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ON THE COVER: Research Across Borders: Institutional and Geographic is a theme the Co-Editors and I came up with way back in November of 2012, and it is more relevant than ever! We have borders all across our profession – departmentally, institutionally, by counties, townships, states, as well as nations. I love the cover image because it shows us without hard lined boundaries but simply with connections points because that is what we as research administrators do, eliminate the walls and administrative burden to provide a seamless service to our best and brightest. In fact, many of our own best and brightest NCURA members, in 2013, have been involved with the “Geographic” part by helping research administration in China, Japan, Ghana, and taking part in meetings in Canada, England, Austria, and Australia. On the “Institutional” front we continue to implement our NCURA tagline — supporting research… together — by having programs that help us develop and build our professional network.

Even a government shutdown did not discourage authors from wanting to be involved with this theme. We have institutions all over the world represented with articles in this issue — Kyoto University, University of British Columbia, University of Southern Denmark, the Institute of Photonic Sciences in Barcelona, University of Melbourne as well as coast to coast in the U.S. from the University of Maryland, Baltimore to Oregon State University. Now for a quick peek at some of the articles you will be seeing.

President Michael M. Crow from Arizona State University (ASU) tells us about President Michael M. Crow from Arizona State University (ASU) tells us about what ASU is doing globally. As many of you know, Dr. Crow keeps us all on the edge of our seat related to innovative ideas and leadership – it must be all that wonderful sunny day in Tempe. I introduce all of you to our new global Contributing Editors covering Japan, Canada, and Europe, thanks to Keiko Okano, Martin Kirk, and Olaf Svenningsen. Past President Denise Clark, along with her friends from the down under (Bryony Wakefield, Sue O’Brien, and Julie Ward), talk about their U.S. Australia connection. Mary Ellen Sheridan, Ghafe El-Hajj Fuleihan, Thalia Arawi share with us the heavy duty work related to “Developing an International Responsible Conduct of Research Program for Clinical Researchers.” Simon Kerr, from Melbourne, tells us about his summer vacation where he learned all about international research collaboration.
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May the world feel like a smaller and friendlier place after reading this issue, enjoy!

Dan Nordquist, Senior Editor

Dan is currently the Assistant Vice President, Office of Research, and Director of Washington State University’s Office of Grant and Research Development. He oversees research development, proposal and award processing, research metrics, non-financial post-award, and is significantly involved in strategic initiatives at WSU. He has a passion for technology and its positive impact on research management. Dan has significant leadership experience internally and externally, and is currently NCURA’s Immediate Past President. He can be reached at nordquist@wsu.edu
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Message from Your President

By Patricia Hawk, NCURA President

The theme for this edition of the Magazine is Research Across Borders: Institutional and Geographic. As I thought about the work that NCURA has done over this past year, I want to tell you about our most recent Board meeting, held in Philadelphia in early October. I think of this meeting as a historic meeting in a historic place (Philadelphia). I also think this meeting fits this issue’s theme — research administration/management across borders, both institutional and geographic.

Since 1959, NCURA has been involved in professional development and training — it’s our hallmark and our “bread and butter.” As we’ve grown over the years, we’ve seen training and professional development grow at both the national and the regional level. We now have 3 national level conferences — the Annual Meeting, the Financial Research Administration Conference and the Pre-Award Research Administration Conference. We also have 4 national traveling workshops — Fundamentals, SPAII, FRA and DRA. It’s also a sign of our growth to see regions expanding out to do more than just a regional-level annual meeting. So it was a perfect time for the Board of Directors to look at our administrative policies and make sure there were clear “roles and responsibilities” and “who does what” for supporting regional training and professional development activities. It was important to set up the national and regional organizations for future programming success, and I’m proud to say the Board came up with some great additions to our administrative policies.

It will now be clear that regions receive the following support for one annual regional meeting from the national organization at no cost: up to $500 for speaker support; review of all hotel and vendor contracts; access to on-line meeting registration; and assistance/guidance on event planning. For regions that offer training or professional development outside of their annual regional meeting, the national organization will also support those events, but regions will be assessed a modest fee to help offset the additional staff effort.

Another important addition to our administrative policies is a statement of the regions’ responsibilities to the national organization for these professional development/training activities outside of an annual regional meeting. For example, regions will be responsible for following our Equitable Participation policy, providing an evaluation plan and methodology for faculty recruitment and faculty selection. I’m truly happy that the Board has put a structure in place for regions to develop their own professional development and training activities. I’m also truly happy if regions just continue with their regional annual meetings. It’s always nice to have choices!

Now, on to NCURA’s research administration/management across geographic borders. As President, I was very fortunate to attend meetings of some of our sister societies. It was an experience I will always remember. It’s true that attendance at these meetings took me to some nice places — Canada, England, Austria and Australia. But the colleagues and friends made and the knowledge gained and exchanged are priceless. I wrote about some of my experiences earlier this year, but attending these events only confirmed and cemented my belief that research administration is global and I believe the global strategic plan approved by the Board at our October meeting gives us the framework to continue the great work we do domestically and globally.

Attending all of these global meetings made me think about all of NCURA’s global activities. We’ve got Global Fundamentals, we’ve got a global fellowship program that will be expanded to more of our global sister organizations, we’ve got our international region established, and they will hold their first regional meeting in April 2014. And of course, we’re co-hosting the INORMS Congress in April 2014! It’s been a real joy to be able to serve as President this year, and it’s an honor to lead the Board through what I consider to be an important year.

Leading the Board and leading NCURA this year has been an amazing experience for me both personally and professionally. There are a lot of people I have to thank for allowing me to enjoy this amazing experience.

I wouldn’t have been able to have this amazing experience without the help and support of a lot of people, and I would like to acknowledge that support. First, I have to thank my Vice President for Research, Rick Spinrad and my Associate Vice President for Research, Rich Holdren. Both have given my tremendous support throughout the years, and their support demonstrates the value NCURA and participation in NCURA brings to
The resumption of operations at the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and National Science Foundation, to catch up in the processes of reviewing applications and awarding of funds available under the CR.

In the midst of the resumption of operations, NIH issued a new Grants Policy Statement (GPS) that was effective immediately (October 13, 2013) (NIH, 2013). In a Summary of Significant Changes, NIH points to the sections that have been changed in this new version of the GPS. As in the past with annual revisions, NIH has incorporated new and modified requirements implemented since the last update. The requirement for graduate and undergraduate students with a measurable role on a project to have an eRA Commons ID is included in the new GPS. As cautioned in the NIH Guide Notice NOT-OD-13-097 (NIH NOT, 2013), beginning on October 18, 2013, a warning will be generated when a Research Performance Progress Report (RPPR) is submitted that lists individuals in a graduate or undergraduate student role who have not established an eRA Commons ID. Then, beginning in October 2014, RPPRs lacking the eRA Commons ID for graduate and undergraduate students will receive an error, and the RPPR will not be accepted by the NIH. There is a new award term for grants funded under the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) Program concerning prostitution and sex trafficking, which limits the use of funds. This provision is similar to those implemented by USAID and other agencies distributing funds under (PEPFAR).

You will recall NIH’s notice issued on July 23, 2013, that encouraged institutions to assist graduate students and postdoctoral researchers to achieve their career goals through the use of Individual Development Plans (IDPs) and report on this in all progress reports submitted on/after October 1, 2014, using the Research Performance Progress Report (RPPR). The new GPS embeds this “expectation” as a reportable element in the RPPR. This transition of “expectation” to veiled “policy” is surprising and worth noting [See GPS Sections 8.4.1.1.2 and 11.3.13.4].

In a similar almost-annual event, the National Science Foundation (NSF) announced in May, 2013, a proposed revision to its Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide (PAPPG). NSF usually finalizes proposed revisions in October with an effective date in January of the following year. This past October was a little odd. As NSF labored to catch up, NSF staff announced at the October Council on Governmental Relations (OOGR) meeting that NSF planned to issue the revised PAPPG in November with an effective date in February, 2014. The May draft included a number of modifications, most aligning the PAPPG with new policies and procedures announced throughout the year. Some changes are either helpful or of limited consequence. NSF provided useful information and guidance concerning the allowance of visa costs and introduced a new process and procedures with regard to environmental impacts that include a checklist that will be used only if additional information is needed and requested by NSF. Some changes are not unexpected but, nonetheless, frustrating—including the exclusion of participant costs from the Facilities & Administrative (F&A) calculation.

Unfortunately, NSF continues to propose modifications to its financial conflicts of interest (COI) policy through the PAPPG. In the last (2012) revision, NSF made a change to the requirements concerning an unmanageable conflict of interest, describing the review by the NSF Office of General Counsel (OGC) of institutional policies to determine the institution’s procedures for addressing unmanageable conflicts. NSF’s policy does not require procedures for addressing unmanageable conflicts, per se, beyond notifying NSF. The proposed PAPPG adds an additional requirement to provide notification to the NSF OGC “if the institution finds that research will proceed without the imposition of conditions or restriction when a COI exists.” Under the current policy, a determination by the institution to allow a project to proceed without restrictions or conditions is a managed conflict of interest and not reportable to NSF. It will be interesting to see if this language is in the final PAPPG.

In an ironic twist (or not), Congress turned its attention to transparency and accountability as the Federal government resumed operations in October. Rep. James Lankford (R-OK) reintroduced a slightly modified version of the Grant Reform and New Transparency (GRANT) Act (H.R. 3316) that aims at ensuring accountability in the federal grants process by increasing its transparency to the public. While the new version of the GRANT Act includes some modifications to the version introduced in November, 2011 (described in the NCURA Magazine XLIV, No. 1 January/February 2012), the bill retained the requirement to post all funded grant applications, grant performance information, and executed grant agreements to a publicly accessible website. The bill includes a provision for each Department to make exceptions to protect intellectual property and sensitive information but the default procedure—which was not defined—is that the application, performance information, and executed agreement for all awarded grants must be posted online. The research community feared that the provisions, particularly as related to the application, could lead to a number of problems, including release of unprotected intellectual property, the misuse of information related to dual-use research of concern (DURC), and the release of sensitive information about researchers and facilities involving research with animals.

Despite changes aimed at preserving the anonymity of peer reviewers, the revamped bill still requires the institutional affiliation or employer of peer reviewers to be posted which could lead to the identification of reviewers in fields with a small cohort of experts. The research community argued that real anonymity in the peer review process permits greater candor in the evaluation of grant applications and thereby contributes to a higher quality of review than would otherwise occur and urged the bill’s sponsors to consider the assignment of a unique identifier for agency use. As with many ef-
forts at transparency and accountability, one wonders if unfiltered access to broad categories of information provided out of context improves the public’s understanding.

The fate of the revised GRANT Act will likely have been resolved by the time you read this. If passed in the House as proposed, the research community will be working with members of the Senate to attempt to modify provisions that are viewed as increasing the administrative burden on the investigators and their home institutions.

Legislatively, Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee Chairman Jay Rockefeller (D-WV) announced on October 31, 2013, that hearings will begin in November, 2013, to start the process for the reauthorization of the America COMPETES Act. Currently, the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee is working a dual track on the reauthorization of COMPETES. The Committee Democrats have released their version of a COMPETES Reauthorization bill while the Committee Republicans have decided to consider COMPETES reauthorization in a series of smaller, targeted bills. Two of these bills are the EINSTEIN (Enabling Innovation for Science, Technology and Energy in America) Act which encompasses the Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Science parts of COMPETES; and the FIRST (Frontier in Innovative Research, Science, and Technology) Act which includes reauthorization for the NSF, the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), and STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) education components of COMPETES.

The House Science Subcommittee on Energy began its hearings on EINSTEIN on October 31, 2013, and the House Science Subcommittee on Research and Technology is planning a hearing on the FIRST bill in November, 2013. Since its passage in 2007 and through reauthorization in 2010, the America COMPETES Act of 2007 has cumulatively added the NSF provisions for mentoring post-doctoral fellows, providing education in the responsible conduct of research for undergraduate and graduate students and fellows, and public access to “final” reports. The 2010 reauthorization addressed the expansion and consolidation of the STEM program initiatives across the Federal government. The research community has appreciated the focus on “promot[ing] excellence in technology, education, and science” [the PETES in COMPETES] but remains cautious about regulatory changes embedded in the legislation. With these strikingly dissimilar approaches to reauthorization, it will likely be a little while until the COMPETES Act is reauthorized by Congress.

Of course the really big news in the new year will likely be the issuance of the final Reform of Federal Policies Relating to Grants and Cooperative Agreements; Cost Principles and Administrative Requirements (Including Single Audit Act) proposed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in February, 2013. We know that OMB and the interagency Council on Financial Assistance Reform (COFAR) had hoped to issue the final combined circular by the end of 2013. With the intervening government shutdown, the issuance date is likely delayed until at least January, 2014. The proposed revisions were very briefly summarized in the NCURA Magazine in March, 2013 (Volume XIV, No. 2, March/April, 2013) and volumes have been written since as organizations and institutions responded to the request for comments by the June, 2013, deadline.

What will happen? I leave it to fate to determine the outcomes, noting only that Bertrand Russell once observed, “It seems to be the fate of idealists to obtain what they have struggled for in a form which destroys their ideals.” Maybe I’ll stick with Albert Camus: “There is no fate that cannot be surmounted by scorn.”

Carol J. Blum is Director for Research Compliance and Administration at the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR). Before joining COGR in 2001, Carol served Ohio University for ten years as associate vice president for research after three years at the Ohio Board of Regents as director of graduate and special programs. She holds a PhD in history from the University of Cincinnati. She has recently begun exercising the right side of her brain in art classes and continues to volunteer at the Washington Literacy Council and Washington Area (Reproductive Health) Clinic Defense Task Force. Carol can be reached at cblum@cogr.edu
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Is your institution expanding its global research presence or experiencing an escalation in foreign sponsorship or subcontracting? Are you curious about international funding opportunities such as the European Union’s Horizon 2020? As you contemplate your future training opportunities to educate yourself as to how best to manage a growing globally sponsored portfolio, please consider participating in the fifth International Network of Research Management Societies (INORMS) Congress scheduled for April 10-13, 2014.

The theme of the Congress is *Enabling the Global Research Enterprise from Policy to Practice* and consists of three functional tracks: Policy, Practice, and Performance. Between the three tracks, the conference will offer 70 concurrent sessions with plenty of networking opportunities. The conference website is open for registration and we encourage you to register prior to February 21, 2014 to take advantage of the early registration discount and to secure lodging at the conference hotel, the Washington Hilton.

This is the first time that this global conference has been held in North America and NCURA is pleased to be co-hosting the conference along with the Canadian Association of University Research Administrators (CAURA) and the Society of Research Administrators International (SRAI). So grab your business cards and polish up on your cultural exchanges and join us in Washington, D.C. for INORMS 2014!

Program Co-Chairs (l-r): **Martin Kirk**, Univ of British Columbia (CAURA); **Bill Schweri**, Univ of Kentucky (SRAI); **Dave Richardson**, Univ of Illinois (NCURA).
Most of the challenges that confront society—sustainability, renewable energy, public health, national security, access to education—are global in scope and best advanced in a context of global engagement. Research universities are transformational knowledge enterprises with the potential to create solutions with worldwide relevance. The potential to exert global impact, however, comes with challenges that often demand creative approaches to international engagement.

At Arizona State University, the alignment of a broad range of strategic research with critical national goals has been an overarching objective of our research enterprise. In order to accomplish our goals, we pursue a course of deliberate planned evolution. Once we determine an objective, we reengineer our organizational genetic code accordingly. This could mean recombining academic departments or establishing new transdisciplinary units. We generally disregard existing prototypes and approach each new initiative as a unique design problem.

The funding agencies that universities typically engage with—NSF, or NIH, for example—have international divisions, but they don’t match the scale of their domestic programs. This makes truly international research difficult unless we seek alternate funding sources.

To address this challenge, we created ASU Global, a unit within our Office of Knowledge Enterprise Development (OKED) that is distinct from study abroad and international scholars programs. The ASU Global team works to cultivate relationships with funding agencies like USAID, the Department of State, and the World Bank, as well as with potential international research partners. The Global team builds relationships, finds opportunities, and then reaches out to faculty whose talents match those opportunities.

Working with international development agencies presents its own set of challenges. For instance, these organizations are accustomed to working with private contractors and non-governmental organizations. The private sector tends to be wary of engagement with universities because they assume we are not outcome-focused. At ASU we emphasize use-inspired research that contributes to the well-being of our community, nation, and world alike—particularly the developing world. Partner organizations are often surprised by this approach and how successfully we put it into practice.

The turnaround time for international agency applications is incredibly compressed compared to the agencies universities typically approach. Investigators don’t have a long lead-time to put together a proposal—typically about three weeks from when the call goes out to the application due date. Our research administration team makes continual process improvements that streamline both the application process and management of grants once they are received. Our research administration team also brings up unique compliance, human resources, and legal issues. We have established a global operations process that aligns with proposal development and project execution to assess and comply with local laws and employment practices.

We have also streamlined our proposal and awards management processes and are implementing an enterprise research administration system that replaces a set of separate, manual systems. It includes compliance functions, automated proposal development, and an award module. The system saves time and provides greater integration, accuracy, and security.

Crossing national, institutional, and disciplinary boundaries presents new and unique challenges. This requires all research administration staff, both central office and in the departments, to be creative problem-solvers. It is crucial to routinely ask our administrators, researchers, and the entire academic community, “What do we want to accomplish?” and “What do we have to do to get there?”

Michael M. Crow became the sixteenth president of Arizona State University in 2002. He is guiding the transformation of ASU into one of the nation’s leading public metropolitan research universities, an institution combining academic excellence, inclusiveness, and societal impact—a model he terms the “New American University.” During his tenure ASU has established major transdisciplinary research initiatives and witnessed an unprecedented academic infrastructure expansion, tripling of research expenditures, and attainment of record levels of diversity. He was previously professor of science and technology policy and executive vice provost of Columbia University. A fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) and National Academy of Public Administration, he is the author of books and articles analyzing knowledge enterprises and science and technology policy.
Building Connections

Conducting international research requires collaboration with international partners. For someone at a PUI who is considering the possibilities of conducting international research, this requirement may seem like an insurmountable barrier. To overcome this challenge, researchers must seek out and build connections with potential international collaborators. For example, when the first author worked at the National Heart Lung and Blood Institute (NHLBI)/NIH, he was involved with the review and training development of a global network of ten Collaborating Centers of Excellence (CCE; NHLBI, 2013). Each CCE paired an academic institution in a developed country with a partnering institution in the USA. The CCE’s were tasked to develop infrastructures for research and training to enhance their capacity to conduct population-based or clinical research to monitor, prevent, or control chronic diseases. Each year the primary investigators and trainees from the CCE’s met to discuss the accomplishments of the centers and to collaborate on research. Through these meetings, the first author developed friendships with a number of investigators, post-doctoral fellows, PhD students, and student mentors. Connections such as these are fertile ground for nurturing future international research projects. The importance of the role of relationship building cannot be overstressed. In a study of intimate partner violence in Canada and Ethiopia, Bender et al (2011) found “that the best international collaborations may be those that are understood within system realities but are approached first as social relations between people who respect and trust one another” (p.73).
So how does someone at a PUI develop such relationships? Thinking back to one’s undergraduate years, a person may recall having a desire to establish new relationships of the romantic variety. He or she may also recall that the odds of being successful in this endeavor were greatly enhanced by getting out of the dorm room and going places where they were apt to meet people with similar interests. While some time has passed, and motives have changed since the undergraduate years, the ways to establish new relationships are much the same. In order to develop relationships with potential international collaborators, faculty have to go out and meet international researchers with similar interests! One great way to connect with potential collaborators is to meet at conferences in the faculty member’s field.

Connecting At Conferences

Conferences are an obvious place to make connections with people with similar research interests. The best place to make connections at conferences is at poster sessions. An aspiring collaborative investigator can review the poster abstracts in advance to ascertain potential international research posters of interest. Poster presenters are typically eager to discuss their research, especially with an informed researcher with similar interests. Even if the poster presenter is a student, it is likely that their research adviser is close by. Additionally, one is likely to meet other scholars with similar interests who are also visiting the same poster presentation. Many researchers have made productive connections this way.

As in any relationship, potential research collaborators begin feeling each other out for their suitability to carry on a sustained relationship. Just like in dating, if the two don’t “hit it off,” the relationship is likely to go no farther than the first meeting. However, if there is a spark of interest, potential collaborators may decide to take their relationship to the next level. This may include an invitation to speak or work together on a small project. For example, after meeting someone at a poster session, the first author was invited to speak at the presenter’s school in Thailand. After developing a sense of mutual respect and trust, the relationship that started at the poster presentation has continued to evolve to the point where they are presently collaborating on a proposal for a small international grant from their professional association. It is worth noting that these small beginnings are important for larger scale collaborations in the future. For example, some professional associations offer international grants specifically to nurture these types of relationships. When reviewing NIH proposals, reviewers often ask: How much work have the PI’s done together and what have they published together? Given this, working together on a writing project is a good first step for potential research collaborators to establish a working relationship in the eyes of a grant reviewer.

Connecting With International Alumni

A second way to make connections with potential international collaborators is by cultivating relationships with former international students or international collaborators is by cultivating relationships with former international students or international alumni from the PUI who have gone on to earn PhD’s or MD’s and returned to their home countries. Institutions’ alumni associations will be helpful in making such connections. Former students are a great source of potential collaborators because researchers already have an established relationship and work history together and may have already collaborated on poster presentations or publications. Other former undergraduate students and alumni may not have gone on to graduate school but may now be in leadership positions in foreign governments or corporations that may be interested in collaborating on research projects. USAID supports the development of these types of collaborations.

Connecting Through Academic Social Networks

A third way to make connections with potential international collaborators is to use one of the social networks developed specifically for academics and researchers: Academia.edu and ResearchGate.net. These social network sites were developed expressly for scientists and researchers. These sites afford researchers the opportunity to share papers and data sets, and to ask questions or have online conversations about topics of interest. Both sites were launched in 2008 and already have several million users. In a recent online article on the collaborative power of ResearchGate, Leena Rao (2013) highlights the example of how Orazio Romeo, a researcher in Italy, and Emmanuel Nnandi, a PhD student in Nigeria, met through ResearchGate and collaborated to discover a deadly plant yeast that had killed an infant in Nandi’s hometown. In another example, Rao points out how “Sohail Malik (Po
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$716,301,000... the amount of United States higher education R&D expenditures from foreign sources in 2011, as identified in the latest NSF HERD Report. This is up from $649,293,000 in 2010, a rise of 10.3%.

844,400, the number of researchers in Japan in 2012, up 0.2% from 2011. 124,700 of those researchers are female.

R&D performed in East/Southeast Asia and South Asia represented only 24% of the global R&D total in 1999, but accounted for 32% in 2009, including China (12%) and Japan (11%).

$30,043,000,000... the amount of gross domestic spending (Canadian Dollar) on research and development in Canada in 2012, the latest available data from the Canadian GERD Report.

In 2010, R&D intensity (R&D expenditure as a percentage of GDP) in the EU-27 stood at 2.0%. Among the EU Member States, only Finland (3.87%), Sweden (3.42%) and Denmark (3.06%) exceeded the EU goal of devoting 3% of GDP to R&D.

Sources:
http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/88-221-x/2012001/054-eng.htm

Want to share numbers? Email Heather Kubinec at heather.kubinec@research.uci.edu

Finding Funding for International Research

NSF offers several funding opportunities to foster international relationships and collaboration on its website http://www.nsf.gov/funding. One such program is called Catalyzing New International Collaborations (CNIC). This program offers funds for brief international visits or workshops which are expected to lead to research proposals submitted to NSF. Other NSF funding opportunities include the International Collaboration in Chemistry between US Investigators and their Counterparts Abroad (ICC) and the International Research Experiences for Students (IRES) program. Additionally, the NIH Fogarty International Center website www.fic.nih.gov is a great place to direct faculty to look for other funding opportunities. The site lists NIH international opportunities and also lists non-NIH international prospects. Some other places for faculty to look for funding opportunities are the Earthwatch Institute www.earthwatch.org which supports scholarly research worldwide in the biological, physical, social, and cultural sciences through a variety of grants; and the American College of Sports Medicine’s Oded Bar-Or International Scholar Award. This award allows professionals to gain technical expertise and/or scientific knowledge through an international exchange program.

