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The Broadway show Annie is making a comeback on the big stage. As a reminder, Annie is an 11-year-old red-headed orphan girl, optimistic and spunky, whose only wish is to find her parents, according to Wikipedia. Sammy and Derek share optimism in their “Hard Knock Life for Us” piece and Beryline shows spunk with her “Just Thinkin’ About Tomorrow” article. Instead of looking for our parents, we, as research administrators, search for the best and least burdensome way to manage our projects, but sometimes need direction. Bruce and Tony help us navigate processing gifts vs. grants with their “Where Do I Send this Check” article. Ty M. Neffert from Livonenprosser University will make you laugh telling us about “The Theater.”

We also have added a few other items in this issue to help bring some sunshine your way.

1. Several of the answers to our “Question of the Issue” asked on NCURA’s Facebook and Twitter accounts are listed. Remember to like and follow us!

2. “Research Administration…By the Numbers” shows various statistical numbers that impact research administration.

3. “What’s On My Desk” is where I ask four folks from around the country to share the pressing issues on their plate.

Have fun with these new items!

I will do what I can to fill Jim Casey’s shoes and if I stay optimistic and add some spunk, just may be able to keep the sun shining and the colors of the rainbow bright (and no cliffs)!! Maybe, like Annie, we meet “Daddy Warbucks” who open their pocketbooks and hearts to our research projects. Enjoy the Magazine!

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 NCURA’s Immediate Past President. He can be reached at nordquist@wsu.edu
“May you live in exciting times” is my New Year’s salutation to you, and it is very appropriate for NCURA!

I really believe our organization is living in interesting times. It is a time of firsts for our organization. In the last NCURA Magazine, Dan Nordquist, Immediate Past President, talked about what an exciting year 2012 was for NCURA and all of the great things accomplished. As I read his article, I saw the theme for the 2012 Annual Meeting reflected throughout. 2012 did indeed honor old traditions and ring in new beginnings.

The balance of the old and the new are reflected in NCURA’s core values, and this balance is what makes NCURA the strong and vibrant organization it is today. If you look at NCURA’s four strategic goals, you will see that they revolve around education, knowledge exchange and service as an information resource. NCURA’s formal educational opportunities have grown well beyond the annual meeting and the original Fundamentals travelling workshop. In 2013, we should have two versions of Fundamentals—the “traditional” model and a new, more condensed model that will require some advance work. To be able to see this new version of a workshop that has been offered for more than 30 years will be just one of the new beginnings in 2013.

There are more exciting new beginnings for 2013. For the first time ever, the Financial Research Administration (FRA) Conference and the Pre-Award Research Administration (PRA) Conference will be held “back to back”, and they will be held in one of my favorite “foodie” places—New Orleans. Pat Fitzgerald and Dennis Paffrath, co-chairs for FRA, and Christa Johnson and Toni Shaklee, co-chairs for PRA, have assembled outstanding program committees and programs. I hope that I will see you in New Orleans for one or both of these meetings! There are special discounts if you combine parts or all of both meetings. Since these meetings will be run consecutively, we have negotiated an excellent room rate; this helps make the meeting more affordable for you—the member.

Our very first Annual Meeting in the month of August will also occur in 2013. By moving this meeting to August, NCURA was able to negotiate a very favorable contract with the Hilton and the sleeping room rates will roll back significantly. The move helps make the meeting more affordable for you—the member. Although we’re moving the timeframe for the meeting, I know Vivian Holmes, our Vice President/President-Elect, has chosen two outstanding Program Co-Chairs, Bruce Morgan and Susan Zipkin. Vivian has also assembled a great Program Committee. I am also positive that we will see an outstanding meeting program, and one that will honor NCURA’s tradition of high quality Annual Meetings.

I hope you’ll take advantage of the summer timeframe for the meeting and consider bringing your family with you. I grew up in Alexandria—right across the river from Washington, DC, and I now realize how lucky I was to be able to visit all of the galleries the museums, the Zoo, and everything that this area offers. Washington, DC is really a great place for a summer vacation. Bring the family and you also won’t have to worry about conflicts with either Halloween or NIH deadlines!

The last thing I want to share with you in this article are my thoughts for the leadership of NCURA—both nationally and regionally. I want to make sure that our leadership is informing our members. By informing our members, we can inspire our members. With that inspiration, we can then engage our members. NCURA is now over 7,700 strong. With both the national and regional leadership, it my hope that all of you can be informed, inspired, and engaged. I look forward to serving you as your President in 2013, and I hope you will enjoy these interesting times. Just remember the theme of this Magazine—the sun will come out tomorrow. 2013 will be sunny for NCURA!

Patricia Hawk is NCURA President and serves as the Director of Sponsored Programs at Oregon State University.

She can be reached at Patricia.Hawk@oregonstate.edu
As I sit writing this Capitol View in the middle of December, it’s not visions of sugar plums or an elderly gentleman dressed in red that come to mind. I’ve been thinking about whether I’ll get candy or coal in my “professional” stocking this year and wondering what the New Year will bring. And thinking and waiting and wondering seem to be common afflictions among my colleagues in Washington, D.C.

What might my colleagues and I get under the proverbial tree? Hmmm?

My colleague David might get the long-promised grant reform proposal from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Council on Financial Assistance Reform (COFAR). Waiting since the summer, it is more likely a treat for 2013. There is an expectation that OMB and COFAR will propose a new “Consolidated Circular” that combines eight existing circulars into a single OMB guidance document. And what might such a consolidated circular look like?

It may be reasonable to assume that it will be presented as a single document, with three distinct sections: Administrative Requirements (A-110 and A-102), Audit (A-133 and A-50) and Cost Principles (A-21, A-122, A-87, and Hospital). Within each distinct section, the consolidation could vary – for example, A-133 (Single Audit) and A-50 (Audit Follow-up) would seem to have little overlap. On the other hand, consolidation of the Cost Principles would be a more significant update to the Circulars and might include special carve-outs/exceptions for each type of performer (i.e., definitions for organized research, application of the 26% administrative cap, etc. still would be applicable to colleges and universities only). Other more generic cost treatments would be captured in a section applicable to all entities. The greatest risk for any of the government’s partners would be the unintended consequence of a seemingly minor change from consolidation that results in significant repercussions. There would likely be (at least!) a 60-day Public Comment period to make comments to the proposed new Circular.

And my colleague Bob hopes to get a change of heart from the Scrooge-like US Patent Office. During the long process that led to passage of the America Invents Act (AIA, PL 112-29), the Washington-based higher education associations fought hard to maintain the one-year grace period for scientific publications that was a feature of the previous U.S. “first to invent” patent system. Normally, prior public disclosure of an invention constitutes prior art, which prevents one from subsequently obtaining a patent. The associations wanted to ensure that in changing the U.S. patent system to “first inventor to file,” that one-year grace period was maintained.

Unfortunately the final legislative language in the AIA is ambiguous on this point. While it appears to maintain a one-year period prior to filing for a patent where an inventor can make public disclosures and still file for a patent, this prior art exception may be severely limited. In the view of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), the subject matter disclosed must be identical to that disclosed in the patent application for the grace period to apply. Insubstantial changes or obvious variations to the subject matter disclosed are not covered by the grace period (and thus do not fall within the shield provided by the grace period prior art exception). Under this interpretation, someone could copy the disclosure in a scientific publication, introduce a “mere insubstantial change” or “trivial or obvious variant” and publish the resultant product, perhaps just on a website, to establish patent-defeating prior art. The clear intention of the grace period is to encourage early publication consistent with the mission of universities to disseminate new knowledge broadly. This interpretation essentially guts the grace period for scientific publications, and will force universities to make very early (and potentially costly) decisions about filing for patent protection on inventions.
Hoping to get the USPTO to change its views, the associations have proposed that USPTO provide some latitude such that if subject matter previously disclosed is basically commensurate with the claimed invention in a patent application, the grace period will apply. Failing that, a change to the AIA will be advocated in the next session of Congress to restore a full and effective grace period as originally intended.

And me? I bet I get a proposed institutional policy on the management of dual use research of concern (DURC) in the New Year. As reported earlier, the Department of Health and Human Services’ (HHS) Office of Biotechnology Activities (OBA), acting for the Federal government, implemented the US Government Policy for Oversight of Life Sciences Dual Use Research of Concern (DURC) in March, 2012. The policy, addressing research using 15 select agents and toxins and 7 experimental models or aims, describes the principles informing the policy, establishes the scope, and outlines the responsibilities of Federal departments and agencies. Federal agencies reviewed current and proposed research to determine if any of the research fell within the scope (using the identified agents or toxins with the specific research aims) and met the definition of DURC (research that, if directly misapplied, poses a significant threat). Some institutions, identified as conducting research that fell under the policy, engaged in lively and productive discussions to design mitigation measures, as appropriate.

In a presentation in June, Amy Patterson, Associate Director for Science Policy at the National Institutes of Health (NIH), noted that the roles and responsibilities of research institutions would be the subject of a proposed local policy to be issued for comment late in the summer. The policy would be issued with companion documents that provide tools to assist in implementing the policy. Some of those tools are available now through the National Science Advisory Board for Biosecurity and, when complete, offer assistance in identifying and assessing the risks and benefits of DURC research, developing an institutional code of conduct, and providing guidance for responsible communications of DURC.

Hmm? I’m thinking I might take the approach of my mother who, when asked by one of her charming but boisterous, candy-fueled, anticipation-wired five daughters – all born within two years of each other – what she wanted for Christmas, always responded “peace and quiet.”

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

References:
Blum, Helen “Sugar” Kane, 1922-1996.
It seems like the phrase “in today’s economy…” comes out in every conversation and is part of the explanation of preference for anything that we find wrong around us. Any attempt at sharing a positive thought may instantly be shut down by an antagonistic response, crushing any ray of sunshine lurking through the clouds into a bleak scene of menacing thunder, wind, and rain.

It is easy to get swept away by the wave of pessimism in hard times and start complaining about how tough we have it in research administration and how our institutions are being choked by financial crisis. Though times may be challenging in research administration, it is not as if everything is lost. Times are indeed tough for many people who have lost their jobs, their homes, and for people who struggle day-to-day to make it to the next day; so, let us keep things in the right perspective. The research administration landscape looks as exciting and promising as ever.

The Broader Perspective: Even in hard times, people are willing to give and they do give

According to The Charity Aid Foundation’s World Giving Index, the U.S. is ranked as the most charitable country among the 153 nations included in the study (Globalpost, 2011). Other countries, such as China, are trying to emulate the U.S. strategic philanthropy culture (Market Watch, 2012a). There are many organizations still giving away large amounts of money. The Giving in Numbers 2012 Edition report by the Committee Encouraging Corporate Philanthropy (CECP), in association with The Conference Board, indicated that, in 2011, 60% of the 213 surveyed Fortune 500 companies increased their total giving levels compared to 2009, a tough year in which most companies’ corporate giving decreased. With the exception of the Utilities sector, all other industrial sectors reported an increase in their total giving during that period with a median total exceeding $21 million (CECP, p.11). In addition, 40% of companies expected their giving to increase for 2012 (CECP, p.14).

The executive director of the CECP, Charles Moore, said that companies are increasingly giving larger grants to a smaller pool of organizations located where they have community connections, thus increasing community engagement (Market Watch, 2012b). The median grant size has risen 31% in the last several years, from about $23,000 in 2009 to about $30,000 in 2011 (CECP, p.13). Companies rallied the support of employees (a median of $2.37 million) as well as non-employees (a median of $1.97 million) to give to different causes (CECP, p.31).

Narrowing Down on the Research Funding Landscape

Even in a less than ideal economy, sponsors are still funding research. Last September, for example, the National Football League (NFL) donated $30 million to the National Institutes of Health in unrestricted funding (NFL, 2012). In another example, last October the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation announced more than $21 million in new grants through its Grand Challenges Explorations program to fight health and development issues around the world (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2012).

On the federal side, the 26 U.S. federal grant-making agencies together have 900+ grant programs. Even though federal grant spending has gone down after the completion of the ARRA stimulus funding bubble, grant spending in each of the last three years (FY09-FY11) has been more per year than in the previous 8 years (FY00-FY08). Furthermore, the President’s budget request for FY13 includes $140.8 billion for Research & Development, a $1.95 billion (1.4%) increase from the FY12 estimated funding level of $138.9 billion (Sargent, 2012). Even in a financially constrained scenario, there is still a significant amount of money and numerous programs that look to address many problems and needs.

There are grants that look to tackle pressing needs that impact generations to come; from grants to protect vital habitat lands and endangered species (U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service) to those that better our children’s education (U.S. Department of Education Race to the Top Grants). There are also grants to address situations
that happen unexpectedly, a recent example being Hurricane Sandy. The Federal government moved rapidly to offer emergency grants to affected areas. For instance, the U.S. Department of Labor gave a $15.6 million National Emergency Grant to assist New Jersey with cleanup and recovery efforts. Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania also got a $15 million Federal grant to build a large floodwall to prevent not only millions of dollars in losses, but more importantly, to preserve basic services and protect its residents.

We are fortunate to have, even in hard times, the vast resources which many other nations can only dream of.

Coping with the Increasing Challenges in Research Administration: Regrouping and Moving Forward

Though we may tend to easily allow the cloud of “today’s economy” to shadow our daily work in research administration, keeping a healthy perspective on everything around us will help us overcome the day-to-day difficulties we face in our profession. Though you may face some adversity and be under some stress, do not let the situation get the best of you. Put up a fight. Stay positive. Keep your cool and apply your strengths. Think of a time back when you were facing some adversity. What personal quality helped you cope and move forward? Was it your ability to stay focused? Was it persistence, or initiative, or your gift to network, or your creativity?

Whatever it was that helped you overcome some hard times, draw a mental picture of that quality. If it was persistence, what would persistence look like for you? Draw it or describe it out loud. Perhaps persistence can be a picture of a cat jumping numerous times to reach a window in order to get out. Or faith may be a picture of a wife holding her husband’s hand, reassuring him in times of sickness. Initiative may be a picture of a son making a call to a parent to ask for guidance on how to solve a difficult situation.

As you picture/draw that quality, is there anything else about that persistence? What kind of persistence is it? Is there anything else about that faith? Where inside is that faith? What kind of initiative is it? Where is that initiative? When confronted with tough times, recall that image. Activate that mental picture of faith, strength, or creativity.

It is ok to sometimes feel that “It’s the hard-knock life for us!” Just like that Annie song says, “It’s easier than puttin’ up a fight.” But do not forget that other song, that “tomorrow there’ll be sun!”

Yes, things are tough—there is more competition, surely. That it is a challenge, we agree. But so far, we have survived and things are looking up. Instead of fearing the increased competition, let us take advantage of the potential for collaboration. Rather than looking back on how good things were sometime in the past, let us look forward and make it even better. Just like we have done before, let us dig deep, recall and exercise those qualities that, put together, continue to make us a successful enterprise.

References
Where Do I Send this Check –
The Gift Office or the Grant Office?

By Bruce Morgan and Anthony (Tony) F. Ventimiglia

While the goal of increasing extramural funding for our institutions has become more imperative in recent years, achieving consensus on how this funding is classified and processed within an institution sometimes is more challenging than completing a Rubik’s Cube. However, many institutions have been working diligently toward bridging the gap between Sponsored Programs Offices and offices of advancement/corporate and foundation relations and building or repairing relationships through collaborative efforts. Before discussing the advances made in this regard, it is important to understand some of the underlying issues and challenges. With that in mind, please note that the intent of this article is not to examine the IRS definition of “charitable contribution”, but rather to discuss the institutional landscape in which extramural funding classifications are made. As the authors, it is our position that it is up to each institution to determine whether its extramural funding classification policies and procedures account for or consider the IRS definition of a “charitable contribution”. Likewise, it is not our intent to advocate for, or against, an institution’s role in advising a donor/sponsor whether the funds they are providing constitute a “charitable contribution” as defined by the IRS.
GIFTS V. GRANTS: Exchange and Non-exchange Transactions

Appropriate classification of funding is important to institutions; it determines how to account for the funds, recover costs, monitor activities, and report on the use of the funds to internal and external constituents. Most institutions classify extramural funding as non-exchange transactions (i.e., gifts) or exchange transactions (e.g., grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, sales and service agreements, etc.). For public institutions, the appropriate classification of funding takes on additional importance as they are charged with the stewardship of public assets and misclassification of funding may lead to the misuse, mismanagement or abuse of the assets entrusted to them.

In non-exchange transactions, the intent of the giving party (donor) is to make a charitable contribution (typically cash, cash equivalents or property). The donor neither receives nor expects to receive anything of material value in return for the contribution. Typically the donor seeks only to ensure that the disposition of the gift is carried out in accordance with their wishes and that the gift is appropriately recognized. Such transactions are generally processed by an institution’s advancement/corporate and foundation relations unit. In contrast, an exchange transaction is one in which the sponsor receives something of material value in return for giving something that the parties perceive to be of equitable value – a quid pro quo arrangement. These reciprocal transactions usually take the form of a contract, agreement, grant, or letter of understanding and breach the agreement usually triggers consequences for the breaching party. Exchange transactions are generally handled and processed by an institution’s Sponsored Programs Office.

A critical aspect of the extramural funding classification process is conducting an analysis that examines the intent of the party providing the funding. The intent of donors in the context of non-exchange transactions is characterized as charitable and philanthropic in nature. During the analysis, the intent of the donor should receive significantly more consideration than the label used by the donor and others to describe the transaction. A donor may provide a gift, but call it a “grant”. This designation alone is not sufficient to classify and process the funding as an exchange transaction.

It is not unusual for donors to provide “grants.” Likewise, it is not unusual for an institution to determine that such funding is most appropriately accepted as a gift, as defined by the institution in its policies, and administered by its advancement/corporate and foundation relations unit. Consider the example of a company that provides a grant to support student scholarships where the company wants the scholarships to carry its name (e.g., VentMor, Inc. Scholars), as well as receive a report highlighting the scholarship recipients and the amount of each scholarship. Such an arrangement does not convey something of significant value to the donor; thus, a quid pro quo does not exist. In this example, the institution’s advancement/corporate and foundation relations unit would normally process the funding as a gift.

