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ON THE COVER  What a great theme for a Magazine – The Art of Research Administration. A theme like this really invigorated the Magazine Team because our minds immediately went to the different kinds of “art” we can include…and the stories that can go along with them (or maybe I have that reversed!). As you can see from the front cover, we really incorporated the theme. What we envisioned here was an artist painting all of us! People supporting research…together. Researchers and research administrators are all part of this lovely piece of art that shows the ‘together’ part of our endeavors.

NCURA President Vivian Holmes starts us off by sharing the similarities of “Tomato - Tomato” and teaching us about “green vs. gold” in E.U. language. As she contemplates the differences between what we say and what they say (or are we the they and they the we?) – most importantly she is connected with our friends in the E.U. to help the collective of research administrators supporting research. Now back to research, for a moment, as a reminder for us there are more than just the STEM disciplines, so it’s very nice for our contributing editors to provide stories from the National Endowment for the Arts and then National Endowment for the Humanities – such great opportunities for our investigators to make impact and ensure art is maintained.

I’ve had the most fun with our article titles for this issue! David Smelser and Lineia Minnema’s “Play the Right Music” is the perfect “song” to help our PIs. Derek Brown sharing about the “Art of Reporting”, a passion and plea to ensure we are reporting data properly. “What Geese Taught Me” from Sue Kelch about conference planning, honk, honk. We also have several global articles regarding international collaboration, international contracting, EARM’s “European Certificate Programme”, research administration in Japan, and Martin Kirk telling us about all the important elements in creating a masterpiece.

Let’s not forget our continued Uniform Guidance series – The Final Guidance Series. Susan Sedwick tells us what the “implications are for Researchers” while Erin Fay and Carla Helm tell us about “Procurement and Property Standards.” And a separate and added bonus – we have Bruce Morgan commenting on the recent National Science Board report on faculty administrative burden while Jim Luther tells us about the impending storm related to financial and programmatic closeout.

Phew, another full issue, a true masterpiece. With this column, I have included some of my favorite art from water color specialist Andy Sewell. The Yellow Hibiscus, an original, was a wedding gift many years ago, the crimson delphinium says “Go Cougs!” all over it, the little white church reminds us of home, and the river grizzly is from Andy’s son, Josh, who is quite a budding artist. Art really does affect all of us in some form! Just like our profession of research administration… it really DOES something for us. Please enjoy this unique issue.

Dan Nordquist, Senior Editor
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Many years ago while traveling in Europe as an undergraduate, I attended a party with students from all over Europe. Chatting away in a large group, we each introduced ourselves including our major. On my turn, I stated that I was majoring in English. From beside me, a loud male voice exclaimed in disbelief, “English??!! But you SLAUGHTER the language!!”

I had occasion to recall this incident in February at the INORMS (International Network of Research Management Societies) meeting in Washington, DC, when David Lauder, EU Project Manager from the University of York and John Donovan from the Dublin Institute of Technology and President of EARMA (European Association of Research Managers and Administrators) and I met over lunch to work on our project. Several months prior, David had identified discrepancies between the European Commission Funding language within Horizon 2020 and the US Funding language as a challenge worth pursuing.

While we realized that it would be a daunting task to delineate all of these discrepancies, we also recognized that the endeavor would not be without a certain entertainment value. We immediately nicknamed our project, “TomAto - TomAHto” although officially it is the “Transatlantic Funding Dictionary.”

Our institutions are increasingly engaged in international research collaborations which provide opportunities to access further talent, resources, populations and environmental conditions to help speed scientific discovery. Global health research provides humanitarian benefits as well as economic activity and advances in worldwide health. It is our professional responsibility to identify ways in which we as administrators can best facilitate this progress. Of course, this begins with communication.

Within the vernacular of research administration the differences go beyond vocabulary. There is local color, international legalese, and, like expressions that exist within families, often an institutional argot. Although our most common acronyms are carefully decoded in our funding glossaries, our use of terms such as “internal controls” and “key personnel” and “just in time” are not entirely intuitive. Similarly, the Horizon 2020 use of words such as “beneficiaries” and “green and gold” can be equally confusing to the administrator accustomed to US NIH language. Webster’s Dictionary is certainly no help here; this is our professional jargon, our lingua franca.

For instance, consider the commonly used “Just in Time.” Those of us familiar with the National Institutes of Health applications and grant awards know in a second that this names a frequent task in which we provide supplemental and current information and documentation to the sponsoring agency prior to an award. Out of the context of research administration, this commonly used phrase is defined variously as: a production strategy that strives to improve a business’ return on investment by reducing in-process inventory and associated carrying costs (Wikipedia); an inventory strategy companies employ to increase efficiency (Investopedia); a philosophy of complete elimination of waste, making only what is needed, when it is needed, and in the amount needed (Toyota).

Later this month, David, John and I are presenting our project at the 2014 EARMA Annual Meeting, a He Said-She Said with H2020 and NIH lingo. With the help of a video entitled “Meet the Professor,” we will use light comedy and animation to journey through the proposal and award processes. As moderator, David will celebrate the confusion, but in the end, we will produce the pilot tool as a first step. We will follow up by hosting a Discussion Group at NCURA’s 56th Annual Meeting.

It is our intention to be inclusive rather than exclusive, to expand our vocabulary rather than limit it. That afternoon in Washington, DC, John Donovan taught me the meaning of “green and gold,” the European Commission’s distinction between two types of Open Access publication policies. Apprehending the beautiful imagery of this terminology, I immediately felt more literate, more competent, and more excited about all continuing international collaborations. It is my hope that this Transatlantic Funding Dictionary will provide you with a similar experience.

Vivian Holmes is NCURA President and serves as the Director, Sponsored Research Operations at the Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard. She can be reached at vholmes@broadinstitute.org
Ask any undergrad walking around campus, with their ear buds connected to their iPhone, “What is the definition of good music?” and your answer will be a discussion of more genres than you even knew existed. You might here: Alternative, Blues, Classical, Country, Jazz, Rock, Emo, Hip-Hop, and so on. None of the genres are any more the correct answer than the next. They all have merit and they all have their purpose. Regardless of your personal favorites, most would agree that the right song at the right time can be just what you need. Maybe you scroll down your iPhone’s song list to Bobby McFerrin’s Don’t Worry, Be Happy during a break on a stressful day, hoping it will lift your spirits. However, just as that right song can be what you need, the wrong song can have the opposite effect. Accidentally pressing play on Paul McCartney’s Scrambled Eggs during the White House’s annual Easter Egg Roll probably isn’t a good idea. As research administrators, we can think of our individual skill sets as the “music we play” and we need to learn to play a wide variety of music to be successful.

Like any good musician, we have to know our audience and have the ability to play the right song at the right time. For research administrators, the audience is the faculty we serve, our principal investigators. As much as we like to lump them together into groups, they are individuals just like us. They each have their own unique work styles, strengths and weaknesses, and idea of how they would like the process to move forward. In essence, they all have their own personal playlist of favorite tunes and want to hear them in the order they set. As research administrators, we need to understand that the songs we use to assist one PI might not resonate with the next. To achieve the results that best suit everyone, we cannot simply prepare a playlist that works for us, just as conforming exactly to a faculty member’s set list isn’t the right approach either. Instead, we must act as a DJ with a vast repertoire of songs, because we never know who is going to show up at the party. Sometimes, following up Bobby Bare’s Praise The Lord & Send Me The Money with Notorious B.I.G.’s Mo Money, Mo Problems is the right thing to do. We have to learn to play the right songs for the right audience.

For example, some PIs always seem to be at their wits end when writing proposals. Their approach is scattered, unorganized, and even small problems have a tendency to send them off track. It’s like they are listening to Led Zeppelin’s Dazed and Confused on loop. These PIs might have the best of intentions in the beginning, but get so caught up in the requirements, regulations, and red tape that they just don’t know what to do next. When working with this type of PI, perhaps it’s best to play something a little more soothing, like Bob Marley’s Everything’s Gonna Be Alright and use your skills to help them settle down and reassure them that together, we will crescendo to a brilliant finish.

On the other hand, some PIs can be too laid back. They never seem to be in a hurry to do what needs to be done, like Jimmy Buffet’s Boats, Beaches, Bars, and Ballads is the only album they own. Their overly calm demeanor might result in not starting proposals until it is too late or letting reports become overdue because they aren’t as in tune to these requirements as they should be. In this situation, playing some soothing reggae isn’t going to produce the necessary results. These PIs need you to exercise a different skill set, such as playing Motley Crue’s Keep Your Eye on the Money to help them focus on the task at hand.