Summary

Hopefully, this brief discussion will encourage you to consider the potential opportunities in international research. If international research aligns with your institution’s business plan, then consider this quote attributed to Ross Perot (n.d.): “Business is not just doing deals; business is having great products, doing great engineering, and providing tremendous service to customers. Finally, business is a cobweb of human relationships.” Although funds are available to support international research, PUI grant success is dependent upon how effective the institution is at building their web of human relationships. So, if research is your business, get out there and start building!

Mark Roltsch, Ph.D., is Executive Director of the Office of Academic Research and Sponsored Projects and a faculty member in the Department of Exercise and Sport Science at St. Mary’s University. San Antonio, Texas. Previous positions include Peer Review Administrator at NASA and Scientific Review Officer at the National Heart Lung and Blood Institute. He can be reached at mroltsch@stmarytx.edu

Steven M. Gerardi, MS, is a Visiting Instructor in the Department of Exercise and Sport Science at St. Mary’s University. He retired from the U.S. Army after a 30 year career; having gained international experience in Germany, Honduras, Iraq, Korea, and Kosovo. He can be reached at sgerardi@stmarytx.edu
Academia is where more than 60% of the basic research in the United States is performed. Forty of the world’s top fifty research universities are in the U.S., and U.S. researchers are responsible for more publications in top scientific journals than researchers of any other nation, accounting for nearly half of the top one percent of the most cited scientific papers. Still, there is a significant trend of internationalizing scientific research. In 2000, only 25 percent of the U.S. research articles had an international co-author; today that number is 33 percent. Researchers are increasingly mobile, traveling long distances to work with the best colleagues in their fields. They are being supported internationally through cross-border funding from international organizations, multilateral initiatives between governments and research councils, multinational funding bodies, and shared scientific infrastructure. This trend acknowledges that international, multidisciplinary collaborations are needed to solve global challenges such as climate change, biodiversity, food and water security, energy, and potential pandemics. For research administrators, this means dealing with an increasingly complex level of issues to facilitate inter-institutional research collaborations.

Collaborating across borders goes beyond geography. Other barriers come into play, such as resources, time zones, culture, and language. When I moved to the United States from Australia, 28 years ago, my phone calls home cost $1.21 per minute. I would talk to my mother once a month for an hour. I wrote a lot of letters back then – pen on paper letters that took two weeks by air-mail to reach my family. Ironically, one of my U.S.-born adult children went to Scotland for his undergraduate education, and then to Australia to attend graduate school and where he now lives, 9,679 miles and eleven time zones away! He’s a night owl so the time difference isn’t a barrier for us. We talk via Skype for as long as we like, as often as we like, for the price of internet service, so there are few resource barriers. He and his sister (who lives in the U.S.) are collaborating on Skype to create an on-line game design business. When they want input from their friends from around the world, Skype, Face Time, Facebook, Twitter, and e-mail are their tools. They all speak the same language (and I’m not just talking about Scottish/American/Australian/British English!). How “Jetsons-like” we have become.

Some borders still exist in our own backyards. One might argue that a border exists between researchers and research administrators, and that crossing that border requires special communication skills. When you consider resources, time zones, culture, and language, the contrasts of our worlds are quite jarring. Faculty conduct research and teach the next generation; administrators manage and carry out the operations of our complex organizations. Faculty are in a world of labs with specialized research equipment, computers for data analysis and modeling, research centers for specialized populations, clinical resources, animal research facilities, etc. Research administrators wrestle with the nuances of laws and regulations, cost principles, administrative requirements, audits and compliance, IRBs, IACUCs, grants, contracts, the Code of Federal Regulations, and the FAR.

How do faculty and research administrators collaborate when our cultures are so different? I suggest that if you want to connect with people, you have to get to know them better. Like any relationship, those between faculty and research administrators need nurturing. The more comfortable and confident faculty are with your competence, the more likely they will be to engage with you in the grant application process. Sometimes the research field is quite accessible, particularly in social science, and getting to know something about your faculty’s research will help you appreciate administrative difficulties they may encounter for which you are the best qualified person to address. Ultimately you help your institution when you un-
derstand your faculty members’ research because you can be more effective at matching funding opportunities with their interests, at helping them build budgets that make sense, and at matching researchers with others with whom they might collaborate.

Let me share a story which I think illustrates how knowing about a faculty member’s research can be useful. Recently, during a pre-award consultation with a faculty member, I asked him to describe his vision for his project, and was fascinated to learn how he planned to use cell phones to capture information about the behavior of people when they were in risky environments. I thought his idea was brilliant, and asked “How are you going to do that?” to which he replied, “I don’t know yet. I’ll have to find a really clever programmer.” Serendipitously, a few days later while I was visiting colleges with my daughter, I learned, during a presentation on links between cognitive science and computer science, of three alumni who had developed new cell phone technology that allows for automated, individual text messaging conversations. I saw the potential of a partnership, and was able to link these researchers with a few quick emails on my smart phone before I had even left the campus. I made the connection because I had asked about the research, and that faculty member now knows that I am invested in helping him succeed.

All this is well and good when the news you are conveying is positive. What about when you have to deliver bad news? Robert Bies offers ten best practices:

- There should be no surprises — warn your audience of what is coming.
- Don’t delay sharing the news, thinking it will improve — it might get worse!
- Be truthful — don’t hide the facts.
- Keep an accurate, written record of what led to the problem.
- Explain why are you telling them bad news?
- Find a silver lining — this will help with morale and productivity.
- Present a solution or an action plan for how you’re going to solve the problem.
- Inform all stakeholders when you deliver the message.
- Track the progress of the solution and let everyone know the problem has been solved.
- Treat people with dignity and respect.

I had cause to employ these practices when the new Conflict Of Interest (COI) regulations went into effect a few weeks before the September 7, 2012 AIDS deadline. Our investigators were, in actuality, the institution’s “guinea pigs” as the new process was rolled out. My role was that of liaison between the sponsored research office, COI office, anxious investigators and their U.S. and foreign collaborators. Our sponsored research office and COI office gave us unswerving support through this tense period, and we submitted all the applications on time and in compliance (including a certain P30 Center renewal grant application!). The trust I had established with our faculty stood me in good stead in guiding them through the process, explaining the forms, tracking their responses, keeping them informed of updates, and sympathizing with what they saw as just another piece of red tape in the bureaucracy.

Recently, one of our Russian collaborators was visiting our Center. In a sidebar conversation with me, she admitted that she and her colleagues really didn’t understand what they were signing when we asked them to sign our sub-recipient information and compliance form. We sat down together for the next thirty minutes and talked about F&A rates, fringe rates, conflict of interest policies, debarment and suspension, audits, and the final declaration of the form that reads “The appropriate programmatic and administrative personnel involved in this application are aware of agency policy in regard to sub-awards and are prepared to establish the necessary inter-institutional agreement consistent with those policies….” Not only was this enlightening to her, it was a useful exercise for me to check in with myself and make sure I truly understood what we were asking of these researchers whose primary language is not English.

I consider myself fortunate to be working in a Center where faculty research contributes to the prevention and care of HIV/AIDS. Our Center hosts faculty seminars, organizes peer reviews of grant proposals and manuscripts, and disseminates research findings. I have ample opportunities to develop some understanding of their research, although I admit that until recently, when researchers discussed the methods they employed to analyze the data, I zoned out. Since taking courses on biostatistics and research design and methods,1 I now know the significance (pun intended) of a p-value and have a much deeper appreciation of our faculty’s successes as well as the roadblocks they encounter. Stephen Covey recommends that we “Seek first to understand, then to be understood”. We need good strategies for understanding our faculty’s research and needs that match our internal capabilities. We may not have much authority, so our leadership approach needs to be tailored to the situation. We must be able to build teams internally as well as negotiate — both internally and with our faculty. We can be a source of innovation, generating new ideas for new processes and services, and become indispensable to faculty, keeping them informed of what is relevant to them. Embrace your administrator-faculty relationships to successfully support what is certainly a future of complex, intra- and inter-institutional collaborations.

1 A shameless advertisement for Rush University’s Master’s Degree Program in Research Administration
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When I was a scientist doing research in evolutionary biology, I never thought of myself as an exporter. An exporter was a person like Art Vandelay, Elaine’s fake boyfriend on the TV show *Seinfeld* who imported chips and exported diapers, or a company like Sony that manufactured TVs to sell to consumers in other countries. I thought of myself as a researcher. After all, I spent my time studying the mechanisms of flowering in plants with the help of a Japanese graduate student and a German postdoc. As a departmental research administrator (DRA), I now work closely with scientists and engineers every day. They may not think of themselves as exporters either, but almost all of them are. According to data from the National Science Foundation, in 2011, 30% of full-time graduate students and 53% of postdocs in science and engineering were foreign nationals with temporary visas (1, 2). And according to federal regulations, exports include communication with a foreign person (3, 4) —this is referred to as a ‘deemed export.’ Thus, given how many researchers are from abroad and in the U.S. on visas, sharing of data among researchers is very likely to be a deemed export. Whether these deemed exports or any other aspects of the research in the department where I work are subject to export controls depends on many factors. As a DRA, my proximity to the researchers and to their work puts me in a unique position to identify potential export control issues.

The purpose of this article is to give DRAs an overview of the export control landscape so that you can use your proximity to research and researchers to identify potential export control issues. The first step for any DRA is to understand the definition of exports and to get an overview of export controls as they relate to the scientists and engineers that you work alongside. Next, it is important to be aware of the common exclusions from export controls. Finally, armed with your new knowledge, you can implement best practices as you encounter issues or situations that may be subject to export controls.

What is an Export?

An export is a transfer of technology, information, equipment, software, or services to a foreign person by any means. A foreign person is defined as anyone who is not a U.S. citizen or permanent resident or who is not a protected individual (such as someone who has been granted asylum or refugee status) (4). Exports include the actual transfer of one of these items outside the U.S., which is what most of us think of when we think of an export. However, exports also include making any of these items available for visual inspection, written or oral disclosures about the items, and electronic communication about the items (3) —this is what is referred to as a deemed export. Given the definition of exports above, and the fact that as many as half of the researchers in science and engineering are temporary visa holders, it is likely that deemed exports are occurring frequently in the departments where you work.

What are Export Controls?

Export controls is a broad term applied to U.S. laws that regulate the distribution of strategically important technology, services, and information for reasons of national security, foreign policy, and economic objectives. Export controls are the law, and they apply not just to sponsored research but to all activities. Many government regulatory agencies are involved in export controls, such as the Department of the Interior, which manages fish and wildlife controls and endangered species, and the Food and Drug Administration, which manages medical devices (5). There are three principal agencies with export control responsibilities that most frequently impact university research: the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of the Treasury. When determining if an item is subject to export control, start by determining
Export Controls Administered by the Department of State: ITAR

The Department of State, through the Directorate of Defense Trade Controls, regulates the export of defense articles and defense services for the purpose of safeguarding U.S. national security and furthering U.S. foreign policy objectives. The regulated defense articles and defense services can be found on the United States Munitions List (USML), which is part of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR). Defense articles include technical data relating to items on the USML (4), and defense services include providing assistance or training in the “design, development, engineering, manufacture, production, assembly, testing, repair, maintenance, modification, operation, demilitarization, destruction, processing or use” of defense articles (4). If your item is not specifically enumerated on the USML, you can conclude that it is not subject to ITAR and proceed to determine if it is subject to Commerce control.

Export Controls Administered by the Department of Commerce: EAR

The Department of Commerce, through the Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS), regulates the export of dual use items under the Export Administration Regulations (EAR). Their mission includes not only supporting U.S. national security and foreign policy objectives, but also ensuring the health of the U.S. economy and the competitiveness of U.S. industry. Items subject to BIS control are listed in the Commerce Control List (CCL). These items on the CCL include systems, equipment, components, materials, software, and technology. Technology is defined as information necessary for the development, production, and use of an item on the CCL and includes technical data (6). Each item on the CCL has an Export Control Classification Number (ECCN) that is used to determine export license requirements and eligibility for exceptions to those requirements. Items that are not on the CCL are designated as EAR99 and do not require a license to export. However, EAR99 items are still subject to restrictions by the Department of the Treasury.

Export Controls Administered by the Department of Treasury: OFAC

The Department of the Treasury, through the Office of Foreign Asset Controls (OFAC), administers and enforces economic and trade sanctions against targeted foreign governments, individuals, entities, and practices. OFAC sanctions programs are in place to accomplish foreign policy and national security goals, and they prohibit providing products or services to sanctioned countries, individuals, or entities without a license. OFAC administers a number of different sanctions programs, which can be either comprehensive or selective, and either by country or by activity. Examples of comprehensive country sanctions programs are those against Syria, Iran, and Cuba. Examples of selective activity-based sanctions programs are counter terrorism sanctions, counter narcotics sanctions, and nuclear non-proliferation sanctions. A list of all sanctions programs can be found at (see 1 below) under the resources tab. Transactions with sanctioned countries, individuals, or entities require a specific license or exemption from OFAC. In addition to sanctions programs, OFAC also maintains a list of individuals and entities, called “Specially Designated Nationals” or “SDNs,” who are operating with or on behalf of controlled countries or who are participating in controlled activities. The assets of SDNs are blocked and U.S. persons are generally prohibited from dealing with them. A list of SDNs, which is updated frequently, can be found here (see 2 below) There are no licenses or exceptions available for dealings with SDNs.

By this point, you may be getting worried that your department has a major export control issue. After all, the research going on in your department involves lots of technology, information, equipment, and software, and you've never looked at any of these lists to see if any of it is controlled. Plus, you know there are a lot of folks working with these items and sharing this information who are not U.S. citizens, permanent residents or protected individuals. Don't panic. There are many exclusions from export controls and most likely the research that is going on in your department falls under one of them.

Exclusions from Export Controls

Information is not subject to export controls under ITAR and EAR if it results from fundamental research (3,4), is available in the public domain (4), or is educational information (5,4). It is important to note that fundamental research, public domain, and education exclusions apply only to the transfer of research data and information to foreign persons, not to the transfer of material goods abroad. In the absence of one of these exclusions, a license must be obtained from the Department of the Treasury, the Department of State, and/or the Department of Commerce to share controlled technical information. In general, universities rely on the exclusions above for exports of information.

It is also important to note slight differences in the definitions of public domain and fundamental research under the ITAR versus the EAR. The definition of public domain under ITAR includes only release at an open gathering in the U.S. (such as a conference, meeting, seminar, or trade show), whereas the definition of public domain under EAR includes open gatherings abroad. The definition of fundamental research under ITAR requires that there be no restrictions on publication of the research and that there be no restrictions on the participation of foreign nationals in the research (4). In contrast, under EAR, if research qualifies as fundamental (5), then certain specific national security controls on the research can be accepted (such as pre-publication review and approval of foreign nationals), the research is still considered fundamental, and information can be exported without violating export controls (7).

There are exemptions to license requirements under OFAC that are applicable to universities. Information already in the public domain can be exported to OFAC countries, and activities in support of publishing (such as aca-

---

1. http://www.treasury.gov/offices/enforcement/ofac
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### Best Practices for DRAs

The university where you work most likely has policies and procedures in place at a central level to comply with export controls, yet as a Dra you are in a unique position with regards to export controls. As the ones who are often closest to research and the researchers, we can be the first to become aware of potential export control issues. Below are some of the most common areas of risk which require special attention. If you come across a potential export control issue in one of these areas, work with others at your university to make sure that you stay in compliance.

### Foreign Travel:

DRAs are more likely to know about planned travel by researchers than someone in the central office. If one of the researchers you work with is planning a trip abroad, find out if he or she plans to carry any research devices or equipment on the trip, as these items may be subject to license requirements. You might also want to find out if any unpublished data is being taken on the trip, for example on the hard drive of a laptop, as this could potentially be subject to export controls.

### Shipping of Material Goods Abroad:

Sometimes researchers traveling to another country prefer to ship research devices or equipment rather than hand carry them. Or the researchers may want to share items with foreign collaborators outside of a planned trip. If you find out one of the researchers you work with is shipping items abroad, you should connect them with the appropriate export control compliance officers. Although export of goods abroad is always subject to export control, there are many license exemptions available under the EAR (8) and very few under ITAR (9).

### Working with Industry:

With the current federal funding landscape, research sponsored by industry is becoming more common. The exclusion from export controls for fundamental research is nullified if an agreement with a company includes restrictions on publication of the data, or restrictions on who can work on the project. It is also nullified if a researcher makes a ‘side deal’ to restrict publication or access, and as a Dra, you are the one who may spot such a side deal that could threaten the fundamental research exclusion. Another issue to remember when working with Industry is that the fundamental research exclusion does not apply to research conducted by a company. So if you have an award with a subcontract to an industry collaborator, there could be export control issues, even if the university’s research is fundamental.

### International Collaborations:

Working with collaborators in other countries is likely to involve foreign travel and may also involve shipping of material goods.

Looking back on my time as a researcher, I now know that I was an exporter. Any time I shared my data with the Japanese graduate student and German postdoc, I was effectively exporting the data to their home countries — a deemed export. However, my research was not subject to export controls. As fundamental research, it was excluded from regulation by the Commerce Department or the State Department, and since my work did not involve travel to, or interaction with, persons in sanctioned countries such as Cuba, Iran, or North Korea, it was also excluded from regulation by the Treasury Department. Although I was not aware of any of the export control implications of my research at the time, there was probably a Dra who was.

### Summary

An export is a transfer of technology, information, equipment, software, or services by any means to anyone who is not a U.S. citizen, a permanent resident, or a protected individual. Export controls are the law, and they apply to not only sponsored research but to all activities. Export controls that most frequently impact sponsored research are the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR), the Export Administration Regulations (EAR), and sanctions programs. The transfer of information is not subject to export controls if it results from fundamental research, is available in the public domain, or is educational information. Exporting material goods abroad is always subject to export controls, but not all material goods will require a license to export. DRAs are well positioned to identify potential risk around activities such as foreign travel, shipping, working with industry, and international collaborations.
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We are pleased to report that development of the FRA conference program is nearly finished. Track leaders have engaged thought leaders and innovators to create an amazing program! Not only will the ongoing issues of post-award administration be addressed, but the program will do so in the context of the current research environment. Rapid, unplanned changes in the federal government have impacted us all. Foundations and corporate-sponsored research have added unique requirements. International research has added the complexity of an unfamiliar vernacular and program requirements. Innovative strategies, new tools and techniques will be offered and allow us to employ the best solutions for seemingly insurmountable challenges – the possible!

Track leaders have recruited stellar research administrators to present workshops, concurrent sessions and moderate discussion groups. Each will share best practices that can be easily transferred to other institutions. FRA conference attendees will return to their home institutions with the tools to be more effective in their positions while improving relationships with the many customers in sponsored research. Our collective goal is to give attendees the ability to develop professionally, expand professional networks, and learn from the experiences of others. Home institutions which support professional development will gain by the implementation of ideas and improvements gleaned from the ideas and key points learned at FRA. Now is the time to request travel authorization – the practical!

Some highlights from the FRA 2014 program are a three part series on a real audit experience where both the agency and university perspectives are presented, a live contract negotiation, how the impending A-81 OMNI circular will impact our business and the ins and outs of F&A, from which method to use, to planning and negotiating. We are so happy to have Kimberly Pace as the keynote speaker. We will all benefit from her expertise on developing our Executive AURA!

There is never a situation that is unique to one individual or institution; these issues usually impact us all in some way. FRA 2014 will offer many new resources that are only a few keystrokes away. We challenge each of you to identify one thing to bring back to your organization which will improve operations. Share this knowledge with stakeholders at your institution – turn the possible into the practical!

In research administration, we must innovate at the rate of scientific advancement if we are to be effective in supporting research. Collaboration is equally important for those in research administration. Learn about the best practices of others and make them better by attending the FRA meeting. We look forward to seeing you in San Francisco!
A little about myself, mostly as a University Research Administrator (URA):

My career as a URA is short. In the fall of 2011, I started as a grant proposal editor for a particular grant program at a private university. I really liked the job, and they seemed to be happy with my performance, so I was hired for a longer term. I enjoyed interacting with faculty and researchers, and wanted to do more for them. Then I found a posting for a “research administrator” position at Kyoto University, which became my current profession in January 2013.

My primary responsibility is still proposal editing, but I also help with organizing symposiums, do information gathering and analyses, support contract negotiations, edit journal manuscripts, and … pretty much anything as requested. This is because URA’s are quite new in Japan and people don’t know what to expect of us. Therefore, I am in the process of building experience and trust between URA’s and researchers, and I believe most, if not all, of my colleagues in this country are doing the same.

In my free time, I try to take advantage of living in Kyoto, the city filled with traditional beauty of Japan. I visit temples and shrines and walk or bike around the back streets of the city. I also started to learn how to wear kimono, traditional Japanese clothing. Once I master this to some extent, I will try other traditional cultural activities, such as tea ceremony and incense burning.

Japan’s research overview and its direction:

Being scarce in marketable natural resources, Japan has been geared toward establishing itself upon science and technology. In 1996, Basic Act on Science and Technology was enacted. Its basic principle is to raise Japan’s standard of science and technology, through which we promote our economic growth and welfare in addition to contributing to the global advancement of science and technology and sustainable development. Every five years since, a Science and Technology Basic Plan is formulated, based on which individual programs are proposed and implemented.

The first (1996-2000) and the second (2001-2005) Basic Plans expanded the government investment in research and development, promoting basic research and strategically prioritizing funds for R&D addressing national and social issues. They also expanded competitive funds and restructured national universities and research institutions. The third (2006-2010) Basic Plan stressed on more strategic implementation of R&D, while reserving room for research diversity and independent basic research. It set eight prioritized areas of study: Life science, information communication technology (ICT), environment, nano-tech/material, energy, manufacturing technology, social infrastructure, and frontier science.

Delivery of the fourth Science and Technology Basic Plan (2011-2015) was delayed due to the great east Japan earthquake. Recovery from the disaster is the top priority, but it also raised awareness of global issues. In addition, the word “innovation” is taking the center stage. Strategic systems are to be established, and government-industry-academia networking is strengthened, in order to spur innovation. The two fields of special emphasis are “green” (energy supply, conservation, and infrastructure) and “life” (prevention, early diagnosis, and treatment of diseases, and quality of life improvement for the sick, elderly, and disabled).

Other policies worth mentioning for the readers of this magazine are 1) The reinforcement and promotion of research universities and 2) The support for internationalization of universities.
The former mandates active involvement of URAs, which should help establish our standing. The latter promotes international research collaborations and invites researchers, instructors, and students from overseas, as well as sending abroad Japanese researchers, instructors, and students. It means that WE, including YOU, have greater chances to work together!

With this in scope, in the future articles, I would like to introduce what Japanese URAs do and discuss how we can collaborate. In the next article, I will report on the 3rd URA Symposium and the 5th RA Study Group Meeting which will be jointly held on November 18-19 at Kyoto University. There, URAs from all over Japan will gather and discuss the formation of a national URA network.

From Rock Hound to Cat Herder/Research Administrator - University Research Administration in Europe

By Olaf Svenningsen,
Global Contributing Editor, Europe

Originally trained as a scientist with a Ph.D. in geology from Lund University in Sweden, my knowledge of extremely slow moving and unstoppable tectonic forces and sudden, unexpected natural disasters has turned out to be somewhat appropriate in my role as a research administrator, too. My subduction into research administration began in 2000, when I was employed by the NSF to be the office manager of the NSF-MARGINS Program, that office being located at Columbia University in New York. In 2003, I moved back to my native Sweden, to Uppsala University, and the job of setting up a grants office, a new feature for that institution. In 2009, I moved to Denmark and the University of Southern Denmark (SDU) in Odense, the birth town of the storyteller Hans Christian Andersen. Here, I am head of a small research support office, providing service primarily to SDU’s Faculty of Health Sciences and the hospital-based research in the Region of Southern Denmark. In addition, I am presently interim chair of DARMA, the Danish Association of Research Managers and Administrators, and member of the board of its European sister organization, EARMA.

