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Making the Connection…

I am not very traditional, but I have been involved with starting new beginnings at certain points in my career and I am definitely old…so I am probably the ideal person to introduce this edition of *NCURA Magazine*.

Andre Walker points out in his article that an ending can often lead you into a beginning and we need to be prepared to take action to launch our new beginning. Karen Woodward Massey’s analysis of a team approach to management demonstrates that we do not need to launch the new beginning of a project or analysis of a problem alone. Karen points out that a team approach to issues can be more effective drawing upon the expertise and diversity of team members.

Transformation is a word often used on our campuses and usually refers to expansion of university physical plant and infrastructure. The analysis and enhancement of research administration through transformation is an effective way to adapt our institutions to the changing environment of research administration, as adeptly pointed out in the article by Cathy Snyder and her co-authors from Huron, Matthew Stamen, Rick Rohrbach and Joe Taylor.

Social media can be an effective way of promoting research administration on our campuses as pointed out in the article written by Charles Bartunek and Kathryn Magroogan.

Regardless of whether you currently use social media at your institution or not, this is a must read on how to use these tools effectively within your organization.

I wish to thank all of the authors for their contributions to this edition of *NCURA Magazine*, which leads us to our last “election day” annual meeting and affords our members their last opportunity to show off your NCURA annual meeting winter wear. Starting in 2013, it will be summer wear around the hotel pool and patio.

Tom Wilson
Co-Editor
Expectations of NCURA for the Next Five Years  By Dan Nordquist, NCURA President

The 2012 Board of Directors, just prior to NCURA’s first ever International Conference in Vancouver, B.C., met and mapped out what we should expect of ourselves for the next five years. We have a group of extremely intelligent, forward thinking, and thorough Board members. The updated planning horizon items listed below required an engaged group that had experiences all across our spectrum of research administration and management. We believe this list will be a great place for the Board of 2017 to take us through 2022.

“By 2017, NCURA:

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

In order to achieve this, we must work to develop career ladders for our younger research administrators to see that this is not just a job they fell into but a true profession they are a part of, chart out various volunteer pathways for our members, and increase virtual volunteer opportunities (because of limited travel budgets). As our members continue to clearly see membership benefits, we will grow and have an engaged group.

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

Our previous goal was that NCURA will have significantly advanced the field of research administration. The Board believed wholeheartedly that we had achieved that goal with much success. It seemed reasonable to simply adjust this goal to clearly communicate our push towards professionalizing what we do. NCURA can

• Assist with promoting the career ladders at institutions by considering volunteerism at the campus level as the first step for involvement.
• Continue to promote the Master’s in Research Administration program.

• Generate other ideas regarding outreach and connectivity with faculty, certification programs, accreditation, and mentoring.

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

More importantly here was NCURA’s need to maintain the leadership role of being the voice of research administration and management content while creating opportunities for professional development. We need to demonstrate and find innovative ways to enhance our leading role. This statement also incorporates NCURA’s global involvement which has been growing by leaps and bounds in the last several years.

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

The researcher, university leadership, and the research administrator are all integral to the research endeavor. The role of the research administrator is not only transactional but also includes strategic initiatives, policy development, creating research metrics, risk management, and a host of other non-operational activities. We have many more VP levels in our ranks these days because we have shown our value.

Continued on page 45
We write this article on sponsorship in academia from our perspective as female faculty members at The University of Texas at San Antonio. We are in different fields, and at different stages in our careers (Dr. Gonzales is an Associate Professor of History and Dr. Sponsel is a Professor of Biology). We came together twelve months ago as participants in Leadership UTSA, a nine-month program for a select group of faculty and staff, which was described in the first article in this three part series by our administrative staff colleagues Donna Edmondson and Maggie Floyd (NCURA Magazine, August 2012). Briefly, our cohort of Leadership UTSA, twenty men and women, met monthly under the guidance of the Vice President of Student Affairs (Dr. Gage Paine) and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (Dr. John Frederick) to learn about UTSA’s organizational structure and to examine such topics as resource management and strategic planning. The sustained collegial relationships formed between members of the cohort has led to on-going discussions on various issues, including the status of women and minorities in academia, and the sharing of our mutual reactions to The Sponsor Effect: Breaking Through the Last Glass Ceiling by Sylvia Ann Hewlett, with Kerrie Peraino, Laura Sherbin and Karen Sumberg (2010).

Discussions centered on The Sponsor Effect revealed that our experiences as faculty were distinct from those of our administrative staff colleagues. As female faculty this article resonated with us even though the authors are describing the status of women within a corporate setting rather than in academia. It concludes that women occupy a “marzipan” layer immediately below the glass ceiling and have difficulty breaking through because they lack the sponsorship relationships needed to propel them to the highest executive levels, what they term the C-suite (as in CEO, CFO, COO, etc.). In seeking to find what precludes women from establishing effective sponsor-sponsor interactions, the authors examined the attitudes of men and women toward cultivating and capitalizing on business relationships. We believe that many of their findings have relevance not only in business but in academia too.

In making the distinction between mentors and sponsors Hewlett et al. define a mentor as someone who works behind the scenes to support and encourage their mentee, whereas a sponsor puts their own credibility on the line by stepping up and standing out “when they discern talent, [to] anoint it with their attention and support.” Our staff colleagues describe how, as students at this institution, they caught the discerning eyes of sponsors who were on hand “at each evolutionary step” to usher them to their current managerial positions (Edmondson and Floyd, 2012). In contrast to our experiences, we noted that new faculty members typically arrive at an institution within which they have no established relationships with either fellow faculty or administrators. Their first few years of employment are spent cultivating three sets of relationships pertinent to meeting the teaching, research, and service requirements for successful tenure and promotion. But this leads us to ask, from these relationships do all faculty members find the necessary sponsors who will “protect, prepare and push them” to their next level (Hewlett et al., 2010)? We believe not, and while in our experience we perceive this as not solely a problem for female faculty, we do agree with Hewlett et al. that an absence of strong and sustained sponsorship affects in a negative way the careers of women more often than their male colleagues.

In examining the reasons why female faculty tend to garner less sponsorship than their male colleagues we consider one of the first problems that arises at the time of their recruitment. Many women are recruited into departments and colleges in which the majority of their senior-ranking colleagues are men, and this sets up a potential impediment to building sponsor-sponsor relationships. This reality dovetails with the point that Hewlett et al. spells out, that is, that women often find it difficult to set up and maintain a viable and healthy one-on-one relationship with a powerful man. Among the most inhibitive reasons for this is suspicion that there are problematic sexual intentions motivating their collaboration. Even suspicion can poison a work-place environment, and the reality of inappropriate relationships can damage reputations and marriages. The disincentives for women to form strong sponsor-sponsor interactions is especially troubling as Hewlett et al. perceive women to actually be in more need of sponsorship than their male counterparts. Among the many reasons for this is that women “tend to deflect attention from themselves, however accomplished or deserving they may be of that attention.”

In contrast to male-female impediments to sponsorship-building, men have opportunities to establish sponsor-sponsor relationships through normative male bonding experiences on the golf course, over drinks, during sporting events, and so on. Once the relationship is established their male faculty sponsors can be influential in an academic setting by helping to set up research collaborations, sharing resources, being co-Principal Investigators on research grants, co-authors on papers and more. In contrast, women, who are less likely to establish similar relationships, often find themselves isolated. And the reality is that while women are clearly competent and well able to “go it alone,” their performance for tenure and promotion is evaluated and judged relative to their colleagues who have benefited from the fruits of sponsorship. Moreover, male colleagues have powerful advocates since their male sponsors often sit on their tenure and promotion committees.

In The Sponsor Effect, Hewlett et al. highlight many additional institutional and social challenges that inhibit attempts to build positive sponsor-sponsor relationships between men and women. The authors conclude that in order for women to reach the C-suite the corporate culture needs to make a conscientious change toward “formalizing the networking process as a way to sow sponsorship where it is unlikely to seed itself—among women and minorities—that is where it would make the most measurable difference in talent outcomes.” It is along these lines that we note that the Leadership UTSA initiative has created a pathway toward doing just that in an academic setting. While doing so may not have been its foremost objective, a positive, additional by-product of the initial Leadership UTSA effort has been to foster and sustain important campus-wide interactions amongst faculty and staff. We are now invested in using our training to shape policy and practice that better serves and ad-
In the next installment of this three-part series, we will elaborate on an inaugural initiative—the Women’s Professional Advancement and Synergy Academy (WPASA), which is a program that encourages sponsoring relationships across traditional faculty and staff divides. Two female participants of Leadership UTSA recognized the need to address the leadership and career advancement issues that are imperative to women’s professional upward mobility, and have made some impactful progress toward that important goal.
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**NCURA MILESTONES**

Michelle Auerbach, formerly Director, Research and Sponsored Programs, Suffolk University is now Director, Research Administration at Steward St. Elizabeth’s Medical Center of Boston.

James Casey has been promoted to Assistant Vice President, Office of Sponsored Project Administration, at The University of Texas at San Antonio.

Jeannie Kim-Han, formerly Director, Office of Research Development, California State University-Fullerton is now Special Assistant to the President at California State University-Dominguez Hills.

David Lynch, previously Director, Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, Mayo Clinic is now Executive Director, Office for Sponsored Research at Northwestern University, Chicago campus.

Myrta Stager, Manager, Volunteer and Regional Relations at NCURA has retired.

Gene Stein, Co-Director, Contracting and Compliance at San Diego State University Research Foundation has retired as of July, 2012.
You have had an extensive career in higher education, leading to your present position as President of The University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA). What are the highlights of your career to date, and what do you still seek to accomplish?

Since becoming President of UTSA in 1999, I have focused on several critical areas: 1) Transforming UTSA into a more traditional university that is exemplified by academic excellence—a “School of First Choice;” 2) Moving away from open enrollment as the primary determinant of student admissions; and 3) Moving from a non-research institution into a “Tier One” university. And, over the past several years, we’ve established an NCAA Division I football program. This latter accomplishment is a nice recent addition to the significant academic and research gains we have achieved over the past decade.

Texas needs more Tier One universities, especially in the large geographic region of south Texas. There is no exact definition for “Tier One,” but I think it is fair to say that the definition includes higher admission standards, the recruitment of “star” faculty in strategic areas, increased research and sponsored projects activity, and more/varied graduate programs. For example, in 1999 UTSA had three doctoral programs; we now have twenty-four. On all these fronts, we have made significant progress.

In 1999 UTSA was primarily a commuter university; now it has many more students living on campus with additional residential facilities under construction. This change, like the academic and research changes, impacts the type of school UTSA is, and will become.

As president, I think it is important to hire leaders-scholars, such as Dr. George Perry, Dean of the College of Sciences and a widely-known Alzheimer researcher, and Dr. Mauli Agrawal, Dean of the College of Engineering and a widely-known expert in biomedical engineering.

Over the past few years we have hired star faculty such as Dr. Les Shepard in the energy field, who came to us from Sandia National Laboratories. With him on board, we have in place a $50 million partnership with CPS Energy, the City of San Antonio-owned public utility. In addition, this project would not have happened without the energetic and visionary leadership provided by the Mayor of San Antonio, Julian Castro. This project represents the best of what a true partnership should be—it benefits UTSA and the people of San Antonio. Not a small matter since San Antonio is the seventh largest city in the United States.

UTSA also has strong partnerships with other organizations, such as the San Antonio-based Southwest Research Institute (SwRI), which conducts approximately $580 million/year in contract research and development. In addition, UTSA and SwRI are partners in the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR), which is part of the National Academies in Washington.

While we have accomplished much during my tenure, much remains to be done. This includes endowed professorships in all colleges; increasing Ph.D. program offerings to the 40-50 range; management of enrollment for enduring Tier One quality; and continuing the enhancement of our research capacity, including but not limited to faculty hiring and research facilities. This sounds like a tall order, but given our success over the past 13 years we can eventually reach these goals.

You are moving UTSA to a higher level of academic and research accomplishment, known as “Tier One.” What suggestions can you give to other universities looking to make such a move?

There are a few suggestions I can give to other universities that are seeking to make such a move, and these principles can apply at the institutional or personal levels:

1. Be bold!
2. Hire and retain visionary vice presidents and deans.
3. Strive to become leaders in your fields.
4. Create knowledge and innovation.
5. Be thoughtful and selective.

For universities wishing to move to a higher level of research capacity, good planning and priority setting is a must. In 2006, a team of administrators, faculty, and staff met to map UTSA’s direction and growth for the next decade. Over months of strategic planning exercises, we identified five major interdisciplinary areas to enhance critical strength and advance research. These areas are: (1) Cyber Security; (2) Energy and Environment; (3) Health; (4) Human and Social Development; and (5) Sustainability.

Promoting a higher level of research activity required adding new faculty who had been trained in top research universities, building new research facilities, and expanding our research administration infrastructure. In the five areas (noted above), our goal was to recruit established research scholars with the expectation that they could jump start new scientific investigation. Over a relatively short period (2007-2011) total research expenditure grew by 75%, topping $56 Million in 2011. In several areas, including cyber security and energy, we successfully competed for prized faculty with endowed professorships and STAR funding from the UT System. Almost from the point of their hiring, several of
these researchers secured sufficient grants to establish research centers and institutes.

**What is the proper role of research in an institution of higher education?**

A report by the National Research Council of the National Academies submits that “America is driven by innovation—advances in ideas, products, and processes that create new industries and jobs, spur economic growth and support a high standard of living, and achieve national goals for defense, health, and energy” (National Research Council, 2012, p. 1). Ground breaking innovation generally derives from educated people. For the past 50 years, research universities have been at the forefront in the creation of new knowledge. Jonathan Cole noted that the list of major discoveries by university researchers include the laser, magnetic-resonance imaging, the algorithm for Google searches, DNA fingerprinting, bar codes, and mainframe computers (National Research Council, 2012, p. 3). All our research efforts at UTSA are directed at having some positive impact on society. We are in agreement with University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee scholars who proposed that “without research, we would not be able to transform disease into health, shortage into plenty, stasis into mobility, brown fields into green fields” (Scanes, et al., 2011). Furthermore, as former AAU President Robert M. Berdahl reminds us, “…the work of research universities enriches teaching and learning at all institutions, creating path-breaking scholarship that expands students’ ability to grapple with the most current and pressing issues” (Berdahl, 2009).

**What leadership skills are important in your position?**

No amount of experience prepares one to be a university president. That being said, the major lesson I learned—and which I share to this day—is that leaders need mentors. **Mentors are important.** I was very fortunate to have had mentors during my career. Some of my exceptional mentors include three individuals who have served as president of The University of Texas at Austin, including Dr. Peter T. Flawn, who also served as president here at UTSA, Mr. Mark Yudof, who is the president of the University of California System, and Dr. Robert Berdahl, who also served as president of American Association of Universities. I am very grateful for the advice and guidance they have given me over the years.

Exemplary leaders delegate to the visionary people they hire. This reinforces the point I made earlier—that as president I have hired individuals who are visionary leaders-scholars. That is the sort of connection that will elevate UTSA to Tier One status.

As president, one of my primary responsibilities is to seek and obtain resources for the university—whether it is from the Texas Legislature, a foundation, or our expanding network of alumni. This responsibility is critical given the increased competition for resources at all levels.

**What are your thoughts on UTSA’s global reach?**

In many ways, UTSA is an “international university.” We have students from 90 countries, which is a very strong number for a school that was fairly small until recently. We have international agreements with 52 foreign entities. The top five countries where our international students come from are Saudi Arabia, India, Mexico, China, and South Korea. More than 70 of our students and faculty have been Fulbright Scholars since 1969. People naturally assume that our international activities are largely located in Mexico given our geographic proximity, and we have many programs in Mexico. But the reality is that UTSA has connections on every continent, and that number grows with each passing year.

What do you see as being the major research issues facing universities over the next 5-10 years?

I think that the major research issues facing universities over the next 5-10 years largely revolve around the uncertain funding circumstances at the federal and state levels. From my perspective, I see some cuts in the defense budget; steady funding in areas related to homeland security; and steady support for the science and engineering fields.

The uncertain funding environment will require universities to be more nimble and thoughtful in terms of their academic and research activities and will require presidents that possess those qualities. "

---
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When thinking about starting a project it is important to first ask yourself “Do I need a team?” Teams can take longer to do things and require extensive coordination to work well. If facilitating meetings, communicating, and coordinating is not your forte then don’t form a team or instead find someone else to partner with who can help you. Planning, organization, communication, and trust are all keys to effective teamwork. If the team doesn’t address all of these things and more, it might be better to do the project yourself, or to delegate it to someone else.