In the world of research administration, however, singing only the karaoke-classics will not bring you the success we all strive for. It is very easy to build your own personal playlist that you’re comfortable with and that uses your natural skill set. But, because we don’t get to choose which audience we play for and our PIs don’t get to choose which concerts they attend, we as the DJs need to be ready for any request from the crowd. Research administrators exist to assist all the PIs at our institutions and each of those PIs need to receive that assistance in a way that works for them. Whether it’s The Beatles or Stevie Wonder’s rendition, we have to sing We Can Work it Out in whatever way the job gets done.

In this spirit, new (and maybe even some not-so-new) research administrators must ask themselves, “How do I get better at playing the right music?” In the same way that Jimmy Page didn’t have Stairway to Heaven in perfect form the moment he picked up a guitar, it takes time and practice to build up your research administration skill set. Also, it takes having the courage to make some mistakes along the way, like the little child sitting on the piano bench at their very first recital. No one in the audience expects Mozart from the 6-year-old, but they know that eventually the little one will come and design the song. It might be a little bumpy, but we will get done. Anyone who has been in this profession for more than a few days will have a story about a time when a proposal was barely completed in time for the deadline or when their interactions with a PI were less than harmonious. We all have Britten Spears’ Oops!...I Did it Again in our song list, even if we don’t want to admit that out loud.
The moral of the story is research administrators must learn something from each experience and play a different song the next time. We must commit to practice and patience to learn new songs and discover different genres. So, how do we do that?

It’s important to keep in mind that even Mozart had a teacher. He was inherently more talented than most, but he had someone to guide his practice and instruct him when he needed assistance. Having a more seasoned research administration mentor is great for those times when Help! by The Beatles is the only song you know and you need another mind to go over a problem

For research administrators, like musicians, it is important to have a long list of “songs to play” for diverse audiences. It is equally important to keep that list growing so that we can handle the new situations that come our way. Grow your list and watch your career climb the charts. 

2014 NCURA Election Results

Robert Andresen, Director of Research Financial Services, Associate Director, Research and Sponsored Programs, University of Wisconsin - Madison, has been elected Vice President/President-Elect of NCURA. Throughout his 25 years of NCURA membership, Bob has been extremely active in NCURA. He is currently serving as NCURA’s Treasurer and the Chair of the Financial Management Committee and is on NCURA’s Education Scholarship Fund’s Task Force. Bob has been on the Global Traveling Workshop Faculty since 2012 and has been a Peer Reviewer since 2007. He has served as a Faculty member for both the Financial Research Administration and Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration Workshops. He has been on many program committees, both at the national and regional level, and has presented at countless regional meetings, Annual Meetings, FRA and PRA conferences. Upon his election as NCURA Vice President/President-Elect, Bob says, “Being elected as Vice President/President Elect is very exciting and I am extremely honored by and grateful to my colleagues and friends for this opportunity. Thank you! Now more than ever, many of us rely on NCURA’s professional development programs and outreach as we deal with new Federal guidance and a challenging funding environment. I look forward to working with everyone as we continue to learn from each other and to grow our profession.”

Glenda Bullock, Manager of Business Operations, Washington University in St. Louis, has been elected to the position of At-Large Board Member. Since joining NCURA in 1993, Glenda has been involved at both the regional and national levels. Glenda is currently on the Departmental Research Administration Workshop Faculty. She has both presented and been on the workshop faculty for NCURA’s FRA and PRA conferences, Annual Meeting, and Region IV’s meetings.

Glenda was on the national Nominating and Leadership Development Committee and has also served on several regional committees. Glenda received both Region IV’s Distinguished Service Award and Kevin Reed Award. On being elected to this position, Glenda expresses, “I am beyond excited to be selected to serve on NCURA’s Board of Directors. It is humbling to know the membership would place their faith in me. I am proud to be a part of an organization that offers so much to its membership. I do not take this responsibility lightly, and will do everything possible to foster the continued growth of training and personal development of the membership.”

Toni Shaklee, Assistant Vice President for Research, Oklahoma State University, has been elected to the position of At-Large Board Member. In Toni’s nearly 25 years of NCURA membership, she has made many contributions to NCURA. Toni is currently a Co-Editor for NCURA Magazine, a member of the Peer Review team, a member of NCURA’s Education Scholarship Fund Task Force, and a member of the Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration Traveling Workshop Faculty. She has been on Annual Meeting Program Committees and served as a Co-Chair for the 2013 PRA conference. Toni was also a member of NCURA’s Professional Development Committee from 2010-2013. Upon being elected, Toni shares, “I’ve always appreciated that NCURA provides me with several ways to be part of a community of professionals around the nation (and now the world) engaged in research administration. I am delighted to have this new opportunity to serve as an at-large member of the Board of Directors for this vibrant organization.”

Both Bullock and Shaklee will begin serving January 1, 2015 for a two-year term. Andresen will take office January 1, 2015 for one year after which he will succeed to a one-year term as President of NCURA.
Most of us know the feeling: Your boss or a colleague comes to your desk fifteen minutes before the end-of-day whistle blows and says, “I need this data, and I need it today!” Panic immediately ensues as questions run rampant through your head. “Do we even collect that information?!” “Is that what they really want – do they even know what they want?” “Do they need the information organized by fiscal year or calendar year?” “Are they asking for proposal, award or expenditure data?” And of course there is the instant thought – “Fifteen minutes before I was out the door and they want this today. That figures!” Depending on the level of detail needed, that fifteen minutes could easily extend to several hours of data crunching. But these considerations are the least of your worries as there is another, even more critical, concern: Is our data even correct?!?

To report data correctly, you must have a system in place to easily (we all hope) query and interpret the figures. As any artist knows, it is crucial to have all of your tools-of-the-trade organized and easily accessible, and reporting data is no different. There are excellent manufactured options of course, including rSmart’s Grant and Research Management Suite and Evisions’ Cayuse SP, which offer professionally-designed management systems that are improving all the time. However we are fortunate here, at Washington State University (WSU), to have created a homegrown proposal and award database that exceeds any of the products I have encountered. At WSU we are able to report on a myriad of subjects, including the common PI, unit and sponsor reports most systems can compute. What I believe sets our database apart from most others is its customization capabilities and our IT staff who have the advanced knowledge and freedom to get almost any requested update in place swiftly. Our system pulls data in from several sources to ensure accuracy, including our central WSU Data Warehouse, Payroll, and HRS systems. These connections have enabled us to introduce several exciting reporting tools, including our recent additions of reporting projects by gender, age, faculty rank, graphical trends, proposal success rates and other metrics. For example, being able to quickly provide a success rate figure on NIH R01 or NSF Division of Physics proposals, further broken down by whether a proposal was a “rush” in to our office or not, is a great feeling.

But all of this means nothing if the data isn’t accurate. “Garbage in, garbage out” can be heard regularly from my cubicle during data cleanup time. In addition to recurring weekly cleanup...
tasks, we also have lengthy lists of checks and verifications that are performed every three and six months to keep our data correct. While multiple pages of cleanup every 90 days may seem rather burdensome, the feeling of quickly being able to identify specific DOE or USDA program data when asked, far outweighs any of those cleanup pains.

Accuracy in reporting is critical, which brings me to a significant point… or perhaps “pet peeve of mine” is a better way to phrase it. The National Institutes of Health is NOT an agency. The NIH is a subagency under Health & Human Services. I regularly see reports detailing funding by the USDA, DOE, NSF and NIH; I wonder how NIH constantly gets included. Proper reporting structure would be agency > subagency > program; such as HHS > NIH > National Cancer Institute (NCI), for example. All of this is information we track in our database at WSU. Your boss might want to track flow-through projects also, so don’t forget about your awarding agencies (and if you are looking for NIH flow-through projects, you better have awarding subagency data, because HHS would be the actual awarding agency!). I commonly see this same agency/subagency mistake with many sponsors and keeping all of this straight is enough to make one’s head spin. Popular subagencies that I have seen incorrectly reported as an agency include the ONR (part of DOD), USGS (part of DOJ), Forest Service (part of USDA), DARPA (part of DOD) and NJI (which is not even a subagency, it is actually a program under DOJ’s Office of Justice Programs!). I doubt that HRSA, CDC, the FDA and the other HHS subagencies appreciate when the NIH is regularly portrayed as an agency.

In addition to agency structure, there are certainly other data considerations to consider. If you are asked for a report detailing an investigator’s funding from NASA, they could be asking for a few different things. Are you being asked for award allocations, which I would consider common? If the query is coming directly from a PI, they will likely want to know the figures based on projected estimated totals (“I got a $5 million dollar grant last year, why are you only reporting the first year’s allocation of $1 million?”), or perhaps they might even be looking for their specific percentage of funding based on project credit. We have several chairs and deans that use project credit as a reporting metric for their faculty’s annual reviews. Be sure to ask about flow-through projects also, because including those will undoubtedly change the data!