I still retain some geology activities, and enjoy hiking in the arctic wilderness of the Sarek Mountains in northernmost Sweden, where I also did the fieldwork for my Ph.D. thesis. Denmark, on the other side, is pleasantly flat and absolutely mountain-free (the “Funen Alps” just south of Odense are ironically named, gently rolling, low hills), so as often as we can, my wife and I get out on our custom-built touring tandem bike, enjoying the scenic and very pretty countryside. Tandem biking is also the ultimate test of trust and collaboration skills.

Research in Europe reflects some major political trends, as well as the region’s heterogeneity. While Europe has a long, proud history of scientific discovery and breakthrough, there are concerns about competitiveness. “Brain drain” to the US is a concern as well as the growing competition from the emerging economies in for e.g. the BRIC countries. Making all the different ends meet is challenging: The European Union consists of 28 independent countries, each with its own history and traditions, not least when it comes to academic traditions and research systems. In addition there are the so-called Associated Countries – non-EU member states like Norway and Switzerland (the US is also an “AC”) – shaping a complex situation. Imagine that each state in the US would have its own, completely and fiercely independent academic tradition and funding system, and you get an idea of the European research landscape. Each country has its own public funding agencies, roughly equivalent to the NIH and the NSF, but also a wildly varying plethora of private or semi-private foundations and charities, each with their own rules and expectations. Research administration is often compared to herding cats, and such complex settings make the challenge… let’s call it “interesting”.

The EU’s Commission (EC) – the executive body or administration of the EU – is the major player in European cross-national research funding. EU’s research funding does not operate through regular funding agencies à la NIH or NSF. Instead, it is organized into time-limited, so called “Framework Programs” (FP). These FP’s have had a major impact, transforming European research funding – also at the national level – over the past decades. The thing of the moment is the launch in January 2014 of the 8th Framework Program for Research and Innovation, called Horizon 2020 that will run until 2020. With an estimated budget of c. €70 billion (c. $95 billion), Horizon 2020 is one of the biggest research funding programs ever.

It is my ambition to contribute articles to NCURA Magazine that explore and explain this European situation – the EU and national perspectives – with a Trans-Atlantic or American angle.

Olaf M. Svenningsen, Ph.D.,
Head of Southern Denmark Research Support at The University of Southern Denmark (SDU) and the Region of Southern Denmark. Olaf’s primary responsibilities at SDU are pre-award activities, including strategy and systems development and implementation. Olaf is presently interim chair of DARMA, the Danish Association for Research Managers and Administrators, and board member at its European sister organization, EARMA. He can be reached at osvenningsen@health.sdu.dk

Looking for new directions from the Vuoinestjåhkkå Ridge while hiking in the Sarek National park in Lapland, northernmost Sweden.
University Research Administration in Canada

By Martin Kirk, Global Contributing Editor, Canada

Research and research administration in Canada is an interesting, challenging business and we have a lot in common with you, our US colleagues!

On the research front, Canada may be small in relative output but produces top quality research as part of the global innovation capacity. We have 3 universities amongst the top 40 in the Times Higher Education (THE) World University Rankings.

CAURA (The Canadian Association of University Research Administrators) is your sister association that represents the research administration profession in Canada, and we have around 830 members across the country. We have over 40 years of history as an association and provide many of the services (conferences, networking and professional development) that NCURA provides its members.

In working more closely with NCURA in the future we hope we can reach out and partner for the benefit of the profession in North America and beyond! The co-sponsoring of INORMS in Washington, DC in 2014 is a very valuable partnership and will benefit our sister organizations and their members around the globe. We have much to learn from each other!

There are a number of hot topics I’d like to explore over the coming year including:

- The evolving global innovation strategy and the part Canada is playing – The global innovation strategy seems to be tilting away from the focus on university spin-off towards enhanced industry partnership and knowledge mobilization. We know university based research is important but we still don’t seem to know the best way to “capture or measure the return on investment”.

- Important new and evolving research policies: open access, data management planning, etc. – We are all slaves to the ever changing compliance landscape and trying to protect researcher productivity. How to maintain compliance and provide frictionless administration in an evolving compliance landscape is the million dollar question!

- Research Metrics - Research impact, research administration metrics (efficiency, capacity, etc.). We live in a world of endless assessment. We have STAR Metrics, Snowball, REF, ERA, THE, QS, SciVal, InCites and many other assessment systems and tools. What does it all mean, how do we measure success, and what key performance indicators make sense?

- Research administration as a career… comparing CAURA survey to global data — Simon Kerr in Melbourne, Australia carried out a neat study on the state of the profession. CAURA is now in the process of carrying out a parallel survey to look closely at the profession in Canada and compare with Australia and hopefully the US.

- Research administration (IT) systems… How they help us become more efficient and compliant –Deploying state-of-the-art systems to track research funding and compliance is vital to maintain efficiency, but it is a risky and expensive business. There are many products to choose from. What are the best approaches to planning a system and how do we avoid wasting time and money and even failed system implementation?

- Indirect Cost of Research (ICR)… How long can we continue to subsidize research that does not come with ICR funds and how the rates of ICR funding vary across the globe? How do we assess the true cost of research and what is the best practice in tracking and recovering ICR?

Martin Kirk, Ph.D., is currently president of the Canadian Association of University Administrators (CAURA) and director of the office of research services at The University of British Columbia in Vancouver. Prior to working at UBC, Martin was associate VP research at the University of Calgary. He is a graduate of Heriot-Watt University in Edinburgh (BSc in chemistry) and University of Calgary (PhD in applied chemistry-1989). Martin worked in research in industry before embarking on a career in research administration in 1999. Martin enjoys sailing, biking, golfing, travelling, photography and skiing, and can be reached at Martin.Kirk@ors.ubc.ca
“Research Across Borders” – the theme of this month’s *NCURA Magazine* perfectly matches the objectives of BILAT USA 2.0 – a project funded by the European Union, Directorate General for Research and Innovation. It is well-documented fact that international cooperation in research and innovation has the potential to multiply the return on investment gained from only domestic public expenditure. Therefore, with the overall objective of facilitating research and innovation cooperation between US and European scientists and innovators, BILAT USA 2.0 functions as a ‘flexible instrument’ responding to the needs of (a) Researchers, (b) Research managers, and (c) Policy-makers.

The project’s thematic direction is oriented towards the EU-US Science & Technology Agreement that determines four priority areas for cooperation – namely Marine and Arctic Science, Health research, Transport & Nanosciences, Nanotechnologies, Materials and new Production Technologies (NMP). Up to now, BILAT USA 2.0 has been involved in two major events in Galway and Rome related to the newly launched Transatlantic Research Alliance and BILAT USA 2.0 has organized a first ‘thematic workshop’ in the area of NMP inviting European and US nano-scientists and materials-researchers. By bringing researchers of one specific area from both sides of the Atlantic together and giving them room for discussion, it is intended to increase the number of international research cooperation projects. At the same time European funding opportunities and possibilities for US researchers within Horizon 2020, the new European Framework Programme for Research and Innovation that is planned to be launched still in 2013.

BILAT USA 2.0 further organizes targeted events for research managers and multipliers within the USA explaining legal and financial specificities of upcoming Horizon 2020 as well as giving an overview of programs and open calls. In the aftermath of this year’s NCURA Annual Meeting, a start has been made by organizing a very practical workshop in Washington providing detailed information about developments in Horizon 2020 and changes in programs frequently used by US-scientists, e.g. Marie-Curie Actions or the European Research Council (ERC).

Within the next two years the project will organize thematic workshops in its priority areas as well as Horizon 2020 awareness raising activities for US-researchers and research managers. BILAT USA 2.0 events will be announced on the project’s website.

Visit us: www.euusscienceandtechnology.eu

---

**IN MEMORIAM**

After a brief illness, NCURA Past President Cheryl-Lee Howard passed away on November 10, 2013, with her family at her bedside. Howard, Assistant Provost for Research Administration at the Johns Hopkins University, was a member of NCURA for over thirty years and during that time held a number of positions within the organization.

At the Regional level of NCURA, Cheryl-Lee was elected and served as Treasurer for both Regions I and II and served on numerous committees. Nationally she was elected and served as Treasurer, Vice President, President, and Immediate Past President. Over the years, Cheryl chaired or served on a number of NCURA committees including the Board of Directors, Executive Committee, Finance, Nominating & Leadership Development Committee, and Professional Development Committee. Known as a mentor and teacher to many research administrators, she was part of the Leadership Team during NCURA’s launch of the Leadership Development Institute. She was the co-chair of the inaugural University/Industry Collaboration national conference, the forerunner of the UIDP and also a springboard for NCURA’s global activities. She was a faculty for NCURA’s traveling workshop Sponsored Projects Administration Level II: Critical Issues in Research Administration, and appeared on NCURA TV along with countless Annual Meeting and national conference panels and workshops. She was a co-author in the first edition of NCURA’s *The Role of Research Administration*. In 2003, she was one of five individuals to receive a special commendation from the NCURA Board of Directors for her role in the strategic direction and redesign of NCURA’s governance; a four year project that took place, in part, during her vice presidency and presidency. She received the Distinguished Service Award in 2004 and in 2008 NCURA bestowed its highest honor to her, the Award for Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration.

She is survived by her husband Jim, daughter Alyssa and her husband Vincent and their sons Vincent and Zachary. The family has requested memorial donations may be made to the American Cancer Society, 8219 Town Center Drive Nottingham, MD 21236.

https://donate.cancer.org/index?campaign=legacy&dn=mem&fn=Cheryl&ln=Howard
The Science of Team Science:

Understanding the Federal Government’s Influence on Research Collaboration

Scientific collaborations can be as simple as sharing ideas over coffee; they can be as complex as the Human Genome Project, Large Hadron Collider, and the International Space Station. These collaborations are strikingly more prevalent today than they were decades ago (Wuchty, 2007). The increased emphasis on collaborative research has been augmented by major federal funding support for researchers and institutions seeking to expand their network.

By Andrew Steil and Linda Samson
To capitalize on these initiatives, many institutions have begun to encourage their faculty and staff to work in a more integrative fashion in recognition that teams are more likely to have a faster and fuller impact than independent researchers. The practice of team science, and the factors contributing to its success, should be of interest whether you are an institutional administrator interested in facilitating collaboration among research faculty or a senior investigator with a track record of obtaining large federal funding grants.

Trend Toward Research Collaboration

Collaborative research is not a new concept and has been historically associated with two or more researchers from the same discipline at the same institution. The ability to share a common language and methodological approach made it more appealing for faculty and staff to conduct research, especially when additional duties were required by the institution. This view has changed in our present environment as more team-based research projects recognize the value in multiple disciplines addressing more complex problems facing our scientific and societal communities. The structure can range across three levels of collaboration:

1. Multidisciplinary: Team members look at the project from the view of their own specific discipline
2. Interdisciplinary: The knowledge and methods from more than one discipline are combined to solve the problem
3. Transdisciplinary: The research strategy crosses many disciplinary boundaries to create a holistic approach

Each of these contributes to inter-professional collaboration, where two or more disciplines learn from one another to share a common meaning to their problem-solving actions. These efforts are often viewed as the application of team science: collaborative approaches are used to answer research questions about particular phenomena.

The Science of Team Science

The field of inquiry into the science behind team science is based on an understanding of how collaborations work and the methods that are used. Researchers investigating the science of team science may identify approaches to facilitate the formation and functioning of successful collaborative science teams, remove inter-institutional barriers to team science, support effective collaboration among researchers working together within a team, and develop team science training pro-

grams (Fiore, 2008; Stokols, Taylor, Moser, 2008; Bennett, Gadlin, Levine-Finley, 2010). As the field of team science emerges, one of the challenges is the vast disparity in the units of measurement of collaborations. Some of the disparity comes from variation in disciplinary composition, size of the team, organizational complexity, and geographic scope. Additional disparity emerges from the overall goals of the teams, some focused on education, others on service delivery, and additional teams building research collaborations (Stokols, Taylor, Moser, 2008).

Characteristics of an Effective Team

- Effective leadership and management skills
- Self-awareness and team awareness
- Trust is established among team members
- Strategies developed for communicating openly
- Effective building of a team, including setting shared expectations and defining roles and responsibilities
- Creating, sharing, and revisiting a shared vision
- Making provisions for appropriate recognition and credit
- Promoting disagreement while containing conflict
- Enjoying the science and the work together

Depending on the size, complexity, and goal of the research, the following steps should be considered in the development of collaborative research partnerships:

1. Plan: Build successful relationships well in advance of any Request for Proposal (RFP) deadlines
2. Integrate: Peer review members at the Office of Extramural Research can easily tell when people have been placed on a team and not integrated into it. Do not include researchers just to check off grant requirements
3. Scrutinize: Agencies tend to fund proposals including senior investigators with an established record
4. Simplify: Resist the urge to be expansive. If you include all possible collaborators you will create a bloated, unproductive team

New Image for Sponsored Research Collaboration

Until recently, many research institutions have had little incentive to move outside their comfort zone of basic research to explore and advance discoveries in clinical application (Portilla, Evans, Eng, Fadem, 2010). For example, although basic biomedical research has shown great strides in understanding disease mechanisms, there have not been commensurate gains in new disease treatments, diagnostics, and preventative strategies. This issue is commonly addressed through the establishment of research alliances among various groups with different strengths and viewpoints who seek to achieve the goal of translating basic biomedical research into improved clinical medicine. The widening gap between basic and clinical research, a major barrier to progress sometimes known as ‘the valley of death,’ helped carve the way for many of today’s federal decision making models and funding regimens.

Over the past decade, the demand for the commercialization of research discoveries has greatly incentivized scientific collaboration. While basic biomedical research still makes up a large portion of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) portfolio, many investigators have recently found cuts to the availability of these funding opportunities. Instead, the agency has developed a preference for projects with the shortest timelines for creating vaccines and other clinical applications; an approach that is best executed through collaborative endeavors. Spearheading this effort are 60 Clinical and Translational Science Centers (CTSCs) at universities and academic health centers across the country. One of the most successful examples of this practice is led by the University of California, Davis. The CTSA Pharmaceutical Assets Portal aims to find, through industry-academic collaborations, new uses for compounds whose commercial development is no longer being developed by pharmaceutical companies (Marusina, Welsch, Rose, Brock,
Bahr, 2012). These findings can often be repurposed for other diagnoses, such as the treatment of rare disease.

The NIH, which had not actively pursued or funded collaborative research until the early 2000s, is behind the National Science Foundation (NSF) in funding interdisciplinary research. NSF has been refining various models, including the Engineering Research Centers, since the mid-1980s. More recently, the agency launched Science and Technology Centers and the Industry and University Cooperative Research Program to spur the momentum of scientific collaboration. In a move to match NSF’s efforts, NIH has made several substantial investments in collaborative research opportunities over the past decade. The Roadmap for Medical Research, released in 2003, was created to identify major opportunities and gaps in biomedical research that no single institute at NIH could tackle alone. The roadmap seeks to support both individual creativity and collaborative team efforts by supporting interdisciplinary research, high-risk research, and public-private partnerships (NIH Roadmap). Other measures, such as the creation of the multiple principal investigator (PI) function in 2007, have been taken to ensure the viability of team science initiatives.

Many agencies are increasingly structuring requests for proposals to favor the involvement of interdisciplinary teams. The NIH and NSF both have plans in place to support projects that ask for researchers in different disciplines to work together. For example, NIH Program Project/Center Grants (P-Series) fund investigators who are working on related projects that draw on shared resources. Most research administrators are also familiar with NSF’s collaborative research awards, which competitively fund several grantees under one award. These are awarded either as one proposal, in which a single award is being requested by a lead organization and collaborative institutions (non-leads) serve as subawardees or as simultaneous submission of proposals from different organizations requesting separate awards. The collaborative requirements of these proposals often fall to the sponsored research office because of the great deal of work required behind the scenes with colleagues at non-lead institutions.

**Conclusion**

Undoubtedly collaborative research will continue to evolve and become more valuable to our research institutions. Key stakeholders must start down the collaborative path today to understand how these resources can drive their organization’s desired outcomes in the future. So, the question then becomes—where should leaders start? Have you given your researchers and staff the tools they need to create a collaborative atmosphere? Or, do they start by creating that atmosphere themselves, so that when the resources arrive, the infrastructure is able to handle the challenge? Based on most observations to date, the answer seems to be both. Thus far institutions have chosen to tackle the issue in different ways—some opting to highlight it in their strategic plans, while others are still unsure of their approach. We face a unique and unclear opportunity ahead—make sure you are informed and aware of the opportunities available to you and your institutions. Good luck!
The Pre-Award Research Administration (PRA) Conference in San Francisco, March 18-20, 2014 is for you, regardless of your pre- or post-award emphasis. Join your colleagues for informative sessions that will help you with your everyday job. In addition to attending informative sessions, you will have the opportunity to meet new colleagues and form mutually beneficial relationships that continue long after the conference is over.

We’ll kick off our sessions with a keynote by Dr. Robert Sapolsky, stress expert and friend to baboons. Dr. Sapolsky lived among baboons in Kenya to learn more about stress and stress-related illnesses. He will speak about why we respond to stress and what we can do about it. And if you don’t believe a talk on stress can be entertaining, you are in for a very pleasant surprise.

After our keynote, take the following “cable car” tracks towards a bright new horizon:

**Human Capital**  Career paths and office structure and training (oh my)! And don’t forget employee development . . . . Navigate through this track for a better understanding of the human element in research administration.

**Funding Opportunities and Proposal Development**  In a difficult funding environment, it’s more important than ever to understand what opportunities are best for a given project and to explore alternative options. Take this track towards essential information on finding funding and preparing the most competitive proposal possible.

**Federal**  How will the proposed Omni Circular affect us in our day-to-day work? What are the latest developments at the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health? Just how are institutions dealing with the administrative burden of complying with federal regulations? How are your peers dealing with budget cuts and sequestration? These topics and more will be covered in our federal sessions. All aboard!

**Compliance**  Our compliance sessions will help you to stay on the right track in properly administering sponsored research. Stops along the way include human subjects research, data management, conflict of interest, and audits. We won’t forget to address those grey areas that so often threaten to derail us.

**Medical**  This track will travel along familiar scenery for medical research administrators by covering topics such as clinical trials, veteran’s administration and university collaborations, as well as managing clinical faculty and scientists. We’ll also explore how to forge ahead in an environment in which there is less and less NIH funding.

**Departmental**  No matter the condition of the track, no research train can run without solid administration at the department level. These sessions are your ticket to best practices on working with the central office, collaborating with other departments, and using metrics in departmental research administration.

**Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions**  How can a track run in 27 different directions at the same time? Research administrators at predominantly undergraduate institutions understand exactly how this can happen. Hop aboard for sessions on dealing with issues that face the PUI research administrator every day.

**International**  Although international issues are woven throughout our tracks, this track covers the topic in more detail. It focuses on pre-award research administration for our international colleagues, as well as US research administrators working on international collaborations. No passport required, just come to this platform and head down the track.

We look forward to seeing you in San Francisco! You will take away new connections, new skills, and a bright outlook on your research administration horizons.

Mary Louise Healy is co-chair for the 8th PRA Conference. She is a long-time NCURA member and is a graduate of the Leadership Development Institute and Executive Leadership Program and a proud Region II member and volunteer. Mary Louise currently serves as the Director of Research Administration for the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, Johns Hopkins University. Prior to that, she worked for 21 years in research administration at Towson University. She can be reached at mhealy11@jhu.edu
New Collaborations are Possible and Priceless

By Denise Clark, Sue O’Brien, Bryony Wakefield and Julie Ward

Making connections

We all have a story about a new connection made at a conference but what makes this story come alive is that the connections you will read about turned into real, instant, sustainable collaborations, new collegial partnerships, new strategic research endeavours, and new trusted friendships. We would like to share our story to highlight how a chance meeting can (and does!) turn into ongoing collaborations, engagement, and continued professional development.

Impact

Once upon a time in a hospitality suite at the NCURA 54th Annual Meeting, three girls from Australia – Bryony Wakefield, Sue O’Brien and Julie Ward were experiencing the new and exciting ‘hospitality suite hopping’ activities that happen at NCURA meetings and randomly bumped into a lady dressed up as an Indian, which turned out to be Denise Clark from the University of Maryland. Bryony, Sue and Julie spoke to Denise for around 5 minutes, posed for a few photos, traded business cards and then went about their night.
And so, the relationship began, with this impromptu exchange of smiles, laughs and intrigue. In an instant, it was obvious that they had the synergy, personality and desire to build a new professional network.

**Knowledge Transfer**

One day after unpacking from the Annual Meeting, Denise came across those beloved business cards and had an instant flashback, remembering the three Australian research administrators; their charisma, enthusiasm, marked interest in NCURA and its professional development opportunities, and …… their accents. Following up on the discussions that occurred in those now infamous five minutes, Denise reached out to Julie and that is when they started to seriously discuss potential topics for Denise to present at the Australasian Research Management Society (ARMS) Conference in Adelaide in September 2013. After months of email correspondence and potential session description writings (tweaking and re-tweaking), Denise’s abstracts were selected for inclusion in the ARMS program. Filled with excitement about this amazing positive outcome, Julie proposed and spearheaded an itinerary for Denise to visit Australia and share research administration knowledge above and beyond what was confirmed through ARMS. Julie organized a visit to her institution – the University of New South Wales – for Denise to meet with the Executive team within the Division of Research and to present to over 60 senior research administrators on topics such as US compliance and the audit processes. Denise and Julie then went to Adelaide where Denise was a co-presenter in a pre-conference workshop on “US-Australia Research Collaborations: Whole-of-life Financial Management to Support Successful Outcomes”. Denise subsequently delivered the two accepted abstracts as presentations at the ARMS conference; “Recognising Research Management as a Global Profession” and “US Collaborations – How do I Provide Adequate Oversight of a Collaboration/Subaward”. These presentations were well attended, well received, extremely interactive, and highlighted the importance of sharing knowledge across the globe. It was clear that the NCURA method for knowledge transfer, through its professional development programs and commitment to establishing research administration as a recognized global profession, was a model for other international research administration organizations.

**Collaboration**

Bryony, Sue and Julie also have their own story to tell… How did the three of them end up in that hospitality suite that Tuesday night? Well, believe it or not, they didn’t know each other before meeting at the NCURA conference. Bryony works at the University of Melbourne, Sue at the University of Queensland in Brisbane and Julie at the University of New South Wales in Sydney. They were brought together by happenstance, or otherwise known as the NCURA Annual Meeting. Together they bonded and manoeuvred through the intimidating Annual Meeting; weaving in and out amongst 2,000 other attendees; not knowing anyone else, not knowing the environment; new to the breadth of concurrent sessions and discussion groups, but carrying a common thread. They were hungry for professional development opportunities – for themselves and for their Australian constituents that had the foresight to invest in their travel to the US. They were thrown together by coincidence but walked away with an undeniable new desire and determination to make a difference for new members attending their first NCURA Annual Meeting. They saw and experienced the value and opportunities that were available to the attendees of the Annual Meeting. The three new colleagues promised to keep in touch after the NCURA conference and they did. They sought out the opportunity to express their adventure and make an impact on others by sharing their experience and telling their story as guests in the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health blog in the three-part series titled ‘Australia & The USA: So Far Yet So Close’. They didn’t stop there; they built on their new collegiality and submitted an abstract for a session that would tell their tales, to be presented at the ARMS conference in Adelaide in September 2013. Their session on “How to Be Seen and Collaborate at an International Conference: How Three Aussie Girls Survived and Thrived at NCURA” highlighted their experience at NCURA and provided advice and tips and tricks for other colleagues to attend an international conference. Were they nervous? Yes. Did they have reservations about presenting together for other colleagues to attend an international conference? Yes. Did they knock it out of the park? Yes. The audience was engaged, enthralled and extremely envious of the story told by the otherwise three nomadic research administrators, brought together by fate, and their future sealed.

**Connecting**

In our journey, we learned that in order to facilitate and enable sound research that will impact society as a whole, we need to be supporting our researchers to the fullest extent possible. As such, we as research administrators need to establish relationships that will encourage, empower and enhance our ability to work, together in
a more global, cohesive, and inviting environment. Engagement with research administrators through our sister society networks provides a platform to share best practices and approaches to research best practices on a global scale.

