how the IP is co-owned when this method is applied. For example, should each party have the right to commercialize the co-owned IP, including granting licenses to third parties without the consent of the other co-owning party? This is an important consideration as a university as a non-business entity cannot benefit directly from any co-owned IP other than by the right to grant licenses, whereas a company can freely apply the co-owned IP in production of goods or provision of services to make a profit. Other important questions that should be considered are (i) Should the two parties share the cost of patent applications or of maintaining patents as a precondition of co-owning any patent?; and (ii) What rights can be left to a party who elects not to participate in sharing the costs of protecting particular items of IP? These questions should be discussed and relevant provisions should be drafted in the final contract according to the capacity of each party and the contribution of tangible (financial) and intangible (intelligence, reputation, goodwill) benefits.

**Compliance with Governmental Policy**

As a state-founded public education organization, apart from the usual technical, social, and economic considerations concerning university-industry R&D contracts, Chinese universities must also follow relevant Chinese government regulations, especially for projects partially sponsored by public funding from various government departments. For example, according to the “Provisional Regulations on Management of Intellectual Property Rights for International Science and Technology Collaboration Projects”, which was promulgated by MOST (the Ministry of Science and Technology) in 2006, and is applicable to projects under any inter-governmental international science and technology agreement, as well as any international science and technology projects sponsored by government financial funding, Chinese universities are obliged to negotiate and incorporate into relevant international R&D contracts terms and conditions concerning the allocation, identification, protection, management and exploitation of intellectual property rights in accordance with the provisions set forth in the Provisional Regulation. Care must be taken also to ensure that parties to international R&D contracts also comply with any applicable laws and regulations, including those relevant to technology export regulations.

**Conclusions**

The issues addressed above are given as an empirical study based on our practical experience in the establishment of university-industry partnerships. The results show that good communication and management, as well as compliance with Chinese government regulations, are critical to ensure successful R&D collaborations between Chinese universities and multinational companies and to create win-win R&D international partnerships.

Dr. Ma Jun obtained her M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees in Materials Physics from the University of Ulster, UK, where she worked on the development of materials for flat panel display screens. Dr. Ma is now director of the Overseas R&D Management Office of Tsinghua University and Executive Secretary General of the University Industry Collaboration Committee of Tsinghua University. In this position, Dr. Ma works closely with multinational companies to leverage resources from both Tsinghua University and its counterparts. The main objective is to provide collaboration platforms that allow cutting-edge research to be conducted and to promote win-win collaborations between Tsinghua University and its industrial partners. She may be reached via email at majun@tsinghua.edu.cn.
A recent publication by The Royal Society – the World’s oldest scientific academy in continuous existence (officially founded in 1660) – is a must read for science policy makers and research administrators interested in the growth in global collaborations and the opportunities and benefits such scientific partnerships generate.

The report – titled *Knowledge, networks and nations: Global scientific collaboration in the 21st century* – draws upon a wealth of interesting and resonant data and also provides a clear and compelling basis for understanding the changing features of global scientific collaboration. As stated in its Executive Summary, the report aims to identify how these opportunities and benefits can best be realized, and perhaps most importantly how it can further the conversation on ways international scientific collaboration “can best be harnessed to tackle global problems more efficiently” (p. 5).

The report notes the key factors driving international scientific research – quality, efficiency and effectiveness, and necessity – and puts forward a number of recommendations for fortifying and extending global collaborative research, all of which are meaningful enough to state in detail (pp. 104-107):

1. Support for International science should be maintained and strengthened.
   - National governments need to maintain investment in their science base.
   - International activities and collaboration should be embedded in national science and innovation strategies.
   - Commitments to multinational research efforts and infrastructures should not be seen as easy targets for cuts during a period of economic turbulence.

2. Internationally collaborative science should be encouraged, supported and facilitated.
   - Research funders should provide greater support for international research collaboration.
   - National border agencies should minimise barriers to the flow of talented people.
   - National research policies should be flexible and adaptive.

3. National and international strategies for science are required to address global challenges.
   - Funders of global challenge programmes should devise ways to better co-ordinate their efforts, share good practice, minimise duplication and maximise impact.
   - National research funding should be adaptive and responsive to global challenges.
   - In devising responses to global challenges, governments worldwide need to rely on robust evidence-based policy making.

4. International capacity building is crucial to ensure that the impacts of scientific research are shared globally.
   - Researchers and funders should commit to building scientific capacity in less developed countries.
   - Scientific capacity building must involve financial support for authors in developing countries to publish in open access journals.
   - National academies, learned societies and other similar institutions should actively promote public and wider stakeholder dialogue to help identify, shape and respond to global challenges and their local manifestations.

5. Better indicators are required in order to properly evaluate global science.
   - UNESCO (and other agencies such as the OECD) should investigate new ways in which trends in global science can be captured, quantified and benchmarked.
   - There is a specific lack of data on the flow and migration of talented scientists and their diaspora networks.

In sum, this is a critically important study and one I hope you will read with great interest. A free (PDF) copy can be downloaded via The Royal Society’s website at http://royalsociety.org/uploadedFiles/Royal_Society_Content/Influencing_Policy/Reports/2011-03-28-Knowledge-networks-nations.pdf.

---

Dr. John M. Carfora is Associate Vice President for Research Advancement and Compliance at Loyola Marymount University in Los Angeles, and co-author of *The Art of Funding and Implementing Ideas: A Guide to Proposal Development and Project Management* (Sage, 2010).
Jennifer Shambrook, Ph.D., has been named as Editor for Research Management Review. Research Management Review is the scholarly, peer-reviewed publication of NCURA, which focuses on a broad range of issues affecting the administration of academic research. The RMR publishes research articles, case studies, book reviews, and editorials twice per year. Past editors of the RMR include immediate past editor Dr. Pamela Plotkin; Dr. William Sharp; James Casey, J.D.; Robert Killoren, M.A.; Dr. Stephen Erickson; Dr. Earl Freise and founding editor Dr. Mary Ellen Sheridan.

Dr. Shambrook is a long-time member of NCURA with twenty-five years of research administration experience. She has published broadly and serves on the editorial board of two other peer reviewed scholarly journals. She currently serves as Director of the Grant and Contract Management Office at St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital. She also maintains an adjunct faculty appointment with the Medical University of South Carolina where she teaches three online classes in their Masters of Research Administration program. She is the 2010-2011 Chair of NCURA Region III.

“Scholarly publications, such as RMR, are more important to our profession than ever with the emergence of graduate programs in research administration,” says Shambrook. “As a profession, we need a vehicle for the dissemination of scholarly information for the benefit of our profession and about our profession. Also, most research administrators work in the academic environment, where scholarly publications are highly valued as a token of success and professionalism. The RMR provides a venue for research administrators to disseminate scholarly work and for our colleagues to learn from the experiences and research of the leaders of our profession. I hope to see capstone projects and papers written for the new MRA programs turned into scholarly articles which are shared through the RMR. It is a great honor to be following in the footsteps of the previous editors of the RMR and to be working with the outstanding RMR Editorial Board.”

If you are interested in submitting an article, case study, or book review which is relevant to the administration of research, please visit the http://www.ncura.edu/content/news/rmr/author_instructions.php for the Instructions for Authors. The next deadline for submission is September 1st, 2011. N

5th Annual Pre-Award Research Administration Conference

By Glenda Bullock and Dianne Horrocks

The Cubs, the Workshops, the Food, the Keynote, the White Sox, the Discussion Groups, Second City, the Concurrent Sessions, the Networking, the Cheezborgor, Cheezborgor, Cheezborgor – No Pepsi…Coke, the Historic Palmer House Hotel, the Place to be July 24 – 26, 2011 – The NCURA 5th Annual PRA Conference!

Got your attention? We hope so because this year has more to offer than ever before. We’re excited to present an outstanding conference for you beginning on Sunday, July 24th with an expanded selection of workshops – both morning and afternoon; 13 in all and we even have one which is free! This year’s workshop program co-chaired by Michelle Powell, of the Georgia Institute of Technology, and Tricia Callahan, of Miami University, has a diverse menu of offerings. With everything from the basic Primer on Pre-Award Administration Issues to the intermediate Legal Issues for Pre-Award Research Administrators to the advanced, University Research Result Driving Economic Development - Opportunity or Issue?, you’ll be certain to find a workshop that can help you expand your knowledge.

On Monday morning, the conference Keynote will be given by Michael Turner, Director and Rauner Distinguished Service Professor, Kavli Institute of Cosmological Physics at the University of Chicago. Dr. Turner is known for pioneering the deep connections between particle physics and cosmology and his seminal work on dark energy. This exciting session will not only be informative, but is a great reminder of why we do what we do. After the Keynote, we’ll split into concurrent sessions and discussion groups. We have provided six tracks covering the areas of Compliance, Departmental, Federal/Funding Opportunities, Medical, Clinical, Predominantly Undergraduate Institution Issues and Senior Level. And, this year, in between each set of sessions most breaks will last 30 minutes so you’ll be able to have refreshments, network, and learn about the products & services of our vendor partners.

On Tuesday morning education and information continues, with Breakfast Roundtable discussions or, sit back and relax and have a casual continental breakfast with friends and new acquaintances. Either way, it’s a great way to start your day. The sessions continue until 3:45 pm when the conference adjourns. We’ve provided a number of opportunities for networking throughout the conference with a first night welcome reception, continental breakfasts, luncheon each day, refreshment breaks and dinner groups Sunday and Monday evenings.

Chicago is a spectacular city! Quality theater, outdoor events, museums, world-class shopping and wonderful restaurants (even Billy Goat’s Tavern with its “Cheezborgors”) are just part of this city’s charm and make it a wonderful vacation destination. We hope you will bring friends and family along and can take some time to stroll the Miracle Mile before, or after, attending Creating a Solid Foundation: Building Blocks to Research Success, NCURA’s 5th Annual Pre-Award Research Administration Conference. For more information on the conference and its educational sessions, (or how to get tickets to see the Cubs play the Astros at famous Wrigley Field), go to the fully-loaded meeting web site at http://www.ncura.edu/content/educational_programs/sites/pras/

Our sincere thanks to this year’s program committee for helping us design such a strong conference and to the many outstanding speakers who have agreed to present the important and timely information from which we will all benefit. We look forward to seeing you in Chicago!

Glenda Bullock and Dianne Horrocks are the conference co-chairs. Glenda serves as Manager for Financial Operations, Washington University. Dianne serves as Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Idaho State University.
Erin Bailey, Center Manager and Senior Research Administrator at the Buffalo Center for Social Research, University at Buffalo, has received the Chancellor’s Award in Professional Service. The award recognizes individuals who have repeatedly sought improvement of themselves, their campuses, and ultimately the State University of New York and in doing so have transcended the normal definitions of excellence. Erin is an NCURA LDI Graduate, current Region II Treasurer and chair of the Departmental Administration Neighborhood.