That said, teams are essential when one person can’t do it alone (Mind Tools, Ltd, 2009-2011). Diverse teams can be great at complex problem solving because multiple perspectives allow the team to see most, if not all, sides of the problem. Great satisfaction also comes from working with a high-performing team to explore options and make the necessary missteps to produce exemplary innovative work. Finally, teamwork is especially important when a complex problem or project requires change management. The more people can be involved and have suggestions incorporated into the work, even tangentially, the more buy-in is created. People who have buy-in naturally support and advocate for the project.

Long Term Teams vs. Ad Hoc, Project Based Teams

There are two types of teams (Mind Tools, Ltd, 2009-2011). The first type is the official, long term team: people you work with every day, colleagues participating in standing committees, or the members that lead an organization (NCURA Regional advisory committee work comes to mind). These teams are probably not of your choosing, and can pose particular challenges when one is working with people who are volunteering their time. As a new manager you may inherit a team, as a long term manager you may have the luxury of populating your team over months or years. One would think that as a supervisor you would be allowed to direct others to do what you want, exactly how you want it. How-
ever, savvy managers know that making someone do something is much less effective than allowing them to choose what they want to do, steering them towards work that plays to their talents, and giving them the autonomy to do the work in the manner that the employee wants. For the most part, long term teams are made up of people that you did not choose and they pose particular challenges to teamwork, especially if bad habits are entrenched. Helping this type of a team to become effective and innovative can be especially challenging. However, some of the information in this article can be applied to long term teams as well as ad hoc, project based teams.

Ad hoc, project based teams are different in that you, as an organizational leader, probably have more control over who you choose. In addition, the project or mission, of the team is most likely pretty clear from the outset. The ultimate “due date” may also be clear. For instance, the program committee of an annual conference knows that they need to plan and carry out a conference to be held on a certain date. However, everything else about how the team will operate, what the culture will be, who will do what, specific milestones, etc. is open to interpretation. Finally, these working groups are temporary in nature and must be adjourned at some point, hopefully with a celebration of success and a record of how the project was accomplished. In the case of a program committee for an annual conference, the members of the following year’s committee may be completely different. However, they may appreciate knowing how the committee was structured, who did what by when, etc., so that they don’t have to reinvent the wheel.

**Team Theory:**
**Forming, Storming, Norming, Performing, and Adjourning**

Bruce Tuckman introduced the above team development model in the article “Developmental Sequence in Small Groups” (Tuckman, 1965), ultimately adding the Adjourning stage. Here it is in a nutshell:

**Forming** People are introduced to each other, are positive and polite, excited and anxious, the team facilitator plays a key role in setting the tone and expectations with the group. A formal or informal team charter is a great thing to create (see below for more). At the least, the group leader needs to help the group define what the goals, deadlines, culture, and processes for accomplishing the work are.

**Storming** Team members jockey for position, and try to figure out who will do what and how the project will be accomplished. Some people may question the scope of work of the project. It is important for the team leader to encourage professional discussion and debate at this point. The team needs to consider all options and be honest with each other in order to move to the next stages.

**Norming** Hierarchy and roles are established, processes and structures are created, team members hold each other accountable and ask each other for help, everyone commits to the group goal. Storming may still happen but Norming becomes more and more prevalent.

**Performing** Aided by the structures, roles, and processes established in previous stages, team members work hard to progress toward team goals and achieve results. The team leader is able to delegate the work and help individuals develop themselves.

**Adjourning (or, “Mourning”)** When the project is finished, or the team is disbanded for other reasons, it is important to celebrate lessons learned and achievements. If the team is high-functioning, members have developed close working relationships. Acknowledgement and celebration is crucial to the creation of future teams. Documentation of roles, processes, and lessons is especially important if this is a project (such as planning an annual conference) that will need to be re-created periodically.

**Forming: Research, Diversity, and Agreeing on Direction**

The three most important aspects of starting a project are researching, determining who will be on the team, and reaching consensus with the team on what will be accomplished, how it will happen, and what success will look like.

**Research and “External Activity”**

According to the book “X-Teams: How to Build Teams that Lead, Innovate, and Succeed” (Ancona, 2007), teams must always be observing and communicating with people and groups external to the team.

Before you choose team members, consider who the major stakeholders in the project will be. For instance, if you’re forming a team that will develop Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) policy, procedures, and pedagogy your institution’s chief compliance officer is probably a major stakeholder. Departmental staff are also stakeholders in that they may be needed to identify who has to take RCR and track who has taken it. Principal Investigators may be needed to design and teach the courses. The Dean may need to provide monetary support. If you take the time to identify stakeholders it may be possible to invite representatives of each major stakeholder in order to get maximum diverse perspectives and, ultimately, a broad range of support for the project and/or team.

Great teams will also research within and outside their organization to see if anyone else has already attempted or succeeded at what the team is trying to do. Another consideration is how this project fits into the goals of the organization. RCR may be extremely important to the office for sponsored projects but when resources are tight and no one has ever been audited or fined for non-compliance it may be pretty far down on the institutional risk assessment list. You can help the project to ultimate success by doing at least some of this research before the team is convened.

**Diversity of Strengths** If you have the luxury of inviting people to the team this is where you, as a leader, can set the team on the path to success. If you are inheriting a team you can still set the team on the path to success by considering some of the following factors, keeping the structure of the team flexible, allowing current members to play to their strengths, and by adding team members as necessary. The book “Strengths Based Leadership, Great Leaders, Teams, and Why People Follow” (Gallup, Inc., 2008) details four types of people that should be included in any team. It is unlikely that one person has all of the traits listed after each type but I have attempted to encapsulate them below.
Strategic Thinkers: People Who Plan
Strategic Thinkers are people who find it easy to plan and organize. These include people who are analytical, like to research and put things in context and who think ahead. They may also be fascinated with ideas and make connections between things that, at first glance, seem to have no commonality.

Executors: People Who Do
People strong in execution like to achieve things that will make a difference. They believe in fairness and like to take time to choose the right way forward. They are disciplined and have the focus to finish what they start. If they take on something they will follow it through, no matter what. They may also be natural problem solvers.

Relationship Builders: People Who Glue
Relationship builders are the people who hold the team together. They are adaptable, like to develop people, enjoy connecting with others, and can easily understand where others are coming from. They may also be able to instinctively assess other people and pinpoint how team members can best help the team move forward.

Influencers: People Who W.O.O.
Influencers are very good at getting projects started and, once the project is in progress, in Winning Others Over. They have great communication skills and wide networks and they can easily identify people outside the team who are needed to maintain and ensure the success of the project. Influencers may be comfortable taking charge and may automatically exude the confidence needed to keep people going.

Agree on Direction via Team Chartering
We have already discussed identification of stakeholders and considering team goals in the context of organizational goals. These are two things that should be discussed and agreed upon in a formal or informal team charter. A charter will help the team get off to the right start, or may be used to jump start a team that is not working cohesively (Mind Tools, Ltd, 2009-2011).

There is no “right” way to create a charter. Just the act of considering and coming to consensus on some of the following questions allows the team members to get to know each other and to start to work together. Questions that the team may want to address include:

- What is the scope of work/problem to be solved?
- Has any work already been done that can help us?
- How will the team communicate with each other?
- How will the team be structured?
- What are the project milestones?
- What is the timeline for results?
- What will each team member be expected to do?
- What will individuals specifically be in charge of/responsible for?
- What support does the team need to succeed?
- When will the team meet and what will be accomplished?
- How will meetings be run?
- How often should team members check in with each other and review what has been accomplished?
- If a team member is having trouble accomplishing something, who should he/she talk to for help?

Again, negotiation and agreement are keys to this process. The team doesn’t need to agree on each item necessarily, but everyone should be on the same page and working towards the same goals.

As a leader, you will have to do a lot of work to prepare for these initial meetings, as a facilitator you set the tone, introduce people, try to create a safe environment where everyone’s voice can be heard and “speed bumps” are allowed. It is also your job to ensure that everyone knows what has been decided, what the next steps are, and who will try to accomplish what by when.

Storming: Challenges to Great Teamwork
Before I get into the challenges inherent to team work, I want to emphasize that the Storming phase is essential to creating a great team. As team members jockey for position, and debate how and when the project will be accomplished, they build trust and respect for each other. They become brave enough to be honest and express how they feel, and they learn to focus on the issue and not make things personal. It is the leader’s job to help the team work through this stage, focusing on individual development when needed and ensuring that the team is truly reaching consensus. The team, however, must deal with growing pains in order to blossom.

Everyone who has been part of a team or who has led a team knows that it is easy to miss the mark. The book “The Five Dysfunctions of a Team” (Lencioni, 2002) does a good job of identifying root causes of some of the challenges (see the pyramid at the beginning of this article).

Trust is the foundation of all effective teams. Trust is engendered when people come to know each other’s strengths and are able to take the time to build relationships with each other. Lack of trust is exacerbated when the team is separated by distance and must communicate via email and telephone. If trust is present and if team members respect other’s perspectives and talents then members can stay focused on the project instead of taking things personally, making discussions into diatribes where other team members are vilified, or staying silent because they don’t want to “rock the boat.” Debates are a healthy part of moving through the Storming phase. If a team can manage to steer through them and reach consensus then they will be able to commit to the project, even if they may not agree with certain aspects of how the project will get done.

Another challenge comes when individual team members don’t want to work as a team. They may be star performers who get things done extremely
well on their own terms but are unwilling to bend, communicate what they are doing, and stick to goals and schedules that the team has agreed to. When this happens it is the leader’s job to decide how disruptive this is to the team and, if needed, take steps to mitigate the problem. You may be working with someone that has a lot of experience, historical knowledge and has put a lot of work into the project or the organization. However, when a project is long term and/or titanic it is imperative to have people who are committed to teamwork, especially if the individual is taking on too much, missing deadlines, and/or disrespecting the team process. If this situation goes unchecked the work will be less satisfying and other team members will never be able to hold other accountable for accomplishments because the work is not spread out. This may also result in a “blame game” when deadlines are missed. If lack of progress is always someone else’s fault then it is unlikely that extraordinary success will ultimately be accomplished.

**Norming**

Storming is an essential stage for team growth. It cannot be skipped because an effective team must be able to be honest with each other and work through conflict. When the Norming phase develops, the team may still revert to Storming occasionally but eventually the team will work out who will lead which effort and who will be responsible for which deliverables. The team will start to agree upon processes and structures, to hold each other accountable, and to ask each other for help. Eventually, everyone will be able to commit to the group goal or will decide to leave the team (literally or figuratively) by not attending or participating in debates, etc. At the end of this phase, a leader will want to scope out a seat in the dugout and let others step up to the plate.

**Performing:**

**What does a high-performing team look like?**

The best teams reach a point where they can operate effectively without the leader and can take it in stride when individual members depart or join the team. These teams have trust and respect for each other, hold honest debates about issues, and are committed to the project and to each other. They are also great at holding one another accountable and, ultimately, accomplishing results. If a leader is lucky enough to shepherd a team to the Performing stage her focus may be able to shift towards developing individual members of the team, and helping the team communicate successes to stakeholders.

**Adjourning/Mourning or Sustaining the Team**

Ultimately, the leader and the team must work on identifying the conditions needed to sustain the team indefinitely or decide when and how the team should be adjourned. If there is good reason for the team to continue team members and leaders may need to be replenished periodically or permanent staff may need to be hired. If it is determined that the team should be adjourned then it is important to assess what went well, what could be done differently next time, and how satisfied the stakeholders were. There may also be records/systems/processes that can be documented and forwarded to the next team. Also, the closer a team has become the more important it is to allow yourself and individual team members to “mourn.” This is a little extreme, perhaps, but there is a loss to disbanding a team, and it is wise to be aware of it (plus, “Mourning” is a better rhyme than “Adjourning”).

In any case, temporary teams and long term teams should be encouraged to take the time to celebrate their success. This helps people to look forward to the next project and creates good will amongst team members and stakeholders alike.

**Final Thoughts on Innovation**

Innovation is a catchphrase in today’s workplace. It is synonymous with creativity, taking risks, and thinking outside the box. In order to foster an innovative team, the group must be encouraged to be flexible and gain inspiration by reaching outside itself. The team should always be aspiring to learn from the world, from each other, and from people in all strata of the organization. The more a team can connect across networks the more likely it is to be able to innovate and find the resources and gravitas to succeed (Ancona, 2007). Teams must have the time to be creative and must be encouraged to take risks, even if this means that they might take longer to succeed (Pink, 2009).

Thank you for taking the time to read this article. If you found it helpful, please consider attending the session of the same name and/or the Drive Book Club at the NCURA Annual Meeting in November 2012. Questions and comments may also be addressed to the author. kwmassey@fas.harvard.edu.
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Introduction

Change is a defining feature of Research Administration. From the constantly-shifting project priorities that administrators individually juggle on a daily basis, to the range of questions that we field, turning-on-a-dime comes with the territory. Beyond the micro-level machinations, administrators also face macro-level, industry-wide change resulting from new agency programs and initiatives (e.g. ARRA or FCOI). Somewhere in between lie the changes that have a big impact on a local scale (such as departmental re-organizations, new eRA systems, or the retirement of a valued colleague) that send ripples through a particular institution. Often, it is the altered personal relationships that present the most difficult adjustment.

Per Shambrook and Roberts (2011), more than a third of current research administrators are over the age of 50, and more than half of current administrators have been in the field fewer than 10 years. This suggests that over the next decade, we can expect that a significant number of the more experienced individuals will leave the field (and be replaced by less-experienced new employees). This turnover is likely to pose a challenge to all involved (the current employees, the former employees, and the new employees), as each works to adjust to their particular facet of the change.

The 54th Annual Meeting is just around the corner, and this year’s theme focuses on change. This will be our last winter annual meeting. Beginning next year, attendees will trade the chilly November temperatures for the balmy DC summer. It will be a big change, and it provides a perfect opening to consider the many types of change research administrators face.

In his book “Transitions: Making Sense of Life’s Changes,” William Bridges offers a three-stage process for understanding and dealing with the transition brought about by change. As he defines the terms, “change” is external and situational (e.g. re-location to a new city), whereas “transition” is internal and psychological (e.g. accepting different commutes and city amenities as the new normal). The stages (Ending, Neutral Zone, and Beginning) are part of a continuous cycle of renewal that we experience throughout our lives. Recognizing this process makes it easier for one to successfully navigate through the transition that should accompany any change. Otherwise, one risks becoming stuck in the past.

The Rhythm of Life

According to Bridges, early tribal societies knew how to deal with change and foster transition. All of the major life events were well-known and marked by signposts, universally known and understood rituals or “rites of passage.” So, a young person did not have to figure out the role of “young adult,” and a newly-married couple did not have to figure out the process of building a family. In each case, the transition into the new role was clearly mapped by the community. However, in our modern society we have not only added to the list of major life events (re-location, job loss, medical leave of absence, etc.), but we have also forgotten the rites of passage to lead us through the traditional events. We face an abundance of change, but we don’t always recognize the need for (or the process for making) transitions.

Ending

In Bridges’ model, endings are the beginning. They kick-off the process of transition. Some change has occurred, and the situation that was before has ceased to exist. Some of the commonly recognized endings include job loss, divorce, or the death of a loved-one. However, positive changes such as the birth of a child, a job promotion, or the move to a new house, also mark the end of a situation as it existed before. It is in these endings that one must recognize loss and mourn it. Not necessarily with tears, but with the recognition that a familiar situation (good or bad) has changed. Your behavior, conditioned to the previous familiar situation, must now also change.

Tribal communities used ritualized ceremony, rites of passage, to allow an initiate to experience
a symbolic death in order to prepare them to be “re-born” as their new selves. While this experience sounds appropriate for a young member of the tribe coming of age, or a new military recruit entering boot camp, it sounds overly dramatic for the average modern individual. After all, talk of death and re-birth seems excessive when one is dealing with the disappointment of a missed promotion or any of the other small tragedies of everyday life. However, Bridges argues that it is the framing of change, as the (sometimes small) death of a possible future, that allows us to begin mourning the loss. Mourning is the first act of transition.

In Bridges’ model, endings are characterized by the “Five Ds”: disengagement, dismantling, disidentification, disenchantment, and disorientation. **Disengagement** begins once a change has occurred, and we break the old pattern of social cues that defined our prior situation. According to Bridges, “in times of transition people need to be separated from their familiar places in the social order.” **Dismantling** occurs when one begins to break the physical patterns that characterized a prior situation (e.g. no longer driving a familiar route to work, no more regular conversations with a former spouse or close colleague, etc.). **Dis-identification** occurs when one has taken down the infrastructure beneath a prior situation (e.g. no longer part of a league, etc.). Dis-identification begins once a change has occurred, and we break the old pattern of social cues that defined our prior situation. According to Bridges, “in times of transition people need to be separated from their familiar places in the social order.” **Dismantling** occurs when one begins to break the physical patterns that characterized a prior situation (e.g. no longer driving a familiar route to work, no more regular conversations with a former spouse or close colleague, etc.). **Dis-identification** occurs when one has taken down the infrastructure beneath a prior situation (e.g. no longer part of a league, etc.).

