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The last issue of NCURA Magazine each year is meant to be a look back — to reflect on the past year. However, this issue is a bit different because it focuses on the central federal role in research funding and management. 2013 promises to be a pivotal year.

In addition to the normal slate of excellent articles, this issue has a couple items of note. One is a NCURA Magazine first - an insert article that is meant to be a desk reference. Rather than breaking up the Lorenzi/Bogdanski/Goetz article into a series, we decided to release it in its entirety as a desk reference. The reader is treated to an in-depth look at property issues in research administration. The second item of note is the article on science diplomacy by Norman P. Neureiter. Long known in Washington and international circles for his exemplary public service, Dr. Neureiter writes on the importance of science diplomacy — especially as it applies to foreign countries that are at odds with the United States.

This issue concludes my six year tenure on the NCURA Magazine editorial board, the last three as its first senior editor. Significant substantive, visual and stylistic enhancements are the hallmarks of how the former Newsletter turned into the Magazine.

That being said, I want to focus on the human dimension of this evolution. Over the years I have been fortunate to partner with a hard working group of professionals: Kathleen Larmett and the NCURA staff; co-Editors Lynette Arias, Kristine Kulage, Bob Lowman, Jerry Pogatshnik, Olivia Scriven, Debbie Smith, and Tom Wilson; a number of contributing editors including Carol Blum, who has served 7+ years in her current role; and all the authors who have dedicated their time and talent. This group deserves my heartfelt thanks.

The NCURA Magazine is a true team effort. I know it will continue to prosper under the leadership of incoming Senior Editor Dan Nordquist.

Happy New Year!

James Casey, Senior Editor
Reflections of NCURA 2012

By Dan Nordquist, NCURA President

2012 has been an eventful year for our nation and the world!

Oh yes, and OUR world in 2012 went through FCOI implementation (heavens!), Grant Reform (talk of a new circular), Sequestration (the Fiscal Cliff), The National Research Council (NRC) report: Research Universities and the Future of America: Ten Breakthrough Actions Vital to Our Nation’s Prosperity and Security (where we liked #’s 3, 4, 6, and 7), just to name a few. Whether Blue or Red, young or old, federal or non-federal, sponsored research has been a part of our life, well…for a long time and we hope it will be for a long time to come.

What about NCURA in 2012?
Here are a few reflections:

Even though NCURA is the world’s first and largest association (now well over 7,000 members) of research administrators, we did not, and do not want to rest on our laurels. We started 2012 communicating what our Brand was and how it was not just our logo (even our brand new one), our website, our cool NCURA YouTube Tuesdays, our stellar Traveling Workshops, our spectacular national conferences, or our other great benefits and programs. It’s our reputation - what we say and do. It’s the overall NCURA experience from start to finish. Each of us creates that brand and each of us experiences that brand. The professional network and professional development activities we all participate in, through NCURA, are supported by the tagline we created this year – supporting research…together. Let’s continue to build our brand.

We developed and sent out a membership survey to ensure we stay on the cutting edge of what we, as research administrators, want from our national organization. We had 1,200 respondents and here is a summary of the feedback:

When asked if NCURA represents the interests of the profession, 94% agreed-to-strongly agreed and 93% agreed-to-strongly agreed that NCURA is keeping pace with the changes in the profession. 84% responded that they found NCURA to be very valuable to valuable. Areas where we can improve – the NCURA website (new one going live very soon and NCURA Collaborate is growing by the day – soon to go mobile) and providing clear understanding of how volunteering work in NCURA at the regional and national level (we have Presidential Task forces looking at these). Lastly, 86% rated the NCURA Magazine Very Good and Good and 73% preferred to read the hard copy of the magazine.

The NCURA Board performed a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis of our organization and Board Members Bruce Morgan and Nancy Daneau wrote a very nice article in NCURA Magazine about our results – here are some of the highlights:

Strengths and Weaknesses: NCURA’s strength comes from its members and our willingness to volunteer our time and effort to help one another. Our “community” culture permeates our organization. We are recognized for being a community of communities - communities full of professionals. However, one of NCURA's most valued strengths, the volunteer culture created by all of us, also represents a potential weakness. As NCURA's membership continues to grow, sustaining our culture of volunteerism will become more difficult. It is essential that we continue to find ways to increase volunteer opportunities to keep all of us engaged for the benefit and the betterment of NCURA.

Threats: Our threats continue to be the economy and its impact on our members, including shrinking institutional budgets, increasing workloads and less time for professional development. Complacency was recognized as a threat, however, competition from other non-profit and for-profit organizations actually keeps NCURA from becoming complacent and ensures that we stay on the cutting edge of research administration training and professional development. We did not become the largest by being complacent – that’s for sure.
Any predictions that you read concerning the federal budget and operation of the federal government written before the conclusion of the November elections are worth less than the paper they’re written on. Fearlessly and foolishly let me offer a Capitol View on the topic!

In order to minimize the risk of foolishness, it feels appropriate to offer a bit of a primer on what is happening with the federal budget for fiscal year 2013 – the fiscal year that began October 1, 2012. First, the continuing resolution (CR). Congress passed and President Obama signed a six-month continuing resolution that will keep the government running until March 27, 2013. CRs simply continue supporting the federal agencies, usually at the same level as in the previous year, in this case FY 2012. CRs are necessary when the Congress has failed to pass and/or the president has failed to sign the major appropriation bills before the end of the federal fiscal year, September 30. Without a CR, the federal government would have to stop non-essential operations because the departments and agencies are not authorized to spend money. Because the action “continues” the prior appropriation resolutions, any special requirements, limitations, etc., continue as well; for example, the freeze on federal pay, the cap at Executive Level II on NIH salaries, etc. With some exceptions, the current CR provides small increases to federal appropriations across the board bringing funding up to the $1.047 trillion spending level agreed to in last year’s Budget Control Act (BCA). CRs aren’t new and are, unfortunately, becoming a regular part of the federal appropriations process for passing budgets by the federal government.

What’s “new” for this fiscal year is the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA, P.L. 112-25). Signed into law in August 2011, the BCA was intended to begin the decade-long process of deficit reductions as a part of a deal to increase the debt ceiling. In terms of spending, it established multiyear caps for defense and nondefense discretionary spending that excluded some entitlements like Social Security and Medicare. The caps are designed to control discretionary spending by almost $1 trillion. You will recall that BCA established a two-step process for reducing spending by an additional $1.2 trillion over nine years from FY 2013 to FY 2021. Initially, the law gave responsibility to the Congressional Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction—known as the “Supercommittee”—for developing legislation to close the deficit through some mix of spending cuts and revenue increases, with a November, 2011 deadline and a built-in contingency. When the Supercommittee failed to produce a legislative fix, the contingency kicked in: the automatic across-the-board reductions of $1.2 trillion known as the “sequestration” will kick in for the FY 2013 budget.

As a follow-up to the BCA, Congress passed the Sequestration Transparency Act of 2012 (STA) (P.L. 112-155) that required the President to submit to Congress a report on the impact of the sequestration. On September 14, 2012, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) released a detailed report outlining the funding impacts of sequestration. In the report, OMB makes clear that “the Administration strongly believes that sequestration is bad policy and that Congress can and should take action to avoid it by passing a comprehensive and balanced deficit reduction package.” OMB calls sequestration a “blunt and indiscriminate instrument” and pledges the Administration’s willingness to achieve the deficient reductions needed to move toward a balanced budget.

According to the report, discretionary defense programs would be reduced by 9.4 percent and discretionary nondefense programs by 8.2 percent. This would amount to roughly $12.3 billion in R&D cuts: $7.4 billion on the defense side, and $5.0 billion on the nondefense side. As has been noted in a number of reports, sequestration has created rare unanimity across various stakeholder communities. Universities, industry, small business, states, and local governments all predict that across-the-board cuts in discretionary spending will hurt everyone.

What this means for the principal college and university federal research partners is reductions of 8.2 percent to the budgets of the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation. For academic medical centers, the cap on Medicare of 2 per cent will likely result in additional reductions for research. Estimates for NIH suggest 2,400 fewer research grants and those for NSF 1,600 fewer research and education grants, which will drive the success rate of applicants even lower. Cuts to the defense science programs are likely even deeper – 9.4 percent.

Will Congress be able to act after the elections and before January, 2013, to avoid the imposition of the cuts? I’m not foolish enough to predict that outcome!

On a more positive note, Representative Mo Brooks (R-AL), chair of the House Science, Space and Technology Subcommittee on Research and Science Education, requested the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to
report on federal requirements that are creating reporting burdens on research organizations. GAO is asked to identify “ineffective, duplicative, redundant, inappropriately applied and/or onerous regulations.” In his letter to US Comptroller Gene Dodaro, Rep. Brooks notes that he is following up on a recommendation included in the National Research Council’s recent report, Research Universities and the Future of America: Ten Breakthrough Actions Vital to our Nation’s Prosperity and Security. Rep. Brooks focuses further attention on the challenges of effort reporting under OMB Circular A-21, subrecipient monitoring under A-133, and document retention requirements under FAR 4.703 – all issues raised in hearings held by the Subcommittee. Before you rush to offer Rep. Brooks your favorite two or three (hundred!) ineffective, duplicative, redundant, and onerous regulations, we’ll wait to see what steps GAO takes to respond to this Congressional request.

And finally, you’ve read in past Capitol Views about Rep. Darrell E. Issa (R-CA) Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2011 (DATA Act), including earlier notes on a Senate version introduced by Sen. Mark Warner (D-VA). Sen. Warner (D-VA) has introduced a new version of the DATA Act that is simpler than, and for the research performing organizations highly preferable to, both his previous bill (S. 1222) and the House-passed version of the bill (H.R. 2146). The Senate may consider the new bill during its post-election session.

The new Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2012 (DATA Act S. 3600), co-sponsored by Sen. Rob Portman (R-OH), shares the same goal as the earlier versions – to centralize and make more transparent financial reporting on federal research contracts and grants. But, unlike the House-passed bill, the new Senate bill places no additional reporting requirements on federal award recipients. Federal agencies would be required to provide additional information in an expansion of the federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (FFATA Act), but recipients would continue all current reporting requirements. Rather, it requires OMB to review the current financial reporting that federal agencies require of federal recipients to reduce duplicative financial reporting and compliance costs for recipients. The Senate measure also specifies that OMB request comments from institutions of higher education in that process. Introduced on September 20, 2012, the bill has been referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

No matter the outcome of the elections in November, as “citizens” in your community, you should talk with your legislative affairs colleagues on campus and consider inviting members of your Congressional delegation to campus. As the discussions and debates over sequestration begin, members of Congress should understand the consequences of the choices they will be making to meet the economic challenges facing the US.

Pbew! Dodged predictions. My mamma didn’t raise no fool!

References:
Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-25); Sequestration Transparency Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-155). To find the final version of all Public Laws, go to THOMAS (the Library of Congress search engine) and “Browse Public Laws”: http://thomas.loc.gov/home/thomas.php.

Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2011 – the DATA Act, HR 2146; S 1222 and S 3600. 112th Congress at: http://thomas.loc.gov/home/thomas.php


Carol J. Blum is Director for Research Compliance and Administration at the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR). Before joining COGR in 2001, Carol served Ohio University for ten years as associate vice president for research after three years at the Ohio Board of Regents as director of graduate and special programs. She holds a PhD in history from the University of Cincinnati. She has recently begun exercising the right side of her brain in art classes and continues to volunteer at the Washington Literacy Council and Washington Area (Reproductive Health) Clinic Defense Task Force.
One hears a lot about science diplomacy today, but I am going to tell you how we define those words at AAAS and try to put science diplomacy in the broader context of U.S. foreign policy. There is hardly an issue that arises in international relations that does not involve some aspect of science and technology (S&T). These issues include international trade, military alliances and positioning, defense postures, pandemic diseases, climate change, communications, natural disasters and subsequent relief and recovery, intellectual property and copyright issues, territorial disputes, natural resources, dam construction, energy, global health, food, clean water, poverty, development, land use, agriculture, education, population, biodiversity, fisheries and other marine resources, forests, transportation, waste disposal, pollution, and countering terrorism. All of these issues have technical dimensions and, in general, diplomats have not been so comfortable dealing with them. But this is changing; embassies of many nations have added S&T units. In addition, every technical agency of the U.S. Government now has an international unit that cooperates with the State Department in dealing with these issues.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) is a non-profit science organization—in fact, the largest general scientific organization in the world with approximately 120,000 members. With 262 affiliated scientific societies we represent approximately ten million scientists. Our board-approved broad mission is “to advance science, engineering and innovation throughout the world for the benefit of all people.” Our motto is “Advancing science, serving society.” We are perhaps best known for the publication of SCIENCE magazine, a weekly science journal, initially started by Thomas Edison, and today recognized as one of the world’s most prestigious journals for publication of important scientific discoveries in any field of science. In addition to major
AAAS efforts devoted to issues of national science policy, public support and understanding of science, and science education, AAAS also has a chief international officer, Dr. Vaughan Turekian, who is responsible for our many international relationships. His section has been a pioneer in focusing on science diplomacy, even creating an on-line quarterly publication called Science and Diplomacy. It contains invited or submitted (and reviewed) articles that examine the many relationships between science/technology and contemporary diplomacy. www.sciencediplomacy.org. It has already published articles by some very distinguished authors and has received excellent reviews.

**Defining Science and Diplomacy**

Let us take a closer look at the words science and diplomacy. It is convenient to see any form of international cooperation in science as science diplomacy and to believe that every investigator that cooperates or interacts with a colleague abroad is engaged in science diplomacy. We like science cooperation; we think it is an imperative today since good ideas are in no way a U.S. monopoly, and it also fosters closer international relationships. However, our definitions are a bit more complicated; we see the science-diplomacy relationship from three different angles:

**Science in diplomacy**: Many issues affect multiple countries and hence become foreign policy concerns. Examples past and present are the banning of DDT to spray for mosquitoes, climate change, acid rain (formerly a big issue between the U.S. and Canada and also the impact on European forests), the “ozone hole” and the removal of fluorocarbon aerosols from spray cans, genetically modified foods, etc. These depend/depended on the best available scientific information for a decision on what to do (solution) and whether to establish a policy, to reach an international agreement or to propose an international treaty. The conclusion must be based on the best possible scientific data—which, of course, can sometimes still not be sufficient to reach an agreement. An example is climate change: I suspect that most New Yorkers today are beginning to suspect that there is some validity to the threats attributed to global warming. We call this process *science in diplomacy*, in which science and scientists can find themselves at the center of intense diplomatic interactions.

**Diplomacy for science**: This is where diplomatic negotiations become necessary to reach agreement among several nations on large international projects in science. Certainly the International Space Station was one example, with years of intense diplomatic negotiations over astronauts, use of the facility and difficulties in funding. ITER, the international nuclear fusion energy project now being built in France, finally got underway after nearly 20 years of diplomatic attention, including intense competition over location among the six involved parties. CERN, the huge accelerator facility on the Swiss border with France, is another example. It grew out of a UNESCO meeting many years ago and came into being after the European countries realized that no country alone could finance such a program. CERN’s particle physics triumph was their recent announcement of the detection of the long-sought Higgs boson. Many American scientists have worked and continue to work at CERN, now the leading accelerator facility in the world. The same phenomenon exists in astronomy where a massive joint radioastronomy facility called the Square Kilometer Array (SKA) is being built cooperatively in South Africa and Australia, opening new windows on the universe and a good example of diplomacy for science.

**Science for diplomacy**: This is our focus at AAAS, what we call science diplomacy. Our definition is quite narrow. It is very simply the use of science cooperation as an instrument of constructive engagement with countries where political relations are not good or even downright hostile. It is peaceful engagement with such countries in the hopes of improving the overall relationship via scientific cooperation. We have, in the eight years I have been at AAAS, concentrated on five countries (Iran, North Korea, Syria, Cuba and Myanmar), where I think contacts and interactions have been quite remarkable. It is less certain that we have changed the global equation, but we do have contacts where none existed before and we could be doing far more if more funding were available. Needless to say, export controls, sanctions regimes and the intensity of political feelings about these countries have often made interactions difficult and at times impossible. In Syria, where after a year of effort, some concrete opportunities looked promising and we were on the verge of beginning our first project, all activity ended with anti-government demonstrations and the brutal response from the Syrian Government—a situation that appears to have turned into a fiercely destructive civil war.

But we at AAAS did not invent science diplomacy. It has been going on for a long time, although no one seemed to call it that until recently. It turns out that I have been involved in it since my first job in government—with the National Science Foundation (NSF) almost 50 years ago.

**The Historical Context**

**Japan**

I arrived shortly after NSF had been charged by President Kennedy to manage a new program with Japan. The program was recommended by Harvard professor Edwin Reischauer—an expert on Japan and then serving as U.S Ambassador in Tokyo. He was very concerned with the deterioration in U.S.-Japan relations. He sensed that the intellectual contacts between the scientific and intellectual communities of the two countries had broken down. There were almost no contacts between them, no dialog. He wanted to fix what he called the “broken dialog.” So, when Japanese Prime Minister Ikeda came to Washington for a state visit in 1961, President Kennedy proposed the creation of a U.S.-Japan Joint Committee on Scientific Cooperation—the first relationship of this kind between the two countries. I became the program’s first permanent director. Incredibly, that program, with many changes, is still going on and recently celebrated its 50th birthday. Furthermore, U.S.-Japan cooperation in science and technology has gone far beyond the NSF program; strong ties exist today among universities, government agencies and private companies. Science cooperation has been an important part of
U.S.-Japan relations. But there are even more dramatic examples of science diplomacy.

China

In 1972, I was working as assistant to the President’s Science Advisor in the White House Office of Science and Technology. At that time there had been essentially no contacts of any kind (except threats) between the U.S. and China for 23 long and often very tense years. Secretly, President Nixon and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger were planning a trip to China to try to change the dynamics in the relationship. President Nixon wanted to propose science cooperation to the Chinese, because he saw science as something concrete, something tangible—something more than just a shift in geopolitical positioning and U.S. foreign policy. Working in great secrecy, our office managed in a short time to put together 40 specific proposals for cooperative scientific projects in non-sensitive areas that we thought would be possible between the two countries. These proposals were taken to Beijing and were part of discussions with senior Chinese leadership. The result was that at the end of that very famous visit, the official Shanghai Communiqué stated that science would be one of the areas in which cooperation could develop. That cooperation began very slowly with a few cautious visits of scientists in both directions followed by some cooperation and scientist exchanges. It is a very nice model for cooperation and I think could be an effective model for other countries if endowment funds were as active or as successful as the science agreement with China. With this history in mind, let us look at what is happening now.

2000-Present

On his visit to improve U.S. relations with India in 2000, President Clinton established a new kind of program for increasing science and technology cooperation between the two countries. Funding was provided as an endowment by the two governments, but the program is managed through a non-government organization called the Indo-U.S. Science and Technology Forum. The main secretariat is in Delhi, India with a U.S. support office located at AAAS in Washington. I have been serving as the U.S. co-chair of this Forum for the past 12 years, during which over twelve thousand U.S. and Indian scientists have been involved in our workshops, conferences, joint research centers and scientist exchanges. It is a very nice model for cooperation and I think could be an effective model for other countries if endowment funds were ascertainment.

Today, it is well understood that science and technology are essential elements of the economic development process. In Africa the President of Rwanda has been very active in planning for the
Iran

Despite the fact that formal relations between Iran and the U.S. are not strong, since 2000 the U.S. National Academy of Sciences has had an agreement with the Iranian Academy of Sciences providing for scientific exchanges and joint workshops. Remarkably, these have been successful. Topics for the workshops, which consist of visits of delegations in both directions (or in third countries such as France or Turkey), have included disease and health issues, earthquakes, ethics in science, water issues, environment, and science policy. Even as sanctions have been levied on Iran by the United Nations Security Council and intensified recently by U.S. and European countries because of their uranium enrichment program, it is still possible (though not easy) for Iranian students to get visas to study in non-sensitive areas of science in the United States. There are some science visits in both directions. A research professor from Harvard just returned from a very successful meeting on HIV/AIDS she had organized in Tehran and which laid the basis for further cooperation. Interestingly, the growth of science in Iran is among the most active in the Muslim world and the Iranians have begun to sponsor science diplomacy missions of their own, particularly in other developing or emerging countries. At the same time, the standoff remains over Iran’s nuclear program. It remains to be seen if new negotiations—rumored to be held after the U.S. presidential election—can be successful in reaching some agreement that will satisfy both sides. My third and most recent visit to Iran was in June 2012; Nobelist Peter Agre of Johns Hopkins University and I lectured at four universities and were very cordially received. The potential for science cooperation with Iran is great and some exchanges are still being planned, but present political tensions are a major hindrance. American science and technology is highly admired by Iranian scientists and prominent U.S. scientists are welcomed and treated royally. Princeton physics Nobelist Joseph Taylor, who visited Iran in 2007, was at the time measured for a statute. One year later a bronze bust of him was unveiled in front of Iran’s largest science park, Pardis. There is great emphasis on science in Iran and the quality of their students is excellent—some of whom do manage to come to the U.S. for post-graduate work.

Cuba

Several visits organized by AAAS have been made to Cuba, where we had a very warm welcome and saw definite interest in cooperation. Cuban scientific work in biotechnology and vaccine development, as well as organic urban agriculture is considered to be of high quality. We believe there are potentially very good opportunities for cooperation, but present U.S. laws regarding relations with Cuba have so far limited progress. Those laws do permit visits “to discuss research,” but it is not easy to engage in joint research or to transfer equipment, materials or money. One day that situation will change.

Myanmar

AAAS representatives have also been pioneers with two major visits to Myanmar (or Burma), the first before liberalization took effect and the second when it was actively underway and the illustrious Aung San Suu Kyi was running (successfully, as it turned out) for a seat in Parliament. We were received warmly on both visits, even effusively on the second, when we visited seven ministries and were exposed to many possible areas of cooperation. There is a chance that USAID will be in a position to fund projects and it is clear that many Americans are interested in closer relations. However, their science and education communities are not strong and it will take considerable effort to develop good projects. Fellowships for professors and students abroad for advanced training would be very desirable. There are good prospects for cooperation in health, environmental protection, and forest conservation. They are interested in almost every area of science. There are also some efforts underway in the West to consider establishing new private universities. Education and capacity building are extremely important for the future development of Myanmar.

North Korea

Almost seven years ago AAAS began to explore cooperation with North Korea (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK)). It took considerable time, but I can now report a successful exchange of visits between a consortium of AAAS and three other U.S organizations and the DPRK State Academy of Sciences. There have been two formal visits to Pyongyang related to the teaching of English language to scientists of the DPRK Academy. The main U.S. participants were from CRDF Global—a non-profit organization deeply involved in international science cooperation, and Syracuse University. Syracuse also has been involved in a digital library project with Kim Chaek University that has been going on, albeit slowly, for some ten years. AAAS also recently put together, with support from the
Lounsbery Foundation, a very successful seminar on “Restoration of Forests and Landscape” and we presently have from the DPRK a proposal for a second such meeting. The first meeting brought 85 of their scientists together with 14 scientists from outside—including five Americans, one Chinese and the others from several European countries. The DPRK recognizes its major challenges in soil fertility, and restoration of their decimated forests and depleted lands. A book with all slides and texts in both languages of the 28 papers presented at the seminar is available. We were impressed with the frankness of the Korean scientists and the chance for visits to a tree nursery, a collective farm and a beautiful regional mountain park. It is not yet clear how the politics will develop under the new, young Supreme Leader Kim Jong Un and whether relations with South Korea and the U.S. will improve or remain strained.

There is one truly remarkable institution in Pyongyang, the capital of North Korea. It is the Pyongyang University of Science and Technology (PUST). It was built by a Korean-American who had a successful business, and then decided to devote the rest of his life to helping Koreans in China and then later in North Korea. He collected money, largely from the Korean Christian communities around the world, and then built schools and finally a university (YUST) in Yanbian Province in China (also known as the Korean autonomous district of China). When the North Koreans asked if he could do the same in North Korea and gave him land on the edge of Pyongyang, he did. He collected approximately $40 million, and built a 17-building institution which is now in operation. I was there for the dedication in 2009 and then again for the first international conference in 2011. I am told that the university now has 300 undergraduates and 70 graduate students. Seeing a former American astronaut at the international conference lecture in English to the students. Seeing a former American astronaut at the international conference in 2011. I am told that the university now has 300 undergraduates and 70 graduate students. Seeing a former American astronaut at the international conference lecture in English to the students.

The DPRK recognizes its major challenges in soil fertility, and restoration of their decimated forests and depleted lands. A book with all slides and texts in both languages of the 28 papers presented at the seminar is available. We were impressed with the frankness of the Korean scientists and the chance for visits to a tree nursery, a collective farm and a beautiful regional mountain park. It is not yet clear how the politics will develop under the new, young Supreme Leader Kim Jong Un and whether relations with South Korea and the U.S. will improve or remain strained.

There is one truly remarkable institution in Pyongyang, the capital of North Korea. It is the Pyongyang University of Science and Technology (PUST). It was built by a Korean-American who had a successful business, and then decided to devote the rest of his life to helping Koreans in China and then later in North Korea. He collected money, largely from the Korean Christian communities around the world, and then built schools and finally a university (YUST) in Yanbian Province in China (also known as the Korean autonomous district of China). When the North Koreans asked if he could do the same in North Korea and gave him land on the edge of Pyongyang, he did. He collected approximately $40 million, and built a 17-building institution which is now in operation. I was there for the dedication in 2009 and then again for the first international conference in 2011. I am told that the university now has 300 undergraduates and 70 graduate students. Seeing a former American astronaut at the international conference lecture in English to the students.

Dr. Neureiter was born in Illinois and grew up near Rochester, New York. He received a B.A. degree in chemistry from the University of Rochester in 1952 and a Ph.D. in organic chemistry from Northwestern University in 1957. He spent a year (’55-6) as a Fulbright Fellow in the Institute of Organic Chemistry at the University of Munich.