Barbara Cole, previously at Stanford, as of June 1, will be the Associate Vice President for Research Administration at the University of Miami.

David Lynch is now the Director, Office of Sponsored Project Administration, Mayo Clinic (Minnesota, Arizona and Florida). Dave was formerly the Director for Industry Sponsored Research at Mayo Clinic.

Anita Mills is now Assistant Director, Office of Sponsored Projects and Research at the University of the Sciences in Philadelphia.

Dennis Pafrath has been promoted to Assistant Vice President for Sponsored Programs Administration at the University of Maryland, Baltimore.

Stacy Riseman is now the Director of Grants and Contracts at Rhode Island School of Design.

Allen Soltow, currently Vice President for Research and Sponsored Programs, who has overseen research operations at The University of Tulsa for nearly 35 years, has announced he will retire from his full-time position effective December 31, 2011. Al is a long-time member, who has served regional and nationally including on the Board of Director, and is a 2008 Distinguished Service Awardee.

Brian Squilla, previously at the University of Pennsylvania, is now Chief of Staff, Office of the Dean, in the Medical College of Thomas Jefferson University.

Ruth Tallman, previously at Lehigh University, is now at the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science, where she is Director, Office of Research Administration and Advancement.

Angela Wishon is now the Vice President for Research Administration at the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center in Dallas.

2011 Polls Will Open This Summer

The Nominating and Leadership Development Committee is accepting nominations through May 20, 2011, for the positions of Vice President/President Elect, Secretary, Treasurer Elect and two At-Large Board Members. NCURA Members will then receive an electronic ballot in the summer and will be asked to vote at that time. Elections are open for 30 days after the polls open. Your vote counts! Thank you in advance for your participation in these important upcoming elections!

The 2011 Nominating and Leadership Development Committee

Chair Vivian Holmes, Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard
Vice Chair Gunta Liders, University of Rochester
Immediate Past President, Ex-Officio David Richardson, Pennsylvania State University
Region I Gary Smith, Massachusetts General Hospital
Region II Brenda Kavanaugh, University of Rochester
Region III Michelle Powell, Georgia Institute of Technology
Region IV Diane Barrett, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Region V Susan Sedwick, University of Texas at Austin
Region VI Virginia Anders, University of California, Santa Barbara
Region VII Jackie Hinton, University of Utah
In anticipation of pending Federal regulations, NCURA is pleased to announce its newest DVD workshop, Promoting Objectivity in Research: The Faculty Perspective

The workshop is broken into four easy-to-view 20 minute modules covering the following key areas:

- Regulatory Environment
- Disclosing Conflicts
- Faculty Consultant versus University Investigator
- Management and Mitigation
- Ownership vs. Exclusivity
- Royalties vs. Publications
- Clinical Research
- Use of Facilities
- Cost Recovery
- Risk/Insurance
- Use of Institutional Employees
- Multiple Demands on Time
- Release Time
- Supporting Students
- Effort Reporting

Led by Dave Richardson, Associate Vice President for Research, Pennsylvania State University with panelists: Jilda Garto, Associate Vice Provost for Research and General Manager of GTRC/GTARC, Georgia Institute of Technology; Denise McCartney, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research Administration, Washington University in St. Louis, and Lillie Ryans-Culclager, Director of Contracts, SRI International, this workshop is an excellent addition to your continuing education library and has been developed for:

- Faculty at U.S. universities
- Post-doctoral researchers and graduate students in later stages of their graduate studies
- University technology transfer professionals and those involved in commercialization of inventions and new company formation
- University business development officers, incubator professionals, and corporate relations staff
- Deans, Schools Chairs and Conflict of Interest Officers

Copies of the program may be purchased individually or in bulk. Watch for the electronic announcement and order form in June.

www.ncura.edu
Do research administrators and senior investigators believe policies for sharing facilities and administrative (F&A) cost recovery on sponsored projects between schools, departments, or units would help promote interdisciplinary research initiatives? How many colleges, universities, and academic medical centers actually have such policies in place? What are the most common, effective, and satisfying types of policies? These are the questions that prompted an article I recently first-authored for *Academic Medicine*, “Sharing Facilities and Administrative Cost Recovery to Facilitate Interdisciplinary Research.”  

Our published findings, which present an emphatic “yes” to the first question and illustrate an important policy gap, in the end point readers to one last open-ended question: What now?  

My history with this topic began in early 2004 when I was the grants administrator for one of the 21 exploratory interdisciplinary centers initially funded by the National Center for Research Resources of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) under the NIH Director’s Roadmap Initiative. After four difficult but rewarding years and a large learning curve, in 2008 I presented a case study on this topic at the 50th Annual NCURA Meeting where I discovered that I was not alone in facing the administrative difficulties inherent in interdisciplinary research. A year ago, I detailed my experiences working with this center in an *NCURA Magazine* article which highlights the challenges of setting up multiple financial accounts across departments that would allow for the sharing of F&A cost recovery at an institution where this was not standard practice and a policy did not exist. Fortunately, I was able to develop “backdoor” methods within our archaic accounting systems that allowed us to share this grant’s F&A cost recovery. This caught the attention of the Mailman School of Public Health’s Associate Dean for Interdisciplinary Programs who was struggling with the same issues and led to our eventual collaboration on the *Academic Medicine* original research article.

We began our investigation with several key questions: “What F&A cost recovery sharing policies currently exist?”; “Is there interest in this topic among colleges, universities, and academic medical centers?”; and “Is there a gap in the literature about this topic that we can fill?” As we searched online for general information about the topic, we noted that there was almost nothing in the published literature. In addition, an in-depth search failed to reveal any peer-reviewed articles which described and examined, in a systematic way, policies for sharing F&A cost recovery or assessed user satisfaction with any existing policies.

I spent over 100 hours scouring the Internet for universities which currently have policies for sharing F&A cost recovery between schools, departments, or units posted on their websites. The limited number of policies I found were buried deep within layers and sub layers of convoluted university websites, and were found across a wide array of homepage types (e.g., controller’s office, sponsored projects administration office, post-award office, general policy pages, etc.). A few were available through a single link to the findings of a previously convened task force where the actual policy was stated in one sentence on page 25 of 30 pages. Based on this, I imagine some of these policies are not well-publicized and or well-known even for administrators and researchers at that institution. After using almost 50 distinct search terms in Google searches and investigating any links which looked remotely like they would lead to a policy, I was only able to find 54 policies. Although the policy descriptions and types ranged from very generic and loose to exhaustingly specific percentages of F&A split, we were able to categorize them into 4 major types which then informed our survey that we targeted to both investigators and research administrators.

Our simple, brief survey was designed to capture information about attitudes toward policies for sharing F&A cost recovery, specifically in regard to their impact on interdisciplinary research. It also asked respondents if their institution has such a policy and, if so, what is the overall design of their policy and how satisfied are they with it.
The invitation to participate in the survey was sent to all principal investigators (PIs) of NIH-funded Clinical and Translational Science Awards (CTSA) as well as all members of four NCURA Neighborhood Listservs. The high response rate from the CTSA PIs was especially impressive considering the heavy workload these senior investigators typically have, which attests to their interest in the topic.

In all honesty, we were not surprised to find that the vast majority of respondents, administrators and researchers alike, agreed that a policy for sharing F&A cost recovery between participating schools, departments, or units would improve interdisciplinary research efforts. Logically, it makes sense that receiving a portion of the indirect costs associated with conducting the research would be a huge incentive to collaboration—money talks, and loudly in today’s economy. Even so, the majority of respondents reported that their institution does not have a formal policy in place.  

There was a surprising lack of knowledge and awareness among both groups of respondents: over 8% indicated they didn’t know if their institution even has a policy for sharing F&A cost recovery. Considering the experience level of CTSA PIs and active NCURA members, we were surprised that nearly 1 out of 12 couldn’t answer this question. This could be a direct result of how difficult policies are to find on their websites or that they are simply not publicized internally. Our most important survey finding was the fact that most individuals who indicated their institution had a policy also indicated that they were satisfied with the policy. Statistical analyses showed that, amazingly, this was true regardless of the type of policy they have. This speaks volumes in support of having policies, rules, and regulations in this area rather than ambiguity or dealing with the issue on a case-by-case basis as it arises.

As a way of saying “thank you,” once our article was available in PubMed, I again contacted all members of the four NCURA listservs which had been invited to participate in the survey. In less than two hours I received 80 responses requesting a copy of the article and to date I have sent copies to over 200 NCURA members (the article will be freely available in PubMed Central, http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/, PMCID: PMC3045474, on 3/1/2012). Several respondents added that they are currently working with central administration on developing such a policy, a testament to the article’s timeliness. Very few institutions currently have policies, but recent NCURA responses indicate this trend is changing.

Obviously, interest in this topic remains high, and our Academic Medicine article has great potential to prompt research administrators to promote the adoption of a policy for sharing F&A cost recovery at their institution. Ultimately, it is my hope that the article will also empower them to begin negotiations with central and department administration to develop tasks forces to explore policy options for sharing F&A cost recovery best suited for their institution’s unique needs and dynamics. Since it has become clear that interdisciplinary research is not just a passing fad, it’s time for institutions to embrace the reality and set themselves up for success. Our research has shown that one positive step in this direction is to establish a policy that allows collaborating schools, departments, and units to share in the F&A cost recovery of sponsored projects.

Kristine M. Kulage, MA is Director, Office of Scholarship and Research, Columbia University School of Nursing and Biomed Corner Contributing Editor of NCURA Magazine.

Master of Research Administration

Graduate Program
www.ce.ucf.edu/research

The Master of Research Administration (M.R.A.) program at UCF provides individuals with the knowledge and skills necessary for professional advancement in the field of research administration.

From Concept to Compliance to Commercialization.

Program Highlights:
- Fully Online Delivery
- Cohort Model
- Completion in Two Years
- No GRE Required

Department of Public Administration
College of Health and Public Affairs
University of Central Florida

UCF Stands For Opportunity®
Targeted People, Property, and Governments

OFAC administers sanctions programs that target foreign governments, individuals, and practices. The majority of these programs are regime or list-based, meaning that the targets can be found on a list or fit a certain criteria such as Specially Designated Nationals (SDNs). Screening transactions for restricted parties can be an efficient way to reduce your institution’s risk of violating list-based sanctions.

In addition to regime and list-based sanctions programs, OFAC administers comprehensive sanctions against Cuba, Iran, and Sudan. Comprehensive sanctions are the most stringent programs and contain broad prohibitions and narrow licensing opportunities. Prohibitions, exemptions, and licensing policies vary from program to program. However, there are general consistencies among the programs that can lead to a greater understanding of the regulations.