We brainstormed seven steps that can help to expand your network and potentially develop new collaborations. These steps are drawn from our recent shared experiences which began at the 5th NCURA Annual Meeting and continue today. Enhance your personal potential by reaching out to someone; emphasize your emotional intelligence by engaging in stimulating conversation; excel towards the unknown by challenging your perceived boundaries; enhance your participation by seizing the volunteer opportunities; encourage yourself to step out of your comfort zone; enable change through collaboration; envision the endless possibilities that this adventure can produce!

**Priceless**

Chance, serendipity, fate - whatever and however new connections are made, the rewards are only as big as the drive and energy you put into them. So, say hello to that random person at a conference, spark a discussion, enable a new futurist path – who knows who you could be presenting at next year’s conference with them! You could be establishing a fellowship exchange program that will enlighten and revitalize your entire organization!

**Future Collaboration**

As the saying goes, “What have you done for me lately?” So we all met and have had some interim success stories. How do we plan on keeping up the momentum? Funny thing… our next adventure is already underway and the hot air balloon is ready to launch. We are in the midst of participating in the planning for the 1st NCURA Annual Meeting and continue today. Enhance your personal potential by reaching out to someone; emphasize your emotional intelligence by engaging in stimulating conversation; excel towards the unknown by challenging your perceived boundaries; enhance your participation by seizing the volunteer opportunities; encourage yourself to step out of your comfort zone; enable change through collaboration; envision the endless possibilities that this adventure can produce!

Denise Clark is the Associate Vice President for Research Administration in the Division of Research at the University of Maryland, College Park and is responsible for providing support to the campus community’s research, creative activity, and outreach initiatives. Her responsibilities include oversight of activities for proposal preparation and submission, award negotiation and management, subaward issuance and monitoring, compliance with University State and federal regulations, ethical stewardship of funds, and strategic planning. In addition Denise oversees the Compliance Office (use of human, animal welfare, export controls, and conflict of interest). On behalf of the Vice President for Research and Chief Research Officer, Denise is responsible for all budgetary and human resource actions within the Division. Denise is a Past President, Past Secretary and a recipient of the Region II Distinguished Service Award as well as the National Distinguished Service Award. She can be reached at djclark@umd.edu

Dr. Sue O’Brien is Senior Research Integrity Officer, Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) at The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia. Her role is to actively promote responsible conduct of research across the university as well as managing all potential complaints of research misconduct and associated investigations. Previously Sue was Manager of the Sponsored Health and Biomedical Initiatives team at The University of Queensland overseeing pre and post award processes for all Australian granting agencies as well as international awards such as NIH prime and subawards. Sue has a Bachelor of Science and PhD in plant reproductive biology from the University of Melbourne. She can be reached at s.obrien@research.qld.edu.au

Dr. Bryony Wakefield is Director of the Research Unit, Office of the Dean, Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences at the University of Melbourne, Australia. Bryony and her team focus on the strategic and operational management of research at the Faculty level. They support researchers and professional staff across the Faculty’s schools, departments and institutes in the areas of research development and funding, grant mentoring, graduate research, performance analysis and strategic initiatives. Bryony is the NCURA International Region Volunteer Coordinator and is part of the planning committee for the NCURA 1st International Region meeting. In addition to her involvement with NCURA, Bryony is on the INORMS 2016 congress planning committee and Chair of the INORMS 2016 Marketing sub-committee. Prior to working in research management Bryony worked and studied in art history and curatorship, receiving her PhD in art history from The Australian National University in 2004. She can be reached at bryonyw@unimelb.edu.au

Julie Ward is the Research Coordinator for the Division of Research at the University of New South Wales in Sydney, Australia. Julie is responsible for managing projects which support the strategic goals of the Division like International Memorandums of Understanding and joint PhD Programs. Julie graduated from the University of Sydney with a Bachelor of Science majoring in Pharmacology. She can be reached at julie.s@unsw.edu.au
As a member-staff driven organization, the success of NCURA is a result of the time and commitment provided by our member volunteers. We would like to take this opportunity to recognize those who have dedicated countless hours to support their colleagues and our professional staff by taking a leading role in furthering the goals and the values of the organization.

Thank you to the following volunteer leaders, who are completing their service terms in 2013:

**Executive Committee**
Dan Nordquist, Washington State University  
Immediate Past President (2013)
Georgette Sakumoto, University of Hawaii  
Secretary (2012-2013)

**Standing Committee Chairs**
Diane Barrett, rSmart  
Chair, Nominating & Leadership Development Committee (2013)
Kallie Firestone, Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Chair, Professional Development Committee (2013)

**Ambassador Corps**
David Mayo, California Institute of Technology  
Chair (2010-2013)

---

**NCURA Magazine**
Debbie Smith, University of Tennessee Health Sciences Center  
Co-Editor (2010-2013)

Thomas Wilson, Rush University Medical Center  
Co-Editor (2010-2013)

**Research Management Review (RMR)**
Jennifer Shambrook, St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital  
Editor (2011-2013)

---

NCURA would also like to thank all of our volunteers, who have dedicated time to plan, present and assist in the execution of our conferences; contribute to the educational resources provided to our members; foster professional networking and knowledge exchange; and help the NCURA community expand its reach beyond national borders.

If you are interested in becoming more involved with your professional association, visit NCURA’s Volunteer Central [http://collaborate.ncura.edu/NCURA/VolunteerOpportunities](http://collaborate.ncura.edu/NCURA/VolunteerOpportunities) to learn more about available volunteer opportunities.

Please contact Alissa Brower, Manager, National Volunteer Programs for more information at [brower@ncura.edu](mailto:brower@ncura.edu) or by calling 202.466.3894.
Robert Redford starred in the 1998 movie “The Horse Whisperer.” A TV show called “Dog Whisperer” starred Cesar Millan on the NatGeo Wild Channel. The basis of both shows is the idea of a human being who is somehow able to communicate with a creature of another species, someone who can transcend the limitations of language and culture that are usually barriers to understanding and collaboration. In some religious traditions, the word ‘whisperer’ has a bad connotation, as a rumormonger who spreads discord among a group. In the Free Dictionary, at http://www.thefreedictionary.com/whisperer the second definition of the verb “whisper” is “to speak quietly and privately, as by way of gossip, slander, or intrigue.” If we disregard the negative connotation, we see it is the quiet nature of a whisper that makes a horse or dog whisperer mysterious. The communication is offered between the person and the beast privately, not broadcast in a way that can be easily observed and studied by a group.

Am I stretching the analogy? As a Research Administrator (RA), I am not comparing Faculty and/or Principal Investigators (PIs) to horses and dogs, nor suggesting they are beasts, creatures, or in any way non-human. I’m not! I am saying there are differences in language and culture between RAs and PIs that can be barriers to understanding and collaboration. Any time two or more clearly identified groups work together, the danger exists that a ‘we/they’ or ‘us/them’ dichotomy will develop. Cultural differences reinforce the dichotomy and, if not acknowledged and defused, must be dealt with again and again in the course of continuing efforts between the groups. I propose we address those barriers in a new way, and take on the task of becoming ‘PI Whisperers.’

Some (very) generalized differences between RAs and PIs may include: spoken language, academic discipline, demographics, and career phase. Add to these the variables of personal temperaments, and there is often a disconnect between what the PI wants to do and what the RA believes to be either possible and/or in their institution’s best interest. Don’t forget to factor in the level of experience with research administration and deadlines! A PI Whisperer does not attempt to change the nature or requirements of the PI, just as an animal Whisperer does not ask a dog or horse to act in an unnatural way. Rather, the PI Whisperer seeks a level of communication to let the PI know they are valued and understood just as they are, even as some ambitious mutual goal is proposed. And the PI Whisperer recognizes the PI as an individual, not just one of the herd, and seeks to build a relationship on that basis.

This is a brief introduction to how to become a PI Whisperer. There are many roads to wisdom, and the journey is long! Here are four suggestions for approaches I have found useful.

1. Check your ego…at the door, before you send an email, when you answer the phone. Making the effort to present oneself as non-threatening can be surprisingly effective. It can be useful in negotiation and may also disarm and soothe someone expecting you to present an adversarial stance. I learned this while working as a defense contractor years ago and found it to be one of the most transferable skills I brought with me when I moved to an academic setting. Surprised? Think about the similarities between a military administrator (accustomed to winning the day through strategy or intimidation through position), and a tenured academic (whose reputation is built on rigorously defending ideas developed over a long career).
Volunteer Pathways

NCURA has identified three distinct volunteer pathways for its members to get involved – presenter, leadership and volunteer at the regional and/or national level. “Pathways” is intended to inspire and inform members on how to engage NCURA as a volunteer in any or all of these opportunities. To get involved visit http://collaborate.ncura.edu/VolunteerOpportunities

Working my way through college at Colorado State University, I saw the kind of work being done by Contracts and Grants Administrators in our Office of Sponsored Programs. I was so excited to be offered a position in that office not long after graduating. My mentor, the Assistant Vice President for Research, stopped by my desk one day and told me he had volunteered me for an officer position in Region VII. He encouraged me to get more involved in NCURA, especially at the Regional level. His small kindness launched me on the Leadership Pathway. NCURA membership, and active participation at the National and Regional levels, was to become one of the most important relationships of my career. NCURA became my chief means of professional and leadership development, and its members a network of valued friends and colleagues. Find your Pathway. Perhaps more importantly, help someone else find theirs.

Kathi Delehoy is the Senior Associate Vice President for Research Administration at Colorado State University. She can be reached at Kathi.Delehoy@colostate.edu

2. Assume the appropriate role. At this moment, with this person, are you a muse, mentor, editor, or conscience? You know you are the subject matter expert; the other person may not know that, or may be focused on some substantially different subject matter. Has a PI ever presented you with a grant application that is a completely inappropriate mess? I do acknowledge there are times when the only reaction that makes sense is to push it back across the table and refuse to take ownership. But usually the mess will not ever be transformed into a successful proposal without your skills. And to make that happen, you need to elicit information from the PI about their vision for the work. What do they see where you see only chaos? Where is the nugget of innovation that can be mined for organization? How can you illuminate the idea to showcase your PI’s expertise and structure the idea in a way that will beg for funding? You may need to wear several hats during the proposal development process, and the fit of each one will depend on your dedication to communication.

3. Look for a way to make a connection. It has to be personal; it doesn’t have to be forever. Find something about the person, the project, the agency, that you can respond to in a positive, encouraging way. What can you admire or compliment to show the PI you are engaged in their work or with them? Never forget their work is deeply personal to them, as yours is to you. Any compliment, however small, must be sincere. If all you can manage is that they wear beautiful shoes, then start there. Maybe their office has a great view, or you notice they always wear two watches. Most PIs (like most people) are interesting and engaging to begin with, and you will be able to connect quickly. But as a PI Whisperer, the effectiveness of your work as an RA will positively reflect the nature and authenticity of your connection to the PI.

4. Manage the mission. You know what you need to accomplish; how can you allocate resources to get the best result possible? What is the timeline? How many people/agencies need to be involved? As an RA, you have the knowledge and expertise to focus your interactions with the PI to get great results. Always remember that our profession exists to facilitate research and that research is performed by people. Therefore, effective Research Administration will always require a strong personal component. The interactions of a PI with an RA influence the PI’s perception of the entire research experience and may leave the PI feeling either empowered or misunderstood, hopeful or bitter.

The PI Whisperer, in the role of research facilitator, embodies a quote from Sinclair Lewis’ Arrowsmith, the story of a medical researcher: ‘You see, by having other people do the vulgar things for you, it saves your own energy for the things that only you can do.’

When I was considering how to present these ideas, I thought it would be fun to produce an acronym. I like acronyms; I find them both useful and fun. So I cast sentences and arranged paragraphs to produce the word ‘CALM,’ a sense of which is often missing when working with PIs. With a little re-arrangement, you could just as easily spell ‘CLAM,’ if you prefer. Or for you DOD types, how about ‘M-LAC?’ In any order you choose, I hope my suggestions are helpful to you. And in recognition of our collective and evolving expertise, I welcome any comments, suggestions, or other techniques you care to offer in support of our quest to become ‘PI Whispersers.’

Elizabeth C. Foushee, MPA, CRA/CPRA, is Grant Officer/Writer at Tidewater Community College in Norfolk, VA. Betsy works with faculty and staff in the Arts and Humanities, Business, Career and Technical Education, and Workforce Development areas. Her sponsored program responsibilities include pre-award, post-award, and compliance. Elizabeth can be reached at bfoushee@tcc.edu
University of Washington (UW) doctoral student Hawkeye King walked upstairs to get coffee on an ordinary spring morning in 2012. Blake Hannaford, his adviser and a UW electrical engineering professor, was ahead of him in line. “Did you hear about the Hollywood thing?” Hannaford asked. King recalls saying, “No, but I’m in.” Hannaford went on to explain that a director from the movie “Ender’s Game” had contacted the UW BioRobotics Laboratory to see about using the lab’s Raven II surgical robot on the movie set. That’s when King almost dropped his coffee.

“ ‘Ender’s Game’ is one of those iconic sci-fi books,” King explained. “When we got back to the lab and told people, everyone’s jaw collectively dropped.”

The movie “Ender’s Game,” starring Harrison Ford and Asa Butterfield and directed by Gavin Hood, is based on the 1980s military science-fiction novel by Orson Scott Card. The movie opens Nov. 1 in theaters across the country.

Within a month of getting the call, King and then-UW bioengineering doctoral student Lee White packed up their lab’s surgical robot and flew to New Orleans. The students would be the sole operators of the robot during filming, and they also needed time to prepare its exterior to look less like a lab machine. The students helped to decide how the robot would operate to make it look as realistic as possible, King said.

“We were really part of the creative process of getting the robot on the set,” he said.

Less than a week later, they were filming on the movie set, a New Orleans NASA facility that builds rockets. King and White sat just off-set behind a curtain, where they used several computer monitors and controllers to move the robot’s four arms as it simulated brain surgery on one of the lead characters. The students ran the robot for more than 14 hours, and King still remembers feeling an intense pressure to perform. A day of filming is astronomically expensive, he explained,
and each minute on the set counts, especially when producers, actors, directors, movie backers – and even caterers – are all keenly watching.

“We were petrified that something would break, that the robot would screw up,” King said. “Everything had to be working perfectly from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. on the set.”

At one point, King and White, now a medical student at Stanford University, controlled the robot during a close-up shoot. For several minutes, everyone watched as the students maneuvered the robot’s arms around and behind the actor’s head.

King remembers “sweating bullets” and having to ignore swarms of Louisiana mosquitos attacking his legs and arms as he worked.

In a scene around the movie’s 58-minute mark, Bonzo Madrid, one of the main characters who is played by actor Moisés Arias, was critically injured and suffered brain trauma after a fight with Ender Wiggin at the battle school. The UW robot simulates opening Bonzo’s skull to operate on his brain. The scene deviates from the book’s plot, King said, and nearly all of the main characters are present.

King and White used a nonverbal signaling system to communicate as they operated the robot in tandem. It takes two people to move all four of the robot’s arms. The robot’s hands and wrists stayed locked in place during filming, because those components are unrealistically large to simulate fine-tuned brain surgery. The robot’s hands were hidden behind Arias’ head.
and the actor held an emergency “off” button to press in case of a close call.

After the close-up shoot and more than 14 hours of operating, nothing broke or malfunctioned. “At the end of the day, I asked the props director how we did,” King recalls with a laugh. “He said, ‘Let me put it this way, if they didn’t like it, it wouldn’t get a close-up.’”

Hannaford’s lab developed the first Raven surgical robot about 10 years ago after the U.S. Army expressed interest in technology for remote medical care. A next-generation Raven II was built through National Science Foundation funding and collaboration with Jacob Rosen of University of California, Santa Cruz, and sent to seven research universities, including the UW. This past summer five more universities purchased robots for research. Hannaford and Rosen recently spun out a company called Applied Dexterity to build future robots.

The Raven robots aren’t yet used in clinics for surgery, but that is the eventual goal, he said. Universities are mainly using them to design and test new hardware and software for tele-surgery procedures. The robots are designed to have state-of-the-art motion control and to fit in a standard operating room. A similar robot called the da Vinci is currently used to perform minimally invasive procedures such as appendix, gallbladder and ovarian cyst removals.

After a week of hanging out with the movie’s props team, exploring New Orleans and even joking around with Harrison Ford, the UW students returned to campus, where they had to stay tight-lipped about their robot’s stardom for more than a year. For King, who plans to graduate this year and has spent his entire doctorate working on the surgical robot, it’s a memorable way to finish his degree.

“It was a really fantastic experience,” he said.

For more information, contact King at hawkeye1@uw.edu or 206-697-3955, and Hannaford at blake@ee.washington.edu or 206-412-0182. If you want to share a “cool” project idea, please email Danielle Anthony at danthony@wsu.edu
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NCURA Education Scholarship Fund

NCURA received a generous gift from Jerry Fife, an NCURA past president from Vanderbilt University, to provide financial assistance to support continuing educational and professional development needs for NCURA members. A taskforce is hard at work developing business and marketing plans for this new initiative. NCURA has been challenged to raise $50,000 in matching funds by 2021. Has NCURA made a difference in your professional life? Do you want others to have the opportunity to receive professional development? Can you help us meet our goal of $50K by 2021?

Why I gave to the NCURA Education Scholarship Fund

“For many years, NCURA has been my professional family. Just like my own family, my NCURA family has provided me with wisdom from elders, values from mentors, and playfulness from colleagues. I can think of no better way to support my professional family to grow and succeed than by contributing to the NCURA Education Scholarship Fund.”

Peggy S. Lowry, Program Manager, NCURA Peer Review
National Council of University Research Administrators

“I gave to the NCURA Education Scholarship Fund because I believe in the value of the professional development offered by NCURA. It is important to me that others have the opportunities I have been afforded. I want to help grow, support and nurture the profession of research administration.”

Kris Monahan, Ph.D.,
Director of Sponsored Research & Programs, Providence College

“NCURA has been a vital resource for me both professionally and personally for over twenty years. I have been able to stay current on the ever changing landscape of research administration through multiple venues that NCURA offers – in person conferences, YouTube Tuesdays, printed materials and, most importantly, personal contact with colleagues in our field. Coming from a smaller institution with the next university more than ninety miles away, NCURA has been a lifeline. The establishment of the Education Scholarship will continue to serve NCURA and our members through professional development support and opportunities to meet and share information with colleagues. NCURA is truly family – there’s always someone willing to help with questions and issues.”

Pamela B. Whitlock, MBA, CRA
Educational Consultant and Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, UNC Wilmington, Emeritus

Donate online at http://www.ncura.edu/content/misc/edu_scholarship_fund.php or use the enclosed pre-addressed envelope to make your tax-deductible donation TODAY.

We need your help. Even a little makes a difference.
SPONSORED RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION: A GUIDE TO EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES AND RECOMMENDED PRACTICES

The world of sponsored research administration is filled with a plethora of complexities and nuance. Expanding government regulations demand you to stay informed. In order to provide effective support for the research enterprise and be responsible stewards of federal funds, administrators need to be knowledgeable about multiple areas of research management. NCURA provides the comprehensive reference guide that helps you.

This two-volume compendium covers all major areas of sponsored research with more than 20 chapters written by well-respected administrators known for their expertise. The 1900+ page publication walks through essential principles and practices, sample policies and procedures, practical tools and supplementary materials.

CHAPTERS INCLUDE:

✓ Overview of Sponsored Research
✓ Organizational Models
✓ Regulatory Environment
✓ Research Compliance
✓ Assessing the Sponsored Research Office
✓ Facilities and Administrative Costs
✓ Pre-Award Services
✓ Data Rights and Intellectual Property
✓ Subawards
✓ Special Issues for Medical Schools
✓ Special Issues for PUIs
✓ Administering Research Contracts
✓ Interactions with Auditors
✓ Post-Award Administration
✓ Export Controls
✓ Legal Considerations
✓ Information Systems
✓ International Research Collaborations
✓ Training and Education
✓ Leadership Development
✓ Communication

The guide is a valuable publication for a range of individuals, including sponsored programs personnel, departmental/college administrators, and business officers at smaller institutions who manage sponsored research “on the side.” It is also an excellent training tool for newcomers to sponsored research.

The Annual Subscription Includes:

❖ Two-volume compendium
❖ Quarterly updates
❖ Annually issued searchable CD

NCURA Members: $345.00 (plus shipping)
Non-Members: $445.00 (plus shipping)

ORDER YOUR SUBSCRIPTION TODAY AT
WWW.NCURA.EDU/BOOKSTORE!
Developing an International ‘Responsible Conduct of Research Program’ for Clinical Researchers

By Mary Ellen Sheridan, Ghada El-Hajj Fuleihan, and Thalia Arawi

This article describes curriculum development and teaching of a Research Ethics and Responsible Conduct of Research course as a core component of a National Institutes of Health Fogarty International Center research training grant awarded to the American University of Beirut in September 2012.

AUB Background

The American University of Beirut (AUB), founded in 1866, is a private, non-sectarian, co-educational university, with 700 faculty and a student population of around 8,000. AUB is accredited by the US Middle States Accrediting Commission, and it offers 120 programs leading to the Bachelor’s, Master’s, M.D., and Ph.D. degrees. Since its establishment in 1867, the Faculty of Medicine at AUB has trained generations of medical students and physicians - over 4,000 to date. The Faculty of Medicine and the American University of Beirut Medical Center (AUBMC) are committed to educating and training the best physicians and biomedical researchers, to providing quality cost-effective patient care, and to performing premier clinical research.

NIH’s Fogarty Center – Assisting the Development of Clinical Research in International Universities

The emphasis and outreach of the Fogarty International Center (“Fogarty”), a component of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), is improving global health. Nearly 25% of Fogarty awards are made directly to robust research institutions in the developing world. The remaining grants support academics at U.S. institutions that collaborate with colleagues abroad. The Division of International Training and Research oversees research grants, training grants and fellowship programs in more than 100 countries.

In 2010, Fogarty issued a Request for Applications (RFA) to address chronic, non-communicable diseases (NCDs) and disorders across the lifespan through collaborative research training between institutions in the U.S. and low- and middle-income countries. Unfortunately, despite the high prevalence rates of NCDs and their risk factors in the Middle East North Africa (MENA) region, the capacity to conduct the needed research to assess and influence their determinants is very limited. Consequently, the RFA was a “perfect fit” for AUB and the Faculty of Medicine’s vision for enhanced clinical and translational research training and sustainably strengthening research capacity in all health science areas at AUB. Principal Investigator (PI) Dr. Ghada El-Hajj Fuleihan and her AUB colleagues seized on the opportunity and flexibility of the Fogarty RFA and proposed to establish the first training grant in the region. Faculty leadership at AUB invited colleagues at the Harvard Medical School and the Harvard School of Public Health to help shape a new Masters in Clinical Re-
search degree program emphasizing research skill development for improved patient care and research studies in NCD. The Scholars in Health Research Program (abbreviated as ‘SHARP’) at AUB establishes a novel curriculum and training vehicle to generate the human capital required to conduct general NCD-related research and to investigate specifically those NCDs with the greatest burden on Lebanon and the MENA region (for example, obesity and overweight, metabolic syndrome, diabetes and cardiovascular disorders, and hypovitaminosis D [vitamin D deficiency]). In September 2012, Fogarty awarded AUB a four-year training grant of $863,000.

**Commitment to Research Ethics through SHARP Bioethics/RCR Course (SHARP 315)**

From the earliest stages of developing the SHARP curriculum, leaders envisioned a comprehensive bioethics and Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) course. Dr. El-Hajj Fuleihan and consultant Dr. Mary Ellen Sheridan, who met in 2009 at a research compliance workshop sponsored by AUB’s Office of Grants and Contracts, collaborated during 2010 to improve the human research infrastructure at AUB. Together, they articulated an institutional Human Research Protection Program (HRPP) and improved the University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) policies and practices. Later, Dr. El-Hajj Fuleihan, Dr. Thalia Arawi, Founding Director of the Salim El-Hoss Bioethics and Professionalism Program at the AUB’s Faculty of Medicine and its medical center, and Dr. Sheridan worked together to enhance NIH’s RCR training grant requirement and AUB’s HRPP, in an emphatic statement of AUB’s commitment to conducting research at the highest standard of ethical behavior. As a result, a large component of RCR is delivered through Research Ethics (SHARP 315), an intensive three-week summer course comprising of nine lecture sessions. It is complemented by the delivery of additional instruction in Advanced Research Ethics (SHARP 500) throughout the ensuing fall and spring terms (as part of the Longitudinal Seminar Series,) and through ongoing “Ethics Matters” lectures and conferences/workshops offered by the Salim El-Hoss Bioethics and Professionalism Program.