While the intent of the party providing the funding is very important, it is not the only factor and institutions should ask additional questions during classification analysis, such as:

- Does the funding support an activity or project with a defined period of performance?
- Does the donor/sponsor reserve the right to revoke the funding at its own discretion?
- Will the donor/sponsor acquire patent and/or other intellectual property (IP) rights?
- Does the donor/sponsor require the return of unexpended funds?
- Does the donor/sponsor reserve the right to conduct a detailed audit of the program or activity?
- Are financial reports and/or detailed programmatic progress reports required by the donor/sponsor?
- Does the activity involve the testing, analysis or use of the donor/sponsor’s proprietary information, materials, or products?
- Does the donor/sponsor have material transfer agreements or IP exchange agreements in place with the institution where the materials or IP will be used in the performance of the activity or project?

In light of these requirements, and without careful analysis, this funding may appear to be an exchange transaction. However, when one considers that the foundation’s mission is to advance nanotechnology research programs is a reasonable and necessary requirement. Likewise, the annual report requirement is necessary to enable the foundation to fulfill its mission-based obligation of increasing the general public’s understanding of nanotechnology. Most institutions consider such reports to be an appropriate stewardship activity, especially when the reports are written at a summary level and lack the detail usually found in the progress and financial reports associated with exchange transactions. Regarding the requirement to return funds if the institution’s tax-exempt status is lost, the foundation is also tax-exempt under Section 501(c)(3) of the IRS Code and as such it operates exempt prior to expending all of the foundation’s funds, the foundation’s tax-exempt status could be at risk.

WHO CARES? – Motivations for Classification and the Differing Perspectives of Key Players

Understanding the motivations, perspectives, and the roles and responsibilities of key players in extramural funding classification and processing is key to fostering collaboration amongst these players. These key players will differ between institutions, but in general they include:

- The funding may only be used for the purpose of advancing the institution’s nanotechnology research programs;
- The institution must provide annual reports of how the funds are utilized;
- The institution is required to return all or part of the funds if it loses its tax-exempt status under Section 501(c)(3) of the IRS Code;
- Does the donor/sponsor have material transfer agreements or IP exchange agreements in place with the institution where the materials or IP will be used in the performance of the activity or project?
The advancement and/or corporate and foundation relations unit

Development Officers

The Sponsored Programs Office

Researchers/program directors

Donors/sponsors

Other individuals and/or institutional organizations may be involved in the processing of extramural funding and may have their own motivations for having funding classified as an exchange or non-exchange transactions. However, those listed above are key stakeholders within the classification process at most institutions. As such, they may have the opportunity and/or political capital to influence the classification decisions.

An institution’s advancement/corporate and foundation relations unit tends to have an external focus aimed at establishing, nurturing and expanding broad relationships on the institution’s behalf with individual and family donors, alumni, corporations, charities, and foundations. They foster these relationships over time and typically with extensive efforts, which result in contributions and donations to support the furtherance of an institution’s mission. Donor stewardship and recognition efforts are part of this unit’s activities. Such activities are essential to the continued development and nurturing of institution/donor relations.

At some institutions, Development Officers (usually employees of the advancement/corporate and foundation relations unit) are embedded in schools, academic departments and research centers. These individuals are responsible for the fundraising activities of the units to which they are attached, and they work closely with faculty researchers. Often they report to both the head of the academic/research unit and the advancement/corporate and foundation relations unit. These individuals are often compensated and evaluated based on several performance factors, including how much money they raise for the academic/research unit. Therefore, they have a strong motivation to ensure that such funding is classified as a gift so that they may receive credit for it.

Sponsored Programs Offices (SPO) tend to focus on internal constituents (primarily faculty/researchers) to prepare and submit proposals to federal, state, corporate, and private entities (for-profit and non-profit), in addition to other responsibilities related to compliance and award management. SPOs interact with sponsors on exchange transactions regularly. As a result, if a proposal submitted to a non-profit through an institution’s SPO is funded, the resulting award may be processed as a grant or other exchange transaction purely out of habit or routine.

Researchers and program directors/managers also play a critical role in non-exchange and exchange transactions. They are responsible for ensuring that their programs have sufficient funds to continue their planned activities. The competition for funding can be, and often is, very fierce. Researchers and program directors/managers generally strive to maximize the funding for their programs. Sometimes, the interests of these individuals and their programs conflict with the interests of the institution. For example, a researcher might verbally agree to conduct a specific scope of work and provide the sponsor with exclusive access to research results in exchange for the sponsor’s “gift” to the researcher’s lab. A common motivation for such an arrangement is the avoidance of facilities and administrative (F&A) costs. The researcher may not understand such costs are essential for supporting the institution’s research enterprise and may consider such costs to be a tax or penalty that should be avoided whenever possible.

Of course, donors and sponsors play a key role as well — without them, there would be much less funding available for our institutions’ research programs. While they are motivated to provide funding to our institutions for reasons that span a broad spectrum, they do not have unlimited resources to support their funding programs. Consequently, they often seek to leverage their funding to our institutions for reasons that span a broad spectrum, they do not have unlimited resources to support their funding programs. For example, a startup company without its own research facilities may have a verbal understanding with a researcher related to a “gift” provided in exchange for services that directly benefit the company and advances their research interests or moves their product closer to market. In such a situation, the company is usually motivated by a desire to minimize costs while maximizing the value received for their funding. Disguising an exchange transaction as a gift avoids the additional charge of institutional F&A costs.

EFFECTIVE EXTRAMURAL FUNDING CLASSIFICATION – THREE PROVEN MODELS

The organizational model for extramural funding classification varies across institutions. Successful models have at least one thing in common — open and collegial communication and collaboration between most or all of the individuals involved in the classification process. Collectively, we have worked at institutions where all three models described below have been successfully used.

The Team Model

In this model, the SPO and advancement/corporate and foundation relations offices work together as a team, often times in conjunction with other offices and individuals. This is the model currently in place at Auburn University where the offices of Sponsored Programs, Contracts and Grants Accounting, Corporate and Foundation Relations, Development Accounting and Vice President for Business and Finance meet on a monthly basis.

The team’s goals are to: foster a collaborative environment; increase extramural funding; create common definitions and understandings for gifts, grants, contracts and exchange transactions; create a common understanding for soliciting, administering, and counting extramural funding; create common definitions and understanding of the role of each office; and ensure compliance with all applicable policies, guidelines and procedures. Some of the outcomes of this collaboration have included the development of a new policy and associated checklist, discussions on specific solicitations (wherein the team will review a proposal request and/or award documents to determine the appropriate treatment), joint presentations across campus (representing a united front), as well as open more lines of communication between the offices (including the inclusion of Corporate and Foundation Relations in the dissemination of Sponsored Programs bi-monthly Funding Opportunities Newsletter). Even though there are still challenges and issues to face, this model enables the team to work closely and collegially to address them.

The Committee Model

This model is similar to the Team Model, but is more formal in its structure, authority and procedures. The committee is usually constituted and charged by a senior level institutional official,
such as a Provost or Executive Vice Chancellor. The membership of the committee is defined in policy, as is the committee’s scope of authority. Membership often consists of one or two knowledgeable representatives from the Sponsored Programs Office, the University Advancement Office (which typically includes the Foundation Relations and Corporate Relations offices) and the Accounting/Financial Services Office. In some implementations of this model, additional representatives are added from units such as the Budget Office, Purchasing/Business Contracts and Risk Management. The committee is usually charged with conducting reviews and making decisions for the institution regarding the classification of extramural funding. The goals and activities of the committee are typically very similar to those described in the Team Model above.

The Flexible Model

Unlike the other two models, which bring key offices and individuals together on a regularly scheduled basis, this model functions in a less formal way and relies on ad hoc groupings to address issues related to extramural funding classification, as well as the goals and activities discussed above in the Team Model. This is the model currently in place at the University of California, Irvine (UCI).

In this model, policy typically vests the responsibility for reviewing extramural funding and making classification decisions in one individual or an office (institutional reviewer). When questions arise regarding the appropriate classification of funding, the institutional reviewer coordinates with a variety of key constituents from across the institution based on the nature of and circumstances surrounding the funding. The Flexible Model helps secure additional information from researchers and/or program directors/managers by engaging them in discussions regarding the purpose of the funding and the intent of the sponsor/donor. Their involvement in the classification process opens up lines of communication that are necessary to ensure that all of the facts and information available are considered prior to making a classification decision. Involving them in the process also creates opportunities to educate and orient them on the importance of appropriate extramural funds classification.

Summary

Classification analysis is critical to ensuring the proper handling of extramural funding and the methods to achieve this will vary across institutions. However, equally important is that the stakeholders within an institution understand each other – their roles and their motives – and build an extramural funding classification process upon a foundation of collegial collaboration and open communication.

Bruce Morgan is the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research Administration at the University of California, Irvine. His responsibilities include Sponsored Projects Administration (pre-award and non-financial post-award), Research Protections (human and animal research subjects and the use of human stem cells and radioactive drugs in research) and Conflict of Interest in Research. Bruce started his career in research administration in 1987 and has worked at three of the University of California’s ten campuses. He is an active volunteer for NCURA and currently serves as Co-Chair of the 55th Annual Meeting, Vice Chair of the Professional Development Committee, and as a member of the Board of Directors. He can be reached at bruce.morgan@research.uci.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 at Auburn University. 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. He can be reached at VENTIAF@auburn.edu.

What’s on My DESK

It is mid-December, and I am looking at many “to-do” lists. It is crazy because I seem to have lists everywhere on my desk, and in some cases I have post-it notes. December seems to be a time when I try to get things “checked off” the list. For me, it is a sense of accomplishment to get things done and “checked off” the list. There is a short list of things that I must get done before the university winter holiday begins. Then, I spend time creating a long task list which actually turns out to be my goals for the coming year. I like to be able to come back from the winter holiday and hit the ground running on many of those tasks. The list helps to provide a sense of direction and as a way to better prioritize my time.

Robyn B. Remotigue, CRA
Assistant Director, Mississippi State University

Right now I am desperately trying to get the last few PIs to finish taking the new mandatory online export control training course and quiz. The VPR recently sent a memo requiring everyone working on an export controlled project to take the training within 30 days or be removed from the project. Writing the training course and quiz was the easy part – rolling it out and getting everyone to take it was a huge “challenge”. We had glitches in the system that sent “Congratulations on completing the course” emails to people who had not yet taken it, while others who had really completed the training and passed the quiz were shown as incompletes. What a headache! We did manage to work those kinks out, but I still have a few recalcitrant souls I am desperately trying to track down before the boom is lowered. In addition, I have to start writing a new course which needs to be online the first of the year!

Kay Ellis, MHR
Export Controls Officer
University of Arizona
Have you ever thought this about some of your faculty: “I wish I could have worked with them earlier in their career before they had such a bad experience with a research grant?” I have, and it led me to think about our students and wonder: Are they aware of all the opportunities on our campus for student research grants? What if we could work with students in the beginning of their adventure, find a way to tap into their energy, and gain inspiration from their enthusiasm? Wouldn’t it be wonderful if we, as research administrators, could help shape our future faculty and help prepare them for the challenges of pursuing and obtaining support for their research goals?

At present, our university does not have a program that facilitates partnering faculty mentors with undergraduate student researchers. In some of our academic departments, however, we do have undergraduate research representatives. Unfortunately, most of our students don’t even know that undergraduate research representatives exist or who the active faculty researchers are, much less whom they should consult for more information. These representatives are usually faculty who are already overburdened, and it is very hard to catch up with them. This situation is not uncommon at universities, as evidenced by a talk Sara Rockwell (2008) gave to the NCURA Senior Research Leadership Summit. She stated that most faculty spend about 58% of their time on research and, of that 58%, 76% is spent on research and 24% is spent on mentoring students who perform research (Decker, 2008; Decker, et al., 2007). As a Predominately Undergraduate Institution (PUI), our university is more focused on teaching and publishing than on research. Over the past several years our administration has been making some small moves toward building an infrastructure to support more research for faculty and to encourage faculty/student mentorship collaborations.

The Mathematical Association of America (MAA), the largest mathematical society in the world, in its “Undergraduate Student” section on “Undergraduate Research” (2012) reports that there has been an explosion in the field of undergraduate research. MAA also states that student research is the ultimate in engaged learning and that this growth is attributed to capstone courses, senior theses, and sometimes results from an enthusiastic student approaching a professor and asking for help. This is true at our institution as well, in that it is left up to the student to pursue opportunities for research.

For many years, faculty researchers at most universities have included undergraduate students in their research to complete their projects more efficiently and quickly (Ryser & Halseth, 2009). At PUIs, it is extremely difficult to have the appropriate policies and infrastructure to support the pedagogical requirements to adequately train faculty and develop programs for students in research. Several researchers agree that, “Limited institutional support for students through mechanisms that include research assistantships contributes to an underdeveloped culture of seeking employment and training through university research projects” (Ryser & Halseth, 2009, p. 58; Panelli & Welch, 2005). Ryser and Halseth continue, “The constantly changing nature and demands of research activities, faculty teaching schedules, and student commitments impact the time available to create opportunities for training and mentoring the next generation of researchers” (2009, p. 60). Faculty at PUIs must do more with less, including assuming many research administrative duties because there are no departmental research administrators, and the support personnel in the departments aren’t available or trained to help (Temples, Simons & Atkinson, 2012).
Clearly our students are playing a more important role in supporting research at our institution. Somehow, we must develop greater clarity and a broader range of opportunities as well as training to prepare our students to be the next generation of researchers. With limited resources and personnel, what can research administration do to help encourage more collaboration between faculty and student researchers? Some ideas are volunteering to work with student organizations by attending their meetings, conducting funding workshops for their student members, attending university student recruitment activities, and talking to current as well as prospective students about their research interests and expectations. I discovered from talking with our college and department representatives at recruitment fairs that they needed research administration personnel to talk to prospective students about research opportunities at these fairs so that they had more free time to talk to the students about courses of study.

After listening and brainstorming with students in various venues, our office discovered there were a number of things research administration might be able to do to help nurture the spirit of our future researchers. Some examples follow:

- Create a database of student funding opportunities, grants, scholarships, fellowships, internships, and other types of opportunities.
- Coordinate workshops that bring faculty mentors together to talk with students about research, methodology, selecting a mentor, and various opportunities to present undergraduate research and funding opportunities.
- Develop a program to bring together experienced faculty researchers to mentor students and open the doors to their future by keeping their enthusiasm and desire to succeed alive.
- Coordinate student development workshops to help them better understand funding programs, guidelines, and requirements, and advise them on how to get started.
- Attend student recruitment fairs to help departments and colleges recruit students by adding the value of research and research opportunities at our university and explaining how the advantage of an undergraduate student research experience can influence their academic careers and future.
- Create or obtain inexpensive development and recruitment tools such as brochures, slogan buttons, pens, pencils, rulers, high-lighters, and tote bags, all with our university and department’s name, logo, and web address.
- Create a database of all department undergraduate research representatives.
- Create a database of faculty mentor and student research teams and match them with funding opportunities.
- This is what we have managed to do so far:
  - Develop a database of internal and external funding opportunities for students at all levels, undergraduate to post-doctoral, called STOPS (STudent OPrportunities @ stops.uca.edu), including a survey of students to determine the database’s usefulness and to collect more ideas from students for improvements. This database is available to all students with an internet connection, from any type of computer, laptop, tablet, or phone that has internet access; no special application is needed.
  - Share the STOPS database description and URL with all high school advisors across the state.
  - Coordinate a workshop with a panel of experienced faculty research mentors, student researchers with previous awards, and students interested in participating in research.
  - Distribute recruitment tools and showcase the new STOPS database at five student recruitment events.

We plan to add tabs or screens to the STOPS database for available mentors with research interests, as well as another tab for department undergraduate research representatives. As we become aware of mentor and student research teams, we also plan to create another tab on the database to list the research teams and their special research interests so that we can begin to match available opportunities to specific research.

One of the comments we heard about the STOPS database at a recruitment event we attended was from an upper-classman who said, “I wish there had been a database like this when I started college so I wouldn’t have had to take out so many student loans!” Let’s hope that we can make a small difference that will help us crystallize this facet of our ever-growing and changing field of research administration.

Something else to think about and make us smile: Maybe we can make such a good impression that one or more of these students might choose to go into research administration. Who knows? ✎
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Compliance — Cooperation and Collaboration

By Cynthia Nichols

The conduct of research involves extensive rules and regulations at the federal, state, local, and institutional levels. As colleges and universities strive to comply with the ever-increasing number of these complicated and sometimes conflicting regulations, their sponsored programs offices can become an invaluable asset to the university compliance officers and committees. Research administrators help safeguard the university from possible regulatory noncompliance by early detection of issues which could potentially result in extremely high fines, audit findings, and tarnished reputations. Without the help of well-trained research administrators, principal investigators would need to invest an incredible amount of time in staying up to date on the current regulatory restrictions and requirements; and the compliance officers need well-trained eyes and ears throughout the university community helping them accomplish their daunting tasks. In January 2011, President Obama signed Executive Order 13563 to help improve regulation and review. It stated:

Our regulatory system must protect public health, welfare, safety, and our environment while promoting economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation. . . . It must identify and use the best, most innovative, and least burdensome tools for achieving regulatory ends. It must take into account benefits and costs, both quantitative and qualitative. It must ensure that regulations are accessible, consistent, written in plain language, and easy to understand. It must measure, and seek to improve, the actual results of regulatory requirements.

(Executive Order No. 13,563, 2011)

Individuals who work in the university environment may have decidedly different opinions on many political issues, but most agree that the current regulatory system is extensive, complicated, and in need of some adjustment. As required by the Executive Order, the federal agencies are completing retrospective reviews. So we can look forward to positive changes in the future; but in the meantime, research offices must find ways to better support their faculty and their institutions in today's complicated regulatory environment. As state and other traditional funding sources wane, many universities are relying heavily on extramural funding, and the faculty must submit more and more proposals for their programs to survive. While we are all doing more with less in today's extensive regulatory realm, research offices are effectively managing their compliance requirements through a combination of technology, training, and most importantly, teamwork within the university community.