In 1957, he joined Humble Oil and Refining (now part of Exxon) in Baytown, Texas as a research chemist, also teaching German and Russian at the University of Houston. On leave from Humble in 1959, he served as a guide at the U.S. National Exhibition in Moscow, subsequently qualifying as an escort interpreter for the Department of State. In 1963, he joined the International Affairs Office of the U.S. National Science Foundation in Washington and managed the newly established U.S.-Japan Cooperative Science Program. Entering the U.S. Foreign Service in 1965, he was named Deputy Scientific Attaché at the U.S. Embassy in Bonn. In 1967, he was transferred to Warsaw as the first U.S. Scientific Attaché in Eastern Europe with responsibility for Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

Dr. Neureiter returned to Washington in 1969 as the Assistant for International Affairs to the President’s Science Advisor in the White House Office of Science and Technology. He left government service in 1973 and joined Texas Instruments (TI), where he held a number of staff and management positions including Manager, East-West Business Development; Manager, TI Europe Division; Vice President, Corporate Staff; and Vice President of TI Asia, resident in Tokyo from 1989-94.

After retirement from TI in 1996, he worked as a consultant until being appointed in September 2000 as the first Science and Technology Adviser to the U.S. Secretary of State. Finishing the 3-year assignment in 2003, he was made a Distinguished Presidential Fellow for International Affairs at the U.S. National Academy of Sciences (NAS). In 2004, he joined the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) to become the first Director of the newly established AAAS Center for Science, Technology and Security Policy (CSTSP), funded with support from the McArthur Foundation. In October 2009, he stepped down as the Director of CSTSP but remains as Senior Advisor both to CSTSP and the recently formed AAAS Center for Science Diplomacy (CSD), which seeks via scientific cooperation to engage with countries where overall relations are strained. To date, the CSD has been involved in initiatives with Cuba, Iran, Myanmar, North Korea, and Syria.

On October 23, 2012, he was awarded the Austrian Cross of Honor in Science and Art 1st Class, in the name of the President of Austria and presented by the Austrian Minister of Science and Research at a gala dinner event celebrating the 40th Anniversary of IIASA—an international organization of 20 countries. IIASA’s mission is to address the great challenges facing the world today: food, water, health, energy, poverty, development, terrorism, and others. We urge you to follow our online journal Science & Diplomacy www.sciencediplomacy.org and will respond to any questions or suggestions.

There are three major downsides to cooperation with North Korea. One is that communication is very difficult; there are no direct email or phone links, at least for Americans. One either goes through an intermediate or the DPRK Mission to the U.N. in New York. Hence, detailed planning of a complex project is not simple. Secondly, the foreign correspondent has to pay for everything; there is no cost sharing and goods are not as inexpensive as one might think. Finally, U.S. and other Western export control regulations and some North Korean limitations on imported equipment can greatly complicate or undermine project plans. Again, much will depend on how the overall political situation evolves between the DPRK and the West. One might also expect that good opportunities for cooperation could take place through PUST, but except for the very interesting international conference at PUST, cooperation through PUST with other DPRK institutions has not taken place and will not be so simple to arrange.

Conclusion

Science diplomacy is a very important and useful instrument of international scientific engagement and can contribute to a more peaceful world. AAAS intends to continue and expand these activities and would welcome partners in the process. We also believe that only through more scientific cooperation will mankind successfully address the great challenges facing the world today: food, water, health, energy, poverty, development, terrorism, and others. We urge you to follow our online journal Science & Diplomacy www.sciencediplomacy.org and will respond to any questions or suggestions.

Dr. Neureiter is a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. In 2008, he was elected a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and also was a recipient of the National Academy of Sciences’ Public Welfare Medal, considered the highest honor of that institution. In 2010, he received from the Emperor of Japan the Order of the Rising Sun, Gold and Silver Star, for contributions over many years to furthering scientific cooperation between the U.S. and Japan. He is presently also a member of the NAS Committee on International Security and Arms Control (GISSC). Dr. Neureiter is married with four children and speaks German, Russian, Polish, French, Spanish and Japanese.
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Looking Back on 2012, Looking Forward to 2013
By Denise Moody, Jane Tolbert, and Andre Walker

As we came together to write this article, we were struck by the difficulty of the task. That is, how do we write a “federal-themed” article while recognizing that the single biggest federal factor, the outcome of the 2012 Presidential election, is unknown at the time of writing? We chose instead to reflect, as is customary at year-end, on the past year and the year ahead. What went well? What will we do differently in the new year? As we each shared our own experiences, we found that the conversation settled around five themes: collaboration, organization and balance, bottom-line focus, electronic Research Administration (eRA), and continuous learning. We immediately recognized these themes as key attributes of both the successful research administrator and the well-run sponsored programs office, so we used them as our template.

Collaboration
Creating and maintaining professional connections is crucial to navigating the increasing complexity of our jobs. Of the many wonderful aspects of our profession, foremost among them are the wealth of experience embodied in our colleagues and the willingness of those colleagues to share their expertise. Over the past year, we have witnessed colleagues come together across institutions and across the country to respond to a number of thorny issues. Highlights of this year include implementing policies for the Public Health Service financial conflict of interest regulation, decoding the NASA China restriction, and weighing in on the proposed merger of Office of Management and Budget circulars, and the movement of project reporting for National Science Foundation awards to Research.gov. This past spring, NCURA launched Collaborate, a professional-networking platform that allows administrators to build relationships with peers and tap essential know-how, regardless of their geographic location.

Looking forward to 2013, there will doubtless be more opportunities to bring the collective expertise of the RA community to bear on important questions. We will likely continue to grapple with all of the aforementioned issues, as well as the unknowns that will crop up. Whatever the issue, networking tools like Collaborate can help identify, understand, and manage emerging issues in real-time. Each of us, if not already using Collaborate, should take a test drive. The more members who contribute to the system, the richer it becomes as a resource for all.

Organization and Balance
The notorious, ever-increasing and evolving workload is familiar to all research administrators. While the constant busyness might feel like job security, it may also lead to poor work-life balance. The unpredictable nature of our jobs makes it easy to lose perspective. We have all seen work plans evaporate with the appearance of one (or many) last-minute proposal submissions. However, rather than simply “grinding through” the deadlines or periods when we may be short-staffed, taking a proactive approach may lead to a greater sense of job satisfaction.

How does one achieve that seemingly elusive balance between working hard and enjoying our personal lives? We suggest a three-step approach.

Step One: Get organized. Our job descriptions demand that we handle many projects at once, and our internal drive may lead us to take on too many tasks at once. However, multi-tasking never quite works the way we expect. Talk with colleagues and model best practices for each business process (e.g., proposal review, subaward preparation, contract review, etc.), as well as for follow-up activities. Also, explore ways to more effectively prioritize items in your workload. Lastly, if you feel inundated, do not suffer in silence. Let your manager know so that workload can be reallocated or reprioritized, if necessary.

Step Two: Identify the barriers to achieving balance. Try to assess what prevented the achievement of balance this year. Are your habits for organizing workload effective? Do extra hours at the office encroach on your home life? Do you regularly discuss workload with supervisors or colleagues who might be able to provide support and the necessary resources?

Step Three: Strive to gain balance. In 2013, commit to making at least one small change to promote better work-life balance. Goals might include working toward better communication with our supervisors or colleagues, organizing paperwork or “virtual” documentation to become more efficient, or attending a work-life balance workshop.

Research administration is often a demanding job. However, with organization and forethought, we administrators can achieve balance and avoid feeling forever “behind the eight-ball.”

Bottom-Line Focus
As budgets have continued to shrink at institutions and sponsoring agencies, this year found many research administrators looking for novel ways to
cut costs and to identify new sponsored research funding opportunities. We have had to rethink traditional ways of conducting our business and embrace the concept of “doing more with less.” Unsurprisingly, many of us found creative ways to get positive results. Under tightened budgets, we have been able to maintain or improve levels of service by streamlining processes, prioritizing critical and non-critical tasks, and increasing collaboration between department and central office administrators. Also, we have investigated non-traditional sources, such as “crowd-funding,” as an emerging option for sponsored research.

We should expect institutional budget pressure and growing competition for research funding to continue in 2013 and beyond. Yet, we may be confident that research administrators will respond with creativity and flexibility to find new ways to do more.

**Electronic Research Administration**

Over the past year, many institutions began to realize the promise of electronic Research Administration, or eRA, moving them closer to the ideal of a paperless office. It emerged in many formats, including new and expanded in-house RA systems, expanded use of government systems (e.g., xTrain), new compliance systems, and new proprietary systems for some private sponsors. These systems benefitted users by reducing the paperwork burden, streamlining office processes to allow for more efficient staff deployment, and increasing visibility and tracking for work-in-progress. However, the benefits did not come without some cost. We have often had to endure the training and debugging phases that accompany a new system and, at times, the pushback from our institutional users. In time, the new systems have, for the most part, won over skeptics and become standard operating procedure.

The coming year promises more of the same. NIH and NSF, the two largest funding agencies for most institutions, along with a number of other federal agencies, are participating in an effort to streamline progress reporting. NIH Research Performance Progress Reports (RPPR) began pilot testing this past October, and a full rollout is planned in the first half of 2013. RPPR will replace the familiar eSNAP reporting process for non-competing continuations. Similarly, NSF announced the intended transition of all research reporting from Fastlane to Research.gov in 2013, starting with a pilot in November 2012. NIH will also expand the use of Grants.gov by transitioning multi-project (program) applications to electronic submission. And, as in past years, we can probably count at least one sponsor to add a new proprietary proposal submission system or process to the mix in 2013.

**Continuous Learning**

Research administrators face change on a daily basis. In addition to shifting workloads, we often juggle organizational and life changes. The authors' own lives are a case in point. Among us, one started a new position at a new institution this past year, one dealt with significant organizational changes, and one started graduate study as a non-traditional student. In discussing our individual experiences, we identified several lessons learned:

- **Expect to learn something new every day.** In our profession, if you are not learning something new every day, then you are not paying attention. Always be on the lookout for new nuggets of knowledge from colleagues, and think about how you can use the information become a better administrator.

- **Set realistic expectations.** It is extremely difficult to learn and navigate a new institution and its policies, procedures, systems, and culture. We must be kind and give ourselves sufficient time to “learn the ropes” while also ensuring that the new supervisor is continuously involved in setting these expectations.

- **Understand responsibilities.** What is not made clear in the interview process or the employment database job description should be understood during the initial months of your new role. While we should be continuously challenging ourselves and open to changes outside of the job description, we should also be aware of, and meet, our core deliverables.

- **Leverage colleague's knowledge and tools.** If you are taking on a brand-new role and are challenged to create your own processes and systems, leverage your fellow NCURA colleagues. You will likely find a multitude with experience in the role, as well as practical knowledge and tools. Each of us has been the newbie at some time during our careers, and we are open to sharing and mentoring one another.

*Embrace change. As a research administrator, our job is never boring! It is constantly changing, but that change also brings opportunity. So, be ready when an opportunity presents itself, and remember that each of us is not alone.*

In the coming year, the authors plan to use the lessons learned and take on at least one new challenge. We invite each of you to join us. Learn one new skill, or accept a new responsibility in 2013. If we are constantly challenging ourselves, we will be better prepared to embrace external change, whether new sponsor requirements, institutional reorganization, or new job responsibilities.

**Conclusion**

As we look back on 2012, we can see many successes in the rear-view mirror that appeared to be roadblocks when we first approached them. Looking forward to 2013, we can already see road signs flashing “caution ahead”. However, as research administrators always do, we will rely on our expertise, our colleagues, and our belief in the investigators and the research that we support in order to overcome any obstacle. Whatever the challenge, we will embrace it and roll with it. So, let’s roll in 2013!

---

**Denise Moody** is the Program Manager for Research Policy in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Research Administration Services at Harvard University. She currently serves on the NCURA Professional Development Committee, the Pre-Award Community Committee, and the Region 1 Curriculum Committee. Denise is also a graduate of NCURA’s 2007 Leadership Development Institute.

**Jane Tolbert, Ph.D.**, is the Senior Administrator in the Center for Neural Development & Disease at the University of Rochester Medical Center. Her experience includes grant and program administration at the central and department level, and clinical project management industry. She currently serves on the NCURA Pre-Award Community Committee.

**Andre Walker, M.B.A., C.R.A.**, is a Grants and Contracts Manager in University Research Administration at The University of Chicago. He currently serves on the NCURA Pre-Award Community Committee, and he is the Contributing Editor for Biomed for NCURA Magazine.
I wanted to give everyone a quick update on our 54th Annual Meeting. It was quite a memorable event for me, and I hope it was just as memorable for all of you that attended. There were about 2,000 members, and 450 of you were new members! NCURA’s membership—now upwards of 7,700—was well represented at AM54.

It made me so proud to be an NCURA member and see the engagement of attendees. I don’t know that I’ve ever seen attendees rush the stage for autographs from Paul Begala and Tucker Carlson—our two keynote speakers. It was a pretty special moment.

Hurricane Sandy wrought serious devastation to our friends in the Northeast just days before the meeting. I am so thankful and so proud that we still “do it live” in NCURA! Those in attendance participated in a raffle drawing to raise money for both the Red Cross and Feeding America. We raised about $2,200 at the meeting, with nothing more than announcements at the meeting. We also contributed unused hotel room toiletries to make up hygiene kits for the area’s less fortunate residents. This was a wonderful idea offered by Laura Letbetter (Kennesaw State University), who is a graduate of the 2012 Executive Leadership Program.

I look forward to serving as your President in 2013—you will hear more from me in future Magazine articles.

**Patricia Hawk** is NCURA Vice President/President Elect and serves as the Director, Office of Sponsored Programs at Oregon State University.
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**AM54 Program Committee**

- Seated: Cathy Snyder, Patricia Hawk, Tony Ventlingia, Denise Moody, Alison Wellman Smith
- Back Row: Toni Shashke, Pamela Webb, Dennis Paikzahl, David Mayor, Josie Jimenez, Lilli Ryans-Culicke, Barbara Cole, Julie Guggino, Kay Ellis, Patrick Fitzgerald, David Lynch, Vivian Holmes
- Not Pictured: Vincent Bogdanski, Carolyn Elliott-Farino, John Harold, Pamela Hawkins, Aimee Howell, Jose Leite, Matthew Stroman, Garrett Steed
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**2012 Executive Committee**

**Front Row:** Patricia Hawk, Vice President (Oregon State University); Dan Nordquist, President (Washington State University); Judy Fredenberg, Immediate Past President (University of Montana)

**Back Row:** Georgette Sakumoto, Secretary (University of Hawaii); Kathleen Lamett, NCURA Executive Director; Mario Medina, Treasurer (University of Texas at San Antonio)
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**2012 Board of Directors**

**Front Row:** Kris Monahan, Judy Friedenberg, Michelle Vazin, Patricia Hawk, Georgette Sakumoto, Dan Nordquist

**Back Row:** Kathleen Lamett, Antonette Lawson, Bruce Morgan, Samantha Westcott, James Casey, Josie Jimenez, David Lynch, Cilla Casplas, Ted Northover, Mario Medina

Not Pictured: Ralph Brown, Nancy Dansau, Jill Frazier Tincher, Marianne Woods
MEETING IN REVIEW

Keynote Speakers
Tucker Carlson; Kathleen Larmett, NCURA Executive Director; Patricia Hawk, NCURA Vice President; Paul Begala; Dan Nordquist, NCURA President
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Seated: Marjorie Foster, Mary Husemoller, Julia Jacobsen
Standing: Genta Liders, Cindy White, Pamela Webb, Barbara Gray, Nan Wells, John Case, Denise Clark, Cheryl-Lee Howard, Thomas Coggins

AMS4 Co-Chairs
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Seated: Judy Fredenberg, Mary Husemoller, Pam Whitlock
Standing: Jerry Fife, David Mayo, Jane Youngers, John Case, Kim Moreland, Cheryl-Lee Howard, Denise Clark, David Richardson, Steven Smartt, Patrick Fitzgerald
It’s one of the most often-invoked pieces of wisdom that pre-award administrators share with researchers: Read (and follow) the guidelines carefully.

One of the first brochures I used regularly when preparing training sessions stated the need to read the guidelines repeatedly, to make sure that the audience got the picture. It’s something that has always stayed with me, and to this day I repeat it when talking to anyone about proposal writing. Yes, it is that important. No one wants to prepare a proposal that will not be read due to lack of compliance with the guidelines. Sometimes, though, those guidelines are confusing and unclear. That’s another place where we come in: Interpreting the guidelines.

Language interpretation facilitates communication between parties who speak different languages. An interpreter does more than just translate into a different language. The interpreter’s job is also to ensure that the intended message is received, including sometimes subtle nuances. To do so, the interpreter may go back to the speaker to ask questions and clarify the intent. While we are not technically interpreting between different languages when we explain proposal guidelines, there are times when it feels as if we are. There are also times when, just like a language interpreter, we need to go back to the source (the sponsor), to gain insight into the actual intent.

The inspiration for this article came from a series of exchanges on listservs and NCURA Neighborhood groups. The original posters were asking questions that ranged from how to interpret a specific statement to what to do when the program announcement said one thing and the sponsor’s usual guidance stated another. I couldn’t help but think about how many times we have all faced these questions, even as experienced research administrators. I know I have made many phone calls to program and grants offices, even when I thought I knew the answer, just to be sure, to clarify not just the words, but also the intent. Occasionally, as we all know, what is stated is not what was actually intended.

I remember sitting in a concurrent session with NSF staff members years ago. As they so often do, the NSF staff members were listening to our concerns and trying to see what they could do to help us create a more effective partnership. At that time, one of the prime concerns was that proposal guidelines differed so much. Hunting through the guidelines for standard information, such as indirect cost recovery or cost-sharing requirements, was a challenge. Out of that session and others like it, the current NSF ‘template’ was born. While there may still be some slight variances, standard information is now generally much easier to find, and this has made all of our lives easier.

And then there’s another area that we also addressed that day in the concurrent session, one that is a little more difficult to address. Sometimes, the language itself is simply not clear. One of the participants commented that some of the program announcements seem to have been written by an aspiring author using the guidelines as a way to utilize his or her creative writing skills. Although we all understood that our jobs, as well as those of the sponsors, can get a little boring and not allow much room for creative expression, we agreed that a more straightforward approach was needed. The fewer words you can use to describe something, the better, although those words must be chosen carefully and still say what needs to be communicated.

From my own experience with writing, I know that this is easier said than done. Recently, I tried communicating, via email, about the requirements for a renewal proposal. What seemed a simple answer to me, after many years in research administration, was not so straightforward for the first-time federal principal investigator (PI) preparing the renewal. The PI was confused by guidance in the “results from prior support” section that indicated that the quality of the previous work would be considered if the proposal was for renewed support. After all, if you had prior support, wouldn’t it seem to be understood that the proposal was for renewed support? I explained,
or so I thought, that it was in fact possible to have prior support from a sponsor and still have the new proposal not be for renewed support. I thought I was being clear each time I repeated that. But the PI was still confused. Finally, I explained that the sponsor was referring to renewed support of the project, not the PI. This time, my answer, shorter than any of my previous attempts, made sense to the PI. I knew what I was trying to tell the researcher the whole time, but until I finally made sure that what was in my mind was concisely but still fully stated in my explanation, it didn’t make sense to the other person. This experience made me think more of the article I was already writing, and how important it is not only to state what may seem obvious, but also to state it clearly and as simply as possible. It also gave me something I knew I could share when I tell PIs to make sure they explain things very well for the proposal reviewer. We all tend to be biased by what we already know, and have difficulty making sure that we explain it clearly for a reader who does not have our experience and cannot see what we have in our own minds. Consequently, I can understand the difficulty of writing proposal guidelines, but still advocate for anticipating questions and potential areas of confusion.

Along these lines, I recall a new state program that had the forethought to send out their guidelines for comment prior to finalizing them. The people running the program were new to the granting business and had not written proposal guidelines before, so they wanted to be sure that they had included the necessary information. Still, they were rather surprised by the number of comments we research administrators supplied, as well as the types of concerns we addressed. Those guidelines were not perfect when they were finalized . . . we did not catch everything or anticipate every question . . . but I am sure they probably received significantly fewer phone calls than they would have with the first version.

Sometimes the answers to questions about guidelines are easy, sometimes, not so much. Other times, that standard answer, “it depends,” may apply. When some of the recent online discussions were taking place, I remember thinking that program guidelines are supposed to take precedence over normal agency guidelines, and that usually that is what I would advise. But I also knew that I would still want to verify. Just in case. Perhaps I am paranoid; perhaps I have been bitten once too often by an occasional discrepancy, but yes, I would ask for clarification.

Interpreting guidelines is an art, not a science. There is lots of room for interpretation. But then again, maybe there is some science in it after all, if, as we often do, we come up with our hypotheses, but then test it by asking others for input.

Pamela Vargas is the Executive Director of the Research Center at Kutztown University. She serves as Contributing Editor for the NCURA Magazine Pre-award corner and has previously served as Co-chair of the NCURA PRA Meeting and Chair of NCURA Region IV.
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This is the final article in a three-part series on sponsorship and mentorship and their significance in supporting women’s career advancement in a university setting written by staff (Edmondson & Floyd, 2012) and faculty (Gonzales & Sponsel, 2012) at the University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA). In this article the focus shifts from staff and faculty perspectives on sponsorship and mentorship toward the role of academic institutions. We propose ways in which various vice presidential (VP) offices within a university can create and sustain sponsoring and mentoring activities and incorporate them into administrative policies and practice. We maintain that institutional commitment to these is essential to achieving gender parity when it comes to women’s career advancement (Hewlett, Peraino, Sherbin, & Sumberg, 2010). Executive administration must take the lead in generating a shift in institutional culture and practices in a manner that sets women’s career development as a strategic imperative (Colleen O’Neill & Boyle, 2011). Additionally, women must actively contribute to creating this institutional transformation as the development of “women-centered leadership” is essential for this transformation to occur (Barsh, Cranston, & Craske, 2008).

In summer 2012 the four authors of this article participated in a three-day Women’s Professional Advancement and Synergy Academy (WPASA), an inaugural initiative that the six VP offices at our institution supported. One of our authors (Gonzales) organized support for this initiative and she was one of its leaders. Perhaps one of the most unique and beneficial aspects of the WPASA experience was that the twenty participants did not all hold formal leadership roles at the institution. Participants held titles ranging from associate dean to administrative assistant, and the unique perspectives that this type of diversity brought to our dialogue was critical to the success of the forum. We focused on the topic of our professional advancement as women in the academy, and discussed common challenges women face in striving for their goals. Each participant was encouraged to explore her personal aspirations, and to see ways that she could influence her career path in a positive way.

Soon after WPASA, UTSA Provost/VP for Academic Affairs and Interim VP for Research, Dr. John Frederick, brought together a small number of faculty members to comprise the “Diverse Faculty Initiative” (DFI) chaired by Ret. Col. Lisa Firmin, Associate Provost for Faculty and Student Diversity and Recruitment. Firmin had been a panel member in the session “Securing Your Seat at the Table” from her presentation led to one of our authors (Sponsel) becoming a member of the DFI. The Initiative is still in the process of formulating its recommendations to the Provost, but in this article we would like to offer some suggestions on ways to improve the number of female tenured/tenure-track (T/TT) faculty at our university, and ensure that they compete successfully with their male counterparts for promotion to senior ranks. We view these as particularly vital in the science and engineering fields in which women are so poorly represented, especially at the senior level. We also see these as important matters in staff hiring and promotion across the University. This is why this article centers on institutional changes that address both faculty and staff.

It is useful to think in terms of recognition, recruitment, recognition, and retention. Recruitment of women will improve when the climate for women at the institution is favorable to candidates. One way to demonstrate this to prospective employees is to have sponsoring and mentoring programs in place for new faculty and staff. This is especially important for women who are less likely to establish sponsor/sponsee and mentor/mentee relationships spontaneously (Hewlett et al., 2010). We recommend that the original search committees for T/TT faculty and administrative and professional (A&P) level staff positions assume responsibility for initiating sponsoring and mentoring relationships with each successful candidate. The search committee members will likely share some professional, teaching and/or research interests with the new employee. In addition, they would be best placed to give them relevant advice, encouragement and support. Ensuring that this responsibility belongs to the entire committee overcomes the difficult situation of a departmental supervisor, chair or dean making an ad hoc one-on-one match between a sponsor/mentor and a newly hired sponsee/mentee. Structured implementation of sponsorship and mentoring at the point of hire for these positions holds great potential for establishing a shared responsibility for sponsoring and mentoring that would be sustainable at multiple institutional levels. Furthermore, this practice would circumvent some of the gendered assumptions that commonly make such relationships difficult for senior men and junior women to establish (Gonzales & Sponsel, 2012).

In terms of recognition, women must know that their contributions to the institution are valued and will be considered when they are being evaluated for performance and promotion. To make this possible, there needs to be an acknowledgement that not all members of a department contribute to the success of the institution in the same way, but that this heterogeneity of effort is what sustains a university and builds it to the next level. For example, it has been documented that female associate professors spend significantly more time in teaching and service than their male counterparts (Misra, Hickes, Holmes, & Agiomavritos, 2011). Male colleagues who then have more time to devote to research disproportionately enjoy the recognition and reward that comes from the activity appreciated as more prestigious. Even when it comes to service, Misra et al. documented that not all service is viewed equally. They found that male associate professors are more likely to engage in service to their profession which provides external visibility, whereas females of the same rank are more likely to be involved in “a range of activities necessary to keep the university going but less likely to increase one’s faculty status.” Since female associate professors often fall (or are pushed) into the “midcareer service gully” we recommend
that sponsor/ee and mentor/ee relationships continue until they attain their professional goals (Misra et al., 2011). Similarly, these commitments should not end when staff employees are promoted to mid-level positions.

The final institutional priority we highlight centers on the matter of retention. Women leave employment with universities for many reasons. Some faculty do not achieve tenure, other women choose to leave because they are offered new opportunities, but many leave and are lost to their profession because they have relinquished their desire to compete on a playing field that is far from level. The loss of talented female faculty and staff is a continuing problem at many institutions. We hope this important issue will be addressed by the DFI and other administrative initiatives. It is our belief that if mentoring and sponsorship programs are in place, together with appropriate recognition for all types of worthwhile contributions to the university, then attrition of women faculty and staff will be reduced.