**Dis-identification** begins once a change has occurred, so that they begin to lose the cues that defined our prior situation. According to Bridges, “in times of transition people need to be separated from their familiar places in the social order.” **Dismantling** occurs when one begins to break the physical patterns that characterized a prior situation (e.g. no longer driving a familiar route to work, no more regular conversations with a former spouse or close colleague, etc.). **Dis-identification** occurs when one has taken down the infrastructure beneath a prior situation (e.g. no longer part of a league, etc.). Dis-identification begins once a change has occurred, so that they begin to lose the cues that defined our prior situation. According to Bridges, “in times of transition people need to be separated from their familiar places in the social order.” **Dismantling** occurs when one begins to break the physical patterns that characterized a prior situation (e.g. no longer driving a familiar route to work, no more regular conversations with a former spouse or close colleague, etc.). **Dis-identification** occurs when one has taken down the infrastructure beneath a prior situation (e.g. no longer part of a league, etc.). Dis-identification begins once a change has occurred, so that they begin to lose the cues that defined our prior situation. According to Bridges, “in times of transition people need to be separated from their familiar places in the social order.”

**Neutral Zone**

The inelegantly-named Neutral Zone is where the real work of transition takes place. The loss of tribal ritual is most noticeable here, because those rituals focused on a process for navigating the essentially empty space between endings and new beginnings. It is the emptiness that allows one to get to a place where new possibilities can be conceived. To be sure, this period is loaded with possibility, but it is also probably the most frightening. The thought of moving forward without a script will unnerve many. Bridges offers some activities to aid in passage through. First, he recommends **surrender – give in to the emptiness.** Any transformation is, on some level, about death and re-birth. The emptiness of the Neutral Zone provides a pause between an ending and a new beginning, giving perspective. Next, **accept the need for a neutral zone.** Recognize that the pause is part of the regular cycle and rhythm of life. Then, **find a regular time and place to be alone (and do nothing).** Major life changes may require more time in the zone and perhaps greater physical separation (e.g. a retreat or sabbatical). However, if taking time away is not practical (e.g. at the start of a new job or promotion), think in terms of long weekends. Make sure that the time you set aside is empty (i.e. no commitments or errands, just time to sit and think). Working through smaller-scale changes can be more like regular meditation. Finally, **log your experiences.** It is important to capture your thoughts. The ideas (wild and otherwise) that may spring from this period of introspection can provide the basis for a new beginning.

**Beginning**

In tribal communities, young initiates would emerge from the forest as a full-fledged member of the tribe. Their time in the wilderness (neutral zone) provided an opportunity to face their fears, commune with nature, and converse with their guides in the spirit world. Having completed their rites of passage, they could now assume their new role in the community.

In the modern world, unfortunately, there is no such clear-cut juncture to mark a new beginning. The key question at this stage is whether the work of the neutral zone is done. Can you begin again? Bridges does not offer an easy answer. He essentially says that when you’re ready, you will know it. That is, when a new idea or opportunity presents itself, you will recognize it not because it seems a logical fit, but because it “resonates” with your desires on a deeper level. Your work in the neutral zone was a chance to tap into those deep feelings. He does, however, point to two signs that suggest the time has come. First, how do your friends react? Do they believe you’re doing something new, or simply engaging in old behaviors and patterns? Second, how does it feel to you? Does it feel like a new beginning or simply stalling for time? Honest answers to these questions can signal that it’s time to move forward.

Once green shoots begin to emerge, Bridges offers four actions to help ensure that the new growth firmly takes root. First, stop getting ready to act and just act. As the old Nike slogan advises, “Just do it.” Second, begin to identify yourself with the end result, your new beginning. Next, take things step-by-step and resist the temptation to be discouraged when the going is slow. Finally, as you gain momentum, shift your focus from the goal to the process for reaching it. As you move through each of these stages, you will be on your way to a successful transition.

**Conclusion**

Change is a fact of life and a constant in research administration. The extent to which we work to transform ourselves determines whether we grow as a result of change or are simply pushed around by it. Bridges’ three-stage model offers a way to understand change and engage transformation. Not every change will be life-altering. For some small change, we need no more than a pause and introspection to adjust to it. However, every change offers the opportunity for growth. Embrace it!

---


This article is dedicated to my colleague Gilda Reyes, who is retiring from The University of Chicago after thirty-five years. Gilda apprenticed many staff (myself included) to the craft of research administration. She has been a reliable teacher and mentor and a model research administrator. Equal parts subject-matter expert, patient counselor and traffic cop, she has shown a knack for striking the right balance between agency and institutional requirements and faculty desires for their projects. To her I offer my best wishes as she prepares for her own new beginning.

Andre Walker, MBA, CRA is a Grants and Contracts Manager at The University of Chicago. He currently serves on the NCURA Pre-Award Neighborhood Committee, and he is the Contributing Editor for Biomed for NCURA Magazine.
NCURA’s 54th Annual Meeting Honoring Old Traditions and New Beginnings is rapidly approaching. Since its launch in late June, the web site for the meeting has been available to you with useful information related to lodging, registration, and, most importantly, the incredible workshops and sessions that have been designed with you — the NCURA member — in mind! If you have not already done so, be sure to check out the site as information is continuously updated: http://collaborate.ncura.edu/Annual54/Home/.

In addition to the great educational and professional development opportunities that will be available, the annual meeting will also host some incredible networking opportunities. Beginning with Sunday night, a hearty Thanksgiving dinner honoring old traditions will be followed by a performance by The Second City, a leading brand in improv-based sketch comedy. With theatres in Chicago and Toronto, training centers in those cities as well as Hollywood, 11 full-time touring ensembles, thriving corporate communication and theatrical divisions as well as television and film operations, The Second City has been called “A Comedy Empire” by the New York Times. What better way to end a great meal than with laughter!

Monday night will play host to another traditional offering — NCURA Dinner Groups. Dinner Groups have always offered NCURA members, old and new, the opportunity to meet in an informal, smaller setting. With a wide selection of restaurants and cuisines to choose from, there is always an opportunity to experience the best that Washington DC has to offer.

Finally, Tuesday night’s New Year’s Eve Party will have everyone rocking-around-the-clock to the hits of yesterday and today, as well as providing the always-popular “Election Central” activities during this year’s Presidential election.

Are You Ready to Celebrate With Us?

Are You a Newcomer to the Annual Meeting?
The following information is provided to help you “Make the Connection!”

Dress Code:
Sunday Workshops and Sunday Night Dinner..................................Business Casual
Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday Sessions ..................................Business Attire
Tuesday Evening ..............................................Casual
Thursday Workshops .........................................Business Casual

Interested in volunteering? There are many ways to get involved in NCURA as a volunteer. The volunteer page on the NCURA web site offers an overview of opportunities ranging from one-time activities to elected positions: http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/

A targeted “call for volunteers” will be issued prior to the annual meeting, so if you are interested in getting involved, now is the time!

Can I get session materials for those sessions where there is a conflict with another session that I plan to attend? Yes! As the annual meetings have gone green, presentations will be made available online before the meeting for all annual meeting attendees. Attendees may elect to print or download their own copies before or after the meeting.

What are Regions? Regions are NCURA members grouped by location. NCURA has eight different regions, each of which hold annual conferences and conduct other activities throughout the year. At the NCURA 54th Annual Meeting, regions will host (or co-host) regional hospitality suites where you can connect and relax with others in your region or visit other regions’ suites to meet members outside of your region. Information regarding the regions and regional activities can be found online: http://www.ncura.edu/content/regions_and_neighborhoods/.

Still have questions? Feel free to ask for guidance from a colleague who has previously attended an NCURA meeting. In addition, the National Office is always available!
Interdisciplinary collaborations among faculty on university campuses are important for continued innovation and to facilitate groundbreaking research. Until 2011, Washington University in St. Louis met this need through programs like Science on Tap (partnering with a local brewer to provide space outside the traditional academic context to explore the latest ideas in science and technology), and Topics for Conversation (a series of discussion groups designed to engage the university in conversations about energy, sustainable development, the environment, etc.). These programs, and others, offer an environment that fosters collaboration across disciplines. Until now, however, we weren’t providing an internal next step—a vehicle to encourage the collaboration’s further development. In autumn 2011 the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research set out to create an internal grant program with the aim to promote new, interdisciplinary collaborations among Washington University faculty. Through this article we will share our experience, successes, and challenges in starting a collaborative seed fund.

Washington University, like many other institutions, has more than one campus performing research: The Danforth Campus includes the Schools of Arts and Sciences, Social Work, Engineering and Applied Science, Design and Visual Arts, Law, and Business and the other campus holds the School of Medicine. The two campuses are located at either end of Forest Park, a 1,371 acre urban greenway and recreational center that can also act as a barrier, more vast than its size, to communication and idea sharing—the components necessary to form new collaborations. The goal of our seed fund was to encourage new groups of investigators to work on new research problems and in new ways. The focus was not primarily on the outcomes of research, although this would be a component, but rather more on the collaboration ecosystem itself: creating a shared culture where new collaborations build on different scientific and scholarly backgrounds to facilitate breakthroughs in solving research questions in a collaborative manner. The result was a small seed funding program called University Research Strategic Alliance or URSA. The Washington University mascot is the bear, so the seed program promoted brand identity. Eligibility criteria specified that each proposal must have at least two Co-Principal Investigators, and that the collaboration needed to be new (as evidenced by a lack of prior manuscript co-authorship or grant proposal co-submission). The URSA program provides up to six awards with a value of up to $25,000 each, up to a total of $150,000 per round of funding, as seed funding for new interdisciplinary collaborative research projects for full time faculty at Washington University.

The response was overwhelmingly positive. We received 40 proposals which included 96 faculty collaborating. Six of the seven schools at Washington University submitted proposals. Of the 40 proposals, fifteen had Co-PIs on both campuses, and all 40 proposals had Co-PIs from different departments. Six proposals were awarded and five of the six had collaborations between at least two schools. Of the total amount of funding awarded 55% went to the School of Medicine, 17% went to the School of Social Work, 16% went to the School of Engineering, and 12% went to the School of Arts and Sciences. Clearly a need has been met.
There were several challenges in establishing a new interdisciplinary pilot grant program. Our first challenge when creating URSA was the timeframe. Due to a short interval between the “go” decision to move forward with URSA and a looming summer hiatus, we needed an accelerated schedule. We had only a month between announcing the competition and the due date for the letter of intent. We did receive high-quality submissions in this timeframe, evidencing the ability of highly motivated faculty to be nimble; however this may not represent an optimal time frame for faculty to explore their collaborative opportunities. In our second request for proposals we extended the time period: two months between announcement and the letter of intent, and one month between the letter of intent and the full proposal due date.

Our second challenge was finding reviewers, given the number and extremely broad range of topics. To help make the process of soliciting reviewers easier, letters of intent were requested. However, the exact and complete content of these letters was not specified in detail. This resulted in not enough information to begin reviewer solicitation, which had to wait until the full proposals were received. The search for reviewers was tough mainly due to the objectives of the pilot program. The topics can be about anything, as long as the project brings together researchers who haven’t worked together before. We also aim to have reviewer representation from every school at Washington University, which means faculty members must review proposals outside their area expertise. For the 40 proposals received, we recruited 25 reviewers, engaged three reviewers per proposal and 5 to 6 proposals assigned to each reviewer. The reviewers scored each proposal based on URSA’s four review criteria (quality and expertise, diversity of the investigative team, originality and innovativeness of the proposed research, budget and sustainability) on a scale of 1-9 (1 best, 9 worst). We also asked the reviewers to list two or three overall strengths and two or three overall weaknesses for each proposal in addition to any constructive feedback that they could give.

The next challenge we faced was in the way we set up the award budget and the terms and conditions. We really needed to think through the differences in how the two campuses track and monitor a sponsored project and look at the differences in the accounting mechanisms to make sure that we could track all the awards in the same way. This included ensuring that we could use a single award number. When setting up our terms and conditions we used both NSF and NIH’s award notices as guides to what to include. Our main discussion points revolved around how we would handle the awards that didn’t use all of their funds by the end of the project period and how we would handle a change in the PI and/or a change in effort. Would we structure the awards so that the funds would revert back? Would we allow for no cost extensions? In the end we elected to go with a straightforward format for our terms and conditions, breaking out each section into a bullet point (see below).

**Items included in our terms and conditions:**

- Payments: includes how payments will be made, a contact person, and the amount of time the PI has to establish the account.
- Fiscal reporting requirements: includes language about how often we would like to see a report.
- Project reporting: includes language about how often and when we would like to see progress reports and final project reports.
- Agreement Type: includes how remaining funds at the end of the project will be handled.
- Allowable Costs: explains which costs are allowable.
- Unallowable Costs: explains which costs are unallowable.
- Prior Approval: defines which activities will need approval by the award issuer (i.e. change in the scope of work, decrease in effort of 25% or more for key personnel, re-budgeting of funds in excess of 25% of total award, PI absence or transfer).
- Publications: includes what the acknowledgments should be for any publications that may result from research performed.
- Post Award Contact: includes contact information.

While there are yet no data, such as publications, new grants submitted, or new awards, from which to draw any objective conclusions on the success of URSA, nonetheless one metric of success is the large number of proposals which included faculty from more than one school. Subjectively, we see that more faculty are communicating despite their physical distance and utilizing the vast and varied expertise internally to test their ideas and theories. Further success metrics for the program will be the acquisition of external funds, publications, new courses, or new centers by URSA awardees.

It is our intention that URSA will continue to encourage and promote new collaborations and research at Washington University. For future Requests for Proposals, we are requiring in the Letter of Intent the following information: Proposal Title; Two or more Co-Principal Investigators: name, school affiliation, department, and contact information; Brief description of the proposal (no more than one page, single spaced). This enables us to begin our reviewer search before the full proposal due date. We also look forward to continued dialogue and changes that improve and strengthen our program. There is still much that we can do as a university to support and encourage our faculty researchers.

Kate Woerheide serves as the Grant Writer for the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research at Washington University in St. Louis. Her focus is assisting with large interdisciplinary strategic grants. She has prepared many award winning proposals for a range of Federal, State, and private agencies. Her background includes experience in Communications and marketing, in addition to serving as the CEO for an online non-profit literary arts magazine.

Laura Langton received her PhD in Population and Evolutionary Biology at Washington University in St. Louis. She spent several years working as a DNA analyst for the Illinois State Police crime lab before eventually coming back to academia to do research in genetics. Since 2010 she has been the Research Development Manager in the Office of Sponsored Research at Washington University.

Evan D. Kharasch, M.D., Ph.D. is the Vice Chancellor for Research and the Russell D. and Mary B. Shelden Professor of Anesthesiology, and a Professor of Biochemistry and Molecular Biophysics at Washington University in St. Louis. He is responsible for the University’s research mission and oversees more than $500 million for sponsored research from various funding sources. Evan is leading an effort to encourage and improve processes promoting faculty innovation and entrepreneurship.
Introduction

For time-starved research administrators (RAs), efforts at making lasting changes in day-to-day operations are often tied to “special projects” related to compliance issues, implementing new information systems, or the ramping up that occurs from winning a large grant, hiring a new faculty member, or responding to faculty complaints. The efforts toward improvement are well-intended, but too often focus on incremental change in targeted areas which can result in unfortunate consequences such as:

- Increased complexity and less efficient business processes
- Decline in communication and service levels
- Increase in FTEs and costs that could have been avoided or more limited
- Too much attention by the institution, faculty and/or staff on the “crisis issue” at the expense of focus and investment in other core service areas

Because of a confluence of events occurring in today’s research administration world, it is becoming apparent that RAs would benefit from focusing more on comprehensive transformation. A combination of external factors - most notably the decline in government support for research funding, the budget challenges facing private and public universities and health systems, and the changes related to the new healthcare reform law - have significantly increased pressures on research institutions. These pressures are beginning to stimulate dramatic change in the focus of the research enterprise at many organizations, and will likely demand more of RAs.

What is “Transformation?”

For the purposes of this article, transformation means a research enterprise-wide change that:

- Ensures tight alignment of investments, processes and incentives with the strategy and goals of the institution;
- Balances service, efficiency, and compliance;

This article will address how RAs can best prepare for this evolution, balancing the traditions of academic cultures with the transformation efforts needed to meet the new pressures.
Motivates employees to surpass their own interests and direct themselves to the interests of the institution; and

Significantly raises the level of performance and allows the organization to respond to threats and opportunities.

In practical terms, this will mean making more extensive and intensive changes which allow institutions to better respond to the pressures of the environment.