Prohibitions

As one might assume, physical exports to sanctioned countries are heavily regulated and a license is generally required (FACR §§ 515.201, 560.204, 538.205). OFAC and BIS may share licensing responsibility for physical exports and depending on the country; a license may be required from BIS, OFAC, or in the case of Sudan, both. OFAC licenses all exports, including EAR99 items while BIS licenses items that are found on the CCL; therefore, proposed exports may need authorization from both BIS and OFAC.

The restrictions on physical exports also regulate the exportation of services to Cuba, Iran, and Sudan and the exportation of financial services to Burma (Myanmar) (FACR § 537.202). A professor’s giving a guest lecture at a university in Tehran, a faculty member’s corresponding via e-mail with a student located in Cuba regarding a recent publication, or a department’s providing distance learning services to a student located in southern Sudan may be considered “services of value” and prohibited without a license. Even though these activities would fit the definitions of “educational information,” or “fundamental research.” (EAR § 734.8) This article is intended to be a brief introduction of how the Foreign Assets Control Regulations (FACR) administered by OFAC apply to university activity.
Exempt Transactions

Exemptions contained in comprehensive sanctions programs differ from those contained in the EAR and the ITAR. "Fundamental research" and "educational information" are concepts not found in sanctions exemptions. Instead, categories of activities such as personal communications, humanitarian donations, and information and informational materials are exempt from regulations (FACR, §§ 515.205, 560.210, 538.212). The information and informational materials exemption is not as encompassing as may be expected. Only information and informational materials (books, films, etc.) that are "fully created and in existence" at the time of the transactions are exempted. This caveat precludes revisions, collaboration, and co-authorship related transactions with individuals located in the comprehensively sanctioned countries of Cuba, Iran, and Sudan. Transactions not included in the exemption may be authorized pursuant to a general license discussed in more detail later in this article.

The Sudanese Regulations contain a provision exempting certain areas of Sudan, referred to as Specified Areas of Sudan or SAS, from most prohibitions. In general, imports from, and exports to the SAS are not prohibited. However, the transshipment of goods or financial services through the SAS, transactions involving blocked property and transactions involving the petroleum or petrochemical industries in Sudan are prohibited regardless of whether or not they occur in the SAS (FACR, § 538.212(g)). It is also important to remember that the SAS exemption is unique to OFAC regulations and is not applicable to BIS regulations. Thus, any physical export to Sudan, regardless of whether the destination is in a SAS, requires approval from BIS or must qualify for one of the few BIS license exceptions available for Sudan.

In addition to the exemptions above, transactions incident to travel are exempted from regulations—except in the case of Cuba. This includes accompanied baggage for personal use, payment of living expenses in-country, and purchasing goods or services for personal use in-country (FACR, §§ 560.210(d), 538.212(d)). Personnel traveling to sanctioned countries with university equipment should be aware that the commonly relied upon BIS license exception for the temporary export of "tools of the trade" are limited (EAR, § 740.9), or in the case Iran not available at all (EAR, § 746.7(c)).

Licenses and Country-Specific Provisions

One constant throughout OFAC's regulations is the concept of two license types: general licenses and specific licenses. A general license is blanket authorization for an otherwise prohibited transaction if certain criteria are met. The applicability of the general license is self-determined, meaning no official written authorization or other involvement from OFAC is required (FACR, § 501.801(a)). Several general licenses are particularly useful to universities and will be covered in more detail later in this article. A specific license is official written authorization from OFAC to engage in a regulated activity. A written application and subsequent approval are required (FACR, § 501.801(b)). Each sanctions program identifies several specific licenses that OFAC will consider.

Several categories of travel-related transactions involving Cuba and academic institutions are authorized pursuant to general licenses. If travel to Cuba is authorized by a general license or by a specific license, then transportation-related transactions and transactions incident to living expenses are also authorized (FACR, § 515.560(c)). One general license is for professional research and professional meetings in Cuba (FACR, § 515.564(a)(1)). To qualify for this general license, the traveler must be a full-time research professional who will be conducting professional research in his or her professional area. The research must be academic with a "substantial likelihood" of being published. The research must encompass a full work schedule and cannot include any tourist activities.

Another general license authorizes travel transactions that are directly related to professional meetings that are organized by an international professional organization. To qualify, the sponsoring organization cannot be headquartered in the U.S. unless the organization has received a specific license from OFAC to host the meeting. The purpose of the meeting cannot be the promotion of tourism to Cuba, or to encourage production of biotechnical products (FACR, § 515.564(a)(2)).

Since January, university faculty, staff and students have been able to engage in the following transactions pursuant to a general license:

- Activities related to an educational program (sponsored by the American institution or a formal course of study at a Cuban academic institution) in Cuba as long as the coursework will be accepted for credit towards the traveler's degree
- Graduate student academic research related to Cuba
- Teaching sponsored by the home institution to teach at a Cuban academic institution, as
Travelers must make reservations through a Travel Service Provider (TSP) that has been authorized by OFAC to make such arrangements. The TSP will require certification that a general license applies or, if required, a copy of the specific license.

Perhaps most helpful for universities is the general license authorizing activities related to publishing. It authorizes transactions “necessary and ordinarily incident to” the publishing process, including collaboration, editing, and augmenting publications with graphics, explanatory texts, or translations that are not exempted as information and informational materials. The general license does not authorize any physical exports, the involvement of the Governments of Burma (Myanmar) Cuba, Iran, or Sudan or any other transaction that is not necessary and ordinarily associated with publishing and marketing activities (FACR, §§ 537.526, 515.577, 560.538, 538.529).

As a result of the Iranian civil protests of June 2009, OFAC implemented a general license authorizing transactions incident to a licensed transaction (general or specific) are authorized (FACR, §§ 560.405, 538.405). Cuba, in particular, has several specific licenses available that are helpful to universities. Specific licenses may be authorized for the importation of research samples from Cuba (FACR, § 515.547). Travel-related transactions not covered by a general license may be available pursuant a specific license. For example, specific licenses may be authorized for multiple trips to Cuba by a research professional (FACR, § 515.564(b)), educational exchanges not involving academic course work toward a degree, or sponsorship of academic meetings related to Cuba (FACR, § 515.565(b)(2) and (3)).

Applying for a license from OFAC is less formalized than other export licensing agencies. An exception is travel to Cuba pursuant to a general license or specific license. Guidance and forms relating to Cuban travel can be found on OFAC’s website (OFAC). For most other license applications relevant information may be supplied in letter format (FACR, § 501.801(b)(2)). If granted, licenses may include provisos and can be amended, modified or revoked by OFAC at any time (FACR, § 501.803). Regardless of whether or not an activity required a license (general or specific), complete records must be kept for a period of five years after the date of any transaction subject to sanctions regulations (FACR, § 501.601).

Assessing Risk
Identifying activities subject to sanctions regulations can be a challenge in the university setting because the transactions may not get flagged in the same way that other export control issues do. For example, the transaction may not be an export and it may not be tied to a written agreement. It may even be considered fundamental research. OFAC will consider the presence and scope of an institution’s risk-based compliance program when determining a response to a potential violation (FACR, App. § 501 at III.E). Appendix A to Part 501 contains the Economic Sanctions Enforcement Guidelines and is an excellent resource for institutions developing or auditing the OFAC compliance section of their export control management systems. When developing institutional practices to address OFAC issues, it is essential to begin with identifying the institution’s most risk-prone areas. Once the risks are identified, written policies and procedures can be developed to address the issues.

Conclusion
The information contained in this article is intended to be a brief overview of the mechanics of economic sanctions and to identify regulatory requirements, exemptions, and authorizations that are relevant to universities. Sanctions regulations and policies change quickly in response to world events. Every situation is unique, and there is no substitute for a thorough reading of the regulations. As universities become more global and the world becomes more connected, a comprehensive understanding of OFAC regulations is essential for compliance.

References:
Export Administration Regulations (EAR), 15 C.F.R. § 730-774.
Foreign Assets Control Regulations (FACR), 31 C.F.R. § 500-599.
International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR), 22 C.F.R. § 120-130.

Jessa Albertson is the Export Control Analyst in the Office of Export Controls at the University of Oklahoma. As the Export Control Analyst, Jessa determines the applicability of export control regulations to University activity and helps maintain and update guidelines and procedures to ensure compliance with export control regulations including the Export Administration Regulations (EAR), International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR), and Foreign Assets Control Regulations (FACR). Jessa has been with the Office of Export Controls since January 2008. She graduated from the University of Oklahoma with a Bachelor of Arts in Human Relations.
It is difficult to imagine life before – or without – the Internet; it’s our daily, hourly, near-instantaneous source for news, an essential work platform, and where we go for information of all sorts. But with all of its knowledge and information sharing potential comes certain disadvantages too, like the threat of intellectual property loss, cyber attacks, and other possible security risks.

Members of the National Academies’ Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR) convened in February of this year to consider the intersection of intellectual property (IP) and cybersecurity. Proposed by The University of Texas at San Antonio and the Southwest Research Institute (SwRI), the meeting discussed a twin challenge: How to openly share research information across boundaries (geographic as well as by G-U-I sector) while also protecting critical IP and not impeding national innovation and commercialization that drives business development and wealth creation. Representatives from the federal government, universities, and industry spoke to the complex technical and policy challenges in this area, as well as to the opportunities for public-private cooperation.

The meeting opened with comments by the deputy assistant director of the Cyber Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), who noted that cybersecurity falls into two general categories. The first is malevolent “cyberterrorist” attacks meant to cripple digital systems. The second is the more clandestine penetrations (e.g., foreign entities and criminals) meant to siphon off information related to IP or cash. Considerable effort is being made by the FBI to detect IP theft from companies, of which the cumulative impact over all U.S. companies is very significant. A subsequent speaker reinforced this statement by citing a 2008 report by security vendor McAfee that suggested that total IP losses worldwide could be as much as $1 trillion.

Presenters emphasized the need for many types of security architectures with the ability to handle massive amounts of data and make real-time decisions. One presenter underscored the importance of pursuing proactive rather than reactive remedies, while another suggested that “fine-grained cybersecurity technologies and security approaches are needed, with multi-tier containment spanning across platforms, cloud computing centers, middleware, and collaborations.” Yet another speaker suggested that “while good cybersecurity is not cheap in absolute terms, spending just one percent of large budgets intelligently should enable a significant level of cyber protection.”

Prompting further discussion was a law professor who urged his audience to be skeptical of copyright cybersecurity as commonly practiced, and another from academia who argued that cybersecurity needs to become its own discipline and not just a subset of computer science.