Drs. Arawi and Sheridan collaborated closely on curriculum development for SHARP 315. They agreed that the importance of articulating detailed course objectives from the inception of curriculum development could not be underestimated. Specific and tangible instructional objectives in an RCR course were clustered as attributes of Knowledge, Attitude and Behavior. Each attribute was more fully detailed in student learning objectives. Ultimately, students should be familiar with the concept of research compliance through a framework of ethical, legal, and policy considerations that affect the practice of scientific research. Most importantly, students should know how to conduct and assess research from an ethical standpoint. The resulting course matter is a broad spectrum covering traditional modules in RCR such as:

- conduct of research involving human subjects
- research misconduct and fraud
- data acquisition, data management, sharing and ownership
- publication practices and responsible authorship, peer review
- mentor/mentee relationships
- animal welfare
- conflict of interest and commitment
- collaborative research

Two factors are noteworthy in the development of course content. To begin with, reflecting the goal of the SHARP training grant to produce NCD researchers, an emphasis on ethical behavior in human research and the important role of the IRB was paramount. Secondly, the identification of appropriate educational resources and leads for relevant course content was greatly facilitated by extensive Internet searches. Federal agencies such as the Office of Research Integrity and the Office of Human Research Protections provide invaluable links for developing educational programs. Web sites from leading U.S. Translational Research Centers are rich resources for institutional policies and practices, case studies, RCR guidelines, and postings of course materials. Reviews of these materials greatly informed the SHARP 315 curriculum and facilitated refinement of the RCR units into a sequence of topics and aspects of conduct most relevant for clinical research.

Ultimately, SHARP 315 was team taught under Dr. Arawi’s leadership with the involvement of AUB faculty, the IRB Vice Chair, the IRB Administrator and Dr. Sheridan. Students attended lectures, participated in discussions, analyzed case studies and watched audio-visual materials. The course relied on both face-to-face and web-enhanced instruction via Moodle, an online learning management system. A wide variety of web-accessible materials enabled through Moodle significantly enhanced the students’ learning opportunities and allowed course leaders to make the most efficient use of student and faculty time.

SHARP 315 enrolled its first class of 23 students in the summer of 2013. The class included several features that merit special mention. First, it convened a mock IRB session that was a great success. Trainees learned about preparing a protocol, role playing as members of the IRB and engaging in the dynamics of a review board. The impact of the session was maximized by its timing, following a four-unit sequence focused on clinical research. The sequence included bioethical history, human subject research policies and regulations, informed consent, and data acquisition and medical records management. Thus, SHARP students came to the mock IRB with the necessary rich background of human research ethical issues and practices.

Next, thirty percent (30%) of each student's grade was based on a special project assignment. Working in groups of about four, students were required to develop a user-friendly Introduction to Clinical Research pamphlet that could be used in subject-recruitment settings. The student groups prepared a rich and diverse array of brochures that reflected their awareness of recruitment, informed consent, and the roles and responsibilities of researchers and subjects in clinical research.

Finally, each student group was also assigned, by random syllabus subject, to give a five-minute presentation on the last instructional day. Students were given free latitude to express their knowledge of responsible conduct of research through their choice of presentation style. With only 36-hours’ notice, the groups did a remarkable job of applying their creative skills to produce musical sketches, case studies, role-playing skits and targeted presentations on the major points of ethical decision-making in clinical research. As a last class day event, this was both an instructive and entertaining success. The students left SHARP 315 with a positive impression of the significance of ethical conduct and decision-making in their future research program. As one summer SHARP evaluator stated, “The SHARP program has put me on the right track to becoming a clinical researcher.”

**Looking to the Future**

The RCR faculty and students alike have been pleased with the RCR course; SHARP 315 was one
Volunteer Pathways

NCURA has identified three distinct volunteer pathways for its members to get involved – presenter, leadership and volunteer at the regional and/or national level. “Pathways” is intended to inspire and inform members on how to engage NCURA as a volunteer in any or all of these opportunities. To get involved visit http://collaborate.ncura.edu/VolunteerOpportunities

My first NCURA meeting scared me to death. I was intimidated by the number of research administrators and the amount of knowledge in the room. That knowledge is what drew me into volunteering with NCURA. Now, it didn’t happen overnight. I started out by volunteering at the registration desk at a regional meeting. A couple of years later, someone asked me, “What have you done lately for NCURA?” That direct question definitely helped me become more involved. I started reaching out to others to see if they wanted to be part of my presentation and workshops, a practice that has come full circle as I now reach out to new members to see if they want to be part of my presentation team. Becoming involved with NCURA has led me down a fantastic path. I’ve co-chaired PRA and FRA conferences, been on National and regional meeting programs, and am now on the Board of Directors. The exciting part is that I reach across the U.S, in volunteering for NCURA given me countless opportunities to grow as a research administrator, it has given me opportunities to grow personally, which is a “good thing.”

Dennis Paffrath is the Assistant Vice President for Sponsored Programs Administration for University of Maryland, Baltimore. He can be reached at dpaffrat@umaryland.edu

of the highest rated SHARP summer courses. Now that the new SHARP program has been successfully launched, the PI, colleagues at AUB and the SHARP program’s Technical Advisory Group are looking to the coming year to implement additional components of the master’s program. AUB also anticipates that it will expand the reach of the RCR experience to other regional institutions, while the recruitment program for new SHARP trainees is expected to identify new and expand existing clinical research collaborations in NCD areas.

The RCR faculty attribute the success of the SHARP 315 course to a number of factors, which can be taken as Points for Success for other international institutions considering such a program:

• Proven collaborative working relationship among research administrators, consultant, and faculty colleagues at AUB and US cooperating institutions
• Continuous communication and open dialogue between consultant and PI and AUB colleagues
• Involvement of critical faculty at AUB in curriculum development
• On-site consultant participation in RCR course
• Continuing research capacity building initiatives between research administration, Drs. Sheridan and El-Hajj Fuleihan, and AUB faculty

All told, the SHARP 315 course has proven an excellent example of the opportunity for impact that exists through international research funding when combined with strong collaboration between faculty and research administrators.
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These are the voyages of the Starship Continuing Resolution. Our mission: to explore strange new CDAs, to seek out elusive cooperative grant agreements, to boldly contract where no contracts have been negotiated before.

We’ve entered the Sequester nebula. Our first contract was with a Romulan vessel. This was a surprise. They are totally out of their territory and unfamiliar with this realm of experience as demonstrated by their beaming over a new material before an MTA was in place.

The material was very strange. We suspect it is a controlled substance under the United Federation of Planets’ Export Administration Regulations. We are not sure what form it has taken. It fits in the palm of one’s hand, is fuzzy, makes a cooing sound, and apparently is stimulated by a genre of ancient music known as Jazz. Obviously, we would have tried to refuse the shipment until the MTA was signed, but it was transported aboard before Central knew about it. Personally, I believe the notification process was adversely impacted because unit administrators may have gotten caught up in observing its unique characteristics, antics, and behavior. It’s so darn cute. Unfortunately, this is a common side-tracking tactic with some regulated materials that are programmed for infiltration. We must remain vigilant.

We have been negotiating a contract for months with a species with whom we have never worked before. Our primary Universal Translator Device (UTD) has had some difficulties with the language and, as a result, negotiations have been slow. Perhaps it requires yet another software upgrade. This is a perpetual challenge with OrNge products. I was able to beam back a redlined version of the contract, though I honestly am not quite sure I understood all of the nuances and clauses contained in their original. From all indications, it appeared that they were giving our PI full rights to publish outside our galaxy, yet the contract period had ended.

As always, I attended a session on effort certification. You’d think that after this many centuries we would have evolved beyond this requirement. All species agree that 100% is still 100%, no matter what planet you live on. I didn’t recognize the presenter, though my handheld UTD feed and automatically activated NCURA Talking app. Without it, I’m quite sure I would never have run across Ardhed. Seriously. Ardhed is of a very small species that doesn’t enlarge to human dimensions unless an electron request is received, routed, and planetarily approved.

That’s why it was so rewarding when my nametag alarm went off, the magnetic fields activated, Ardhed’s resizing was approved, and our nametags became the same color and began strobing in unison. We shook hands, both giggling like school children.

Interestingly, NCURA meetings have maintained hand shaking as the uniform greeting method. I admit to being perpetually surprised and delighted with the Board of Directors’ embracing a shared code of conduct (E-NCURA AM CC-3149.3) and integrating a common greeting. Many participants don’t have earthling appendages so “hands” assume a variety of forms and some retract to unexpected . . . locations. Fascinating, to say the least.

Some in the audience were surprised, but not me. Yes, there are still relationships and communication styles that might surprise, but I am a lifelong learner, a student of research administration history. Bureaucracies are notoriously slow to change, even in 67276.1. Rather than exhibiting any behavior that could be perceived as smug or aloof to new administrators. I finally met Ardhed Hadminstrr this year. We’ve been negotiating a contract for ages and have become something akin to friends. The interactive meeting roster, of course, knew this from the UTD feed and automatically activated NCURA Talking app. Without it, I’m quite sure I would never have run across Ardhed. Seriously. Ardhed is of a very small species that doesn’t enlarge to human dimensions unless an electron request is received, routed, and planetarily approved.

That’s why it was so rewarding when my nametag alarm went off, the magnetic fields activated, Ardhed’s resizing was approved, and our nametags became the same color and began strobing in unison. We shook hands, both giggling like school children.

Interestingly, NCURA meetings have maintained hand shaking as the uniform greeting method. I admit to being perpetually surprised and delighted with the Board of Directors’ embracing a shared code of conduct (E-NCURA AM CC-3149.3) and integrating a common greeting. Many participants don’t have earthling appendages so “hands” assume a variety of forms and some retract to unexpected . . . locations. Fascinating, to say the least.

As always, I attended a session on effort certification. You’d think that after this many centuries we would have evolved beyond this requirement. All species agree that 100% is still 100%, no matter what planet you live on. I didn’t recognize the presenter, though my handheld UTD indicated origin from the planet Oembee in the Uuhuh galaxy. The presenter emphasized the continuing need for such certification, and also reminded us that the Federation’s proposed universal guidance on grants and cooperative agreements, referred to as “Beyond Super Circular,” would be forthcoming any day now. Unfortunately, no specifics were available until the Federation’s standard 999 year commenting period had ended.

Some in the audience were surprised, but not me. Yes, there are still relationships and communication styles that might surprise, but I am a lifelong learner, a student of research administration history. Bureaucracies are notoriously slow to change, even in 67276.1. Rather than exhibiting any behavior that could be perceived as smug or aloof to new members, I simply raised my eyebrow and, to use an ancient idiom, exhibiting any behavior that could be perceived as smug or aloof to new members, I simply raised my eyebrow and, to use an ancient idiom, straightened my face.

Live long and prosper, Friends.

NCURAbly Pedantic is written by long-standing NCURA members, all under pseudonym protection.
Culture, International Research Agreements, and Collaboration

By James Casey

One of the central factors impacting the successful negotiation of international research agreements and collaboration is culture. Recognizing this, the International Research Collaborations project (“I-Group”) of the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR) held its second workshop at the National Academy of Sciences on July 29-31, 2013. The workshop “Culture Matters: An Approach to International Research Agreements” brought together a broad range of U.S. Government, higher education, and private sector participants to consider cultural dimensions in this space. The workshop followed the very successful July 2010 workshop “Examining Core Elements of International Research Collaboration: A Workshop.”

Bringing together nearly 80 participants, the workshop encompassed four tracks and examined their relationships with culture, research, and agreements: 1) People/Human Subjects; 2) Environment and Natural Resources; 3) Science, Engineering, and Manufacturing (SEM); and 4) Agriculture and Animal Issues.

NCURA members Pat Schlesinger, John Carfora, and Jim Casey moderated plenary sessions centered on wealthy vs. poor underdeveloped countries, urbanization/ecological sustainability/social resilience, and intellectual property, respectively. Participants were highly energized, the discussions were vigorous, and participants are looking forward to future follow-on activities.

If you would like to further explore materials from the 2013 and the 2010 workshops, please visit http://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/guirr/PGA_050827#culture

James Casey is a research manager and attorney based in San Antonio, TX. A member of the July 2013 planning committee, he co-chaired the SEM break out group and moderated the IP plenary. He was co-chair of the July 2010 workshop. An attorney since 1990 and a member of NCURA since 1995, he is a member of the NCURA Board of Directors, the Education Scholarship Fund Task Force, and is the former Senior Editor of NCURA Magazine. He teaches in the Rush University M.S. in Research Administration Program. This article and any opinions present herein are solely those of the author and do not represent the positions of I-Group, GUIRR, or the National Academies. He can be reached at lawrev@hotmail.com.
Introduction

The field of research administration is a diverse and often misunderstood profession. In many cases, people have “stumbled” into their positions after pursuing other careers — often with great stories about how they entered the field. However, many Research Administrators, after finding themselves employed in the field, remain loyal to this unique profession despite the numerous challenges faced on a daily basis. For some, the most frustrating aspect of the job is the fact that every challenge seems to have a new “twist” (although for some of us, this may be why we love research administration!). With almost thirty years of cumulative experience, we have compiled a top ten list - in no particular order - of lessons learned that we hope will: (1) provide some guidance for those new to the field; and (2) provide a chuckle for those more “seasoned” professionals who have seen it all before!

1. Building a rapport with sponsors, as well as with other offices on campus, can go a long way!

Tony: I am sure everyone has had “that” experience where a question you needed answered immediately was not responded to or the negotiation that may have veered toward “contentious.” However, one lesson that I have learned in this regard (thanks to the profound wisdom of Depeche Mode) is that “people are people so why should it be, you and I should get along so awfully?” How can we turn these interactions around? One tool I have utilized is the regional connection. Whether speaking to a new faculty member or a sponsor, if they are from and/or located in the northeast — even better if New York or Long Island (where I spent the first thirty years of my life) — I will always start a conversation about the area, ask about the weather and how much things have changed over the years, etc. I am also not above referencing areas where I have relatives or have visited. It is just a simple opportunity to develop a connection — even a limited one — that will help when the “work” needs to be addressed. It may not always be applicable, but it is a great start when the opportunity is available.

2. Be careful what you ask for, because you just might get it...

Tony: I cannot begin to tell you how quickly my blood runs cold when someone says, “It’s only a proposal; the chances that it will be funded anyway are not that great, so let’s just leave it as-is.” Guess what Murphy’s Law will often dictate? Yep, an award gets made with some bizarre commitment, budgetary line item, or proposed deliverable that is going to require an act of Congress and/or approval of the Vatican to move forward at the award stage. Recommendation? Treat every proposal as if the award is anticipated and expected.

3. Communication — how a team approach during negotiations can be a benefit.

Tony: Depending on your institution, negotiations will generally be handled by a contract administrator/negotiator within the central pre-award office. This is how it is handled at my institution. However, a negotiation should not start with a sponsor until all parties “internal” to the arrangement are on the same page. This may (should) include the pre-award individual (or team), the Principal Investigator (PI), department or college-level administrator, technology transfer officer, and post-award representative (if specific issues to be negotiated are related to post-award activities and/or responsibilities). It is detrimental to a negotiation to draw a line in the sand related to certain terms and conditions, only to find out that someone else on the “team” had informed the sponsor that this would not be a problem. It is equally troubling to hear the phrase, “Well, our understanding is that the investigator has already started work and we want to make sure that we are able to cover his expenses.” I’ve experienced both scenarios in the past, and I can tell you that the amount of tap dancing I had to do would have qualified me for Dancing with the Stars!

4. Give a man a fish, and he eats for a day; teach a man to fish and he eats for a lifetime!

Tony: This is one area where I still have to learn to take my own advice. When I served as a contract administrator, I had some faculty who preferred to work through me to submit their final reports through Fastlane — not at all necessary (since the module for reports was an investigator function), but something they preferred to do. For some, this may be within your job description; for our office, it is nice to do, just above and beyond the normal call of duty. The problem? The investigators would send me a word document containing all the wonderful information that needed to be put into the report and then come to my office to sit with me and watch as I uploaded each component. This was great except for the fact that these investigators never actually gained the experience of submitting the report, and when I was promoted, the incoming contract administrator inherited a few “needy” individuals. I am proud to say, he has been teaching them to fish!

5. Education, Education, Education (and the importance of…).

Tony: This is one that I have touted for a long time, and clearly after years of stating that we needed to be much more proactive in our education programs, I became tasked with doing just that (re-
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member, be careful what you ask for – see #2 above….). However, it is a topic and area that I feel does get overlooked because of all the other deadlines, compliance requirements and emergencies that consume any given day. Even if it is as simple as a monthly “tip” or article that you can make available or quarterly brown bag session (or better yet, providing snacks is always a great draw), my advice is to start small but be relevant. Determine the high priority areas that need attention immediately and move forward from there. Some of the programs/activities that we have initiated at Auburn include a departmental certification course and (COMPASS); a number of brown bag sessions, proposal development workshops (held in conjunction with new faculty orientation and an annual research week event); and monthly informal lunches with new faculty.

The tenuous balance between customer service and institutional responsibility.

Robyn: When you talk with any university sponsored programs administrator, a common theme seems to be providing the best customer service for their PIs. It is more comfortable to be liked and respected by our PIs than to be considered “the police.” More importantly, administrators need to develop a balance between providing great customer service and providing information to PIs about their responsibilities. I always remember that when I am a customer, I don’t want to be told what I can’t do. Instead, I want to be told what I can do. I strive to live by this daily in working with PIs, keeping in mind that compliance is necessary but, at the same time, letting them know what I can do for them. This helps to strike a balance between customer service and being responsible.

Who signs what?
Understanding the hierarchy of signature authority.

Robyn: An administrator should understand who has signature authority at their institution as well as the chain of signatures that might be required. Educating your PI about this signature “chain of command” is also important so they know what is required. It is also critical to educate your PI that with signing comes a certain amount of responsibility. Educating your PI will help avoid any major problems they might encounter should they decide to sign on behalf of the institution; it will also go a long way toward helping to prevent them from signing on behalf of the institution in the first place.

If you don’t understand something during a negotiation process, DO NOT be afraid to ask the contract negotiator (or discuss with a colleague).

Robyn: Reviewing the plethora of documentation that comes with a contract can be overwhelming. It is important to remember that, no matter how long you have been in this business, when in doubt you should always ask the contracting officer (CO). Asking for points of clarification during the process can also help strengthen your relationship with the CO. In most cases, you will gain their respect because they will know you are trying to do the right thing. Remember, you also need to be able to explain to your PI, or others on campus, any compliance issues so it would be prudent to obtain clarification on the front end.
Get involved if a PI/faculty member tells you that they are getting a no-cost extension on a project that is about to expire.

Robyn: If a PI’s project is about to expire and they tell you the sponsor is granting them a no-cost extension to continue their work, get involved—especially when the PI also requests that the project account remain open. Ask the PI to provide you with any documentation or email as evidence that the sponsor is granting a no-cost extension. It would also be prudent for you to email the sponsor asking for any current updates on the project. You want to trust the PI, but you also don’t want them getting into a bind with their project.

Do not dodge or avoid that troublesome PI or the one that you consider to be a pain in your day. Be proactive…

Robyn: Every research administrator has a PI they would like to avoid because they either don’t follow the instructions, desire to be a “Lone Ranger,” or they are quite frankly a “pain” to work with during the proposal process. It may be a PI who never seems to be grateful for administrative assistance. There may be times that you would like to send your phone directly to voice mail, or wish that you were experiencing email problems. You simply want to avoid this person because they seem to wreck your day. In reality, it is much easier to be proactive and reach out to assist those “difficult” PIs who are working on proposals. When you are proactive, you are seeking to prevent any potential problems or hurdles before they arise or become a greater problem. Sometimes it may be necessary to step out of your comfort zone or go out of your way to get involved in helping the PI. It really takes more energy to avoid a PI than it does to be proactive. A proactive administrator reflects a positive attitude. Perhaps your positive attitude and energy will rub off on your PI and help to reverse what would otherwise have been an unpleasant situation.

Summary

It is our hope that this list of lessons learned provides you with some useful information that you can apply to your daily routine—or at the very least, provide a moment of levity during a hectic day! You might even consider keeping this list handy as a reminder of lessons learned by two research administrators who, though they may not have seen it all, have experienced enough to share this advice with you.

Robyn Remotigue is Research Manager, Dean of the School of Public Health at University of North Texas Health Science Center in Fort Worth. She has been in the field of research administration since 1994. She is a graduate of the 2012 NCURA Executive Leadership Program and 2010 NCURA Leadership Development Institute. She is actively involved with NCURA, serving on the Professional Development Committee and is Chair of the PDC Social Media Subcommittee. In addition, she has volunteered in various capacities at the regional level. Robyn can be reached at robyn.remo@unthsc.edu

Anthony (Tony) F. Ventimiglia is the Associate Director for Education and Communication in the Auburn University Office of Sponsored Programs where his responsibilities include the development and implementation of education programs for both faculty and staff. Tony has been working in research administration since 1999 and has volunteered in various capacities at both the regional and national level. He is a graduate of the 2005 class of the NCURA Leadership Development Institute and currently serves on the NCURA Board of Directors. Tony can be reached at ventiaf@auburn.edu

Stewe Bekk’s Desk

It’s all about American funding at the moment – DoD, NIH, Templeton, you name it. Notably, one of our first NIH proposals is about to go out so we are tying up lots of loose ends. I remember when I first entered into this “new world” of calls, having already had extensive experience with European ones, I thought: What additional things could we be asked to handle that we have not already managed? Well, it turns out - a lot. FCOI, sub-awards, ERA Commons, A133-audit requirements, are just a few of our new discoveries. It is fitting that I should bring up these things here since it is in large part NCURA’s “fault” that I’m now facing these issues! Attending one of your NIH-101 courses in New Orleans this March really helped us get active in this area. But we’re getting there and hopefully these typical “growing pains” will go away once we have a few more proposals behind us.

Stewe Bekk is the International Project Manager for IFCO – The Institute of Photonic Sciences — in Barcelona, Spain.
SMARTPHONES: Why They Are Not Called Secure Phones

By Paul J. Millis
Introduction
Smartphones are vulnerable to attack. They run software like a PC but in an unsecured environment. Portability and connectivity provide capabilities an attacker can exploit. As functionality expands, threats grow.

Smartphones are a valued business tool. The issue is not whether to use smartphones for business but how to use smartphones securely for business. The key is creating a secure environment by providing the best-controlled implementation of smartphone technology consistent with your organization’s risk tolerance.

Discussion
Opportunity: “(Why do you rob banks, Willie? Because that’s where the money is.)”

According to the UN, there are 6 billion mobile phone subscriptions in the world; nearly one for each of the 7 billion people (BBC, 2012), creating an attractive target for cyber criminals. This has caused attackers to target smartphones for the data they contain and as a way to gain access to an organization’s network. The threat universe is daunting. As the number of Internet-enabled handheld devices continues to grow, web-based threats will continue to grow in number and sophistication.

Malware
There were 6 times as many cyber-attacks on mobile phones as there were during the previous year (McAfee, 2013). Malware takes advantage of users’ interest in popular applications. Some malware are legitimate pieces of software that are reverse engineered with malicious code injected prior to re-publishing. Hackers prey on user emotions like greed and fear by offering free versions of popular apps or bogus security apps that include dangerous code. Therefore, users should be trained to be wary and not assume that apps are legitimate – even security apps. Users need to check sellers and read reviews prior to downloading software. Organizations need to be aware of who controls which apps can be downloaded.

Attackers
People who attack other people’s systems are increasingly professionals. Their minions are the “script kiddies” who use tools written by more experienced attackers to break into computer systems and smartphones. These attackers are dangerous because of what your phone represents: “Many thieves . . . think of your smartphone as an effective key to unlock your personal wealth and hijack your company’s sensitive data” (Sileo, 2012).

Users
Careless or untrained users are the weakest link in the security chain. Carelessness usually takes the form of lost phones or downloading malicious apps. Untrained users are more the result of organizational inaction, but the users themselves also contribute to this problem.