Management of the research enterprise will need to become more strategic especially in terms of resource allocation

Research administration processes will need to become more efficient to reduce costs

Research administration service will need to be more focused and nimble to support strategic plans and adjustments to the environment

RAs will be called upon to play an even greater role in providing information to institutional leaders to support effective decision making

Transformation at Your Institution

Successful transformation of the research enterprise will be highly dependent on leadership from the highest levels of the institution. Change is hard at any organization; at research institutions, with a tradition of shared governance, it is often very difficult. Institutions can and do respond to burning platforms. However, institutions now need to focus on developing and communicating more comprehensive plans for change that are tied to their mission and values to optimize progress and enhance results.

Transformation Vision

The essential elements of a transformation vision include a clear set of goals, guiding principles and an objective appraisal of the current state of a research organization’s operations. Guiding principles help articulate why the institution needs to make changes, what parameters and constraints must be observed, what the intended outcomes are, and how those outcomes support the research mission. Some guiding principles that might be considered include:

Making the Principal Investigator (PI) your “true north” (e.g. what process/procedure changes are needed to meet their needs?)

Balancing efficiency, responsiveness and compliance in developing business processes, rather than setting up separate “compliance” functions and processes

Making information available to decision makers from research teams to Deans and VPs for Research (i.e., transparency and communication)

Simplifying processes

As organizations develop a vision for transformation, they must also define a picture of what success will look like. This includes both qualitative statements about services to the research community and compliance, and whenever possible, quantitative goals related to efficiency and effectiveness. These key objectives then provide a basis against which success can be measured.

Current State Assessment

Understanding the current environment is also an essential element of the transformation: where is the organization today? This involves assessing all aspects of the operation including business process, organizational structure, people, technology, and performance measurement.

The scope of the current state assessment should be guided by the scope of the overall effort which may include some or all research administration areas. Some of the questions that should be considered in carrying out the assessment include:

Business process: How many steps / handoffs are needed for each process? Is compliance baked into the process or layered on as extra steps? Is the process understood by customers in the research community?

Organizational structure: Is the organization structured to promote effective communications and provide good service? Do reporting lines impede effectiveness?

People: Are roles and responsibilities appropriate and widely understood? Are the right people assigned to do each function and task? Are they qualified and trained?

Technology: Are there opportunities to better leverage technology? Is the same information keyed into different information systems numerous times?

Performance Measurement: Is information readily available to enable effective decision making? Are there metrics in place to measure improvements and can baseline measures be developed?
Developing a Planning Roadmap

The results from the current state assessment, along with the guiding principles, will serve as a strong foundation from which research administration leaders can develop a roadmap for improvements that aligns with institutional priorities. The benefit of developing a roadmap is that individual improvements can be implemented over time while still focusing on the path to achieve the broader vision and goals. For most institutions, comprehensive transformation will occur over an extended period of time, but benefits in costs, effectiveness and PI satisfaction can be realized throughout the process. In developing the roadmap for improvements, many questions should be considered:

- What are the opportunities for improvement?
  What are the priorities? Where will the institution get the biggest bang for the buck, and what changes most align with the guiding principles?
- What opportunities will have the greatest impact on reducing faculty burden?
- How should specific change efforts be sequenced? Considerations might include priority, interdependencies, and the ability to achieve “quick wins” that build support.
- What resources are or can be made available to the effort? Can a case be made to invest short-term resources for a long term benefit?
- How should the overall effort be governed? How should the institution balance the cultural norms and values of shared governance with the need for potentially significant change?

Communication

Communication is vital in any transformation effort. Many initiatives face challenges because insufficient communication allows for confusion and frustration, which can lead to or increase resistance. Effective communication enables all stakeholders to engage effectively in the process. Even though not everyone will become a champion of change, communication greatly increases the chances that individuals will be prepared to adapt. Effective communication efforts include:

- Regular leadership updates to the research community
- Creation and use of advisory committees of PIs and research personnel
- Forums with various stakeholder groups for insights and feedback
- Targeted updates to individuals most directly affected by changes
- Website / newsletter updates

Implementing Changes

Within the context of the comprehensive transformation, an institution is likely to carry out several individual projects in targeted areas – redesigning a set of related processes, developing a set of policies, rolling out training, implementing reporting tools and metrics, etc. – but each will be aligned such that it is contributing to the broader objectives. Each new project should have its own appropriately scaled project plan that lays out the work to be done, the resources assigned, the timeline and the objectives and expected benefits. As the plan is implemented the team will work together to design the changes and determine how to implement them. During this process, several steps can be taken to increase the likelihood of success and acceptance of change:

- Include advisory groups as appropriate in reviewing changes to be sure that they are clear and to gather suggestions for improvement.
- Whenever possible (often for systems, reporting and metrics and for new processes), conduct a pilot before full rollout. This allows for feedback and refinement before the entire research community is affected.
- Plan for adjustments through the rollout process as more information is learned.
- Incorporate metrics into processes where possible. This allows the organization to show progress against baseline metrics (from the current state assessment) and communicate those improvements to the community, and also supports measuring the impact of future changes.

To optimize results, it is essential to have the right people leading the changes, and to have the right people in place to perform the new roles. An organization can have the most elegant plan, the right workflow and incentives, measurements for productivity and progress and still risk failure if the right leaders and teams are not in place and aligned.

Summary

Helping organizations react to a highly regulated and changing environment, while managing and supporting the routine activities, has always been a crucial role for RAs. This is becoming increasingly acute and difficult to balance, and as such, will force RAs to lead their institutions through larger scale changes that allow for enhanced efficiency, greater focus, quicker adaptations, and more data-driven decisions by key institution leaders. Several institutions are becoming increasingly proactive to prepare for the new environment. Don’t wait and fall behind – it is time to be prepared!

L to R: Cathy Snyder is Director, Office of Contract and Grant Accounting, Vanderbilt University. Matthew Staman, Rick Rohrbach, and Joe Taylor are Managing Directors at the Huron Consulting Group.
**PUI Outreach to Faculty:**

**Learning about Research Interests**

By Anne Pascucci

Reaching out to faculty to determine their research or scholarly interests is a tricky game. All too often, faculty receive email surveys from various departments across campus, as well as from external organizations. It can be a time consuming effort for faculty to decide which surveys they might be interested in completing, never mind actually answering all the questions! For sponsored programs/research offices (SP/RO), finding a way to get good participation in a faculty interest survey can be very difficult.

There is an element of community at Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions (PUIs) in the SP/RO because this office often serves as both the central office and the departmental office. They are responsible for preaward, postaward, and often compliance. Throw in research development, and now you have a sense of the relationship established at a PUI SP/RO with the faculty and staff of their institution. Like many of our counterparts at more research intensive institutions, we are always seeking ways to get a better understanding of our faculty interests. However, unlike our counterparts, we are the sole face of research administration and sponsored programs at our institutions.

I am relatively new to Christopher Newport University, and I thought that an interesting way to get into the hearts and minds of our faculty would be to explain why I do what I do. The following is an excerpt of an email that I sent to faculty.

“… I enjoy the atmosphere of higher education and particularly the creativity and innovation around research and sponsored programs, and so here I am. For me, though, there was an added incentive. I found institutions of higher education to be the most welcoming and helpful to my brother, Michael Joseph Maloney, who daily wins the battle with Cerebral Palsy as a spasmodic quadriplegic. When I was small child, although I didn’t recognize it at the time, it was Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute’s wonderful engineering faculty member Dr. David Gisser who designed my brother’s first independent mobility, His first electric wheelchair was a project that Dr. Gisser took upon himself to accomplish in his spare time. … Neuroscientists, occupational and physical therapists, chemists, special education faculty, biologists, informational technology faculty, art therapists, engineers and so many other faculty/researchers who work at institutions of higher education were and are making strides at chipping away at the causes and effects of disabilities like that of my brother and so many others. There is no more welcoming place on the planet for a disabled person than a college or university. There is something about the atmosphere of learning

---

A note from the annual meeting PUI track coordinators, Julie Guggino and Carolyn Elliott-Farino:

This edition’s Predominantly Undergraduate Institution (PUI) article is by Anne Pascucci who recently became the director of sponsored programs at Christopher Newport University (CNU). Anne’s article focuses on how essential it is for PUI research administrators to reach out to their faculty to find out what their research and scholarly interests are. One of the most important functions of a sponsored programs or research office at a PUI is to disseminate funding opportunities to faculty. To avoid overloading inboxes, research administrators must ensure that these opportunities are relevant to the faculty to whom they are sent, and this is where the need to know faculty research and scholarly interests becomes paramount.

Though the PUI track at the national meeting offers a broad array of sessions, there is not one devoted to getting to know faculty research interests. However, Anne will be leading the “Hot Topics from the PUI Listserv” discussion session, so if you would like to discuss this area of PUI preaward responsibility, plan to attend this session and bring your questions to ask about her success in getting to know CNU faculty interests.

This year’s annual meeting PUI track will have sessions covering administrative and policy issues (preaward for post/post for pre), starting a sponsored research office, the role of the grants manager, managing and resolving problems, moving from a research intensive institution to a PUI, allocation strategies for indirects, effort reporting systems, grants management software; programmatic topics (sponsored programs other than research, goal setting, several on research development/promoting research, institutional proposals and inter-departmental collaboration, RUI and AREA proposals); compliance concerns (how PUIs implement compliance programs with follow-up discussion); and professional development ideas (staff development, PUI mentoring program). Each time block has a concurrent session and a discussion group, and we tried to ensure that the two sessions covered different areas, e.g. an administrative and policy session and a programmatic session, or a compliance session and a professional development session. Consequently, if your goal is to attend as many PUI sessions on administrative/policy issues as possible, you could attend all eight sessions offered this year as none of them overlap.

We hope you are able to join us for the annual meeting and that you find plenty of sessions within the PUI track and the other tracks that will help you become an even better research administrator! – Julie and Carolyn
and acceptance that produces a unique safe place for those who are less able-bodied. This is the essence of why I love supporting research and sponsored programs. In my case it is a calling.

Now you know a bit about why I do what I do. I would love to learn about what you do and why. The Office of Sponsored Programs at CNU issues a newsletter each semester. Your research and sponsored programs and the reasons that you do it will be the focus of our next issue.

[If the article about Dr. Gisser and the mobility that he provided to Michael Maloney in 1972 inspires you, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (RPI) annually awards the Gisser Award. Donations to the award are received at Gifts Processing Center, P.O. Box 3164, Boston, MA 02241-3164]

Two responses in particular moved me and are included in my spring newsletter C-N-U Potential for Discovery and Creativity located at http://www.cnu.edu/sponpro/pdf/Spring.pdf. I will be presenting this newsletter to new faculty at fall orientation in the hopes that they, too, will seek out opportunities to fulfill their inspirations through my office! I am very fortunate to be at a PUI where this outreach does not elicit the automatic delete that often occurs when faculty receive non-departmental, non-teaching, non-individual research related email. CNU faculty members know that I don’t just send funding opportunities, but that I ask to meet them and their students. I look for ways to give back, and I was fortunate to have our faculty give my office what I hope will be guidance for incoming faculty. Good luck!

---

NCURA 2012 ELECTION RESULTS

VIVIAN HOLMES, Director of Sponsored Research Operations, Broad Institute of MIT & Harvard, was elected Vice President/President Elect of NCURA. Having joined NCURA in 1992, Vivian has been an active member for many years at both the regional and national levels. Vivian currently serves as the Workshop Co-Chair for this year’s 54th Annual Meeting Program Committee. Other activities include Post Award Track Leader for FRA13 Program Committee, and Leadership Team member for the NCURA Executive Leadership Program. Vivian has also served on the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee and in 2010-2011 was the Vice Chair and Chair of this committee. In addition to serving on the Board of Directors from 2002-2006, she was Co-Chair of the 45th Annual Meeting Program Committee in 2003. Vivian received the NCURA Distinguished Service Award in 2010 and the Region I Merit Award in 2008. As Vice President, Vivian will be responsible for the 2013 Annual Meeting in August 2013. When asked for her thoughts about being the incoming Vice President/President Elect of NCURA, Vivian responded, “The benefits of teaching and learning through NCURA have had such a significant impact on my professional development I am delighted and honored to serve as NCURA’s next VP/President Elect. I look forward to planning and collaborating with all my NCURA colleagues to continue the tradition of excellent programming while providing new and exciting opportunities for our members.”

DENNIS PAFFRATH, Assistant Vice President for Sponsored Programs Administration, University of Maryland, Baltimore, is elected to the NCURA Board of Directors. An NCURA member since 1994, Dennis has served on numerous NCURA Program Committees including his current service on the 54th Annual Meeting Program Committee. Dennis was a participant of the 2011 NCURA Executive Leadership Program and currently serves on the Region II Steering Committee (2012), and also is Chair of the Region II Professional Development Committee (2011-2012). Upon learning that he was elected to serve on the NCURA Board of Directors, Dennis offered, “This is a very exciting opportunity to not only learn more but to give back to this fantastic organization.”

SUSANNE RIVERA, Associate Vice President for Research, Case Western Reserve University, was elected to the NCURA Board of Directors. Suzanne joined NCURA in 2002 and is a graduate of the NCURA Leadership Development Institute in 2005. Her service on NCURA Program Committees includes the 2012 Pre-Award Research Administration Conference Workshop Co-Coordinator, Annual Meeting Program Committees in 2009 and 2011, and Region V Spring Meeting Program Committee in 2008. Suzanne also served on the Region V Executive Committee 2009-2010. When asked about her upcoming service on the NCURA Board of Directors, Suzanne replied, “I am so delighted to have been given this opportunity to serve NCURA at the national level. I have benefited greatly from NCURA’s many wonderful professional development programs over the years and I am eager to participate in its leadership during my term as a Board Member.”

Both Paffrath and Rivera will begin serving on the Board of Directors on January 1, 2013 and will serve for two years. Holmes will take office on January 1, 2013 and will serve for one year after which she will succeed to a one-year term as President of NCURA.

Anne Pascucci has worked with institutions of higher education and nonprofits since the 1980’s, in both development and research administration. She is currently the Director of Sponsored Programs at Christopher Newport University in Virginia.

Anne has a Bachelor’s Degree in Business Administration from Siena College, a Master’s Degree in Public Administration, and a Graduate Certificate in Nonprofit Studies from Rhode Island College, and she is a Certified Research Administrator. She is also a graduate of the NCURA LDI program and the Higher Education Resource Services (HERS) Management Institute. Anne has served on many committees for NCURA and moderated and served on panels and sessions at both regional and national meetings.
MEMBERS OF THE COEUS CONSORTIUM HAVE BEEN COLLABORATING OFFICIALLY SINCE 2004, WORKING COMMUNALLY TO ENHANCE OUR MANY EXISTING FEATURES AS WELL AS DESIGNING SIGNIFICANT INITIATIVES LIKE OUR NEWEST MODULE FOR ANIMAL CARE. EVEN BEFORE THE CONSORTIUM, COEUS REACHED OUT TO OTHER INSTITUTIONS TO CREATE THE BEST POSSIBLE IRB MODULE. WE KNOW THE BEST IDEAS ARE CREATED WHEN THE BEST MINDS CONVERGE.

THE COEUS CONSORTIUM’S CONVERGENCE WITH THE KUALI FOUNDATION WILL CONTINUE THIS COMMUNITY CONNECTION OF COLLABORATIVE SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT. AS DEDICATED RESEARCH ADMINISTRATORS, WE KNOW WHAT TOOLS ARE NEEDED TO SUPPORT OUR CAMPUS INITIATIVES. JOIN US WITH OUR PROVEN MODEL OF COLLABORATIVE ENHANCEMENT AS WE VENTURE FORTH IN THE OPEN SOURCE SOFTWARE ARENA.

TO CONTACT US, JUST GO TO: www.kuali.org/contact
Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award

David Mayo, Director of Sponsored Research at the California Institute of Technology, is the 2012 recipient of the NCURA Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award. This award recognizes a current or past NCURA member who has made 1) noteworthy contributions to NCURA, and 2) significant contributions to the profession of Research Administration. First awarded in 1994, this award is NCURA's highest honor.

David's contributions to NCURA are many, spanning his eighteen years as a NCURA member, and include Vice President/President Elect 2007-2009, service on the National Board of Directors, Professional Development Committee, Nominating and Leadership Development Committee, and also his numerous contributions to the international research community through his involvement in the International Research Administration Neighborhood, the Ambassador Corps, the EARMA/NCURA International Fellowship Working Group and numerous presentations and workshops.

Judy Fredenberg, University of Montana, shares, “I have known David for two decades. Active in Region VI, a renowned presenter at both regional and national levels, and an NCURA past president, his engagement in and contribution to NCURA and the profession are admirable and noteworthy. He is thoughtful and inclusive. David is always willing to help out NCURA and his research administration colleagues — even it it’s at the last moment — and he always appears calm and unflappable, making it look incredibly easy. I, like many, routinely reach out to David for advice from extra compensation to Marie Curie Fellowships to the topic for which David is best known, the FAR.”