While matters of recruitment, recognition, and retention of T/TT faculty come under the purview of the VP for Academic Affairs, achievement in research is a vitally important factor for tenure and promotion. Therefore we believe the VP for Research can play a significant role in helping junior faculty meet or exceed expectations in research. Our VP for Research Office has recently been reorganized to improve efficiency and provide many additional services. Six (6) research service centers have been set up on the Downtown and Main Campuses for pre- and post-award grant administration. Researchers will now interact with a smaller number of administrative staff whose physical proximity within colleges will be mutually beneficial. Research administrators can visit researchers’ offices and laboratories within a college, especially those of new faculty members, and provide a mechanism for linking faculty who have similar research interests and who will tap into similar funding sources. The office of the VPR, in conjunction with the VP for Academic Affairs, is also establishing a program to link new faculty members with an outside research mentor of national or international standing.

Another way to improve retention, recognition and recruitment in the University is for the Department of Human Resources office of Training and Development, which is under the purview of the VP for Business Affairs, to enhance their already robust and effective supervisory and personnel leadership training series to include additional sponsoring and mentoring skill development. Additionally, including a mentorship component that connects current participants with alumni of these programs holds great potential for enriching that overall training experience, while at the same time helping to infuse mentorship into the overall culture of the organization.

An additional proposal to come from discussions during WPASA is for the administration to encourage and support “shadowing” whereby a junior staff member could identify and be paired with a mentor in another department or section, and work side-by-side with this mentor to learn new job skills. This would involve a commitment by both mentor and mentee, and would require support from both the mentor’s and mentee’s departments.

A recent speech at a political convention articulated a powerful image of a successful person who reaches back through the doorway of opportunity to offer a helping hand to assist new colleagues through. This welcoming and supportive image was contrasted with one in which that powerful person chooses instead to slam the door of opportunity in the faces of junior colleagues. Many of us, whether employed in academia or corporate America, have had to shoulder open that closing door. The former more compelling image is one that appeals to us as female staff and faculty at UTSA. Opening doors for one another is good, and is something we should all be doing all the time regardless of gender. As participants in WPASA and Leadership UTSA, we are committed to using some of our newly-minted leadership skills to not only reach back, as individuals, through the doorway of opportunity to offer support to our junior colleagues, but also to shift the culture of our institution to one that offers and sees the value in systemic sponsorship and mentorship for its employees.
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This issue of NCURA Magazine is dedicated to a discussion of how federal issues affect our jobs and higher education in general. The economy and the federal budget are major issues that will continue to impact the profession in the near future. When Congress and the current administration failed to pass a budget for the fiscal year 2013, the bodies enacted a Continuing Resolution to fund the government for six months. This, in effect, freezes the budget at current spending levels. However, due to the Budget Control Act of 2011, which mandates across the board cuts on January 2, 2013 (known as sequestration), this action will cut spending. While the outcome of the upcoming general elections will have an impact on the overall direction the country will take, in the short term colleges and universities appear to be moving toward difficult financial times that may have a direct impact on our profession.

**Federal Budget**

According to the analysis released by the White House (OMB, 2012), if sequestration were enacted, the Department of Education would see an 8.2 percent reduction in funding. Research programs will fare no better. An analysis by Research America (Research America, 2012) suggests that the National Institutes of Health (NIH) could see a budget cut of approximately $2.39 billion; cuts to the National Science Foundation (NSF) could reach $538 million; and agencies such as the Centers for Disease Prevention and Control (CDC) and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) could receive cuts totaling approximately $640 million. Other agencies, which touch a wide spectrum of activities across colleges and universities, including student loans, student grants, and training and research grants, will see significant budget reductions. Cuts of this magnitude would have a devastating effect on the operations of many colleges and universities.

**State Budgets**

Most states are facing major budget problems in addition to the shortfall in the federal budget. Many states have asked colleges and universities to prepare contingency plans for further budget reductions ranging from 5 to 25 percent. According to an analysis by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP) (2012), 31 states face fiscal deficits in the fiscal year 2013 and plan to cut health care and education programs. For example, according to a press release from the Missouri Department of Higher Education (2012), university presidents have been asked to “determine the impact of 15, 20, and 25 percent reductions to their operating appropriations.” Other states with major university systems have suffered from major cuts over the past four years. In California, for example, a major state budget plan proposed by Governor Jerry Brown is on the ballot in November; if it does not pass, there will be further drastic cuts to its university system (Medina, 2012).

**Endowments**

Over the past three decades, endowments have become a major part of college and university operating budgets, funding a wide range of programs including scholarships, student financial aid, doctoral programs, faculty chairs, as well as general operations. Through most of the 2000’s endowments experienced a national median annual growth rate of approximately 9.5 percent, allowing institutions to fund and even expand aid and educational programs, often relying on the income from endowments to fill gaps in operating budgets. Since the beginning of the recession in 2008, the rate of return on the endowments has taken a downward turn; some institutions have lost as much as 30 percent (Center for Social Philanthropy Tellus Institute, 2010) of their total endowment value. These reductions in endowment value, and the resulting lower income, have put pressure on institutional operating budgets and have already resulted in a number of institutions’ announcing cuts or freezes in their programs (Center for Social Philanthropy Tellus Institute, 2010).

**Impact on Our Jobs**

These pressures on college and university budgets come at a time when student populations are growing, particularly in state colleges, and when the recession has required that more students seek financial aid. Faced with economic realities of reduced income from all of the sources of funding (i.e., federal, state, and endowments) many institutional leaders are faced with difficult choices. They must balance the need to provide a high-quality education with the need for administrative programs, capital projects, and other
major non-academic initiatives. Inevitably this will lead to cuts or freezes in these areas and possibly in some academic programs.

In a broad sense, research administrators are involved in most aspects of the university programs that could be impacted by the economic stressors mentioned above. Freezes in hiring or even in filling vacant positions, as well as reduced travel and training budgets are inevitable short-term consequences. Meanwhile, many researchers will submit proposals for funding that will increase the workload in our offices. As federal funding for research is reduced, there will be more interaction with private industry. As universities look for alternative sources of funding, a trend that has been on the rise the past few years. This increased focus on industry partnerships only increases the complexity of our operations and adds further stress to our offices.

**Action**

The impact of these economic stressors will affect each institution differently; a larger institution with a large research administration office may be able to absorb the stresses associated with a spending freeze or cut better than a smaller office that is already working at capacity. However, there are some actions that might help with the short-term pressures that the economic situation might place on us over the next few years. Through discussions with colleagues we arrived at several concepts that have been implemented in anticipation of, as one of my colleagues said, “the hard-times ahead of us.” Although not new, these are ideas that have been used routinely by many of our colleagues, and we may be well served to review them:

**Review of what we do:** A brief review of what we do and why we do it should help us identify areas that we could streamline.

As part of an assessment program conducted by my institution, we asked all of our research support units the simple question, “are there things you do that you would improve, and if so please describe in detail what and how.” The thoughtful suggestions and comments were remarkable. We found that we could streamline activities significantly simply by implementing many of these suggestions that would also save time and reduce the pressure on our staff.

**Interaction with other offices:** Research administration offices interact with many offices such as the Institutional Review Board (IRB), Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), Financial Conflict of Interest Committee, and many more. Interaction with these regulatory mandated offices are important, however often results in delays in processing proposals or setting up awards. The stressor factors impacting research administrators will have a similar impact on these offices and their resources; forging closer collaboration with them on how processes can be streamlined would benefit all.

**Departmental administrators and researchers:** Close collaboration and interaction with departmental administrators and the research community is essential when resources are scarce. Limited central resources make enhanced communications and training programs even more relevant. Any assistance in improving the preparation of the proposals would help in streamlining the review and submission process. As one colleague said, “this is the time to improve fire prevention and reduce firefighting efforts!”

**Conclusion**

The short-term budgetary landscape appears gloomy; however, we have been through these times before, and as a profession we have come out stronger and more vibrant. Research has become an internationally accepted means of improving the economy and quality of life in almost every nation. Through the efforts of its membership, NCURA has been a contributor and a beneficiary of this international effort. With some adjustment in our operations, our profession will sustain itself, and I am certain that in a few years we will look back at this period as one that we overcame through innovation.

---
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Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award

David Mayo received the Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award at the 54th NCURA Annual Meeting on Monday, November 5, 2012. This is NCURA's most prestigious award, given to a member who has made a significant contribution to the profession and demonstrated noteworthy service to NCURA. The following is his acceptance speech.

Thank you, Judy. And I would also like to thank Dianne Horrocks, Dave Richardson, Dick Seligman, and Denise Wallen, who I learned also sent letters in support of my nomination. It is truly an honor to have been chosen for the Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award, especially considering the contributions made by those who have received it in the past. I still find it difficult to believe that I’m being included in their company – it is quite humbling. Julie Norris in 1994 was the first recipient of this award. She has since retired, but I remember watching her receive her award and thinking to myself, “I hope someday that I’m half as accomplished and self-assured as she is.”

Many of you may not know that individuals nominated for this award are not aware that they’re under consideration. Therefore it was a complete surprise when I was informed. My first reaction was, “Wow, what an incredible honor!” My second reaction was, “Hell – I’m going to have to give a speech!” As much time as I spend presenting I’m really not comfortable being the center of attention. But since I’ve got you all as a captive audience, there are few things I’ve learned over the years that have helped me and which I would like to share with you (Don’t worry – it won’t include anything about FAR clauses).

I’ve been fortunate to have worked for very supportive people who encouraged me to take on more and more responsibility and who supported my involvement in NCURA. This, in turn, gave me access to even more people from whom I could learn. I would like to acknowledge Pamela Webb and Dick Seligman in this regard. Each has been my boss and a mentor, and from them I’ve learned a great deal more than simply “research administration.” Thank you, Pamela and Dick.

As was probably the case with many of you, I started working in research administration without knowing that I was part of a profession and, when all is said and done, without any idea of what I was doing. I had just graduated from college and had no marketable skills. I needed a job, and this one seemed as good as any. I started as a departmental administrator, and my job included oversight of one NASA grant and one NSF grant. My time was charged 50% to each award; before you say anything, F.6.b did not yet exist.

I’ve been in research administration a little over 30 years, and I’ve learned a lot of “information” during that time. AND, as many of you know, if you ask me a question, I will go on and on and on with the answer. While much of the information I’ve learned is not directly pertinent to my specific job, all of it is important to understanding where my job fits into the bigger picture and how my decisions affect others. And, I’m still learning. One of my biggest peeves is the statement, “because we’ve always done it that way.” I encourage you as I have been encouraged, to keep an open mind and keep evaluating what you do.

People communicate in different ways, and one thing that’s always been challenging for me is perceiving more subtle communication styles. It wasn’t until college that I discovered there was such a thing as subtext — I mean sometimes you just have to hit me over the head. I’ve found it really helpful to watch how other people do it; people who are skilled at working with and juggling different personalities and communication styles. As my circle of colleagues has grown over the years, I have had the privilege to work with and get to know many people, several of whom I now consider to be good friends; and I don’t use that term lightly. Each has a different way of handling challenging situations, but each does it very well. Playing well with others is a key component in almost every aspect of life, and I’ve found that the personal relationships that have developed out of professional relationships have been incredibly valuable.

Once I attained a certain level of expertise in the pre-award office, I was expected to help teach the campus’s research administration classes. I used to get horrible stage fright — to the point where I thought I would be sick, and I couldn’t remember anything I’d said once the ordeal had ended. During this time, I started taking aerobics classes because that’s what people did in the late 80’s. Evidently, I picked it up easily enough that the club director asked if I would be willing to train to teach. I thought, “Cool,” took a big step outside my comfort zone and said, “Yes,” as I knew that this would probably help me overcome my stage fright. Now, this required me to practice teaching in front of people in a mirrored room several times a week, and with a lot more pressure than simply speaking — if I gave the cues incorrectly, the whole class would stumble to a stop. But, the experience definitely solved my stage fright. Let’s face it, once you can get up in front of 40-50 people, dressed in spandex, you are in charge of the world!

To sum up, I’ve found that NCURA is an amazingly supportive community and the relationships that I’ve developed through NCURA have helped me become a more accomplished research administrator, helped me attain a degree of self-confidence I don’t think would have been possible otherwise, and helped broaden my horizons.

I’d like to thank you all for the opportunity to share my thoughts, and I wish you all success in your research administration careers. Have a great meeting. Thank you!
Do you find yourself managing a growing number of global projects in your institutional sponsored projects portfolio? Is your institution looking to expand its global reach and sponsorship beyond the United States? If you answered yes, then the 2014 conference of the International Network of Research Management Societies (INORMS) — with the theme “Enabling the Global Research Enterprise from Policy to Practice” — will provide you with multiple opportunities to expand your global network and knowledge. While the conference is over a year away, planning is well underway and we encourage you to save the date of April 10-13, 2014. Plan on coming to Washington D.C. and let us bring the world to you!

David Richardson is Associate Vice President for Research and Director of Sponsored Programs at The Pennsylvania State University.
The purpose of the Office of Research at the University of Michigan Medical School (UMMS) is to enhance the research enterprise, including maintaining an investigator-focused infrastructure, facilitating and diversifying investigators’ avenues for funding, and streamlining research processes. One of the key goals is to help faculty members remain competitive in turbulent funding waters. UMMS is unquestionably doing well, with $545M in research expenditures and 2.7% of the market share of NIH funding last year. Despite this institutional strength, individual investigator’s research labs or programs occasionally run aground when sources of funding dry up, e.g., a long-standing study is not renewed. When situations like this occur, the UMMS Office of Research offers three bridging programs to help investigators stay afloat and maintain lab and program staff and activities. Bridging is defined as temporary internal funding used by a Principal Investigator (PI) to support his or her research program for a span of time either between grants or between grant submission phases.

Two of the primary motivations for a department or school to offer bridging funds are: 1) a demonstration of faculty support and encouragement of retention, and 2) a protection of investments. At UMMS, funding for bridging programs is split 1:1 between the Dean’s Office and the PI’s department. While departments likely need to ration their resources, offering funds to help maintain or build a research program is often a sound investment that reaps later success. On the other hand, the dire consequences of failing to provide bridging support during a dry funding period are the closing of a productive research laboratory or program and losing the PI’s key personnel necessary for the generation and maintenance of research. Based on their talent, commitment, vision, and effort, faculty members may thus earn the opportunity to receive the bridging support required to resume or redirect their investigations.

The three bridging programs described here do not necessarily plug all the holes in the proverbial dike, but these bridging opportunities have evolved in response to commonly experienced situations. Joint funding (administration/department) offers a dual layer of review that helps assess the quality of the research program as well as the PI’s need for financing.

**1. “Grant-to-Grant” Bridging Support Program**

The Biomedical Research Council (BMRC) is a group of approximately 20 investigators from health sciences (both the Medical School and other units on campus) who meet to facilitate interdisciplinary research. One of their functions is to review requests for bridging support. Started in 2006, this program provides funding to continue federally funded biomedical research programs that demonstrate a likelihood of successfully competing for federal funding.

The Grant-to-Grant bridging application is submitted after an NIH Research (R) series original (A0) submission has been reviewed and rejected; research grants to other federal sponsors may be eligible if reviewer critiques are available. A PI must demonstrate in the bridging application both continuity with current research in the laboratory and efforts to address NIH grant critiques (i.e., the Summary Statement) in preparation for a re-
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There are three internal bridging programs at UMMS, described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Faculty Eligibility</th>
<th>Point of Request/ Need for Funding</th>
<th>Amount and Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Grant-to-Grant Bridging</td>
<td>Must have an established externally funded research program</td>
<td>Funds needed to develop A1 resubmission &amp; maintain research staff until grant is funded</td>
<td>Up to $50,000/ 12 months, matched by department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FAST TRACK Bridging (quick funding to prepare resubmission)</td>
<td>Any investigator (new or senior) who has received a review score close to funding</td>
<td>Same as above. Internal scientific review waived based on review score (i.e., 5 percentile points from payline)</td>
<td>Up to $50,000/ 12 months, matched by department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Extended Bridging (safety net for PI to rebuild a research program)</td>
<td>Must have history of at least 2 R01s as PI</td>
<td>Funding for investigators to making research course corrections &amp; submit grants to reinvigorate research</td>
<td>Average $140K/year for 1 or 2 years, matched by department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

By Christine Black
FAST TRACK Bridging

Viewed once by the sponsor. A faculty member cover new grant applications that are a continuous address this, the opportunity was expanded to the number of bridging applications declined. To of resubmissions permitted (from two to one), is the fact that, since the NIH reduced the number deadlines have also been increased from three to six per year. One of the reasons for these revisions is the fact that, since the NIH reduced the number of resubmissions permitted (from two to one), the number of bridging applications declined. To address this, the opportunity was expanded to cover new grant applications that are a continuation of funded research and that have been reviewed once by the sponsor. A faculty member who has never been funded cannot apply for bridging under this mechanism.

2. FAST TRACK Bridging

FAST TRACK bridging is a new mechanism that also supports development of an A1 resubmission, and award amounts are the same as above. The main difference between this mechanism and Grant-to-Grant bridging is that applications do not require internal scientific review. The Impact Score from the reviewed A0 must be within five (5) percentile points of the relevant NIH Institute’s payline, representing very favorable review from the NIH study section. Only NIH R series grants are eligible. Another difference is that FAST TRACK bridging accommodates all faculty members (including new faculty) if both the scoring and financial need requirements are met; prior NIH funding is not required. This mechanism was launched in July 2012 in response to a suggestion from a faculty commit-tee convened at the Dean’s request to make recommendations regarding school wide investment to support the biomedical research programs of medical school faculty. In the first deadline cycle of the mechanism (August 2012), two applications were received and funded.

3. Extended Bridging Program for Instructional Track Faculty

Extended Bridging support is available for UMMS tenure track faculty members with a record of signifi-cant continuous external funding (i.e., PI on at least two NIH R01 or equivalent grants in the Medical School), and who currently lack external funding or face impending funding depletion. The program assumes some degree of staff reduction and/or cost-cutting measures have already been implemented or planned. The Medical School administration feels internal financial support is essential to both (a) maintain research programs at a productive level in order to develop competitive research funding applications; and (b) convey the School’s confidence in the faculty member’s potential and offer collegial support.

Funding (including departmental match) is pro-vided for up to two years; a progress report is required if a second year is requested. Only faculty members with recent grant reviews based on failed external submissions are eligible for consideration. The amount bridged averages $140,000/year and primarily covers staff salaries and supplies. The PI may apply for 10% salary eff ort to be covered by the department match. The program started in 2008 and since then 15 faculty members have applied; of these, 14 were funded, one was denied, and seven applied for a second year of funding.

Each recipient is expected to submit a R01 (or equivalent) application within the 12 months after Extended Bridge funding has commenced. While not all bridged PIs have been successful in obtaining subsequent external funding, the total amount of grant funding subsequently awarded to the applicants as PIs is more than four times the amount of the bridging awarded. To date, after excluding the three bridging awards for which currently pending proposals have been submitted, approximately $2 million in bridging support has been internally funded; the return-on-investment (ROI) has been $8.2 million in subsequent federal funding (n.b., funding from industry or foundations is not counted in the ROI calculation).

Another avowed benefit of Extended Bridging is the round table review of the applicant’s research program and future plans by an interdisciplinary, internal scientific panel composed of the PI’s peer experts. The panel is comprised of the Medical School’s Senior Associate Dean for Research and three subject matter experts from within the University. This face-to-face meeting includes a chalk talk by the PI, wherein the faculty member reviews recent grant submission history and plans to move the research forward. After a question and answer period, the PI is excused and the panel makes a funding decision and offers suggestions for moving forward, both of which are recorded by staff. This collegial exchange has mutually benefited both the PI and the participants as most reviewers admit that they are one or two failed renewals away from foundering.

In summary, while one would hope never to need them, internal faculty bridging programs are – like life jackets – available in case of impending danger. There are several reasons why schools and departments should consider offering these safety nets. For one, financial bridging opportunities send a message to buoy faculty confidence that support is available in case research programs experience drought, provided the investigator has proven worthy. Indicators of “worthiness” may include publication productivity, the number of recent grant submissions, and evidence of responsiveness to reviewers’ or peer feedback – all of which demonstrate the PI’s continuous commitment and engagement in the field, and willingness to make changes. Careful review and approval of bridging applications at the departmental level often results in a much needed mid-stream assessment of a PI’s research program, and alerts the chair to be on the lookout for resources and opportunities to aid the PI. For it is the department chair who is in the best position to determine the PI’s financial need, including other internal sources of funding available to him or her.

It is often worth the investment to maintain established resources instead of trying to salvage them later – especially the talented key personnel who are crucial to obtaining future funding. In most cases, the bridging investments at the University of Michigan Medical School have paid off in future funding. As Benjamin Franklin said, “An investment in knowledge always pays the best interest.”

Christine Black, M.L.S., Assistant Director for Research Services at the University of Michigan (U-M) Medical School, began her career in research administration and development as a Project Director and author of instructional media grants funded by the U.S. Department of Education. She has worked in several schools within U-M, as well as the central Office of Research and Sponsored Projects, as an interdisciplinary proposal writer. She presents proposal writing workshops at U-M and elsewhere, and has participated in non-profit development and grant funding.
As leaders we’re responsible for building teams at the same time that we are team members in divisions which are themselves components of a larger whole. Anyone who leads, is led, or like most of us, does both, has by interest or sheer dint of necessity spent some time thinking about the qualities of great leadership: their own, those of their team(s), and those of the leaders they report to. In integrating these various roles within our universities and community and professional organizations, self-leadership is key to becoming a truly effective leader. Great leaders recognize that they have the ability to make choices and changes that impact their ability to be effective. Accomplishing this requires self-reflection and ultimately a commitment to self-leadership; that is, to lead ourselves in accordance with our values.

Self-Leadership

This is no small endeavor! From the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MTBI) personality inventory, to the five practices of exemplary leadership described by Kouzes and Posner (2012), and the leadership parables enshrined in Who Moved My Cheese (2002) and The Five Dysfunctions of a Team (2002), the consensus from the field of leadership theory is that great leaders become through rigorous daily practice and reflection that represent a lifelong commitment to strengthening core leadership competencies.

Presidential leadership has been a powerful theme during this election year, and I’ve been struck by the key importance of self-leadership in affecting the success and failure of candidates from across the political spectrum. In his first inaugural address in March 1801, Thomas Jefferson wrote that “Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he then be trusted with the government of others?”

For Daniel Goleman (1998), an indispensable component of what he terms Emotional Intelligence is self-regulation, or the ability to control one’s feelings and impulses that is essential for trust and foundational for integrity. This concept of self-regulation is at the center of the larger notion of self-leadership. Consider the case of Abraham Lincoln, who throughout much of his career used satire and invective against opponents. At a political gathering in 1840, for example, he so cruelly mocked and ridiculed his opponent, Jesse Thomas, impersonating him “in gesture and voice, at times caricaturing his walk and the very motion of his body,” that Thomas was reduced to tears and driven from the stage, weeping and politically vanquished (Bray, 1995). Wadhwa (2012) regards that moment, referred to as “the skinning of Thomas” as a turning point for Lincoln, whom she believes began slowly thereafter to change himself. But changing oneself is not easy, and similar behavior was recorded in ensuing years (Bray, 1995).

By the time of the Civil War, however, rather than giving free rein to his rage in public, Lincoln wrote what Doris Kearns Goodwin termed “hot letters” that were then set aside, unsent. In A Team of Rivals (2005), she describes one such letter to Major General George G. Meade regarding his failure in 1863 to capture General Robert E. Lee, the leader of the Confederate Army, in the wake of triumphs at Gettysburg and Vicksburg. Lincoln wrote “…He was within your easy grasp, and to have closed upon him would, in connection with our other late successes, have ended the war. As it is, the war will be prolonged indefinitely.” Obviously this letter would have greatly disturbed General Meade, and in the end, Lincoln placed the letter in an envelope inscribed “To Gen. Meade, never sent, or signed” (p. 628).

Most leaders demonstrate a mix of leadership strengths and weaknesses that can be tied to the notion of self-leadership. Although imperfectly accomplished, Lincoln’s deliberate effort to control his anger points to a high degree of self-awareness that stands in stark contrast to President Richard M. Nixon’s launching of the covert campaign against his perceived enemies that doomed his presidency. Even so, Nixon’s strength as a strategic thinker and his willingness to take risks enabled him to shift from a strong Cold War anti-communism stance to establish a relationship with the People’s Republic of China by the end of his first term.

Goleman and Boyatzis (2008) distinguished Emotional from what they termed Social Intelligence, with the latter incorporating such leadership qualities as empathy, articulating a compelling vision, teamwork, coaching and mentoring others, etc. Bill Clinton’s ability to em-
pathize with Americans in his 1992 debate with President George H.W. Bush and Ross Perot contrasted sharply with President Bush’s apparent disinterest and impatience for the debate to end, highlighted by his checking the time on his watch, underscoring the feeling that he was disconnected from the problems of real people. However, even as President Clinton’s empathy enabled him to appreciate the real concerns and fears of Americans, impulsive and high-risk behavior in his personal life reduced his effectiveness in his second term.

Kouzes and Posner (2012) write that to become a credible leader, “You have to discover what you care about, what defines you, and what makes you who you are” (p. 48). That self-knowledge enables great leaders to communicate their ideas, make choices, and act consciously and with determination (p. 50). That, as these cases illustrate, is difficult to accomplish even with self-knowledge, and this is where self-leadership is most critical.

Becoming a Great Leader
Assuming the baseline skills of leaders already include mastery of technical skills and core competencies, great leaders distinguish themselves through self-leadership. Self-leadership involves thoughtful reflection on the qualities of exemplary leadership; a thorough inventory of one’s own leadership attributes — both weaknesses and strengths; and a choice and commitment to retool/rewire one’s thinking and one’s behaviors. Equally important, it also involves a commitment to better understand, collaborate with, and empower others to act.