Other common reporting pitfalls I have seen include:

- Incorrectly double counting proposal amount totals on non-competitive continuation proposals (you have likely already counted those dollars in the original proposal submission).
- Including pre-proposal data when it should not be included. (a $20 million dollar pre-proposal that results in a $20 million dollar full proposal should not be counted as $40 million on the proposal reports. We HAVE built this into our system as an option, in case we get asked for that data, but prefer to state actual full proposal amounts).
- Forgetting about CO-I roles. When asked to provide data on a specific investigator, be sure to get clarification if projects where they are a CO-I should be included. We have many faculty who, due to their niche here at the University, get listed commonly as CO-Is instead of lead PIs on various projects. Our statisticians commonly get listed as CO-Is on other peoples’ projects, for example. To really capture a specific individual’s data, it may be best to include CO-I as well as PI projects in your report.
- Having no connections between master agreements and projects that follow under them. Being able to tie reporting back to a master agreement can be very important. Be sure you can do this via an internal reference number or other tracking mechanism. This same applies to internal competitions as well. Be sure you have a way to tie data back to the home or top account if queried.

Why is reporting important? Besides being able to quickly and confidently reply to your boss or colleague, having accessible and correct data is crucial when providing yearly or ad hoc information to external organizations. Reporting to the National Science Foundation’s Higher Education Research and Development Survey (HERD) or the joint NIH/NSF/White House Office of Science and Technology Policy STAR METRICS project is a big deal, and having an organized method to produce accurate data is vital. Reporting data correctly can be a difficult and tedious process. Having the tools in place to help you succeed is paramount. The examples listed above are only a few to keep in mind when thinking of reporting and overall data structure. Hopefully this article, combined with your personal experiences working within your own systems, can provide a starting point for discussing reporting and what tools may be necessary to do so accurately and quickly for your organization. Reporting truly can be an art, even if it never makes its way to the walls of the Smithsonian! 🕰️

Derek Brown is currently the Sub-Award and Reporting Administrator for Washington State University’s Office of Grant and Research Development. He began as an Office Assistant, advanced to Grant and Contract Specialist where he helped implement WSU’s electronic proposal routing and approval process and now serves as a Sub-Award and Reporting Administrator. Derek has been at WSU since 2005. He can be reached at derekbrown@wsu.edu.
Focus: Property and Procurement Standards

By Erin Fay and Carla Helm

With the current focus on effective stewardship of public monies, the federal government’s effort to streamline guidance on administrative requirements, cost principles and audit requirements for federal awards in the form of the new Uniform Guidance will result in some improvements that benefit academic research. However, the new property and procurement requirements in the Guidance may place unintentional, additional burdens on researchers and administrators. It will be important to work collaboratively with COFAR to clarify these areas of concern and to bring the Property and Procurement professionals on your campus into the conversation promptly.

A guiding principle of the new Uniform Guidance is the focus on performance in addition to accountability. In support of this principle, the Property and Procurement Standards sections of the Guidance recommend, or in some cases, require the use of recognized best practices. The new Guidance has been derived largely from OMB Circular A-110 or Circular A-102. The discussion below focuses on those areas of the Guidance which are requirements. Requirements are indicated in the Guidance by the use of the term “must”, whereas the term “should” is used when the guidance is recommended, but not required.

Although the Guidance is based on established best practices, and much of it is carried forward from the former Circular A-110, some concerns exist. The rules in Circular A-110 were less prescriptive, therefore the new rules may require additional effort on the part of the entity if existing processes don’t match the new requirements, and some may require system changes in addition to procedural changes.

Several highlights of the new Guidance, either new or changed from the previous rules in A-110, are discussed below:

Property Standards

Real Property (200.311)

This section explicitly states that title will vest upon acquisition in the non-Federal entity ((a) Title)) and that property only be used for its original purpose unless permission is provided ((b) Use). Language was also added allowing net proceeds from disposition to be used as an offset to the cost of the replacement property ( (c)(1)), if the original property is acquired with the same award as the replacement property.

Federally-Owned and Exempt Property (200.312)

This section had one significant wording change (c) and now states that “Absent statutory authority and specific terms and conditions of the Federal award, title to exempt federally-owned property acquired under the Federal award remains with the Federal government.” Previously, A-110 stated that “Should a Federal awarding agency not establish conditions title to the exempt property upon acquisition shall vest in the recipient without further obligation to the Federal Government.”

Equipment (200.313)

This section, arguably, had the most change of the Property Standards. The following new or subtle changes in terminology between the old A-110, section .34 and the new Uniform Guidance have caught the attention of the university community, Council on Governmental Relations (COGR) and Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP). We hope for additional clarification regarding these items via a COFAR clarification or FAQ:

The term “conditional title” has been added to section (a) Title. It now states “Subject to the obligations and conditions set forth in this section, title to equipment acquired under a Federal award will vest upon acquisition in the non-Federal entity. Unless a statute specifically authorized the Federal agency to vest title in the non-Federal entity without further obligation to the Federal government, and the Federal agency elects to do so, the title must be a conditional title.” It is unclear at this point if this is a new term that has new meaning or if it is a term that has always been effective, just not explicitly used in A-110.
Section (d) Management requirements added that property records include the Federal Award Identification Number (FAIN). Uniform Guidance now states “Property records must…include… the source of funding for the property (including the Federal Award Identification Number - FAIN)”. This wording change has the potential to require institutions make changes to their inventory systems to capture this data.

Section (d) also had had a minor wording change that also in unclear to its meaning. “Property records must include…percentage of Federal participation in the project costs for the Federal award under which the property was acquired” is slightly different from the previous A-110 language that simply stated “Information from which one can calculate the percentage of Federal participation in the cost of the equipment…” If percentage is required to be housed in property records, institutions may have to make changes to their inventory systems to calculate and capture that percentage systematically.

Section (d) (1) now states that property records must include “use and condition of the property.” The “use” component is new and may require institutions to make systems changes to comply, depending on how “use” is defined.

Additional changes to this section include the addition of the term “vest upon acquisition” and three specific conditions:
1. Use the equipment for the authorized purposes of the project until funding ceases, or until no longer needed for purposes of the project.
2. Not encumber the property without approval of the awarding agency or pass-through entity.
3. Use and dispose of the property in accordance with paragraphs (b), (c), and (e) of this section.

Section (b) also had the addition of “A state must use, manage and dispose of equipment acquired under a Federal award by the state in accordance with state laws and procedures. Other non-Federal entities must follow paragraphs (c) through (e) of this section.”

Section (e) (1) provides clarification by stating “equipment with a FMV $5,000 or less may be retained, sold or otherwise disposed of with no further obligation” and (e) (4) adds clarifying language stating “In cases where a non-Federal entity fails to take appropriate disposition actions, the Federal awarding agency may direct the non-Federal entity to take disposition actions.”

Procurement Standards
The Uniform Guidance contains a number of changes to the procurement standards, which are outlined below:

General Procurement Standards (200.318)
Section 200.318 (b) requires that the entity have adequate oversight of contracts to ensure that contractors comply with contract requirements. It is not required that the entity have a contract management system, however they must have processes and procedures to adequately manage and maintain oversight of contracts. This change is less prescriptive than the past A-110 rule which required a system for contract management.

A written code of conduct is required to address organizational conflicts of interest in procurement activities in Section 200.318 (c) (2) if an entity has a parent, affiliate, or subsidiary organization. The new guidance strengthens the language to require a code of conduct for organizational conflicts as well as individual conflicts.

Maintenance of adequate records detailing the history of the procurement is required in Section 200.318 (i) adding several new and arguably unclear requirements including the rationale for the method of procurement and the basis for contract price. There is no dollar threshold expressed in this section. Formerly, A-110 simply required record keeping for purchases over $25,000 and it is unclear whether this same threshold applies. The record keeping requirements in section 200.318 (i) could add significant administrative burden, particularly if the threshold is lower than $25,000.

Competition (200.319)
A new requirement that may impact an institution’s processes is the prohibition of using state or local geographic preferences, which is currently a requirement for many state institutions of higher education which are subject to state procurement rules.