“When it comes to smartphones, users create significant risk. Despite the talk of sophisticated malware and ingenious attackers, losing the phone is the top concern about any mobile device. Data are most often harvested from phones that are lost or stolen because the devices are not password protected or encrypted.

When users are calling, texting, and surfing they can be subject to “shoulder surfing,” which is using direct observation techniques, such as looking over someone’s shoulder, to get information (WikiPedia). Shoulder surfing is particularly effective in crowded places such as airports and restaurants.

High-profile users are the most difficult to say “no” to when they want to bring in the newest, shiniest toys. Organizations are often forced to support devices and technologies before an effective approach to security has coalesced. Hackers know this and exploit those users with the most to lose. It is vital that enterprise security extend to high-profile users.

BYOD
Security is hard. Security over devices you don’t own is even harder. The blending of personal and work time caused by ubiquitous access has forced organizations to support more types of devices than ever before and to expand significantly the perimeter to be defended. The ability to use technology in a business setting must be consistent with user needs. Smartphones are no exception. When people bring their own devices to work, restricting access is a much more difficult problem.

Users who bring their own devices to work increase the risk associated with smartphones and tablets. Relying upon user configuration is always risky and when the user is the administrator of a device, they can misconfigure it or weaken secure configurations by changing settings.

Smartphones
Smartphones represent a critical attack vector. Security professionals must protect phones from over-the-network intrusions from attackers while securing data against access if the device is lost or stolen. Smartphones are no less vulnerable to denial-of-service attacks, malware infections, and phishing attacks than an unprotected PC. Smartphones need to be treated the same as other computers. This entails hardening the hardware and operating system, use of the latest security technology, and training users. Users are constantly downloading potentially dangerous apps to their smartphones. Often, these smartphones do not have antivirus protection, so the problems caused by flawed apps can propagate.

Risk
How security professionals respond to the threats and vulnerabilities introduced by the use of smartphones depends upon your organization’s risk tolerance. What creates risk in this context?

- Lack of adequate policy;
- Lack of security training;
- Degradation of security through personalization of settings;
- Failure to physically secure devices;
- Insecure configuration;
- Access inconsistent with user job requirements;
- Inappropriate data stored on the device;
- Failure to encrypt sensitive data;
- Users connecting to the network in insecure ways.

Policy provides a baseline for users and allows them to understand the criteria against which their conduct is judged. Training helps improve
users’ performance. If you don’t tell your users what you want them to do they aren’t going to do it. Personal use of smartphones may be ‘learn as you go’ but you can’t afford that approach in a business context.

Organizations are more concerned with protecting the data on their devices than in protecting the devices themselves. This underscores the need for organizations to have policy that gives them the ability to wipe devices remotely, even if they are privately owned. Encryption of data at rest and in transit is vital to a secure environment.

Security
The first step in security is to enable password-protection. This is the most important aspect of smartphone security. Access control is the simplest safeguard you can apply to any mobile device. All contemporary mobile operating systems support power-on PINs or passwords.

Enable the ability to invoke a hard reset or data wipe on a lost or stolen mobile device. This security measure can be deployed selectively and can be used to disable business data on personally-owned devices. Another key to securing smartphones is creating and enforcing a secure configuration, including controls that guard the connection and smartphone against key threats. Organizations should implement security software, use strong passwords, incorporate reasonable time-outs, and check for malware.

Encryption “scrambles” the information so it can’t be transferred and interpreted if your device falls into the wrong hands or gets hacked. Lost smartphones pose serious security risks to data, but remote autolock technology, GPS tracking and use of a strong password can help mitigate those risks. Autolock provides an essential security feature to a mobile device by protecting the data currently displayed on it. GPS tracking allows you to pinpoint the location of the lost phone to facilitate retrieval of a lost phone or to alert authorities of the location of a stolen phone. Password protection apps are available for every type of smartphone. A single secure password is used to protect sensitive passwords, credit card data, financial data, and online identities that are stored on a smartphone.

Enabling location-based services allows a built-in GPS to provide a user’s real-time location to the service providers. This information can be used to determine home addresses, work addresses, and daily schedules. Most smartphones allow users to control location-based GPS features for each individual app; permitting a user to use it for a mapping program but not social media. Such selective usage of GPS will limit availability of sensitive location data like home and work locations, and current whereabouts of key employees from those without a need to know.

Updates and bug fixes to system software and apps help ensure that software on smartphones contain the most recent security updates. A regular update cycle is necessary and automated updates are better.

Policy
Proper Use Policy should address personally supplied hardware and also needs to provide for wiping of devices at termination or transfer. Portable Electronic Device Policy should mandate appropriate protection of sensitive information when it is stored, transferred to, or accessed from portable electronic devices or removable media. Policy should require:

- Password, biometric, or similar protection;
- Sensitive information be encrypted with the strongest encryption method practicable;
- Approval to store unencrypted sensitive information;
- Measures to physically secure the device or media;
- Immediate reporting of lost or theft of portable electronic devices containing sensitive information and
- Management approval for exceptions for systems or devices not meeting the standards of this policy.

References

Summary
A secure journey of a thousand miles begins with a single control.

Smartphones are vulnerable to attack. People who attack other peoples’ systems are increasingly professionals. When it comes to smartphones, users create significant risk. The blending of personal and work time caused by ubiquitous access has forced organizations to support more types of devices than ever before and significantly expand the perimeter to be defended. How security professionals respond to the threats and vulnerabilities introduced by the use of smartphones depends upon your organization’s risk tolerance. Smartphones are no less vulnerable to denial-of-service attacks, malware infections, and phishing attacks than an unprotected PC. Smartphones need to be treated the same as other computers. This entails hardening the hardware and operating system, use of the latest security technology, and training users. If you plan to use smartphones in business:

- Update your policy to address smartphones.
- Protect devices with a passcode lock.
- Auto-wipe devices after a specific number of failed unlock attempts.
- Use protected configuration profiles.
- Require encryption.
- Wipe devices if they are lost or stolen.
- Auto-lock devices after periods of inactivity.
- Utilize password protection software.
- Implement continuous refresh policies.
- Minimize use of location-based services.

Paul J. Millis, CPA, CIA, CISA, CCEP, MBA, has worked at the University of Michigan since 1994. He is the Senior Information Technology Audit Manager. He holds a BA in accounting and an MBA from Michigan State University. You may contact Paul at pmillis@umich.edu
SBIR/STTR – on Your Radar Yet?

In the last few years there have been cases involving fraud related to a University Researcher’s SBIR/STTR. The researchers in some cases misrepresented the involvement of their respective institutions. In August of 2009, Senate hearing 111-392 was held to hear testimony related to Waste, Fraud, and Abuse in the SBIR program. We can anticipate that we will hear more from the federal agencies and GAO as the fraud cases continue.

The concept of the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer (SBIR/STTR) Programs is to seed and potentially groom new research to yield technology that will evidently be commercialized. Central to the STTR program is expansion of the public/private sector partnership to include the joint venture opportunities for small business and the nation’s premier nonprofit research institutions.

One of the cases mentioned in the senate hearing involved a former Professor at the University of Florida and Director of UF’s Innovations Nuclear Space Power and Propulsion Institute, INSPI. In February 2009, NASA OIG and the FBI executed Federal seizure warrants at UF as well as at the home and offices of a NASA SBIR contactor, New Era Technology (NETECH). These warrants were issued based on probable cause that the professor, who was a principle at NETECH and his family submitted multiple fraudulent SBIR proposals to NASA to receive maximum SBIR funding. A subsequent US attorney’s Office press release announced the conviction of the professor for wire fraud and producing false documents to a federal agency. According to court documents, the professor and his family members set up a company, NETECH with his wife as president. The press release states that he, working together with his wife, submitted fraudulent contract proposals to NASA and the Air Force. The defendants falsely represented that NETECH would provide research services of scientists, engineers, and laboratory assistants, working in a state-of-the-art analysis and data communication laboratory and that NETECH would be collaborating with INSPI at UF.

The couple submitted contract proposals and reports to NASA and the Air Force, that claimed research and analysis had been performed by NETECH when in reality, the research and analysis had been taken from research projects, theses, and presentations of graduate and doctoral students at UF without their knowledge or consent. Contrary to the couple’s representations, the information provided under the contract was not performed by NETECH, but was taken from work performed at INSPI, at the UF’s Major Analytical Instrumentation Center (MAIC), and at a laboratory located in Russia. The couple also submitted fraudulent invoices and deposited the reimbursement payments into their own accounts and into bank accounts held by their sons, only to later transfer the money back into their own accounts. University of Florida was unaware of the criminal conduct and cooperated fully in the investigation. The professor received six months in prison followed by home confinement and probation.

In another highly publicized case in 2012 a former professor and researcher at Penn State pleaded guilty to multiple counts involving multiple agencies awards; related to duplicate funding involving university and SBIR awards to his private company; he received a 3&1/2 years prison sentence and was ordered to pay $660,000 restitution. The professor was convicted of wire fraud, money laundering and making false statements to secure grants through his solely-owned company, SentechBiomed (SBIR). Count I and Count II of the indictment related to activity of his SBIR. In the application, the professor specifically represented to NIH that he would direct approximately $500K of the $1.2M received to the Hershey Medical Center to conduct clinical research on adult and infant subjects. The clinical studies/trials were not performed and the money was never paid. Instead, the grant funds were misappropriated, in part, for his own use. The US attorney said that the diverted grant money was used in part for a trip to Europe with his wife, a jaunt to Texas for a job interview and the purchase of 53 copies of textbooks he’d written. Count II of the indictment charged him with making false statements to the Dept. of Energy in connection with another grant as a professor at Penn State – he stated he had no other funding for the research when he had a grant from NSF. The professor accepted a second grant later in the year from DOE. When questioned by the University Administration, he assured them there was no overlap in the 2 grants. Subsequently, in 2010 he wrote a paper in which he openly acknowledged funding from both NSF and ARPA-E for supporting the same work. That year, the DOE IG spotted similarity between the grants and NSF began its investigation. The rationale that he gave to the Judge was that he was zealous in wanting to help the world, he said that he committed the crimes because, “I got carried away.” in the search to fund his work. “I honestly ignored grant rules and regulations,” he said. He was sentenced to 41 months in federal prison.

In November of 2012 a DOJ Press Release was issued regarding a Morgan State University Professor and Director of the University’s Center for Advanced Transportation and Infrastructure Engineering Research, ATRC, who was indicted in a Scheme to Defraud the NSF. The Morgan State professor incorporated Amar Transportation Research and Consulting, Inc. (ATRC), and was its president and only director. The indictment alleges that he submitted funding proposals on behalf of ATRC to the STTR. According to the indictment, he fraudulently obtained $200,000 in grant funds from the (NSF) Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) program to fund a highway project, and attempted to obtain another $500,000 though the same program. The indictment alleges that the professor converted the funds to his personal use, including: to make payments on his mortgage and personal credit card; authorizing approximately $11,000 in salary payments to his wife, who did not perform NSF-related work; and writing a $6,000 check to himself. He falsely represented that: he would secure “release time” or negotiate other leave options with Morgan State University.
Janet Simons’s Desk

This week seems to be all about Visiting Scientist/Scholar Agreements (VSAs) for self-funded international visitors to the University of Maryland, Baltimore. Over the past year we’ve executed 140 such agreements. I reviewed a couple of VSAs, and gave some training on export compliance that covers VSA procedures. I’ve even talked with colleagues at another institution working on their own visiting scholar policies and procedures.

As with so many other aspects of research administration, we must balance facilitation with policing. We welcome visitors while we address export compliance and other issues through the VSA process. When the process involves multiple offices and complex regulations, it’s challenging to smooth the way for our visitors and our research administrators. At UMB, we continue to struggle with a conduit that will best “capture” visitors who have independent access to campus resources and need to sign the VSA. But it’s all worth it for the thank yous and smiles from our international colleagues when they arrive on campus.

Janet Simons, MBA, is the Director of Research Policy at the University of Maryland, Baltimore.

What’s on my DESK

Charlene Blevens, CPA is the Director of Post Award Operations at the University of Miami. She is a Certified Fraud Examiner. She has worked in the financial area in both the public and private sector in various capacities for more than 23 years with more than 11 years’ experience at universities in research. She has presented at the NCURA, FRA, SRA and NACCA conferences. In addition she is the author of the Summary of University Audits, Settlements and Investigations located on the National Conference on College Cost Accounting (NACCA) website at www.costaccounting.org. She can be reached at c.blevens@miami.edu

“Collaborate Conversations”

Hello NCURA Magazine readers! We have again compiled some of our favorite recent Collaborate Community conversation topics. Login to NCURA Collaborate and see what else is being discussed out there! Notable recent topics include:

Departmental Administration and Compliance – “Effort Reporting Question”, by Karen Thomas, an Administrative Research Associate from West Virginia State University. Karen is inquiring about effort certification and PI issues where a PI may be full-time and 100% soft-funded, yet still listed on other proposals with no salary commitment.

In Financial Research, Diane Meyer from the Iowa State University Engineering Research Institute posted a survey on cloud computing and sharing of proposal files, to gather data for her article in this month’s Magazine!

Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions – “Faculty Recognition”, by Jeanne Viviani, Director of Research Programs and Services for New College of Florida, asked for some samples of recognition activities to celebrate faculty accomplishments.

Finally, in the Electronic Research Community, Terri Hall, Director of Electronic Research Administration & Reporting at the University of Notre Dame, provided some humor during the recent federal government shutdown by posting a link and lyrics to a humorous “I Need a Grant” parody.

http://collaborate.ncura.edu/home

in order to spend time at ATRC working on the highway project; that ATRC had eight employees; and that another Morgan State professor would be working for ATRC as a Senior Scientific Advisor. In fact, he remained employed full time as a professor at Morgan State and the indictment alleges that none of the statements were true. The professor also allegedly misrepresented the involvement of the University of Maryland in conducting research on the project and further misrepresented that he had obtained a $100,000 investment from a third party in order to qualify for matching funds from NSF. This case is still pending.

Other investigations mentioned in the senate hearing by the IG offices involved duplicate SBIR proposals, providing the same deliverables to multiple agencies, resulting in multiple payments for the same work, misrepresentation of the principle investigator (required to be primarily employed by the SBIR) and submitting false certifications. The NSF IG identified two best practices that are beneficial in preventing and prosecuting fraud; required disclosures and certifications and mandatory attendance at awardee briefings. ■
University of Washington (UW) Grant and Contract Accounting (GCA) is responsible for post-award financial management at an institution that is among the top five universities, public and private, in federal funding. From setting up new awards in the University’s financial system, to billing, reporting to sponsors, compliance, and managing the closeout process in GCA we handle each component of post-award financial management.

Do the following sound familiar: Dramatic increase in research volume? Stagnant staffing levels? Increasingly complex invoicing and reporting requirements? Extensive growth in global research? Explosion in outgoing subcontracts? Swamped beneath a flood of new compliance requirements? “Heritage” financial systems not built for grants management? These were the challenges that GCA faced in 2010 that sparked the clear need for a radical change.

For years we had utilized traditional process-improvement methods to oversee the ballooning post-award workload. Leadership implemented several projects and structural models to address the growing variety and complexity of UW’s diverse research enterprise. We struggled to keep up with growth in customer demand, and our inability to process transactions in a timely manner resulted in unacceptable backlogs. GCA needed to build a foundation of strong business practices to support both employees and daily operations if we were to remain successful.

Enter Lean. Late in 2009, V’ Ella Warren, Senior Vice President for Finance and Facilities at the UW, introduced Lean to her organization. In January 2010, with the guidance of Lean expertise from SISU consultant Mike Martyn, GCA embarked on the first of three major improvement projects focused on budget closings (the financial reconciliation after the end of the research project). At this time, we were structured in teams of three to five. Each team performed four major functions and customer service for a designated group of academic units. GCA’s work areas were filled with unclosed, partially closed, or un-reconciled budgets that, in the face of higher priorities, fell behind—creating a backlog of 5,478 expired budgets, some that had expired years earlier.

A cross-functional team of GCA staff and additional fiscal staff directly involved in the support of researchers, mapped the current state of the process, identified where the process got stuck, and set about to target a streamlined way of closing budgets. A decidedly “low-tech” approach reinforced collaboration, standardized steps, and immediate feedback. We created a standardized physical workspace lacking distractions and competing priorities: six clustered workstations each dedicated to one of the key steps in closing a budget. GCA staff monitored each workstation for visual cues that indicated sticky spots or slowdowns in the closing process. The Lean team kept careful track of progress and at the end of each day, solicited feedback from the staff for ways to improve before the next day began. Within the first 90 days, GCA saw a 50% decrease in the backlog of unclosed budgets.

Customer involvement in designing the new closing process proved to be instrumental to success, as it provided a transparency for the customers into GCA’s work. According to one campus customer who participated on the Lean team, “I like knowing what happens after my department’s 60 days are up (the point at which the budget goes to GCA for closing).”

On the heels of the improvements to the closeout process, a second Lean team was formed to address GCA’s invoice backlog. This backlog consisted of work already performed by researchers, and waiting to be billed to sponsoring agencies within the following month or quarter. This rolling backlog represented $10-16 million in unbilled expenditures during any given month, creating challenges for UW’s sponsors—not to mention the risk to the University of un-reimbursed costs. Mapping the current state of the process uncovered several complicating factors. Chief among these were the wildly varying requirements for documentation from UW’s 3,000 + sponsors, as well as unclear instructions from the sponsors accompanying the respective awards. Strengthening the partnership with our pre-award department, UW’s Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP)—was the next step.

2010: GCA’s standardized workspace for closing budgets
A three-day process-mapping, led by Mike Martyn and using in-house facilitators, focused and energized the invoicing team which included campus representatives and staff from OSP. One member stated, “The best thing about it (the three-day process mapping) is that it will really grab leaders’ attention; it will have impact. We have so much support now!” Team members also noted how integrated all of GCA’s processes are: “It’s all so connected...almost everything starts with budget set-up, whether it’s invoicing, reporting or closing.” Another team member found, “Most of the pain and opportunities are towards the front of the process—if we address that, it may eliminate much of the work toward the back end.” Targeted Lean improvements applied across the invoicing function addressed effective communication between GCA and campus, a strong partnership between GCA and OSP, IT improvements to allow for same-day invoicing set-up, and direct contact with sponsoring agencies to resolve the most complex invoicing requirements.

After these first two GCA teams proved their concepts and saw significant improvements in a short time, a third team came together to leverage what was learned. This team addressed workflow across the office as a whole and radically reconfigured the space. Before the change, staff and leader desks were overflowing with file folders but the type of work and its status were unclear, making it difficult to tell where problems in the processes were. The space was redesigned to support the flow of work by removing physical barriers to invite more collaboration. We created a separate team responsible for customer service to allow the work groups to focus on improving their processes. Processes were re-envisioned, and were transformed. We reorganized from a customer-based structure where each team performed all processes for a set of schools and colleges, to a process-based structure where each process has a dedicated group of staff assigned to it. We refer to these groups as “streams” to encourage the idea of flow. Each stream is broken down into stations dedicated to individual functions and manned by multiple staff trained on that particular function. Creating handoffs as an award moves between stations has resulted in staff exposing steps that may not be necessary or valued by our customer.

Now, almost four years after the first team kicked off, GCA operates completely differently. The walls, cubicles and offices have been torn down. Each stream sits together to facilitate collaboration and information sharing. Standardized desk layouts help provide clear visual cues regarding workflow progress. Visuals show problem areas, and stream members gather each day to review progress, targets and gaps. Staff work together to discuss roadblocks and brainstorm potential solutions which they are encouraged to implement right away. Every day, representatives from each stream in GCA share emerging issues and new ideas at a 15 minute stand-up meeting called a huddle. This daily huddle brings the staff together from their individual processes to celebrate and support each other. The result: decreases in all our backlogs by an average of 80% and a marked increase in customer satisfaction. Our team has a renewed sense of purpose and a common goal to serve our researchers and enable amazing science. All of the changes we have made since implementing Lean have helped us nimbly move toward our goal of serving the growing demands of the research community with no degradation in timeliness or quality.

Lean is a journey. While we’ve made significant progress in GCA, we will continue to make each day better than the last. Lean has helped us realize that, though the volume flowing into the streams will likely increase, we now have the tools to manage that flow, rather than allowing it to become an overpowering flood.

Sue Camber is the Associate Vice President of Financial Management at the University of Washington and the Chair of the Board of the Council on Government Relations. She can be reached at scamber@uw.edu

Kirsten DeFries is the Director of Campus Services at Grant and Contract Accounting at the University of Washington and can be reached at kirsten5@uw.edu

Lily Gebrenegus is the Associate Director of Campus Services at Grant and Contract Accounting at the University of Washington. She can be reached at lgebren@uw.edu

**Path to Zero: Closing**

**Goal: Eliminate entire backlog by December 2013**

September 2013: GCA’s progress toward closing budgets

The backlog eliminating goal was reset in July 2013
NCURA’s International Region, (Region VIII) will hold its first Annual Meeting on April 9th, 2014, in Washington, DC. NCURA Magazine asked the members of the program committee Agatha Keller (ETH Zurich), Annika Glauner (University of Zurich) and Bryony Wakefield (The University of Melbourne), what’s it’s like planning such a momentous meeting.

NCURA Magazine: How does it feel to be developing the International Region’s first meeting?

Agatha Keller (AK): I am very excited about it and am learning constantly. It is very enriching to work together with the other two members of the program committee, to develop ideas, to discuss them, to dismiss them, start again and find a perfect solution.

Annika Glauner (AG): Though it is a big responsibility within the framework of NCURA and its long history of outstanding annual meetings, it is a unique opportunity to actually organize its first international regional meeting. Unique as it gives us the freedom and the responsibility to set the bar and to define formats. Our intention in designing the first International Region Meeting GOING GLOBAL is to stimulate interaction, generate insight and achieve impact across all of NCURA’s regions and communities. We would like the International Region Meetings to become the premier gathering of International Research Administrators and Managers of multinational research centers and institutions.

Bryony Wakefield (BW): Planning the program with Agatha and Annika is a wonderful experience. It showcases research management on an international playing field; as we work together and with the presenters to develop a program that will (hopefully) capture your attention and entice you to attend. Moreover, it demonstrates the ease of working across time zones – Skype has become a very useful tool! I first met Agatha and Annika at the NCURA 54th annual meeting and value the opportunity to work with them. This year I have had the opportunity to present at the Australasian Research Management Society (ARMS) conference and at an ARMS Forum entitled ‘Research Management: Putting the Pieces Together’ and discuss the importance of sister societies. The conference and forum have provided opportunities to promote the upcoming international region meeting and the importance of NCURA.

NCURA Magazine: How did you become involved in the program committee for this meeting?

AK: During the NCURA Annual Conference 2012 Annika and I had a meeting with NCURA Executive Director Kathleen Larmett and we discussed the possible options for the first International Region Meeting. We are convinced that after an initial set-up phase of the International Region the youngest NCURA region is now mature enough to organize its first meeting. As the Past Chair of the International Region it is a great pleasure for me to take over the role as Program Committee Chair. Needless to say that the organization of such a meeting is a team effort between Kathleen’s NCURA Staff in Washington and the Program Committee Members. Without the tremendous help of the NCURA staff this would not happen. They are great!

AG: We believe in the importance of a strong international region for NCURA and this belief we have been engaged in communicating over the past two annual meetings. The International Region seeks to identify, recognize and disseminate initiatives in global research administration endeavors. Thus, the upcoming meeting will be a forum to provide the best expertise and knowledge for problem-solving in international research administration and management with the mission to improve the state of research administration world-wide.

BW: Being able to come together with people from across the globe at the NCURA 54th annual meeting was very important to the development of the
first international region meeting. It provided space to discuss issues pertinent to those working in research administration outside of the United States, wanting to work more closely with research administrations within the United States. There was also a social opportunity for members of the international region to come together at a dinner during the annual meeting. The meeting and dinner provided a space for members from outside of the United States to come together and discuss the value of NCURA and how we, as international members, can be further involved in this exceptional society.