What are the qualities of great leaders?
Much is written about the qualities of exemplary leadership. To take but one example, for more than 25 years, James Kouzes and Barry Posner (2012) have asked the basic question “What did you do when you were at your personal best as a leader?” (p. 17). The responses to those questions led them to identify the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership©. When leaders do their best, they Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable others to Act, and Encourage the Heart. A short list of leadership behaviors reflecting these practices includes setting a personal example, following through on promises and commitments, building consensus around the organization’s values, describing a compelling image of the future, setting goals and milestones to reach those goals, supporting decisions other people make, giving team members appreciation and support, and recognizing that team accomplishments are just that and not the result of a single person’s actions. Such lists are a good starting point from which to begin to examine one’s own leadership qualities.

Leadership programs offered by many universities or professional organizations (like NCURA’s Executive Leadership Program) are commonly designed to nurture leadership traits in individuals who have been identified as having the potential to lead their organizations into the future. These programs foster a shared vision of the organization, its operating principals, mission, goals, and objectives, and characteristically include significant participation by senior leadership.

How do I measure up?
Other good starting points include the MBTI leadership inventory of your particular strengths and challenges, as well as those of other individuals who differ from you. A thorough inventory definitely requires leaders to step outside their comfort zones to critically examine their own behaviors and also to invite such 360 degree assessments from others including your boss, colleagues, and staff. The goal is to arrive, however painfully, at a realistic starting point from which to appreciate your strengths and begin to reshape behaviors in areas where you’ve identified weaknesses.

What is my plan to become the leader I want to be?
Just as external feedback is critical for developing a thorough understanding of your leadership attributes, the same may be true for identifying next steps. Take, for example, an intention to follow through on promises and commitments. Separating that goal into its component parts may reveal tendencies towards procrastination, taking on too many obligations, a reluctance to work as a member of a team, or to share/delegate responsibility to others, all of which indicate and acerbate distrust within and among team members. Self-leadership in this case begins with addressing these core trust issues. For Kouzes and Posner (p. 47), it is consistency between words and actions that builds credibility and thereby trust.

The good/bad news is that this is a life-long process that begins with one’s willingness to adopt new behaviors and commit to the daily practice of self-leadership. The inventory is the beginning; daily practice is the work of self-reflection and assessment of your leadership practices, and how they change, rearrange, and modify over time, whether leading your team or acting as a member of a team led by someone else.
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**Work Package 2: Helping Raise Awareness about Research and Innovation Opportunities**
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More specifically, we will be looking at federal funding opportunities that are available to our international partners and analyzing potential federal programs that match the priorities of the EC research areas through subcontract relationship data gathered from our U.S. members. In addition, we will help facilitate BILAT–USA 2.0 events at our national conferences. We want to share our expertise with any of our potential international research collaborators because we will need theirs when Horizon 2020 officially starts.

The kickoff meeting went extremely well; we connected with our Work Package leaders and task partners and are very excited to get started. The consortium we belong includes individuals from Norway, Spain, France, Turkey, Germany (our project leaders), Austria, Poland, Belgium, and other U.S. Partners. This core group will support collaborations throughout all of Europe and the U.S. hence BILAT–USA 2.0 (Bilateral Coordination for the Enhancement and Development of S&T Partnerships). The Consortium is very happy that we are involved. Kathleen Larmett, NCURA Executive Director; Dan Nordquist, Washington State University; Pat Hawk, Oregon State University; and Dave Richardson, Pennsylvania State University all represented NCURA at the Kickoff Event.

If you are reading this and have experience with international funding opportunities or are aware of federal programs that emphasize and support international collaboration, please contact Dan Nordquist if you would like to help.

The main reason NCURA committed to the BILAT–USA 2.0 project is the connectedness, of this work, to the details of the Horizon 2020 project. This will provide tremendous benefit to our membership as it rolls out.

Dan Nordquist is the Assistant Vice President and Director, Office of Grant and Research Development at Washington State University.
It Is Not CHATTTEL

A Look at Personal/Tangible Property Issues in Research Administration

What’s the Problem?  Everyone knows that under a grant the recipient owns any property purchased; under a contract, the government owns the property provided or purchased, right?  Next clause. Hold on partner - NOT SO FAST!
Purchase, ownership, management, and disposition of property under a government project can be confusing, involved and, if done wrong, expensive. So, what does that mean for the research administrator and the university? Well first, it is essential to make sure the correct property clauses and requirements are in place for the nature of the award. Second, and, even more importantly, the research administrator must use the accurate interpretation of the property requirements at the beginning of any project to minimize confusion throughout the project and at closeout. Third, the research administrator must be familiar with the content and have an understanding of the appropriate property clauses and requirements in each type of award, whether a contract, grant, cooperative agreement or other type of award. Last, but not least, the research administrator must work with her or his team to make conscious choices about property based on her or his knowledge of the property clause in the award and have the negotiated property terms with the agency documented thoroughly. Thorough, up-front planning and documentation between the principal investigator, central administration, departmental administration and property administration will make life much easier throughout the project and especially at the conclusion.

Throughout this article the term “property” refers to physical or tangible property only (equipment, special test equipment, special tooling, materials, supplies, and expendable property). We will discuss federal property and non-federal property, e.g., private, for comparison purposes. Also, we are assuming that property administration at your university takes place in an office completely outside those traditional research administration specialties; departmental, pre-award, post-award, compliance, etc. This is the model used by most universities and the reason close coordination between all the administrative parties is so important.

Why is property important? Aside from personnel, it is the largest expenditure category in research administration and, the potential for the disappearance, abuse or misuse of property in an open, university setting is perceived to be high risk by sponsors. A single property item can be anywhere from a penny to millions of dollars. It is remarkable—the number of smaller items that cumulate in a laboratory or research area from beakers to cameras to laptops to electron microscopes. Most sponsors expect accountability for all the items purchased or provided under an award as the sponsor is told, and therefore, believes, that the research cannot be performed without it. Principal Investigators and their teams sometime forget that the property is owned by the university or the sponsor and is not titled to them, their lab or their department. Rather, they are the stewards of the property and they are accountable for that property.
Grants And Cooperative Agreements Under Financial Assistance Agreements

OK, so in this wide world of property, where does one start? How about with the document that research administrators are most familiar with; 2 CFR 215, Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals and Other Nonprofit Organizations (also known as A-110). Part 215.30 of A-110 contain the property standards the U.S. Government (“Government”) expects the university to implement in their own property management system and then, actually follow these requirements. Please note that your property management system may be reviewed by your Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO) to determine if you have a property management system adequate for managing property purchased with federal funds or provided to you by the agency. Take note, all agencies are expected to observe these standards and shall not impose additional requirements unless required by federal statute.” (215.30). It should also be noted that A-110 applies only to financial assistance agreements as defined in the Grants and Cooperative Agreement Act of 1975; it does not apply to awards with private organizations or to procurement contracts under the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR).

As with any agreement, it is important to understand the definitions applied to the project. A-110 has specific definitions for equipment, excess property, exempt property, personal property, property, etc., and they may not be the same as other documents referenced in this article, such as the FAR, or, grants and agreements with private entities.

In A-110, “Property means… real property, equipment, intangible property and debt instruments,” and “Supplies means all personal property excluding equipment, intangible property, debt instruments,… and inventions of a contractor conceived or first actually reduced to practice in the performance of work under a funding agreement….” Personal property means “property of any kind except real property; may be tangible, have physical existence or intangible….” To add to the above and avoid confusion, we will not include discussions on intangible property, e.g., intellectual property, real property, e.g. land/buildings, or debt instruments, but will focus on equipment, personal property and supplies.

To plan appropriately, recognize that Section 215.31 requires insurance coverage on property purchased under A-110 to be equivalent to insurance the university purchases on its own property. If special insurance is required due to location, cost or use of the equipment, or requirements of the agency, additional insurance costs above your normal university insurance may need to be addressed in your proposal (Reference Section J.25, Insurance and Indemnification, of 2 CFR 220, Cost Principles for Universities (A-21)). A small note – insurance for Government Property (GP) under a contract is handled differently – we’ll talk about that later.

In A-110, 215.33, the Government may choose to provide federally owned property, or Government furnished property (GFP) in the general vernacular, to the university to use on a specific research project. This rarely happens under grants or cooperative agreements so the topic is discussed further in relation to contracts. However, a research administrator needs to be able to manage the situation as all GFP must be controlled from time of receipt to completion of final disposition.

Universities have a common problem that sometimes results from close relationships between the Government technical representative and a PI or university employees who work at or near a government facility. The Government employee provides an “excess” piece of GP without going through the GFP procedures. Eventually, the Government Property Administrator (GPA) finds out about this “gift” and they are not happy. If this occurs corrected procedures are required to be installed in both locations after the fact and that requires additional work and more hassles than if originally done correctly. If the university does not have procedures in place for handling property, unexpected costs may be incurred. As stated earlier, all GFP must be controlled.
Title of property acquired by the university under a grant or cooperative agreement will normally pass to the university thereby relieving universities of many challenges associated with keeping track of GP. However, do not be lulled into complacency by this idea. When working with the U.S. Government, there are always strings of some sort that are attached – the research administrator needs to know what to look for so she can share it with the PI and department. For example, some federal agencies reserve the right to take title back within 120 days of the conclusion of the grant or cooperative agreement. In actuality, title to the property may only be on a conditional basis.

Section 215.34 allows title to go to a university for equipment and supplies but establishes certain conditions controlling the use and disposition of this property. These conditions for equipment purchased with federal funds include:

A university cannot use equipment to provide services to a non-federal, outside organization for a fee while it is being used on federally funded projects. If the equipment is not currently being utilized for a project and used to provide outside services, a university cannot undercut the fees of a private sector provider of the same or similar services.

A university must use the equipment on the project under which it was required as long as needed for the project. This condition applies whether or not the project continues to be funded by the government. The equipment cannot be encumbered without approval of the Government, i.e., taking a loan using the equipment as collateral.

Once a project is over, a university must use the equipment in connection with its other federally sponsored projects.

Equipment can be used for other federally funded projects when it is not needed for the project under which it was purchased. Preference is given to other projects funded by the same agency.

When the equipment requires replacement, a university may use the old equipment as a trade-in or, sell and use the proceeds to offset the costs of replacement equipment – with agency approval, of course.

A university property management system must keep track of all equipment and include a long list of descriptive information as listed in 215.34(f)(1); A physical inventory must be conducted every 2 years; a control system with safeguards to prevent loss, damage or theft must be established; a university is responsible for the maintenance and upkeep of the equipment; and should a university want to sell the equipment, proper sales procedures are required to provide for competition.

If any property is lost, stolen or damaged, an investigation must ensue as to the conditions and events around the incident and be fully documented. If the property is GFP the incident must be reported to the agency grant officer promptly.

When a university no longer needs the equipment, it may be used for other activities in accordance with these additional standards:

- If equipment fair market value is $5,000 or more, a university may retain and use the equipment for other uses provided the original awarding agency is compensated based on current market value. If equipment is no longer required by a university, request disposition instructions from the awarding agency. Instructions must be provided by the agency within 120 calendar days.

- If instructed by the awarding agency or disposition is not received in 120 days, the university may sell the equipment but must reimburse the awarding agency by a prescribed formula.

- If the university is instructed to ship the equipment elsewhere or dispose of the equipment, the university shall be reimbursed by the agency based on a formula taking into consideration the university’s shared investment in the equipment (if any).

Supplies and other expendable property are discussed in Section 215.35. Title to supplies and expendable materials will vest in the university upon acquisition. Any unused supplies can be used for other federally sponsored projects. If no other federal project can use them, the supplies may be used for non-federal sponsored activities or sold. The university is re-
quired to compensate the government for the use or sale of supplies not used on a federal project. Again, any supplies used to provide outside services, a university cannot undercut the fees of a private sector provider of the same or similar services.

One very important consideration of working with the Federal Government is to recognize the “property trust” relationship related to property as stated Section 215.37:

“Real property, equipment and intangible property and debt instruments that are acquired or improved with federal funds shall be held in trust by the university as trustee for the beneficiaries of the project and program under which the property was acquired or improved. Agencies may require recipients to record liens or other appropriate notices of record to indicate that personal or real property has been acquired or improved with federal funds and that use and disposition conditions apply to the property.”

A “trust,” as defined in Black’s Law Dictionary, is “1) the right, enforceable solely in equity to the beneficial enjoyment of property to which another person holds the legal title; a property interest held by one person (the trustee) at the request of another (the settlor) for the benefit of a third party (beneficiary). For a trust to be valid, it must involve specific property, reflect the settler’s intent and be created for lawful purposes. 2) A fiduciary relationship regarding property and subjecting the person with title to the property to equitable duties to deal with it for another’s benefit; the confidence placed in the trustee, together with the trustee’s obligations toward the property and the beneficiary. A trust arises as of a result of the manifestation of an intention to create it.” (p. 1513).

If you consider the university as a trustee, the Government as the settlor and the PI/award as the beneficiary, the idea of the trust begins to make sense. In other words, the Government has the right to take back title to property it is funding under an award if the GPA determines that the university is not using it appropriately, is mishandling or misusing the property, or, is not safeguarding the property adequately. To date, it is not obvious that federal agencies strictly enforce all of the requirements stated above; they have so many issues on their plates these days. However, be prepared for that to change if your university does not make a reasonable effort to establish an adequate property management system that complies with the above stated conditions.

A research administrator must know something about agency differences in interpreting this trust relationship. For example, agencies have the authority to vest title to tangible personal property for research under 31 United States Code (U.S.C.) section 63.6306 (Title 31, Money and Finance, Subtitle V, General Assistance Administration). However, in accordance with Title 15 U.S.C., Commerce and Trade, Section 3710, Utilization of Federal Technology, (i) Research Equipment, “the Director of a laboratory, or the head of a federal agency or department, may loan, lease or give research equipment that is excess to the needs of the laboratory, agency, or department to an educational institution or nonprofit organization for the conduct of technical and scientific education and research activities. Title of ownership shall transfer with a gift under this section.” In other words, know what to ask of the agency should your university ask for permanent disposition of equipment.

A good example relating to the trust relationship is the NSF “Grant General Conditions.” The rule is found in Article 6, paragraph a. Title to Equipment – Non-profit Organizations, and states: “Unless otherwise specified in the grant, title to equipment purchased or fabricated with NSF grant funds shall vest in the grantee upon acquisition. Such equipment is considered exempt property and shall be acquired and used in accordance with paragraph c below.”

---

So, what is exempt property? A-110 defines exempt property as “tangible nonexpendable personal property acquired in whole or in part with federal funds, where the federal awarding agency has statutory authority to vest title in the recipient without further obligation to the Federal Government.”

Now, we look for the strings attached to this disposition of property at paragraph c. *Conditions for Acquisition and Use of Equipment;* sound familiar?

1. **Grantee Assurance.** The grantee will assure that each purchase of equipment is:
   (a) Necessary for the research or activity supported by the grant;
   (b) Not otherwise reasonably available and accessible;
   (c) Of the type normally charged as a direct cost to sponsored agreements; and
   (d) Acquired in accordance with organizational practice.

2. **General Purpose Equipment.** Expenditures for general-purpose equipment (see AAG Chapter V.B.2d) are unallowable unless the equipment is primarily or exclusively used in the actual conduct of the research.

3. **Equipment Usage.** The equipment will remain in use for the specific project for which it was obtained in accordance with 2 CFR § 215.34(c), unless the provision in 2 CFR § 215.34(e) applies.

4. **Equipment Sharing.** The equipment must be shared on other projects or programs in accordance with 2 CFR § 215.34(d).

5. **Property Management Standards.** The grantee shall maintain a property management system that, at a minimum, meets the requirements of 2 CFR § 215.34(f). Because of increasing threats to information technology systems, the grantee is reminded that, under 2 CFR §§ 215.34(f)(4) and (5), “[a] control system shall be in effect to insure adequate safeguards to prevent loss, damage, or theft of the equipment” and “adequate maintenance procedures shall be implemented to keep the equipment in good condition.” This requirement imposes on the grantee a duty to adequately maintain and to insure adequate safeguards against the loss, damage, or theft of information technology equipment and systems purchased with NSF funds.

6. **Inventory Requirements.**
   (a) In accordance with the requirements of 2 CFR § 215.33(a)(1), for all equipment exceeding $5,000, the grantee must submit an annual inventory listing of Government owned property to the NSF Property Administrator, Division of Administrative Services (DAS). The listing should include all Government-owned equipment purchased under the award or acquired by screening excess through the General Services Administration (GSA); and include the type of equipment, serial number, acquisition price, acquisition date and condition of the equipment. The inventory listing and a copy of the organization’s audited financial statement should be submitted electronically to fsrpts@nsf.gov and must be received by DAS no later than September 1 each year.
   (b) A physical inventory of Government-owned equipment shall be conducted every two years pursuant to 2 CFR § 215.34(f). Upon expiration of the award, the grantee shall report the property to the DAS Property Administrator for further agency utilization.

7. **Competition.** The grantee shall not use equipment acquired with Federal funds to provide services to non-Federal outside organizations for a fee that is less than private companies charge for equivalent services, unless specifically authorized by statute in accordance with 2 CFR § 215.34(b).

8. **Right to Transfer Title.**
   (a) NSF may identify items of equipment having an acquisition cost of $5,000 or more where NSF reserves the right to transfer the title to the Federal Government or a third party named by the Federal Government at any time during the grant period.
   (b) In cases where NSF elects to transfer the title, disposition instructions will be issued no later than 120 calendar days after the expiration date of the NSF-supported project for which it was acquired.
An issue common to all universities occurs when a PI moves from one university to another. Many PIs believe property is tied to the grant or cooperative agreement. This, simply, is not the rule. Title to the property is with the university or a university’s foundation depending upon the structure of the university and the university decides if it is appropriate for property to be transferred with the departure of a PI. Often, program managers “insist” that the property accompany the PI but, in reality, the decision remains with the university. One factor important to the decision process is that good relations with any federal agency are almost always paramount. However, determination of an adequate property management system at the new university is also important. The best way to avoid these issues is to develop good policies and procedures that are used consistently in the decision making process.

Private Foundations, Nonprofits and Industry Sponsors

Non-federal sponsors sometimes want to take title to equipment purchased with their sponsor funds. Often, the solicitation or award does not discuss, much less determine, title to property, sponsor provided property, liability issues, normal wear and tear, maintenance, disposal and shipping costs at the conclusion of the award. We suggest all these issues be addressed in negotiations and before acceptance of the award. A major consideration is the cost of property to the university versus cost of property to the sponsor. Most universities receive significant discounts for materials and equipment that a private sponsor cannot obtain and, they are tax exempt. It is better to make it clear in your proposal or in your sponsored research agreement that ownership/title to all property will reside in the university to avoid being implicated in possible IRS issues or be in the predicament of a public entity providing special treatment to a private entity.

In addition, do not plan on the sponsor to specify the requirements for handling sponsor-owned property as a government agency might. The internal property management requirements of the Federal Government are quite different than the requirements imposed upon universities by non-profits and other sponsors. If the property is to be provided by the sponsor, and, if this equipment is needed for other projects at your university, a contingency plan should be considered to buy that equipment. As mentioned above, if your university accepts use of property owned by the sponsor, that property should be controlled using a property management system similar to the GP management system described above.

Property Associated with Government Contracts

Moving from financial assistance agreements to procurement, if your university receives Federal Government contracts, FAR 52.245-1, Government Property (Government Property Clause), should be a clause you find in all cost type, time and material, as well as fixed price contracts where GFP is provided. The primary sections of this clause we want to discuss are as follows (the other sections, i.e., systems, handling, liability, and equitable adjustments, will be discussed in general around these sections):

Section (a) provides the all-important definitions (read each definition carefully; hint - they are different from A-110);

Section (b) requires a “system of internal controls to manage (control, use preserve, protect, repair and maintain) Government Property” – also known as a property management system;

Section (c) discusses the use of GP under a contract;

Section (d) discusses the warranties and guarantees made by the Government for GFP as well as the Government’s authorities to change the GFP, i.e., increase, decrease or substitute; and

Section (e) states that the government retains title to all GP furnished, acquired or fabricated under the contract.
The Government Property Clause states, “the contractor shall use the Government property, either furnished or acquired under this contract, only for the performing this contract.” Comparing the requirements of the FAR to A-110, though similar in many respects, the FAR is much more strict and less flexible. Therefore, if your university participates in financial assistance agreements and contracts, your property management system is required to relate to the FAR requirements and may require evaluation by the ACO or Government Property Administrator (GPA) to determine if it is adequate.

**Property Management System (PMS)** The FAR, under paragraph (b) of the Government Property Clause, requires the contractor to “have a system of internal controls to manage (control, use, preserve, protect, repair and maintain) government property in its possession.” A few years ago, the Government changed its approach to internal controls by moving from a dictated set of controls to a more commercial, contractor-determined managerial approach. “The contractor may employ customary commercial practices, voluntary consensus standards, or industry leading practices and standards that provide effective and efficient government property management that are necessary and appropriate for the performance of this contract.” The government outlines the extent of the responsibilities but leaves the specifics of “how” to the contractor. The contractor, in this case the university, is deemed to be the “steward” of that Government property.

This requirement is also a required flow-down to subcontractors; “This requirement applies to all government property under the contractor’s accountability, stewardship, possession or control, including its vendors or subcontractors.”

In working with your industry partners, you may find that many entities, universities and commercial contractors alike, used Voluntary Consensus Standards (VCS) created through VCS Bodies such as ASTM International or the International Standards Organization (ISO). No matter what standard you apply within your property management system, the government reserves the right to audit and determine whether or not your property management system is “adequate.”

**Government Property/Government Furnished Property** Paragraphs (c) and (d) of the Government Property Clause discusses the “Use of Government Property” and “Government Furnished Property.” For use of any GP provided under a Government contract, the university is to use that GP ONLY for the contract under which it was provided – or, for any other use, only as authorized by the Contracting Officer. For paragraph (d) dealing with GFP — this paragraph describes the warranties made regarding that GFP as well as the authorities to “change” that property. Specifically, the Government has the unilateral right to increase or decrease that GFP or substitute other GFP. But, the Government also assumes some responsibilities in regard to the quantity and condition of that GFP. First, the Government provides that the GFP will be suitable for its intended use and delivered in a timely fashion, enabling your principal investigators to perform their research and meet research deadlines. If the Government fails to meet these obligations the university may be entitled to an equitable adjustment. Of course there are always exceptions – and in some cases the Government may provide that GFP in “AS-IS” condition, at which point the university would not be entitled to an equitable adjustment for any repair work done to bring the equipment up to a working standard. In addition, any repair parts used to make the equipment suitable for use under an “AS-IS” situation becomes GP. Second, the Government has the unilateral right to increase, decrease or even substitute other GFP for the GFP listed in the contract. It appears that the Government has a lot of clout when dealing with GFP.

**Liability for Loss of Government Property** FAR 45.104 states: “Generally contractors are generally not held liable for the loss of Government Property under the following types of contracts:

1) Cost-reimbursement contracts.
2) Time-and-material contracts.
3) Labor-hour contracts.
4) Fixed-price contracts awarded on the basis of submission of certified cost or pricing data.” [NOTE: the Department of Defense has modified this to include Negotiated Fixed-price contracts where there is no requirement for a certificate of current cost and pricing data.]
As long as your PMS is deemed adequate, the Government assumes most liability for the loss of GP unless there is other specific wording in the contract to the contrary or the recipient accepts FAR 52.245-1, Government Property with Alternate I. Under Alternate I, the liability for loss is placed upon the contractor. Also, there is potential liability when there is GFP provided by a federally operated laboratory or GOCO facility. Often these organizations “modify” the GFP language to limit their liability and move that liability to the recipient of the contract. Pay special emphasis to GFP wording that is not quoted word-for-word from the FAR.

**Disposition and Disposal of Government Property** At the conclusion of the project, your university must comply with the disposition instructions for GP. These disposal requirements are set forth under FAR 52.245-1 paragraph (j) for the university and FAR Subpart 45.6, as well as other statutory requirements, for the Government. There are a number of possible options that the Government may use:

1) The accountability of the GP may be transferred, with authorization provided by contract modification, to another contract or grant/cooperative agreement at your university which is performing similar work and has need for the use of the equipment.
2) The Government may direct your university to ship the equipment to another location, with the shipping normally at the Government’s expense.
3) The Government may abandon GP in place, if there is no longer a need for the equipment or the economics of the situation do not warrant shipping to another location.
4) The Government may ask the university to dispose of the GP through sale.
5) Universities have an additional advantage in that the Government can “donate” excess GP under specific circumstances such as the donation of Educationally Useful Federal Equipment under Executive Order 12999.

**Title under Fixed Price Contracts** If you have a fixed price contract awarded competitively, FAR 52.245-1(e) provides the guidance regarding title. It states, “The contractor retains title to ALL (Emphasis added) property acquired by the Contractor for use on the contract....” Now of course with the Government there are always exceptions. These title exceptions (Where the Government claims title) include:

1) if GFP is provided,
2) if there are financing provisions,
3) if there are special circumstances, or
4) if property is the deliverable.

If property is a deliverable, a wise, prudent university would try to negotiate, Freight on Board (FOB) ORIGIN, for the deliverable so that the Government takes title before shipment and, more importantly, the Government assumes liability for property in transit. This saves you the shipping hassles associated with costs, transportation and liability. Note, if the university is required to pay for shipping, make sure the costs are estimated in the budget or the terms of the contract are “pre-pay and add.” Most university PIs and proposal analysts do not think to include shipping and other costs in their proposed budgets. In addition, these costs are not normally included in a university facilities and administrative (“F&A”) rate.