Methods of Procurement (200.320)
The $3,000 micro purchase limit is lower than many organizations’ existing limit for Procurement Card and other small purchase processes. In addition to the process and system changes, this requirement could pose change management challenges for faculty and staff who may be accustomed to higher dollar thresholds based on state or institutional limits. It will be important to engage early with campus stakeholders on this change, and to track the additional burden this requirement may place on organizations.
Focus: Implications for Researchers

By Susan Sedwick

Santa Claus came late in 2013 as the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) published its final guidance entitled *Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards*’ (Uniform Guidance) in the Federal Register. The Uniform Guidance which can be found in Title 2 Part 200 of the Code of Federal Regulations (2 CFR 200) combines the requirements of eight longstanding OMB circulars including A-21* Cost Principles for Educational Institutions*, A-110* Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Other Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals and Other Non-Profit Organizations*, and A-133* Audits of States, Local Governments and Non-Profit Organizations*.

The Committee on Financial Assistance Reform (CoFAR) undertook this insurmountable task with the intention of (1) streamlining processes associated with the awarding of federal funding, (2) easing the administrative burden on grant applicants and recipients and (3) to reduce the risk of waste, fraud and abuse. The Uniform Guidance will be effective one year from its publication on December 26, 2014. Research administrators are busy analyzing the Uniform Guidance and assessing whether the revised principles will require changes to institutional policies, procedures and practices. While NSF has published, for comment, its implementation plan, it is anticipated that most other agencies will not follow suit and the implementation plans will be issued on or before December 26 as Interim Final Guidance. Institutions cannot wait for these plans to inform their own institutional implementations.

The FDP Faculty Workload Survey II affirmed that federally-funded principal investigators are still spending 42% of their research time on administrative tasks associated with their federal awards. Time will tell if the Uniform Guidance will offer any demonstrable relief or, in some cases, exacerbate the burden. However, some changes will clearly have a direct impact on principal investigators and it is not too soon to start that dialogue on your campus. The following sections of the Uniform Guidance contain deviations from prior OMB circular requirements and should be considered for closer review and discussion with researchers.

- §200.203 Notices of funding opportunities
  Funding Opportunity Announcements must be published in a standard format and made available for a minimum of 60 days prior to the deadline for application except as required by statute or in exigent circumstances in which case a minimum availability of 30 days applies.

- §200.206 Standard application requirements
  Application forms must be pre-approved by OMB.

- §200.210 Information contained in a Federal award
  The format, terms and conditions, and elements of Federal awards are prescribed and include the requirement for the inclusion of a Federal Award Identification Number (FAIN).

- §200.301 Performance measurement
  The guidance requires the use of OMB-approved government-wide standard information collection when providing financial and performance information. We assume the latter will be the Research Performance Progress Report (RPPR) for technical reporting.

- §200.306 Cost sharing or matching
  The NSF model is adopted for all agencies in that voluntary committed cost sharing is not expected and may not normally be considered in the review of research proposals unless statutorily required.

- §200.307 Program income
  While the definition of Program Income remains unchanged, the Uniform Guidance omitted an exclusion for licensing/royalty income at institutions of higher education putting the definition in conflict with the Bayh-Dole Act. A clarification or correction by OMB will be requested by COGR.

- §200.308 Revision of budget and program plans
  The sponsor must be notified of the “disengagement” by the principal investigator/project director for more than three months. The prior requirement called for notice for the “absence”.

- §200.317 - .326 Procurement Standards
  State or local geographical preferences for procurement are allowable only for States but not for state supported institutions of higher education. Requirements
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for competition in procurement actions under Federal awards for purchases exceeding $3000 could result in significant delays for purchasing materials and supplies particularly using procurement cards. COGR is seeking clarifications regarding these requirements.

§200.330 - .332 Subrecipient monitoring and management These sections contain some of the most onerous revisions to the Federal requirements including the documentation that performance reports from subrecipients were received and were related to invoices, decision was made to categorize transaction mechanisms as subawards versus vendor agreements, Facilities and Administrative Costs rate agreements must be honored and subrecipients without a Federally negotiated rate are afforded a 10% rate calculated on Modified Total Direct Costs (MTDC).

§200.332 Fixed amount subawards In an effort to reduce administrative burden, fixed amount awards are encouraged but limited to cumulative funding not to exceed the Single Acquisition Threshold (currently $150,000) and cannot be used if cost sharing is applicable. §200.201 Use of grant agreements and 200.400 Policy guide prohibit the realization of an increment above actual costs. It is unclear whether this applies solely to “profit” motives or to reasonable residual balances.

§200.343 Closeout Federal agencies are required to close out awards within one year of receipt and acceptance of all required final reports.

§200.413 Direct Costs This section has some very favorable revisions including criteria for charging administrative and clerical salaries as direct costs (services must be integral to the project, specifically justified by the non-Federal recipient, and approved in writing by the sponsor or identified in the awarded budget, and for costs not included in the F&A rate calculation).

§200.414 Indirect (F&A) costs All Federal awarding agencies must accept negotiated rates.

§200.415 Required certifications The Uniform Guidance requires a certification by an authorized official of all financial reports. Certifications that are found to be false or fraudulent may result in criminal, civil and administrative penalties. It is unclear how these certifications will be effected but PIs can assume that authorized officials making these certifications will require assurances by principal investigators.

§200.430 Compensation - personal services While neither any specific examples nor the terms “effort reporting” or “certification” are mentioned in this section of the Uniform Guidance, after-the-fact validation that the labor distribution is accurate, allowable and properly allocated is still required. Personnel charges that are not confirmed through the use of time cards must still be based on a percentage distribution of total Institutional Base Salary i.e. “effort”. This section provides clarification and flexibility for when protocol related costs are allowable as direct costs.

§200.432 Conferences Dependent care during conferences associated with dissemination of research results are allowable as a direct cost but must be treated consistently across all funding sources.

§200.440 Exchange rates Prior agency approval is required for cost increases resulting from fluctuations in exchange rates.

§200.453 Materials and supplies costs including costs of computing devices Computing devices as defined in §200.20 are allowable as direct costs provided essential and allocable but not solely dedicated to the performance of the project.

§200.461 Publication and printing costs Publication costs for work supported by the Federal government are allowable after the award end date but prior to closeout (See §200.343 Closeout).

§200.456 Participant support costs These costs are allowable with prior approval but as defined in §200.75, are limited to exclusion from MTDC to conference and training grants.

The Council on Governmental Relations (COGR) has taken on the monumental task of reviewing the Uniform Guidance and has issued its COGR Guide to the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards. Periodic updates will be made as COGR’s ongoing dialogue with OMB and the Federal agencies, and OMB’s additions to its Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) render clarity. The Federal Demonstration Partnership is also actively seeking opportunities to partner with the Federal agencies to gather data or pursue pilot demonstrations that might provide substantive evidence of the impact on administrative burden for researchers. Readers are encouraged to seek guidance from both COGR and FDP through their public websites.

Dr. Susan Sedwick is Associate Vice President for Research and Director of Sponsored Projects at the University of Texas at Austin. She can be reached at sedwick@austin.utexas.edu
Alleviating Administrative Burden:
A NOVEL APPROACH FOR INSTITUTIONS AND INVESTIGATORS

By Andrew Steil
Over the past decade, there has been a variety of reports suggesting that administrative requirements are an increasing burden for both academic researchers and the institutions that support them. A 2012 report by the National Research Council’s (NRC) Committee on Research Universities found that “the problem of excessive regulatory burdens is itself an issue that puts a drag on the efficiency of all university research… [potentially costing] billions of dollars over the next decade” (Research Universities and the Future of America, 2012). The report recommends that federal agencies work to “reduce or eliminate regulations that increase administrative costs, impede research productivity, and deflect creative energy without substantially improving the research environment.” It also recommends that agencies review and synthesize the regulations and reporting requirements they impose on research entities with the aim of eliminating those that are redundant, ineffective, burdensome, or inappropriately applied to institutions. Other key topics included the findings of two Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) Faculty Workload surveys administered in 2005 and 2012 concluded that approximately 42 percent of an awardee’s federal research time was devoted to administrative reporting efforts. On average, 23 percent of respondents’ time was spent writing proposals and progress reports and nearly 20 percent was spent on other administrative requirements (Federal Demonstration Partnership, 2012). The FDP is a cooperative initiative among 10 federal agencies and 119 institutional recipients of federal funds, charged with the goal of reducing the administrative burdens associated with research grants and contracts.

**Governmental Response**

Since the release of these reports, much has been done by the federal government to address the administrative burden placed on our nation’s research institutions. Congress, in response to the NRC report, has held multiple hearings on the topic and in October of 2012 requested that the Government Accountability Office conduct a review of the current regulations and reporting requirements imposed on research universities. The Obama Administration has also issued several Executive Orders (EOs) on the topic, including “Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review” (EO 13563) and “Identifying and Reducing Regulatory Burdens” (EO 13610). These orders seek to “reduce the significant burdens and costs associated with federal regulations while recognizing their indispensable role in protecting public health, welfare, safety, and our environment” (Exec. Order No. 13610, 2012). As a result of these reports and many others, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) released a number of changes and reforms relating to the administration of research grants. In December 2013, OMB released its Uniform Grants Guidance, or Part 200—Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards, with the goal of synthesizing the often contradictory and overlapping regulations previously in effect under eight separate circulars.