From California Institute of Technology, Richard Seligman offers, “David’s rise in the research administration profession has been nothing short of meteoric. His knowledge of the “stuff” of research administration is legendary. He is recognized as one of the country’s leading experts on the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), all aspects of electronic research administration, administration of federal contracts and subcontracts, to name just a few.

David’s professional contributions have extended beyond NCURA to include the Federal Demonstration Partnership, and, more recently the University-Industry Demonstration Partnership. In every professional activity with which he has been associated, he has demonstrated stellar performance. His skills as a lecturer, teacher, and writer on a variety of research administration topics are highly sought after by program planners throughout the country.

The profession of research administration is filled with highly gifted, talented people who devote their working lives to a very noble calling. This award, however, is for “outstanding achievement”, and because of this, the number of people who have earned this designation is rather limited. As I look at the past recipients of this award and think of their contributions to research administration, there is no doubt whatsoever that David is a perfect fit for that august group.”

Dianne Horrocks, Idaho State University, adds, “David has been a tireless contributor to our profession for many years presenting both regionally and nationally. David’s contributions to our profession are not only visible in his service to NCURA, but he has also served as a mentor behind the scenes to numerous colleagues sharing advice and support over the years. He has become a friend and someone I know I can contact for information and counsel. His opinion is widely regarded and he has established both a national and international presence through his service and volunteerism.”

David Richardson, Pennsylvania State University, and a past President of NCURA, writes, “Within the field of research administration, David has influenced everything from our basic understanding of the federal acquisition regulations to the fundamental concepts associated with proposal submission and budgeting of cost sharing… His service to our organization is unparalleled and his impact upon the field of research administration is far beyond the wisdom that he has shared in his many workshops and sessions. As President of NCURA, David initiated efforts to have the impact of our organization expand beyond the borders of the United States. He has chaired our Ambassador Corps since its inception in 2010 and has worked to improve the value of membership to our international members. As for the field of research administration, one of David’s greatest contributions is his capacity and zeal for absorbing new and complex regulations and then summarizing them for public consumption. David’s unselfish readiness to assist his fellow research administrators has endeared him to many and is evidence of his worthiness to receive NCURA’s highest honor.”

Denise Wallen, University of New Mexico, summarizes, “His noteworthy service to NCURA is personified by his stellar leadership, creative thinking, mentoring of new and emerging leaders, training, and serving as a role model that inspires all who meet him. It is easy to see how David has touched so many lives through NCURA in regional, national and international venues. Over the years his contributions have impacted so many of our members and institutions.”

About his award, David shared, “I was completely flabbergasted when Dan Nordquist informed me that I had been selected to receive NCURA’s Award for Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration. I am truly honored and humbled by the award, and I truly appreciate the support and opportunities that NCURA has given me in my research administration career.”

David Mayo will receive the Award for Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration on Monday, November 5, 2012, at the 54th Annual Meeting Keynote Address.
This year the NCURA Nominating and Leadership Development Committee selected five veteran NCURA members to receive the Distinguished Service Award. This award recognizes members who have made sustained and distinctive contributions to the organization.

Each recipient has contributed to NCURA’s success in numerous ways and for many years. The following summaries provide a snapshot of their service and contributions in addition to the many presentations they’ve each made at regional and national meetings and conferences over the years.

2012 Award recipients are:


**Barbara Cole**, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, University of Miami. Barbara serves on the Social Media Task Force and is a member of the SPA Level II Traveling Workshop faculty. She served as the NCURA Treasurer, 2009-2010, and on the Board of Directors during this same time. In addition, she served as Chair of the Financial Management Committee, 2009-2010 and was a member of this Committee 2006-2007 and 2011. Her service also includes the FMC Subcommittee on Development, 2009-2010, LDI Advisor, 2009, NCURA TV faculty, 2008 and 2011, Leadership Convention, 2008-2010 and the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee, 2002-2003. Barbara’s service on program committees includes the 54th Annual Meeting Program Committee, 2012, FRA VIII Conference Program Committee, 2007 and the 45th Annual Meeting, 2003. Barbara’s regional service includes Region IV Treasurer, 1995-1997, and service on committees in both Regions I and IV as well as serving on the Region I Fundamentals Faculty.

**Francois (Franc) Lemire**, Director of Grants Administration and Compliance, American Academy of Addiction Psychiatry. Franc’s service over the years has included the FRA IX Program Committee, 2007-2008, member of the International Neighborhood Sub委员会, 2007, NCURA Research Management Review Editorial Board member, 2006-2008, Chair of the Predominantly Undergraduate Institution Neighborhood Committee, 2002, member of the Electronic Neighborhood Committee, 2002, and member of the National Finance and Budget Committee, 1998-1999. In addition, Franc served as Chair of Region I Spring Meeting Program Committee in 2008, was Chair of Region I in 2009, and served as Region I Treasurer in 2003. He served as the Coordinator for the Region I Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration Workshop, 1995-1996 and is currently a member of the Region I Advisory Committee. Franc is the 2011 recipient of the Region I Distinguished Service Award.

**Susan Sedwick**, Associate Vice President for Research and Director, Office of Sponsored Projects, University of Texas at Austin. Susan has served on the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee, 2011, the Board of Directors, 2008-2009, and the Professional Development Committee as Vice Chair and Chair, 2006-2007 and member, 1997-1999. She served on the FRA12 Program Committee in 2011, the PRA IV Program Committee in 2010, and the Senior Summit Program Committee in 2008. She has served as a Research Management Review author in 2009, the NCURA/AIS Sponsored Research Administration: A Guide to Effective Strategies & Recommended Practices author on Export Controls, 2007, NCURA Micrograph author, 2007, NCURA Newsletter Contributor, 2005-2007. Susan also has been an Online Chat featured speaker in 2007, an LDI Advisor in 2007, and served on the Membership Committee, 1995-1997. Susan also has served on many Region V Meeting Program Committees.

**Michelle Vazin**, Director, Office of Contracts and Grants, Vanderbilt University. Michelle currently serves on the Board of Directors, 2010, 2012-2013, and also was Co-Chair of the FRA13 Program Committee, 2012. Following her completion of the LDI class of 2010, she served throughout 2011 as a Magazine contributor, a NCURA TV presenter and also on the 53rd Annual Meeting Program Committee. Michelle’s service also includes membership on the FMC Subcommittee on Development, 2007-2009, NCURA Podcast, 2009, 51st Annual Meeting Program Committee Co-Chair, 2009 and FRA VIII Program Committee, 2007. In addition, Michelle served as Region III Chair Elect/Chair, 2006-2007 and was Chair of the Region III Meeting Program Committee, 2006.

The Distinguished Service Award recipients will be recognized at the upcoming 54th Annual Meeting during the luncheon on Monday, November 5, 2012. Please join us in thanking them for their service and their contributions!
Joseph F. Carrabino Award

The Joseph F. Carrabino Award, established in 2003 by the NCURA Board of Directors, is named after the late Joe Carrabino, NSF Grants Officer. This award recognizes a current or former Federal partner who has made a significant contribution to research administration, either by a single project, activity, or innovation, or by a lifetime of service. The NCURA Nominating and Leadership Development Committee selected Mary Santonastasso, National Science Foundation, as the recipient of the 2012 Joseph F. Carrabino Award.

Mary Santonastasso received her Bachelor of Arts-Psychology degree from Catholic University in 1978 and Masters of Public Policy degree from Princeton University in 1999. She currently serves as the Director of Institution and Award Support, Office of Budget, Finance and Award Management, NSF. Mary provides executive leadership to the NSF Grants Policy Office, the Awards System Office, and the Cost Analysis, Audit Resolution, and Post-award Monitoring and Oversight Branch. She leads the NSF post-award monitoring program, and the underlying risk identification and mitigation strategy, that has been benchmarked by other federal agencies. Through this effort, NSF fulfills its financial stewardship role for an active portfolio of $20 billion in federal financial assistance.

Beginning in 2004, Mary assumed the co-lead role as the Managing Partner for the Grants management Line of Business, a cross-agency initiative sponsored by the Office of Federal Financial Management, Office of Management of Budget. This high profile, high value initiative has set policy for government-wide financial assistance processes and technology efforts.

Joanna Rom, NSF Deputy Director, Office of Budget, Finance, and Award Management, shared with us that “throughout her lifetime of service, Mary has exemplified the ideals of this award as an effective advocate for the research community, and as a public servant of the highest integrity. Of special note is Ms. Santonastasso’s role as innovator. Research.gov is a singular achievement and lays the groundwork for a unified portal for grantees that builds on (and takes the lessons learned from) grants.gov. As NSF lead co-managing partner of the Grants Management Line of Business (GMLOB), Mary has been the key proponent in the development of re-search.gov. Research.gov, led by NSF, ‘improves customer service for the research community by increasing access to information and services while streamlining and standardizing business processes among partner agencies. Research.gov is also a transparent source for information about federal research spending and outcomes for the general public.’”

Cynthia Hope, The University of Alabama, offers “During Mary’s career of service, she has steered NSF into positions of leadership in facilitating Government-University relationships, such as Research.gov while continuing to foster NSF’s individual outreach to the University community. Her leadership within NSF, particularly through changes and challenges of the past several years, has helped keep the agency a ‘favorite’ among university research administrators.”

Pamela Webb, University of Minnesota, adds “Mary has also been a major force in national efforts to achieve a ‘common face to the government’. Mary has often worked behind the scenes, working on such projects as Research.gov and serving as NSF’s representative on a number of key government-wide grants management committees, including co-leading the Grants Management Line of Business. She is an avid facilitator of the Research Performance Progress Report, and is pushing to create standardization across federal agencies. I am delighted that she is serving as NSF’s representative on COFAR [Council of Financial Assistance Reform], especially at a time when they will have such a major role to play on grants reform and changes to the OMB Circulars.”

Denise Clark, University of Maryland, College Park, adds “Mary has been instrumental in bridging the gap between the federal agencies and the awardees. She has a shared vision with her awardee community, one which portrays an integrated approach to research administration. That approach is simple – the role of research administrators is to streamline the administrative processes in an effort to reduce unnecessary burdens on the researchers. In order to accomplish this, it is imperative that the research administrator community is properly trained and educated on federal regulations. Mary is a conduit for this and works closely with awardees to make this vision a reality. Her demeanor is calm and approachable and her warm smile is inviting and welcoming.”

Richard Seligman, California Institute of Technology, sums it up “Mary personifies the very attributes that brought about the creation of the Carrabino Award in the first place: diligence in fostering and maintaining government-university relationships. She is a high ranking federal grants management official who remains open and approachable by rank-and-file research administrators. She is always willing to answer questions about NSF and provide assistance to those who are seeking information so that they can ‘do things right’.”

On her award, Mary shares, “It is truly an honor to be recognized by NCURA with this, the Joseph F. Carrabino Award - given what it signifies and knowing the cadre of past award recipients and their accomplishments. Universities and federal sponsors are important partners in the U.S. research enterprise that advances the overall intellectual welfare and economic prosperity of our country. Research administration is that complementary institution-federal partnership, supporting researchers and their work.

I am proud of the service that I and my colleagues provide to these important endeavors. Thank you NCURA!”

As recipient of the 2012 Joseph F. Carrabino Award, Mary will be recognized at the 54th Annual Meeting during the luncheon on Monday, November 5, 2012.
Developing a Procedural Manual for Department Level Research Administration  

By Yvonne S. McCool-McLaughlin

Working at the department level in research or grants administration is both challenging and rewarding. Grants are governed by sponsor guidelines as well as institutional policies. Federal government grants must comply with OMB Circulars; private grants must meet stipulations stated in award notices; and all grants must follow institutional policies. Learning how to complete a task and meet government, private and institutional requirements and policies can be frustrating. Asking colleagues or searching for past examples can be time consuming and decreases productivity. A procedural manual is an excellent method for dealing with these challenges. It is a step-by-step guide detailing the documents required and processes necessary to complete tasks. It ensures departmental knowledge is documented and serves as a useful tool for providing consistency, managing requirements, and maintaining accuracy. A manual can offer guidance on how to provide the appropriate justification to help facilitate institutional approval and can include guidelines linked to institutional policies and OMB Circulars when appropriate. Before beginning the process of creating a manual, however, it is important to know what the literature says are best practices in procedural manual development.

Procedural manuals are also referred to as Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), continuity binders, continuity manuals, or handbooks. They provide a step-by-step guide on how to complete specific tasks. Most literature details guidelines for the non-academic, non-grants administration offices, yet all stress the importance of maintaining a handbook. Policies and procedures detailing every task including answering the phones and taking breaks are considered important. Guides are “vital” for a successful business (Chang, 2010) regardless of their size (White, 2010). Factors to consider when preparing a procedural guide include the appropriate layout, language, and process needed to prepare the manuals.

The purpose of a procedural manual is to thoroughly document the process so that anyone can follow the steps needed to complete a task. They are especially beneficial when completing tasks that are not performed on a daily basis or that require multiple steps. In our profession, the best person to prepare a procedural manual is the research administrator since the literature stresses the importance of understanding the work and expectations before beginning to write (Rupert & Loudermilk, 2002). If the research administrator is not the only user, then the writer must consider the most effective use of language (Reddout, 1987) and, when possible, write in plain language (Byrne, 2008), reducing the amount of acronyms and technical words without definitions.

Preparing the manual requires writing in the form of directions and actions. While most writers are discouraged from writing with personal pronouns, using the word “you” is considered appropriate for instructional guides. Utilizing “you” allows the writer to connect with the reader, building a rapport while engaging the reader. It prevents the impression of talking down to the reader and enables the writer to explain information more clearly (Reddout, 1987). Appropriate language is only part of the challenge. Knowing what information and format to use is also critical to a successful manual.

In the book Writing Exceptional Policies and Procedures, Stephen B. Page discusses an eight-section format (2009). The sections include purpose, individuals affected, policy, definitions, responsibilities, procedures, document approvals, revision history and appendix, if needed. These sections are appropriate for a central pre- and/or post-award office, but as a department level research administrator preparing procedures for completing a task and link-
ing it to institutional policies, many of these sections are not needed. One can often manage with the following three sections: purpose of the procedure; applicability or explanation of when it is to be used; and the actual step-by-step procedures. If the action requires completing a form, a copy of the form can be included in the Appendix. Some tasks require multiple procedures while other procedures are dependent upon responses to questions.

Lockwood discusses the value of using flow charts to help determine when a specific task should be employed (2005). Flow charts begin with a decision that needs to be made and follow the responses guiding a person to the next decision, task, or action. Flow charts can be very time consuming when dissecting each task, but can be less intimidating when searching for the basic process. For example, in Figure 1 the simple task of getting a glass of water begins with getting a glass, deciding if you want ice or not, and then completing the task based on the response.

Although the flow chart works for simple tasks, it can become quite cumbersome if attempting to detail actions requiring more than one person or decision. Something needing more detail can be described in the format of a table, with reference to a specific procedure.

Table 1 shows how such a table could be used to describe an activity and reference specific procedures. The example is very basic and shows that ordering supplies could involve three separate procedures.

Deciding what process works best for your office depends on the size of the office, the size of the research administrative staff, and the departmental and institutional policies related to processing specific transactions. In addition to the preparation of the guide, it is important to establish a central location accessible to all potential users. Maintaining a file in an office with limited accessibility may not be feasible for faculty needing to complete a task or action. On the other hand, filing the manual on the department server can present its own barriers to accessibility, but these barriers can often be easily resolved by granting public access with limited editing rights, and by sending an informational e-mail explaining the location of the files as needed, especially when a new employee arrives.

Once it is decided that a procedural manual is appropriate, the writing must begin. Management needs to allow the research administrator to dedicate a specific block of time each week to preparing guidelines. The instructions will include all steps required by the research administrator, investigator, and department level approving authority. As procedures are prepared, a designated person should check the instructions for clarity and accuracy. This person should not be familiar with the process or topic. The individual’s ability to work through the process will provide the quality check needed to affirm the completion of the procedure. Once the procedures are completed and compiled, a hardcopy of the manual should be maintained in the research administrator’s office for easy access as well as an electronic file accessible to all who will need to refer to the manual. Instructions detailing access information for faculty investigators should be provided by the department research administrator. But the work doesn’t stop there. Procedures must be regularly updated and reviewed for accuracy, at least annually or whenever policies or procedures change in the interim.

In conclusion, procedural manuals are very important for the flow of work in a departmental research administration office and help ensure continuity of processes. In order to prepare the manual, an experienced research administrator must thoroughly document each action required and provide images for clarity. H/she should assume that a majority of users will not be familiar with the grant process being documented and should therefore strive to be clear, concise, and use nontechnical language. When done successfully and followed consistently, a department level procedural manual can be an effective tool in maintaining an efficient and compliant research administration program.
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Introduction  I have known Jim Casey since he first joined NCURA in 1995, and over the years we have regularly co-presented and co-published – in the USA and abroad – on a variety of areas in research administration. Over the past several years, though, our work together has primarily focused on international research collaboration.