Most fixed price contracts are not subject to the Government Property Clause as all property acquired vests with the university and there may be no GFP provided under the contract. If GFP is provided under the fixed price contract – then the contract needs the
GP Clause. If the purchase of property is required to become the successful bidder, the cost of that property is in the total fixed price as either a direct or indirect cost or that property MUST be listed as a deliverable. The Government DOES NOT have title to any property purchased in anticipation of or as a result of a successful fixed price competitive proposal – other than a listed deliverable or through bad things happening, i.e., termination.

**Title under Cost Reimbursable Contracts**

Title to GP is determined by Paragraph (e)(3)(i) of FAR 52.245-1. It states, “Title to all property purchased by the Contractor for which the Contractor is entitled to be reimbursed as a direct item of cost under this contract shall pass to and vest in the Government upon the vendor’s delivery of such property.” This paragraph has three components to it:

1) The Government claims title to ALL property,
2) To which the university is entitled to Reimbursement. This issue of entitled to reimbursement brings into play other issues, or sub issues:
   a) First, for an item to be entitled to be reimbursed it must be Reasonable, Allocable and Allowable. These terms are defined in A-21 (which, by the way, is incorporated into the FAR through Part 31.3) and play an important role in what the university MAY or MAY NOT charge the Government.
   b) Second, the property must be charged DIRECT. Indirect charged and it is university property.
   c) Third, with respect to Cost Accounting Standards, universities have their own application of Cost Accounting Standards set forth in A-21. One of the critical ones for property is CAS 9905.502—Consistency in Allocating Costs Incurred for the Same Purpose by Educational Institutions,
3) And lastly, the Government states the exact instant WHEN it claims title – under this paragraph of the clause – at vendor’s delivery.

Paragraph (e)(3)(ii) AMPLIFIES the title provisions to provide other situations where the Government takes title. These may be more applicable to a commercial production environment than a university setting – but they are still important to understand. There are four actions that impact title. Specifically, the Government claims title to all OTHER property, i.e., property not delivered by a vendor, upon:

1) Issuance of that property (Say from a stock room setting where the company maintains its own inventory);
2) Commencement of processing (Company owned raw stock out on a factory floor which is then used for the instant contract);
3) Reimbursement (Getting paid for the property as a direct item of cost) with the overarching umbrella condition; and
4) Whichever occurs first.

Paragraph (e)(1) of FAR 52.245-1 provides guidance regarding any installation or improvements to that GP. If the asset IS an item of GP, acquired under an account that direct changes the Government for that property, there are two restrictions placed upon any improvements or other actions:

1) You cannot install that GP such that it becomes non-severable as defined in 52.245-1(a), and
2) Any improvements made to the GP do NOT affect its title. That item remains GP INCLUDING any of the improvements made to it.

Again, up-front planning and understanding the award conditions will save work later.

So, how does Section (e)(3) and (e)(4) apply to universities? Fortunately, we are different. When in doubt, read the prescriptive language to the Government in FAR 45.107(a)(3). It states, “The Contracting Officer shall use the clause with its Alternate II when a contract for the conduct of basic or applied research at nonprofit institutions of higher education or at nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research (see 35.104) is contemplated.” This is a key clause for universities.
The first statement you see in Alternate II is, “As prescribed in 45.1-7(a)(3), substitute the following for paragraph (e)(3) of the basic clause.” In essence, the original (e)(3) goes away and is replaced by the following:

“Title to property …purchased with funds available for research and having a unit acquisition cost of less than $5,000 shall vest in the contractor…provided that the contractor obtained the Contracting Officer's approval before each acquisition.”

This is great, right? No mess, no fuss, the university owns anything it purchases under $5,000 under a Government contract. Think again; this is not quite so simple. First, many research administrators tend to substitute ‘equipment’ for property in this sentence. Second, the contracting officer has to give her or his approval for the purchase of all property per this sentence. Unlike a grant, the fact that the property is already identified in the budget that is in your contract does not mean that the property purchase has been approved (a significant difference between contracts and grants). A specific request for approval has to be submitted to the contracting officer for approval. For example, NASA is very strict about this requirement. Each agency has their own system for this approval and it is up to the research administrator to know or find out what that system is. There is a possibility that you can have this approval written into the terms of the contract but do not count on it.

Another consideration of this purchase approval is tied to A-21. Remember, A-21 is discussed as policy in FAR Subpart 31.3. Section F of A-21 discusses certain costs that are associated with facilities and administrative (“F&A”) expenses. Many types of property are considered “general purpose” in a university setting (such as laptops, cameras, printers, stamps, etc.) but are needed to support the research and normally purchased with F&A funds. The typical reason is that this property cannot be controlled to the extent that it is identified with one specific project. As such, when requesting approval to purchase property documentation is required to justify the purchase in that: 1) it will be used only on this one project; 2) it is not a duplication of a cost incurred under F&A; and 3) there is a need for this specific purchase that cannot be supported by other property already at the university. Now the fun part of Alternate II (yes, there is a lot more to know). Like most businesses, capital equipment is a carve-out of property that is defined as costing over $5,000 with a life of one year for IRS purposes so that capital depreciation costs can be determined. Keeping this in mind, the second half of Alternate II says the following:

“Title to property purchased with funds available for research and having a unit acquisition cost of $5,000 or more shall vest as set forth in the contract. If title to property vests in the contractor under this paragraph, the contractor agrees that no costs shall be allowed for any depreciation, amortization, or use under any existing or future contract or sub-contract thereunder.

The contractor shall furnish the Contracting Officer a list of all property to which title is vested in the contractor under this paragraph within 10 days following the end of the calendar quarter during which it was received.”

Where does one start with this section of Alternate II? First, distinguish between property required to support the research vs. property that will go into a deliverable or is a deliverable to the Government. It is in the best interest of a university to recognize under a cost reimbursement type contract that any property purchased that will go into a deliverable would be considered GP. If it is a general piece of equipment over $5000 used to SUPPORT the program and does NOT go into the deliverable, then you need to determine whether it is F&A chargeable.

For property over $5,000 that is to be acquired to support the research, make sure that property is identified. Work with the contracting officer to determine who, the Government or the university, will take title
and document it in the contract. This includes property that will be fabricated (starts out as parts but becomes a piece of equipment with a value over $5,000). It is important that the project team makes a conscious decision on what is best for the university – to ask for title or to recognize purchased property as Government-owned property. Need (now and in the future), use, liability and cost of ownership are criteria on which to make this decision.

At the end of the contract, one more requirement must be met. Property purchased under a Government contract will require that the university request disposition if title is not vested in the university.

FAR 52.245-1 paragraph (j) provides detailed directions in regard to the reporting of excess GP – as well as specific time frames for these actions to be started by the university AND completed by the Government. Again a reminder: Property, where title is with the Government, cannot be used on any other project (even another government project) without specific approval of the contracting officer. Also, remember 31 U.S.C. section 63.6306 (Title 31, Money and Finance, Subtitle V, General Assistance Administration) and Title 15 U.S.C., Commerce and Trade, Section 3710, Utilization of Federal Technology, (i) Research Equipment, from our earlier discussion of a trust relationship.

■ FAR Part 35, Research and Development Contracts In all the discussion previously about FAR 52.245-1, do not forget about your other FAR sources to support your negotiations. FAR 35.014, Government Property and Title, states that “the requirements in Part 45 for establishing and maintaining control over Government property apply to all R&D contracts.” However, Section (b) can be critical to the cause:

(b) In implementing 31 U.S.C. 6306, and unless an agency head provides otherwise, the policies in paragraphs (1) through (4) following, regarding title to equipment (and other tangible personal property) purchased by the contractor using Government funds provided for the conduct of basic or applied scientific research, apply to contracts with nonprofit institutions of higher education and nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research:

(1) If the contractor obtains the contracting officer’s advance approval, the contractor shall automatically acquire and retain title to any item of equipment costing less than $5,000 (or a lesser amount established by agency regulations) acquired on a reimbursable basis.

(2) If purchased equipment costs $5,000 (or a lesser amount established by agency regulations) or more, and as the parties specifically agree in the contract, title may—

(i) Vest in the contractor upon acquisition without further obligation to the Government;

(ii) Vest in the contractor, subject to the Government’s right to direct transfer of the title to the Government or to a third party within 12 months after the contract’s completion or termination (transfer of title to the Government or third party shall not be the basis for any claim by the contractor); or

(iii) Vest in the Government, if the contracting officer determines that vesting of title in the contractor would not further the objectives of the agency’s research program.

(3) If title to equipment is vested in the contractor, depreciation, amortization, or use charges are not allowable with respect to that equipment under any existing or future Government contract or subcontract.

(4) If the contract is performed at a Government installation and there is a continuing need for the equipment following contract completion, title need not be transferred to the contractor.

(c) The absence of an agreement covering title to equipment acquired by the contractor with Government funds that cost $1,000 or more does not limit an agency’s right to act to vest title in a contractor as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 6306.

Talk about repeatability in the FAR and other regulations.
Some Agency Specifics  Recently, universities have been experiencing federal sponsors that are requiring Government title to property under all contracts (both fixed price and cost type). Primarily, these sponsors have been Management and Operating (“M&O”) contractors at federal laboratories under the Department of Energy. The justification they are using is that they are required to utilize the subcontracting requirements of DEAR 970.945-1 instead of the standard FAR 42.245-1. This DEAR supplement clause is appropriate for contractors providing on-site support to the M&Os, but not to universities performing research projects at the university. One explanation provided is that since the university operating the M&O is on a Government Facility or laboratory – that lab needs to be able to continue operation even if the incumbent university leaves and another is brought in to operate the lab. Universities need to be aware that the laboratories may ask for a detailed budget for small dollar proposals, which is their right, in order to make a price acceptability determination, but then modify the FAR clause associated with their “normal” university agreements to include Government title to all property even in fixed price awards. Negotiating with the laboratories is difficult even with a strong basis so Government title to property becomes a university decision with all the issues related to the first part of this article.

Property Associated with Subawards and Subcontracts

For the purposes of this article, remember that subawards are issued under federal financial assistance agreements and subcontracts are issued under federal procurement contracts.

Normally, when a university receives a subaward which passes through a federal grant or cooperative agreement, the property clauses or agency policies associated with the grant or cooperative agreement are flowed to and must be accepted by the subawardee. A-110 property terms should be the basis of most subawards unless special circumstances are involved. Sometimes a non-profit or for-profit organization that received the prime requires title to any property purchased. If you are the subawardee, you should try to negotiate title for your university based on the agency practices and A-110. If you cannot, then the terms and conditions of the subaward prevail — be sure to negotiate those topics already discussed under non-federal granting agencies above; liability, normal wear and tear, maintenance, and shipping costs at the conclusion of the grant.

Caution is urged if you are a subcontractor for a FOR PROFIT CONTRACTOR. If a for-profit is given title through your acquisition, you may be guilty of providing a non-taxed purchase to a for-profit organization for the benefit of the for-profit. That purchase may have been made using a higher education discount not available to for-profits. If you are a public university, you will be using state funds (your purchasing system) to assist a for-profit by buying the item for them tax free. We recommend that you negotiate Government ownership or ask the for-profit to purchase the equipment and provide it to you in a similar way that the Government provides GFP.

There is no requirement to flow down title to the recipient of the subaward unless the grant or cooperative agreement has specific wording requiring that flow down. If your university is the prime recipient of a grant or cooperative agreement, you should make property title decisions based on the sponsor’s and your university’s best interests.

If your university is the recipient of a subcon contract based on a federal prime contract, title to equipment may be defined in either the subcontract instrument you receive from the prime or terms and conditions of the prime award may be flowed down as part of the subcontract. Sometimes property clauses are in both the subcontract and the prime flow down clauses. In this case, try to remove one or the other or be sure to negotiate an ‘order of precedence’ clause in the subcontract to clarify which clause takes priority. We suggest that your university provide a proposal submittal letter with your budget and technical proposal to the prime. In this submittal letter, outline the...
clauses you believe are appropriate for the subcontract you expect to receive. Be sure to include a request for the Government Property Clause inclusive of Alt II so that the prime contractor will have this information when negotiating its contract with the Government agency.

Finally, if you are the recipient of a federal contract with the Government Property Clause, hopefully you negotiated Alternate II (for basic and applied research) and defined in the contract where title to property will reside that will remain with the university and where title to deliverable property will exchange hands.

It is critical to understand that there is no requirement to flow down Alternate II of the Government Property Clause to a for-profit entity. Just because you, the university, may acquire title through the Alternate II provision, you cannot turn around and provide the equivalent title vesting allowance to a for-profit subcontractor. Typically, when working with a for-profit organization, the university should take title as the prime contractor with the intention that, ultimately, the title will vest in the government. This discussion should be part of your negotiation. This may be a good option if there are many pieces of purchased property or a piece of high valued property required for the project. We provide this example to show that by being the prime there should not be an “automatic” decision of property title when you have a subcontract. Make a conscious decision regarding property title that is in accordance with the regulations and the best interests of the parties. One other note — remember, the prime is responsible for the actions of the subcontractor including the adequacy of their property management system and any property reporting required by the contract.

Other Considerations

Most universities have equipment definition thresholds of $5,000 and a life of one year. What happens when a funding agency requires property control at some value below $5,000? Also, some agencies, such as the M&O contractors discussed above, have a concept called “sensitive property.” If possible, negotiate to the $5,000 threshold. If sensitive property is to be used under the grant or contract, be sure to have a specific definition of the type of property that is expected to be controlled and any specific requirements for that control. As a research administrator, you must be sure that your university has mechanisms to track, control and manage sensitive property within its property management system.

Things to Remember

The authors are strong proponents of up-front planning, actually reading the grant, cooperative agreement or contract and all the clauses thereof, and making conscious decisions when it comes to property. The critical time in planning is prior to proposal submittal. However, if that is not possible, be sure to develop your strategy while in negotiations prior to award. The key to research property administration is recognizing the consequences of improper application of the property clauses, the lack of property clauses, misunderstanding the property clauses, or the incorrect property clauses. Putting property in perspective to the statement of work defined in the award takes some thought. Here are some recommendations to consider:

- Every decision regarding property should conform to your university’s property administration practices and controls.
- It is usually best to obtain property title for your university upon acquisition. However, other options are available and may be more appropriate to the circumstances. Decisions should take into consideration the management procedures that are in place at your university.
- Non-standard property language in a grant, cooperative agreement or contract is usually a cause for extra scrutiny and discussion.
- If GFP is available, be sure the Government includes a list/description of the GFP in the appropriate solicitation and award document (FAR 45.201(a)).
- Grants (A-110) provide more flexibility for use of property than contracts (FAR).
- FAR 52.245-1 with Alt II (if appropriate) is a “friendly” university/non-profit clause but the research administrator must think through the entire spectrum of possibilities to properly control acquired property.
• There is a requirement to flow property management requirements to subawardees or subcontractors. There is no requirement to flow the prime property conditions, i.e., title vesting language and liability considerations to a subawardee or subcontractor if other considerations make sense for that individual project.

• Be very mindful when addressing title to property purchased by a for-profit organization under a university prime grant or contract.

• Fixed price awards should generally not require sponsor or Government title under competitive conditions other than for deliverable items.

• Read the entire property clause even if it looks like standard FAR or A-110 language.

Think we are through? NOT SO FAST. Go back to the beginning of this article and read it again. There are a number of concerns that need to be considered when property title is part of the equation.

Reference Notes:
FAR - Federal Acquisition Regulations, codified in 48 CFR, Chapter 1.
The NCURA Executive Leadership Program (ELP) is a six-month program which is conducted between January and June. The first five months of class is done in a virtual environment, with a facilitator and various guest speakers on topics such as MBTI; MBTI 2; Five Practices of Leadership – for beginners and for the advanced; Executive Aura; Executive Coaching and others. The program ends with a four-day in-person retreat led by nationally-recognized leadership educators. Our guest facilitators covered topics such as Emotional Intelligence; Public Speaking; Maintaining Balance in Your Life; and Best Practices of Successful Boards, including simulated Board Meetings which students participate in. Because NCURA's Board of Directors believes the ELP is an investment in our future, there is no charge to participate.

Participants must be nominated by a Regional Chair, National Board Member or Standing Committee Chair and the selection criteria follows:

- Has demonstrated leadership traits successfully in a regional or national leadership role
- Has been an NCURA member for a minimum of five years
- Committed to remaining in the profession and active in NCURA
- Has been regionally recognized for their leadership activities through recommendation for participation in the program by regional or national leaders (past and present)
- Will commit to fully participate in program assignments and activities
- Has the support and commitment of their home organization

The 2012 Executive Leadership Program class completed their experience and it was unanimously a positive experience:

“This was one of the top 10 best experiences of my life! I have come out of this program with more self-awareness and confidence.”

“I think the ELP was great, and I’m very fortunate to have had the opportunity to participate.”

“This program has been SO useful for me both in learning about NCURA and about leadership. It has made me so enthusiastic to start serving on a national level.”

“This has been an amazing experience for me.”

Congratulations to the ELP Class of 2012! If you have questions about the program contact NCURA Executive Director Kathleen Larmett at Larmett@ncura.edu or 202-466-3894.

**ELP Leadership Team**

**Vivian Holmes**, Director, Sponsored Research Operations, Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard  
**Pam Whitlock**, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, University of North Carolina at Wilmington (Emeritis)  
**Jerry Fife**, Vice Chancellor for Administration, Vanderbilt University  
**Gunta Liders**, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, University of Rochester  
**Kathleen Larmett**, Executive Director, National Council of University Research Administrators  
**Tara Bishop**, Associate Executive Director, National Council of University Research Administrators
One of the wonderful things about being a research administrator is the opportunity to be part of a much larger community. While a research administrator sometimes faces a world where few people know what a research administrator is, there is a very large and growing network of research administrators throughout the country, and throughout the world. The Research Administration Community is a very collaborative community that openly shares knowledge and experiences. Becoming more involved in this community beyond your institution provides the opportunity to benefit from many other people’s knowledge and experience. This article discusses some of the ways that financial research administrators can become more involved in the Research Administration Community (even without leaving their desks).

Collaborating with Federal Representatives

An area that financial research administrators need to pay close attention to is federal guidelines and policies. These frequently change and can very dramatically impact what we are required to do. Whether it is new reporting requirements (such as those that came with ARRA or FFATA) or a policy change (such as the change in the HHS salary caps), the change can greatly impact how some or many research awards are administered. In some cases, there may be the requirement for new information or business process systems. The changes may also result in an increased (or possibly decreased) administrative burden that will need to be evaluated and addressed. While many of us may interact with federal representatives on individual awards, having the opportunity to discuss new policies and requirements may not be readily available.

Frequently when changes are proposed, federal representatives will seek feedback prior to executing the change. This provides the research administration community with an opportunity to have input into many potential changes. While the ultimate resulting requirement may not be the action preferred by the research community, the federal representatives may alter the outcome based upon the feedback provided by the research community. Developing a strong, collaborative relationship with our federal representatives is very important.

There are various opportunities for Universities to collaborate and interact with federal representatives regarding policy and related changes. As individuals, not all research administrators will have the opportunity to directly interact at this level but there is likely to be individuals within your central administration offices that do have that opportunity who will be able to bring the feedback from their institutional research communities to the federal representatives.

Some of the available networks for research universities to interact with federal representatives are outlined below.

By Kerry Peluso
COGR  The Council on Governmental Relations (COGR) is an association of research universities. Since its inception in 1948, COGR has been continuously involved in the development of all major financial and administrative aspects of federally-funded research.

Today, COGR's primary function is to provide advice and information to its membership and to make certain that federal agencies understand academic operations and the impact of proposed regulations on colleges and universities. COGR helps to develop policies and practices that fairly reflect the mutual interests and separate obligations of federal agencies and universities in research and graduate education.

COGR holds three meetings each year to keep its membership informed of any and all issues facing research institutions today. Federal representatives often attend these meetings to present on or discuss upcoming and potential changes. These meetings are open to representatives from Universities that are COGR members only. More information about COGR is available at www.cogr.edu.

FDP  The Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) is an association of federal agencies, academic research institutions with administrative, faculty and technical representation, and research policy organizations that work to streamline the administration of federally sponsored research. FDP members of all sectors cooperate in identifying, testing, and implementing new, more effective ways of managing the more than $15 Billion in federal research grants and contracts awarded to research institutions. The goal of improving the productivity of research without compromising its stewardship has benefits for the entire nation.

The FDP uniquely offers a forum for individuals from universities and nonprofits to work collaboratively with federal agency officials to improve the national research enterprise. At its regular meetings, faculty and administrators talk face-to-face with decision-makers from agencies that sponsor and regulate research. They hold spirited, frank discussions, identify problems, and develop action plans for change. Then – again working jointly – they test the new ways of doing things in the real world before putting them into effect.

Begun as an experiment in 1986 between five federal agencies (National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, Office of Naval Research, Department of Energy, and US Department of Agriculture) and the Florida State University System and the University of Miami to test and evaluate a grant mechanism utilizing a standardized and simplified set of terms and conditions across all participating agencies, the FDP has evolved into an organization of 10 federal agencies and more that 90 research institutions are joining together to form more informal networks. Some of these groups meet regularly to discuss new and old challenges and how they are handling them. In addition, many people who are not close to other similar institutions have formed informal email networks. Research Administrators use these methods to interact on various topics that they encounter.

For additional ideas on how to collaborate with other institutions, talk to other research administrators about what they find effective. There are many ways for research administrators to communicate, collaborate and share ideas. Sharing our knowledge, experience, and our questions, makes us all stronger.

NCURA Conferences  Federal representatives very frequently present on a variety of topics at NCURA Conferences (National Meeting, Financial Research Administration Conference, Pre-Award Research Administration Conference, and some regional conferences). These concurrent and discussion sessions provide opportunities to hear directly from the federal representatives and provide feed-back. More information regarding upcoming NCURA Conferences can be accessed at: http://www.ncura.edu/content/educational_programs/.

**Collaborating with Other Universities**

The forums described above all provide wonderful opportunities to interact with representatives from other Universities as well as federal representatives. The best solutions come from everyone working together and sharing ideas. There will also be times when you may seek to interact with people in similar positions to yours at other institutions. Beyond the networks noted above, below are some other ways to collaborate with others.

**NCURA** NCURA offers a variety of ways to collaborate. Beyond conferences, collaboration can occur right from a member's desk. The Collaborate NCURA professional networking platform allows members to easily interact and communicate online, empowering members to work effectively. Resource tools such as commenting capabilities will ensure quick and easy access to the most relevant/popular information. http://collaborate.ncura.edu/home/

**Listservs** There are a variety of listservs that research administrators can interact in with each other. One of the most popular is the Research Administration Discussion List RESADM-L. A variety of topics are regularly discussed including financial research administration and other topics. For more information, visit http://lists.healthresearch.org/cgi-bin/wa?INDEX.

**Informal Networks** With tightening budgets and increasing workloads, the opportunities to travel to conferences is being reduced for many people. Some regions of the country that have nearby research institutions are joining together to form more informal networks. Some of these groups meet regularly to discuss new and old challenges and how they are handling them. In addition, many people who are not close to other similar institutions have formed informal email networks. Research Administrators use these methods to interact on various topics that they encounter.

For additional ideas on how to collaborate with other institutions, talk to other research administrators about what they find effective. There are many ways for research administrators to communicate, collaborate and share ideas. Sharing our knowledge, experience, and our questions, makes us all stronger.

---

**Kerry Peluso** is the Associate Vice President for Research Administration at Emory University. Kerry has over 22 years experience in research and grants administration, is a CPA and holds an MBA. In her current role, she is responsible for the Office of Sponsored Programs and the Office of Grants and Contracts Accounting. Kerry has been involved in a variety of roles with NCURA including serving as National Treasurer, Chair/co-Chair of national conferences, Chair of the Financial Research Administration Neighborhood Committee, as a faculty member for NCURA’s Financial Research Administration Workshop and is currently a Peer Reviewer for the NCURA Peer Review Program and a Contributing Editor to the NCURA Magazine.
The Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR) of The National Academies addresses pressing cross-sector issues that are relevant to science, technology, and the national interest. The group convenes thrice yearly, with the focus most recently on how research universities might be remodeled to meet the changing paradigms in higher education. ‘Reimagining the University’ was the theme of GUIRR’s Fall Meeting, October 9-10, 2012, looking in particular at the economics of higher education. Experts from academia, industry, and government came together to address such questions as, “What is the best way to reduce college costs?” and, “How rapidly should we move to online education as an economic solution?” A written summary of the meeting, along with the speaker presentations, is posted on the GUIRR website, www.nas.edu/guirr, under “Past Meetings.”

GUIRR also recently launched a webinar series where university reform is among an array of topics being explored. On September 12, 2012, GUIRR hosted a webinar on a report of the Research Universities Futures Consortium entitled The Current Health and Future Well-Being of the American Research University. The report examines the challenges facing U.S. research universities and suggests that the institutions are currently caught in an unsustainable and counterproductive “research arms race.” Three consortium representatives presented: Dr. Brad Fenwick, University of Tennessee/Elsevier; Dr. Gregory Reed, University of Tennessee; and Dr. Charles Louis, University of California, Riverside. The webinar was offered free of charge.

Another webinar was held November 20, 2012, reviewing the findings from and recommendations made in an important National Research Council report. Titled Research Universities and the Future of America, the report highlights actions needed to improve American universities and thereby increase national prosperity and security. Mr. Chad Holliday, chair of the committee that wrote the report and Chairman of the Board for Bank of America, delivered the webinar presentation accompanied by Dr. Peter Henderson, the report’s study director.

Recordings and presenter slides from each GUIRR webinar are posted on GUIRR’s website, www.nas.edu/guirr. Each webinar includes Q&A with the presenters, giving an opportunity for attendees to go beyond the report pages and into the minds of the authors. More webinars will be hosted in 2013; registration information is posted on the GUIRR website.

Any opinions expressed in this article are solely those of the author and do not represent the positions of the GUIRR or the National Academies.