**NSB Task Force on Administrative Burden**

The National Science Board (NSB), the National Science Foundation’s (NSF) policy and advisory board, recently appointed a task force on administrative burden, which took voluminous testimony from numerous groups representing principal investigators, research universities, and non-governmental organizations. The most frequently reported areas associated with high administrative workload included financial management, the grant proposal process, progress and other outcome reporting, human subjects research and institutional review boards, time and effort reporting, research involving animals, institutional animal care and use committees, and personnel management. Other areas frequently addressed were subcontracts, financial conflict-of-interest,
training, and laboratory safety and security (National Science Foundation, 2014).

The task force released its final report to Congress, universities, and the broader scientific community on March 10th, 2014. The report contained the findings of the task force and described a number of policy actions aimed at modifying and streamlining inefficient requirements while retaining necessary oversight of federally-funded research. High-level recommendations included:

1. Focus on the Science

Investigators’ administrative workload could be reduced significantly if requirements that are not critical to a proposal’s merit review were postponed until the proposal has been positively reviewed and is being considered for funding. Administrative work could be reduced further if progress reports were streamlined and focused solely on performance outcomes. The Board strongly encourages the NSF Director and other federal agencies funding scientific research to focus the peer-review process and post-award oversight on merit and achievement.

2. Eliminate or Modify Ineffective Regulations

In a number of areas, investigators and institutions have identified regulations that are ineffective or inappropriately applied to research time and again in surveys and reports. Effective action should be taken to eliminate or modify these requirements to avoid further waste of federal research dollars and to accelerate the pace of scientific discovery and innovation.

3. Harmonize and Streamline Requirements

Despite efforts on the part of OMB, federal agencies and groups such as the Research Business Models Working Group (RBM) and FDP, a substantial lack of consistency and standardization remains within and among agencies in all aspects of grant management (i.e., regulations, policies, guidelines, and reporting requirements; terms and conditions; oversight; forms and formatting; electronic research administrative systems; and training). This lack of consistency comes at a high cost to investigators and institutions and must be addressed.

4. Increase University Efficiency and Effectiveness

University resources and the ability of institutions to manage federal grants and comply with regulations vary widely, and this variance has real implications for investigators. Dissemination of effective practices and models can create efficiencies that reduce PI’s administrative workload (Reducing Investigators’ Administrative Workload for Federally Funded Research, 2014).

How Leaders are Responding

It is important to note that many of the issues raised by the NSB and other non-governmental bodies are well-known to research institutions. While most institutions can confidently say that their sponsored programs offices are aware of these investigator-related concerns, not nearly as many can say that they regularly review processes and procedures to identify ways for introducing efficiencies. Even the best policies and procedures require periodic arms-length evaluations. The questions asked should include whether a particular area is being well executed (e.g. time from proposal review to submission, award set-up turnaround, etc.), how it might be improved, what type of data is needed to guide evaluation, and whether the goals might be better met in other ways.

Although the NSB’s recommendations provide a loose framework for alleviating administrative burden, much of their guidance is focused on the government’s role in the process. There is a dire need for institutions to take a serious look at their actions related to investigator support and fortunately there are numerous steps that can be taken to reduce the administrative workload. If understood and executed correctly, these actions can have a major impact on your institution’s ability to efficiently manage the research enterprise and, in turn, provide better support to the investigator community.
**Take a Hard Look**

The increasingly complex regulatory environment has required institutions to address the rules and regulations that govern the operation of research. Thankfully, there are more than a few areas that have an immediate window for action. The following recommendations offer assistance to areas that are creating the most risk—and opportunity—for research institutions:

1. **Expand research efforts to be more competitive in attracting funding**

The past decade has seen a surge of interest and investment in large-scale team science programs. Many agencies are increasingly structuring requests-for-proposals to favor the involvement of interdisciplinary teams. The National Institutes of Health (NIH) and NSF both have plans in place to support projects that require researchers in different disciplines to work together. For example, NIH Program Project/Center Grants (P-Series) fund investigators who are working on related projects that draw on shared resources.

Institutions are also encouraged to explore industry/university cooperative endeavors. The NSF has been awarding the Industry/University Cooperative Research Centers program to institutions like Ohio State University, Georgia Institute of Technology, and North Carolina State University since the early 1980s.

2. **Utilize OMB’s Uniform Guidance as a catalyst for change**

There are a number of opportunities included in OMB’s Uniform Guidance that may have significant impact on regulatory burdens. A failure to implement these changes may prove to be a significant missed opportunity. Highlighted opportunities include:

- Uniform Guidance offers an intuitive and logical presentation of payroll and compensation considerations that, if implemented, may alleviate long-standing investigator and administrative burden associated with effort reporting.
  - Use this as an opportunity to revamp your aging effort certification process or simply revisit small opportunities for improvement based on enterprise-wide feedback.

- Uniform Guidance has the potential to reduce investigator administrative burden by allowing those activities conducted by administrative and clerical staff to be charged to federal awards.* This may help your institution:
  - Reduce the number of institution-level administrators and return to departmentally-based, distributed system of support; and
  - Increase administrative support generally across all levels.

* note that these activities must be accounted for in the grant proposal project budget

3. **Complete an assessment of your institution’s research technology resources**

“Archaic” research administration systems often create fractured and siloed business practices. An over-reliance on physical files and highly manual business processes typically leads to individualized shadow and tracking efforts within research offices.

Implementing a successful research technology infrastructure can be a daunting task for any institution; however, the risk is well worth the reward. Regularly reviewing the technology resources available to your institutions (whether it be a pre-award, compliance, or effort reporting system) can pay dividends in terms of faculty support. Business-process and approval-driven systems give not only your investigators, but also your research administrators, the tools to rise to the occasion and successfully support the grant-making process.
4. Forget the long-held assumption that the research enterprise will constantly expand

There is a severe imbalance between the dollars available for research and the still-growing scientific community in the U.S. This imbalance has created a hypercompetitive atmosphere in which scientific productivity is reduced and jobs are threatened. Since approximately 2003, when the doubling of the NIH budget ended, the demands for research dollars grew much faster than the supply. Further slowdowns in federal research funding, caused by the Great Recession of 2008 and by the budget sequestration that followed in 2013, have significantly worsened the problem (Alberts, Kirschner, Tilghman, and Varmus, 2014).

Today, many universities fund their faculty’s salaries through grants, many often funded at 75 percent or more. Institutions frequently view these grant-funded personnel favorably because they are able to recoup indirect costs as a result of their appointment. “Soft money” incentives also encourage grantee institutions to grow without making significant investments in their own faculty. As a result, there is now a vast surplus of investigators competing not only for research dollars, but also their own salary. One field of thought is to do away with positions that are funded entirely by grants in an effort to make sure each faculty member is a solid and substantial investment for the institution. This method, many contend, is the only way to ensure universities do not create too many unneeded faculty positions and, in turn, too many overstaffed departmental and administrative roles.

5. Conduct regular portfolio reviews with a goal of increasing faculty support

Conducting regular portfolio reviews, with an emphasis on faculty arrivals/departures, ebbs and flows in funding cycles, proposal submission volume, and requisite staff knowledge are a great way to boost faculty and local support.

6. Develop a training plan for specialized staff in specific processes such as grant proposals and financial reporting, and provide backup (trained) staff in case of absence or turnover

Conduct an internal gap analysis—take a look at the jobs and roles you have in your office and consider what it really takes to succeed within that role. Once identified, determine the skills needed for the role from the skills that they currently have. And finally, what is the difference between the two? Once major weaknesses are identified, work on prioritizing your training plan so that you can address these gaps within your office.

Cross-training is one of the most valuable assets for any research administrator. Training should be conducted in a variety of ways—across offices and skill bases (e.g., pre-award administrator training an invoicing specialist on Grants.gov proposal submissions)—so that if a member of your office is absent, another staff member can effectively fill the void.

These transformative measures cannot alone reduce your institution’s administrative burden. However, if followed and executed carefully, they can have a lasting impact on your institutions research administration support model.