The research offices help the faculty submit their proposals and manage their projects while preventing any breach of the multitude of compliance regulations involved with these research projects like conflict of interest, animal care and use, human subjects, export control, and select agents. One valuable tool for early detection of compliance issues is an electronic proposal routing and approval system that includes appropriate questions to highlight potential risks. Compliance officers should be involved in the design of the questions and also should be notified if the answers indicate the project involves a potential risk. To maximize its benefit, the system should include immediate electronic notification of the appropriate individual to handle the issue. With manual notification, delays may be frequent and troublesome. This is extremely helpful in the areas of animal welfare, human subjects, conflict of interest, and export control. For instance, if there is a possibility of an export control issue, then an immediate email notifying the export control officer minimizes the risk of a faculty member's innocence making an error that could significantly cost both the principal investigator and the institution. The export control officer can check foreign individuals and organizations involved in the project against restricted parties lists or identify export-controlled technology that may require a license. In most cases, the earlier the export control official becomes involved, the better the outcome for all parties.

Another invaluable tool is the well-trained research professional. While most research offices operate on a very tight deadline schedule and most research administrators carry heavy workloads, nothing is a greater asset to the researcher and the compliance officers than an individual who takes the time to understand the researcher's proposal and can clearly evaluate potential risks of noncompliance. Like the President, many of us also long for regulations in clear language and that are not burdensome, but that are predictable, cost effective, and successful in protecting us all while promoting our best and most innovative programs. However, that is not the situation today. It takes a lot of time and extensive training to understand some of the more complicated guidelines and requirements. Sponsored programs offices must provide the resources to keep their administrators up to date on the latest changes in all areas of research regulation and compliance issues. These administrators can be the first to notice that wording in proposals needs follow-up and could be inconsistent with compliance questions — such as a survey that may require Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval. Also, while reviewing proposals and their corresponding budgets, the research administrator can quickly discover costs that are not consistent with the guidance of Office of Management and Budget (OMB) circulars and can remove them from the proposal before submission to the agency. A few common examples of costs to be removed are items such as clerical and administrative salaries and general office supplies, which should normally be covered by Facilities and Administrative (F&A) costs but that are sometimes incorrectly included as direct charges to grants. Recent audit findings clearly demonstrate that this error can be extremely costly to an institution if ultimately disallowed. International travel, collaboration, or material transfer agreements can highlight the potential for a possible export control issue. Other compliance issues the research administrator can easily detect are conflict of interest, Family Educational Rights and Protection Act (FERPA), and Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR).
obvious way to educate research office staff is by offering online training classes and conferences, but the compliance officer can also greatly support the research professional on a day-to-day basis.

Employing a research compliance officer inside the sponsored programs office can greatly benefit the researchers, the administrators, and ultimately the institution as a whole. One of the most important tasks of the compliance officer is to stay current regarding new and changing regulations and to alert the sponsored programs personnel to these changes. In addition, sponsored programs office personnel should feel free to take complicated issues to the compliance officer for help in evaluating potential risks while proposals are being reviewed for submission. In turn, the compliance officer can efficiently liaise with other university committees like the IRB, Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), and the Institutional Biosafety Committee.

The recent National Institutes of Health (NIH) congruency requirement between animal research proposals and the IACUC approved protocols clearly exemplifies the benefit of closely-aligned sponsored programs and compliance personnel. The NIH Grants Policy Statement holds an institution responsible for ensuring that the research described in the proposal application is congruent with any corresponding protocols approved by the IACUC. The compliance officer can work with the sponsored programs administrator reviewing the proposal, the investigator writing the proposal, and the IACUC committee reviewing the protocol. In addition, the compliance officer can educate the sponsored programs staff of this new regulation, help establish a policy to protect the university from risk of noncompliance with this change, and hold training sessions for faculty and staff to explain the recent requirement for congruence and the new university procedures to ensure that proposals and corresponding protocols match. Compliance officers and sponsored program administrators’ working closely together promotes a level of excellence and integrity in the conduct of research that simply could not be achieved by either group individually.

While we all await the less burdensome and more cost-effective regulatory requirements the federal agencies are working toward, we can make changes at our own institutions to improve our compliance success by realizing that compliance requires everyone to be on the same page. When we accept that first dollar of federal funds, we agree to comply with all the regulations governing those funds, and we ensure that the costs charged to our projects are allowable under the cost principles. With the vast amount of complex regulations and ever-changing guidance, it truly takes extensive teamwork. Regulatory compliance and excellence in the conduct of research can only be achieved by cooperation between the research office, the principal investigator, the compliance officer and committees, and an institutional climate that fosters a high level of integrity.
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Question of the Issue

What does NCURA’s new tagline “supporting research...together” mean to you?

Exchange best practices within a worldwide network of research managers.

Agatha Keller
Co-Director EU GrantsAccess
ETH Zurich/University of Zurich

For me, it reflects that I have a network of colleagues and friends that I can connect with and learn from in order to be a better Research Administrator.

Tony Ventimiglia
Associate Director
Auburn University

I have to “DITTO” what Tony said! He summed it up perfectly for me!

Erica Gambrell
Manager, Sponsored Programs Financial Services
The University of Alabama

What does NCURA’s new tagline “supporting research...together” mean to you?

For me, it reflects that I have a network of colleagues and friends that I can connect with and learn from in order to be a better Research Administrator.

Tony Ventimiglia
Associate Director
Auburn University

I have to “DITTO” what Tony said! He summed it up perfectly for me!

Erica Gambrell
Manager, Sponsored Programs Financial Services
The University of Alabama

Editor’s Note: The Question of the Issue is posted on the NCURA Facebook Page and Tweeted, so everyone look for it. Erica’s comment is a reply from Tony’s FB post. Gotta love Social Media!

Cynthia L. Nichols, CPA, Director of the University of Tennessee, Institute of Agriculture Department of Sponsored Programs, began her research administration career at the University of Tennessee System in 1991. Her background includes financial accounting, financial analysis, and business administration. Cynthia’s responsibilities at UTIA include policy development and sponsored programs administration. She can be reached at cnichols@utk.edu.

JANUARY/FEBRUARY 2013
Renowned lecturer and science journalist Daniel Goleman is widely credited for bringing the concept of emotional intelligence to the general public and to the business world. His 1995 book *Emotional Intelligence* remained on the New York Times bestseller list for a well over a year, and there are five million copies in print in numerous languages. His article “What Makes a Leader?” is highly recommended reading for leadership courses and seminars, including those organized by NCURA. In this definitive article, Goleman describes emotional intelligence as the sine qua non of leadership (p. 3), and he defines and describes each of its five components: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skill (p. 2). Three members of the NCURA Leadership Development Institute class of 2010 provided an overview and their personal insights on the five components of emotional intelligence in the September/October issue of this magazine. In June of 2012, eight members of the NCURA Executive Leadership Program (ELP) Class of 2012 participated in an emotional intelligence workshop led by Susan Dunlap of Susan Dunlap & Associates. Dunlap directed the group’s attention to Peter Salovey and John D. Mayer’s definition: emotional intelligence is the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions. How one can use this information about emotions in an important question for research administrators.

Research on emotional intelligence indicates that it can have a far greater impact on being a successful leader than IQ or technical skills. Research also indicates that emotional intelligence can differentiate between an average leader and an exceptional leader. According to Goleman, “If your emotional abilities aren’t in hand, if you don’t have self-awareness, if you are not able to manage your distressing emotions, if you can’t have empathy and have effective relationships, then no matter how smart you are, you are not going to get very far” (qtd. in Hughes, 2004). This statement should resonate with research administrators. We work in a charged environment. Ideally research is an objective endeavor, but in real life, it is riddled with emotion. Applications, proposals, and contracts can be risky ventures for principal investigators. Their careers and their sense of self-worth are often at stake. Our own careers and sense of self-worth are predicated not only on what we know and what we can do, but also on whether PI’s, colleagues, supervisors, and sponsors believe we know what we are doing. Trust between PI’s and research administrators is essential, and emotional intelligence is the key to building trust.

If it is intuitively obvious as well as supported by social science research that our technical abilities, cognitive skills, and competencies just aren’t enough, then what gets in the way of our exercising and developing our capacity for emotional intelligence? The answer to this question may lie in how human beings are wired. There are specific reasons why we sometimes react to stress as though we are not ourselves. Dunlap (2012) offered the ELP class several examples: a person whose normal state is to be a considerate, good natured team player may under stress become possessive, detached, stubborn, or insensitive. A person who is normally pioneering, assertive, and positive may become abrasive, arbitrary, controlling, and opinionated. A colleague who is normally considered to be knowledgeable, thorough, and diplomatic may transform into a perfectionist who is hard to please and defensive. The outgoing, persuasive, or inspiring individual may seem overly confident, a poor listener, or a self-promoter. Dunlap asked us to consider what could explain such extreme transformations. She then introduced the concept of *amygdala hijacking* and how it impacts us at work. The term comes from Goleman’s 1996 book, *Emotional Intelligence*. The amygdala is an almond-shaped mass of gray matter in the anterior portion of the temporal lobe of our brain. Its job is to process our emotional reactions and survival instincts. The neocortex, located on the outer surface of the cerebrum, is in charge of higher functions such as language and memory. In a 2011 interview, Goleman explained in lay terms how amygdala hijacking works:

The amygdala is the trigger point for the fight, flight, or freeze response. When these circuits perceive a threat, they flood the body with stress hormones that do several things to prepare us for an emergency. Blood shunts away from the organs to...
the limbs; that’s the fight or flee. But the response is also cognitive—and, in modern life this is what matters most, it makes some shifts in how the mind functions. Attention tends to fixate on the thing that is bothering us, that’s stressing us, that we’re worried about, that’s upsetting, frustrating, or angering us. That means that we don’t have as much attentional capacity left for whatever it is we’re supposed to be doing or want to be doing. In addition, our memory reshuffles its hierarchy so that what’s most relevant to the perceived threat is what comes to mind most easily—and what’s deemed irrelevant is harder to bring to mind. That, again, makes it more difficult to get things done than we might want. Plus, we tend to fall back on over-learned responses, which are responses learned early in life—which can lead us to do or say things that we regret later. It is important to understand that the impulses that come to us when we’re under stress—particularly if we get hijacked by it—are likely to lead us astray.

Dunlap asked us to consider how the amygdala is perfectly designed for activating our response to a saber toothed tiger, but far less helpful in the 21st century workplace! The amygdala hijack is common in every level of the research administration environment. You receive notification at the last minute that a proposal is due on a day you asked off weeks ago, and the PI is a college dean. Hello, amygdala! You spend hours developing a detailed five year budget that includes a team of 22 faculty, only to find that the lead PI has manually overwritten every formula in your spreadsheet. Can you feel your cortisol level rising? In response to deadline pressure, you submit a multidisciplinary proposal minus one dean’s signature, with the understanding you have approval to move forward, only to learn later that that dean has significant issues with the submitted proposal and is unwilling to sign off. Now your amygdala is going off like a rocket! Venting to a colleague may provide some immediate relief, but the price is that you are spending precious time doing something other than working the problem.

The trick is to find a way to give your neocortex a chance to catch up. How many times have you wished your life had a pause button? Not only so you could enjoy the wonderful moments, but so that you could have that extra moment to think about how to respond in a high pressure situation? As research administrators, we need to be mindful of what triggers our emotions and identify strategies for redirecting ourselves from emotional reactions. It is important to remember that we do actually have pause buttons at our disposal; we just need to find them. Think about what sets you off emotionally. Is it when someone doubts your knowledge or interpretation of a program or policy? Is it a late breaking email insisting upon an unreasonably last minute proposal submission or contract deadline? Is it when a PI assumes you must be an unfeeling bureaucrat who doesn’t care about science? A perceived lack of disrespect for one’s time, experience, intelligence, or humanity is a big trigger in academia and in the research administration environment. Simply acknowledging what upsets you and what can help you find potential pause buttons. Dunlap suggests easy meditation by taking three deep breaths or a potential pause buttons. Dunlap suggests easy meditation by taking three deep breaths or a quick walk inside or outside your office. You may wish your life had a pause button? Not only so you could enjoy the wonderful moments, but so that you could have that extra moment to think about how to respond in a high pressure situation? As research administrators, we need to be mindful of what triggers our emotions and identify strategies for redirecting ourselves from emotional reactions. It is important to remember that we do actually have pause buttons at our disposal; we just need to find them. Think about what sets you off emotionally. Is it when someone doubts your knowledge or interpretation of a program or policy? Is it a late breaking email insisting upon an unreasonably last minute proposal submission or contract deadline? Is it when a PI assumes you must be an unfeeling bureaucrat who doesn’t care about science? A perceived lack of disrespect for one’s time, experience, intelligence, or humanity is a big trigger in academia and in the research administration environment. Simply acknowledging what upsets you and what can help you find potential pause buttons. Dunlap suggests easy meditation by taking three deep breaths or a quick walk inside or outside your office. You may be on a tight deadline, but you will save time and improve relationships by taking a moment on the front end. One ELP member suggested the use of a mirror at your desk so you can keep watch of your facial expressions while taking a phone call! Learn to smile more at yourself in the mirror. Turn off your light for thirty seconds and then turn it back on again, visualizing the light as a reset button. Naming your emotions by keeping a journal is a time tested method. Another ELP member suggested writing words and thoughts about how you feel at the moment and then throwing them in the trash to symbolize your mastery over those feelings. Dunlap even suggested pinching yourfinger during times when you are triggered, a Reiki technique for increasing awareness and management of your emotions. Whatever technique you choose, the idea is to find a way to buy yourself enough time to allow the thinking brain to catch up, to recognize that there is no tiger. Then your next steps can be directed by your neocortex and not by your amygdala.

Finding the pause button is an act of leadership. When you redirect yourself from a potential amygdala hijacking, you are also defusing the situation for the person who initially triggered you. You will find yourself spending less time venting and more time doing what you do best, as well as those around you. We are more valuable to our PIs, our colleagues, and our institutions when we are able to master our own emotions. Many of us would like to fine tune our self-awareness. Like learning to play the cello, speak another language, or interpret OMB circulars, it takes practice. Self-mastery is a lifetime journey, a process rather than an event. Knowing a paper tiger when you see one is a good starting point.
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We work in a rapidly changing environment and 2013 promises to be a year with changes that are sure to impact research administrators and their institutions. Join over 800+ colleagues to learn, share and discuss challenges and what it takes to be an effective steward of federal funds. Whether you are an experienced administrator or new to the profession, you will leave the conference armed with the latest information, a revitalized perspective, and new connections. The program offers 160 educational sessions over two days and 25 pre-conference workshops for more in-depth learning on Sunday, March, 10th.

The seven conference tracks include:

- Audit/Financial Compliance
- Costing/F&A
- Departmental Administration
- Federal Track
- Post-Award
- Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions
- Special Interest/Hot Topics

In the wake of Superstorm Sandy and other natural and manmade disasters the opening general session will convene a panel of local university colleagues to discuss lessons learned about emergency preparedness, disaster recovery and the opportunities that arise from tragedies. The panelists represent multiple perspectives — departmental, college/school, central office and senior management. Discussions will include incident readiness planning as well as disaster recovery strategies that can minimize interruption of programs and services and precautions to protect institutional assets. This promises to be an informative and timely session.

The conference will take place at the Sheraton New Orleans Hotel, steps away from the historic and energetic French Quarter and within walking distance to numerous amazing restaurants, attractions and jazz venues. Don’t miss out on an incredible opportunity to combine outstanding professional development with enjoying one of the world’s most charming cities.

The conference program and registration information is available at http://collaborate.ncura.edu/FRA14/Home

*Make your plans to join us in New Orleans for this must-attend annual conference!*
Maureen Lichtveld, M.D., M.P.H. and Freeport McMoRan Chair of Environmental Policy at the Tulane University School of Public Health, will present the keynote address Thursday, March 14 at NCURA’s Seventh Pre-award Research Administration (PRA) Conference. Dr. Lichtveld’s address, “From Concept to Community: When Research Hits the Road,” will focus on the challenges (for both researchers and research administrators) involved in conducting community-based participatory research. Her address will kick-off the conference to be held March 13-15, 2013 in New Orleans.

Lichtveld has an over 30 year career in environmental public health and currently is Professor and Chair of the Department of Global Environmental Health Sciences, Tulane School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine. Her research interests include environmentally-induced disease such as asthma and cancer, health disparities, environmental health policy, disaster preparedness, and public health systems. She holds an endowed chair in environmental policy and serves as Associate Director, Population Sciences of the Louisiana Cancer Research Consortium. Lichtveld has a track record as an expert in community-based participatory research with a special emphasis on persistent environmental health threats affecting health disparate communities living in disaster prone areas. Prior to joining Tulane University, Lichtveld completed a successful 18 year career at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)’s Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) in several leadership capacities. She was honored as CDC’s Environmental Health Scientist of the Year. Lichtveld is a member and former Chair of the Science Board of the American Public Health Association, and the Environmental and Occupational Health Council of the Association of Schools of Public Health. She serves as an expert consultant to the Institute of Medicine and on numerous editorial boards of globally recognized peer reviewed journals including the American Journal of Public Health, public health’s most prestigious journal. Lichtveld was named Woman of the Year by the City of New Orleans.

Lichtveld is the Principal Investigator of four research consortia funded by the National Institutes of Health. The Head Off Environmental Asthma in Louisiana (HEAL) study, examined the relationship between exposure to Post-Katrina mold and exacerbation of childhood asthma. She is the Co-PI of the Gulf Coast Transdisciplinary Research Center for Community Health, a multi-institutional collaborative center engaged in health disparities, disaster, and environmental health research. She is also PI of the Transdisciplinary Research Consortium for Gulf Resilience On Women’s Health (GROWH), a research partnership between academia and community organizations formed to strengthen the health security and resilience of vulnerable pregnant women and women of reproductive age potentially affected by the Deep Water Horizon oil spill and at risk of future disasters.

Lichtveld was recently appointed Director, Center for Gulf Coast Environmental Research, Leadership, and Strategic Initiatives, providing oversight for all Gulf Coast- associated environmental health research and capacity building projects. Her global environmental health research includes the NIH-funded Caribbean Consortium for Research in Environmental and Occupational Health (CCREOH) established to address the pressing environmental and occupational health issues in Suriname and the Caribbean. She was recently awarded two Gulf Coast-wide projects to strengthen environmental health capacity and literacy. Key aspects of the programs include establishing an environmental medicine referral network, deploying a cadre of trained community health workers, and creating an emerging scholars program in environmental health science targeting upper level high school students and their teachers.