Katie Kalinowski is a Senior Program Associate supporting the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR) and the University-Industry Demonstration Partnership (UIDP) at the National Academies. Prior to joining the Academies in 2012, Ms. Kalinowski analyzed green power and climate change issues for the Renewable Northwest Project and she facilitated the National Wind Coordinating Collaborative, a national forum on wind power development, at RESOLVE. She served as a U.S. Peace Corps volunteer in Macedonia from 2009-2011. She holds a master’s degree in Economics from North Carolina State University and a B.S. in Natural Resources from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.
The Nominating and Leadership Development Committee is pleased to announce the Call for Nominations for the 2013 NCURA Awards.

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

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

**Distinguished Service Award** This award is given to up to five individuals who have made significant contributions to NCURA. [Note: Current National Officers and NCURA Standing Committee (FMC, NLDC and PDC) Chairs and Vice Chairs are ineligible for nomination for this award.]

**Joseph F. Carrabino Award** This award is given to a current, or former, federal employee who has made a significant contribution to research administration, either through a single project, activity, or innovation, or by a lifetime of service. **Deadline for nominations: March 22, 2013**

**Catherine Core Minority Travel Award** This program supports travel-related costs to attend the NCURA Annual Meeting for up to four individuals from under-represented groups who would not otherwise be able to attend this meeting. **Deadline for applications March 22, 2013**
As the Internet evolves and grows, university technology transfer is on a path similar to that of other human transactions, from selling to social networking. It will never move entirely online but there is great potential yet to be tapped. Some aspects of tech transfer can be done much more effectively if they are automated online — the IT functionality exists and is waiting to be widely deployed — and new models of online collaboration are just starting to be explored.

From what I am learning as director of a technology portal, I want to highlight an idea whose time I believe has come: online “clickwrap” licensing of non-big-ticket items such as research tools. Later I will mention two collaborative models worthy of notice.

Putting the Click in the Long Tail

Although most research does not produce high mass-market revenues, it has value beyond the publication of findings. The researchers create practical end products and byproducts: software programs, cell lines, ideas embodied or encoded in forms that are useful if in the right hands. Multitudes of these goods make up “the long tail” of university research output. And as Chris Anderson, the editor of Wired, explained in his 2004 article of the same name, the Internet’s reach provides a way to unlock the value of the long tail:

The average Barnes & Noble carries 130,000 titles. Yet more than half of Amazon’s book sales come from outside its top 130,000 titles.

When you think about it, most successful businesses on the Internet are about aggregating the Long Tail in one way or another. [For instance] eBay is mostly tail as well — niche and one-off products.1

A key first step toward building a strong market for long-tail research technologies is now mostly done. The tech transfer community has an array of so-called “aggregator” sites for connecting producers and users of research. Sites that list innovations from universities across North America and elsewhere include Flintbox, launched in 2003, and the Kauffman Foundation’s iBridge Network, online since 2005. Technologies from the NIH’s Clinical and Translational Science Awards program have been posted on the CTSA-IP website since 2009, and in February 2012, the AUTM Global Technology Portal went active. There are more, including regional aggregator portals.

To show the worth of such sites I will briefly share some figures and examples from the iBridge Network, which I direct. Then let’s see what has transpired as we have added the next key ingredient, online licensing.

Inside One Portal

At this writing the iBridge Network lists over 17,909 innovations posted by 168 research institutions. Visitors browsing the site range from university researchers themselves to entrepreneurs and executives at multinational firms. In five and half years, over 79 technologies have been licensed a total of about 2,000 times. Most licenses are non-exclusive and many are free of charge, although deals have been offered for fees from a few dollars up to $19,000.

Results vary widely. While some innovations draw occasional online interest, or none at all, some become viral hits. One example of the latter is NeuronMetrics, a software package for image analysis created by a neuroscience team at the University of Arizona. The team, led by Dr. Linda Restifo, has been working to discover drugs that could treat the root causes of autism and other developmental brain disorders. This involves testing myriad compounds on fruit flies, then reading photomicrographs of their brain tissue to judge the effects. The NeuronMetrics software helps analyze the status of intricate “neurite arbors,” a process normally so arduous as to hamper any research of the type.

Neuronmetrics was listed on the then-new iBridge Network in March 2007. By May 2008, 65 research
teams had licensed the software — a license-per-week average — and more inquiries were pouring in. Clearly such results cannot be gained solely through Internet magic. An innovation has to meet a real need. Still, the task of the portal operator is to optimize the chances of every technology posted. So in 2010, at iBridge, we relaunched the option to augment online listing with e-commerce and online licensing functionality.

Our reasoning was essentially that people expect such a function on the Internet, and its absence can be a barrier. Results to date are gratifying — for the few universities that have tried the option.

‘On the Cusp’ of Mainstream Adoption

Only eight institutions thus far, of our current 168, have offered clickwrap licenses on a total of 57 currently available technologies out of many hundreds they have posted. Those products have been licensed over 2,000 times, a rate well above the iBridge norm. In two years they have generated about $212,000 in licensing fees.

NeuronMetrics is now offered for clickwrap download on a sliding fee scale: free to non-profit researchers, $100 for “small commercial entities” such as startups, and up to $500 for larger firms. A software suite for hip analysis, from the University of Chicago, has been licensed at $3,000 per user. About half of the clickwrap items are downloadable software, but they also include cell lines, animal models, and hard goods outside the life sciences: for example, workbooks for a “job crafting exercise,” which HR departments at private firms can order from the University of Michigan for $34.95.

Online licensing looks very much like an idea on the cusp of mainstream adoption, though obviously not there yet. The procedure is simple and familiar to all. An appropriate pro forma license is displayed for reading, which the licensee clicks to accept. Payment can be made online as well, including for shipping if needed. Why aren’t the early adopters using this method more; why don’t more institutions try it?

Sources of Resistance to Overcome

I have asked people from the iBridge universities and received a range of responses. Many simply say they want to retain control of negotiating their licenses. Some have cited a problem that keeps them from posting more often in the first place: difficulty in tracking down shelf technologies that ought to be moved off the shelf. (Research universities are highly complex organizations. I have been told it is possible to have hundreds, even thousands of cell lines and literally not know where they all are.)

And what stops some, ironically, is the concern that online licensing might work too well. TLOs have finite staff and resources. Filling online orders for tangible goods could add a sizable burden of small-ticket piecework.

One could answer the objections by invoking an obligation to disseminate the fruits of funded research — using all means available. However it is fruitless to address nuts-and-bolts concerns by pointing to an ideal state. My judgment is that online licensing will move up the adoption curve gradually and selectively, but inevitably.

More people will recognize cases where the benefits outweigh the downsides. Concerns will be eased as the practice grows more common, and perhaps new ways around the concerns are found. Eventually the question will shift from “Why don’t you try online licensing?” to “How can you not have it?”

Two Ideas for the Next Wave

Meanwhile, the proliferation of “aggregator” sites for technology has led to much multi-listing and interlinking. The University of Chicago licensing office, for instance, lists the same innovations on iBridge and Flintbox; some universities use other combinations. We encourage this and even invite other technology portals to link with ours.

Might all such sites consolidate into a dominant mega-portal, much as Facebook came to dominate social networking? More likely, in my view, is a pattern of some like-to-like consolidation with many portals persisting or emerging for special purposes. Recall that as huge as Facebook is, it is fruitless to address nuts-and-bolts concerns by pointing to an ideal state. My judgment is that online licensing will move up the adoption curve gradually and selectively, but inevitably.
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Planning for AM55 Begins

“Bruce Morgan, Susan Zipkin, and I have already begun planning for August 2013. We have a fantastic program committee with representatives from across all of our regions and communities. The committee will be meeting in late November to begin the process of formulating a program that will include more than 30 workshops and hundreds of sessions spanning all aspects of research administration. Recently invigorated by AM54, we’re excited and proud to be organizing the first NCURA Annual Meeting to be held in the summer. We plan on taking advantage of many new ideas and opportunities for our members, including expanded amenities such as Camp NCURA for those members who plan to bring their future research administrators to AM55!”

L-R: Bruce Morgan (Co-Chair), Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research Administration, University of California-Irvine; Susan Zipkin (Co-Chair), Director, Post Award Administration, Office for Sponsored Programs, Boston College; Vivian Holmes (2013 NCURA Vice President), Director, Sponsored Research Operations, The Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard
Getting to Know Federally Designated MSIs

By Angie Rochat

Minority Serving Institutions (MSIs) have a unique and historical role in the higher education framework of the United States. The origins and missions of MSIs are as different as the students they serve. The federal designation of MSIs defines them as “institutions of higher education enrolling populations with significant percentages of minority students, or that serve certain populations of minority students...” The federal designation of MSIs defines them as “institutions of higher education enrolling populations with significant percentages of minority students, or that serve certain populations of minority students under various programs created by Congress.”

MSIs have traditional designations that date back to the mid 1960’s such as Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs), Minority Institutions, and American Indian Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities (TGCUs). In 2008 several new designations were created, such as Native American-Serving Non-Tribal Institutions (NASNTIs), Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions (AANAPISIs), Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions, Predominantly Black Institutions (PBIs), and High Hispanic enrollment. Within these designations there are varying degrees of percentages of underrepresented students required to qualify for federal designation of a minority serving school. For example, NASNTIs require a minimum of 10% undergraduate student enrollment of American Indian/Alaskan Native (AI/AN) students and HSIs require a minimum of 25% Hispanic student enrollment.

MSIs provide access and opportunity to a growing segment of the nation’s population that is enrolling in higher education as the “number of minority student enrollment grew 56% to 5.8 million and the number of White students increased by 14% to 11.1 million during the past decade.” In spite of enrollment growth, White students receive more bachelor’s degrees as a percentage of students enrolled than do minorities. For example, in 2008 whites made up 58.4% of enrollment but earned 67% of bachelor’s degrees while minorities accounted for 31.7% of enrolled students and only 23.7% of degrees awarded. According to the Census Bureau projections, minorities will comprise about half of the resident United States population by 2050.

Federal Focus on MSIs

Minority students are an increasingly important focus nationally as institutions of higher education, and particularly MSIs, play a pivotal role in diversifying the nation’s workforce. Federal sponsors such as the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH), often encourage diversity in their initiatives, acknowledging the widening gap between White students and underrepresented students, such as women and minorities in the science and engineering workforce. A recent NSF report stated that HBCUs are important baccalaureate-origin institutions of future Black science and engineering doctorate recipients. Other federal sponsors have highly competitive funds limited to MSIs that serve national goals to increase minority educational degree attainment rates and provide academic and student support services.

Reaffirming the Federal Government’s commitment to ensure that Tribal Nations are full partners with the Federal family, in 2011 President Obama announced the signing of Executive Order No. 13592 entitled, “Improving American Indian and Alaska Native Educational Opportunities and Strengthening Tribal Colleges and Universities.” In order to meet President Obama’s goal for college attainment, there will need to be an additional 112,000 AI/AN students completing college by the year 2020. NASNTIs play an important role as more than 90% of AI/AN postsecondary students attend institutions of higher education that are not tribally-controlled.

Many MSIs are predominately undergraduate institutions (PUs) that offer a rich, culturally diverse learning environment, a focus on teaching over research, and dual missions that are both academic and historic. Many also have low educational and general fund expenditures and students with high financial need, and they must qualify for Title III funds to compete in discretionary grant competitions at the U.S. Department of Education.

History and Missions

The history of MSIs depicts the communities and students that the institutions serve across the nation. Recently, three MSIs discussed their institutions during a NCURA PUI podcast led by Katie Plum, Director of Sponsored Projects at Angelo State University in San Angelo, TX, (an HSI). Denise Willis, Grant Accountant Manager from Morehouse College (HBCU) in Atlanta, GA said, “Morehouse was founded in 1867 and focuses on the education of African American males.” Morehouse became a HBCU in 1964 when the designation was established. Anne Frey, Associate Director of Grant Development from Texas A & M International University (TAMIU) in Laredo, TX describes this HSI as “a relatively young institution of 40 years” and “one that far exceeds the 25% Hispanic student enrollment eligibility requirement for their designation, by serving 92% Hispanic students.” My institution, Fort Lewis College (FLC) in Durango, CO, is an NASNTI where almost a quarter of the students are American Indian/Alaskan Native from 138 tribes. FLC’s origins date back to 1910 as an Indian boarding school and a military fort. NASNTIs are different from Tribal Colleges which are tribally controlled, award primarily Associate’s degrees, and are located on reservations.

During the podcast, participants described their institutions’ missions and students. Denise said the mission of Morehouse College is “to develop men with disciplined minds who will lead life with leadership and service.” She further stated that “Morehouse realizes its mission by emphasizing the intellectual and character development of its students.” The college also assumes a special responsibility in teaching the history and culture of African Americans. Anne Frey describes TAMIU as
the only “four-year institution within a 150 mile radius of Laredo, TX that mainly serves students from the area that are 72% Pell eligible and 40% first generation.” Traditionally, they have a partner institution on the other side of the U.S./Mexico border, but are currently unable to develop this relationship because of travel restrictions due to violence in the border region. When developing proposals, TAMU is cognizant of the needs of its partner institution in Mexico and includes training, mentoring, and research experiences for their partner in their proposals. At FLC, our mission is both historic and academic with the “academic mission focused on undergraduate liberal arts education for a diverse student population.” Our historic mission involves a contract with the federal government that transferred 6,279 acres in southwest Colorado to the State of Colorado “to be maintained as an institution of learning to which Indian students will be admitted free of tuition and on an equality with white students” in perpetuity (Act of 61st Congress, 1911). FLC and the University of Minnesota, Morris, which also has origins as an Indian Boarding School, are the only two institutions in the nation with a historic mission to admit qualified American Indian/Alaskan Native students from all federally recognized U.S. tribes free of tuition.

Examples of Types of Sponsored Projects at MSIs

Typical of both PUIs and MSIs, the three institutions represented in the podcast have a variety of sponsored projects to advance scholarship and research interests of faculty members, as well as those that typically serve low income, first generation students, and involve outreach efforts to their regional communities. Summer research experiences for undergraduate students at research and medical institutions are also a focus of institutional collaborations that mirror national initiatives to increase minority student participation in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics).

Denise from Morehouse College highlighted the “minority male health program” funded through the Department of Health and Human Services that works in the surrounding Atlanta community to teach healthy lifestyles to minority males in a variety of activities in high schools and summer camps. It also sponsors farmers’ markets in neighborhoods that may not have fresh fruits and vegetables, as well as health fairs where health screenings are conducted for diseases that affect African American males. Morehouse has a large population of students that are accepted into professional schools and graduate programs in public health sciences, such as epidemiology and biostatistics. Morehouse also has a Public Health Institute that is a collaboration with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) that provides students with internships, public health awareness conferences, mentoring, and curriculum development opportunities. Morehouse also has STEM focused collaborations with research institutions in the Atlanta area in nuclear and material sciences.

TAMIU has U.S. Department of Education TRiO programs in an effort to conduct outreach activities in the community to get the students of Laredo college-ready. One project that Anne highlighted was GEAR Up (Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs), a project that TAMIU has had since the 1990s for four consecutive competitions. The most recent GEAR Up grant is funded at almost $43 million and will serve 8,000 students, 19 school districts, and 11 counties, getting 7th graders college ready and following them through the first year of college. Anne also talked about TAMIU’s desire to engage in more research-oriented funding and recent successes with NSF Major Research Instrumentation and Research Corporation grants.

At FLC we have many of the same TRiO projects, such as Upward Bound, Talent Search, and two Student Support Services projects, one that serves students in traditional academic disciplines and another that is specific to STEM majors, as many students are first generation and low income. Other STEM projects include a NIH Minority Access to Research Careers project that provides mentoring to STEM majors and student summer research opportunities at research institutions and medical centers. Recently, FLC partnered with another NASNTI, San Juan College in Farmington, NM, on a successful NSF STEM Talent Expansion Program that creates a pipeline for community college students to be able to come to a four-year institution and participate in collaborative summer research projects with faculty and undergraduate students in STEM disciplines. At FLC, the U.S. Department of Education’s Title III grants are vitally important to the institution in terms of meeting infrastructure needs, such as providing lab equipment and curriculum development opportunities that PUIs cannot usually afford.

Collaborating with MSIs

MSIs offer quality undergraduate programs and opportunities for a diverse student body that is underrepresented in higher education. Collaborative opportunities in sponsored projects for these institutions, most of which are PUIs, are highly desirable and often conducive to mutually beneficial partnerships for students and faculty. The resources that these institutions bring to collaboration are dynamic faculty, diverse students, and access to undergraduate students who desire to enter graduate and professional schools.

With deep appreciation and a better understanding of all MSIs, I would like to thank Denise Willis of Morehouse College, Anne Frey of Texas A & M International University, and Katie Plum of Angelo State University for their time. To learn more about collaborating with MSIs, please listen to the NCURA podcast titled “Working with Minority Serving Institutions” that can be found on the NCURA website at http://collaborate.ncura.edu/NCURA/Communitykey=697c2db5-9c98-4237-84b9-8862d1aa556e&tab=LibraryFoldersDashboard.

References


This year NCURA received an impressive pool of applicants for the Catherine Core Minority Travel Award. This award is available to minority applicants who, because of institutional financial constraints, could not otherwise attend the NCURA Annual Meeting. The award recipients receive up to $1,500 toward travel-related expenses associated with attending the Annual Meeting. This award, however, is not only to assist in the financial aspects of attending the meeting, it also offers a wide variety of services and opportunities for the awardees to interact with their peers and colleagues from other educational institutions around the country.

The 2012 award recipients are:
- Traci Jackson, The University at Buffalo
- Latica Jones, University of Memphis
- Valerie Knight, Arizona State University
- Arlenin Perez, Children’s Hospital Boston

The Nominating and Leadership Development Committee (N&LDC) eagerly anticipates the participation and leadership that our award recipients will bring to future NCURA activities. Here’s what this year’s award recipients had to say about their Annual Meeting experience:

Traci Jackson, The University at Buffalo
Each session I attended provided me with a new insight or strategy for handling the various responsibilities associated with research administration. I will take the new knowledge, tools and strategies that I have acquired and share them with faculty and university personnel with the goal of strengthening our excellence in research and research administration.

One special moment that shall forever remain near and dear to my heart was meeting Catherine Core. What an honor and pleasure it was to personally meet Ms. Core, to thank her for the travel award and to let her know that I will do all in my power to “pay it forward.”

Latica Jones, University of Memphis
Enlightening, rich and rewarding; those are some of the words that I can truthfully say exemplifies my experience by attending NCURA’s 54th Annual Meeting in Washington, DC. What a great time to be in the nation’s capital, attending this meeting with research administrators from all over the world! The privilege of meeting and having lunch with Ms. Catherine Core was indeed the highlight of my time in Washington. As a trailblazer for NCURA, she has made it possible for me and the other recipients to attend this meeting and to honor her legacy by giving back to the organization. When the Region III meeting comes to Memphis in April, I plan to devote volunteer time and to become more engaged in other NCURA activities throughout the year. I am thankful for receiving the travel award; I have gained new friends and knowledge of policies and best practices demonstrated by other universities that would not have been possible without the vision of Ms. Core.

Valerie Knight, Arizona State University
I am so very thankful and honored to have been a recipient of the “NCURA 2012 Catherine Core Minority Travel Award”. It was a pleasure to meet Catherine Core, someone that has laid the groundwork for others to be able to be a part of NCURA’s rewarding and important work.

Attending the NCURA annual meeting provided valuable information to help me enhance the service I provide to our faculty members… I have also developed a nationwide network to be able to expand my knowledge, and have resources outside of Arizona State University.

The application for the 2013 Catherine Core Minority Travel Award will be available soon, and we look forward to many outstanding applications in 2013. If you have any questions contact Alissa Brower, NCURA National Volunteer Coordinator at brower@ncura.edu
Our Program Committee has created an outstanding array of sessions and workshops that encompasses the many diverse aspects of financial research administration and are designed to meet the needs of administrators of all experience levels. In addition to the traditional financial administration sessions, we will be offering sessions on non-financial topics that will provide attendees with information to aid their personal and professional development and that will be good for your soul! There is no better place to refresh your mind, and your soul, than New Orleans, where we can experience ‘all that jazz’, Cajun, Zydeco, and other types of music.

As a financial administrator, you need to aware of the latest regulations, policies, best practices, and trends in our industry that affect you and your job responsibilities. We are confident that after attending FRA 2013 you will be better equipped to do your job and to meet your professional development goals.

In planning this fantastic conference, we’ve taken ideas from past FRA programs and expanded on them, and we have introduced new topics. The program is comprised of six tracks totaling 160 sessions and 25 workshops. We will again have a Hot Topics/Special Interest track which will address a variety of issues and other topics we believe will be of interest to you. Sample sessions from this track include:

- The Impact of Sponsored Research on Personnel Management
- Research Administration Performance Data, Findings & Analysis from the 2012 Benchmarking Survey
- The Real Life of a Departmental Research Administrator: When There are Internal Challenges/Problems in the Lab/Department
- Collaborating with Foreign Entities – Financial Complexities
- Subrecipient Monitoring of High Risk International Subawards
- Risk Assessing versus Risk Aversion
- Key Indicators of the Business Control Environment (KIBCE)
- Turning Researchers into Research Administrators

Our workshop co-chairs have put together a record-number of workshops. These workshops are diverse and cover a broad spectrum of financial research administration topics. The following is a sampling of the exceptional workshops we have planned for you:

- Financial Compliance: What You Need To Know
- Congratulations, You’re a Manager. What Happens Next & How Can the Experience Benefit Your Leadership Journey
- Financial Management for Department Administrators: Pre and Post Award
- Case Studies on International Collaborations for Senior Research Administrators
- Good COPS, Bad COPS [Central Office Post-Award Support]
- Financial Compliance at a PUI, What Management Tools Do I Need?
- Surviving Audits

Building on the conference theme there will be plenty of time for participants to network by meeting new colleagues and renewing relationships with familiar colleagues and friends. And what better place to meet than New Orleans, a city of great food, great music, and unique culture. Our conference hotel is close to many famous locations (Bourbon Street, the French Quarter) and landmarks. So don’t miss out on a fantastic conference in an equally fantastic city.

We work in a rapidly changing environment and 2013 promises to be a year of many changes and challenges, especially in Washington. Congress must confront the looming fiscal crisis and OMB is moving ahead with regulatory reform and a consolidation of the OMB circulars. FRA 2013 will provide a wealth of practical information that will help us do our jobs better and give us insight on changes in the federal government that are sure to have a significant impact on our institutions. We certainly hope that you don’t miss out on this fantastic opportunity to grow professional and personally and you will join us!

Mark your calendars and make plans to join us in New Orleans for the Financial Research Administration (FRA) Conference!
Pre-award research administrators attending the PRA VII conference in March 2013 will experience both an exciting conference designed to meet their specific professional needs and the magic and mystery of New Orleans, Louisiana.

Whether you have many years of experience or are new to the research administration field, you will leave the PRA VII conference armed with the latest information and confidence in your ability to succeed as a pre-award research administration professional.

The range of knowledge required by the pre-award research administrator continues to grow and we’re reflecting that expansion with nine session tracks at this year’s conference. The International and the Developing Research Initiatives tracks represent relatively new, but quickly growing, areas of focus for pre-award research administrators. Among offerings in the International track are sessions on “Developing Research Management Leaders for a Global Research Environment,” “What Do Your Faculty Need to Know Before They Leave the Country,” “Challenges in Managing a Globally Funded Portfolio,” “Assessing and Managing Risk on International Projects,” and “Globally Financed Intellectual Property Challenges.” Concurrent and discussion sessions to be presented in the Developing Research Initiatives track include “Team Science: Encouraging Collaboration…Bringing People Together Internally and Externally,” “Whether, When and How to Use a Professional Grant Writer,” “Research Metrics—The InCites and SciVal Approach,” and “Growing a Research Development Infrastructure from the Ground Up.”

We all face tighter budgets and our federal sponsors are no different. A large part of this year’s Federal track will be in a virtual format. Agency updates by representatives of Federal sponsors including the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Department of Energy will come to us virtually from Washington via video conferencing. In addition, concurrent sessions and discussion sessions will focus on topics including “Planning for Open Government,” “Taking the X-Train—NIH Training Grants,” and “Developing a Large Center Proposal.”

Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions face challenges that are uniquely their own. PRA VII’s PUI track features sessions such as “Strategic Goal Setting for a Small Pre-Award Office,” “Typical Audit Findings at PUIs: A Proactive Approach to Avoiding Negative Findings,” “Faculty Development Gumbo: Best PUI Practices in One Pot,” and “Strategies for Effective Proposal Development at PUIs.”

For the research administrator with a few years experience, the Senior track will include a wide range of topics including “Managing ‘Up’ Tools and Strategies,” “Promoting and Sustaining the Research Environment,” “Grant Writing—The Institutional and Individual Resource,” and “What Research Compliance Encompasses and Where Does it Fit at Your Institution?” Senior research administrators will also have the opportunity to participate in hot topic and open forum sessions throughout PRA VII.

The changing nature of not only what we do in pre-award research administration offices but how we do it is reflected in sessions such as “Doing the Group Dance: Getting in Step with our Partners in Research Administration,” “Customer Service Issues for Departmental Administrators,” “The Office Has Been Reorganized…Now What?,” and “A Research Office on Mars?”

Among the concurrent and discussions sessions in the Departmental track will be “Current Practices in the Organization of Departmental Pre-Award Staff: Is there a Middle Ground?”, “Contracting Issues for the Departmental Research Administrator,” and “Tips and Tools for the Successful Departmental Administrator.”

A wide range of topics will be covered in the Compliance track ranging from “Tricky Costs: Where do I Charge Dog Food?” and “Subrecipient Monitoring” to “Juggling Compliance Issues at a PUI,” and “Implementing the New COI Rules: Truth or Dare.”

“Human Subjects Compliance Issues in Proposal Development,” “Key Negotiation Issues and Strategies in Clinical Trials,” and “Working with Biomedical Research Foundations” are among the sessions planned for the Medical/Clinical track.

Research administration isn’t just about procedures and rules, it is about people. The Human Capital track features several member-suggested sessions including “Using Problem Based Learning in Your Staff Development and Training,” “Doing the Dance: Getting in Step with your Partners in Research Administration,” and “Leadership Succession Planning: Developing a Strategy.”