Conclusion

Academic researchers in the U.S. face peril and promise. Rising pressures, partially due to increased federal oversight, are driving universities and colleges to transform the way they conduct research so that they can remain in business. The array of pressing challenges requires academic leaders and individual researchers to act with strategic clarity and vision in order to seize the opportunities that lie ahead. A handful of institutions around the nation are demonstrating creative and innovative solutions that leaders can draw on to shore up their institution’s research infrastructure in the immediate future. Widespread engagement with these changes is necessary, beginning with conversations at the institutional level, followed by strong advocacy for change with the funding agencies and larger governmental bodies. Your actions will drive the future of the American research enterprise. Good luck!

Andrew Steil, CRA, is an Associate in the Higher Education and Life Sciences practice at Huron Consulting Group. Andrew has experience with research administration operations support, research technology system selections and implementations, and business process analysis and redesign, particularly in the areas of pre- and post-award administration. In addition, he is a member of NCURA and SRA. Andrew can be reached at asteil@huronconsultinggroup.com
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The Art of Research Administration

By Edward (Eddie) Okonowicz, Timothy Schailey, and Jorge Vázquez

According to Kulakowski and Chronister (2006), “[r]esearch administration is the support required for success in research programs” (p. 9). As research administrators who facilitate the administrative progression of scientific inquiry on behalf of Principal Investigators (PIs), the term support can be defined by industry standards and/or an individual’s specific desire to offer administrative backing that transcends expectations. Similar to the supplies an artist utilizes to develop a visually compelling work of art, there are specific tools a research administrator relies on to ensure the administrative aspects of sponsored programs are managed in accordance with the internal and external rules and regulations that govern the scientific pursuits of supported investigators. Therefore, there is an art to research administration that is “essential for channeling research into areas of greatest benefit to society” (p. 3). To describe the art of research administration, an examination of relevant elements, including style and tools, specialists, leadership, management systems, blending of roles, prioritizing deadlines, and expertise must be considered.

Styles and Tools

Classicism. Impressionism. Pop Art – three utterly different styles all classified as art. The same can be said for organizational styles, which have evolved from a conventional centralized model to include decentralized, shared services and various hybrid iterations. “In the organizational world, function also generally dictates form or structure, though we do occasionally find abnormalities. The research enterprise is no different. There are typical organizational structures, but many other forms that are equally appropriate” (Kulakowski & Chronister, 2006, p. 41). This organic shift occurred as organizations broke with customary practices to identify the appropriate style that best suited the needs of the institution. The ideal style cultivates a collaborative relationship between the investigator and the administrator with each supporting and understanding the role of the other.

Art is a continually evolving reflection of humanity. An examination of art history reveals a progression of styles, tools and platforms — from primitive drawings on cave walls to Marina Abramović’s performance art at New York City’s Museum of Modern Art (MoMA), art has taken many shapes and forms throughout history. Similarly, research administration has advanced from primitive to complex. Since its inception, organizational styles have adapted to fit the culture of institutions, the tools used have become increasingly specialized, and the expansions of platforms (areas of expertise) have warranted the creation of specialists.

The advancement of the field of research administration requires individuals to serve as specialists. Essentially, these specialists are individuals who develop skills, fine-tune processes, and over time are recognized by their peers as experts. The art of research administration is not developed overnight and cannot be accomplished by one person; it is a multi-faceted process that requires niche skillsets and processes to be followed. To those who work within the research administration profession, there may be a shared consensus that the talents of an effective administrator are developed from education, experience, individual style, vision and perspective (Kulakowski & Chronister, 2006, p. 77). Just as artists use brushes and pencils to create masterpieces, administrators must also rely on tools. Grant management systems and institutional policies and procedures represent some of the necessary items found in the toolbox of the research administrator. The combination of these resources allows the research administrator to review, implement and monitor a project from submission to final approval. To be successful, research administration requires leadership, prioritization, and knowledge.

Leadership

Strong leadership exhibited from a scientific and administrative perspective can yield success in a research enterprise. PIs and administrative leaders establish their own canvases which depict a scientific image that supports the vision of their institution’s research enterprise while offering a benefit to society. The illustration that defines a PI’s scientific interests essentially determines where a proposal application should be sent for
consideration. Nevertheless, a research administrator responsible for assisting a PI with administrative aspects of a proposal should be knowledgeable of the materials needed to ensure a successful submission.

In addition to a reliance on strong leadership for an enterprise to be successful, research administrators need to be confident in their roles to perform the day-to-day responsibilities of their positions while serving as a vital resource to PIs and other grants personnel. The organized and effective management of a research office and team will establish the groundwork that is necessary to achieve overall success. Sponsors of clinical trials recruit sites across the country and select institutions and investigators to execute the aims of their protocols. These sponsors need to have a level of control on the activities to ensure an outcome of quality data for evaluation (Poston & Buescher, 2010, p. 55).

**Management Systems**

Comparable to an artists’ portfolio, which is meant to showcase the best work of an individual's style, a database management system serves as a repository where the body of a PI’s proposal submissions are retained. Fortunately, “[1]he success of such databases is that they can be available at relatively no mailing cost, can be updated daily, if necessary, and can be available instantly to potential applicants” (Kulakowski and Chronister, 2006, p. 38). The immediate availability of this information is especially useful in circumstances that require a PI to submit a summary of current and pending support for a proposal to the National Science Foundation or the Department of Energy or for the Other Support documentation required by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) when summoned to submit just-in-time information prior to the possible funding of a pending proposal.

**Blending of Roles**

The “Art of Research Administration” also requires a blend of different roles and responsibilities throughout the life of a project. To illustrate, a PI is responsible for spearheading the scientific efforts of a project whereas a research administrator is tasked with overseeing the administrative aspects of a sponsored program. This collaboration requires both parties to cultivate a strong professional rapport with one another, and necessitates that each party is effectively utilizing their respective tools to ensure compliance with internal/external policies. There is an industry standard which typically defines the roles and responsibilities of a PI and the administrative support he/she can expect to receive from a research administrator. However, the overall quality of institutional research relies on the mortar required to ensure the supporting foundation remains bonded to the research enterprise as a result of a successful collaboration between an administrator and PI.

**Prioritizing Deadlines**

Prioritizing to meet deadlines is crucial for the successful operation of a research office. A research administrator must be organized and identify what initiatives are most important to meet deadlines determined by the central research office, and those of the sponsor to whom the research project will be submitted. Individuals within a research office need time to review proposals in their entirety prior to final submission; therefore, the administrator should have a thorough understanding of the skillset of each individual with whom he/she interacts to streamline the review process and diminish any bureaucratic red tape that could impede the overall process.

**Expertise**

According to the NIH, research is defined as “A systematic, intensive study intended to increase knowledge or understanding of the subject studied…” (NIH Grants Policy Statement, 2013). Researchers perform tasks and conduct studies to become more knowledgeable about new drugs, interventions, or effects of variables on populations. The research administrator needs to serve as the expert in various circumstances so the institution can draw upon his/her knowledge. Oftentimes, an administrator needs to be knowledgeable about all aspects of research administration in order to adequately address inquiries he/she may field from supported investigators and institutional leadership. Sharing knowledge and information with the research community routinely is necessary to ensure a successful program. Those submitting and working on proposals rely on the administrator and his/her team to educate them regularly so they can do their jobs to the best of their ability and are familiar with the tools of the trade.
On my desk is an ever-growing pile of notes to prepare for Harvard’s University-area Facilities and Administration (F&A) rate proposal. FY2014 is our base year, and I’m coordinating the efforts for FAS’ portion of the rate calculation. My current focus is the space survey. We’re striving to find the delicate balance between accurate data and an efficient process. Thank goodness for DCA’s 2006 Best Practices Manual - it allows for coding the activities by A-21 functionality of specific room types. We are functionalizing the room types and departments where the majority (90%) of the research occurs, rather than reviewing every room on campus. This process considerably reduces the volume of what needs to be functionalized. We’ll still capture the activity in the remaining space on campus, but with (what should be) a simpler methodology. F&A calculation truly is an art, as well as a science!

Alison Wellman Smith, MPH
Senior Manager for Systems and Reporting
Research Administration Services, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University

Today’s tools have become hyper-specialized, creating new technologies by major software vendors specific to the field of research administration. From metric tracking spreadsheets to grants management systems, the industry has come a long way. Newly refined systems have the ability to track application submissions and allow system-to-system electronic transmission to sponsors. “In the future the principal investigator will be able to complete the proposal electronically and append it electronically to the online internal clearance form…” (Kulakowski & Chronister, 2006, p. 38). A report by the NIH’s Office of Extramural Research, which provides Electronic Research Administration (eRA) systems to the PHS agencies, reported that 73,429 applications were submitted electronically in FY2011 (OER Annual Reports, 2013), less than a decade since Kulakowski and Chronister’s prediction. Although there has been a progression towards new technologies and programming, there are many in the industry still relying on trusted metric tracking spreadsheets. As an artist today who may choose an easel or Instagram to showcase their work, there is always room for both traditional and modern.