A full day of workshops on Wednesday, March 13 will open PRA VII. Sixteen half-day workshops are scheduled on a variety of topics with a pre-award focus. Following Dr. Lichtveld’s address on Thursday morning, conference participants will be able to choose from more than 100 concurrent, discussion and SPARK sessions presented in nine tracks (compliance, departmental, developing research initiatives, federal and funding opportunities, human capital, international, medical/clinical, PUI, and senior management). Breakfast roundtables Thursday and Friday morning offer participants the opportunity to have informal, targeted discussions to start the day. In addition, for those attendees who really like to get an early start on the day, an Early Bird session will be held on Thursday and Friday morning. Networking opportunities will be available throughout the conference.

The full PRA VII program is available online at: http://collaborate.acura.edu/PRA7/Home/. Register today for PRA VII, the pre-award research administration conference.
University Global Ranking Systems

By Martin Kirk

Universities may have been around for over 1,000 years, but we have never been under more pressure to justify the investment society makes in us. This is an interesting challenge. The public believe we do good work but once they move beyond the undergraduate part of the academy the value of research is a bit of an unknown.

The new reality is that ‘knowledge for knowledge’s sake’ is no longer sufficient justification for the investment in university research. Governments are targeting funding to specific areas of research (e.g. green energy, genomics, business) and looking for direct and measurable socio-economic benefits.

Governments and universities are now looking at global ranking systems and other assessment tools to measure their competitiveness and the return on investment made in research. This article seeks to educate the reader on the basics of global ranking systems, including what measures the systems use, how they differ, their limitations and what this means for us as the research administration community. My hope is that a better informed research community will allow us to understand the important context around global rankings and assessment systems.

Why do ranking and assessment systems exist?
The university global rankings have become a gold standard measure of national competitiveness and innovativeness. The first serious ranking system was the Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU/Shanghai) compiled by the Shanghai Jiao Tong University. The purpose of the ARWU system, funded by the Chinese government, was to measure the gap between their own universities and world class institutions. The other two most influential ranking systems are the Times Higher Education (THE) World University Rankings and the QS World University Rankings.

The big three ranking systems (ARWU, THE and QS) are worth looking at more closely to see how institutions vary in their rankings by each system. Figures 1 - 3 examine the actual indicators and weightings within each ranking system.

Let us examine the profile of an institution that will rank highest in each system.

ARWU/Shanghai [http://www.arwu.org] The university that will rank highest in the ARWU system will be among the elite institutions of the world, been in existence for a long time, enjoy substantial funding to hire the very best researchers (Nobel and Fields awardees – 25% of total score), be very large with a huge professoriate of world, top ranking, highly productive (publishing) professors with a strong focus on health research and natural, physical and social sciences. This is a highly quantitative system, and is entirely focused on research.

QS [http://www.iu.qs.com/university-rankings/world-university-rankings]
The university that will rank highest in the QS system has been in existence...
for a long time and has a very strong global brand recognition and reputation. It does not need to be large but must have a high quality professoriate that are prolific publishers and publishing in traditional scholarly journals. Thus, a focus on medicine, science, and engineering will score highest. This institution will enjoy a large proportion of international faculty and students. The QS system is less on the elitist side of the continuum in rating research excellence in that it looks at the productivity i.e. citations/research instead of citation impact which would measure impact on peer researchers rather than raw productivity. The QS system relies on much more subjective criteria (reputational surveys) for a large portion (50%) of the overall score and also brings students into the picture e.g. faculty to student ratio.

THE http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings

The institution that scores highest in the THE system is a large university that has been in existence for a long time, has a global reputation for excellence in teaching and research, a large number of faculty in medicine, science and engineering where research funding is highest and many publications in traditional scholarly journals. This institution has a high degree of international students and faculty and strong partnership with industry as well as a successful technology transfer group.

The upper reaches of all three ranking systems are very consistent and include: Harvard, Stanford, MIT, Oxford and Cambridge. Other institutions further down the ranking are usually fairly consistent. The University of British Columbia (for example), ranged from 30 (THE) position to 39 (ARWU) in 2012. The University of Toronto ranged from 19 (QS) to 27 (ARWU) in 2012. These are all old, established, well-funded, institutions brimming with world class, top ranking faculty. One can clearly see that the three systems have significant differences in profile and one would expect to see dramatic variation in how institutions rank in each system (see table 1) once we move further down the rankings.

Table 1 illustrates some of the consistent rankings (UBC and Toronto) and inconsistent rankings (the others) from the three systems demonstrating that different metrics can cause widely contradictory rankings. For example, Nanyang and Tsinghua likely do poorly in the ARWU rank likely because, although they are superb research institutions, they are fairly new and have less absolute research output. Karolinska does well in ARWU and THE but likely poorly in QS probably related to poor performance in the reputational survey metric (i.e. although it is a superb research institute it does not have the global brand recognition it deserves based on scholarly output/impact). The University of Copenhagen does well in ARWU and QS but poorly in THE, which may relate to the teaching environment metric.

These ranking systems also rely heavily on bibliometrics which ignore a very large part of the academy (e.g. social sciences, humanities and...
Research Administration... By the NUMBERS

11.5%…
FY12 “R01 equivalent” NIH proposal success rate for first timers.

$2,004,482,000…
Total R&D expenditures at Johns Hopkins University, tops on the NSF FY10 HERD Survey.

348…
Number of National Academy Members at Harvard University, number one in the U.S., as reported in the 2011 CMUP Top American Research Universities Report.

891…
Number of Doctorates awarded at UC Berkeley, number one in the U.S., as detailed in that same 2011 CMUP Top American Research Universities Report.

39…
Number of years Patrick Green (Vanderbilt University) has been a member of NCURA.

Sources:
http://mup.asu.edu

Want to share numbers? Email Derek Brown at derekbrown@wsu.edu

---

fine arts) that do not routinely publish in the traditional scholarly journals. Clearly, a university that focuses more on the social sciences than the medical, science and engineering disciplines will be disadvantaged. On the other end of the spectrum are the “reputational” survey type indicators that are clearly more subjective.

Another issue is that some ranking systems focus on absolute research productivity (e.g. ARWU) and so favor the very large research universities. Other ranking systems favor relative research productivity measures (e.g. THE, Leiden and HEE- ACT. See url below for details of other ranking systems.) so they are studying the efficiency of an institution to produce impact/output as opposed to merely the total output. http://www.shanghairanking.com/resources.html

The real shortcomings of some of the ranking systems are them relying on quantitative metrics (input or output versus impact) that only tell part of the story. They also rely on subjective surveys. The global research community is struggling with this very same issue since our governments do not necessarily value activity and want evidence of research impact that makes life better for society and tax payers/voters.

One has to bear in mind that these global ranking systems focus on a very small number (~3%; 500 of 17,000) of global institutions, representing the world’s elite research institutions. However, are these rankings a useful indicator of the world’s innovation capacity?

The future of research impact metrics will certainly continue to focus on quantitative key performance indicators (KPIs) but will surely include a hybrid model where activity (funding, publications) is considered along with research peer impact (citation, citation impact, h-index, etc.) and some form of evolved research impact statements (as used in the UK, REF assessment) with embedded quantitative data that are assessed and scored. The success of the hybrid impact statement/scoring will depend on the transparency of the assessment process and the fairness of the scoring, etc.

How does this impact research administrators? The most important piece of advice to take away from this piece is that as we (professional research administrators) are being pushed to develop research impact metrics and institutional KPI’s, we need to bear in mind the subtleties of the various ranking and assessment systems. We need to remember that we have large number of scholars that carry out very important research of great value but do not publish in the traditional scholarly journals, so they may not rank well in the purely quantitative measure, e.g. bibliometrics. We also need to ensure that the scorecards we build contain metrics that capture qualitative evaluation of direct research impact and that, overall, we are not creating a reward scheme that creates perverse incentives.

My hope for the future is that we work together as a global research administration/community to create a new scorecard of research impact metrics that measures what we believe to be important indicators of research impact, excellence, and societal value.

Martin Kirk, Ph.D. Martin is the President of the Canadian Association of University Research Administration (CAURA) and the Director, Office of Research Services at the University of British Columbia (UBC) in Vancouver, Canada. His completed his first degree in chemistry at Heriot-Watt University in Edinburgh and next completed his PhD in applied chemistry at the University of Calgary in Canada. Martin is a keen world traveler, photographer, sailor, golfer, climber, biker, backpacker. He can be reached at Martin.Kirk@ors.ubc.ca.
How an **Entrepreneurial Mindset**  
Can Increase Your Achievements!  

By Sarah Lampson and Katie Porter

In the last 2 years we have published and/or presented on various topics in research administration more than 10 times, including launching 2 successful books, Steer Your Career: A Research Administrator’s Manual for Mapping Success (2011) and The A-Z Guide to Research Contract Review (2012). We also started a successful consulting business. We have had a lot of fun and are often asked how we find the time to achieve these accomplishments. We’re sharing our “secrets” here to encourage all of you who are hesitating to take that first step and become an entrepreneurial research administrator! For us, the rewards included new professional contacts and friends, opportunities to contribute more, increased excitement and engagement in our field, award nominations, feedback on our projects, increased professional respect and higher profiles.

**STEP 1:** Find the time! We all have 24 hours per day. We each have young families, work full time and volunteer in our communities, but by setting aside at least 30 minutes a week consistently we made slow and steady progress. Whether using your lunch break once a week or staying up writing after your children are in bed, 2 hours a month can equal an article or book chapter or part of a speech.

**STEP 2:** Find a partner. A creative collaborator significantly lightens the load and can offer that accountability and motivation when you start to lag. Also, you can brainstorm and develop your ideas more efficiently with a partner. Balancing multiple projects is easier with a partner too. Each partner can play to their own strengths. Perhaps one of you is the creativity powerhouse, while the other is planning and organizational guru. Together, you’re unstoppable!

**STEP 3:** Chose the goal and backtrack. If you want to write a book, start with a chapter. If you want to speak at a conference, develop a topic and submit an outline. Make sure your goal includes a timeline. When we committed to having our first book written and released, our ambitious timeline of 5 months ensured an aggressive pace for weekly writing goals. We worked together, were motivated by each other’s hard work, and we met our deadline!

**STEP 4:** Have more than 1 iron in the fire. In order to keep the momentum, especially in writing or consulting, you have to look ahead as well as focus on the present. While we worked on our book, we continued to set aside time for articles, applying to speak at conferences and deliver on our consulting work. In turn, the research we undertook for those articles provided more material for our book. While not every article, poster or presentation was accepted, it was good to have other options on the horizon to keep us motivated and looking forward. A second benefit is the cross-pollination that happens. A presentation leads to a request for an article or a book leads to a consulting opportunity.

**STEP 5:** Find supporters. Reach out and ask your counterparts to help you. Award nominations, book reviews, plum speaking engagements, consulting work and simple introductions can be yours for the asking. Many people are happy to help and the more you ask, the higher the odds you’ll get some or all of the things you seek.

**STEP 6:** Identify what you really want. Knowing what you want is very important as each project is a significant time investment. If you want to earn more money, then focus on seeking consulting work or writing a book. If you want more professional development opportunities, focus on speaking at conferences that waive registration fees for speakers.

**STEP 7:** Find more customers. If you want to publish more, expand the number of journals and magazines you solicit. If you want to do some consulting to boost your income, ask your supporters and network for leads, call other institutions and ask if they can use your services to help with a busy schedule or training new staff. Develop a list of the services you can provide and email it to your network. Create a webpage that details your expertise and services or advertises your publications.

**STEP 8:** Say thank you. People are very generous and like to help others succeed. When the first printing of our first book sold out in 8 months, it was a culmination of hard work and a smooth process. From our printer, to the post office staff, from our readers who reviewed us online, to the conferences who invited us to sell our book to attendees, and our many customers, we had a lot of people we thanked. Not only were we grateful but it made everyone feel happy for the project to succeed.

**JANUARY/FEBRUARY 2013**
STEP 9: Celebrate! Take time to celebrate and enjoy your success. Whether it is a party, lunch or special mention in a meeting, embrace the chance to bring people together and celebrate! Your hard work paid off in something tangible and it is time to rejoice!

STEP 10: Honour each achievement with another. After a big project is finished, make sure you don’t become a 1 hit wonder – start the next one. By the time the first edition of our first book sold out we were halfway through the second edition, and had started an entirely new book – which we released shortly after the first anniversary of our first book. There are several benefits to this approach: the relationships you have built with the first success continue to flourish, your foundation of achievement remains solid, and you retain your energy by engaging in a new and exciting undertaking.

Each activity and idea can be a stepping stone for the next. When we reflect on what we achieved in a year, it seems substantial and certainly was a lot of hard work; however, it was the steady incremental gains that propelled us forward one project at a time. Last year when we started to deliberately set goals and take small steps, we couldn’t anticipate all that we would achieve. Now we feel we have found our footing and are even more confident and engaged in our field. We have each been honoured by an award from a professional organization and we also received internal recognition for our performance. Best of all, we have broadened larger network of caring, supportive professionals and have even more opportunities on the horizon. Research administration is a diverse and exciting field, with significant opportunities. We encourage you to be creative and adopt an entrepreneurial mindset, both at work, and outside of work. Look for opportunities to share your expertise, learn more and develop yourself. By doing so, you’ll increase your own achievements, and also better serve our field of research administration.

Sarah Lampson, B.A. (Hons) is the Clinical Research Agreements, Contracts and Grants Specialist, Cancer Research at Hamilton Health Sciences Corporation. She has more than ten years progressive experience in research administration in a variety of settings, including work at a comprehensive university, granting agency and academic hospitals. In 2012 Sarah founded the LinkedIn Group University and Hospital Research Administrators. She has authored or presented more than 25 articles or talks on research administration, as well as 2 books which are used by research administrators at more than 225 institutions globally. She can be reached at Sarah.Lampson@jcc.hhsc.ca.

Katie Porter, MA, B.Ed is the Clinical Research Agreements and Contracts Specialist at Hamilton Health Sciences Corporation in Ontario, Canada. Katie is an expert in both clinical and non-clinical contract management and is a regular guest lecturer at McMaster University and other institutions speaking on topics ranging from broad research legal issues to specific contract negotiation skills. She is currently working on her executive MBA at the Richard Ivey School of Business. She can be reached at porterk@hhsc.ca.

Unlock the promise of your research

SciVal® from Elsevier delivers up-to-date information, analyses and illustrations of scientific achievement considered necessary for successful strategic planning and the enhancement of research performance.

The SciVal suite helps decision makers answer these important questions:
• What are the research strengths of our institution?
• Who are our key competitors?
• With whom should we collaborate?
• Which are the most relevant funding opportunities?
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I’m Not a Research Administrator –
But I Play One on TV

By Carole Knight

Have you ever tried to explain to an “outsider” just what a research administrator does? Some of our faculty, probably most, don’t even know! So what if we could convince one of the major networks to create a TV series based on research administration? It could visually depict how exciting, rewarding, and necessary a job in this field really is. Looking at the day-to-day activities of research administrators, the series could be a reality show — or a comedy — or a drama — or a combination of all of these. When you think about it, the possibilities for a research administration TV show are numerous:

**Law and Order — the OIG Audit**

**American Idol — Faculty Who Submit Grant Applications Two Weeks in Advance**

**Mission Impossible — An electronic NIH Grant Application with no Errors or Warnings**

**Dirty Jobs (needs no explanation)**

Given the broad spectrum of possibilities associated with the roles of research administrators today and the realities of higher education, I might pitch the following as a pilot for a research administration TV series if I were a TV producer:

**ER (Emergency Research) Episode One**  The scene opens to a bright and sunny morning on the campus of This University. We see Dr. Karen Solvit, Director of Research, smiling as she walks briskly to her office. Carrying her double grande café latte espresso, a laptop computer, and a five inch thick notebook filled with the latest federal compliance regulations, she feels that this is going to be a great day. Yesterday her team reviewed all of the grant applications due today. It should be a snap to get them submitted. But…

As she enters the office, her new assistant Pam greets her waving her hands, holding an inch-thick program announcement and talking excitedly. “Emer-
emergency! You’ve got to help me Doctor. Seven faculty members all want to apply for this MRI grant. They’re all in different departments, and the grants are due at 5:00 today! Nobody knew about this until now.”

“Well,” Dr. Solvit says calmly, “only three of them can apply — maybe only two. Let me have a look.”

Pam hands the guidelines to Dr. Solvit who places her espresso on her desk, noticing the message light flashing on her telephone. She drops the laptop and notebook onto her desk, flips on her computer, and begins to review the MRI requests. Just then, Grants and Contracts Specialist, Jim, races in. “Doctor! I need your help STAT! My computer crashed and these seven National Institutes of Health (NIH) grants.gov applications are due at 5:00 p.m. today. Tech support says there’s a serious virus in the OR (Office of Research). It needs to be quarantined. What do we do?”

Just then Pam comes in, frantic. “Doctor, Doctor. Help! These six Department of Education grants have to go electronically too — by 3:30 today! I’ve never done this before. We’re all going down! We’re doomed!”

“Just a minute,” Dr. Solvit says. “Calm down, Pam. Jim, go down to the library and use their computers. They’re secure and have the right software. Pam, I’ll show you how to do these.”

Jim rushes out and runs headlong into Claire, a business manager from Biochemical Research. Jim sighs and says, “Claire, what can I do for you?” Claire and her department chair have discovered a huge undisclosed conflict of interest for one of their funded researchers. “We don’t know how to treat this. I need to see Dr. Solvit.”

Pam flies out of Dr. Solvit’s office to answer the department phone and crashes into an agitated Dr. Mefirst, a researcher in Cardiology. “This $10 million subcontract needs to be signed now so I can send it to That University. Just sign it, and I’ll be off.”

Pam tries to explain logically, but unsuccessfully, that the 36-page subcontract needs to be reviewed, negotiated, and approved by the chair, dean, and Research Administration office. The office needs at least 48 hours to complete this task. Dr. Mefirst is insistent. He’s not leaving without a signature.

Claire slips into Dr. Solvit’s office as she is checking her 78 latest phone messages. She gets through about three messages before Claire shows up, followed very closely by Dr. Mefirst, who is quite upset.

After assisting Claire and soothing Dr. Mefirst, Dr. Solvit notices the message on her computer, “You have 471 new e-mail messages.” One of them is a travel expense report for Dr. Spender’s National Science Foundation grant awaiting her approval. “Why would Dr. Spender need to travel to the Bahamas for this grant? Her research is on a rare insect found only in northern Canada. This can’t be an allowable cost.”