Examples of successful research consortia were showcased. The ultimate take-away message from the meeting was this: “Cybersecurity is manageable, but not ‘solvable,’ in an environment where cyber threats are continually evolving and yesterday’s security has a limited shelf life.”

For a more expansive recap of the February 8-9, 2011 GUIRR meeting, please visit www.nas.edu/guirr (see “Past Meetings”). All online presentations are posted with the speakers’ permission.

Susan Sauer Sloan is Director of the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR).
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.
Spring is always a busy time as we prepare for the annual Spring Meeting. The theme of this year’s meeting – “The Sponsored Network: Connections, Communications, Community” captures key elements that are critical to a successful career in research administration. Pat Fitzgerald, Program Chair, Co-Chairs Nancy Kendrick from Yale University and Estelle Lang from Brown University, and the Program Committee have developed a great program. Our meeting is in New Haven, Connecticut near the campus of Yale University. Our keynote speaker will be Andrew Rudczynski, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, and he will be discussing the lessons learned from the audit of Yale University.

With the meeting just around the corner this is a good time to remind our members about our Region I mentor program. Information about the Mentor Program is available on the Region I website at http://www.ncuraregion1.org/mentorprogram.html. If you are a new member looking for a mentor, or if you are a seasoned member who is willing to volunteer some of your time to mentor a new member, please contact Kris Monahan, Chair of the Volunteer and Membership Committee (VMC).

The Region I Advisory Committee met for the first time in March, and we have embarked upon our main initiative for the year – transition documentation for future officers and committee chairs. Our goal is to provide guidance for future leaders and that this documentation will foster balance between our commitment to our jobs, our volunteer endeavors, and other demands of life.

As announced last year, Region I now offers travel awards to the FRA (Financial Research Administration) and the PRA (Pre-Award Research Administration) conference for Region I members. The first awardee for the FRA conference was Kelley McCue from Tufts Medical Center. A call for nominations should be announced in May for the PRA conference, which will be July 24-26, 2011 in Chicago, Illinois. Nomination forms and information about the process will be available on the Region I website at that time.

Other opportunities abound in the region for members to be actively involved in our programs. If you have suggestions or wish to volunteer for any of the committees for Region I please visit the Region I website at www.ncuraregion1.org.

Bethanne Giehl is Chair of Region I and serves as Associate Director of Grants and Research Funding at the University of Massachusetts Medical School.
ership Development Committee, and the Volunteer Committee. Each of these has several responsibilities and lots of opportunity to contribute your talents and try new professional experiences. Information on the roles of our officers and the committees is available on the website: http://ncuraregioniii.org. The call for nominations will be out very soon.

Summer is also the time the season for selecting Travel Awards recipients for NCURA’s Annual meeting. Region II provides two awards to research administrators who have not yet attended a National meeting and whose participation will significantly advance their careers as well as fill the needs of their organizations. Receiving an award is also an excellent way to get to know other members of Region II and to become involved in Region activities. Information on the travel awards is on the website, an announcement will be sent to all Region II members, and nominations will be accepted beginning in early July.

Besides the Spring Meetings, what does a Region do to keep itself occupied? That is a good question that the ad hoc Region II Strategic Planning Committee has been asking itself since the end of the 2010, and some interesting answers are emerging about professional and leadership development, and supporting and encouraging members, and communication. While I want to tell you all about our ideas, I can’t yet because they have not progressed into goals and plans. Trust me: But the things that have been covered in this brief article are hints of the seeds for great things to come.

One thing did already happen: Region II is on Facebook! If you are also on Facebook, friend us! Just search for NCURA Region II.

In closing, one last comment about the 2012 Spring Meeting: Next Year In Gettysburg!

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

REGION III Southeast
www.ncuraregioniii.com

Region III hosted a superb Spring Meeting at Wild Dunes in Isle of Palms, SC in early May. Over 300 attendees representing every NCURA Region attended, and everyone went home feeling enlightened and refreshed. For 3 and 1/2 days, Wild Dunes was bathed in warm sunlight and balmy breezes, beckoning folks oceanside. Our NCURA brethren and sistren were staunch, however, and filled the breakout rooms session after session.

By popular demand, the pre-conference programming once again included a day-long Saturday NIH Fundamentals Workshop. This overview of the National Institutes of Health research grants process was designed with new research administrators in mind and was presented by two Chief Grants Management Officers from NIH. A wide range of workshop topics and tracks were offered on Sunday, including sessions on conducting training, understanding OMB circulars, contracting with industry, using technology, financial compliance, and organizational models.

The conference programming this year was stellar, thanks to the hard work of Rick Smiley (East Carolina University) and his program committee, and thanks to the contribution of ideas from members throughout the region.

To give every Region III member the opportunity to shape the agenda, a call for presentations went out in early December. There were many thoughtful and interesting abstracts submitted. Conference attendees could choose from 30 concurrent sessions across seven different tracks: pre-award, post-award, general, federal, departmental, professional development, and predominantly undergraduate institutions.

Conference attendees sharpened their command of a variety of topics, including intellectual property, FFATA, departmental controls, budgeting basics, the fundamental research exclusion from export controls, problem solving strategies, protecting our institutions from fraud, research administration career development, building good relationships with faculty, building research collaborations between institutions, and many others. With sessions targeted at four experience levels, there was truly something for everyone.

After the sessions, attendees slapped on the sunscreen and were omnipresent on the beach, on the court, and on the links – always in broadly diverse groups optimally sized for productive networking. As always, the conference offered multiple networking opportunities for members to make new friends and reconnect with old ones. As for the quality of their play, it is hardly surprising that there are newly minted records at both golf courses and on the mini-triathlon course. Families familiar with Region III will surely be wondering if the night life was up to the standards of the elite revelers of whom Region III is justly proud; but no concern at all was justified as the revels were robust and diverting. There was damage, to be sure, but minor it was and amends swiftly made. It was, by all accounts, the most remarkable professional conference (if such an extraordinary event can be characterized as such) in this part of the galaxy since the angels got together and decided to create a dream come true. Unfortunately the pink flamingo tattoo demonstration had to be abandoned due to health codes and licensing restrictions … but there is always next year.

On a more serious note, a real highlight of the regional meeting was the kickoff of a new mentoring outreach effort by Region III volunteer coordinator Robyn Remotigue (Mississippi State University). This is the first time a volunteer coordinator of Region III has reached out to create a committee. Robyn identified Region III members who were willing to serve as mentors and then paired them with the meeting’s first-time attendees. She organized a special time for mentors to gather and meet each other for the first time before the Sunday evening welcome reception. This created the opportunity for mentors to escort mentees to the welcome reception and introduce them to other members in the region. The next morning, there was an area reserved for mentors and mentees to have breakfast together, giving mentees an opportunity to discuss any questions they may have had about the meeting agenda. The idea was for everyone to walk away feeling welcomed and having made a few new friends and colleagues. After all, today’s new NCURA member is tomorrow’s conference organizer! Thanks to everyone who made this outreach effort a success.

Even those who do not have the time to serve as mentors or volunteer for committees right now can play an important role in reaching out to new members. One way is to continue to encourage new members to apply for Region III travel support opportunities. As noted on the Region III web site, Kevin Mills (East Carolina University) was this year’s winner of the $1,000 travel award to be applied toward expenses associated with attending the
spring meeting. Region III also makes a travel award for the national meeting in Washington, D.C., so keep your eyes open for the next opportunity to nominate a colleague, especially if you know of someone who may never have had the opportunity to attend an NCURA meeting.

Region III encourages members to get involved at the national level as well. The Nominating and Leadership Development Committee (NLDC) has announced the 2011 Call for Nominations for Officer/Board positions and the call for 2011 NCURA Awards. You can read about these great opportunities at http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/opportunities.

Region III appreciates the efforts of the program committee, presenters, volunteers and attendees who made this event a success. We couldn’t do it without Region III’s great spirit of volunteerism! Is there a Region III volunteer who particularly stands out? If so, a great way to recognize a colleague’s contribution of time and talent is to nominate him or her for NCURA Volunteer(s) of the Month. Go to http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/volunteer_of_the_month.php to read the stories and get the nomination instructions. We would love to see Region III represented here!

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.

Dear NCURA Region IV Friends:

Research Rocks! is the theme of the upcoming Region IV Spring Meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, April 16-20, 2011. Chair-Elect David Ngo and his Program Committee put together what is sure to be an exciting and enriching program for our Region IV members. The keynote speaker will be Jim Henke, Vice President of Exhibitions and Curatorial Affairs of the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and Museum, who will be rocking our members with some great stories and information about Rock and Roll research. You can read his bio at http://rockhall.com/visit-the-museum/learn/staff-bios/james-henke/. David Ngo and his team promise to “blow the doors off” the Region IV Spring Meeting! Let Research Rock!

There are many opportunities to volunteer at the upcoming Spring Meeting. If you are interested in volunteering, please contact David Ngo at dvngo@rsp.wisc.edu.

Please also 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 making 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: Kirsten Yehl, Northwestern University, k-yehl@northwestern.edu.

We hope to see you in Cleveland 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 Edwardsville.

**REGION IV**

Mid-America

www.ncuraregioniv.com

Dear NCURA Region IV Friends:

Research Rocks! is the theme of the upcoming Region IV Spring Meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, April 16-20, 2011. Chair-Elect David Ngo and his Program Committee put together what is sure to be an exciting and enriching program for our Region IV members. The keynote speaker will be Jim Henke, Vice President of Exhibitions and Curatorial Affairs of the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and Museum, who will be rocking our members with some great stories and information about Rock and Roll research. You can read his bio at http://rockhall.com/visit-the-museum/learn/staff-bios/james-henke/. David Ngo and his team promise to “blow the doors off” the Region IV Spring Meeting! Let Research Rock!

There are many opportunities to volunteer at the upcoming Spring Meeting. If you are interested in volunteering, please contact David Ngo at dvngo@rsp.wisc.edu.

Please also 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 making 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: Kirsten Yehl, Northwestern University, k-yehl@northwestern.edu.

We hope to see you in Cleveland 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 Edwardsville.

**REGION V**

Southwestern

www.ncuraregionv.com

Regional Spring Meeting

The Region V Spring meeting was held at the Magnolia hotel in downtown Houston April 17th – 20th, 2011. The meeting hosted a record number of participants and an informative and good time was had by all attendees.

**Quinten Mathews Travel Scholarship Awardees**

The awardees of the Quinten Mathews Travel Scholarship to the Regional Conference in Houston, Texas on April 17-20, 2011 were Camelia Matthews of the University of Texas Southwest Medical Center and Steve McLean of West Texas A&M University. Each awardee received a $750 travel scholarship.