**NCURA Magazine: Where in Washington, DC, will the meeting take place?**

**AK:** The meeting will take place where the idea for it was borne – the Washington Hilton. The annual conference has been held in DC for the past 55 years, 2014 being the 56th annual meeting. But it is not only this tradition, which made us chose this location. GOING GLOBAL will take place exactly prior to next year’s International Network of Research Management Societies (INORMS) conference which will be held in the US for the first time. Our audience as well as the one INORMS intends to attract are similar. So you can call visiting both events a perfect “double bill,” and which will be a win-win situation for the participants as well as the organizers.

**NCURA Magazine: What types of topics will be covered at the meeting?**

**AG:** The title of the Meeting is GOING GLOBAL. It comes at a time when research institutions and centers around the world are facing an unprecedented set of interwoven global challenges – economic, political, societal and environmental. A changing world order, demographic shifts, resource shortages and widening inequalities are putting pressure on governments to create growth and employment while ensuring fiscal prudence, social equity and environmental sustainability. The challenges raised by emerging technologies and changing consumer behaviors require creative solutions around the world. These challenges cannot be solved by one country, by one organization, by one institution but ask for coordinated global research collaborations.

Research endeavors world-wide point to a future where innovation – the effort to create purposeful, focused change in an organization’s or institution’s economic or social potential – is increasingly important as a driver of economic development, competitiveness and risk resilience.

Under the theme GOING GLOBAL, the Meeting’s intensive one-day program therefore explores the innovation imperative under three thematic sub-themes: *Unleashing Innovation: HORIZON 2020; S&T Agreements: Towards a global circular research system and Implications, Challenges and Recommendations: Finding Compliance in legal, financial and ethical aspects world-wide.*

**NCURA Magazine: When will registration be available?**

**BW:** The registration has already started and the program is continuously updated. So if you have not registered yet, we invite you to do so as the number of seats are limited and we are convinced that the sessions will be of great interest not only to our international members but to research administrators from the US as well. So please visit our website regularly: [http://ncuraintlregion.org/meeting](http://ncuraintlregion.org/meeting)

**NCURA Magazine: Will you be attending the INORMS 2014 meeting?**

**AK:** Yes, definitely. It will be a perfect continuation of our meeting and we will have plenty of time to network. They made a great program and I am convinced that one can only benefit by attending both meetings.

**AG:** I completely agree. Our aim with GOING GLOBAL is to encourage dialogue and spread awareness on critical issues to the global research administrators’ community by providing a platform on which ideas, thoughts and questions can be expressed and tackled in an open environment – INORMS allows us to widen this open environment. Therefore the program of the 1st International Region Meeting and INORMS are complementary.

**NCURA Magazine: If a member of your region wishes to volunteer, who do they contact?**

**AK:** Bryony is our Volunteer Coordinator so please turn to her if you are interested in volunteering. And do not worry if you are not yet familiar with NCURA and its regions. Volunteering is actually a perfect way to learn a lot in a short amount of time. You get to know your colleagues and learn to benefit from the vast expertise of your colleagues at home and abroad.

**BW:** If you are interested in becoming a member of the international region committee, please contact me via e-mail: bryonyjw@unimelb.edu.au It would be great to hear from you and also to see you at the NCURA 1st international region meeting.

**Annika Glauner** is Senior Programme & Research Manager, EU GrantsAccess at the ETH Zurich/University Zurich. She can be reached at annika.glauner@sl.ethz.ch

**Agatha Keller** is Co-Director, EU GrantsAccess at the ETH Zurich/University Zurich. She can be reached at agatha.keller@sl.ethz.ch

**Bryony Wakefield** is the Director, Research Unit of Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences at The University of Melbourne. She can be reached at bryonyjw@unimelb.edu.au

---

Don’t miss the International Region’s inaugural meeting April 9, 2014!
Proposal Development and Project Management:

Are You Ready for the Cloud Age?

By Diane M. Meyer

History

So what is the Cloud anyway? It sounds really new and techy, but it isn’t. The Cloud is a term that has been coined to describe a virtual network of computers that are physically located around the world. Cloud services (Nicholson, 2009; Turim-Nygren, 2013) come in a variety of formats, including:

- **Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS)** — provides servers, storage disks, and facilities
- **Platform as a Service (PaaS)** — offers an application platform upon which an application can run, programming language, and web server
- **Computing as a Service (CaaS)** — gives access to raw computing power
- **Software as a Service (SaaS)** — hosting applications on Cloud-based servers; e.g., Cloud storage via Box, Dropbox, Google Drive, iCloud, SkyDrive; email via Google, Hotmail, and Yahoo!

The idea of an “intergalactic computer network” was introduced in the sixties by J.C.R. Licklider, who was responsible for enabling the development of ARPANET (Advanced Research Projects Agency Network) in 1969 (Mohamed, 2009). So, the concept of “Cloud Age” (my term, not Licklider’s) goes back several decades, but it reached critical mass in the late 2000’s when Web 2.0 expanded, allowing Google, Yahoo!, and others to offer browser-based applications to the masses.

My intention, in this article, is to provide information about the use of the Cloud in Higher Education and more specifically in Research Administration, to help the readers make informed decisions about appropriate usage of Cloud Programs/Services and apply the best practices that have been shared by our colleagues. This is not an endorsement of any product or service, and I have no personal or professional conflict of interest to disclose in this area.

The Cloud in Higher Education

Students and faculty at institutions of higher education have used and become proficient in a variety of programs and services that are Cloud-based. They teach and learn on-line, collaborate and write papers, and perform research using High Performance Computing or Big Data. There are many articles on the web that discuss the advantages and disadvantages of Cloud usage in Higher Education (Winkler, 2011; “Carol,” 2010, Hignite, Katz, & Yanosky, 2013; Butler, 2012). Some of the Advantages and disadvantages are highlighted below.

**Advantages:** scalable storage capacity, standardization, security, access to applications and Information Technology (IT) talent, mobile access, cost efficiency (e.g., pay as you go)

**Disadvantages:** cyber-attacks, reliability and availability (e.g., downtime), security, cost for smaller organizations, compliance issues, exit strategies

The Cloud in Research Administration: A Survey

Our responsibilities as research administrators have grown along with the way our researchers work. As grant applications have become more complex with larger requests, increasing interdisciplinary nature of research, and multi-campus applications, file sharing has grown in complexity. The files often become too large to disseminate via email. Plus, so many individuals are involved in contributing to and editing the file(s) that it’s difficult to keep track of versions by email. We are frequently looking for ways to streamline this work. Use of the Cloud may be one answer.

To get a better idea of how research administrators are using the Cloud, I conducted a survey in October 2013. It was open for 11 days and I received 55 responses that were complete enough to include in the following summary (Figure 1). Respondents were from at least 20 states, primarily from pre-award central administration offices, closely followed by post-award central administration offices and pre-award college/department offices.

Survey Design

For the survey, I was interested in the use of Cloud storage for file sharing as it relates to sponsored program administrators. I described Cloud storage as a model of networked data storage which is maintained, managed, and backed up remotely on virtualized pools of storage and made available to users over a network (typically the Internet). There are three main Cloud storage models: Pub-

---

“We believe we’re moving out of the Ice Age, the Iron Age, the Industrial Age, the Information Age, to the participation age. You get on the Net and you do stuff. You IM (instant message), you blog, you take pictures, you publish, you podcast, you transact, you distance learn, you telemedicine. You are participating on the Internet, not just viewing stuff.”

- Scott McNealy, former CEO, Sun Microsystems (Shankland, 2005)

---

**Figure 1. Demographics of Survey Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central Admin</th>
<th>College/Department Admin</th>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Award</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Award</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lic Cloud storage services, such as Dropbox and GoogleDocs; Private Cloud storage services that provide a dedicated environment protected behind an organization’s firewall; and Hybrid Cloud storage which is a combination of these two models, including at least one private Cloud and one public Cloud infrastructure. The security of the files depends upon the hosting companies and the applications that leverage the Cloud storage.

Although nine Cloud Storage Programs/Services were included in the responses (Figure 2), Dropbox was by far the most frequently used, followed by Google and Box. It’s interesting to note that of those who indicated whether they had used another program/service prior to the one they were reviewing, roughly one-third said they had used either Dropbox or Google.

Selection

When asked to rate 18 factors in selection of a Cloud program/service, the top five responses (in order where 1 was selected most) were 1) overall reliability, 2) overall performance, 3) security of data, 4) easy to learn, and 5) file recovery/versioning; the bottom five responses, in order where (a) was selected least, were a) ability to assign and manage tasks, b) integration with other programs/apps, c) accessibility of program/service support, d) quality of program/service support, and e) ease of sharing with users outside the institution. While it makes sense that 1-5 would match the benefits and a-e would match the challenges described below, it isn’t a perfect fit. Could this be because there aren’t enough options to meet our perfect scenario?

Benefits

The most common response to the benefits of the Cloud program/services was ease of use (e.g., administration and file sharing), followed in no particular order by accessibility over low bandwidth, access from various platforms (e.g., desktop, mobile device), backups and security, speed and reliability, versioning (e.g., who accessed the file, what changes were made, ability to access previous versions), and cost (most were free). Several comments highlighted the advantage of using the Cloud when working with international collaborators. As an example, one user said, “[The program] looks and acts exactly as a shared drive. The moderator can invite or disinvite individuals to have access to the shared folders. [The program] makes it extremely easy for multiple users to contribute to proposal materials as long as everyone is aware of the quirks […] (e.g., dragging and dropping files physically moves them from and into [the program folder] instead of copying files). Another advantage […] is that the system sends alerts to users as files are being updated […]. I love this feature because collaborators can get real-time updates when others are working on proposal materials, and I find it motivates others to action. And finally, although our university has the ability to share files, the process of getting the shared drives and user permissions established or removed is cumbersome, multi-step process requiring service requests, etc., and when developing proposals with multiple investigators, I need to keep the process as simple and user-friendly as possible.”

Challenges

The disadvantages of the Cloud program/services can be categorized into two basic areas, with “administration concerns” cited nearly four times as often as “security.” Issues with administration include the burden of creating accounts, assigning/restricting permissions, inability to track versions or assign tasks, and the fact that users can inadvertently delete files from the Cloud folder or edit a file at the same time, which creates multiple versions or lost edits. Most of the comments about security reflected the disapproval and/or absence of support from their own IT staff. One respondent summarized the dilemma this way, “Our IT people would have fits if they learned we were using it, but IT has so far failed to provide an alternative, so it has been and will continue to be used.”

Since the physical computers that are used to support Cloud services can be located anywhere in the world and could contain personal health information (PHI), their usage causes the Research Administration community to pause and consider whether storing particular files in the Cloud is compliant with federal regulations like The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPPA) Privacy Rule, Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR), and Export Administration Regulations (EAR) as well as state, local, and institutional policies. As one survey responded indicated, we need to be cautious that “we are not oversharing & creating risks” as a result and another expressed concerns for HIPPA compliance when using public Cloud services.

Several universities including Iowa State University (ISU) and the University of Wisconsin have worked with Box, Inc. to negotiate a contract that will assure compliance with HIPPA, FERPA, and ITAR/EAR regulations, thus assuring that the files will remain on American-based servers. According to Jason Shuck, Manager Information Technology for the College of Engineering at Iowa State University, the selection and implementation of Box was streamlined due to the fact that Box and ISU are members of Internet2 http://www.internet2.edu/about Internet2 is a consortium, consisting of over 250 Higher Education members working in partnership with industry, government agencies, and other education networks to develop and deploy advanced networking technologies and capabilities in service of U.S. research and higher educa-
Usage and Success Stories

“It’s so freeing to be able to call up files on any machine (or phone), so that I’m not tied to a single computer and others can easily access them, and so that I don’t have to be the conduit through which all edits accumulate in a given file.”

- Anonymous Respondent

Many people shared stories of how they use Cloud storage. Twice as many respondents indicated that they used it with internal collaborators compared to those who have used it with external users. The most common usage was for proposal preparation as indicated by this user who “has a ‘sister department’ within the same institution. We pool our resources together when there is a major grant.” Some unique uses include keeping data/minutes/assignments for system-wide user group meetings, developing policy and procedures, collaborating on conference sessions or articles for NCURA Magazine, and using Evernote as a Cloud-based note taking tool.

Best Practices

Several respondents generously offered what they have found to be best practices:

- Offer an introductory session (probably online) to the working group that covers basic and special features, plus allowing for questions and answers while everyone is virtually together.
- Evaluate your needs prior to establishing a site structure instead of trying to mirror your existing process. Take advantage of the opportunity for improvements and efficiency.
- Implement control over file organization and limit permissions for who can create folders, delete files, etc. Perform a periodic review and reorganization of files.
- At the start of a project, create a folder and ask participants to upload their résumé/cv/bio, current and pending support, and other supplementary materials. In this way, they can see if they have submitted a required document without having to check with the research administrator.

Summary

“Once we had an email submission due, and at the last minute found that the file size exceeded our university’s allowable email attachment limits. The Principal Investigator, without breaking a sweat, sent the program manager an invitation to that particular folder in Dropbox, where the manager was able to open the file and save it to her system. It was a lifesaver in the 11th hour. :-)”

The Cloud Age is here and we can be the agents for change at our institutions. We can cautiously and appropriately use the Cloud to assist our investigators while accomplishing the goal to protect our institutions. Vendors of Cloud Programs/Services are competing with each other to provide the tools that we need (e.g., Box (Tam, 2013), Google (McHugh, 2012)), so keep your eyes open to see what’s coming soon!
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Education: Chemistry/Microbiology at Stockholm University followed by PhD in Neuroscience at Karolinska Institutet in Stockholm. I also took some classes in law, business administration and entrepreneurship during that time. I attend NCURA annual meetings and FRA meetings to learn grant-related topics.

Give us a brief overview of your career and how you ended up at the Karolinska Institutet (KI) in your current position.

I did a postdoc in Belgium for three years investigating the sense of touch (in rats) followed by another postdoc at KI where we studied the function of the spinal cord in leg movements. Then, I was recruited into a research project at AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals in Sweden to develop vectors for delivering blockers of chronic pain into the nervous system. Having jumped between different fields for a couple of years made it difficult to establish my own lab. So, when this job as grants coordinator came up, I felt that it offered a nice combination of challenges related to science and security. I have always liked the visionary part of setting up a scientific hypothesis and devising different ways of testing it more than the actual experiments themselves, so I quickly got into the area of giving advice on applications and other pre-contract support. When I started we really didn’t have a central post-contract office for international grants. It was all handled by the departments back then. During the last seven years, this part has grown more and more, and now it occupies all my time.

In the US most Research Administrators have a business background, but not necessarily a scientific background. How do you feel your background in science assists in your role as a Research Administrator?

It is easier to interface with PIs earlier in the application process. My other colleagues with a PhD and I can give advice also on a strategic level and help with the science writing as well. On the post-contract side it is of less importance, but it helps having been working as scientist in a department to understand what is going on (when things go wrong). It is also valuable having an extensive network among the faculty.

What are your current responsibilities at KI and what do you find most interesting about your current position?

I am currently serving as one of two coordinators of our US portfolio of grants. I review and sign contracts and agreements related to those grants and support PIs and the departmental staff on reporting and audits. I teach most of the classes on US grants management in our grants management course and also develop policy and procedures in different areas of compliance.

I like the teaching part the most, but it is also very rewarding to get the opportunity to meet and support many different people from all areas of the university.

What are some of the biggest challenges you encounter related to managing US funding at a Swedish institution?

The US grants only provide about 5% of the revenue of the external funding but have a large administrative overhead. All changes of policy and procedures invoked by US legislation are not always happily accepted by everyone. As the messenger, you need to be bulletproof.

You have been involved with the NCURA/EARMA International Fellowship Program both by hosting fellows at KI and by being a fellow yourself at Stanford. What benefits have you experienced as a result of this program?

I can really recommend taking part in this program. I had a fantastic time at Stanford, and I learned a lot. I think you need to immerse yourself in another organization to see what you could be doing in a different way at home. Hosting someone is even more valuable as the visiting fellow can interact with many people in your own organization, spreading knowledge which could not be obtained easily another way.

You are currently serving as Vice Chair of NCURA’s International Region, which was established in 2011. How do you see this Region assisting NCURA’s members from outside the US?

I hope the Region can serve as a meeting point for the international members and that we can learn from each other. I think many of us face similar challenges, and perhaps we can develop tools and share experiences within this region that will make it attractive for foreign grant administrators to join NCURA.

The International Region will be holding its first regional meeting on April 9, 2014 in Washington, DC. Tell us about your expectations for this initial meeting.

It will be held close in time and space to the International Network of Research Management Societies (INORMS) meeting, which we hope will be a win-win for both meetings by increasing the number of participants. The challenge will be to offer a program that will entice our international members to come to Washington a second time outside the annual meetings. It is really the inverse of the situation for the other Regional Meetings, which are closer to go to for the members. For some it may be more convenient to travel in April rather than August, but we can never replace or compete with the big NCURA meetings so we have to be inventive. We hope that the international flavor of the meeting will also attract many members from other regions who may be interested in our topics. It is the beginning, so we will have to experiment with both the form and content until we see what is most successful.

Patriq Fagerstedt is US Grants Coordinator at the Karolinska Institutet in Stockholm, Sweden. Patriq can be reached at Patriq.Fagerstedt@ki.se
Dear Concerned: What it says is that you’re blessed. Even better, the blessing may remain with you for a while, since we are finally emerging from the age of the interim acting pro-temp adjunct walk-on stand-in administrator.

What disturbs me, though, is your question. Here the gods come down from Olympus with hot towels and massage oil, bid you stretch out for a full body rub, and you wonder if there is something wrong with you.

If there’s anything wrong here, it is the search mechanism.

It seems that whenever universities seek a new chief research officer, they universally opt for the visionary—which puzzles me. Researchers are typically grounded in evidence. So how realistic is it to hope to find among them someone whose beaker doubles as a crystal ball? Nevertheless, normally sensible people go flaky when they seek a new chief research administrative officer.

The makeup of the search committee guarantees that no common sense will enter. After appointing a dean, an associate vice president, and a department chair, the provost packs the committee with a faculty representative from each college and completely skips the research administration office, arguing that adding another member would make the committee unwieldy.

Too bad. Because anecdotal evidence suggests that even an entry-level research administrator can easily discern the sign of the best person for the job: If they’re male, they’re wearing a bow tie; if they’re female, they’re a woman.

But research administrators aren’t part of the search committee, and so you get the typical hire.

The difficulty is once the new hire arrives on campus, they don’t want to admit they don’t understand the day-to-day business of the research office. So they disguise their ignorance behind a series of requests for information, like: “When you have time, could you dig into this?” or “What’s our policy on such and so?” or “Where are the skeletons on this issue buried?”

At first, you respond meticulously to these requests, believing they have a highly refined national matrix against which they will compare the local scene and as a result will be able to put their finger on an infinitesimal change that will improve things vastly. However, all along they are just trying to figure out what “double entry ledger” means, and are hoping your report will let it slip.

After a while, they begin to ask for reports you’ve already sent in. You find yourself searching for tactful ways to say, “It’s already on your desk.” Finally, you say nothing at all, but simply reformat the earlier report, print it in Arial rather than Times New Roman, and send it in.

So how do you get the one who knows the job and with whom you can accomplish things?

You pray that the top four candidates (yours will be fifth) decline the offer for any of the following most frequent reasons: 1) Their home institution countered handsomely; 2) They discovered they have allergies to rocks in your region; 3) They applied only to earn the last 4000 frequent flyer miles necessary for two free tickets to Rio; 4) a scandal has been uncovered. Or they themselves might be “scandalized” by something so random as a chance remark overheard while touring the research administrative offices, something like “Egad, this is the third allegation of scientific misconduct today!” Not knowing that this simple statement was not at all random but actually staged by the one miffed about not being on the search committee.

It usually works. The candidates with the gold necklaces get scared off, making way for the one with the bow tie.

Which makes you wonder why people don’t do the right thing in the first place and just choose the woman.
What I Learnt about Interdisciplinary Research Collaboration on My Summer ‘Vacation’

By Simon Kerr

The way research is carried out is changing. Researchers and research institutions are confronting the grand challenges, the tough, large scale, and complex problems that require new forms of research collaboration to resolve. I recently had the opportunity to explore these changes more thoroughly through a Universitas 21 Scholarship provided by the University of Melbourne, Australia. The question I started with was: How can universities best facilitate collaborative interdisciplinary research collaboration (IRC)? To answer this, I travelled for two months, via Singapore to Europe, Finland, Norway, the United Kingdom, Ireland, the United States and Canada. I left the Melbourne winter for summer in the northern hemisphere and it felt like I was on holiday. Hence, the title.
Here is a taste of what I learnt:

1 I walk into a meeting with a senior professor. He has been asked to meet with this interloper from a colonial outpost on the edge of the known world. He looks bored, disinterested, disengaged. We start talking, I tell him what I have been thinking, ask him a few questions. An hour later his research colleague is dragging him unwillingly out of the room because he is 30 minutes late for his next appointment (repeat scenario many times over). Lesson: There is a very high level of interest in IRC.

2 Everyone I talked to belonged to a connected network of scholars and researchers. Ok, it was a self selecting group, but they were by far the most dynamic researchers on campus (which was why I got to talk to them). Lesson: The future (and a large chunk of the present) does not belong to the traditional lone scholar, even in the humanities. Contemporary societal challenges will only be addressed through the cooperation of the many.

3 Ego is a funny thing; many of the leading researchers I met had it in spades, but they also were able to rein in that ego to successfully collaborate with a wide range of people and across diverse disciplinary cultures. Individuals cannot solve the grand challenges alone. Lesson: Cooperation is the spirit of the contemporary research effort (in universities at least). The group is more important than the individual.

4 Most new Ph.D. students are now Gen Y (whatever that is). But it does mean that their cultural context is different from the previous generations. The role identity of ‘academic’ or ‘researcher’ is also changing. The United Kingdom research councils fund doctoral training centres (DTC) which train cohorts of students across multidisciplinary environments, embedding soft skills with familiarity and consistent exposure to disciplines other than their own. Lesson: New generation researchers, in general, will be more familiar and comfortable with IRC than previous generations. It will (is) changing their expectations of what doing research means.

5 Some researchers in the UK have been visiting the sandpit* a radical funding process used by UK funding agencies to disrupt traditional ways of thinking about research problems and bring together novel interdisciplinary projects to seek new solutions to the big challenges. Lesson: Interdisciplinary is a conscious activity and IRC is a mindset.

6 Universities were established around historically based disciplinary silos. This is their strength, but also their weakness. Silos are hard to see out of, so many universities, faculty and departments I visited were consciously creating connections, deliberately inventing multidisciplinary interaction and exposure for faculty researchers (‘science seminars for dummies’ is how one university described it). Lesson: We must consciously invest in bridging the disciplinary gaps if we are to see effective IRC.

7 These trends add to the demands of time and skill on active academics. As funding gets more problem focused, collaborations larger, and interdisciplinarity complicates communication, many academics need the support of skilled professional staff. This stuff needs facilitation. Lesson: Research administrators and managers had better take these trends seriously because we will have to be as creative as our research colleagues in making all this happen.  

Simon Kerr, Ph.D., is Manager of Research, Melbourne School and Land and Environment, University of Melbourne, Australia, and is the President-Elect of the Australasian Research Management Society (ARMS). Simon’s responsibilities include research strategy, pre and post award management and policy development. He can be reached at simon.kerr@unimelb.edu.au

*http://knowinnovation.com/expertise/sandpit
After seven years at the helm, Dr. Ian Carter’s tenure as Chair of the UK’s Association of Research Managers and Administrators (ARMA) has come to an end, and on August 1, he was succeeded by Dr. Simon Kerridge, Director of Research Services at the University of Kent.

Simon has been a member of ARMA for 17 years and was a member of the Board of Directors for 12 years, from 2000 to 2012. Prior to his new appointment, he acted as a special advisor to the ARMA Board of Directors in relation to the development of the new five-year Strategic Plan & Implementation Framework. Simon brings with him a wealth of experience, including detailed knowledge of pre-award and post-award finance, post-graduate research, ethics and governance, impact and the UK’s Research Assessment Exercises and Research Excellence Framework. Simon’s professional doctorate is in Research Management and Administration and he is a strong advocate for the formal recognition of research management and administration as a profession and for the accreditation of our profession.