James Casey is Assistant Vice President, Office of Sponsored Project Administration, at The University of Texas at San Antonio. In this role he is responsible for developing, implementing, and leading in all pre- and post-award areas of grants, contracts, industrial and international agreements and research administration. He provides guidance to the newly established research service centers for the Downtown and Main Campuses. A member of NCURA since 1995 – and a 2009 recipient of the NCURA Distinguished Service Award – he is Senior Editor of the NCURA Magazine and a member of the NCURA Board of Directors and the Professional Development Committee. In the past he was Editor of the Research Management Review, and former Chair of the International Neighborhood. Jim is currently on the Executive Board of the University-Industry Demonstration Partnership (UIDP).

In the area of international research administration, Jim has presented and lectured in ten foreign countries in Asia, Europe, and the Middle East. He is a former member of the NCURA International Commission, and as Senior Editor of NCURA Magazine Jim has significantly increased the number of international articles from American and international authors. In 2007-08 he was a Visiting Professor of Leadership at Upper Iowa University, Hong Kong, China.

A member of the Wisconsin Bar since 1990, Jim is a member of the State Bar of Wisconsin Communications Committee, which also serves as the editorial board for the Wisconsin Lawyer. A graduate of the University of Dayton School of Law, he was a member of the Dayton Law Review. He also holds master's degrees in international affairs and public administration.

Jim, what were your initial introductions to international topics, before your career in research administration?

My first introduction to international topics – at least measured by a foreign trip – was the summer I spent after my first year of law school at the University of Notre Dame’s London Law Centre. During that summer (1986), I took courses in Soviet Law, European Common Market Law, and International Business Transactions. The courses were top notch, and I credit the European faculty and my classmates for the stimulating rigor. My only regret is that I skipped the Rod Stewart/ELO concert at Wembley Stadium so I could study. I wouldn’t do that today! My time in London is also memorable because that is where I found out that I “wrote on” to the Dayton Law Review (tops in the law review writing competition). Several years later, getting my M.A. in international affairs at Marquette University broadened my international perspective even more. Students who survived the Tiananmen Square crackdown were among my classmates at Marquette. One can’t help but be influenced by that.

What international activities have influenced your career as a research administrator?

The major professional activities that have influenced my career in international research administration includes (1) serving as the project manager for the Fulbright-Hays Program at Northwestern University in the 1990s; (2) my recent participation in a series of AAAS (American Association for the Advancement of Science) workshops in the Middle East focusing on biosecurity and biosafety (Amman, Kuwait City, Tunis, and Dubai); (3) the International Research Collaborations Project at the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (“I-Group”); and (4) my various NCURA activities. The latter includes my focus to publish more international articles in the NCURA Magazine. Since 2007 I have brought in 70 outside articles for publication in the Magazine,
administrators have a critical role in such expansion. A second major issue will continue to include certain technical areas, including contract negotiation, intellectual property, and research compliance (including but not limited to human subjects, biosecurity, and use of animals in research). Similarly, harmonizing technical issues with interpersonal skills will continue to be important.

Research administrators operate within the larger funding universe, so the importance of research/grant funding at all levels is a major concern. U.S. Government funding of R&D remains a significant concern so long as our Federal budget remains a mess.

**What are the major lessons you have learned working with colleagues outside the United States?**

Working with colleagues overseas, one of the major lessons I have learned is that their research administration problems are very similar to ours in the United States. The phraseology and nomenclature may be different, but the broad similarites are undeniable. That means hope for the future in terms of finding mutually agreeable solutions.

A second lesson I learned is that our colleagues in the Middle East are extremely interested in Western methods of research administration. Notice that I didn’t say “American.” I think it is important for American research administrators to maintain humility when it comes to our professional work. Americans (not to mention our Western colleagues) need to keep an open mind when it comes to research management practices used by colleagues the world over. Flexibility is an important professional attribute.

A third lesson is that the profession of research management – if it is to maintain global vitality – needs to constantly grow and change, so that it is not simply viewed as bureaucratic “mumbo-jumbo.” Leadership in the profession needs to be vibrant and visionary. Stagnant leadership will doom the profession.

In the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) workshops on biosecurity, you had extensive interaction with scientists based in the so-called BMENA region (Broader Middle East and North Africa). What have you learned from that series of workshops?

I was very impressed with the faculty and university administrators I met from the BMENA region. They are thirsty for best practices, whether from an applied research or a research management perspective. Without exception, they were very friendly to the American participants, and I made some lasting friendships from those workshops. They have significant challenges in terms of university infrastructure and funding from their governments, and those are not going away any time soon.

The best gift we can give to our colleagues in the BMENA region is to share our extensive knowledge with them – helping them become more expert – which will in turn provide greater assistance to their faculty.

Jim, what do you see as the major future issues facing American research administrators as they interact with their foreign colleagues?

I think one major issue – and it is a positive one – centers around ways to increase collaboration between U.S. and non-U.S. partners. American research administrators have a critical role in such expansion.

A second major issue will continue to include certain technical areas, including contract negotiation, intellectual property, and research compliance (including but not limited to human subjects, biosecurity, and use of animals in research). Similarly, harmonizing technical issues with interpersonal skills will continue to be important.

Research administrators operate within the larger funding universe, so the importance of research/grant funding at all levels is a major concern. U.S. Government funding of R&D remains a significant concern so long as our Federal budget remains a mess.

**What do you think one should have in his/her toolbox to succeed in international research administration?**

Instead of focusing on the technical skills, I would like to focus here on the intangibles that lead to success in international research administration. In my opinion these include the willingness to listen; the ability to learn; being a sponge for new information; the ability to be humble; knowing what your limitations are and knowing when to manage and rise above those limitations; the ability to constantly grow in the profession through reading, writing, or presenting; and the ability to be nuanced in thought and action. Looking at this list, these are equally applicable to research administration in general. This goes to show that the profession is more closely linked – in a global sense – than we realize.

**Finally, you have certainly accomplished a lot in your career as a research administrator, and later this year you will be stepping-down as Senior Editor of the NCURA Magazine. Let me add that you have truly transformed the Magazine into one of our professions leading publications. What are your plans for the future?**

My career has always been built upon variety, but more recently I have been thinking about the ways I can share my knowledge and experience with my colleagues. I know that continued publishing, lecturing, and travel are in my future. I have former students in Hong Kong who want me to visit, so I think that will happen in the near future. A visit to Dublin is in order as one can never tire of that city. Barcelona and Shanghai are two cities I want to spend time exploring. I do not want to plan everything; serendipity adds to the richness of a professional career.

Dr. John M. Carfora is Associate Provost for Research Advancement and Compliance at Loyola Marymount University in Los Angeles. John is co-author of The Art of Funding and Implementing Ideas: A Guide to Proposal Development and Project Management (Sage, 2011), and a 2007 recipient of NCURA’s Distinguished Service Award.
Pre-Award Research Administration (PRA 6) Conference Recap

By Norm Herbert and Denise Wallen

The first international venue for PRA 6 was in Vancouver, BC, Canada in July – this was a historical moment for a new NCURA era supporting global research administration. By all accounts our attendees were charmed by the fabulous surroundings, the world-class conference hotel and friendly residents. Of course, our partners from Canadian Association of University Research Administrators (CAURA) gave us a very warm Canadian welcome and contributed to the success of the conference.

Exemplifying the conference theme – Collaborate! – the conference started off with a thought provoking keynote address by Dr. John Robinson, University of British Columbia, who challenged us to think about creating sustainable futures through problem-driven interdisciplinary collaboration - using interdisciplinary collaboration to solve real-world problems, such as renewable energy and carbon sequestration.

The conference venue incorporated the newly envisioned SPARK sessions where participants could rapidly engage in hot topics and have immediate take-aways. There were many networking opportunities – Breakfast Roundtables, community sessions, lunchtime activities, Early Bird sessions and Dine Aroun– adding opportunities to collaborate with participants from many countries including Japan, Australia, the UK, Qatar, the US and Canada.

Another first was the very successful virtual appearances for the traditional NIH and NSF updates which blazed a new trail for collaboration and presentation. As always there were many interesting, timely and provocative sessions including the COGR update, Export Controls: Graduate Studies at the School of Hard Knocks, the third round NCURA International Fellowships update, and a few creative titles including some of our favorites: Managing your Peeps, Being an Introvert in an Extroverted World, and Quick – Get Them While They Are Young.

All of this happened because of the fabulous teamwork demonstrated by the Program Committee’s hard work and the exceptional support and dedication of the NCURA staff.
Develop integrated campus-scale systems
• Demonstration and research
• Engage and train students, develop new curricula and programs

Keynote Speaker Dr. John Robinson, University of British Columbia

(L-R) Keynote Speaker Dr. John Robinson; Kathleen Larmett, Executive Director, NCURA; Dan Nordquist, NCURA President; Denise Wallen, PRA Co-Chair; Norm Hebert, PRA Co-Chair
The Research Community Mosaic

By Jim Wrenn

Back in April of this year, IT Works celebrated its 25th anniversary as a company. Over 25 years, I have met a lot of people. Today, I would like to take this time to thank you - our clients and all the other scientists and research administrators with whom we have interacted. Not just thank you for purchasing our software and services, but for your research, your teaching, and all your other efforts that often go unseen. You affect so many people. For me, this affect became very personal, earlier this year.

Late in the afternoon, 4:15 to be exact, on Friday February 3, 2012, I received a call from my mother. It was a call I had been anxiously anticipating all day, more like all week. She had just finished an appointment with her oncologist in my home town of New Bern, North Carolina. In the appointment, she received the results of her PET scan that was completed the week before. It was a great call! The lung cancer that had been discovered in the spring of 2011 was completely gone. The odds of this happening were just 1 in 5, but the radiation and chemotherapy treatments had worked.

I do not know if you have ever experienced anything like this. If you have not, I can tell you that it can be emotional and that a lot goes through your mind fast – from praising God, to breaking out the champagne, to letting your friends know – the list is long.

While probably unusual for most people, one of my thoughts went to our first client, the Lineberger Comprehensive Cancer Center at UNC Chapel Hill. I started working with them in 1987 when I was just finishing graduate school. It turns out that the cancer oncologist who treated my mother was once a fellow at Lineberger. In addition, Lineberger medical staff had helped develop the cancer protocol that he used to treat my mother. While I never met him during his time at Lineberger, there is a record of his history there, in our software - the software that Lineberger administrators have used to help manage their research for the past 25 years. It has helped them prepare the other support pages and specialized reports required by the NCI P30 application that helps fund their center. It has helped them push financial reports out to their research faculty, saving lots of time and allowing their faculty to do what they do best – focus on their teaching, their research, and their clinical activities.

While I do not have this kind of history with all of our clients and the results of their work may not be as personal, I know they are just as important. We have clients whose work impacts medical care, our environment, the defense of our country, and teaching, just to name a few. We have clients who are Nobel laureates as well as clients that go unnoticed to most. However, all are part of a giant, research community. When asked to describe it, I like to use one word, mosaic – a picture composed of diverse elements. It is a mosaic containing the faces from a community of the scientists and administrators. It has been an honor to be part of it.

So, in case I forgot to thank you, thank you. Not just to our clients, but also to everyone who is part of the mosaic, thanks for all that you do.

Jim Wrenn, President & CEO, IT Works
Today everything in research administration is electronic, from submittals to awards to compliance. But back when I started in research administration, if we wanted to respond to an RFA from NIH, we had to carve our proposal into the walls of the Center for Scientific Review in hieroglyphs no smaller than 150 font. And we liked it. (Interesting fact: my first PI invented the wheel with a grant from NIST, but it languished in the lab for a good 10,000 years because no one had yet thought to let grantees own their intellectual property.)

As years passed, paper eventually became available. But sharpening charcoal sticks to a point — and working to keep that edge — was increasingly messy. The resulting smudges were, unfortunately, often misinterpreted by the reviewers as important proposal components. I remember the time that Bergettolfs got a mammoth protocol approved by the IACUC that he didn’t even request! Those were the days. . . .

Okay, on a serious note, like many of us who are growing long in the tooth, I took typing in high school. Today it is called “keyboarding.” Fancy that. When I was first hired in academia, I truly sat at a desk with a manual typewriter — the kind that doesn’t connect to electricity, which was, in itself, something of a novelty. The “enter” feature was called a carriage return. For those of you too young to remember, starting a new line of text was accomplished by removing one’s left hand from the keyboard and manually shoving a handle to the right that moved the paper back to the left and also turned the “carriage” a slight rotation that equaled one line. Copies were made by putting sheets of carbon between typing paper. Sometimes you really had to whack those keys to be sure all the copies were legible. We had strong wrists and fingers. The strongest and the fittest survived; whoever didn’t get Carpal Tunnel Syndrome was promoted to management. We were happy.

It wasn’t long before we received new typewriter technology: the IBM Selectric. (Youngsters out there, think of Peggy’s desk in AMC’s Mad Men.) These were amazing. There was a small ball with the letters that could be exchanged to change exchange fonts. We were shocked and awed. And to move to the next line, instead of using the carriage return, we simply hit a “return” key on the keyboard! Any mistakes were corrected with white-out that we would fan dry by hand, being careful to avoid inhaling the intoxicating fumes — or not, depending on how our day was going. This was living. The future had arrived.

We relied on our three-ring resource binders and updated information via mail received from sponsors. Along with wallets and cigarettes, these were grabbed during a fire alarm. Now, with abundant WiFi, we simply respond to questions with, “Let’s Google it.” Along with our binders, the NCURA directory was invaluable. Each updated version was placed in a position of importance right next to Rossaruck’s phone directory. And we meticulously maintained our Rolodex of colleagues whom we’d personally met. If we had business cards, they would be punched and placed there with reverence. If not, we penciled in information as necessary so that they held a position of prominence. Fast forward to today. We download an “app” on our smart phones and simply exchange contact information via something called Bump (which, I might add, meant something entirely different back in the day).

After IBM Selectrics, the next technology wave brought us computers! DOS, WordPerfect 4.0, and Quattro-Pro were the implements that took us to new heights. These programs were key-stroke driven, and the monitors were small with grey screens and radioactive green letters that glowed. They may have been powered with plutonium. I’m not sure. Heavens! Later computers came equipped with an additional device called a mouse, of all things. Couldn’t they have thought of a better description than mouse? We think of mice differently in research administration and were surprised when the little buggers didn’t develop tumors. We learned how to move the pointy thing around a screen to select items. Some (nearly all) practiced using a mouse by playing Solitaire. This was encouraged by our supervisors as time well-spent. Responding to an obvious demand for additional card-game themed training, some creative computer programmer developed another application based on strip poker, or so I’ve heard. But I digress.

Later versions of WordPerfect followed on the heels of WP 4.0, but soon Microsoft became a contender with Word and Excel. It wasn’t long before even the WordPerfect Devout transitioned to the Microsoft Office Suite. Moving to the World Wide Web had its own share of twists and turns via Gopher, FTP, and basic mail programs like Elm. It was amazing! In the early days, an often-used phrase was, “Take a memo.” The secretary would grab her (note gender) steno book and, as the boss was speaking, would use shorthand to write down everything that he (again, note gender) said. She would then transcribe and type the memo for his signature. Later the boss would use a handheld recording device and leave small cassette tapes on the secretary’s desk for transcription. She would use a headset that went in each ear and hung below her chin where it joined before connecting to a cord that went into a larger replay device. In the last years that transcription devices were popular, I recall walking into the President’s Office and seeing a new secretary using the headset like one she used with her Walkman: She had it upside down! Luckily, the President’s dictation had a good beat and she could dance to it. She gave it a 98 on the American Bandstand Rate-A-Record scale. The entire campus had a good laugh and the ensuing Presidential Transaction Danceathon is still talked about to this today. (We were easily entertained back then.) Those were the days, my friend.

Computers and transcription aside, consider telephones: They were all rotary dial. These are hard to find anymore, but some still exist. I was at a meeting recently where the story was told about a contractor sending a summer employee to make a call in another room. When he didn’t return, the contractor went to find him. The young man was staring at a rotary phone and replied, “This appears to be the phone, but I don’t know how to use it.” Today most of us always have a phone with us regardless of where we are. We’re no longer tethered to a phone attached to a desk or wall. We no longer have rotary dial— or even cords of any kind (except to our chargers). We can be contacted anytime, anywhere. . . .

Kind of makes me long for the good old days. ■

NCURAbly Pedantic is written by long-standing NCURA members, all under pseudonym protection.
Just as quality research and scholarship call upon envisioning all of the potential outcomes, research administrators must also consider the possibilities. We need to consider post-award, audits, costing and a myriad of other issues…...and then determine what offers the best probability for success in our own situation.