**Distinguished Service Awardee**

The winner of the Distinguished Service Award was Scott Erwin, Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at Texas State University. Scott has been a very active leader in Region V and has presented numerous workshops and concurrent sessions. Congratulations Scott! Scott was presented with an award at the Regional Meeting.

**Quinten Mathews Travel Scholarship Awardees**

The awardees of the Quinten Mathews Travel Scholarship to the Regional Conference in Houston, Texas on April 17-20, 2011 were Camelia Matthews of the University of Texas Southwest Medical Center and Steve McLean of West Texas A&M University. Each awardee received a $750 travel scholarship.

**Distinguished Service Awardee**

The winner of the Distinguished Service Award was Scott Erwin, Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at Texas State University. Scott has been a very active leader in Region V and has presented numerous workshops and concurrent sessions. Congratulations Scott! Scott was presented with an award at the Regional Meeting.

**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.
REGION VI
Western
www.ogrdr.wsu.edu/r6ncura

Springtime generally means people swap their skis for hiking boots and winter coats for light sweaters. The weather gets warmer, and people dust off their grills for family picnics and barbecues. Not so fast though in the Mile High City! The quick spring-to-winter temperature transition we experienced at this year’s Region VI/VII Spring Meeting, proved that springtime in Denver is anything but predictable. We enjoyed warm, sunny days, along with cold, snowy days, nights—truly an experience for this So Cal girl!

The buzz about the weather paled in comparison to the buzz surrounding the meeting! The workshops, presentations and sessions were outstanding. The activities at the luncheons, receptions, and Pub Crawl gave the 260+ attendees the opportunity to network, meet and connect with new colleagues. A special thank you to Vicki Krell and Sara Judd for organizing the activities and entertainment— it was truly an interactive and engaging meeting.

Special thanks to our dynamic keynote speaker, Dr. Rich Feller, Professor, Counseling and Career Development, University Distinguished Teaching Scholar, Colorado State University. His presentation truly inspired each of us to develop our “guru network” and implement strategies to be more productive, efficient and balanced in our careers.

Our regions were very fortunate to have our very own NCURA President, Judy Fredenberg (Region VII), and Vice President Dan Nordquist (Region VI) join us for the meeting and speak at the Monday luncheon and new member reception. We appreciate their active roles in our Regions, as well as their leadership in NCURA.

As Program Chair, it takes an army of volunteers to make a Spring Meeting successful, and it was my honor to work with a great group of volunteers, including the Region VI/VII Program Committee members: Ralph Brown, Csilla Csaplar, Kathi Delehoy, Randy Draper, Kim Eudy, Julie Guggino, Diane Horrocks, Josie Jimenez, Sara Judd, Vicki Krell, Candece Lindsay, Rosemary Madnick, Joseph McNicholas, Sherylle Mills-England, Lisa Mosley, Mich Pane, Georgette Sakamoto, Steve Shapiro, Kerrie Sonnenberg and Gale Yamada. The Program Committee couldn’t have done it without Tim Edwards (Chair, Region VII), Christine Pacheco, Wanda Bowen, Lisa Jordan and all of the members that volunteered their time at the meeting. A great team who worked tremendously hard—and it really showed with a wonderful program in a beautiful location. Thanks also go to our Sponsors, Elsevier, Administrative Management Systems, Cayuse and Emmanuel College, for their support of our meeting.

Don’t forget to complete your evaluations of the 2011 meeting! We want to hear your thoughts and ideas for activities, workshops and sessions for upcoming meetings. Looking forward, Rosemary Madnick (Chair-elect) and I are hard at work negotiating our contract for the 2012 Region VI/VII Joint Spring Meeting, scheduled April 14-18, 2012 in Hawaii. We will be announcing hotel information soon to help plan your future travel.

To assist with travel, our Regional Awards Committee has been hard at work reviewing nominations for travel awards. This year, Region VI funded four awards to support travel to the 2011 Spring Meeting. The recipients of the awards are: Cathi Blackwood, Stanford University, Nina Crow, University of California, Irvine, Donna Obeid, University of Southern California, and Jennifer Teixiera, University of California, Merced. Region VI also awarded a travel award to Linda Christian, California State University, Fresno, to attend the Financial Research Administration (FRA) in San Diego, Ca. These awards provide each recipient with up to $500 for expenses associated with transportation, hotel and food costs associated with the meeting. Our thanks go to the Regional Awards Committee: Kevin Stewart (Chair), Ann Pollack, Csilla Csaplar, Maren Boyack, and Kim Eudy.

As we move into spring, our nominating committee is looking for volunteers to throw their hats in the ring for our regional elections. Being a leader within Region VI is a great way to get involved and serve in one of the elected positions. We are looking for candidates for Chair-elect, Treasurer-elect, Secretary-elect and a Regional Advisory Committee member. It’s a great opportunity to work with your peers from other institutions, as well as the NCURA national organization to organize and implement regional activities and support our members and their institutions.

If you didn’t get the opportunity to participate in the Spring activities, we look forward to seeing you in the Fall at the NCURA National Meeting. Keep an eye out for the email announcing the opening of registration and hotel reservations, as well as volunteer opportunities.

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.

REGION VII
Rocky Mountain
ncuraregionsvii.unm.edu

Greetings from Montana or should I say Denver. We have just completed our Region VI/VII Spring meeting, “Climbing the Heights of Research Administration in the Mile High City” in Denver, Colorado. Jeri Muniz, my co-Chair from Region VI coordinated an excellent program and the Westin in downtown Denver proved to be an excellent site for the meeting. Over 265 folks attend and for the first time in memory we had more Region VII attendees than Region VI. Way to go! We had a great keynote speaker, Dr Richard Feller from Colorado State University, whose talk on “Knowledge Nomads and the Nervously Employed in Turbulent Times” was excellent. The entertainment committee did a superb job as we had the “Magic Dude”, the infamous pub crawl, and the Wii tournament. Thanks also goes out to vendors; Elsevier, Administrative Management Systems, Cayuse and Emmanuel College.

But, the shining star of the meeting was the program. We had a great assortment of workshops and concurrent sessions were outstanding. Congratulations to all.
I would like to thank the program committee members and track leaders for all of their hard work in making this meeting a great success. My thanks goes out to Christine Pacheco (registration mastermind), University of New Mexico; Lisa Jordan (volunteer coordinator guru), Boise State University; Ralph Brown, Colorado School of Mines; Kathi Delehoy, Colorado State University; Randy Draper, University of Colorado – Boulder; Dianne Horrocks, Idaho State University; Josie Jimenez, New Mexico State University; Vicki Krell (Wii champion), Arizona State University; Candyce Lindsay, Arizona State University; Lisa Mosley, Arizona State University; and Kerrie Sonnenberg, University of Arizona. A big thank you goes out to Steve Shapiro (IT/AV organizer), University of Oregon and his gang of IT helpers; we could not have had a successful meeting without you.

Plans are now underway for our 2012 joint regional meeting to be held on the Big Island of Hawaii, April 14 – 18, 2012. Vicki Krell, Arizona State University and Rosemary Madnick, Los Angeles Biomedical Research Institute will be co-chairing the meeting. Please think about volunteering and getting involved. You will get so much more out of it than you ever put in.

Jackie Hinton is our regional representative to the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee (NLDC). Your NLDC members need your help in identifying candidates for Officer and Board positions and for the NCURA Service Awards and the Catherine Core Minority Travel Award. For information check out http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/current_calls.php and http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/awards/index.php. Also be on the lookout this summer for nominations for our regional positions. This will include the chair-elect, secretary/treasurer, and member at large positions. Get involved. We also plan on awarding several travel awards to the national meeting in Washington, DC, November 6-9, 2011 – more information to follow.

Thanks again to everyone who made our regional meeting such a success and be looking for a new updated Region VII website in the coming months. Please feel free to pass along any suggestions or ideas tim.edwards@mso.umt.edu or 406.243.4700.

Tim Edwards is Chair of Region VII and serves as the Accountant for the College of Health Professions and Biomedical Sciences at the University of Montana.
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Compliance Watch

Financial Conflict of Interest (FCOI) is a topic that has been receiving sustained media attention. It is not unusual to pick up a newspaper and find an article about a significant FCOI. The “conflicted” individual could be anyone: a state legislator, a company’s purchasing officer, a government agency employee, a physician, a researcher, etc. There is a broader and more complex “culture” now about FCOI that goes well beyond those conflicts that are research related.

Fortunately, colleges and universities with research programs of all sizes and shapes already have significant experience implementing FCOI policies and procedures going back to the PHS regulation in 1995. Many state and private colleges/universities also have experience dealing with their homegrown FCOI requirements that may not be consistent with the federal requirements for research. For example, some institutions have zero tolerance policies in place for faculty and other workforce members. In any event, I think we understand the importance of transparency in our relationships and actions (see the March/April 2011 NCURA Magazine).

Some of the comments to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) questioned the authority of PHS to enforce compliance and other comments included questions on how to handle an Investigator or his/her PHS-funded research project that transfers from one Institution to another. We’ll have to wait and see how all the comments are addressed. For the time being, and if you haven’t seen it yet, NIH has an excellent chart of the proposed changes at: [http://grants.nih.gov/grants/policy/coi/major_proposed_changes.pdf](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/policy/coi/major_proposed_changes.pdf)

As we await the final rule and get ready to incorporate the changes and adopt them into our policies and procedures, the words of Dr. Francis Collins, the Director of NIH, come to mind:

“The public trust in what we do is just essential, and we cannot afford to take any chances with the integrity of the research process.”

Mike Falzano is Executive Assistant Dean and Director of the Office of Research Affairs, Administration and Compliance, at the Albany Medical College in Albany, New York. He is a member of the NCURA Compliance Neighborhood Committee.

Departmental Administration Watch

Departmental Administrators, NIH and the Looming Possibility of a Government Shutdown

With the clock ticking and the possibility of the government shutting down, grant administrators were scrambling to figure out how the possible shutdown would alter our daily routines. Thankfully, the crisis was adverted, but it made several of us wonder what our plan of action would be if the government were to shut down at a later date?

After numerous emails and calls to those within our administrative networks, we soon found key information as to how this would impact our administrative operations. The biggest concern within our field of grants administration was the shutdown of NIH operations, as it appeared that NIH would completely cease operations if there were a lapse in funding. What would this mean for researchers and grant administrators? Because NIH employees would not be able to work during this time, researchers were encouraged not to submit proposals and notified that grant deadlines would be readdressed once the offices were reopened for business. Moreover, continued funding and the potential for further budget cuts could remain a concern, even after a governmental restart. There was also the specter of a paralyzing backlog of work for NIH after a government shutdown of days or possibly weeks.