‘Art is Never Finished’

“All this cannot be accomplished within a single office—even at an institution that has little sponsored activity” (Kulakowski & Chronister, 2006, p. 42). As the field of research administration continues to advance, keeping pace with the ever-changing regulatory environment, the expansion of platforms has cultivated niche experts specializing in pre-award, post-award, IRB and technology commercialization, among others. The rapid pace of change creates a profession that is equally rewarding and challenging. It is not uncommon to feel like an apprentice and a master in the same week. “Art is never finished, only abandoned,” said Leonardo da Vinci.
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2014 NCURA Julia Jacobsen Distinguished Service Awardees

This year the NCURA Nominating and Leadership Development Committee selected five veteran NCURA members to receive the Julia Jacobsen Distinguished Service Award. This award recognizes members who have made sustained and distinctive contributions to the organization. Each recipient has contributed to NCURA’s success in numerous ways and for many years. The following summaries provide a snapshot of their service and contributions in addition to the many presentations they have made at regional and national meetings and conferences over the years:

**Cynthia Hope**, Assistant Vice President for Research and Director of the Office for Sponsored Programs, The University of Alabama. Cindy has been an active NCURA member for over 10 years, serving both at the regional and national level. She served as the Treasurer and the Chair of Region III, represented Region III in Leadership Conventions from 2008-2010, was on the DRA Traveling Workshop Faculty, and has presented at numerous regional and national conferences. As a recipient of this award, Cindy states, “I consider this award a great compliment. I know, however, that a significant portion of the honor is attributable to my co-workers for all they do, which allows me to devote attention to furthering our profession, and to my friends in this business who have dependably guided me. I can’t overstate how valuable NCURA is for being the type of organization that fosters those kinds of relationships. Thinking of how much help I’ve received over the years makes me want to find ways to give back even more.”

**Antoinette (Toni) Lawson**, Director, Office of Research Administration, University of Maryland College Park. In her over 20 years of membership, Toni has previously served on the Board of Directors, the Professional Development Committee, FRA, PRA and Annual Meeting Program Committees, and Traveling Workshop Faculty. She has also spread her knowledge by presenting at NCURA conferences. Toni shares, “I was shocked, surprised and humbled when I received notification of being one of this year’s distinguished service award recipients. It is such an honor to be recognized by your peers and to be a part of such a talented and dedicated group of people. I am very appreciative.”

**Dan Nordquist**, Assistant Vice President and Director, Office of Grant and Research Development, Washington State University. Dan has been the Webmaster for Region VI since 1998, was on the Fundamentals Traveling Workshop Faculty, and served on the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee and the Professional Development Committee, as well as numerous other regional and national committees and task forces. He was the Region VI Chair in 2001 and the NCURA Vice President/President Elect, President, and Immediate Past President from 2011-2013. He is currently on the Peer Review team and is the NCURA Magazine Senior Editor. In reaction to the award, Dan says, “I am honored to share this important award with the other NCURA award recipients. We love doing what we do and I’m grateful for all of my NCURA colleagues, but more importantly, those colleagues are also my NCURA friends. NCURA allowed us to connect, grow, and serve and where we can enthusiastically say we all support research…together!”

**Tim Reuter**, Director, Post-Award, Office of Sponsored Research, Stanford University. An NCURA member since 1990, Tim has presented at countless Financial Research Administration (FRA) Conferences and Annual Meetings. He served on the Fundamentals Traveling Workshop Faculty from 2007-2009 and the Financial Research Administration Traveling Workshop Faculty from 2010-2013. Tim has been on both the FRA and Annual Meeting program committees. Tim expresses, “I am humbled by this award. To look at all of the previous recipients and this year’s other recipients and think colleagues believe I should be included in that group of people I have admired and learned so much from is very surprising to me and a source of pride. I love my job and this profession. I have met so many wonderful colleagues and my best friends through NCURA.”

**Cathy Snyder**, Director, Vanderbilt Costing Activities, Office of Contract and Grant Accounting, Vanderbilt University. In Cathy’s nearly 20 years of membership, she has served as the Region III Treasurer, has been on the Financial Management Committee, and has been the co-chair for both the FRA and Annual Meetings. She has also been on the FRA and Annual Meeting program committees as well as being a frequent presenter at both regional and national NCURA conferences. Cathy shares, “I am truly honored to receive the 2014 National Council Awards...”
of University Research Administrators' Julia Jacobsen Distinguished Service Award. Over the years, I have had the pleasure of working in many different capacities within NCURA and have met so many wonderful people, developed close friendships, and have gained much knowledge and insight. I continue to be amazed that no matter how much I give to NCURA, the benefits I receive far outweigh the contributions. Thank you all for your support, encouragement, and assistance over the years. NCURA is such a great organization and extremely important to the research administration profession. I am so grateful to be a part of this first class organization and humbled to receive this award.”

The Award recipients will be recognized at the upcoming 56th Annual Meeting during the luncheon on Monday, August 11, 2014. Please join us in thanking them for their service and their contributions!

Jamie Caldwell, Director, Office of Research Services for the Health Sciences of Loyola University Chicago is the 2014 recipient of the NCURA Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award. This award recognizes a current or past NCURA member who has made 1) noteworthy contributions to NCURA, and 2) significant contributions to the profession of Research Administration. First awarded in 1994, this award is NCURA's highest honor.

Jamie's contributions to NCURA are many, spanning his 26 years of NCURA membership. He has been involved at both the regional and national levels, fulfilling the roles of Chair of Region IV, Traveling Workshop Faculty, Peer Reviewer, member of Research Management Review (RMR) Editorial Board, Annual Meeting Program Committee, presenter at regional and national conferences and Leadership Development Institute Advisor. Jamie also received both the Region IV and national Distinguished Service Awards.

Tesheia H. Johnson of Yale School of Medicine shares that Jamie has a wealth of knowledge and experience that he is unfailingly willing to share with fellow NCURA members and colleagues from institutions around the country. He is a respected peer to peer reviewer who is always willing to mentor junior colleagues on issues related to research administration, as well as their individual careers. I have called upon Jamie many times over the years and have repeatedly followed his sound advice and example. I know that many members of NCURA share my view of Jamie, as is obvious at events we attend together, where his counsel is sought after and highly regarded. Jamie’s willingness to help his peers and his leadership as an administrator and mentor are a model for others in the field.

Jamie’s colleague Richard Kennedy of Loyola University Chicago says Jamie is a valued member and leader of our research team and his current position is a reflection of the esteem in which he is held. He works closely with the leadership of the Health Sciences campus, who value his input and abilities. He is also an outstanding director who promotes from within and whose firm approach has greatly benefitted those reporting to him. It is difficult to underestimate the contribution Jamie has made to our research program. Jamie is an exemplary role model for staff and faculty members who are privileged to work with him.

David Lynch of Northwestern University shares that Jamie is an exceptional communicator and sought after by many, for his ability to break complex matters into simple, easily understood terms. He unselfishly shares his expertise, so that others may succeed. Many have a few strengths, but it is rare when one possesses so many. Jamie will encourage all to speak their opinions and strive to seek consensus. We often confer on issues and continue until we have identified a strategy to deal with complex situations. I value his input and look forward to every professional interaction. Jamie is held in the highest regard by his institution, regional and national thought leaders.
On receiving the award, Jamie states, “I am truly honored to have been nominated for this prestigious award. It came as a surprise when I learned I was nominated. NCURA has been such an important part of my professional career for more than twenty years. At every opportunity I am happy to share the knowledge I’ve received through my NCURA experiences with colleagues from across the country.”

Jamie Caldwell will receive the Award for Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration on Monday, August 11, 2014, at the 56th Annual Meeting Keynote Address.

---

**2014 Joseph F. Carrabino Award**

The Joseph F. Carrabino Award, established in 2003 by the NCURA Board of Directors, is named after the late Joe Carrabino, NSF Grants Officer. This award recognizes a current or former federal partner who has made a significant contribution to research administration, either by a single project, activity, or innovation, or by a lifetime of service. The NCURA Nominating and Leadership Development Committee selected Evelyn Baisey-Thomas as the recipient of the 2014 Joseph F. Carrabino Award.

**Evelyn Baisey-Thomas** worked at the National Science Foundation as an Information Technology Specialist and an Outreach Coordinator. Evelyn was instrumental in training others on NSF’s FastLane and Grants.gov and has traveled all over the United States to conferences and universities, including national and regional NCURA conferences, to give presentations on FastLane and Grants.gov. She has willingly shared her deep knowledge on these subjects and has helped shape electronic research administration into what it is today.