The Wednesday workshops planned for PRA VII are equally diverse. Among the 16 workshops planned are “Intellectual Property Basics,” “Pre-Award Basics,” “International Agreements,” “Management and Career Ladders,” and workshops designed specifically for departmental research administrators and administrators at PUIs. PRA VII is also pleased to include the very popular (and free) workshop on effective presentations. All the workshops at this year’s meeting will be half-
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On Campus is typically an interview designed to give a more personal account of the day-to-day activities, issues, and obstacles in research administration. This On Campus interview is slightly different. We have interviewed three different individuals who are involved in communicating changes to the policies and procedures for each of the federal agencies they represent. This approach highlights the emphasis federal agencies put on finding effective ways to communicate policy and procedural changes and the similarities in the way each agency approaches the challenge of communicating changes that impact research administrators.

What has your agency found works and doesn’t work when disseminating information about new policies and procedures?

Sally Rockey, NIH

NIH disseminates new policies that affect the extramural community via the NIH Guide for Grants and Contracts, which has ~40,000 subscribers including scientists and administrators from institutions in the US and around the world. We use multiple communication vehicles to further distribute information on any given policy including newsletters such as the Nexus, LISTSERVs, OER web pages, Facebook, Twitter, webcasts and podcasts. Policy updates are incorporated into the NIH Grants Policy Statement, the main resource for NIH grants policy.

I also maintain an ongoing conversation with the extramural community through my blog, Rock Talk. On the blog, I can discuss new policies and procedures in more detail and present data analyses that often underlie those policies. I garner feedback from the community through the comments. As a recent example, I discussed the new policy implementing a special review of well-funded Principal Investigators (PIs) by NIH Advisory Councils on the blog.

In-person meetings between NIH staff and our grantee community, such as those at our Regional Seminars or at professional society meetings such as NCURA are, of course, extremely valuable for getting out the messages on policies and procedures. These interactions are bolstered by our increasing use of webinars and video conferencing into meetings that we cannot attend in person.

We also disseminate materials that can be used by staff across NIH as they promote the new policies with their grantees. We also make these materials available for reuse by institutions to educate their scientists and administrators. For example, after the publication of the revised regulations on Financial Conflict of Interest (FCOI), we posted a tutorial describing the provisions of the new regulation and the roles and responsibilities of investigators, institutions, and NIH.

Finally, we have multiple help desks (one example is GrantsInfo@nih.gov) and we train the help desk staff on new policies before they roll out so they are ready to answer additional questions.

Judy Havemann, NEH

NEH is one of the largest funders of humanities programs in the United States. NEH awards grants for research to advance knowledge and understanding of the humanities. Awards are made to scholars, universities, museums, filmmakers, libraries, and other recipients.

To address the challenge of reaching such a diverse audience, we focus on attempting to communicate grant requirements in the clearest possible language. Critical and changing information is highlighted in distinctive colors and bold type. Lists of frequently asked questions as well as sample applications are posted on the NEH website.

Here are NEH we have recently launched a new website designed to communicate the work of the Endowment. Nothing is more important to our mission than careful stewardship of the Endowment’s limited resources. The website contains everything from funding announcements to a detailed list of policies and step by step application procedures. We have a RSS feed that sends out announcements about changes in grant programs about three months in advance of the deadline. NEH encourages potential applicants to contact its program officers with any questions that arise early in the course of preparing an application.

Our agency’s senior staff conducts site visits of projects that have received NEH support. They also represent the agency at regional, national, and international conferences in the humanities and in research administration. Grant application workshops are held on Capitol Hill so that Members of Congress and their staffs can help constituents apply for grants. Workshops are also held across the country to make application-writing less intimidating to prospective recipients. NEH also uses social media outlets such as Twitter and Facebook accounts to reach out to its audience. Successful grantees receive award letters with the specific terms and conditions of individual awards as soon as possible after they are notified of their result.
Ralph Otto, NIFA

No one method works effectively. It takes a combination of communications to ensure that we reach a sufficiently broad portion of our customers and stakeholders, and that the information they receive is absorbed and utilized. Blanket emails have sketchy results at best, with many being filtered as ‘spam’, deleted without being read, or left to vegetate in an in-box.

Clear wording on significant announcements that are of interest or value to our constituency also helps. For example, spelling out policy/procedure changes in laymen’s terms at the beginning of Requests for Application.

Webinars seem to be increasingly effective, especially those that are captured electronically and then made available for re-viewing through a website. When it is not possible to record the webinar, even making available a link to the PowerPoint presentation from the webinar is highly useful.

Our bi-weekly newsletter, NIFA Update, is another resource for communication, and each year we work with our university partners to put on an administrative officers’ conference that attracts about 500 participants and covers a multitude of policy and process areas.

We also use press releases, tweets, and brochures/fact sheets to get our messages out to various stakeholders. These can all be accessed through our Newsroom.

We have several listservs that reach selected audiences depending on what information we want to share with others. The USDA NIFA website contains informative web pages such as “Applying for a Grant” and “Managing A Grant.”

What do you expect to be the most pressing change regarding policy that your agency will implement in the near future?

Sally Rockey, NIH

It is difficult to predict exactly which policies changes will emerge in the future. However, Dr. Francis Collins, the NIH Director, is currently weighing the recommendations - made in reports from three working groups to the NIH Advisory Committee to the Director - on the future of the biomedical workforce, diversity in the biomedical workforce, and data and informatics. If any of those recommendations are accepted and implemented, NIH may need to make changes to a variety of policies and procedures.

Sally Rockey, Ph.D., Deputy Director of Extramural Research, National Institutes of Health (NIH), U. S. Department of Health and Human Services

Judy Havemann, NEH

Each NEH grant program is unique and the Endowment does not plan wholesale changes in its grant-making activities in the near future. Like other federal agencies, NEH is dealing with an unpredictable appropriation for next year and will need to be flexible in its response.

Judy Havemann, Director, Office of Communications, National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), National Council on the Humanities

Ralph Otto, NIFA

Clearly, NIFA’s most pressing policy changes in the near future will be tied to the Farm Bill. Drafts from both the House and the Senate already signal some major shifts, and NIFA will have to be nimble in tailoring its policies and procedures to accommodate these.

Ralph Otto, Deputy Administrator, National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA), U.S. Department of Agriculture

This article was compiled by the NCURA Compliance Community Committee. The NCURA Compliance Community features discussions on such issues of compliance as effort reporting, animal care and use, responsible conduct of research, export control, financial management, or conflict of interest. Our members work in both pre- and post-award settings as well as departmental and central offices. Please visit the Compliance Community at NCURA Collaborate for continued updates about compliant research administration. Also, contact any of the committee members for more information about the resources listed above. The members of the committee are: Terrilani Chong, Deborah Price, Julia Rodriguez (Chairperson), Carrie Saites, and Kris Wolff.
April Heyward works in the Office of Research in the Arnold School of Public Health at the University of South Carolina in Columbia, South Carolina. She is also the author and publisher of April Heyward Research News. She is very active within NCURA on the national and regional level. She serves as a Financial Management Committee (FMC) At-Large Member, Campus Liaison, Volunteer, Mentor, Presenter, and Region III Program Committee member. Her educational background includes a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration/Finance from Benedict College. She is in her second year of the Masters in Research Administration (MRA) program at the University of Central Florida. April has worked in research administration for over nine years.

How did you get into Research Administration? What is your background?

I believe if you ask a number of research administrators how they got involved with research administration, the response would be “it wasn’t planned.” My overall career began in Politics. I worked in Politics for a number of years on the Federal, State, and Local level. I have been the Campaign Manager, Fundraising Director, Policy Director, etc. When I retired from politics and business, I wanted to find a new career not a new job. I reflected on what I like doing and thought about how much I liked working in research when I worked as a research assistant as an undergraduate at Benedict College. I also liked working in the higher education setting.

I have worked in Research Administration for over nine years. I have worked in Pre-Award and Post-Award. Prior to joining the University of South Carolina, I worked at Allen University and Benedict College. I currently work in the Arnold School of Public Health (ASPH) Office of Research. I have a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration/Finance from Benedict College. I am in my second year of the Masters in Research Administration (MRA) program at the University of Central Florida.

How is your role affected by eRA – Electronic Research Administration?

Electronic research administration has made my life and career in research administration a lot easier. I remember when I used to have to print out proposals and hand-carry them to each person (i.e., Department Chair, various Vice Presidents, and President of the College) that had to sign off before getting the proposal off campus. I remember when I had to sit and wait in each party’s office as they reviewed the proposal. The signers would write the changes they wanted to see made on the proposal. I would have to go back to WordPerfect and make the changes and then print another copy. This happened each step of the way until it got to President’s office.

After getting the President’s approval on the printed grant application, I would have to drive through red lights (hope there is a statute of limitation, LOL) generally before midnight trying to catch the last Federal Express plane before it left the Columbia Metropolitan Airport to Washington, D.C. That was many years ago.

Fast forward to the present, I can see everything in USC’s electronic research administration system. The system is completely web-based. I can see proposals going back to the inception of the system. When an award is issued, I can go back to the proposal for more details as I am setting up a project. I can see contracts after they are signed between institutions. I can see where the re-budget request is in the system. I can see when someone has requested a RISK account. eRA rocks!

How do you keep up to date on eRA and other issues?

I have always had an “Investigator” mind set. I love the “whodunits” such as “Miss Marple,” “Murder She Wrote,” “Perry Mason,” “Mystery Woman,” and “Jane Doe.” I seek information as I am generally in a position where I have to create from scratch. In order to create from scratch, you have to find your sources of information. Over the years, I have developed a list of sources. Each business day, I check my sources of information for updates.

What have you done to be pro-active in changes you’ve anticipated in eRA and research administration?

I am proactive by disseminating information via April Heyward Research News, teaching ASPH Faculty and Staff, and when I am speaking at conferences and meetings. April Heyward Research News is the dominate avenue of disseminating in-
You launched your Research News blog in 2011. What led to that decision and what was your goal with it?

I started April Heyward Research News because I wanted to have a creative outlet to talk about a range of research administration news on my terms. I wanted to create a one-stop shop of information as it happens. I have been in the position of needing to find information but not knowing where to go. “Welcome Ms. Heyward, we need you to solve problems but we can’t tell you how to solve the problems or where to go to find the answers.” Not only do I provide information, I want people to know where the information came from. I want people to go directly to the source of information. I provide documents, links, and videos. I want people to watch the videos to see first-hand as Legislators are making decisions that affect our profession.

As research administrators, we are expected to have all the answers. We have many people and organizations who look to us to aid in the decision making process. I believe that individuals should have the appropriate information to make informed decisions. Where you are today is a result of the decisions you made yesterday. Your tomorrow will be a result of the decisions you make today. No person or entity has a monopoly on information. Part of my respect and loyalty to this profession is to pass on information to my fellow colleagues in research administration.

What has been the response to your blog? It seems research administrators are great information seekers.

The response to April Heyward Research News has been humbling and surprising. It has really blown me away. You start out by just providing information and all of a sudden you become a source. Your name is quoted or your blog is quoted. I like to get an idea of who is reading the blog, what they are reading, and how they were referred to the blog. My name kept showing up on www.opencongress.org every time I wrote an article about congressional bills (bills originating in the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate). I talk about congressional bills all the time. Also referrals come from Facebook, Twitter, Stumbled Upon, and other social media websites.

Another surprising aspect is that April Heyward Research News has been viewed in over 70 countries. The blog is translated in other languages. It is mind blowing to me that people are following the blog in the United Kingdom, India, Australia, Japan, Brazil, Italy, Malaysia, Philippines, Switzerland, Russian Federation, Luxembourg, Uganda, Greece, Croatia, Hong Kong, Ireland, and Turkey.

There is so much that I can continue to say about the response. I will end with saying it has been humbling to receive phone calls and emails from research administrators from around the country and overseas. I received an email from a research administrator from Abu Dhabi who enjoys reading the blog. I learn from the subscribers and followers. One surprising revelation was hearing from the number of research administrators that can go to a dedicated source for information as some are in positions and workplaces where information is limited. Yet they are expected to have all the answers.

How do you find time to write the blog? The information you post is so timely… how do you participate in research administration AND write the blog?

It really comes down to having your craft down to a science. Everything balances out because I work in research administration and also cover research administration news. I work in the Office of Research and we are expected to keep up with what is happening in certain areas of research administration. My blog has more extensive coverage of other research administration news that I do not focus on in my workplace. Most importantly, when people are trusting you to give them accurate and up to date information, you make the time. I do not take for granted the trust that has been placed in the information on April Heyward Research News.

Have you found that the blog helps you in your work…. and if so, how?

My blog helps me in my profession immensely. In the course of a day, I am the in-house general counsel, bean counter (aka accountant), policy developer, interpreter of policy and regulations, gatekeeper, counselor, educator, regulator, etc. I have to know what I am talking about. My blog helps me to stay on top of what is happening in research administration.

With all the changes in eRA, how do you think research offices will continue to play a part/change as eRA evolves?

I think that research offices will play an even greater part especially as it relates to compliance. Accountability and transparency is not going anywhere. Business as usual is over. It is up to the research offices to make sure that academic institutions are in compliance. We will always have to educate. We will always have to translate. We will always be facilitators of research.

With the recent budget cuts…. has your office had to reduce staff?

No. Thank God. We have the opposite situation as to where we want to increase the number of employees but we need the space to house the employees. My school, the Arnold School of Public Health, is spread across at least 10 different locations on and off campus. We need more space to accommodate the continuing growth.

How did you get involved in NCURA – what benefits have you experienced in being a member?

As I stated earlier, I have been in the position of having to start from scratch and finding resources to help me in my profession. I absolutely love NCURA. NCURA was one of the first resources that helped me in my profession. I have met so many great people in NCURA. NCURA is another family in addition to the family you are born into and the family you marry into. At the top of the list of benefits that I have experienced is discovering the Masters in Research Administration (MRA) program at the University of Central Florida (UCF).

I discovered the MRA program at the 2010 Annual Meeting. I was looking at next steps in my educational endeavors. I considered the MBA
in Business Administration), MPA (Masters in Public Administration), and the MPP (Masters in Public Policy) degree programs. Although these are great programs, it was not the answer for me. I contacted UCF before the Board of Trustees gave the thumbs up to the School of Public Administration. I submitted my application and received my acceptance letter days before my birthday in 2011. I met Dr. Jo Ann Smith who is my phenomenal faculty advisor and mentor in Research Administration. My cohort members and I will be the inaugural graduating class of the MRA program at UCF on Saturday, August 3, 2013. Thank you NCURA.

This year's theme for the NCURA national meeting is: "Making the Connection: Honoring Old Traditions and New Beginnings". How has research administration changed during your tenure?

First and foremost, I no longer have to drive to the Federal Express hanger at the Columbia Metropolitan Airport to get a proposal to Washington, D.C. I love that research administration is electronic and web-based. Second, changes in research administration via legislation and regulations are taking place at a higher frequency than ever before. What was a "yes" six months ago is a "no" today. What was a "no" six months ago is now a "yes". Third, there are more educational opportunities for research administrators now with graduate certificate programs in research administration and master programs in research administration.

What has been your greatest challenge in eRA or research administration?

The greatest challenge is observing some research cultures embrace change at a snail pace. For instance, I began covering FCOI (Financial Conflict of Interest) Regulations on August 23, 2011 on April Heyward Research News. I continued to cover this after the mandated implementation date of August 24, 2012 including announcing NIH's new Proactive FCOI Program in September 2012. My colleagues around the country and I have had many discussions about the impact of the revised 2011 regulations. The vast majority of us understand how serious the revised 2011 regulations are. When it comes to implementing new and revised policies based on the revised 2011 regulations, you encounter resistance. You hear “our institution does not have conflict of interest issues”, “this is not that serious”, “we don’t have to do all of that”, “we will implement portions of the revised 2011 regulations”, etc. These quotes stem from encounters that some of my colleagues have encountered on the resistance of the revised 2011 regulations in the research administration community.

What are some of your greatest rewards from the profession?

My greatest reward in research administration is seeing that I have a positive influence and making a difference in the profession.

We’ve encountered so many federal regulations through the last few years that have required coordination from the pre-award, post-award, eRA, and other offices throughout our campuses. How involved have you been in implementing systems that address the most recent challenges such as FCOI reporting, Responsible Conduct of Research training requirement, FFATA and RPPR-Performance Reports?

My office is not involved with implementing systems and policy development for the University of South Carolina. The Sponsored Awards Management (SAM) office, the principle research administration office for the University of South Carolina, implements systems and develop policies.

What upcoming issues are “on your radar”, such as Financial Conflict of Interest (FCOI), and RPPR-Performance Reports? What others are in your sights?

There are a few issues that I am tracking. First, will Congress pass the FY 2013 budget and reduce the deficit by $1.2 Trillion prior to the scheduled automatic cuts on January 2, 2013? Second, if the appropriations bills do not come forth how will sequestration (automatic cuts) affect the research community? Third, when will H.R. 3433 GRANT Act appear on the House Majority Leader’s calendar? Fourth, what will happen with the three current DATA Act bills: H.R. 2146, S. 1222, and S. 3600?
I adore A-21.

I sleep with it under my pillow, my right hand resting lovingly atop it. Really.

In fact, I own multiple copies of the NCURA spiral-bound edition and give them as gifts. Why, my mother was simply speechless when she unwrapped it for her birthday. She was so overcome that she did not close her mouth for some time. And why not? It’s so sleek, and don’t you love the cover? Ah, that beautiful cover: those delicious shades of orange, the columns so stately, the big “C” so clear in its circular intent. Sigh.

I take it with me shopping and have gradually replaced my wardrobe with complementary colors. I have noticed the sales clerks staring at it and talking amongst themselves as I use it as a swatch against a shirt or pair of running shorts.

When I open it up, I see that lovely font! I have been searching to find one that is exactly like it. Have you ever seen such a spectacular bold? That lovely “C” motif from the cover continues throughout and frequently appears in the 112 pages of bliss that follow. I have set off the white/black themed pages with my own, numerous, blue and yellow highlights that appear on nearly every page of my worn and frayed copy. My Precious.

It is, of course, the content that really gets my heart pumping. A-21 does not belong to us, the mere research administrators who worship it. Alas, it actually provides instructions to the federal agencies. Lots of instructions — many, many instructions. This is important to note because the fed’s hand it to us and say, “Here — do everything this good book says.” This might lead some to the conclusion that the feds have not read it themselves. The reality is stunning: Rather than keeping every delinquent explanation at bay, they have taken the notion, I know. But the reality is stunning: Rather than keeping every delinquent, beggarly pedantic explanation at bay, they have taken the high road and opted to selflessly share with us. I can’t help but admire that generosity and strength of character.

How, might you ask, did this courtship between me and A-21 start? It’s a love story, and one that touches me still. I spent years walking by table after table upon which A-21 was comfortably positioned in a languid, come-hither pose. Ah, how I fought my inclination to stare slack-jawed at this object of my desire. Yet I always looked away, unwilling to make eye contact as I thought A-21 too far above me. Really, it seemed not to be my type, giving itself instead to post-award and compliance. But then, one sun-kissed afternoon when the stars were aligned, we were introduced by a mutual colleague who, despite being a post-awarder, took me under her wing and started nudging me in that direction, slipping me little hints about what lay inside that gorgeous exterior. A-21 isn’t just another pretty face, she said. Since she is really enamored of A-110, I wasn’t worried about infringing.

As she explained more and more, light bulbs went off everywhere. My brain truly experienced a Fourth of July epiphany. This, I realized, is the ark of pre-award knowledge! Why, I can spit out “reasonable, allocable, allowable” with the best of them, but those very words were cited from its section C.2! My spine shivered as the excitement continued to build. Soon I found myself making eye contact, and shamelessly performing little sashays by the table. Finally, I openly ogled it, hoping beyond hope that it might ask me out. And it did.

On the very first date, it pushed me to Section J. I read with my mouth open, my jaw on the floor. Allowable costs! There they were, right in front of me. I had always thought that we weren’t allowed to buy alcohol on grants because it set a bad example for the students and had been known once or twice not to mix well with the chemicals in some of the labs, but here it was spelled out in Section J.3!

Then came J.10, “Compensation for personal services,” and, oh!, section J.10(c) about effort certification! And later, one of my very favorite topics — J.10(d), “Salary rates for faculty members.” I had always wondered why I would occasionally be told that I was full of BS but coming to understand Institutional Base Salary cleared up all that confusion. Intra-university consulting explained at last — not arbitrary at all! I was smitten.

It wasn’t long before A-21 and I began double-dating with my aforementioned friend and A-110. We shared certain experiences and were sometimes so close we were, like, circular. A-21 talks about cost-sharing in J.15, “Donations and contributions,” and it turns out that A-110 has cost-sharing, too, in its own C.23. In the course of an evening together, A-110 would bring up equipment in A2.1, and A-21 would point to J.18.a.(2). Oh, I look back on those times fondly. We were giddy with new love and, despite the ban on alcohol, I’m grateful that we still enjoy citing each other frequently. And I can’t help but wonder what the future holds for our little foursome.

In closing, I want to take this opportunity to thank not only the esteemed authors of A-21, but also the federal agencies who so graciously shared this wonderfully enlightening document. We, as research administrators, might have little work to do without regulations such as these. Like roads with stoplights and lines, they keep us safe in times of doubt. In fact, I would like to personally call each agency and express my appreciation, but the powers that be at my institution haven’t yet determined whether my cell phone is allowable.

References:

NCURAbly Pedantic is written by long-standing NCURA members, all under pseudonym protection.
Harnessing the Power of Social Media

By Charles Bartunek and Kathryn Magrogan

As we discussed in part one of our series (NCURA Magazine, September-October 2012), social media provides research administration personnel with a wealth of opportunities to facilitate the dissemination of important information to a wide audience. For those looking to join the fray, the best first step is Facebook, which requires little maintenance and is not dependent on original content. Beyond that, there are multiple platforms available that can be used effectively and customized based on their intended content.

Twitter

Twitter allows visitors to access quick bursts of information with little to no interaction required. Web surfers can visit a Twitter account (or ‘feed’) at any time and access all posts made by the user, called ‘tweets,’ and can also view all of their selected feeds in one combined stream. Since each Tweet is limited to 140 characters, abbreviations and even incorrect grammar are the norm in an effort to broadcast maximum content. Many tweeters focus solely on providing links to exterior articles and reposting (or ‘retweeting’) tweets made by other users.

Setup

The process of setting up a Twitter account is by far the easiest of any social network. Simply provide your username and email address, and you’re ready to begin. Remember that it is important to keep your usernames consistent amongst your social media platforms, so name your Twitter account with care. Our choice of “SheldonORA” (referred as @SheldonORA) gave a nod to the name of our office mascot while also identifying our workplace, but we recommend including your school’s name or abbreviation if at all possible.

Upon creation, there is one advanced account setting that may be of interest to users, namely the ability to add a location to your tweets. With this option enabled, anyone with a smartphone can “View Tweets Nearby,” and instantly have your information come up in their queue. This could be particularly attractive if you’re on campus and wish to direct people to a particular event hosted by your office.

Next, search the Twitterverse and find other accounts to which you wish to subscribe (or ‘follow’). By clicking ‘Follow’ on these pages, their tweets will automatically be added to your stream. Perusing these accounts will also offer a great opportunity to gain an understanding of how tweets are most easily organized.

Content

Now that your account is set up, it’s time to start tweeting. The first, and most obvious, method is to post information that your office wishes to publicize. For example, items such as upcoming NIH due dates and training sessions can be tweeted within a matter of seconds.

It may take a while for users to get comfortable tweeting their own content, so retweeting the posts of others will allow an account to boast content and alert its audience that it is active. When logged into your account, simply click ‘Retweet’ under an entry you wish to share and it will be reposted under your account name. Many schools and research facilities, both public and private, maintain valuable Twitter accounts, but our favorites include those hosted by Sally Rockey (@RockTalking) and TechTransferTactics (@TechTranTactics).

In addition to deciding on the content of your tweets, users should also consider hashtagging their posts, which act as a keyword tag that can link your tweet with those posted by other users. Hashtagging involves typing ‘#' and then a word or phrase (using no spaces) that is relevant to your post. For example, if you tweeted “Can’t wait until National! #NCURA,” your post will be grouped with other tweets with the same hashtag, which can all be viewed by clicking on the hashtag itself.

People tend to only browse tweets in their real time, in roughly ninety minute cycles, and thus the older a post, the less attention it receives. Twitter is also most active from 9am to noon in any timezone, so tweets should be made accordingly as much as possible. Finally, a good rule of thumb is to tweet two to six times per day, provided that you have the content available to do so.

Generating Membership

Interacting with other feeds can boost your visibility, be it through a retweet or the inclusion of that feed’s username in a tweet (using the @ [name] designation). In both of those circumstances, the original poster will receive notification of your retweet, which may avail your feed to a wider audience. Retweeting and replying to retweets is both proper etiquette and good for increasing exposure.

Blogging

While Twitter can be useful in the research administration arena, the character limitation often makes it an unwieldy resource for disseminating substantive information. In these instances, a blog is an attractive alternative, as users can tailor entries to their liking and be very descriptive to convey the relevant material. As such, a post can not only provide a link to a notice from NIH, but also an analysis of how it may affect the efforts of PIs and departmental administrators, a benefit not easily available in other platforms.

Setup

When you’re ready to enter the blogging arena, check to see if your institution can provide an internal page that can host your site. If you would prefer to have greater control over the blog’s layout, there are many free hosting options at your disposal. Our blog was initially developed using WordPress, but other companies such as Blogger, Blogspot and Weebly can just as easily allow you to get started. (For those interested in Google+, Blogspot has been designed to streamline cleanly with your profile.) Once again, be sure to choose a username that is consistent with your other platforms. Finally, given that virtually all hosts provide professional templates that are easily customizable, deciding on the look of your page should require minimal effort.
Content

Whether it’s a link to an outside article, a discussion of an important contract term, or even the embedding of the latest edition of NCURA’s YouTube Tuesday, content is at the discretion of the host. Besides external information, you can also use your blog to highlight new institutional policies or guidelines, providing a permanent repository that is readily accessible by your school colleagues.