Nonetheless, it seems that we have made it through unscathed this time; however, as budget negotiations continue in DC, we should use this as a learning opportunity so that we can be prepared in the event of future shutdowns. While it is difficult to give general advice for such a diverse group, the first step in readying yourself is to know if, or how, the agencies you work with could be affected. After that, begin to plan accordingly within your office. Knowing even the basics will help your department calmly address even the gravest of financial times.

Amanda McCrary is a member of the Departmental Administration Neighborhood Committee and serves as Research Coordinator, Department of Surgery, University of Florida.

eRA Watch

The Electronic Research Administration Neighborhood recently interviewed Ed Calimag, Program Advisor, Grants.Gov, to get an inside look at what is new in Grants.Gov. We posted the Podcast to the ERA Neighborhood Overview page and encourage you to listen.

In talking to Ed, we learned a lot of new things, were reminded of a few things, and learned a bit about the personal side of Grant.Gov. Grants.gov, which is a small operation of only eight full time staff plus contractors, is working on a redesign of the website and many enhancements. These in-
include consolidating and making error messages more user friendly and possibly trying to enhance the website to include a crowd source feature where users can help users!

Ed also told us a few of the top errors. Many of the help desk calls are in regards to the registration process and he advised to start early. A couple common errors he pointed out include: don’t copy and paste from a Word document into Grants.gov, this can cause formatting issues; and there are character limits when naming an attachment. The limit is 50 characters and he advised not to use special characters.

To listen to the podcast, please visit us at http://www.ncura.edu/content/regions_and_neighborhoods/neighborhoods/electronic_research/index.php

Cara Egan-Williams is a member of the Electronic Research Administration (eRA) Neighborhood Committee and serves as a Sponsored Projects Officer in the Office of Research at the University of California, Santa Barbara.

International Watch

NCURA and EARMA recently evaluated the NCURA – EARMA Beta Fellowship Program. A working group was assembled to evaluate the program and a report was submitted to the NCURA Ambassador Corps and forwarded to the NCURA Board of Directors. At the January Board of Directors’ meeting the Fellowship Program was approved. Concurrently EARMA evaluated their experience and also approved the fellowship program. As this goes to press NCURA is soliciting and reviewing applications for NCURA host institutions for the 2011 timeframe. Host institutions will provide a research administration experience for visiting EARMA Fellows. EARMA is also in the process of identifying EU host institutions. In addition, a call will be forthcoming for Fellows to submit their applications for consideration. We see this as a significant step in deepening our international ties and are very excited about all the opportunities it will create for our members.

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

Pre-Award Watch

As the 2007 Research Administrator Stress Perception Survey (RASPers) found, more than half of Research Administrators experience high or extremely high levels of stress on the job. For many of us, this stress arises from the risky situations we must navigate on a daily basis. In part, it highlights whether and how effectively we are managing risk.

Building on this theme, the Pre-Award Neighborhood Committee will host a panel discussion on What Research Administrators Need to Know about Risk, to identify current high-risk areas in sponsored research, provide examples of pro-active measures taken by sponsored research offices, and discuss tools that are being used to gauge success.

Our panelists will include Alison N. Wellman Smith, M.P.H., Senior Sponsored Programs Analyst, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University; Min Xiao, Office for Sponsored Programs, Harvard University; Cheryl A. Hutt, Senior Manager of Compliance Audit, Harvard University; Donna J. Walsh, Grant Administrator, Brigham and Women’s Hospital; and Peggy Lowry, NCURA Peer Review Program Coordinator and Interim Director, Office of Research Integrity, Oregon State University. Our moderator will be Denise Moody, Assistant Director of Grants and Contracts, Princeton University.

This sure-to-be lively and informative podcast will be posted on the podcast website in early June at https://www.ncura.edu/content/regions_and_neighborhoods/neighborhoods/podcasts.php. Relax and take a listen!

Andre Walker is a member of the Pre-Award Neighborhood Committee and serves as Grants and Contracts Manager, University Research Administration at The University of Chicago.

Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions Watch

Planning for the upcoming National Conference

At AM52 members of the Predominantly Undergraduate Neighborhood were enthusiastic in their support for the reinstatement of the PUI Track at the 2011 national meeting this November. We have been developing our program now for the past few months. And if there’s anything common to the great variety of PUI experience out there, it’s having that dawning realization, “if we don’t have an office to do X, Y or Z, people think I am the office.” In the spirit of the Annual Meeting motto, we are the original Do It LIVE, Do It NOW people.

The PUI discussion groups and concurrent presentations have been created specifically to help us get it done when we get back to our institutions. We’ll have everything from how to motivate your faculty members to do research and apply for grants in the first place, to how to better ensure their compliance with the huge (and growing) range of regulations when they finally get their awards. Aware of the need to communicate our message in an environment where research administrators are a rare bird indeed, we have scheduled sessions on including undergraduates in research, on partnering with development offices, on being a generalist (jack of all trades?), on communicating up the hierarchy to let university leaders have the best information to support our mission, and on how to ensure we get the right policies in place to support research and best protect our universities, our faculty and ourselves.

The track will feature accumulated wisdom from across the country and from a range of PUIs including both senior voices and those who are fresh to that national conference. All have a great deal to offer, and the PUI Neighborhood committee looks forward to seeing you in Washington.

Joseph McNicholas is Director of the Office for Research and Sponsored Projects at Loyola Marymount University, and is coordinator of the PUI track for AM53.
Playing to Your Strengths:
Bringing Out the Best in Both the Introverts and Ext

By Erin Bailey, Julie Guggino, and Samantha J. Westcott
Demanding leadership challenges in both work and personal relationships often originate from the personality differences between introverts and extroverts. How many of us have been in a meeting with individuals who are quick to respond, often talking over one another or talking over anyone who speaks? At that same meeting, others may sit quietly, seemingly taking everything in, or appear bored or overwhelmed. Meetings and other workplace activities often fail to be productive when conflicting personalities contribute to a breakdown in communication. Neither personality type is better than another; however, learning to successfully lead your team to coalesce where all members play to their strengths and understand how to work together can lead to greater success for the entire organization.
Tips for Extroverted Leaders:

**Be concise.** While you are invigorated by talking, are energized by interruptions, others may consider you overbearing and overpowering.

**Circulate information ahead of a meeting.** Provide as much written information as is feasible before a meeting so that introverted team members have a chance to review the material in order to give you their best thinking.

**Don’t expect immediate decisions.** Pressuring introverted team members to come up with a decision on the spot may likely result in a decision that they don’t fully buy-in.

**Allow silence its moment.** A common complaint of introverts about Extroverts is about their listening skills—in particular, their rush to fill the silence. Practice self-management by valuing pauses which allow the real conversation to be heard.

**Ask introverts for their thoughts.** Introverts generally dislike having the light shining on them, so you may have to seek out their opinions. It is often more fruitful to meet one-on-one rather than in a public forum.

**Respect introverts’ need for privacy.** Practicing good social awareness skills entails understanding that extended extroverted activities can be draining for introverts.

Tips for Introverted Leaders:

**Give visual clues when listening.** While introverts are often better listeners, their expressions may sometimes give the impression that they lack interest or involvement in the topic being discussed. Remedy this with simple things like a nod, a smile, and leaning forward—micro gestures that go a long way to signal to others that they are indeed being heard.

**Raise your comfort level with public speaking.** If public speaking ranks among one of your top dreads, resolve to conquer this. Developing the ability to stand up in front of an audience to deliver an engaging presentation is a strategic imperative. Lee Iacocca once said: “You can have brilliant ideas, but if you can’t get them across, your ideas won’t get you anywhere.” Develop the skills to help you share your brilliance with a wide audience.

**Beware of voids created by non-communication.** A void will be quickly filled by rumors, misinterpretations, and grapevine musings. Take the initiative to share information.

**Provide timely feedback.** Consider voicing your opinions sooner. Providing critical feedback once a project is well underway can frustrate or de-motivate others on the team.

**Learn the art of small talk.** If this is not a preferred activity for you, consider that small talk is the oil that lubricates relationships and paves the way for more important discussions.

**Share more personal information.** This helps more people know you better and increases the level of trust. Transparency strengthens our connections to others.

(\[link\]http://www.openforum.com/idea-hub/topics/the-world/article/are-you-talking-to-me-rx-for-Extroverts-and-introverts-bruna-martinuzzi

Are You Talking to Me? Rx for Extroverts and Introverts, April 8, 2010.)
Introverts and Extroverts 101

The terms “introvert” and “extrovert” may be defined as follows: (1) Introvert: An individual in whom exists an exaggeration of the thought processes in relation to directly observable social behavior, with an accompanying tendency to withdraw from social contacts. (2) Extrovert: An individual in whom exists a diminution of the thought processes in relation to directly observable social behavior, with an accompanying tendency to make social contacts.” (Freyd, M. Psychological Review, Vol 31(1), Jan 1924, 74-87.)

Since 1975 the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) has been used for psychological assessments and as a self-exploration tool. It considers four personality preferences:

- Extroversion/Introversion: how people derive their energy;
- Sensing/Intuition: how individuals perceive the world around them;
- Thinking/Feeling: how individuals make decisions; and
- Judging/Perceiving: how individuals’ public personas, or outer world orientation are viewed.

In this article, we will discuss the Extroversion/Introversion personality preference. As with many aspects of the human personality, introversion and extroversion spectrum can be seen as a continuum.

Each individual’s preference falls somewhere along the continuum. Introverts are internally-directed. An introvert needs time to reflect, appears reserved, contained, and guarded in public. Introverts are often considered “deep” by others. The introvert typically thinks before speaking. Extroverts, on the other hand, are externally-directed. An extrovert is often action-oriented, appears gregarious, expressive, and unreserved in public. An extrovert typically needs to speak to think.

These observable behaviors intuitively make sense when some of the physiological differences between extroverts and introverts are examined. With newer technologies like brain scanning and mind mapping, scientists are beginning to identify physiological differences. Introverts, for example, have a longer neural pathway in their brains and more blood flow to the parts of their brains related to internal experiences like remembering. Extroverts’ blood flow, conversely, is increased in the areas of the brain supporting sensory input: seeing, smelling, sensing. Introverts and extroverts neural pathways also rely on different neurotransmitters. Extrovert pathways utilize dopamine differently than do introvert pathways whereas introvert pathways utilize acetylcholine.