Our conference theme, Making Connections and Creating Harmony, evolves from our need to both serve and guide our institutions through networking with other research administrators and learning how to create harmony through understanding the issues. Whether we work for large institutions or small, private or public, central or departmental offices or in a non-university setting…we all face the same challenges. The excellent program our committee has assembled for you will help you successfully navigate the current environment and plan for the future.

The tracks for this conference include Audit, Costing, Department Administration, Federal, Post Award, PUI and Special Issues/Hot Topics. The assortment of workshops, concurrent sessions, and discussion groups, in addition to the opportunity to network with your colleagues, will arm you with additional tools for success, help you to recharge and make connections for you and your institution.

The conference site, the Sheraton New Orleans is located in the heart of downtown New Orleans on the edge of the French Quarter, and offers easy access to many exciting local attractions. With world-famous music, food, and culture, New Orleans is one of America’s most authentic cities. What an excellent location for this meeting as we make connections and create harmony in the complex arena called Financial Research Administration.

Looking Forward to Seeing You
PRA looks forward to many “firsts” in 2013. It marks the first time The Pre-Award Research Administration Conference will be held in the Spring, the first time it will make an appearance in New Orleans, and the first time it will be partnering with FRA.

The theme for this year’s conference “Supporting Research….Together” takes on added meaning as the PRA and FRA conferences are co-located and presented back-to-back at the recently renovated Sheraton New Orleans on Canal Street.

PRA 2013 will offer more than 15 workshop sessions (including two Senior Forums) and 100 concurrent and discussion sessions to choose from as well as breakfast round tables, community sessions and a variety of networking opportunities. PRA will include a number of sessions that were submitted by NCURA members from around not only the nation, but the globe. We believe there really will be something for everyone.

We have an amazing conference planning team working with us. Workshop chairs are Pamela Webb (University of Minnesota), Pam Hawkins (National Science Foundation) and Angela Wishon (University of Texas-Southwestern Medical Center); our track session leaders are Kallie Firestone (MIT), Sue Rivera (Case Western Reserve University), Beth Seaton (Northwestern University), Hollie Schreiber (Oklahoma State University), Jeremy Forsberg (University of Texas-Arlington), Josine Stallinga (Elsevier), Jean Feldman (National Science Foundation), Susie Sedwick (University of Texas-Austin), Georgette Sakamoto (University of Hawaii), Rosemary Madnick (Los Angeles Biomedical Research Institute), David Mayo (California Institute of Technology), Dave Richardson (Penn State University), Tracey Swift (University of South Australia), Garry Sanders (The Research Foundation for The State University of New York), Tesheia Johnson (Yale University), Kathy Young (Illinois State University), Jerry Pogatschnik (Eastern Kentucky University), Carol Zuiches (University of Chicago), and Cindy Hope (University of Alabama).

Mark your calendars now to attend PRA2013 in New Orleans March 13-15, 2013 and look forward to an announcement concerning registration in early Fall.

PRA Co-Chairs,

Christa Johnson
Washington University in St. Louis

Toni Shaklee
Oklahoma State University
The election results are in and I am pleased to announce our new Region I Officers for FY 2013: Jeff Seo from Harvard Medical School will be Chair-Elect, Peter Hague from Massachusetts General Hospital will be Secretary, and Robert Stemple from Partners Healthcare will serve as Treasurer-Elect. I would like to congratulate Jeff, Peter and Robert on their election and thank them for their willingness to contribute their time and talent to serving the Region I membership. These newly elected officers will join Region I Chair Karen Woodward Massey (Harvard University) and Donna Smith (Massachusetts General Hospital) as the Region I leadership team next year.

We have a number of excellent professional development opportunities scheduled for the fall. There are two remaining “Research Administrators Discussion Group” (RADG) meetings for 2012: September 26th and December 11th, to be held at the Boston Commons Conference Center. The topic for the September 26th RADG meeting is “Service Centers— Up Close and Personal,” and the presenters will be Natalie Nguyen of Partners Healthcare, and Nuala McGowan and Pat Fitzgerald of Harvard University. This session will examine the regulatory elements governing service centers and will attempt to demystify the complexities of service center operation.

The December 11 RADG meeting will be an afternoon session entitled “Federal Update.” The federal update is always a highlight of our RADG series and this year’s session should be especially informative as it will follow the presidential election and will undoubtedly include updates on the looming federal budget crisis. On a lighter note, our annual holiday reception follows the December RADG and will attempt to demystify the complexities of service center operation.

We are also offering two Region I workshops this fall. The introductory full day workshop “Essentials of Sponsored Research” will be held on Tuesday, October 9th. A half-day workshop “Using Excel for Budgeting” will be offered on December 11th, the morning of the RADG meeting. Both workshops will be held at the Boston Commons Conference Center. Please watch your email and the Region I website for registration information.

Finally, I look forward to seeing many of our Region I members at the NCURA Annual Meeting on November 4-7, 2012 in Washington DC. The program for this year’s meeting is exceptional and this is an excellent opportunity to connect with colleagues from across the country. If financial circumstances prevent you from attending, I hope you will apply for one of the three Region I travel awards that are available. And I encourage all Region I members who attend the Annual Meeting to join us for our Regional Meeting. It’s important that you keep informed and get involved.

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.

What a hot summer! And I do not mean only in temperature. Region II has been cooking. It began in April with a sensational spring meeting in Gettysburg, PA and has just continued throughout the summer. It has been fast and furious summer of planning and workshops heading right into the 54th Annual Meeting in DC November 4-7, 2012 “Making the Connection…Honoring Old Traditions & New Beginnings.” Region II members should make sure to register and secure your hotel room now if you have not already as the nearby hotels are filling up quickly.

Now… here are the updates on Region II activity:

We just hosted our second successful One Day Traveling Workshop titled “Hot Topics in Research Compliance” in West Virginia on August 13th. This second workshop was just as successful as the first that we conducted in Baltimore back in February. I want to thank Mary Holleran for all her assistance in serving as the host institution (West Virginia University). I also want to thank our presenters Ann Holmes and Denise Clark for a tremendous presentation, as well as Brian Squilla and Erin Bailey for all their assistance in making this workshop a success. The One Day Traveling Workshop is in its pilot year and has been running beautifully thus far. My goal was that we run three workshops this year across the Region; be sure to stay tuned for details pertaining to the third workshop (to be announced for the late Fall).

We have also begun planning for our 2013 spring meeting being held April 21-24 in Buffalo, NY at the Buffalo Marriott. Our committee program chair Mary Louise Healy has already started conference call meetings, and we are already in the early stages of putting together another incredible experience. This past spring, we extended the length of the meeting by one day. This meant additional learning and networking opportunities, two plenary speakers and more fun and exciting activities. Due to the positive
response we received from the region, we will follow suit for the length of our 2013 meeting.

The steering committee has been just as busy as well. We are updating our administrative policies, further defining officer roles, and establishing our mentor/mentee program and professional development committees. Once complete, we will post all updates on the Region II website - be sure to read it to obtain a better understanding of how our region operates.

I would also like to congratulate Alex McKeown as the NCURA Board of Directors approved her as the Region II member of the nominating and leadership development committee effective January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2014. Congrats Alex!

I would like to say that Region II has some incredible volunteers. Over the years, I have become friends with many of them. Although many of these individuals keep volunteering, it is always great to see new volunteers. Please reach out to us if you are interested in any capacity. You can find us on the NCURA Region II website as a start. We welcome you and thank you for all your efforts.

Until next time…

Jared Littman is Chair of Region II and serves as the Director of the Office of Grants and Sponsored Research, at St. John’s University.

REGION III
Southeast
www.ncuraregioniii.com
https://www.facebook.com/groups/192985687430137

SPRING MEETING 2013
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. Once again you will have access to an outstanding curriculum designed and presented by leaders in research administration. 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.

COMMITTEE CHAIRS APPOINTED FOR 2012-2013
Nominations and Elections — David Snelsor, University of Tennessee
Memberships and Awards — Carolyn Elliott-Farino, Kennesaw State University
Volunteer — Robyn Remotigue, Mississippi State University
Newsletter — Bill Lambert, Emory University
Web — Tricia Page, University of Tennessee Health Science Center

CATHERINE CORE MINORITY TRAVEL AWARD WINNER
Congratulations to Latica Jones, University of Memphis, for receiving one of the Catherine Core Minority Travel Awards. This award is in support of her participation in NCURA’s 54th Annual Meeting, November 4-7, 2012, in Washington, DC.

Bill Lambert and Dhanonjoy C. Saha, Ph.D. serve as Region III’s regional corner contributors. Bill is the Assistant Dean for Research Administration at Emory University. Dr. Saha is assistant V.P. of Research Administration & Operations at Carolinas Medical Center.

Hello Region IV! As I’ve said so often in the past, the strength of NCURA as an organization is that its members are dedicated to raising the bar for professionalism in research administration. A great way for a seasoned veteran or a new-comer to be immersed in this task is to serve on a committee; the time commitment is never more than you can handle, and you’ll find it’s a great way to grow as a professional and a leader in our organization. This year’s Committee Chairs are as follows:

Awards Committee: Julia Rodriguez (University of Missouri)
Communications Committee: Ru Knoedler (University of Michigan)
Membership Committee: Sue Grimes (Purdue University)
Nominations Committee: David Ngo (University of Wisconsin)
Regionally Elected Member to the National Board of Directors: David Lynch (Mayo Clinic)
Site Selection Committee: Natalie Goodwin-Frank (Washington University)
Volunteer Coordinator: Lori Palfalvi (Northwestern University)

If you have an interest in any of these committees, please don’t hesitate to contact me or the committee chair. We’d love to add your energy and insights to the work we’re doing on behalf of our Region.

But committees don’t have a corner on the market for service this year in Region IV. We currently have three regional task forces that are working to provide better services for our members. The region has decided that we need to provide mentoring for our new members, and that task force is hard at work developing a program. We’re also starting a process for benchmarking in research administration among universities in our region, to provide us a better handle on “best practices” in use by our members. And we’re finally cleaning out our electronic attic! A third task force is tackling the chore of records retention and maintenance.

Contact me at (815) 836-5129 if you’d like to be involved in any of these important ventures.
Finally, keep an eye on your email in-basket, because you should be receiving news and updates about AM54, our Annual Meeting in Washington, DC. As many of you know, this will be our last annual meeting to be held in November (moving to August in 2013), so we’ll have one last opportunity to be in our nation’s capital on Election Day. It’s always interesting and exciting!

Jeffrey Ritchie, is the Chair of Region IV and serves as Director of Sponsored Programs at Lewis University.

Joining with our Region IV colleagues in St. Louis in April, Region V had a successful spring meeting with 350 attendees. Eight workshops, 46 concurrent sessions and an outstanding keynote provided professional development on a variety of topics and for varying levels of experience while the opening reception complete with sound effects and lightening show, the hospitality suite, Monday dinner groups and Tuesday dinner offered informal networking opportunities. I extend my most sincere thanks to the program committee, the workshop faculty, the session speakers and the many other volunteers who made it happen.

New Region V officers are Scott Davis, University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Chair-elect, and Brenda Garner, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston, Treasurer. New ad hoc members of the Regional Executive Committee are Shelly Berry-Hebb, Texas A&M University System, and Susan Wyatt Sedwick, University of Texas at Austin. I took office as Regional Chair at the close of the regional meeting. Terms for the treasurer and new members of the Regional Executive Committee begin in January.

Committee chairs for 2012-2013 are:

Program Committee – Scott Davis, University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center
Awards Committee – Jeremy Forsberg, University of Texas at Arlington
Membership/Hospitality Committee – Hollie Schreiber, Oklahoma State University
Nominating Committee – Scott Erwin, Texas State University
Professional Development Committee – Govind Narasimhan, M.D. Anderson Cancer Center
Publications/Communications Committee – Thomas Spencer, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center
Site Selection Committee – Kathleen Harris, Texas Tech University

The Professional Development Committee was established by Jeremy Forsberg last year; its work will continue in 2012-13. The Site Selection Committee is a new committee that will be charged with making recommendations for a location for the 2014 spring meeting and for helping with the initial arrangements. A call for volunteers to fill vacant slots on all committees went out in August.

Kathleen Harris, is the Chair of Region V and serves as the Senior Associate Vice President for Research at Texas Tech University.

Scott Davis and the program committee are working on the Spring 2013 meeting which will take place April 21-24 in Oklahoma City. Scott has already identified a great venue for the Sunday reception. Watch for more details on the Region V web site.

I am sure we are all looking forward to AM54. Toni Shaklee, Oklahoma State University, is a member of the program committee, which has put together another outstanding set of offerings. At the luncheon on Monday Susie Sedwick, University of Texas, will receive a National Council of University Research Administrators’ Award for Distinguished Service. Congratulations to Susie on a well-deserved honor.

The Region V hospitality suite is a great place to relax and spend time with your Region V friends and colleagues. This year we will again be in Room 5101. The suite will be open Sunday, Monday and Tuesday evenings starting at 9:00 p.m. I especially encourage first-time attendees to come by and get to know other members in a small, casual setting.

I hope to see all Region V attendees at the regional business meeting at AM54. We will hear reports from all the regional committees, make decisions about regional business and hand out fabulous door prizes. You have to be present to win.

If you have ideas or suggestions about the region or news you would like to share, please send me an email kathleen.harris@ttu.edu or call 806-742-3884. See you in DC.
night. It’s exciting and exhilarating to watch the returns with your friends, especially during a Presidential election year, and there will be TVs and lounges set up for just this purpose.

The program committee for the annual meeting has put together a diverse and stimulating program with a wide variety of workshops, concurrent sessions, discussion groups, and flash sessions, along with many opportunities for networking, mingling and socializing. Enjoy Thanksgiving dinner on Sunday evening, followed by a memorable performance by the famous, talented and uproarious Second City troupe.

We have some great regional plans for the meeting as well. Our joint hospitality suite (Room 6101) will open on Sunday evening – join us there to visit with old friends and meet new ones, to unwind after a long day, with a glass of wine or beer, soda, water or juice, and some delicious food.

We’ll be serving dessert and coffee on Monday evening following the dinner groups (Dine Around), so stop by after dinner and hang out.

The New Member Mixer will be held on Tuesday evening at 5:30 – come and mingle with our new members before the group goes down together to enjoy the Tuesday evening event, which will involve great food, a variety of musical entertainment to appeal to all listeners, and Election Central!

Regional News: The 2013 regional leadership (Tony Onofrietti and Katherine Ho) are already hard at work planning for our fabulous Spring meeting, to be held in sunny Phoenix, from Sunday, April 7th –Wednesday, April 10th, at the beautiful Marriott Renaissance, located in the heart of downtown Phoenix.


An artful urban retreat among downtown Phoenix hotels, with stylish new guestrooms, the Renaissance Phoenix Downtown combines the body of a full-service business and convention hotel with the soul of a boutique hotel. Outside, the best of downtown is steps away. Walk to a Sun’s game at the US Airways Center or a Diamondback’s game at Chase Field. Hop on the light-rail and head to museum district, home to the world-class Heard Museum. Check out the Phoenix Zoo, the beautiful Botanical Gardens, the historic Orpheum downtown theater, or the thriving arts scene, including the Herberger Theater Center. Phoenix also has great restaurants, pubs, and shops that are sure to satisfy. Phoenix Sky Harbor airport is conveniently close (4 miles) and the earth-friendly light-rail is just outside the door, with service to and from the airport.

Stay tuned for more information. We hope that you will take the opportunity to suggest topics and/or present a session or workshop, and to volunteer to mentor a new member, serve at the registration desk, act as a room monitor, work with our IT team, distribute and collate evaluation materials and information, serve on the entertainment committee, or take advantage of the many other chances to participate and make this a vibrant, informative and exciting meeting.

We look forward to seeing you in Washington in November, and in Phoenix this April! See you soon.

Rosemary Madnick is the Chair of Region VI and serves as the Assistant Vice President, Research Administration, at the Los Angeles Biomedical Research Institute. Vicki Krell is the Chair of Region VII and serves as the Research Advancement Supervisor in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Dean’s Office, Research Advancement Office at Arizona State University.

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

INTERNATIONAL REGION

Nearly one year ago, on 30 November 2011 the European Commission (EC) has published its proposal for the next Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (Horizon 2020) due to start in 2014. The proposal package consists of three main parts that will address the key operational objectives of Horizon 2020: Excellent science, regaining industrial leadership and tackling societal challenges.

The negotiations between the EC and the European Parliament are still ongoing but research managers are already facing questions from their deans, scientific directors, institute managers and researchers: Will the prestigious ERC (European Research Council) be continued? How can we lobby for our research topic? Will the European bureaucracy be simpler? Will the Joint Technology Initiative be part of Horizon 2020? How will key-enabling technologies be connected to Societal Challenges? Will innovation and valorisation be important parts of Horizon 2020?