She picks up the phone to call Dr. Spender when Grant Specialist Inga comes in with a copy of Dr. Workerbee’s effort report. Somehow he managed to work 165% of his time over the past six months on federal grants. No wonder he’s always grumpy! Dr. Solvit reaches for the phone to call Dr. Workerbee just as it rings. It’s the Vice President looking for his quarterly reports. The board meeting is tomorrow. He’s got to have them now.

Jim rushes back in. “I submitted one of the grants but I have errors. I’ve never seen errors like this before. Help me, Doctor!”

Dr. Solvit explains the errors and tells Jim to “take the NIH Guide and call her” if he has a recurrence. Three attempts later, Jim has submitted one of the seven NIH grants. Hours go by as he checks and submits — and resubmits — the rest, after sixteen phone calls to Dr. Solvit.

Later that morning, Pam comes back with a wide-eyed stare and shaking hands. “What’s the matter, Pam?” Dr. Solvit asks.

“I drank eight cups of coffee waiting for the grants to upload and submit. I’m fine. I feel fine. I’m OK. They’re submitted. By the way, is there any problem with exporting Ebola virus to Afghanistan?”

“And, oh, Dr. Solvit. The Office of the Inspector General is on line 1.”

Compiling the quarterly report, a continual stream of subcontracts needing signatures, Clinical Trial Agreement negotiations, budget revisions, phone calls, e-submissions, and e-mails take up the balance of the day for the research administration team. Finally at 7:30 p.m., Dr. Solvit feels guardedly optimistic that her day is about to end. She spies the now ice-cold cafe late espresso still untouched on her desk. She reaches for it as she hears, “Doctor, Doctor. There’s a ten-grant pile-up in chemistry. They’re all on their way here now. They have to go out STAT!”

As she turns to face her assistant, she knocks over the cup and cold café late espresso spills all over her quarterly report. It’s going to be another long night in the ER!

Although this is a fictionalized (and somewhat tongue-in-cheek) account of a day in the life of a research administration team, real research administrators will see the underlying truth. Days can be long and tasks are always deadline driven, coffee pots brew continuously, and last minute emergencies are everyday occurrences. Patience is not only a virtue, it’s a necessity in this line of work. And so is a sense of humor. The breadth of knowledge required can be staggering, so teams depend on each other and organizations like NCURA to keep current. As a child, you probably didn’t think, “Boy, when I grow up, I want to be a research administrator!” But now that you are one — and not just on TV — can you think of anything else you’d rather be doing? Really?

Carole Knight, Ph.D. is Associate Vice President for Research at Saint Louis University, with main responsibilities for research compliance, particularly IRB, IACUC, Conflict of Interest, and Export Controls. She has been an NCURA member since 1997. Carole is a member of the NCURA Region IV communication committee and regularly contributes articles for the Region IV newsletter. She can be reached at knightc1@slu.edu.
NCURA’s Traveling Workshops head to Savannah
March 18-20, 2013

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](http://www.ncura.edu)
The 55th Annual Meeting (AM55) Update

**Investment - Commitment - Rewards**

The 55th Annual Meeting (AM55) Program Chairs, Bruce Morgan, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research Administration at the University of California, Irvine, and Susan Zipkin, Director, Post Award, Office for Sponsored Programs, at Boston College, would like to wish everyone a Happy New Year! The new year is a time for beginnings and reaffirmations as well as reflecting on the past year and planning for the year ahead. It is a time to decide what in what we will be investing, to what we will be committing ourselves and what rewards we hope to gain from our investments and commitments.

**This year’s program theme is “Investment – Commitment – Rewards.”**

**Investment** may take many forms – our institutions invest in us as research administrators, we invest in ourselves and through our efforts we invest in our institution’s research enterprise. In addition, we invest our time and talent in NCURA and NCURA invests in us through its numerous and varied professional development and networking offerings.

**Commitment** is also multi-faceted – we are committed to our careers, to professional development, to continuous learning and to being the very best research administrators we can be. We are also committed to the success of the research enterprise on the world, institutionally and globally. NCURA is committed to the same – our organization is built upon a strong commitment to provide the very best professional development, networking and continuous learning opportunities to research administrators from around the world.

**Rewards** stem from the investments and commitments made by us, our institutions and NCURA. These rewards are valuable and invaluable, tangible and intangible. How does one value or quantify the reward of making a new professional connection at the Annual Meeting who later helps you solve a long-standing issue or problem at your institution simply by sharing their own experiences and providing advice. The rewards that are realized through these investments and commitments complete a cycle and generate the momentum for future investment, commitment and rewards.
As research administrators we work in a cyclical manner all the time. We invest time in identifying a funding source and preparing the proposal with our PI’s. We commit to getting the proposal in on time and we see the reward of our hard work when the awards come in. The sponsor invests in the research and the institution commits to do the work, act as a good steward of the sponsor’s investment, and follow the terms and conditions of the award. The rewards take the form of knowledge created by the work performed and the advancement of the various disciplines supported by our sponsors. The level of success we experience correlates with the level of investment and commitment that we and our institutions make. We would like to take the opportunity to recognize this investment and thank our institutions who support us and our professional development. This is not an insignificant investment, and continued investment is critical for our success, and the success of NCURA.

Seated: Suzanne, Rivera, Debbie Newton, Tom Wilson, Bruce Morgan, Vivian Holmes, Robyn Remotigue, Jean Feldman, Louise Griffin

Standing: Tommy Coggins, Samantha Westcott, Michele Codd, Craig Reynolds, Csilla Csaplar, Alexandra McKeown, Joe Gindhart, Cindy Hope, John Carfora, Jamie Caldwell, Judy Fredenberg, Jim Casey, Heather Offhaus, Jerry Pogatsbnik, Annika Glauner, Pamela Napier, Cathy Snyder, Jim Wrenn, Toni Lawton

Not pictured: Barbara Cole, Kim Moreland, Susan Zipkin
The new year is also a time to celebrate change, and this year brings about a big change in the timing of the annual meeting. **AM55 will be held in August 4-7, 2013.**

While the time of year has changed, the outstanding programming and networking opportunities that you have become accustomed to will not. Our Program Committee is dedicated to creating the highest quality programming and offering members a robust program complete with 11 tracks and over 35 workshops serving research administrators at all levels and across all areas. In addition, we will have plenty of networking opportunities available for NCURA members to connect with their colleagues from across the country and from around the world.

**One thing will change with AM55 being held in August; members (and their institutions) will enjoy lower sleeping room rates.** The change to August may also be a great opportunity to think about tacking on a family vacation on to your annual conference this summer (the lower sleeping room rates will be available three days pre and post conference). There are always lots of things for families to do in Washington, DC in the summertime, and the best part is many of them are free! Family members of all ages will be occupied for hours with visits to the family-friendly historical sites, arts and culture, theatre and performing arts, shopping, restaurants, and other outdoor activities. Put away your wallets, no other city offers as many fun, free attractions to fill your days. Explore Washington DC’s fifteen Smithsonian museums, plus the National Zoo – all free of charge! And, don’t forget CAMP NCURA for those of you who are traveling with little ones, there will be plenty of activities planned to keep your loved ones occupied, with a home base right at the Hilton.

The AM55 program committee met at AM54 and again on November 30 and our track leaders have already begun developing a preliminary line up of sessions. Over the coming weeks, they will be reaching out to our membership to put together a first rate program with sessions for all levels. Many of your favorite tracks will be on the program with a new spin and a new name for AM55. The ‘Clinical’ track will be showcased as the “Biomedical” track and the ‘Human Capital’ track as the “Career Skills” track. The scope and breadth of these tracks have expanded over time and the name changes are intended to more effectively communicate the content of these tracks. In addition, this year’s program will include a new core curriculum track and the return of the Senior Forums. The “Core Curriculum” track will be a comprehensive offering of primer sessions covering the entire lifecycle of an award. Sessions in this track are designed for those new to research administration or looking for an opportunity to explore a new area of interest. We are also bringing back the Senior Forums, which are sessions designed for our advanced level members where critical topics can be discussed in greater depth. These forums will be the equivalent of two consecutive concurrent session time slots to allow for the in-depth discussions.

One of our goals for AM55 is to enable members to customize their experience so that they can maximize their institution’s invest-
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On behalf of the entire AM55 program committee, we wish you a happy and healthy 2013, and we look forward to seeing you and your families in August!
What will the research administration office of the future look like? Not long ago, I asked myself this question. When I used to open my award letters from NSF back in the ’80s, it never occurred to me that, several decades later, our business model with them would be based entirely on electronic processes. We spend a lot of time thinking about the office of the future here at Stanford University, and our future vision drives most of the decisions we make in the here and now.

Our Office of Sponsored Research (OSR) handles both pre- and post-award activities with a staff of more than 70 people. Creating a culture that seamlessly merges these two worlds and dealing with the same budget constraints as most universities requires us to think outside the box and get really creative. Although it would be nice to have a “blank check,” the truth is that most of the ideas we have tried or implemented in creating our vision have not required money. In fact, these have saved us money. We take it as a welcome challenge to continuously innovate given the limited resources available, and I encourage everyone to avoid using “lack of resources” as a reason to hold off on bold ideas. Additionally, when you are constantly tossing out ideas and trying new things, your staff will learn to adapt very quickly, and you avoid having to bring in “change managers.”
Ditch the Paper  In the summer of 2010, we undertook a project to create a paperless research administration system at Stanford. Going forward, all awards, emails, proposal documents, and subawards would be created, managed, and archived online. I would love to say we had a perfect plan, but our journey to a paperless system required us to be flexible and make changes along the way in order to achieve our vision. Succeeding in this mammoth undertaking required converting thousands of active projects (consisting of 1.3 million pages!) to a digital format, all while maintaining our normal business operations. Our approach was to jump in to this endeavor and never look back. As you might imagine, this was a long and painful process, but now we could never imagine keeping paper files... Digital is just too easy! One big payoff came this past November as we moved our organization from our campus to our research park. We had no files to move! Our staff simply packed up their desks and moved down the road.

Work from Anywhere  Every day while walking to work when we had our main campus office, I passed a sign promoting numerous ways to reduce on campus traffic. In addition, many OSR staffers were spending up to an hour each way commuting to and from work. We started kicking around the idea of letting our staff work from home one day a week, and, about a year ago, we implemented a work-from-home (WFH) program. Nearly two thirds of our staff now participate in this program, and the immediate increase in morale alone made it clear that WFH was earning its keep. We also noticed an increase in productivity and a drop in absenteeism to negligible levels. This program has been so well received that our Human Resources representative recently asked if I thought of offering a full-time WFH option to employees moving out of the area. Think about it; if you have a great employee who is moving, what better way to retain them? I can see a day in the not-so-distant future when a quarter of our OSR staff work from some remote location. I recently read a report affirming that working from home boosts employee happiness and productivity. One of our Stanford Business professors calls it part of “being nice to people” practices. We agree.

Overstaffing  What? I know, I know; people will think I’m crazy for even suggesting what might seem on the surface like a fiscally ludicrous idea, but our thinking was pretty simple: Have a small group of “floating” employees trained in either pre- or post-award able to flex into other areas when needed. The trick was selling this idea to management. We started with the fact that like most schools, Stanford always has vacancies. With an office of over 70 staff, reallocating available resources towards overstaffing made sense. Combine this with the fact that on most days, a number of folks are out of the office for a variety of reasons, and it quickly became clear that staffing the office at 125 percent was both organizationally and fiscally prudent.

We piloted this idea with a new research accountant. Once trained, he spent his first year filling in for employees on maternity or medical leave. When a person returned to work, he moved to the next person going on leave or helped other staff while waiting for the next scheduled leave of absence. Around here, there is never a time we don’t have someone that we need to cover for. This has been a success in every way; we always have full coverage and the employee received broad training in post-award functions. We also benefitted from “economies in training,” having saved resources we would have otherwise expended in repeatedly training temps to perform this valuable function on an ongoing basis. We have now brought on a pre-award contract and grant officer who will do the same thing. We have yet to go over budget with this approach.

Training for the Future  My management team and I spend a lot of time discussing how to produce the next generation of research administration leaders. I’m sure you will agree that in order to effectively run any office, you must understand all of the parts. Our pre-award staff handle all activities for the departments they serve – reviewing proposals, negotiating awards of all types, and issuing subawards. Additionally, our officers manage a “blended” portfolio. Instead of specializing in Medicine or Engineering awards, each officer is responsible for a mixture of awards from the Schools of Engineering, Medicine, Humanities and Science, Earth Sciences, Education, Law, Business, and independent lab departments. This functional structure ensures they understand all award types and sponsors and best prepares them for future opportunities. We also assign new hires some of our more challenging departments and PIs right off the bat to get their feet wet.

Cross-training is a concept that gets thrown around a lot in our business. We decided to make a very conscious decision to have our pre- and post-award teams work together. When we moved, we configured our new office space to facilitate cross-functional collaboration by situating our pre-award officers and post-award accountants in a common area. We plan to take advantage of this new arrangement by requiring all pre-award officers to set up an account in our Oracle financial system and all accountants to participate in real-time negotiations and proposal reviews.

It Comes Down to the People  The organizational enhancements I have discussed would be impossible to achieve without great people willing to jump in and try new ideas. Having flexible, forward-thinking folks who don’t let the small stuff ruin their day is key. As our management team throws out ideas, some that might be considered off the wall, the staff are willing to take the ball and run with it. If we need to change course or even abandon an idea, it is not a big deal. Assembling the right team does take work, and we are fastidious in selecting and recruiting new hires to ensure we bring people on with the right mindset for creating our vision of a future research administration office at Stanford.

I believe the biggest challenge facing universities over the next few decades is how to think strategically and plan for the future while dealing with day-to-day pressing business needs. This can be daunting, but in my opinion, the best strategy is to think big and be willing to fail. At Stanford, we are encouraged to think outside the box and challenge the status quo, with no idea off limits. This philosophy drives what we do and creates a certain freedom to try things that might ordinarily “end up on the cutting room floor.” More importantly, it becomes contagious. Give it a try!

Russell Brewer is Associate Vice President of the Office of Sponsored Research at Stanford University and leads the central administrative unit that manages the lifecycle of sponsored research from proposal submission through award closeout. Russell’s career in research administration spans 24 years in both public and private university environments. Russell graduated from Texas Tech University with a degree in Economics. He can be reached at grbrewer@stanford.edu
Electronic Research Administration (eRA) means different things to different people, and eRA projects come in all shapes and sizes. I was hired by our sponsored programs office in December of 1997 because the feds were “about to go electronic with grant applications.” I came from a research lab and had some Information Technology (IT) background, but mostly I could relate complex technical issues to faculty and others across campus. It was very clear that the feds were not going to move to electronic applications very quickly, so I began working with our research administrators to build useful tools to help them and the faculty on campus. eRA was a very new field at that time.

Too often at many organizations, the IT shop runs your eRA projects. I am a big proponent for not letting your IT staff drive your projects. Rather, you should drive them from a business and functional need. However, end users often become intimidated by the language of IT staff. Perhaps folks are embarrassed to ask for clarification. Just as research administration has its own vernacular, so does IT. This brief guide to some commonly used terms is meant to help bridge the gap between your IT staff and your research administrators and end users. Hopefully, this will allow you to speak more freely with your tech staff and enhance collaboration on your future projects. This is not meant to be a complete IT dictionary, but rather highlight some of the common terms you may hear as you work with your IT staff to build a system for routing and tracking proposals, or even replacing a hard copy accepted award report with a web-based report.

ERP: Enterprise Resource Planning. This term typically refers to the back-end systems that support the administrative functions of your university. ERP systems are your Student, Human Resources/Payroll, General Ledger, and Grants Management systems. These large, complex software systems integrate data across many functional areas. Examples of ERP software systems are PeopleSoft, Oracle, SAP, Banner, Kauli Coeus, or even a home-grown system. eRA refers to systems and tools that support research administration, while ERP is a more broad system that generally supports more than one administrative function.

Legacy System: In common terms, a legacy system refers to any system that one is replacing with a new system. However, a more specific view of legacy system is an older software and hardware system that may be out of date and needs replacing. Replacing a legacy system is often needed because the business requirements have changed substantially and the programming cannot be modified to accommodate new requirements, hardware or software may be beyond the support period from the vendor, or there is a need to integrate with other data systems. Think of the old “green screen” computer terminals linked to a mainframe. I like to say that the new ERP systems or other new software systems are the legacy systems of the future: eventually they will need to be replaced.

Virtual Server or Virtual Environment: In the not too distant past, networked programs each required their own server: a physical computer connected to the network. Virtual servers or environments replace many individual computers with one much larger computer that can be the home of many servers. Software manages the use of the larger computer to make it seem like there are many individual computers. You “virtually” have many more computers than you really do. This is a very effective way to manage the needs of many systems. Rather than having five different computer servers running your systems, you can consolidate them into one physical computer and have the software manage them like they are still separate computers. Some of the advantages include savings on power and cooling, the ability to re-allocate additional computing power or memory to specific “virtual” servers as the systems need it, and possibly fewer computer administrators.

PMO: Project Management Office. This refers to the group of people or organization that manages projects according to a structured methodology. The PMO could be the project managers responsible for one particular project such as creating a system for electronically submitting to
Grants.gov. Or it could refer to a larger office that coordinates many projects across your institution. I highly recommend that the PMO be staffed with functional as well as technical staff. It is important that end users have a voice in how projects are managed and coordinated across your office or university.

The code then moves into the live, production environment. Frequently, there are stringent sign-offs to move programming from one environment to the next. The purpose is to ensure that code is tested before it is introduced into your production system. Another common environment is a training environment. This allows you to train users in your new FCOI functionality in a system that is not used for real production work; if people make mistakes in the training environment it doesn’t affect the real system.

Migration: The movement of the software code from one environment to the other. As programming goes from DEV to QA to PROD, the code is said to “migrate.”

Functional Specification: A functional specification, sometimes called a “functional spec,” refers to a document that lays out how a particular system, component of a system, report, etc. works in language that end users can understand. It is typically written by the end users and tells the technical programmers how they want the system to function. It is a very useful document to communicate your expectations to the developers. Technical developers will read your functional specification and then work with you to ensure that your needs are met. I highly recommend that end users complete functional specifications for all projects. This really helps users think about what they need and how their needs fit into larger systems.