Famous Introverts
Albert Einstein
Steven Spielberg
Michael Jordan
Katherine Hepburn
Jane Goodall
Sir Isaac Newton
Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis
Warren Buffett

Famous Extroverts
Eddie Murphy
Jamie Lee Curtis
Tony Blair
Colin Powell
Winston Churchill
Mike Tyson
Paul McCartney
Cher

Introverts and Extroverts in the Workplace

With such a broad spectrum of personality types ranging from the most reserved to the most outspoken, respecting one another’s work styles and finding ways to accommodate the continuum of personality types will result in greater job satisfaction and increased productivity. We will explore opportunities where leadership can bring out the best of everyone on the team.

In meetings, for example, while introverts may find meetings stressful and often times draining, extroverts may see meetings as a way of being productive: a way to energize their batteries and energize those around them. For many introverts, their voices will be heard later, sometimes much later, after they have had a chance to examine all the facts and come up with a sound and informative answer. The leadership necessary for making successful meetings begins with awareness: the leader who can see those quietly biding time and find opportunities to make sure their voices are heard will enrich the interactions in meetings. With proper planning, effective leaders can intervene and create conditions that bring out the best in both the introvert and the extrovert and lead to more productive, effective meetings. Setting a tone and stating expectations for meetings can help curb the distraction or talking over and allow each voice to be heard. All those on the spectrum benefit from one another being a party to the meeting. The introvert needs the spontaneity and energy of the extrovert to start discussions and bring ideas to the table; while the extrovert learns to value the introvert’s ability to look at all the facts and problem solve.

In day-to-day interactions, consider some of your colleagues – you can probably name those who
get their energy being around people. Those team members are likely extroverts. When extroverts are faced with a problem, they like to bounce their ideas off others. The extrovert may pick up the phone and call someone or drop by a colleague’s office. They have a need to connect with people. They externally process information and thrive on the energy from others to solve their problems. Extroverts are typically vocal, spontaneous and comfortable expressing their ideas. Introverts, on the other hand, get their energy from working alone and processing information internally. When faced with a problem, introverts need to gather all the facts and need time to process the information before giving an answer.

To work most effectively, introverts need to have a space where they can retreat and work quietly. They dislike interruptions and are content to work alone. They don’t mind working on long, complex, even tedious, projects. Extroverts can more easily adapt to open concept office environments and may actually increase their productivity due to the constant interactions. They are more welcoming of interruptions and physically move around more. They are quicker to become bored or impatient with repetitive tasks.

Effective Workplace Leaders: Introverts or Extroverts?

A good leader can be anywhere on the spectrum: from the shiest introvert to the most outspoken extrovert. Outgoing personality traits are often associated with top leadership roles. They are the ones seen as outgoing, assertive and excellent at giving directions. However introverts can also be great leaders with their attention to detail, listening skills, and their ability to think through issues in a more focused manner. Research suggests many businesses fail when they do not promote executives with more understated styles. Both introverts and extroverts have various talents and strengths and neither should focus on what they are not. Successful leaders know they are not perfect at everything nor do they want to be, hence they select team members who compliment their challenge areas as well as having a strong track record.

Effective leaders who are aware of the interpersonal dynamics of the members of their team can help alleviate problems based on the differences between introverts and extroverts. There are often assumptions or misunderstandings that occur when individuals come from different personality types. The two different types are diverse in the way that each processes information. If a person is rewarded for participating in meetings in an office, it can create tension for those who find it uncomfortable to speak up in meetings. On the contrary, if the atmosphere is unwelcome to those who think creatively in the moment and who may stray off-topic to follow a train of thought, it can stifle some of the ideas of those who work best when in a group setting. The best listeners in a group are not often the ones who share openly and their contributions can be missed. A lack of response may be misread as a lack of interest by someone who is openly sharing ideas and working within the group. Sometimes, conflict can be extended beyond what is necessary to solve it due to a need to talk everything out by some in the team. Other times, conflict avoidance can be detrimental, as key problems do not get addressed if they are not brought to the surface.

Given that effective leadership is not tied to a specific personality trait or type, the benefit of accepting the different personality types exists in how a leader both understands himself and how he understands and works with his respective team members. A major portion of a leaders’ role is communication, so it is very important for leaders to understand how their employees’ process information, so the leader can adjust their approach to fit their audience needs. Also the leader with this insight can create a safe space in meetings to seek input from those who may be reluctant to speak. Through the resulting diversity of thoughts shared, the end result likely will be more effective and have greater buy in by the entire team.

A leader’s natural style will also offer enhanced development opportunities to the team members. Since a leader’s success is normally a direct result of his team members’ success, everyone wins when everyone’s strengths are leveraged. A leader who is on the far extreme end of the extroversion side of the scale may
offer his team the networking and interpersonal skills that make connections to effectively improve business. A leader who is extremely introverted may offer his team the benefit of long-range strategic planning and written communication skills. The extrovert can lead those team members who are not as likely to stand up to opportunities to shine by connecting them to projects for which they would not volunteer. The introvert can lead those team members who are outspoken to more introspection by modeling the benefits of taking the time to make a thoughtful decision.

The differences in personality types are real and they matter. The contributions of the individual to the team are best when the individual can work at his best. While it is impossible to create an ideal environment that works for all members of a team all the time, knowing how each works best and providing those opportunities for the team member to thrive and do his or her best is the job of the leader. Giving the introvert the time to think, work independently, work quietly, and to get the job done right is key. Offering the extrovert the time to connect and work with others, to listen to others, and try doing things differently than before while still meeting the deadline can lead to success. Furthermore, forming teams that are balanced and sharing the expectations up front of how the team will work together and use their strengths to achieve the goals can offer the chance for every member of the team to share in the success. As introvert Henry Kissinger once said, “The task of the leader is to get his people from where they are to where they have not been.” The journey is as important as the destination to ensure long term repeated success.
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As I sat through the FRA 12 conference in San Diego, I participated in many sessions and observed a common theme. No it wasn’t transparency or financial compliance, sure those topics were discussed, and I heard a lot more than I already knew (that’s always a good thing). As usual NCURA did such a great job of building a list of experts and panelists from diverse institutions that there was always an example or scenario that rang true for me. As a post awarder I was asked to share an experience or a session from the FRA 12 conference, and sort of give it a Pre Award spin. There were so many topics to choose from: Export Controls, Audit and Financial Compliance, Clinical Trials, Subawards and Subcontracts, the list could go on. There was however one common theme in every session I attended; the need and emphasis for coordination and communication.

I had already partnered with my colleagues Mary Ann and Tina to write this article, so we began talking about the topics. Tina and Mary Ann Pre Awarders and myself a Post Awarder (what an odd partnership) began distilling all of the content and topics that were available to us, and we came back to the very theme I had observed in all of the sessions, coordination and communication.

A mutual colleague of ours threw out this concept to us, I had seen it before, matter of fact it was an illustration that was just used to communicate a different topic in a session I had attended at FRA 12. A session titled “Clinical Research: Strategies for Managing Complex Programs” presented by Denise McCartney and Bruce Elliott. It presented the illustration of the three-legged stool. This presentation addressing the complexities of clinical research programs and risk mitigation was excellent, so I hate to say the fundamental thing I took home from this session was a “stool”, but it was actually an important concept that we wanted to apply to our theme of coordination and communication.

As we can all picture in our minds, the three-legged stool is a thing of utilitarian furniture beauty. It can be fancy or simplistically comfortable. It can even be composed of wood, steel, or recycled plastics, but for all of the reasons we may like it (or not) there is one basic principle to making a three-legged stool: the legs MUST all be the same length. Without this the stool becomes unbalanced or dangerous to sit on. Denise McCartney and Bruce Elliott likened the three-legged stool to risk mitigation and how it is borne by the three concepts of leadership, policies and procedures, and roles and responsibilities. Albeit a great concept and one I will remember, we wanted to relate that same illus-
to how Pre Award, Post Award and the Department understand each other’s role on the three-legged stool. The balance we require in institutional research administration between these three significant components is grounded solely in coordination and communication.

As a group, we thought it best to present some scenarios as to why this coordination and communication is so important. These scenarios are not too far-fetched; in fact they are REAL stories. The names of the guilty have been omitted to lessen the embarrassment for missing something as fundamental as just working with the other legs on the stool.

**Broken Stool #1**

A Sponsor makes an award to the University, but they have expedited final invoice and reporting deadlines of thirty days after the end of the award. Pre Award does not negotiate a change to their normal reporting requirements and fails to alert the PI, the Department or accounting (Post Award) on the short turnaround time for final invoice and report.

Three months into the project, the PI decides it will be a better project if they can get the test replicated at another university and gets permission to subcontract $20,000 to this other university. The University issues their standard subcontract to the other university. This includes the standard reporting timeline of 60 days after the end of the subcontract. They also have the end date of the subcontract as the same end date of the prime award. Early the following year a modification was issued for an additional $25,000 and extension for a year.

After that brief summary, we’re sure most of you can already see the problems that can be expected. Yes, this is what happens when the various departments fail to communicate or coordinate effectively. Can you see where this could happen at your university? Do all of your processes flow smoothly and with good coordination and communication? Is that because you have a process to ensure that happens, or are you just lucky?

In that situation, the subcontractor billed according to the terms of the contract, but in the following year did not bill as specified. Instead of billing monthly or even quarterly, they held their final invoice to the end of the project. During this time, the prime award PI was aware the subcontractor was not fulfilling their technical obligations and did not alert their Department, Pre award, or Post Award. The final invoice for the Sponsor (minus the subcontractor’s invoice) was submitted to the Department for approval. Due to the short turnaround time, Post Award could only wait a minimal amount of time for the Department to respond. When no response was given they issued the final invoice to the Sponsor. The subcontractor’s final invoice came in after the final invoice had already been submitted to the Sponsor. Therefore, leaving the subcontractor’s $25,000 final invoice to be paid after the prime award had closed. We wish we could say this story had a happy ending. In the end, the Sponsor refused to pay that final invoice from the subcontractor and in the spirit of collegiality the two schools decided to eat the expenses somewhat equally. It really does take all three departments working closely together with effective communication. Good processes usually do not happen by chance. They are well defined and followed daily.

**Broken Stool #2**

A Sponsor makes an award to the University, but they have unusual quarterly invoicing terms. Pre Award does not negotiate a change to the agreement, nor do they inquire with or inform the Department or Post Award if the terms can be met. The award is for $500,000 from a state agency supported by legislative appropriations, and has cyclical availability of funds. Invoices must be issued quarterly on a cost reimbursable basis, but cannot exceed 25% of the total funding per quarter. Any unspent balances by quarter-end are then deobligated. So essentially it is a cost reimbursable award, worth $125,000 for a fiscal year quarter at a time with no carry forward permitted.

The award is issued for the full award amount instead of increments; Post Award established a quarterly billing schedule with no controls on carry forward allowability. The Department begins spending later in the first quarter in line with the effort and activity on the project, but is only able to spend roughly $15,000. Additionally, Post Award was unaware that quarter 1 and quarter 4 expense activities were planned to be low, and quarters two and three would account for more than 80% of the expense activity.