As HORIZON 2020 is inviting researchers world-wide to participate, also research managers and administrators world-wide need to prepare. How to prepare yourself for the new research funding challenges? What does Horizon 2020 mean for research in the U.S.? Why bother collaborating with researchers outside the U.S.? The International Region sets out to become a platform for focusing on these topics and challenges. Starting with the NCURA 54th annual event the International Region will promote how to get involved in European Research after 2013, will show how the process of designing and developing the next Framework programme for European research works, what roles universities and other stakeholders can play and which strategies research centres and universities worldwide can develop to anticipate on the next research programmes.

We are convinced that the organizing principle for doing research and business in this century will be access, not ownership. We need training for the future(s), so join our mission and get ready for Horizon 2020.


Annika Glauner, is the 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 of the International Region and serves as Co-Director EU GrantsAccess at ETH Zurich/University of Zurich.
Harnessing the Power of Social Media

By Charles Bartunek and Kathryn Magrogan

Did you know that YouTube is the second largest search engine on the web? Or that Twitter isadding 300,000 users per day? Or that the number of Facebook users increased 20% in the lastyear, to a total of 900 million?

The September/October 2011 issue of the NCURA Magazine included a brief article in the Depart-mental Administration Neighborhood Watch section (pp. 58-59) entitled “Social Networking forDepartmental Administrators: Is it Worth the In-vestment?” which focused on departmental re-search administrators (DRA) and how they coulduse Facebook and MySpace to facilitate the ex-change of information among research adminis-tration personnel. In the last year, however, the-social media landscape has changed substantially.MySpace no longer serves as a viable option forresearch administrators, due to its predominantfocus on music and pop culture, whereas estab-lished and emerging platforms, such as Facebookand Google+, are practical for virtually any interest or community.

In spite of its popularity, it was surprising to learn that, in 2011, only 52% of polled research admin-istration personnel were taking advantage of so-cial media for professional purposes. With theindustry continuing to grow, it is important thatresearch administrators recognize how much so-cial media can assist them in their attempts to disseminate information to the masses. Platforms canbe used to publicize award opportunities, providenotice of changes to institutional and departmen-tal policies, and summarize important develop-ments in research legislation. Overall, researchadministrators are constantly faced with height-ened expectations with respect to their output,transparency, and turnaround times, all areas inwhich social media can assist.

The first step in establishing a social media pres-ence is to understand the benefits associated withits creation. Platforms should be utilized to reachas many people as possible and broadcast asmuch information as possible, all the while spendings as little time and money as possible. Whencreated and managed effectively, social mediacautionize the manner in which departments interact with their colleagues and ‘clients’ (i.e., PIs), and afford their personnel ad-ditional time to address more substantive issues.

Next, a potential user should define their goalsand objectives, and then match accordingly withthe most appropriate outlet. At the moment, fiveplatforms offer the most bang for the buck for re-search administrators: Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn,YouTube, and blogs, such as WordPress and Blogspot. Are you mainly interested in publi-cizing NIH funding opportunities? Twitter shouldprobably be your first endeavor. Or, if you wish toshare, and even exchange, information from mul-tiple resources, the better initial foray would likelybe Facebook. Regardless of your interests, thereis a platform available that will allow you to suc-cessfully dive headfirst into social media.

The order in which you establish your social media presence will not only depend on your in-tended use, but also the time available to maintainthe specific accounts. For example, our first plat-form was our blog http://www.bloggingora.com,which was largely created to provide updates topersons internal to Johns Hopkins. In retrospect,we were certainly not aware of the time requiredto manage our blog, and probably would havebeen better served to have started with a less in-volved project, like Facebook.

Consequently, we have developed a recommendedOrder of Creation for Social Media, based on easeof creation and management, information available, and ability to customize for the purposes ofresearch administration. The first platform we tackle is Facebook, and in Part Two of our series (coming December 2012), we will examine Twit-ter, LinkedIn, YouTube, and the various blogs atyour disposal.

Facebook in Research Administration

To put it bluntly, Facebook is the largest social net-work in the world, and not participating is a mis-sed opportunity to reduce headaches both foryou and everyone with whom you interact.

Facebook boasts a clean and streamlined look, making it easy to customize and maintain. Usingthe platform is also quite easy: Tasks can be ac-complished with a minimum of technical knowl-edge, and only infrequent data management isrequired. In essence, Facebook provides a ready-made template, and, to publish, the user only has

Benefits of Cutting Edge Communication Platforms

✔ Free
✔ Dynamic
✔ Anyone Can Use
✔ Minimal People Required for Maintenance
✔ Built-In Audience
✔ Easily Customizable
✔ Easily Integrated
to fill in the appropriate blanks and choose the proper settings.

Even if the page owner has no original content to contribute, a Facebook page can still be useful in sharing notes and articles authored by third parties to which your page’s followers might not otherwise be exposed. Posting any and all relevant material, regardless of its originality, serves multiple purposes. First, it allows you to fulfill your goal of broadcasting information to your intended audience, specifically those people who ‘Like’ your page. Secondly, if your post is reposted or shared by one of your followers, it is then made available to that person’s network and persons who would not ordinarily see your organization’s page.

Setup
To take full advantage of the ability to share information and generate views, the appropriate Facebook forum should be created. For the purposes of research administration, we recommend creating a “Page” over a “Group.” A Facebook Page allows users to subscribe by simply Liking the page, whereas a Group requires the host organization to approve membership requests, thus restricting access and imposing cumbersome restraints on an already busy Office of Research Administration (ORA). Additionally, posts by Page followers do not automatically register on the feeds of other followers, whereas comments on Group pages result in instant notifications on each member’s page, which can be overwhelming to followers.

Once you’re ready to start your Page, it is important to designate multiple administrators, who can establish a system for monitoring and maintaining your page. Providing access to multiple people will ensure that your platform is kept current, even if one person is unavailable. Additionally, in the event that one of the administrators leaves your office, page maintenance will not be interrupted as you search for an adequate replacement.

Part of the creation process also involves deciding on the proper name. A recent improvement to Facebook’s settings is the ability to choose a nickname that reflects their membership in the research administration community.

Content
At the outset, posts will come from third parties. Most articles in trade publications are readily available online, and many of their publishers also publish web-specific content. Additionally, government agencies, such as NIH, publish daily content on their websites that can, and often times should, be communicated to your readership. However, be cognizant of the number of Facebook posts published each day. With Facebook, less is more. Limiting posts to one or two per day is more than sufficient, and waiting even two to three days between entries is acceptable. Audiences do not like Facebook pages that interrupt their newsfeed, and often will unsubscribe from their feed.

Facebook is also useful for announcing attendance at seminars and training sessions, many of which are often available to individuals outside of the host’s institution. Encourage your staff to be active on your Facebook page about their own attendance, as this drives both traffic and excitement for the event. Further, announcing attendance at a forthcoming NCURA meeting and tagging NCURA in a status may generate and develop connections among research administration personnel located in different areas of the country.

Regarding more institution-specific information, Facebook is an invaluable conduit through which users at your own institution can learn of changes to school and office policies, upcoming events (i.e. trainings), deadlines, real-time updates to necessary IT resources, and changes to office hours. A two-sentence post to your Facebook page will alleviate the majority of the communication time burden imposed by phone calls and emails, while also availing the information to a much wider audience.

Generating Membership
Now that your Page is set up and full of content, it’s time to ensnare a large and devoted readership. The easiest way to get your name out is to “Like” other research administration Facebook pages, as well as those of government agencies and other funding sources, as these entities often reciprocate by Liking their members’ pages. Additionally, by “sharing” posts from these other entities, and tagging these entities in your status updates, your page will automatically be promoted and accessible through the original post.

Finally, email and word of mouth can be used to recruit followers from the ranks of your departments, who often times have pages of their own. This built-in audience is perhaps the most attractive feature of Facebook, and, as your material is viewed and shared by your readers, your presence and visibility will increase and membership will increase accordingly.

Facebook provides an excellent first step into the social media arena, as it requires no real internet experience or existing prowess. If you are uncertain as to how to begin, don’t hesitate to contact other institutions who regularly maintain a Facebook presence, such as the JHSPH Office of Research Administration and Washington State’s Office of Grants and Research Development. Further, your own institution’s communications and marketing department will be able to guide you with respect to networking and content. And you can also attend our panel presentation and discussion group during the Annual Meeting in November, where we will discuss all of these issues in more detail and answer any questions.

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 was employed 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.
Gary Wimsett discusses
“Mentoring: A Two-Way Street for both the New and Old Guards!”

Gary Wimsett, Jr., JD, LHRM, directs the Conflict of Interest Program for the College of Medicine. He is a lecturer in Medical Ethics and Interdisciplinary Family Health. Mr. Wimsett also serves as a member of the President's Council on Diversity. On the national level, he is a member of the Forum on Conflict of Interest and the Group on Business Affairs for the Association of American Medical Colleges, a member of the Executive Leadership group for the Association of Academic Health Centers, a member of NCURA and the CTSA Regulatory Knowledge Conflict of Interest Affinity Group. Mr. Wimsett received his Juris Doctor from the University of Florida in 1997.

What forms of mentoring are needed to consistently enable research administrators to honor old traditions and yet continue with new beginnings?

Mentoring is an important part of any high-performing workplace. It is especially important in research administration, in my view, because new research administrators are so dependent on learning:

1. very complex rules and regulations,
2. institutional policies and procedures, and
3. the institution’s compliance culture.

Strong mentor/mentee relationships make progress in these three areas possible. It is simply expecting too much of anyone, no matter their background and education, to require a new research administrator to excel in this field without guidance, instruction, and support. Institutions that recognize this create an atmosphere of excellence.

This kind of mentoring can take many forms and I think it would be a mistake to think too narrowly about what mentorship should look like. A lot of it depends on your institution’s culture. If formal educational sessions can be woven into your team’s busy schedules, they can certainly be effective. At most institutions, however, it might be more effective to let mentoring happen more informally. Some people are natural mentors and, rather than trying to turn everyone into a teacher it might make more sense to identify those leaders in your organization with these tendencies. Some new employees are reluctant to engage senior employees for assistance. All new research administrators, however, will need to be regularly trained and given feedback in order to be successful.

What are the benefits of the mentor/mentee ‘looping strategy’ that honors the traditional research administration while bringing in new beginnings at all levels?

The benefits accruing to the institution, to mentees and mentors, cannot be overstated. These kinds of relationships are fundamental and without them the research administration enterprise is vulnerable to serious system failures. The level of expertise required of all who participate in research administration is daunting. If the system fails to recognize the important of continuous quality improvement through education and mentorship, then compliance gaps will emerge – it is inevitable.

A continuous mentor/mentee “looping” strategy wherein mentors and mentees teach each other gives new administrators confidence to ask important questions, suggest new compliance initiatives, and refine potentially outdated processes. Mentors benefit from these fresh perspectives and new ideas. They also can provide a strong voice of wisdom and restraint when “innovation” is pursued simply for its own sake. The institution gets a dedicated, innovative and experienced workforce.

How can an institution fuel (or provide) support to implement a successful mentoring program(s)?

Institutional leadership and support for active mentoring is critical. The good news, I think, is that many institutions recognize this. It is more challenging, perhaps, to incentivize leadership to allocate real resources to these kinds of programs – even though they typically know they work and are in the institution’s best interests.

One way to encourage resource allocation is to identify mentoring best practices at a peer institution. So much of what we do in research administration is dynamic. It can be difficult to ensure your institution is a step ahead of any compliance challenges. Frequent benchmarking helps. If your peer institutions have had success getting serious about mentorship, you should use this success as a case study and see what can be applied in a meaningful way in your environment. The support and guidance freely given by other institutions has been one of the most gratifying aspects of working in compliance. In this way, I think it is also important to note that more established research administration programs can serve as mentors for developing programs.

Gary Wimsett, Jr., JD, LHRM, Director, University of Florida College of Medicine Dean’s Office Conflict of Interest Program, 352.273.7508, gwimsett@ufl.edu

On Campus is an interview designed to give a more personal account of the day-to-day activities, issues, and obstacles in research administration.
Are faculty complaining about your sponsored programs service or turnaround?

Has your infrastructure not kept up with increasing faculty activity and expectations?

**NCURA Peer Review:** assessing the effectiveness of your sponsored program operation and providing recommendations to help your program better meet institutional and investigator needs.

Senior and experienced research administrators conduct the assessment

Covers all sponsored program operations, communications, organization, staffing

http://www.ncura.edu/content/peer_to_peer_review/

For questions or further information on the NCURA Peer Review Program, contact peerreview@ncura.edu or call: (503) 364-1847

NCURA Supporting research...together
Whether you are involved in developing clinical trial budgets, negotiating contractual terms, enrolling study participants, participating in billing processes or employed by the Institutional Review Board, this 92 page reference will provide an overview of the entire cycle of clinical research administration. It will provide the “big picture” view of the complexities and institutional interrelationships necessary for the successful administration of clinical trials. Contents include:

CHAPTER 1: AN INTRODUCTION TO CLINICAL RESEARCH
CHAPTER 2: PREPARING A CLINICAL TRIAL BUDGET
CHAPTER 3: CONTRACTING WITH INDUSTRY – CLINICAL TRIAL NEGOTIATION AND ACCEPTANCE
CHAPTER 4: FINANCIAL OVERSIGHT OF A CLINICAL TRIAL
CHAPTER 5: OTHER INSTITUTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

AUTHORS: Gunta J. Liders, University of Rochester; Editor; Lisa Benson, Connecticut Children’s Medical Center; Katherine Ho, Stanford University; Tesheia Johnson, Yale University; David Lynch, Mayo Clinic; Michael Ritz, University of Rochester; Patricia Travis, Johns Hopkins University; Mary Jane Welch, Rush University Medical Center; Tom Wilson, Rush University Medical Center

Order today! $21.95 each (plus shipping and handling)
Order 5 or more copies and save! $16.50 each (plus shipping and handling)

www.ncura.edu/bookstore
Expectations of NCURA  Continued from page 3

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

As recorded in the last five year plan, NCURA will continue to work with U.S. sister organizations and also work with associations world-wide, however, we have noted that being strategic about the myriad of opportunities that can come our way is in our best interest.

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

Technology continues to evolve. We have been nimble and flexible when implementing all the Federal Government can obtain our input on, and we continue to push the envelope on social media. We still want to utilize NCURA to its fullest…and whatever else we may confront in the next five years.

“...will ensure the optimal infrastructure necessary to support its activities and goals.”

NCURA cannot take on every opportunity, although we wish we could at times. We need to ensure that the goals we take on are still within our stated goals and in order to do that we need to have sufficient staff and resources to complete our goals. We simply want to mindful of this.

The Board read and reviewed the significant and recent National Academies report titled Research Universities and the Future of America: Ten Breakthrough Actions Vital to Our Nation’s Prosperity and Security which provided a basis, and an excellent reference, for the discussion of NCURA’s actions for the next five years. As a Board, we agreed that the key issues in this particular article were in line with many of the goals and visions of NCURA into 2017. In addition, we reviewed a report entitled The Current Health and Future Well-Being of the American Research University, a report by the Research Universities Futures Consortium.

A message to the future: To the 2017 Board – the environment surrounding our discussion included the slowing down of ARRA (but oh the DATA Act), headlong into FFATA, the speeding up of the new HHS FCOI rules, a Presidential election, the economy still not showing us signs of marked improve-

den, grants reform and discussion of “super circulars” (and the next phase), STAR METRICS, and likely other “issues” that I may not want to remind you of. However, as we support research...together, we look for the very bright silver linings and believe the trend will successfully continue as you take us through 2022 — good luck!

Dan Nordquist is the Assistant Vice President and Director, Office of Grant and Research Development at Washington State University.
Introducing Grant Forward
http://www.grantforward.com

A new and improved version of IRIS (Illinois Research Information Service)
IRIS has been replaced by the grants database service Grant Forward, hosted and managed by Cazoodle, Inc.

Grant Forward Features

Powerful administrative console
- Supports opportunity dissemination and grant annotation (including limited submission)
- Enables submission of public or internal funding opportunities to Grant Forward
- Provides user management support and usage reports

Enhanced search interface
- Combines IRIS’ best features such as category classification and diverse inventory with a fresh, intuitive interface

Improved user account interfaces
- Powerful search, alerts and favorites management

Increased coverage and diversity of available funding opportunities
- 100% increase in foundation and federal opportunities compared to IRIS FY11-12

No price increase from IRIS fiscal year 2011-2012

For a free two-week trial to Grant Forward, please contact:
freetrial@grantforward.com
http://www.grantforward.com/contact
(217) 864-8378