Technical Specification: Similar to the functional specification, the technical specification is a document written by the technical developers that describes the technology, programming, technical logic, etc. to meet the needs laid out in the functional specification. Usually, the technical specification is not something that end users would be involved in developing. Often the technical specifications become the basis for technical documentation of the system.

Code Freeze: This is the point in time when further technical development or changes to the software programming are strictly limited. The purpose of the code freeze is to ensure that the software code that is being moved into the Production environment is well tested and no unexpected changes are introduced into your systems. Code freezes frequently come into play when a system is being patched (see directly below) or upgraded.

Patch: Just as a small square of cloth may be used to fix a hole in your slacks, a patch is a small piece of programming code that fixes a bug or adds new functionality. The patch can often be a temporary fix until larger programming changes are introduced in a system upgrade.

Data Warehouse or Data Mart: This is a central storage for data from administrative systems. It is most often used for reporting and saving data for historical purposes. Typical warehouses are refreshed with data overnight so all the previous day’s proposals, awards, and grant expenditures are available to create useful reports to share with your administrators.

Business Intelligence (BI) or Business Analytics (BA): This refers to the use of data to drive business decisions. Most often the business intelligence and analysis processes utilize data from a data warehouse. An example of business intelligence would be analyzing grant award expenditure data to determine the effect of future reductions in awards. BI reports can assist university leaders in determining where to focus resources to ensure competitiveness or adjust to changes in the future. Many universities have sophisticated business intelligence software systems to assist in data analysis and reporting.

Clearly this is not an exhaustive list of all confusing IT word or phrases. However, I hope this brief listing of IT phrases will help you work more effectively with your IT staff. If you have other suggestions for terms to include in an eRA dictionary, please send them my way for use in a future article. I also encourage you to consider joining the NCURA eRA Community. Good luck in your future eRA projects!

Mark Sweet is Director of Electronic Research Administration in the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at the University of Wisconsin—Madison. He serves as eRA Contributing Editor for NCURA Magazine. He has been working on eRA issues for over 14 years and has presented at several regional and national NCURA conferences. In addition, he is a member of the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) eRA Standing Committee. He can be reached at msweet@rsp.wisc.edu.
IMPLEMENTING ELECTRONIC RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION SYSTEMS – LESSONS LEARNED

By Lynda S. Wolter

Electronic Research Administration (eRA) systems are becoming commonplace in our field, and successful eRA projects require clear direction and planning. Institutions considering a new system face a range of options, from off-the-shelf, vendor-maintained systems to fully-customized solutions. In any scenario, an eRA project is a complex undertaking that will bring together functional users, programmers, and senior management sponsors, among others, to meet the task. This article, which is based on a discussion group led at the NCURA 54th Annual Meeting, lists some considerations for planning an eRA system implementation and some lessons learned from past implementations. Careful upfront planning can help ensure a successful outcome.

1 – Define the Scope
“eRA system” may mean different things to different people. Some may envision a grants-only system for review and approval, while others may see a soup-to-nuts system for multiple award types that incorporates system-to-system submission and post-award accounting. Defining and documenting the project scope allows for a common understanding of the solution, and it can be used to explain the future vision to end-users. A high-level scope document is the first step.

A scope-of-work (SOW) should include a description of the solution, key goals or outcomes, expected benefits, and define the executive sponsors and other key players responsible for the project. If there are known implementation deadlines, it should include these. It should explicitly identify any specific activities that are not in scope as “out of scope.” And, it should identify the party or group responsible for long-term maintenance of the eRA solution. Pulling all of this information into one document at the outset provides the project team with a reference document and draws a broad outline of the tasks involved in the successful solution implementation. Thus, the SOW is a powerful tool for discussion with end-users and constituents of the project. It lays out expectations, starts the overall communication strategy, and keeps the project on task.

The scope also is the launching point for defining more specific requirements and solution needs. The document will help the IT team understand the project goals, and it can be used to educate them on the specific solution. A particular eRA solution may use cutting-edge technology, so the value of the scope document for educating IT personnel should not be underestimated.

2 – Define the Solution Requirements
Once the scope document is set, the next step is to define the specific solution requirements. This is where the specific details take shape, and tough questions are required to ensure that the guiding documents lead to the desired system functionality.

✔ What is the budget?
✔ What are the “must-haves?”
✔ Should the system include a particular feature or function simply because it can be programmed? How often will that particular feature or function be used?
✔ What are the institutional requirements for security, interoperability, accessibility, etc.?
✔ Will the new system require a redesign of the current business process?
✔ Is the new system supported by organizational policy changes, or is it meant to drive them?

There are many hard conversations to have early on, and a key lesson is to learn to say “no.” Whether pushing back on sponsors pressing to do more with less or pushing back on stakeholders who simply want more functionality, managing expectations helps to ensure that the final requirements can be met with the available resources. Scope creep takes up resources and may detract from the real project requirements, so difficult choices made early will generally result in a smoother project in the long run.

3 – Identify the Key Players and Required Staff
A successful eRA project will involve numerous functional participants and stakeholders, so it is important to outline the project team and develop the organizational chart. It’s best to start from the top and clearly identify the executive sponsors and business owners of the project. This illustrates the ultimate institutional support for the project and shows who is ultimately accountable for the budget and can make the tough decisions. From there, appoint the advisory and steering committees, and the technical and business teams. Don’t forget to include the specific project-oriented teams: testing, quality, training, and communication. Creating an organizational

chart with all the team members and making it part of your overall communication strategy, will let everyone know their role in the effort.

As an organization chart is created, staffing needs will become apparent, and there will be multiple considerations to ponder. Will there be staff from the research administration office dedicated to the project? If so, how much of their time will be committed. Who are the technical staff and how much of their time is needed? The scope and timing of the project will help in determining whether full-time dedicated business and technical staff are required or whether part-time staff is sufficient. Larger projects tend to benefit from dedicated project management staff – project managers and project assistants to keep all the logistics of the project, coordinate meetings, project reports and updates and keep the project plan. The end-users of the system/process are also essential members of the project team, so involve them early on in requirements gathering, design sessions, and testing and communication plans. As the chart is fleshed out, clearly identify lines of authority for decision-making. For example, specify which decisions rest with stakeholders and end-users and which can be made by IT.

4 – Use Available Software Tools

While the overall goal of an eRA project is to develop a customized enterprise software application, the effort often benefits from using available off-the-shelf software. For example, scheduling or project management software can be useful to help understand the project phases – requirements gathering, design, development and build, testing, training, and deployment. The project manager needs to keep track of the inter-dependencies of all of the tasks and manage the overall project deadlines, so such software will make their life much easier.

Accounting and budgeting software can help manage project costs. As in developing a sponsored project budget, thoughtful consideration must be used in developing an eRA project budget. Whether with an enterprise accounting software, a small business accounting package, or an Excel spreadsheet, tracking and managing costs is key. The successful eRA project must have a mechanism to track implementation and operation costs versus the initial budget (for hardware and software costs of implementation, annual licensing costs, ongoing staff costs for operation, etc.).

Finally, other technologies, such as web sites, SharePoint sites, and document repositories, can be used to organize and share project documentation. As a basis for project communication, these tools can ensure that all team members are regularly informed of project status and that the particular functions are aware of changes that impact their deliverables. In addition to high-tech solutions, old-fashioned low-tech face-to-face communication is a remarkably effective means of sharing information. So, regular town hall, staff, or stakeholder meetings should be part of any communication strategy.

5 – Test and Commission the System

Once the eRA solution is operational, it should be stress-tested prior to deployment. Such tests should be based on real-world scenarios at the particular institution. A dedicated testing group can test and document a system. However, tests of actual business scenarios run by actual end-users can identify not-so-obvious system bugs. This will demonstrate system performance under work-day conditions. Be aware, testing with end-users should be done prudently. The system should be largely functional and de-bugged prior to their use, as this will be their first impression of the system.

6 – Train the Users

As part of the overall project plan, spend some time developing a training strategy and resources. Consider the current business process and how they will change with the eRA system, then develop specific training for the changes. Understand what resources already exist (e.g. trainers, computer classroom space, training scripts, etc.) and use them. Remember that adults learn in different ways, so tailor training materials to match skill levels, to the extent possible. Quick reference guides and a “live” training environment are helpful. Finally, consider basic research administration orientation for the IT staff, to help them understand the business and appreciate how the business drives the eRA solution.

7 – Convert Legacy Data and Build Reports

Converting data for use by a new eRA system will allow the retirement of an existing system. However, converting data can be a project unto itself, with requirements for timing, resources, technical staff, and costs. Do not make assumptions when converting data and carefully consider what portion (if not all) of the legacy system that will be converted. Practice the data conversion with mock conversions to understand how the conversion will work. Test both native and converted records. Lastly, include the conversion plans in the overall communication strategy, to help end users understand what is and is not included in the solution.

With a repository of converted records and a stream on incoming new records from the new system, the next concerns are data management and reporting. The sudden wealth of data can promise reporting options that did not previously exist. However, while data management and reporting begin in earnest near the end of a project, the management and reporting needs should be part of the solution design from the beginning. This will ensure that the data elements are included in the production system. It will also allow definition of individual elements, their use, their expected evolution over time, and their optimal configuration for warehousing. For example, if system metrics are envisioned, then the data elements to support them should be part of the initial design. Similarly, the decision of whether to generate reports from the live production system or from a standalone data warehouse is best considered early in the system design process. Like data conversion, constructing a data warehouse is itself a significant project with the similar considerations.

Conclusion The preceding list is by no means exhaustive with respect to developing an eRA system. The points identified are more like the tips of an iceberg. However, as with an iceberg, knowing it’s there (i.e. knowing what to expect) provides a huge advantage in dealing with it. eRA systems are here to stay, and it’s only a matter of time before an implementation is likely to begin at any particular institution. For those charged with managing such a project, following the steps outlined above can help them navigate the most treacherous aspects to arrive safely at the other side.

Lynda S. Wolter is currently the Deputy Director of University Research Administration at The University of Chicago, and she has spent her entire twenty-plus-year career at the institution. She began as a departmental administrator, and she has since worked in a variety of settings including department, research institute, and Dean’s and central offices. She was recently business lead for implementation of the University’s first eRA module for grant/contract management. You can reach her at lswolter@uchicago.edu.
This issue’s theme got me to reminiscing about my youthful days in the theater, when I was the lead in a regional production of Wrigley and Chiclet’s Anıe Get Your Gum. They were heady times. The anticipation of opening night. The glamour of visiting Des Moines and Sioux Falls. And all the bubble gum I could chew. Star treatment, indeed.

Like most things in life, I’ve come to accept that I just might learn something if I just pay attention long enough. The theater is no exception (especially if one says “the theater” in a pretentious, high falutin’ accent). By honing my craft, I learned how to fake my way through a broad range of emotions and behaviors, such as caring, sympathy, listening, guidance, encouragement, and so on. I honestly had no idea that these skills would apply to my adult life with such veracity. These are skills every research administrator must possess! Some may call it Emotional Intelligence, but I call it ACTING.

So, for those who have not had the good fortune of spending time on stage, let me share a few insights I gleaned from my days in front of the footlights.

Even with my Pollyanna nature, I can’t help but muse: Will the sun really come out tomorrow? Anyone from Seattle knows this to be a daily question one ponders, much like What is the Meaning of Life? While optimism is all well and good, it’s no way to plan for the future. Oh sure, the elections are over; but, at this writing, the Nation still faces a fiscal cliff. When it comes to Federal funding, the reality exists that the sun might not come out tomorrow. In fact, the future might look a lot more like the final scene of Hamlet than the happy conclusion to Annie. As Tom Stoppard wrote in Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead, “Generally speaking, things have gone about as far as they can possibly go when things have got as bad as they can reasonably get.” Clearly we’re not there yet; plan accordingly.

Do you have Broadway aspirations on a Community Theater budget? Every theater producer dreams, perhaps secretly, of taking his or her play to Broadway. Few ever do. Delusions of grandeur abound. The same is true in research administration. Vice Presidents of Research dream, perhaps secretly, of leading Carnegie RU/VH institutions. In both cases, reality is an inconvenience, though frequently ignored, fact. Limited resources, talent, and geography can all conspire against realizing our dreams. My advice? Aim low, manage expectations (echoing Tucker Carlson? Paul Begala?), and savor the success. Hey, even Springtime for Hitler was a hit. In other words, face facts and act accordingly.

As plays like Stomp and Riverdance have shown, if you’ve run out of ideas or don’t have a compelling story to pitch, you can always resort to jumping up and down, banging on things, and generally making a racket in order to keep people’s attention. As everyone who has worked in research administration knows, this tactic can be just as successful in the office as it is on Broadway. You know the behavior . . . loud, assertive, aggressive, refusing to play well with others, rarely having anything useful to add to the conversation. Doesn’t sound familiar? Confer with friends and colleagues, and double check the mirror.

And what lessons might we learn from Sweeney Todd: The Demon Barber of Fleet Street? It doesn’t take much imagination to grasp the parallels between Todd’s barber shop and the federal proposal review and award process. Both may involve slashing and repackaging. Enough said.

Any of us in the midst of administrative change — whether vice presidents, provosts, chancellors, or presidents — can immediately recognize parallels in our organizational hierarchy to that of The Lyin’ King. Much like higher education, there were troubling times in that kingdom and a host of exotic characters. The casting was so well articulated that one could easily envision the corresponding zoo creature. Speaking of zoos, thank goodness that our post-award operations run more efficiently than that in The Jungle Cook. The way the books were baked in that performance still makes me shudder. In fact, I’ve avoided campfires for over a decade as a result.

Finally, consider the Stage Manager from Our Town. In Thornton Wilder’s work, the Stage Manager is the character who orchestrates the progression of the play, introduces each act to the audience, and steps out of character now and then to play other roles as needed. Research administrators have a similar part to play. We coordinate the production of each proposal, shepherd each grant to conclusion, and do whatever is necessary to keep the research engine running. We organize and provide support for faculty, students, fellow administrators, and funding agencies, just as stage managers do for producers, directors, actors, and technicians. And if we’re lucky enough to be anything like the Stage Manager in Our Town, we will recognize in our own time the brevity and sweetness of life.

Ah, la dolce vita. What to do? Live, laugh, and love accordingly.

End scene.

NCURAbly Pedantic is written by long-standing NCURA members, all under pseudonym protection.
Closing the Books on ARRA: Lessons Learned, Managing Audits and Inquiries, and Looking Forward

Please give us an overview of your professional experience and how you came to be in your current position at the University of Wisconsin – Madison.

I’ve been at the UW-Madison for over 20 years. I currently am the Assistant Director of our central sponsored projects office which is a combined pre-award and post-award operation. I started out as a grant accountant and over the years have taken on additional responsibilities. Today, I oversee the sponsored projects accounting and administration which includes financial reporting, invoicing, revenue management, and F&A rate proposal preparation. I also serve as the University’s audit liaison on all of our sponsored project audits.

In what way(s) did your institution feel you were well prepared for the ARRA reporting requirements, and in what way(s) do you wish you had been better prepared?

We had just come off an implementation of a new grants system which included the ability for electronic work flow of proposal and award documents. This functionality allowed PI’s, divisions, and our central office to route correspondence back and forth much more efficiently. Having that infrastructure in place really benefitted us in handling the quarterly reporting with its tight deadlines.

Our IT staff also designed a simple webpage data entry form that we used to collect the information for progress reporting. Our quarterly emails to faculty included a specific hyperlink where the faculty member could enter the required information and submit it directly back to our office.

Like many institutions, we were challenged by the Section 1512 reporting requirements on measuring jobs. Because the ARRA funding became available on such short notice, the guidance from the Feds on how to measure jobs was late in arriving. We found ourselves adjusting our process right up to the start of the first reporting period.

Did you utilize systems to track and report? If not, do you wish you had? Or, if you did, will you be able to benefit in the future from those systems you already put into place in order to handle new federal requirements coming up?

We did add some additional staff. To handle the accounting and reporting, we reassigned some of our senior accountants’ duties to focus on ARRA and back-filled their previous positions. Our office had never experienced working with a Federal funding program that was created so quickly and that was as large as ARRA. We knew that managing these awards would require a significant amount of time and expertise.

In retrospect, I’m very glad that we did that. Our department administrators and faculty had many questions (and we did too) about how to manage the ARRA funds. Having dedicated, experienced staff available to provide the answers and to meet the new requirements really helped us manage the awards appropriately.

Did you hire temporary ARRA staff or utilize existing staff? Depending on which avenue you took, what were the pros and cons?

We did add some additional staff. To handle the accounting and reporting, we reassigned some of our senior accountants’ duties to focus on ARRA and back-filled their previous positions. Our office had never experienced working with a Federal funding program that was created so quickly and that was as large as ARRA. We knew that managing these awards would require a significant amount of time and expertise.

In retrospect, I’m very glad that we did that. Our department administrators and faculty had many questions (and we did too) about how to manage the ARRA funds. Having dedicated, experienced staff available to provide the answers and to meet the new requirements really helped us manage the awards appropriately.

Tying into the idea behind the reporting requirements for ARRA funding, Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests from the public are another avenue that the public may take to gain access to information on Federal funding provided to universities. Have you had any experience of such requests, and if so, what info has the public been interested in? Is there any pattern?

I have to say that after all the time and resources we put into collecting monitor each project. We even used a specific color for the file folders that held our ARRA paperwork.

What we learned about our grants and accounting systems from our ARRA experience has proved beneficial. Our understanding of the availability of specific data fields and our abilities to build queries and mine our data warehouse has been useful as new reporting requirements, such as FFATA, have been implemented.

Did you hire temporary ARRA staff or utilize existing staff? Depending on which avenue you took, what were the pros and cons?

We did add some additional staff. To handle the accounting and reporting, we reassigned some of our senior accountants’ duties to focus on ARRA and back-filled their previous positions. Our office had never experienced working with a Federal funding program that was created so quickly and that was as large as ARRA. We knew that managing these awards would require a significant amount of time and expertise.

In retrospect, I’m very glad that we did that. Our department administrators and faculty had many questions (and we did too) about how to manage the ARRA funds. Having dedicated, experienced staff available to provide the answers and to meet the new requirements really helped us manage the awards appropriately.