With this summary, we can begin to imagine the problems that are coming downstream. Again the three-legged stool is leaning because of the lack of coordination and communication. Does Pre Award at your institution regularly warn Post Award of oddities or irregularities that they are negotiating or accepting? Does Post Award have a means of coordinating with the Department and PI in getting these expenses incurred in a manner that agrees with the billing and reporting cycle? Did the PI have a plan all along on their expense rates that could have assisted Pre Award in negotiating the terms in a more appropriate way? Can you see this happening at your institution?

How did it all end...the State held firm on the quarterly deobligation of funds. However, this wasn’t discovered until the second quarter’s invoice was issued for more than the permitted threshold. The Department, College and central offices had to utilize unrestricted funds to cover the shortfall and put the project back on track for the final two quarters. The repair job on the leaning stool came with a relatively high price tag.

These two scenarios were not attempts to place blame on Pre Award or Central Offices in general, they were intended to remind us all that our roles impact our downstream colleagues. How do we communicate and coordinate those impacts? Try to keep that stool on all three legs! N
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Do you remember the Department of Defense’s (DoD) Electronic Document Access (EDA) system? It appears that the DoD and several other military agencies have renewed their use of the EDA system.

For those of you who are not familiar with the EDA system, here is a bit of background. The EDA was established as a repository for contracts for both vendors and government entities in 2001. The system provides secure online access, storage, and retrieval of contracts, contract modifications, Government Bills of Lading (GBLs), DFAS Transactions for Other (E110), vouchers, and Contract Deficiency Reports. The EDA system provides “view only” capability of the documents that match validated DUNS or CAGE codes.

The EDA homepage can be found at http://eda.ogden.disa.mil/. There are two current operating sites (Ogden and Columbus). If one site is down or unavailable, you may select an alternate site. You will need Internet Explorer 5.5 (SP2) or newer and a PDF Viewer – Adobe Acrobat Reader 7.x or higher to use the site.

EDA Customer Service Support is available either by phone at 866-618-5988 or 801-605-7095 or email at cscassig@csd.disa.mil, please be sure to include in the subject line “EDA Assistance.” Their response time, both on the phone and by email, is exceptional.

There are also extensive EDA Training Materials available on their website: http://eda.ogden.disa.mil/users_guide/trainMaterial/trn001_index.html. The Contract Query & View Training Module is the most applicable for research administration. It offers step-by-step instructions on how to perform queries and retrieve documents from the system.

There is only one shortfall to the EDA: there are no automatic notifications sent when a contract or contract modification is posted. However, the user can request through the issuing agency that when documents are uploaded that a notification be sent.

Overall, the EDA is an excellent backstop system for locating awards that you are expecting but have not received, such as when your SPAM filter inadvertently catches an important communication: your DoD contract notification!

Rebecca Puig has been at University of South Florida (USF) for over twenty-two years and joined the field of research administration in 1999 as a computer programmer analyst for the Division of Patents & Licensing. In 2000, she joined the Division of Sponsored Research to serve as an Electronic Research Administrator and has served in various capacities within the Division since that time. In 2010, she was appointed Director of USF’s Division of Sponsored Research and is responsible for all pre-award activities. She holds an MS in Entrepreneurship in Applied Technologies and will be pursuing her PhD in the fall of 2011.
Is NCURA a Part of Your Training?

Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration Workshop

Make NCURA a part of your on-boarding program. Send your new staff members to our Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration workshop to learn the basics of research administration from seasoned research administrators.

Benefits:
- Learn the basics
- Interactive discussions
- Meet others in the field of research administration
- Apply knowledge to case studies

Learn more at:
www.ncura.edu/content/educational_programs/workshops/fundamentals/

“I try to get all new staff to Fundamentals within the first year. They come back with great enthusiasm about what they are doing and the new things they’ve learned. The experts in the field are the ones doing the teaching, and the quality of presenters is always strong. Fundamentals brings people out of their own cubicles and gives them an understanding of how different institutions address common problems.” - Kim Moreland, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Research administration is a unique area at any institution with investigators to support, other internal stakeholders to satisfy, and the significant responsibility of representing the institution well to sponsors and other external parties. Research administration roles require fully engaged, self-directed employees who have a strong commitment to customer service, an excellent work ethic and a passion for advancing research. Research administration staff have highly specialized skills and employees need a range of training from the broad issues of current events in the relevant industry, to institutional and team norms right down to role-specific skills. Such staff can be hard to find and harder to retain if you don’t have an organizational and office culture that aligns with and supports these employees’ values.

Our institution focuses on staff empowerment and takes a holistic approach to training and retaining staff. Employees are supported in their professional growth and continuously challenged to improve their performance and expand their skills. Their roles are valued and teamwork is essential and sustainable staffing is an institutional priority.

Employee Awareness
To address the issue of employee awareness of current trends and issues in the sponsored research industry, staff took the initiative and carved their own solutions. The contracts negotiators identified and took advantage of a wide variety of educational opportunities:

1. Set up meetings with sponsors to visit sponsors’ offices and hear industry perspectives
2. Rotated the responsibility of scanning the news for relevant information about the clinical trials industry and send out e-reports to each other with appropriate links. The schedule varied depending on the news but the team checked major papers on a daily basis
3. Read and discussed books from the public library on the pharmaceuticals industry and medical research in general
4. Actively sought articles on relevant industry issues from on-line journals and circulated them among other employees
5. Membership in the Canadian Association of University Research Administrators (CAURA) and Model Agreements and Guidelines International (MAGI)
6. Created profiles on LinkedIn and joined relevant groups

There were no additional costs to the hospital beyond staff time and the staff did their book reading and newspaper scanning outside of work hours. Empowering staff to own this process facilitated their professional growth, increased their engagement and developed team cohesiveness.

Staff Training
Hamilton Health Sciences has a formal 1 day training program for all new staff which provides
The contracts specialist role is distinct and for many years it was filled by a single employee so internal mentoring such as job shadowing, was not accessible as it would have been at a more heavily staffed institution. The responsibilities are now shared and over time Hamilton Health Sciences has had success encouraging and strengthening contracts specialists by:

1. Creating a national email discussion group of contract reviewers to share and seek information
2. Cooperating with other academic hospitals to define common principles for all clinical trial contracts so staff have clear, consistent parameters and sponsors experience more transparency
3. Sending the reviewer to conferences for education and invaluable networking opportunities
4. Emphasizing customer service skills by empowering the customer to provide feedback through in-person conversations and formal surveys
5. Inviting research support staff at other institutions to visit and share their expertise
6. Implementing a database so all work is centrally tracked and documents saved in a consistent format accessible to all staff
7. Allowing specialists to attend the research ethics board meetings to broaden their exposure to a variety of research issues
8. Providing funding and time for staff to take certificate, continuing education or degree programs
9. Providing opportunities for job shadowing, so a new employee has the opportunity to work alongside the current incumbent
10. Coordinating quarterly meetings, where contracts specialists in similar roles throughout the institution have an opportunity to come together to discuss issues and solve challenges

Staff Appreciation
Training opportunities are a form of staff appreciation and keep staff growing and engaged. Other forms of staff appreciation are also valuable tools for retention at our institution, including recognition and the opportunity for advancement. Managers verbally recognize and appreciate the expertise each research administration role requires and emphasis to staff their function in the big picture. Staff members have opportunities for meeting researchers and sponsors in person which raises the office’s profile and increases staff visibility (instead of them being involved behind the scenes, roles which allow for little or no recognition).

Clearly a lot is expected of employees and they are provided with many tools to support them on their paths to success, translating into the benefit of having engaged and passionate staff and retaining these valuable human resources. To help preserve the institution’s investment, open dialogue about career aspirations and goals is facilitated through formal staff reviews annually and 360 reviews bi-annually for leadership roles. Team members have the opportunity to share their interests and career-specific goals with management and they work together to map the plan that will best serve the institution’s objectives.

Succession Planning
Another important issue to address in the continuing success of a strong research administration team is succession planning. As people retire or leave the institution, how do you replace their expertise? A good succession plan ensures leadership capabilities are available to meet current and future organizational requirements. Succession management is a key corporate initiative at Hamilton Health Sciences. It is an open and transparent process that includes clear performance expectations to measure staff’s contributions effectively and determine where their interest and capability is today and where they want to be in the future. Providing meaningful and challenging opportunities is a way to keep staff motivated and inspired, both in their current roles, and in the potential opportunities that lay ahead.

In Conclusion
The forward thinking professionalism at the management level flows down to staff and inspires them to aim higher in their duties. To grow and stretch staff to their maximum potential requires ambitious, confident and decisive management. The return on the investment is significant as the hospital retains its strongest performers by sustaining a culture that supports the most ambitious and hardworking team players.
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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 I 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

PANEL: Robert Andresen, Assistant Director, Post-Award Services, Research & Sponsored Programs, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Craig Reynolds, Chief Administrator, Biological Chemistry, University of Michigan Medical School; Michelle Vazin, Director, Office of Contracts and Grants, Vanderbilt University

Check Out the Lower Fee!!

MANAGING INTERACTIONS AND POTENTIAL CONFLICTS 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

PANEL: Jilda Garton, Associate Vice Provost for Research and General Manager of GTRC/GTARC, Georgia Institute of Technology; Denise McCartney, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research Administration, Washington University in St. Louis; Lillie Ryans-Culclager, Director of Contracts, SRI International

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

PANEL: Barbara Cole, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, University of Miami; Matthew Staman, Managing Director, Huron Consulting Group; Angela Wishon, Vice President for Research Administration, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center

Now you can schedule your training at your convenience!

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

Build a library of NCURA TV workshops that you can use to train all year long

ORDER ONLINE AT WWW.NCURA.EDU
The Master in Research Administration (MRA) Program at the Medical University of South Carolina is designed for professionals working in the research administration field who wish to advance their career. Using internet-based instruction, the program enables students to complete the 36-semester hour curriculum in four or six semesters, while continuing to work and live in their home communities. Students may attend full-time or part-time, taking nine credit hours (full-time) or six credit hours (part-time) each semester.

Course content includes:
- Research Design
- Fundamentals of Research Administration
- The Research Industry
- Research Integrity
- Organizational Theory & Behavior
- Ethical Leadership
- Healthcare Delivery Systems
- Human Resource Management

Applications are currently being accepted for Fall 2011. Students are encouraged to apply as early as possible.

Dr. Jim Zoller, Program Director
MUSC College of Health Professions
(843) 792-3849  |  zollerj@musc.edu
www.musc.edu/chp/mra