During Ian’s time as Chair, be guided the Association through significant developments and major changes including:

✓ Delivery of an expanded Training & Development Programme, successful annual conferences and the 2008 biennial INORMS Congress

✓ Growth of ARMA’s membership number and expansion of their profile to over 2,000 individuals from across 220 research organisations

✓ Development, launch and continual enhancement of the ARMA Professional Development Framework

✓ Recruitment of a specialist, professional staff base, who deliver ARMA services in a robust operational structure

✓ Development and publication of the ARMA Strategic Plan and Implementation Framework for 2013-18

✓ Laying the foundation for professional ARMA qualifications (the first of which will be launched in January 2014) and ultimately ARMA’s target status as the UK’s Chartered Institute of Research Management

Ian will continue to work closely with us on informing and delivering ARMA’s International Excellence strategic priority, and we would like to take this opportunity to formally acknowledge and thank Ian for his significant leadership of ARMA and for his influence in shaping and strengthening our international community.
NCURA is dedicated to advancing the field of research administration through education and professional development programs, the sharing of knowledge and experience by fostering a professional, collegial, and respected community. The annual meeting is a manifestation of this mission, where there are abundant opportunities for professional development, learning, and networking, all of which is made possible by the many skilled and dedicated volunteers that make up NCURA’s membership.

There is a great deal of planning and effort that goes on behind the scenes for many months in preparation for the annual meeting. Each year the president-elect of NCURA is tasked with selecting two co-chairs to form the leadership team of the Annual Meeting Program Committee. However it does not stop there. This newly formed team must use their combined wisdom to select a program committee of their peers to fill the roles of track leaders. The committee is an organic opportunity for mentoring. The annual meeting has always been an occasion for traditions to be accompanied by brand new ideas.

The NCURA staff has the annual meeting planning down to a well-oiled machine, but it is the co-chairs who pump the fuel into the machine. Each year these leaders are challenged with coming up with a theme, a team of their colleagues to form a program committee, and lots of creative ideas to make their meeting unique.

The first step is to come up with a vision and a theme for the meeting. It is usually the Chair (President-elect) who will come up with an idea for a theme, but working with the co-chairs the idea is fleshed out into a vision that will be the theme of the entire meeting. In our case, we chose the theme of “Investment – Commitment – Rewards” to reflect a sequence of events we discover throughout our participation. This cycle is mirrored by the support our institutions and recognizes that the ultimate gratification that comes by way of volunteering is not the reason we do it but the motivation to continue and encourage others.

The next step is development of the team. As leaders it is important to understand how to build your team. It is important to have some seasoned professionals as well as some rookies on the program committee. As leaders, we are always taking risks, but minimizing the risk by pairing excellence and experience with new blood, this is how you build talent. Leaders delegate. Leaders need to identify leaders to carry out their mission. The program co-chairs identify subject matter experts, who they feel can take on a leadership role for a track, who in turn, in their leadership roles, are challenged with finding experienced presenters, as well as bringing in new talent.

In step with the growing number of international collaborations of our universities, NCURA has evolved to reflect this progress. Our global presence and partnerships, including the representation of 24 countries in our membership, has brought us forward. Our program content included a program track dedicated to the issues we face collaborating beyond our borders and across continents. We are extremely fortunate to have strong leadership and participation from the International Region to help develop this major component of our Program.

Communication skills are one of, if not the most important qualities of a good leader. A leader cannot expect to get the desired results if they are not communicated clearly. An annual meeting has a lot of deadlines, and they must be communicated and followed up on. Communication is the key role of the program chairs. Although the NCURA staff does a lot of the actual follow up with the program, it is important for the co-chairs to understand where things stand at all times, and to be able to step in when necessary and evaluate if changes need to be made to keep the program goals on target.

The leaders must communicate the expectations of the committee early and provide a timeline for the deliverables. Our teams are made up of volunteers who are balancing this extra responsibility of participating on the annual meeting program committee with full time jobs, families, friends and other volunteer activities. Time is a valuable commodity to the busy people that are selected to lead the individual tracks that make up the program. It is important to have a kick off meeting to insure that everyone is on the same page, and to connect regularly with team members, but it is

Charged as President-elect with selecting two co-chairs to lead our AM55 Program Committee, I knew that Bruce Morgan, Susan Zipkin, and I would be a team that could energize and organize the planning for the AM55 Program. Bruce and Susan represented several diverse communities within NCURA; Bruce from California, a large public institution and Susan from New England and a smaller private university. The recruitment of the members of the Program Committee is one of the most important tasks with which the Chairs are charged. This is an excellent opportunity to gather the strengths and expertise from across all regions while balancing experience with opportunities to mentor. With representation from research administration communities all over the world, our Program would cover all aspects: US national and global, federal and non-federal, large and small institutions, senior members and those new to the field.

– Vivian Holmes

DECEMBER 2013
Important that committees do not impose meetings that are not necessary just for the sake of having them.

Follow up, is as important as the initial launch of a great idea. Without proper follow up, and check-in with those you have delegated to, a leader cannot be confident that their vision is being carried out. It is important to nurture the relationships with committee members by checking in, and to understand if they are encountering any unanticipated challenges. Regular check-in’s keep committee members on target, and make them feel appreciated for their efforts.

Reward and celebration: Once the project is complete, in this case the annual meeting has kicked off, there needs to be recognition and celebration of the accomplishments of the team. It is a tradition to have a reception for the program committee, in the presidential suite. The recognition of almost a year’s work is noted as your name is called as a member of the team. You are part of history now, just as all the volunteers throughout the program will enjoy having been part of this huge undertaking. Your fellow committee members are colleagues with whom you share a great accomplishment. The members you personally contacted to volunteer are like new friends.

Co-Chairing an annual meeting is a leadership challenge I had always looked forward to take on, in fact when I attended NCURA Executive Leadership Program just over a year ago and we were asked to identify some goals for the next 5 years. To be an Annual Meeting Co-chair was at the top of my list. When Vivian Holmes called me in September and asked me to take on this role, after nearly falling off of my chair, I enthusiastically accepted! When she told me that Bruce Morgan would be my co-chair I was equally excited. There is nothing more important when taking on leadership roles as having good mentors. I knew that with Vivian and Bruce at my side, I would grow in this leadership role over the next 10 months as we pulled together the first NCURA national meeting to be held in August. Working with such an amazing group of colleagues to pull together AM55 has been one of the most rewarding experiences and proudest accomplishments in my career.

– Susan Zipkin

AM56 Planning Underway

Be sure you plan to attend NCURA’s 56th Annual Meeting as it is going to be great! Michelle Vazin, Program Chair, and Georgette Sakumoto and Cathy Snyder, the Program Co-Chairs, are very excited to be working together to develop an excellent program. We have recruited a wonderful committee that is representative of all regions within NCURA to ensure the program is diverse, well-rounded and very worthwhile. We know what everyone is facing daily in research administration…the change, the concerns, and the lack of clarity. That’s why our theme for the meeting is “The Evolution of Research Administration – facing the future…together.”

While our profession is always dealing with some sort of change, we are currently under a heightened state of uncertainty. But through the NCURA network, we band together to face what lies ahead. With this theme in mind, the program committee met in late November to begin planning and coordinating over 200 concurrent sessions and discussion groups as well as many wonderful full and half-day workshops ranging from basic/newcomer sessions to senior-level offerings. There will be numerous networking opportunities and a little bit of relaxation here and there. We are also very excited to announce that Sunday night’s entertainment at dinner will be “After Dark with Paul and Tucker” featuring Paul Bagala and Tucker Carlson! You will not want to miss it! We are just getting started and already the conference is a must for those of us in Research Administration. There will be much, much more!

Mark your calendars now for August 10 – 13, 2014 in Washington, DC.

Susan Zipkin, a 2012 NCURA Executive Leadership Program (ELP) graduate and NCURA Region I’s Curriculum Committee Co-Chair, served as Co-Chair for 55th Annual Meeting. Susan is currently working as a consultant for Altair, on a project at Boston Medical Center. She can be reached at suezipper@gmail.com

Vivian Holmes is NCURA’s President-elect. Vivian Holmes served as a Chair for the 55th Annual Meeting; otherwise known as the “first annual meeting to be held in summer.” It was, by all accounts, a success. Vivian is Director of Sponsored Research Operations at the Broad Institute in Cambridge, MA. She can be reached at vholmes@broadinstitute.org

Michelle Vazin, Vanderbilt University

Georgette Sakumoto, University of Hawaii

Cathy Snyder, Vanderbilt University
Six new Reviewers have joined the NCURA Peer Review Program. These Reviewers volunteered for service as a result of a recent Call for Volunteers for research administrators from Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions. Appointed by the Board of Directors, these Peer Reviewers bring their expertise and knowledge of best practices to the assessment process of sponsored program operations. The newly appointed Reviewers have completed their five hour orientation and will be participating in reviews in the coming months. In its sixth year, over 50 reviews of sponsored program operations have occurred, at institutions of all size and volume of sponsored awards. Further information on the program is found at: http://www.ncura.edu/content/peer_to_peer_review

President's Message continued from page 3

OSU. My staff has been particularly amazing this year. They have “kept the home fires burning” and kept things going when I couldn’t be here in the office. Y’all are the best!!!

There are also the folks in our national office that make this all possible. You deserve a big thanks as well. This year has given me even more respect for all that each of you does to support us, cheer us on, and “keep the NCURA fires burning.” I feel like a real slacker when I think of all the hours each of you put in to make NCURA the fantastic organization it is. Officers, co-chairs and program committee members come and go, but you’re always there to support us.

I want to thank all of the Regional Chairs and officers for your support this year as well. I very much appreciated and enjoyed being welcomed at each regional meeting attended (and I know Dan and Vivian appreciated it when they attended your meeting on my behalf). I also really enjoyed learning about the different activities that go on in each region. Thank you for letting me be a part of your region.

I want to say thank you again to all of the Board members for all that you’ve done for the organization this year. I value your friendship and camaraderie, and thank you for your support and participation.

I will talk about INORMS one more time. I can’t say “thank you” enough to both Dave Richardson and Kathleen Larmett for the outstanding work they’ve done over the past 2+ years to represent NCURA in a historic INORMS meeting. I look forward to celebrating INORMS’ 2014 success with you in April 2014!

Patricia Hawk is NCURA President and serves as the Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at Oregon State University. She can be reached at Patricia.Hawk@oregonstate.edu
Happy almost end of 2013, everyone! Here are my brief and final updates for the year.

The one day Essentials of Sponsored Research Administration workshop held on Wednesday, October 30 sold out and we’re planning to hold one or two workshops the morning of December 11th.

Speaking of December 11th—save the date! The final RADG of the year (working title: “IRB, IACUC, and Biohazards for the Research Administrator”) will take place that afternoon and afterwards we’ll bring the day to an end with a social hour to celebrate Region I’s accomplishments in 2013.

Save these dates too: The 2014 Spring Meeting will be held on April 27-30 (Sunday workshops this year) will be held at the Mystic Marriott Hotel and Spa in Mystic, CT. Best of luck to 2014 Chair-elect Michelle Auernbach and her program committee.

Finally, I need to extend my heartfelt gratitude to all Region I volunteers, especially the 2013 officers and advisory committee. You have been my inspiration for many a year. Thanks for keeping me sane this year and I look forward to working with all of you again in 2014!

Karen Woodward Massey serves as the outgoing Chair of Region I and is the Director of Education and Outreach in Research Administration Services at the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS), Harvard University. She can be reached at kwmassey@fas.harvard.edu or on Twitter @kwmassey.

What an exciting year and so much more to come. I encourage Region II members to visit our website at www.ncuraregionii.org to stay up to date on upcoming events. As you can tell from the flurry of Region II emails you receive, we have been very busy. Our Professional Development Committee has been delivering workshops all over Region II. The evaluations have been fantastic and our members have truly taken advantage of this learning opportunity. Visit our website because the next one may be near you.

Also do not forget to register for our joint meeting with Region III May 4-7, 2014, in St. Pete Beach, Florida. Our program committee is putting together a remarkable program so please make sure to join us.

Brian Squilla serves as the Chair of Region II and is the Chief of Staff, Office of the Dean of the Medical College, Thomas Jefferson University.

Please join Region III and the Barry University community in remembering Patrick Lynch, Director of Grants and Sponsored Programs at Barry and a member of NCURA, who passed away on October 9, 2013. His colleagues at Barry provided the following:

In the five years Patrick worked at Barry, he was responsible for bringing in millions of dollars to the university, which went on to fund faculty research, service programs, and scholarships for disadvantaged students. At NCURA, Patrick was quite active, attending national meetings and leading workshops on pre-award topics and internal grant competitions at PUI campuses. Such was his reach that he was asked to present at the upcoming conference in San Francisco in March 2014.

Patrick was an inspired and committed employee of Barry, believing wholeheartedly in the university’s mission and eager to spread the word. In turn he inspired others through his good deeds, work ethic, drive for excellence and vast potential. He will be missed by all who knew him.

The next Region III annual spring meeting is being held in St. Pete Beach, Florida, in conjunction with Region II, at the TradeWinds Island Grand Resort May 4th – May 7th. If you have not already made your plans to attend, please do. This is a great opportunity for professional development, to find out how other institutions are handling the issues that you are struggling with currently, and to relax a bit in a beautiful location. As usual we will be looking for members to volunteer to help make this meeting successful, so be on the lookout for an email in the near future. 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 conferences.

Region III is thrilled to announce winners in the recent election of Danielle McElwain, University of South Carolina (Chair-Elect) and David Smelser, University of Tennessee (Secretary-Elect). We would also like to congratulate our two travel award winners, MuKesha Voltz from the University of Alabama and April Bennett from Elizabeth City State University.

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

“Give what you have to somebody, it may be better than you think.” – Henry Wadsworth Longfellow

From writing articles for newsletters, magazines, and journals to presenting at workshops, sessions, and YouTube Tuesdays to serving as committee members, mentors, and reception hosts, new and seasoned research administrators alike make contributions of time and talent that are the life-blood of Region IV.

Plan to participate in the Region IV Spring Meeting in Indianapolis on April 27-30, 2014. This cornerstone event promises to be fun-filled, action-packed, and information-loaded. The meeting theme is “Keys to Success,” offering research administrators a clear map as they drive to meet their goals and advance their skills. If you are interested in presenting at the conference, please contact Chair-Elect Sue Kelch suekelch@umich.edu

Watch your email for more updates and volunteer opportunities!

The Region IV Professional Development Committee is recruiting mentors for 2014. Mentors are motivated individuals who provide advice, support and guidance to colleagues who are just entering into the field. Visit the regional website for details on how to sign up: www.ncuraregioniv.com.

Congratulations to Christa Johnson, Washington University in St. Louis, who will serve a two-year term as the Region IV representative on the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee, and to David Lynch, Northwestern University, who will serve a two-year term as Regionally Elected Member to the National Board. Terms are effective January 1, 2014 - December 31, 2015.

Make 2014 the best year ever – give what you have to extend Region IV’s proud tradition of supporting research together!

Jeremy Miner serves as the Chair of Region IV and is Director of Grants and Contracts at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire.

REGION V
Southwestern
www.ncuraregionv.com
https://www.facebook.com/group.php?gid=78596532079&v=wall

Wow, what a year! Usually you are still recovering from the annual meeting. Now, with the annual meeting moved to August, you’ve been back in the office for several months. What possibly could have happened to cause more stress in our jobs? How about sequestration and then a government shutdown! Hopefully your work has settled back to “normal” and you will be able to enjoy the upcoming holiday season. You may want to pick up an updated copy of the FAR clauses to read while you relax by your fireplace.

We need the help of all our members to make our Region the best it can be. In the coming months we will be soliciting volunteers from our members to run for one of our Regional positions. We will be electing a Vice-Chair, Treasurer and two at-large members to the Region V Executive Board. If you want to get more involved in the region and contribute more to the research administration profession, please consider running for one of these positions. Our Regional Committees will also be looking for volunteers, if you are interested, please reach out to the Chairs.

You will soon be receiving an invitation and instructions via email to join Region V’s Collaborate page. Collaborate is an online tool supported by NCURA National. Collaborate provides a forum for communication, not only to our members, but between and amongst our members as well. We believe Collaborate will be a valuable tool for sharing information, ideas, and resources. Many of us have been participating in the Collaborate neighborhoods since their launch in 2012 and have seen firsthand the potential of the system.

During November, the Site Selection Committee visited several hotels in Houston to evaluate possible sites for the Regional Spring 2015 meeting. We hope to announce the meeting dates and location very soon. While we are on the subject of Region V’s Spring Meeting, Chair-Elect Hollie
Schreiber, Oklahoma State University, and her program committee have been busy planning for our 2014 Spring Meeting, May 3-7 in Austin. The theme for the Austin meeting is “Alternative Research Administration: Keepin’ It Weird.”

You can follow Region V on twitter @ncura5 and join our Facebook page by searching for NCURA Region V.

Scott Davis serves as Chair of Region V and is Associate Director at University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center.

REGION VI Western
www.ogrd.wsu.edu/r6ncura

I say this every year when winter begins: “Where did the year go?” I bet you say it too! It may seem like a quiet time of year for NCURA, but we are busily planning for regional activities at the March 2014 Financial Research Administration (FRA) and Pre-Award Research Administration (PRA) conferences in San Francisco. New for us will be the Region VI New Member Receptions at these conferences. In the past, such receptions only took place at our Regional Meeting and the Annual Meeting. However, we know new members join throughout the year and we want to make sure everyone gets a welcome and orientation to Region VI. Please spread the word to your colleagues who will be attending, but who are not members yet. New members will receive their invitations via email.

Quick reminder – The 2014 Regional Meeting will take place October 5-8 in Reno, Nevada. Preliminary meeting information is available at: http://www.ogrd.wsu.edu/r6ncura/meetings.aspx If you are interested in volunteering, helping with the planning, or presenting, please contact 2014 Chair Samantha Westcott swestcott@chla.usc.edu

In the last issue, I thanked my fellow officers, Treasurer Tim Mildren, Seattle University, and Secretary Sinnamon Tierney, Portland State University, for all their work to make this year a success. I would like to now take the opportunity to wish the 2014 officers an even more successful year… Chair Samantha Westcott, Children’s Hospital Los Angeles; Treasurer Sharon Elenbaas, Loyola Marymount University; and Secretary Derrick Jones, LA Biomedical Research Institute. It was my pleasure and honor to serve as your Chair of Region VI. Best wishes for a wonderful holiday season!

Katherine Ho serves as Region VI Chair and is the Deputy to the AVP and Executive Director of the Office of Sponsored Research at Stanford University.

REGION VIII International
http://www.ncuraintlregion.org

Save the date! The 1st International Region Meeting is taking place April 9, 2014, in Washington D.C. This meeting precedes the International Network of Research Management Societies (INORMS) 2014 and is a great way to attend two international meetings in one week, how can you resist?

Colleagues in the International Region are very excited by this meeting. The meeting will focus on synergies between four hotly debated issues in research and higher education world-wide: internationalization and mobility, excellence, funding and social inclusion. The program is currently being finalised and registration will open in early 2014.

We have begun the journey of promoting the meeting in Australia through the NCURA sister society, the Australasian Research Management Society (ARMS). The annual conference for ARMS was held in Adelaide, Australia from 11 – 13 September. A group of research administrators gathered prior to the ARMS reception to discuss the upcoming meeting; those in attendance included Patricia (Pat) Hawk, NCURA President and Director, Sponsored Programs at Oregon State University; Denise Clark, Associate Vice President at University of Maryland and Dr. Bryony Wakefield, NCURA International Region Volunteer Coordinator and Director, Research Unit, Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences at the University of Melbourne.

Highlights of this upcoming meeting were also discussed at the ARMS session, “How to be Seen and Collaborate at an International Conference: How 3 Aussie Girls Survived and Thrived at NCURA,” presented by Dr. Sue O’Brien, The University of Queensland; Dr. Bryony Wakefield, The University of Melbourne; and Julie Ward, The University of New South Wales. This session provided an opportunity to discuss the value of attending research administration meetings and how this can lead to future collaborations.

So start packing and we look forward to seeing you in April 2014.

Dr. Bryony Wakefield serves as the Region VIII Volunteer Coordinator and is the Director, Research Unit, Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences at The University of Melbourne and is a member of the Program Committee for the International Region Meeting 2014.
Earn your Master of Science degree online in Research Administration at RUSH UNIVERSITY

Why Rush University?

• Flexible and engaging online environment with your busy schedule in mind

• The MSRA program provides a unique online graduate education experience for current professionals in all areas of research administration

• Nationwide opportunities for professional career advancement in areas such as universities, research and medical institutions, government laboratories and clinical trial offices

• Learn from the experts! Students enrolled in the program will work with faculty and administrators to become leaders in the field of research administration

• This program will prepare you for leadership roles as administrators and educators

Research Administrators: Advance your career with a Master of Science in Research Administration degree.

for more information:

Email CHS_Admissions@rush.edu or visit our website at www.rushu.rush.edu/msra

APPLY NOW

www.rushu.rush.edu/msra
Charlene Blevens, formerly Assistant Vice President for Research Accounting at Florida International University, became the Director of Post Award Operations at the University of Miami on November 1.

F. John Case, formerly with PricewaterhouseCoopers Higher Education and Academic Medical Center Practice, is now the Senior Vice President for Operations and Chief Financial Officer at Morehouse School of Medicine in Atlanta, GA.

Marianne Woods, formerly Senior Associate Vice President for Research at the University of Texas at San Antonio, has accepted a position at Johns Hopkins University as Faculty and the Director of the Master of Science Program in Research Administration.

Research Administration Memes Facebook Page - https://www.facebook.com/ResearchAdministrationMemes
Research Administration Memes Twitter Page - https://twitter.com/ResAdmMemes
NCURA’s Traveling Workshops head to Orlando
February 10-12, 2014

Start the year off right by enhancing your job knowledge! Learn from well-respected senior research administrators and meet others who share similar job challenges. Choose from:

**Departmental Research Administration Workshop**
- Best practices for a department administrator’s day-to-day activities
- Discussion of OMB Circulars A-21, A-110, and A-133
- Tools for successful department administration
- Pre-Award administration
- Management of the award
- Compliance Challenges
- Close-out and audit

**Level I: Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration Workshop**
- For the newcomer (less than 2 years experience) or for the individual who has worked primarily in only one area of sponsored projects administration
- Provides participants with a broad overview of the various aspects involved in sponsored projects administration
- Compliance Issues
- Preparation and review of proposals
- Negotiation and acceptance of awards
- Financial and administrative management
- Close-out and audit

**Level II: Sponsored Projects Administration Workshop – Critical Issues in Research Administration**
- For more experienced research administrators
- Institutional compliance responsibilities
- Proposal creation, budgeting and award administration
- Contract and subaward review
- Export controls
- Post award financial administration

Registration and hotel information is available at www.ncura.edu
WEBINAR
EXPORT CONTROL REFORM: What Your Institution Needs to Know Today! December 10, 2013, 12:30-2:00 pm ET

NATIONAL TRAVELING WORKSHOPS
FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP
Charleston, SC December 9-11, 2013

DEPARTMENTAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP
Orlando, FL February 10-12, 2014

LEVEL I: FUNDAMENTALS OF SPONSORED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP
Orlando, FL February 10-12, 2014

LEVEL II: SPONSORED PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP – CRITICAL ISSUES IN RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION
Orlando, FL February 10-12, 2014

NATIONAL CONFERENCES
2014 FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION (FRA) CONFERENCE
San Francisco, CA March 15-17, 2014

2014 PRE-AWARD RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION (PRA) CONFERENCE
San Francisco, CA March 18-20, 2014

INTERNATIONAL NETWORK OF RESEARCH MANAGEMENT SOCIETIES (INORMS) CONGRESS
Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, DC April 10-13, 2014

56TH ANNUAL MEETING
Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, DC August 10-13, 2014

ONLINE TUTORIALS
A Primer on Clinical Trials – 8 week program
A Primer on Federal Contracting – 8 week program
A Primer on Intellectual Property in Research Agreements – 8 week program
A Primer on Subawards – 8 week program

DEADLINES FOR JANUARY/FEBRUARY 2014
Submission of Articles to Contributing Editors December 2, 2013
Submission of Articles to Co-editors December 6, 2013
Submission of Advertisements December 6, 2013

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