We did add some additional staff. To handle the accounting and reporting, we reassigned some of our senior accountants’ duties to focus on ARRA and back-filled their previous positions. Our office had never experienced working with a Federal funding program that was created so quickly and that was as large as ARRA. We knew that managing these awards would require a significant amount of time and expertise.

In retrospect, I’m very glad that we did that. Our department administrators and faculty had many questions (and we did too) about how to manage the ARRA funds. Having dedicated, experienced staff available to provide the answers and to meet the new requirements really helped us manage the awards appropriately.

We did add some additional staff. To handle the accounting and reporting, we reassigned some of our senior accountants’ duties to focus on ARRA and back-filled their previous positions. Our office had never experienced working with a Federal funding program that was created so quickly and that was as large as ARRA. We knew that managing these awards would require a significant amount of time and expertise.

In retrospect, I’m very glad that we did that. Our department administrators and faculty had many questions (and we did too) about how to manage the ARRA funds. Having dedicated, experienced staff available to provide the answers and to meet the new requirements really helped us manage the awards appropriately.
and reporting the data, it’s been a little disappointing that most people we ask have not gone to recovery.gov or even heard of the site. We have had some requests and inquiries about a few of our projects. The majority of the requests have come from the media and press. Most of their requests have been related to identifying possible leads for future stories or reports. And there were also a couple of emails that appeared to be spam that congratulated us on our ARRA award and offered to assist us in managing the funds (at a very reasonable fee, of course).

With regard to audits of ARRA awards: what do you anticipate will be reviewed and addressed in these audits?

We’ve actually had a couple of audits on some of our ARRA awards. The auditors have looked at many of the same items that are covered in any sponsored project audit: allocability and allowability of expenses, period of performance, reporting, and invoicing. But, what we found that was a bit different was the ARRA auditors seemed to drill down into a deeper level of detail.

Because the ARRA awards themselves generally tended to have a shorter period of performance with the expectation that funds would be spent quickly and in accordance with the approved budget, I think the auditors wanted to see that the expenses were closely aligned with the approved budget and project plans. If they weren’t, it was very important to have documentation that explained the deviations and notifications to the sponsor.

What I have noticed in reading the published audit reports on ARRA projects is that the areas of identified issues, like prior approvals, or questioned costs, such as equipment purchases, are now showing up as priority items in the A-133 Compliance Supplement and in the agencies’ annual audit plans. So it does appear that the auditors are building on their experiences with the ARRA audits as they look at other federal awards.

In comparing the reporting requirements under ARRA awards to those required by the different individual US States, it has been noted that the some state reporting requirements greatly exceeded the Federal requirements. Do you have any awareness on this issue and if so, did you see this as an overall trend across the nation?

IN MEMORIAM

NCURA has lost one of its original pillars with the December 20, 2012, passing of Julia M. Jacobsen. Jacobsen, past NCURA Treasurer and Secretary-Treasurer was NCURA first female officer, serving from 1974-1975 and then elected to a second term. During her second term, Julia recognized the importance of having a Washington, D.C., presence for NCURA and gave it a D.C. address which, as legend tells, was actually her home address with business transactions taking place at her kitchen table. Not long after, she found space for NCURA’s first “real” office at 1100 17th Street, NW, and added its first part-time secretary. It was during this time that she and her husband Jake went above and beyond the call of duty when the Annual Meeting host hotel required a deposit that the NCURA treasury could not afford. As Julia told Jake about the predicament, he pulled out his check book and floated NCURA a non-interest loan. The Annual Meeting went on as planned.

Other Jacobsen legacies include the establishment of the NCURA Annual Meeting Workshop series; assistance and support of regional programming – she was one of the original designers of the NCURA regional organization; a driver of the professionalism of research administration; and she was a strong and enduring presence for women in the profession.

Jacobsen was a 1945 graduate of Sweet Briar College in Virginia. She served as Director of Government Relations and Sponsored Programs at Sweet Briar College for over twenty years, and prior to that was Special Assistant, Contracts and Grants, at the University of Southern California. The fourth edition of her book From Ideas to Funded Project: Grant Proposals that Work was released in 2007. The same year Julia was the recipient of NCURA’s first Gold Award for having made a sustained and distinctive contribution to the vitality and enduring legacy of NCURA. Jacobsen lived in Washington, D.C. She was 89 years of age.

Donations in Julia’s memory may be sent to Sweet Briar College and/or Holton-Arms School (Bethesda, MD).
Our State did have its own set of reporting requirements, so that did add a level of complexity. Particularly, in terms of deadlines for submission. The Federal ten calendar day requirement was already a challenge. I know some states handled the Section 1512 reporting on behalf of their universities. In some cases, the states set even earlier deadlines. That would have been very tough to accomplish.

In looking back, do you think faculty were prepared to provide the reporting information required by ARRA?

I think, initially, they were. One of the more difficult aspects of the reporting for PIs was the quarterly status reports. For some, the reporting did present itself as a burden as time progressed. For some research projects, the progress that is being made is hard to describe in a few short sentences. For other projects, three months is not a long time, so there may not be much new information since the previous status update to report.

Now, looking forward — if the DATA Act passes, where ARRA-type reporting will be required for all awards, what lessons will you take from your ARRA days to handle the new requirements?

We’ve definitely learned the importance of communicating deadlines and reporting requirements early and often. If the DATA Act is implemented, we will likely use our processes for email notification and webpage data entry to collect information.

We’ve also been tracking the amount of time it has taken for our staff to perform all of these additional duties. If the DATA Act passes, we’ll be looking closely at our existing resources and staffing to figure out what it’s going to take to handle the additional workload.

Finally, in your opinion, did the benefits of the ARRA funding outweigh the pain of all the regulations and compliance issues?

I would say they were. The availability of funds for our faculty was beneficial to further their research, instruction, and outreach work. While there were times where we may have been frustrated by the regulations and reporting requirements, that we were able to receive a large amount of funding for our university made it worthwhile.

---

**NCURA Magazine Seeks Co-Editor**

The *NCURA Magazine* seeks applications for the position of Co-Editor. The position is a three year term, beginning January 1, 2014. The Co-Editors work with the Senior Editor, Contributing Editors, and NCURA staff in ensuring the timely release of six issues during the calendar year. Each Co-Editor works closely with 3-4 Contributing Editors. Applicants should be senior research administrators with strong writing and editing skills and strong connections within NCURA and associated professional associations (such as COGR, FDP, etc.). We expect to have a candidate selected by the end of June 2013 so that the new Co-Editor can work with the existing Co-Editors and Senior Editor, in ensuring an orderly transition.

Individuals interested in this position should initially email Senior Editor Dan Nordquist at nordquist@wsu.edu.
Clinical Study Start-Ups — Best Practices

By Kimberly Irvine

The increase over the last decade in the cost of running clinical trials is well documented. Phase III clinical trial costs account for 90 percent of the cost of drug development, according to a report published by the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research (Roy, 2012). Several issues have contributed to this increase and the disproportionate costs of late-stage clinical trials in the drug development process. One of those issues is the duration of clinical trials. A Tufts University study shows that the average length of a clinical trial increased by 70 percent between 1999 and 2005 (Getz, 2008).

While the reasons for this are many and varied, delays in study start-up are a significant contributor. A 2011 industry study by Thomson CenterWatch showed that clinical trial delays were primarily due to contract and budget negotiations. Other frequent factors leading to delays were patient recruitment, protocol amendments, legal review and review of consent forms (2007 Survey of Investigative Sites in the United States).

Both parties — the study sponsor as well as the investigator — can play a role in streamlining the start-up process and therefore expediting the time. This article addresses how research offices can guide study investigators to prepare for the start-up of a study so it runs on time. These best practices apply not only to industry-sponsored trials, but also investigator-initiated studies.

There are benefits to both a physician and the patient in participating in clinical trials. Physicians gain greater awareness of new therapies and are able to provide them to their patients. Their practice becomes attractive to patients who are seeking the latest treatments. Investigators have opportunities to meet, collaborate and network with leaders in the field.

The relationship between the investigator and the sponsor is important to ensure good science but also to prevent miscommunications and conflicts. Likewise, the research professional can facilitate this relationship by proactively educating and guiding the investigator in order to meet timeline requirements and ensure a timely start-up.

Dedicate an Employee to Staff the Study

Although academic research offices have specially trained study coordinators, it is important that there be a single point of contact on each study protocol. This will ensure smooth and consistent communication among the principals—the sponsor, the Institutional Review Board (IRB), and the department, among others. Additionally, it is important that the investigator identify a nurse or other employee within the practice as the point person to facilitate the administrative tasks critical to starting and running clinical trials. A coordinator working in the investigator’s office can help prepare the regulatory documents for the IRB review, assist in preparing a budget, maintain documentation and study-specific forms and track source documents. Another benefit to having a dedicated employee working on clinical trials is in responding to sponsor monitoring visits and inspections by regulatory agencies. This also ensures that the research office staff is kept aware of any such regulatory audits and visits. At least one person in the investigator’s office should be intimately familiar with all the study documentation and materials.

If an investigator participates in several clinical trials, it is beneficial to invest in special training and education for the investigator’s staff member. Training courses — both in-person and online — can familiarize the employee with fundamentals of clinical research, federal guidelines, ethics and the fundamentals of clinical trial budgeting. While this does not replicate the more advanced training of research office staff, it can provide a baseline of education to ensure smooth communications between the investigator’s staff and the research coordinator.

Consider the Variables

In addition to an IRB review, the protocol may also need to undergo additional reviews by other committees. For example, some institutions have specialty-specific committees in oncology or surgery. While the IRB’s focus is on protecting the rights and ensuring the welfare of research subjects, these other committees may be considering additional issues such as feasibility of the study or biohazard material safety. Additionally, there may be a conflict of interest committee to ensure possible or perceived conflicts are appropriately addressed and managed. The institution’s requirements should be well documented and easily accessible to investigators and the research staff.

Create a Template Workflow Approach

Develop a checklist of policies and procedures as well as expected timelines for the investigator and make it available in various formats. This template can ensure consistency and help to avoid skipping any steps. This can be as simple as a paper-based step-by-step checklist to project management software that specifically guides both the research staff and the investigator through the workflow. Clinical Trials Management Systems (CTMS) are specifically designed to track clinical trials. Whichever system you choose, it should be detailed enough to allow for tracking of activities, timelines and assignment of tasks. This also sets expectations for the investigator in terms of his or her responsibilities.

The workflow should include all the dates and deadlines for meetings, including the IRB and the conflict of interest committee. According to the Association for the Accreditation of Human Research Protection Programs (AAHRPP), the mean time from IRB submission to approval is 45.2 days (Kiskadden, 2012). Investigators should be made aware of these timelines to manage expectations and reduce frustration. Meeting or exceeding expected timelines is crucial.

Evaluate the Investigator’s Qualifications

The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) recently issued draft guidance regarding the role of the IRB. In it, the agency reinforced the need for IRBs to consider the qualifications of the investigator. Having this documentation ready for the IRB can minimize protocol review delays.

A department chair may need to provide a statement of the investigator’s qualifications. IRBs also evaluate evidence of active licensure, board accreditation, professional associations or relevant publications. Particularly in the case of a new faculty member or someone who has not been an investigator at your institution, consider having a process to collect and document his or her experience and capabilities. This is especially important in studies involving vulnerable populations, novel technologies or other trials that may pose higher risks. Also, consider whether...
the investigator, the site, or the institution have enough of a patient population to meet the recruitment goals.

**Develop a Patient-Participant Recruitment Plan**

The holy grail of successful clinical trials is the recruitment and retention of participants. Clinical trial enrollment rates are dropping, and up to 20 percent of research sites never even enroll a single patient (Pierre, 2006)3.

Research professionals should work closely with their investigators to educate them about different recruitment strategies. A common mistake by investigators is to not speak proactively to their patients about active clinical trials. A pocket guide or tip sheet for investigators on how to discuss clinical trials with patients may help. Providing these tips to physician assistants and advance nurse practitioners may also help open the conversation with patients who may be appropriate study participants. Encourage investigators to engage their colleagues to discuss clinical trial opportunities with their own patients. Often a clinician in a group practice may be the investigator on a study while others in the group are unaware of opportunities for their own patients.

Provide guidance to investigators on how to leverage other marketing and outreach activities in your organization as well as the community. These may include community lectures, traditional advertising, flyers, letters to colleagues in the community and listing trials on your Web site. Investigators should be made aware that some of these activities require IRB review as well as sponsors’ approval.

Being awarded a study is just the beginning of the process. Having a clearly defined process and roadmap for investigators for starting the study will improve relationships with the sponsors, making your site more likely to be included in future studies. ■
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The Biomedical Research Alliance of New York (BRANY) is a national AHRPP-accredited organization providing support services to sponsors and investigators involved in research in a wide variety of therapeutic areas, medical devices, biologic and diagnostic trials. Stifled by multi-disciplinary experts, BRANY is an expedited “end-to-end solution” for clinical trials. With a robust network of site affiliates across the United States in every clinical specialty, BRANY is able to offer its partners a turnkey solution for expedited site identification and study startup. BRANY was founded in 1998 by nationally ranked academic medical centers, which today includes: New York University School of Medicine, Montefiore Medical Center, Mount Sinai School of Medicine, and North Shore-Long Island Jewish Health System.
Making a Difference

Three Strategies for Encouraging and Supporting New Faculty

By Kimberly Page, Susan Carter, Kendra Mingo and Meredith Murr

Introduction

Last summer I had the pleasure of moderating a panel presentation at the National Council of University Research Administrators’ 2012 Pre-Award Research Administration Conference. The topic was “Encouraging New Faculty Members” and I was fortunate that three outstanding colleagues agreed to serve on the panel: Susan Carter, Director of Research Development Services at University of California, Merced; Kendra Mingo, Associate Director of the Office for Faculty Research and Resources at Willamette University; and Meredith Murr, Director of Research Development, University of California, Santa Barbara.

The presentation focused on answering the question “What can research administrators do to encourage new faculty to develop the skills, knowledge and support they need to compete effectively in the arena of externally-sponsored research and scholarship?” We identified three strategies that contributed to new faculty success: creating community; building skills, confidence and knowledge; and sustaining relationships. The panelists offered a number of concrete examples of activities that research administrators and development professionals could implement in the context of their own institutional cultures and environments to support these strategies, and participated in a lively discussion as to how to best implement some of these ideas at other institutions. What follows is a selection of these activities that could be scaled to fit your own institution’s needs and resources.

Effective Strategy I: Create Community

Research administrators can assist new faculty by creating opportunities for constructive interaction and community building.

Serve as a recruiting tool Produce a list of resources and services that your office provides to faculty to be included in job candidates’ information packets. The message is communicated that research is integral to the institution’s mission and resources are committed to support faculty success.

Celebrate Grantsmanship If a new faculty member receives sponsored funding, ask your president, vice president for research or the director of your sponsored programs or research development office to write a letter of commendation for the faculty member’s promotion and tenure file.

Host an annual university-wide event to celebrate all faculty who applied for extramural sponsored grants in the past year. This event creates opportunities for new faculty to meet potential colleagues outside of their departments and builds potential collaboration and support networks, while also acknowledging their hard work in writing proposals, funded or not. At a large or research intensive university a campus or system-wide event may not be practical or appropriate, but consider hosting an event geared to faculty in departments and disciplines with less extramural funding.

Reach out to new faculty individually or in small groups Community building is based on relationship building. A personal invitation to
coffee or even a quick exchange in the hallway can have an impact on new faculty. Create opportunities for new faculty to describe their research and offer a custom funding search if you have the resources to do so (or offer to show them how to conduct their own). A more formal agenda for a one-on-one meeting might include an introduction to sponsored research services and research development support and a list of early career funding opportunities.

Host an Office of Research “New Faculty Orientation”
Many new faculty orientation programs do not address the myriad specialty services offered by a research office. A separate orientation that provides an overview of research facilities, sponsored project office pre-and-post award roles and responsibilities, research compliance, technology transfer, and research development functions can serve to bring research-oriented faculty together. Invite seasoned faculty to share their lessons learned in the spirit of offering guidance to new faculty.

Meet with department chairs and deans Department chairs and deans may not be aware of the various resources that are available to new faculty, and therefore cannot encourage them to be used. Some newer faculty may worry that taking advantage of these resources will give the impression that they “can’t make it on their own,” and that it will be held against them when they are considered for promotion and/or tenure. However, if a department chair or dean specifically points out a resource and encourages a new faculty member to take advantage of it, those fears are allayed.

In addition, department chairs or deans are in a position to nominate faculty for early career awards. Since these awards are important to new faculty and are also subject to limited submission requirements, offer to discuss the limited submission process with the department chair and share a list of funding opportunities they can nominate their faculty to receive.

Partner with other offices It’s helpful to recognize that other offices at your institution may be investing much time and energy in faculty development activities. Leverage your time and resources and offer to collaborate on a workshop of mutual interest with other campus offices (promotion and tenure workshops in collaboration with your academic personnel office may be an appropriate option).

Effective Strategy II: Build Skills, Confidence and Knowledge
Many new faculty begin their academic career with little understanding of how to find funding opportunities that are appropriate to their research interests and stage of program development. Many have never written a competitive proposal to an external funder and do not understand that writing a grant proposal is not the same as writing a scholarly paper. They must build proposal writing skills and increase their knowledge of how funding agencies solicit applications and award funding. Confidence and success often follow these steps. Research administrators can play a significant role in helping faculty gain proficiency in grantsmanship.

Set up a special budget for faculty development support
Sometimes the difference between frustration and success for new faculty can be the lack of even minimal funds to participate in training opportunities to develop grant writing skills offered by organizations like Fulbright, NSF, NEH, AAAS, and the like. You can gain tremendous good will with a small award and realize a significant return on investment.

Offer Workshops/Institutes/Seminars/Retreats Consider offering workshops or seminars in topics of particular interest to new tenure track faculty; they are typically very motivated to gain knowledge and skills related
to grantsmanship. Whether you hire an outsider or offer informal brown bag sessions, your efforts will be appreciated and will make a difference. Topics can include proposal writing, strategic proposal development, how to engage in interdisciplinary research, budget development, an overview of funding agencies, and more. Workshops on specific early career opportunities (NSF CAREER, DOE Early Career, etc.) can be particularly useful, and can be structured to include a brief introduction by a research administrator followed by a panel of faculty that were past awardees.