In the end, as with other platforms, it is advantageous to determine your target audience and ensure that your posts are written accordingly. Reading existing blogs such as ours (bloggingora.com) and that hosted by April Heyward, to name just two, may provide further spark as to the types of information that you would like to publish.

Generating Readership

Perhaps more so than with any other platform, improving your blog’s footprint relies heavily on promotion and word of mouth. Take advantage of your office or institution’s Facebook and Twitter accounts and provide frequent links to your blog. Additionally, your institution’s main website can be utilized to alert your colleagues as to your presence. Finally, creating the proper metatags (specifically coded keywords that describe the content of your blog) during setup can boost your ranking in search engine results, which will in turn direct more people to your site.

Once readers have found your blog, you want them to come back regularly. Consequently, it is imperative to post consistently, as once surfers have found a site to be dormant they will likely not make the effort to visit again in the future. Overall, maintaining a blog requires significantly more effort than other social media, but also offers the most options customizable to your needs.

YouTube

The benefits of YouTube may not be readily apparent to research administrators, but the platform can still be used effectively to communicate information. Presentations and webinars can be recorded and uploaded, making them accessible to personnel throughout the world. Accordingly, YouTube provides an opportunity for a field office in Malawi to have access to the same training demonstration as their colleagues in the United States. Archiving and linking to a video is an easier and much cheaper alternative to sending ‘hard copies’ via DVD or flash drive, saving departments both time and money.

To set up a channel, create or select a gmail account that will act as the administrator. Next, log in to YouTube with that address, and click on the option to ‘Create a Channel’ within your Account Settings. Your username should be both memorable and associated with your office, as viewers will be accessing your videos by visiting www.youtube.com/[username]. Once you have selected your name, you will be ready to upload videos.

In order to maximize your channel’s effectiveness, make frequent mention that an important presentation or training seminar is being recorded, and be sure to follow up with reminders when the associated video has been uploaded.

LinkedIn

Although LinkedIn is a fantastic platform on which to network with individuals, the jury is still out as to its viability as a tool for research administration offices. Unfortunately, the framework that works so well for personal accounts acts as a barrier for substantive efforts for organizations. As part of our entrance into social media, our office created a ‘Group’ page with the hope that it would serve as a concurrent but separate platform for us to interact with our followers. However, content has thus far been limited to the providing of links to various blog entries and attempts to create discussions regarding topics of research administration. LinkedIn is currently undergoing a facelift to make it a more attractive platform along the lines of Facebook and Twitter. In the interim, though, we remain skeptical as to its overall usefulness, and believe from a cost-benefit standpoint that other platforms are more worthy of your investment of resources.

Google+

Google+ came into the social media world being estimated as the new ‘to-be’ powerhouse. The actual statistics have so far been unimpressive, and the jury is still out on its long-term viability. For research administrators, Google+ is only strongly relevant if your blog is through Blogspot, as you will be required to create a related Google+ platform. Otherwise, the audience is larger and more active on Facebook and Twitter, and your energies are likely better spent investigating those mediums.

As research administrators, we are constantly trying to contact and educate as many faculty and departmental colleagues as possible. Thankfully, social media provides several platforms that can be used to easily communicate information to the masses, with additional media such as Reddit on the horizon as potential useful mediums. Though each requires varying levels of commitment and resources, with proper use of their features, they can be effective tools for your office and provide a level of efficiency not previously available.

Charles Bartunek, JD, is a Contracts Associate for the Office of Research Administration for the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, where he is the developer and manager of the Office’s social media platforms. Prior to joining JHU, he worked in private practice with a concentration in intellectual property law.

Kathryn Magrogan is formerly the Administrative Coordinator for the Office of Research Administration for the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, where she also developed and managed the Office’s social media platforms. She is currently pursuing her Masters in Conflict Management at Kennesaw State University.
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Our September 26th “Research Administrators Discussion Group” (RADG) was a great success. The title of the session was “Service Centers—up Close and Personal,” and it was my pleasure to be a co-presenter, along with Natalie Nguyen of Partners Healthcare and Nuala McGowan of Harvard University. Thanks to those of you who turned out for this session.

The final RADG meeting of the year will be held on December 11th. This will be an afternoon session entitled “Federal Update” to be held at the Boston Commons Conference Center. This program will be especially informative since we will know the results of the presidential election and will have an update on the looming federal budget crisis. Carol Blum from the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR) and Kevin Casey from Harvard University will be our featured speakers. The RADG will be preceded by a half-day workshop “Using Excel for Budgeting,” which will be offered in the morning, and will be followed by our annual holiday reception. The reception is an excellent opportunity for Region I members to socialize and celebrate the end of the year. I hope you will join us for this informative day and a festive event.

I would like to thank the Co-Chair of the Region I Curriculum Committee, Barbara Richard from Baystate Medical Center, who has done an exceptional job of planning and organizing our RADG events the past two years. RADG is a keystone of our professional development programming and the 2011 and 2012 programs were extraordinary. This is directly attributable to Barbara’s leadership.

I would like to acknowledge the three Region I members who were recipients of Travel Awards for the NCURA Annual Meeting in November. Congratulations to Cheryl Moore from UNH, Kewen Chen from Brown, and Elizabeth Wilson-Mine from Dana Farber.

Finally, it has been my great privilege to serve Region I as your Chair in 2012. It has been a rewarding and enjoyable experience that has given me the opportunity to work closely with exceptional colleagues and to meet many members. I want to thank the Region I Officers, Advisory Committee, and Committee Chairs and Members for the wonderful support you provided to me. Service to our Region is satisfying and rewarding and I hope all members will consider becoming more involved. Best wishes to Karen Woodward Massey, the Region I Chair for 2013, and happy holidays to all of our members.

Pat Fitzgerald is the Chair of Region I and serves as the Associate Dean for Research Administration for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS), Harvard University.
Once again the Annual NCURA Meeting, November 4 – 7, in Washington, DC was a tremendous success and a wonderful opportunity for our members to network and gain valuable knowledge. Region III was well represented by its members who dedicated their time and effort to presenting in various sessions and workshops throughout the meeting. A special thanks to those individuals who shared their knowledge and talent from Region III. Thank you also to the volunteers from Region III who donated their time to help make this meeting a success. Robyn Remotigue, Volunteer Coordinator for Region III, solicited and pulled together those individuals who provided their time and talents. If you are interested in volunteering in any capacity next year or at the upcoming regional meeting, it’s a great way to get involved and also do some networking. Contact Robyn at robyn@spa.msstate.edu to learn about other exciting opportunities to serve at future events.

It is never too early to start making plans for the next annual spring Region III meeting. The meeting will be returning to the Memphis Peabody Hotel April 28th to May 1st in Memphis, Tennessee. If you missed our last visit to Memphis, you have another opportunity to visit the home of Elvis, world-class BBQ, and the birthplace of blues music. Check out the Region III website – www.ncuraregioniii.org – to get more information on the meeting location. If you have never attended one of these meetings, please take a glance at the meeting archives on the website to see the valuable professional development and networking opportunities that are the standard for Region III.

Congratulations to Charlotte Smith, representing Appalachian State University and Laura Snead, representing Longwood University as recipients of this year’s Regional Travel Awards.

We are also thrilled to announce that Valerie Williams of Tennessee State University has been appointed as our Hospitality Coordinator and that Kay Gilstrap of Georgia State University is the new Treasurer-Elect for Region III.

Bill Lambert serves as Region III’s regional corner contributor and is the Assistant Dean for Research Administration at Emory University’s Rollins School of Public Health.

It’s hard to believe that 2012 is nearly over, and we’re already looking ahead to the Region IV spring meeting in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Plan to attend this year’s Region IV spring meeting in Milwaukee. Known as the “City of Festivals,” Milwaukee is home to Summerfest, the world’s largest music festival; Irish Fest, the largest celebration of Irish Culture in the world; and German Fest, the largest German celebration in North America. For one year only, from April 14-17, 2013, Milwaukee will also be home to Researcher Fest, an unsurpassed gathering of the finest research administrators in the Midwest!

If you would like to be a presenter or volunteer at Researcher Fest, contact Jeremy Miner, Program Committee Chair, minerjt@uwec.edu or any of the track chairs listed on the Region IV website. There will be food, music, and fun to complement an outstanding program of workshops, concurrent sessions, discussion groups, case studies, and a keynote address from Dr. Peter Lichtenberg, the director of both the Institute of Gerontology and the Merrill Palmer Skillman Institute at Wayne State University.

The big news coming out of our business meeting in Washington was the creation of a regional mentoring program. After several years of discussion and planning, we’re pleased to announce that the program will be active for 2013. If you’re interested in being a mentor or in being mentored by an experienced research administrator, check out the Region IV website or contact me at jeffrey.ritchie@lewisu.edu for more information.

While we’re on the subject of the Annual Meeting in Washington, I want to be sure to thank the host of volunteers from Region IV who contributed to another successful meeting. Our region is always well-represented among those presenting and volunteering at the Registration Desk and elsewhere. And I want to send a special shout out to the volunteers who hosted the Hospitality Suite and especially to Tricia Callahan for once again coordinating the ever-popular DC After Dark Tour and our Regional Dinner Group.

Thanks to all, and I’ll see you in Milwaukee!

Jeffrey Ritchie, CRA, serves as Region IV Chair and is Director of Sponsored Programs at Lewis University.
Region V is gearing up for the 2013 Spring Meeting - Research Administration: The Energy Behind Research - in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma April 21-24th. Please visit www.ncuraregionV.com or follow our Region V Twitter @ncura5 to receive Spring Meeting updates and information on this very affordable meeting. Scott Davis, University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Chair-Elect and Chair of the Program Committee for the Spring Meeting, has identified the Region V program committee members:

- Scott Davis, University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center
- Matt Berry, University of Oklahoma
- Gina Concannon, Texas A & M University-Corpus Christi
- Brenda Garner, UTMB
- Hollie Schreiber, Oklahoma State University
- Susie Sedwick, UT Austin
- Thomas Spencer, UT Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas

If you have an idea for a meeting session or would like to be a presenter, please contact the Program Committee Chair at Scott-Davis@ouhsc.edu.

We look forward to an exciting program at the Spring Region V meeting.

Kathleen Harris, Ed.D., serves as Region V Chair and is Senior Associate Vice President For Research at Texas Tech University:

One of the highlights of our year together was our Spring Meeting in Waikoloa, Hawaii from April 15th - 18th 2012. The theme of the meeting was “Discover the Difference: Creating Connections Together”. The meeting was marked as the highest attended spring meeting to date with over 380 registered attendees. Our region was pleased to offer four travel awards to individuals to attend the meeting.

I want to express my gratitude, appreciation and thanks to the Region VI 2012 Officers, Committees and Representatives:

- Regional Advisory Committee:
  - Rosemary Madnick, Chair; Gale Yamada, Secretary; Wanda Bowen, Treasurer; Georgette Sakamoto, RAC member; Steven Lichtenstein, RAC member; Derick Jones, RAC member; and Jennifer Teixeira, RAC member
- Region VI Committees:
  - Randi Wasik, Nominating Committee Chair; Mich Pane, Awards Committee Chair; Cece Manoochehri, Educational and Professional Development Committee Chair; and Melissa Mullen, Membership and Volunteer Committee Chair
- Representatives to NCURA National Committees:
  - Dan Nordquist, President; Pat Hawk, Vice President/President Elect; Georgette Sakamoto, Secretary; Gillis Caspall, Sam Westcott, Ted Mordhorst, and Bruce Morgan, who serve as NCURA National Officers and members of the Board of Directors; and Virginia Anders, Nominating and Leadership Development Committee member; and Jennifer Teixeira, National Professional Development Committee member; and Christopher Hale, Financial Management Committee member

Lastly, congratulations to the incoming 2013 leadership: Katherine Ho, Chair-elect, Sinnamon Tierney, Secretary-elect and Tim Mildren, Treasurer-elect.

Rosemary Madnick serves as Region VI Chair and is the Assistant Vice President, Research Administration at the Los Angeles Biomedical Research Institute.

---

Kathleen Harris, Ed.D., serves as Region V Chair and is Senior Associate Vice President For Research at Texas Tech University:

As we close the 2012 year, I was thankful to the entire Region VI membership for allowing me to serve as your Chair. I want to give a SUPER special thanks to Gale Yamada (Secretary, Region VI), Wanda Bowen (Treasurer, Region VI) for all of their support and teamwork. The dedication of these individuals throughout the year was amazing and I truly appreciate their commitment to the Region.
an outstanding group of people. Thank you all so much for giving me the chance to serve the organization and specifically our region.

I hope everyone enjoyed our last November annual meeting as much as I did – as you have most likely already heard, the annual meeting will now be held in August, starting next year in 2013. As always during an election year, it was exhilarating to be in town and share in the excitement, watch returns with friends, and enjoy being in our nation’s capital during this electrifying time. The meeting itself was filled with excellent sessions, workshops, and great networking and social opportunities. Thanks so much to all of our wonderful volunteers, and to everyone who participated in the regional music genre competition during the Tuesday night party – our R&B representation was definitely unique!!

As I prepare to pass the Region VII torch on to Tony Onofrietti and our incoming officers, I want to say thank you again to the following people. Tim Edwards, you have provided me with so much support and guidance throughout the year which has been crucial to my success, and I appreciate you so much. To Lisa Jordan, our superlative secretary/treasurer, working closely with you and getting to know you has been the highlight of my year – we are so lucky to have you serving in this capacity for another year. Thank you so much for being a fabulous officer and a wonderful friend. Candice Lindsay and Kay Ellis have been a dynamic and effective duo as our members at large – thank you both for all of your hard work this year, and for spearheading our travel awards in addition to all of your other duties. To Sandra Logue, thank you so much for bringing all the enthusiasm, energy and great ideas to your role as the Volunteer Coordinator. We’ve taken so many great steps forward this year in resurrecting our buddy program, and in the creation of our first volunteer committee (stay tuned for more info on this and regarding opportunities to be involved in regional activities). To Tony Onofrietti, our incoming Regional Chair, I want to thank you for all your hard work this year, your great ideas to move the region forward, and for being ready to address the challenges of the upcoming year. And last but not least, thank you to Jackie Hinton, Josie Jimenez, Denise Wallen, Dianne Horrocks and Ralph Brown, and to Deb Murphy and Winnie Ennenga, for all of your very valuable assistance and support this year. I feel very lucky to have been part of such a cohesive, knowledgeable and effective team. To my partner in crime in Region VI, Rosie Madnick, I couldn’t have asked for a better person to have worked so closely with – you are a remarkable individual and friend, and I have enjoyed every minute of our partnership.

I wish you all a happy, safe and healthy holiday season and look forward to seeing everyone in Phoenix in April for our marvelous regional meeting! Don’t forget your sunscreen.

Vicki Krell serves as Region VII Chair and is Research Advancement Supervisor at Arizona State University.

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

INTERNATIONAL REGION

NCURA’s 54th Annual Conference is over, and we are convinced that all of you, who have participated are now very well acquainted with Horizon 2020. Horizon 2020 - the EU framework programme for research and innovation for the period 2014-2020, with the objectives of addressing societal challenges and assisting the EU to gain leadership in enabling and industrial technologies. Remember? It will combine all research and innovation funding currently provided through the Framework Programmes for Research and Technical Development, the innovation related activities of the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme and the European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT).

So today, let’s focus on the EIT. The European Institute of Innovation and Technology is a body of the European Union established in March 2008. It is the EIT’s mission to increase European sustainable growth and competitiveness by reinforcing the innovation capacity of the EU. The EIT is novel in the sense that its main activities are implemented through a distributed network of Knowledge and Innovation Communities (KICs). The KICs gather together close-knit partnerships of European education, research and business entities – the so called knowledge triangle – and also involve public authorities in these partnerships. The EIT provides physical sites, called Co-location Centres, in which the partners can meet to work together on shared innovation challenges. Thus, the EIT aspires to scale-up the concentration of knowledge and skills, to share ideas and resources, to create and sustain businesses and to trigger the entrepreneurial spirit. The overall objective of all these activities is to develop solutions to the grand societal challenges whilst, at the same time, improving Europe’s competitiveness on the global stage.

The EIT is also regarded as a model of innovation governance and financing in the European Union. It has been given an important role as part of Horizon 2020: Its proposed financial contribution to the EIT is €3.18bn over 2014-2020. Stay-tuned - more about HORIZON 2020 in 2013!

Annika Glauner is Secretary of the International Region and serves as Senior Programme & Research Manager at ETH Zurich/University of Zurich.

Agatha Keller is the Vice Chairperson/Chairperson-Elect and serves as Co-Director EU Grants/Access at ETH Zurich/University Zurich.
“The year 2012 marks the 10th anniversary of SARIMA and I am so proud to be associated with this organisation,” says Dr. Michelle Mulder, SARIMA president (2011-2013). Dr. Mulder joined the SARIMA Executive Committee in 2005 and has been serving ever since.

SARIMA’s 10th anniversary was celebrated during the SARIMA conference from 5-7 September 2012 in Port Elizabeth in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa. As part of the celebrations the new logo was unveiled and a decennial publication launched. The publication took members and stakeholders on a remarkable journey from a small beginning in 2001 to an organisation that is increasingly being recognised as the primary stakeholder body for research and innovation management in Southern Africa, with a consistent improvement in the quality, quantity and relevance of its activities. “SARIMA could not have achieved this alone and we are so thankful to our members, stakeholders and partners,” says Dr. Mulder.

The 2012 SARIMA conference attracted the largest number of delegates to date - representing 11 countries, more than 40 institutions and 8 government departments. Three pre-conference workshops dealt with The basics of setting up a Technology Transfer Office, IP Valuation and Exploring Horizon 2020 –The new EU framework programme.

The two international speakers not only delivered excellent keynote addresses but generously shared their knowledge and experience throughout the conference. Dr. David Langley, Director of Research and Enterprise Development at the University of Bristol, spoke about the future of our profession: Who are we as research managers and where are we going? In addition he delivered a paper on the role of the research manager in research collaboration and networking, and he discussed a UK study he conducted with a colleague as input to a session on the professionalization of research management. Dr Ashley Stevens, President of Focus IP Group, LLC and Lecturer in the Strategy and Innovation Department of Boston University delivered a keynote address on the role of academic research in South Africa’s innovation ecosystem as well as delivering the pre-conference workshop on IP Valuation.

The conference offered two parallel sessions, one focusing on innovation and technology transfer and the other on research management. Each parallel session started with a session on the first day looking back over the last ten years – where we have come from and what lessons we have learnt - and ending with a session on the last day looking forward to the next ten years – what are the trends and the forecast and where should we be going. In addition, a session on improving research costing in low and middle income countries was presented with a special focus on delegates from the Southern African Development Community (SADC).

One of the highlights of the programme was the reflections from SARIMA’s past presidents. Their contributions were a “trip down memory lane” showing the challenges that we had to face but more importantly the highlights and achievements.

The quality of the speakers and the active participation of the delegates, the conference organisers, the SARIMA Executive and staff and the sponsors ensured that the 2012 SARIMA conference was a successful and memorable event.

According to Prof. Aldo Stroebel, the SARIMA President-elect (2013-2015), the organisation will continue to be firmly focused on relevant, high quality support of research and innovation management-to contribute to the thoughtful development of this capacity in the country, Africa and the World in the years to come. In particular he would like to see SARIMA strengthening its international partnerships with organisations that can expand SARIMA’s role in the facilitation of opportunities for global networking, sharing of good practice and professional development in research, and innovation management and administration.

In this context SARIMA is delighted about the exchange fellowship programme in partnership with NCURA. The programme that will kick-off in 2013 has officially been announced at the SARIMA conference and was received with great excitement and appreciation. “SARIMA is confident that this programme will enhance career and professional development of research and innovation managers in Southern Africa and we feel privileged to collaborate with a reputable organisation like NCURA. We hope that this programme will mark the beginning of a fruitful, mutually beneficial and long-term partnership between SARIMA and NCURA,” says Prof. Stroebel.

SARIMA The Southern African Research and Innovation Management Association (SARIMA) 10 Years of Growth in Research and Innovation Management
day format. Complete workshop details are available in the preliminary on-line program.

Conference components are designed to present information in a variety of formats – panel sessions, town halls, and discussion sessions – to fit your schedule and preferred learning environment. Themed breakfast roundtables will provide less-structured, informal discussion sessions. PRA VII planners have included more than 20 sessions inspired by members’ suggestions. SPARK sessions will impart new knowledge or introduce a traditional session in a lightning fast format. SPARK sessions offer a unique opportunity to focus on breaking information, to provide members with the chance to try their hand at presenting, or perhaps to be part of NCURA’s YouTube Tuesday series. We would love to have you send us your suggestions for SPARK sessions. PRA VII’s on-line program will be updated periodically.

We all know the importance of networking. PRA VII is an excellent opportunity to reconnect with current friends and colleagues and to establish new relationships. New Orleans is the perfect backdrop for a relaxing evening with friends and colleagues after an energetic day at the conference. The Sheraton New Orleans on Canal Street is steps away from the historic French Quarter and within easy walking distance of famous Bourbon Street. Ride a charming New Orleans streetcar along lovely, oak-lined St. Charles Street, or make your way to one of the many landmarks and attractions New Orleans has to offer. Whether your taste runs to shopping, museums, or enjoying the best jazz in the world, there is no better place to wind down with old and new friends after a lively conference day!

Don’t miss out on an incredible opportunity to combine relevant professional development with experiencing one of the most unique and beautiful cities in the world. Join us for PRA VII in New Orleans March 13-15, 2013!}

PRA VII Co-Chairs: Christa Johnson, (left) Assistant Vice Chancellor for Sponsored Research Services, Washington University in St. Louis and Toni Shaklee, (right) Assistant Vice President for Research, Oklahoma State University.

Reflections of NCURA 2012  Continued from page 3

We worked on restructuring the Professional Development Committee (PDC) to take on more and they are doing great. As mentioned above we created the New Volunteer Opportunities and Volunteer Pathways task forces to help our presenters, leaders, and other volunteers grow and develop. The Global Working Group was established to plan for future infrastructure related to global activities. For example, our first NCURA Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration: Global Edition was held in Qatar at Qatar University (thanks Bob Andresen and David Mayo). We received funding for our very first grant proposal entitled, Bilat U.S. 2.0 - Bilateral Coordination for the Enhancement and Development of S&T Partnerships between the European Union and the United States of America. We had a presence this year in Japan, Ireland, Denmark, Australia, and Canada. We held our 1st EVER International meeting with the Pre-Award (PRA) Conference in enchanting Vancouver in July (thanks to Denise Wallen, Norm Hebert, and crew) while we had a tremendously successful FRA in Orlando (kudos to Michelle Vazin, Brenda Kavanaugh, and team).

We continue to strengthen the infrastructure for NCURA’s Educational Scholarship Fund (ESF). NCURA Past President Pam Whitlock has agreed to Chair the Task Force that is responsible for making ESF fully functional. ESF has had remarkable interest therefore we needed to create a governance for using the gifts to provide financial assistance to and support of continuing education needs for Research Administrators. The areas of support include: NCURA sponsored programs such as traveling workshops, national conferences and accompanying workshops (FRA, PRA, Annual Meeting) and, Graduate Certificate programs in research administration, Master’s Degree in Research Administration.

YouTube Tuesdays keep coming. We have 325 subscribers and over 86,000 views from Aug. 2011 to Sept. 2012 (cool!).

Lastly, the 2012 Board (what a great group!!) updated a five year planning document which envisaged that by 2017, NCURA:

“…will have an increased and engaged membership base.”

“…will continue to advance the profession of research administration.”

“…will continue to be a global leader in the innovation of research management and administration practices and professional development.”

“…shall further establish itself as an essential partner in supporting the research enterprise.”

“…will strategically expand, nurture and capitalize our alliances and partnerships.”

“…will effectively and efficiently use technology for sharing programming and membership engagement.”

All of these accomplishments involved many. Thanks very much to the Executive Committee — a great working group that helped implement what we felt best for the organization in 2012 – a great team effort. I appreciate the work of the NCURA Magazine that continues to produce top notch, professional grade issues – thanks for working with me on getting the 2012 word out. Lastly, a successful organization is built upon a strong central staff - the National Office is truly professional and absolutely AWESome to work with. They regularly Do It Live!

Thank you for a great year — 2012!!! I am grateful to all of you that I have met, presented with, planned with, decided with, “discussed with,” and most of all for what I learned from each of you. I feel a bit like what Neil Armstrong must have felt when he landed on the moon – I am just one small step within the giant leap of NCURA, an organization supporting research... together. NCURA, I will always love you (hear Whitney in your head).}

Dan Nordquist is the Assistant Vice President and Director, Office of Grant and Research Development at Washington State University.
NATIONAL CONFERENCES

2013 FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION (FRA) CONFERENCE
New Orleans, LA .................................................................March 10-12, 2013

2013 PRE-AWARD RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION (PRA) CONFERENCE

55TH ANNUAL MEETING
Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, DC ..............................August 4-7, 2013

REGIONAL SPRING MEETINGS
Region I (New England), New Castle, NH .............................April 30-May 2, 2013
Region II (Mid-Atlantic), Buffalo, NY ....................................April 21-24, 2013
Region III (Southeastern), Memphis, TN ...............................April 28-May 1, 2013
Region IV (Mid-America), Milwaukee, WI .............................April 13-17, 2013
Region V (Southwestern), Oklahoma City, OK .........................April 21-24, 2013
Region VI / VII (Western/Rocky Mountain), Phoenix, AZ .........April 7-10, 2013

DEADLINES FOR JANUARY/FEBRUARY 2013
Submission of Articles to Contributing Editors ....................December 10, 2012
Submission of Articles to Co-editors .................................December 17, 2012
Submission of Advertisements ...........................................December 17, 2012

Additional information for authors can be found at:
www.ncura.edu/content/news/newsletter/author_instructions.php

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