**Connect faculty to granting agencies**

There is no substitute for a face-to-face meeting with a program officer; proper preparation is important but when a new faculty member is ready, encourage a visit. Start-up funds can often be used for a trip to Washington DC to visit with several program officers at a time, or a trip to a conference in the mid-Atlantic area can be extended to permit funding agency visits.

### Effective Strategy III: Sustain Relationships

New faculty will need to cultivate and sustain many kinds of relationships to be successful: relationships across disciplines as federal agencies increasingly expect interdisciplinary proposals, and relationships across campus as new faculty learn to work with business units that support research. Oftentimes research administrators and development professionals are the first line of communication between the new faculty member and other faculty as well as various business units within the institution such as purchasing, accounts payable and human resources.

**Encourage participation in mentoring programs**

One of the hallmarks of successful new faculty members is their ability to network and engage with other faculty, particularly senior faculty, and learn from them. Mentoring programs can play a pivotal role in faculty development. There are numerous mentoring models to choose from: one-on-one, group mentoring, expert consultation, and others (Felder & Brent, 2010). A place to start might be to identify those new faculty who have received internal grants and pair them with research-productive faculty who have agreed to serve as mentors.

**Promote cross-institutional collaborations**

Research administrators at smaller schools can serve as critical connectors to regional partners. For example, sponsored research officers at thirteen different PUs in the Pacific Northwest meet to share resources and facilitate collaborative activities between schools. While faculty collaborations across institutions can be vital to new faculty experiences, it is important to encourage faculty to develop partnerships that will help them build independent research careers as well as the capacity to collaborate.

### Encourage best practices in research collaborations

Offer a training session (led by experienced faculty) on how to build and sustain healthy working relationships. For example, ask senior faculty to offer straight-up advice in an annual session on the “do’s and don’ts of collaborations” that addresses subjects such as building trust, managing expectations, keeping commitments, and adjusting to various working styles.

A question and answer session with faculty who have developed successful interdisciplinary research programs can offer valuable lessons learned about the challenges and benefits of collaborating across disciplines.

### In conclusion

Research administrators and development professionals are in a unique position to help new faculty create community, build skills, confidence and knowledge and sustain relationships. If you try some of these activities at your institution please share your experiences!
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Happy New Year Region I colleagues! I hope you all had a memorable and enjoyable holiday season.

The New Year is a time of transition. For Region I this means new Officers and Committee members assume their responsibilities and other Officers and Committee members’ cycle off. I want to acknowledge three Region I Officers who ended their terms on December 31st. Bethanne Giehl (Immediate Past Chair), Carlo Eracleo (Treasurer) and Estelle Lang (Secretary) have all made substantial contributions to Region I the past few years. I want to offer my sincerest appreciation and thanks to Bethanne, Carlo and Estelle for being so generous with their time and their talents. I am especially grateful for the support they provided to me during my year as Chair.

I also want to thank our other Region I Officers for their enormous contributions this past year; Karen Woodward Massey (Chair-Elect) and Donna Smith (Treasurer-Elect). Karen and Donna excelled in their first year as Region I Officers. I’m confident that they will be outstanding in their roles as Chair and Treasurer and I look forward to working with them in the coming year.

My thanks also go to Kris Monahan, our Region I representative to the NCURA National Board of Directors and Ben Prince, the Region I representative to the National N&LDC. Although Kris is very involved in national issues she still finds the time to play a significant role within our Region. And Ben’s effort on N&LDC helped to nominate a Region I candidate, Vivian Holmes, for the NCURA President-Elect position. We are very excited that Vivian was elected and that she will assume her leadership role in our National organization in 2013.

I want to thank our Region I Committee Chairs for their commitment to NCURA and their substantial contributions this past year. Roseanne Lutong and Barbara Richard were Chairs of the Curriculum Committee, Michelle Auerbach was Chair of the Volunteer and Membership Committee, John Harris was Chair of the Awards Committee, Susan Zipkin was Chair of the Nominations Committee, and Nuala McGowan served as Chair of the Sponsorship Committee. It has been my great pleasure to work with such outstanding colleagues.

Finally, I want to offer my sincere appreciation and gratitude to the members of the Region I Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee includes our Officers and Committee Chairs (cited above) and the following individuals: Franc Lemire, Gary Smith, Elizabeth Lennox. It has been great to work with you, thank you for your support.

Please plan on attending the Region I Spring Conference to be held in New Castle, NH at the elegant and historic Wentworth by the Sea Hotel. An expanded selection of Workshops will be offered on Monday April 29th followed by more than 40 informative and dynamic concurrent sessions, discussion groups, and panels to be held Tuesday, April 30th -through Thursday, May 2nd. Expect plenty of networking opportunities and some fun surprises! If you are interested in learning more about the Conference or about volunteering opportunities, please contact the Program Committee Co-Chairs, Stacy Riseman and Jeff Seo, at either sriseman@risd.edu or jeff_seo@hms.harvard.edu.

Pat Fitzgerald is the Chair of Region I and serves as the Associate Dean for Research Administration for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS), Harvard University.

Happy New Year!

As I reflect on 2012, I can certainly say it has been a successful, interesting, hi-octane kind of year. Part of our region was hit with the unfortunate wrath of Sandy, which many of us are still coping with. I want to wish everyone well and a speedy recovery from the damages that had occurred. It has been a tragic end of the year in which I hope will bring us all into a better place during the New Year.

Region II has been busy at work all year on new initiatives. We kicked off a very successful year in improving professional development. In its pilot year we have had two one-day traveling workshops to great success in Baltimore and West Virginia, as well as secured three host sites for 2013. The feedback has been phenomenal and we look to have an even more outstanding upcoming year. In addition, we have updated our Administrative Policy and reorganized some of our officer roles as well as created and reorganized our standing committees. I want to thank all our volunteers who were involved in assisting and our Steering Committee for all the work implementing these new initiatives.

Our Regional meeting will be held in Buffalo, NY April 21-24, 2013 and is titled; Maintaining Balance: Service and Regulations in Research Administration.

Here are just a few of the incredible speakers and workshops that will be held:

Keynote and Plenary Speakers: Jacque L. Waggoner, Chief Executive Officer, Hunter’s Hope Foundation and Martin Wachadlo, Architectural Historian and Preservationist

Workshops: Pre-Award Basics, Reviewing, Negotiating, and Accepting Federal Contracts, Maintaining Balance and Composure in Departmental Research Administration, Export Control Basics

Sessions will be held Monday through Wednesday organized by track. In addition, we will be holding a GRA review session (as we did last year) on Saturday April 20th.
In closing, I would like to say what an honor it has been in serving as Chair of this fantastic region. It has been a wonderful experience. I felt that I have grown professionally as well as built upon the wonderful friendships that were made possible through my association with NCURA. I would recommend that anyone interested in volunteering should absolutely do so, no matter how much time or effort you care to contribute. You will not regret it. Cheers to a wonderful year in passing and wishing you all the best in this brighter one approaching.

See you soon.

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

REGION III Southeast
www.ncuraregioniii.com
https://www.facebook.com/groups/19298587430137

AM5i was another successful gathering of research administrators. The sessions, networking, and entertainment were spectacular as always. If you missed this annual meeting, please make plans to attend in August 2013. A special thanks to all the Region III volunteers who helped make the meeting a success.

The Region III meeting is just around the corner and plans are underway. If you are interested in helping, we will need room monitors, mentors, registration desk help and folks that are tech savvy to help with AV set-up. An email blast will be sent to the Region III members calling for volunteer opportunities, such as with the registration desk, dinner groups, hospitality suite, session evaluations, and greeter-newcomer reception. If you have an interest in volunteering please contact Robyn Remotigue @ robyn@spa.msstate.edu.

The meeting will be returning to the Peabody Hotel, April 28th to May 1st, in Memphis, Tennessee. Check out the Region III website – www.ncuraregioniii.org – to get more information on the meeting location. Information about the program, registration and special events will be added soon and an email will go out to all Region III members. 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.

Please join us in congratulating and thanking our newest Region III officer, Laurianne Torres of Duke University, Chair-Elect, and the new NCURA Board member representing our region, Tony Ventimiglia of Auburn University. Happy New Year to all and see you soon in Memphis!

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

REGION IV Mid-America
www.ncuraregioniv.com
https://www.facebook.com/pages/Ncura-Region-IV/134667746805561

Happy New Year! They certainly seem to fly by any more, don’t they? With the new year comes new initiatives in Region IV, and I encourage your participation. As noted in this space in the last issue, Region IV has recently launched a Mentor Program, and you are cordially invited to be involved as either a mentor or a mentee. You can further assist the program by recommending it to others in your office who would benefit—either from being mentored or from being a mentor. For more information about the program, visit our website at www.ncuraregioniv.com/news.html

The other big development is related to the Mentor Program, as it will be administered by a new committee, the Region IV Professional Development Committee. In addition to the Mentor Program, the Region IV PDC will be responsible for reviewing the content of our regional meetings and ensuring that the quality of information and education remains high. It will also study learning formats to determine if there are more effective ways to deliver content, and how that might be accomplished in our region. If you have an interest in adult learning and pedagogy, this is the committee for you!

Thanks to Jennifer Duncan at the University of Missouri for agreeing to become the first chair of the Region IV PDC! If you want to be a member of the committee, please contact Jennifer at duncanjenn@missouri.edu. If you’d like to sign-up for the Mentor Program, you can obtain the application from our website and send it to trumanante@missouri.edu.

The Program Committee is hard at work, organizing a fabulous Region IV Spring Meeting for April 14-17, 2013 in Milwaukee. Researcher Fest will have food, music, and fun to complement a full program of workshops, concurrent sessions, discussion groups, and case studies. You, too, can get involved in the festivities! Announcements will be coming soon with details about how you can sign up online for specific slots and volunteer opportunities, such as with the registration desk, dinner groups, hospitality suite, session evaluations, and greeter-newcomer reception. Contact program chair Jeremy Miner at minerj@uwec.edu to explore ways you can contribute your time and talents to the region.

Finally, I want to extend the Region’s congratulations to Kirsten Yehl of Northwestern University for being selected to participate in the NCURA Executive Leadership Program for 2013. It’s a well-deserved accolade, and it marks the beginning of a year of a continued professional growth and development. Congratulations, Kirsten!

Jeffrey Ritchie, CRA, serves as Region IV Chair and is Director of Sponsored Programs at Lewis University.
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It was great to see 167 Region V members at the national meeting. Of those 52 were new members. Thanks to our creative, talented and fabulously costumed team of Rock N Roll stars, Region V took home the trophy for the regional competition at the Tuesday night party, Music through the Decades. See the photo in the NCURA magazine.

Congratulations to the winners of the Joan Howeth National Travel Awards:

Lori Beaty, Tarleton State University and
Daniel Marangoni, Rogers State University

Congratulations also to Jeremy Forsberg, University of Texas Arlington, who has been accepted into the 2013 NCURA Executive Leadership Program.

January 1 was the turn-over date for our treasurer and two ad hoc members of the Regional Executive Committee. Reggie Crim, University of Texas Austin, stepped down as treasurer after getting us through two regional spring meetings, including a joint meeting. The terms of Katherine Kissmann, Texas A&M University System, and Thomas Spencer, University of Texas Southwestern, as elected ad hoc members of the Regional Executive Committee ended, but both continue to fill significant roles in the region, Katherine as volunteer coordinator and Thomas as chair of the Publications Committee. We welcome Brenda Garner, University of Texas Medical Branch Galveston, in-coming treasurer, and Shelly Berry, Texas A&M University System, and Susie Sedwick, University of Texas Austin, new members of the Regional Executive Committee.

Our nominating committee is at work seeking applications and nominations for 2014. We will elect a secretary, a vice-chair, two ad hoc members of the Regional Executive Committee and a Region V member of the National Board of Directors. Scott Erwin, Texas State University, chairs the nominating committee.

The Region V Executive Committee has recommended changes to the terms for both the vice-chair/chair and treasurer. The changes are intended to give individuals in these positions a year to gain experience with the position before taking on the full responsibility. The vice-chair/chair position currently requires a three-year commitment with one year as vice-chair, one year as chair and one year as immediate past chair. With the change the commitment would continue to be for three years but the terms would be one year as vice-chair elect, one year as vice-chair and one year as chair. Treasurer is currently a two-year position. The change would be to make it a three-year commitment with the first year as treasurer-elect. These changes will require revisions to the by-laws. A committee to consider this recommendation further will be appointed shortly. If presented for a vote and approved by the Region V membership, these changes would not go into effect until 2014.

If you have not already done so, mark your calendar to attend the Region V Spring Meeting in Oklahoma City, April 21-24, 2013. Working with the apt theme—Research Administration: The Energy Behind Research—Scott Davis and the organizing committee have put together an excellent program. The meeting will be held at the Oklahoma City Sheraton, located across from the Chesapeake Arena and two walking blocks from the Bricktown Entertainment District. The hotel rate is a low $81 per night and the registration cost is $350, same as 2011. See the Region V website for a link for hotel registration and other information.

Kathleen Harris, Ed.D., serves as Region V Chair and is Senior Associate Vice President For Research at Texas Tech University.
and a fantastic location convenient to the airport, restaurants and a variety of activities, including group night out with the Arizona Diamondbacks! Reconnect with your NCURA colleagues while making new connections by attending a quality and informative program themed “Success Through Synergy: Partners, Purpose and Passion.” More details to come so watch your emails and check the Regional Meeting website at http://www.ogrd.wsu.edu/r6ncura/meetings.aspx.

The success of each Region relies on the team efforts of the current officers and the incoming elected officers. We would like to thank the 2012 officers for a great year! From Region VI, officers Rosemary Madnick, Gale Yamada, and Wanda Bowen, as well as outgoing Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) members Jeri Muniz, Georgette Sakumoto, and Derick Jones. From Region VII, officers Tim Edwards, Vicki Krell, Lisa Jordan, Kay Ellis, Candyce Lindsay and Ralph Brown.

For 2013, we would like to welcome new Region VI officers Secretary Sinnamon Tierney of Portland State University and Treasurer Tim Mil tendr of Washington State University. Our new leadership-elects for Region VI are: Samantha Wescott, Children’s Hospital LA, Chair-elect; Sharon Elenbaas, Loyola Marymount University, Treasurer-elect; Derick Jones, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Secretary-elect; Csilla Csaplar, Stanford, member of RAC; and Bruce Morgan, UC Irvine, regionally elected member of the National Board.

Finally for 2013, Region VII would like to welcome its new officers Member-At-Large Marjorie Townsend, Arizona State University; Chair-Elect Karen Henry, Boise State University; Secretary/Treasurer Lisa Jordan, Boise State University; and Vicki Krell, Arizona State University, regionally elected member of the National Board.

We look forward to working with all the officers, leadership, and members of our regions to bring you an amazing 2013 full of learning opportunities, networking, and volunteerism to further your profession as a research administrator. Contact us anytime with questions or comments! We can be reached at katherine.ho@stanford.edu or at tony.onofrietti@hsc.utah.edu.

Katherine Ho is Chair of Region VI and serves as the Deputy to the Associate Vice President and Executive Director, Office of Sponsored Research.

Tony Onofrietti is Chair of Region VII and serves as the Director of Research Education at the University of Utah.

INTERNATIONAL REGION

Horizon 2020 – Why bother

Why should you as research administrators, your institution and/or your researchers bother about Horizon 2020 (the main funding instrument of the European Union between 2014-2020) and keep your eyes and ears open?

Horizon 2020 will address the actual problems and challenges like economic crisis, employment, climate warming, infectious diseases, aging, energy. Challenges that are not only important for Europe but also for the rest of the world. International cooperation is necessary to address effectively many specific objectives defined in Horizon 2020.

Research and innovation are increasingly international endeavours, with scientists cooperating with peers from other countries.

International cooperation is also essential for frontier and basic research in order to capture the benefits from emerging science and technology opportunities.

Researchers from all over the world will be able to participate in Horizon 2020. In some cases they will get the funding directly from Europe in other cases they will have to provide their own funding.

Two interesting bottom-up funding schemes for talented mobile researchers are the European Research Council and the Marie Skłodowska-Curie actions. These two programmes will allow the brightest and most creative minds to extend the frontiers of knowledge by strengthening high risk bottom-up activities. ERC supports the most talented and creative individuals and their teams to carry out frontier research of the outstanding quality. Researchers from outside Europe can apply for these grants, once their project is funded, they will have to move to a European institution or at least spend 50% of their research time at an European Institution. The MSCA actions provide researchers with excellent training and career development opportunities on an entirely individual level. Mostly PostDocs from all over the world will have the opportunity to apply for these grants.

More to follow in this section – stay tuned!

Agatha Keller is the Chairperson of the International Region and serves as Co-Head EU GrantsAccess at ETH Zurich/University Zurich.
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NATIONAL CONFERENCES
2013 FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION (FRA) CONFERENCE
New Orleans, LA..........................March 10-12, 2013
2013 PRE-AWARD RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION (PRA) CONFERENCE
55TH ANNUAL MEETING
Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, DC .........August 4-7, 2013

NATIONAL TRAVELING WORKSHOPS
DEPARTMENTAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP
Savannah, GA.............................March 18-20, 2013
LEVEL I: FUNDAMENTALS OF SPONSORED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP
Savannah, GA.............................March 18-20, 2013
LEVEL II: SPONSORED PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP – CRITICAL ISSUES IN RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION
Savannah, GA.............................March 18-20, 2013

ONLINE TUTORIALS
A Primer on Clinical Trials – 8 week program
A Primer on Federal Contracting – 8 week program
A Primer on Subawards – 8 week program

REGIONAL SPRING MEETINGS
Region I (New England), New Castle, NH ..................April 29-May 2, 2013
Region II (Mid-Atlantic), Buffalo, NY ......................April 21-24, 2013
Region III (Southeastern), Memphis, TN ..................April 28-May 1, 2013
Region IV (Mid-America), Milwaukee, WI ...............April 14-17, 2013
Region V (Southwestern), Oklahoma City, OK .........April 21-24, 2013
Region VI / VII (Western/Rocky Mountain), Phoenix, AZ ...April 7-10, 2013

DEADLINES FOR MARCH/APRIL 2013
Submission of Articles to Contributing Editors ..........February 4, 2013
Submission of Articles to Co-editors ......................February 11, 2013
Submission of Advertisements ............................February 11, 2013

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