Denise Wallen from the University of New Mexico shares

Ms. Baisey-Thomas personifies the attributes of the stellar federal employee that this award is meant to honor: a federal partner who works diligently to foster and maintain government-university relationships. Evelyn was a long-standing and actively engaged federal employee who regularly visited our campuses, and our NCURA regional and national meetings to provide guidance and training. She was instrumental in bringing Fastlane to our desks and fingertips, and she was the key person in doing the same for Grants.gov. She is one of the critical people that shaped the electronic research administration landscape, as we know it today.

Josie Jimenez from New Mexico State University states that

Evelyn is held in high regard by her colleagues across the U.S. for her mentorship, professionalism, team building and passion she offers to the field of research administration. Evelyn’s contributions are highly significant and valued by the university research community. Since the inception of the Joseph F. Carrabino Award, the intent of this award is to recognize and honor individuals who demonstrate above and beyond commitment over the lifetime of their years of service in building and maintaining the bond between the government-university partnerships. I cannot think of a more deserving individual who demonstrates and possesses these qualities as Ms. Baisey-Thomas.

Dianne Horrocks Ross contributed that Evelyn has been a constant and invaluable supporter of research administrators throughout her career at the National Science Foundation and I can think of no one more deserving of this recognition. I was immediately impressed by the breadth of her knowledge and by her sincere willingness to listen to questions and provide solutions to the audience’s concerns. Evelyn was the NSF Fastlane “go-to guru” in a time when electronic submissions were relatively new. She was a tireless collaborator serving on interagency details, contributing as a member of the Change Control Board for all modifications to Grants.gov applications, representing NSF Fastlane at the White House Initiative on HBCU’s conference, etc.

Mildred Huff Ofosu from Morgan State University adds that

Evelyn was extremely patient with us, always answered questions and demonstrated love and affection toward all who participated in her workshops. She provided individual attention and just demonstrated “motherly love and care” as she went from one computer to another to assist anyone. Evelyn is friendly, courteous, efficient, responsive and service-oriented. When we asked questions or bad challenges, she allowed us to treat each experience as a unique experience.

In her own words, Evelyn says, “It is indeed rewarding to be acknowledged by NCURA to receive the Joseph F. Carrabino Award. I am proud to have been in step with his commitment to sustain government and university relationships. With much gratitude, I am grateful to have been accorded the opportunity to participate in the mission of the National Science Foundation. Finally I wish to thank my nominator and those who participated toward my selection of the award.”

As recipient of the 2014 Joseph F. Carrabino Award, Evelyn will be recognized at the 56th Annual Meeting during the luncheon on Monday, August 11, 2014.
NSB Challenges Federal Agencies and Universities to Reduce Investigator Administrative Burdens

By Bruce Morgan

It should not come as a surprise to research administrators that increases in the number and complexity of federal research regulations and federal agency policies have resulted in a corresponding increase in the administrative duties of federally funded investigators. The National Sciences Board’s (NSB) report entitled “Reducing Investigators’ Administrative Workload for Federally Funded Research” states that many regulatory and policy-based requirements are overly burdensome, costly and disproportionate with what is needed to achieve the important goals of safety, transparency and accountability.

The report was the result of work performed by the NSB’s Task Force on Administrative Burdens. The task force undertook an extensive information gathering process that involved a Request for Information (RFI), roundtable discussions with more than 200 faculty and administrators from across the nation and review of prior reports regarding administrative and regulatory burden.

Key Concepts and Concerns

Many requirements intended to ensure safety, accountably and transparency are actually disproportionate with regard to what is needed to achieve those goals. In addition, the report discusses the impact of the ever-growing regulatory burden placed on the shoulders of our research institutions and principal investigators. This impact is best summarized by a comment from a major research university in response to the RFI:

“While acknowledging the importance of regulatory oversight, compliance with the growing number and complexity of such regulations requires substantial administrative effort. This diverts faculty time and resources from active research. The steady stream of new federal regulations and reporting requirements represents one of the fastest rising costs to research universities, results in inefficient use of federal research dollars, and is deleterious to scientific productivity.”

The task force’s concerns are not limited to federal regulations and requirements. It also raised concerns about the compounding of researcher administrative burdens by institutions regarding non-compliance and financial/legal liability arising from the federal audit environment which result in the implementation of institutional policies and practices that exceed the actual federal regulatory requirements. The task force made several recommendations in each of the following key areas: financial management, proposal requirements, progress reporting, effort reporting and research subject protection requirements (including Institutional Review Board [IRB] and Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee [IACUC] processes and procedures).

Key Recommendations and Opportunities for Change

Focus on the Science – This set of recommendations would streamline requirements and shift focus toward evaluating the merit of proposed projects and assessing the achievements resulting from federally funded awards. The report advocates for increased use of just-in-time and simplified/modular budgets procedures such as those currently used by the National Institutes of Health, as well as the use of preliminary proposals to assess merit without necessitating that researchers invest extensive amounts of time preparing a full proposal. A partial path for this goal already exists in the Uniform Guidance (2 CFR 200.206), which allows federal agencies to inform applicants “...that they do not need to provide certain information otherwise required by the relevant information collection.” Consequently, agencies can – at least on a program-by-program basis – provide applicants the opportunity to submit streamlined funding applications focused on demonstrating the merit of proposed projects. However, the Uniform Guidance falls short of creating a uniform set of requirements to ensure consistent implementation of streamlined application processes.

Eliminate or Modify Ineffective Regulations – A primary focus of the task force report is the inefficiency and administrative burden associated with effort reporting. It proposes that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) should issue a clarifying memo (ostensibly aimed at federal auditors) specifying that payroll certification is an acceptable method to the Federal Government for substantiating payroll charges on federal awards. This would help to clarify the acceptability of the payroll certification methodology. However, it could create additional confusion regarding 2 CFR 200.430 Compensation – personal services, which neither uses the word “certification” nor requires effort reporting systems. Rather, it appears to allow an institution’s payroll system to be the basis for confirming payroll charges in the context of a strong and effective internal control framework.
Harmonize and Streamline Requirements – Atop the federal laws and regulations, is a layer of diverse (i.e., rarely common) policies and requirements implemented by the federal agencies and this, too, was the subject of several recommendations. Among those recommendations are: i) establishing a mechanism “…to ensure uniform and consistent audit practices based clearly and directly on regulatory requirements” and ii) establishing a permanent “high-level, inter-agency, inter-sector, committee” with OMB and stakeholder representation. In addition, the task force recommended that the high-level committee generate a priority list of regulations and policies that should be eliminated, modified and/or harmonized. With regard to ensuring uniform and consistent audit practices, the intent of the task force is to go beyond Subpart F of the Uniform Guidance. The concern behind this recommendation is the inconsistency of regulations and requirements during the examination of recipient systems, policies, procedures and practices.

Increase University Efficiency and Effectiveness – The role that institutions play in creating administrative burdens for investigators did not go unnoticed. According to the report, 77% of those responding to the RFI perceived that their institution was a source of additional burden. In response, the report recommends that institutions communicate the origins of compliance requirements more effectively and avoid implementing institutional requirements that go beyond federal requirements unless there are compelling reasons to do so (e.g., compliance with state laws by public institutions). The report also touches on a related issue; 75% of the respondents indicated that the erosion of administrative support for researchers has added to researcher burden. This trend could result in federally funded research being concentrated in a smaller group of institutions that have the financial resources to effectively compete for such funding.

It is important to note that the task force’s recommendations are not designed to be acted upon separately, but implemented through careful coordination overseen by a high-level authority with stakeholder participation. The Uniform Guidance may provide a framework for some of the recommendations, but it is clear that additional and extensive efforts by the Federal Government and recipient institutions are still required to bring about meaningful regulatory change that will reduce researcher burden from its current level.
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Tom Wilson’s Journey
NCURA has identified three distinct volunteer pathways for its members to get involved - Presenter, Leadership, and Volunteer at the regional and/or national level. “Pathways” is intended to inspire and inform NCURA members on how to engage NCURA as a volunteer in any or all of these opportunities.

Research Administration as an Art
My volunteer pathway with NCURA throughout the years has been a collage of roles; leader, presenter, instructor, mentor, editor, performer, but my favorite NCURA role has been that of author. As an author I have had the extraordinary opportunity to practice the art of writing and been allowed to document my career pathway and professional knowledge through publications in NCURA Magazine and the RMR Journal. This artistic expression has expanded my professional experience and has been the vehicle for advancing my career. I would not be at this point in my career as a research administrator and professor without the opportunities for volunteerism with NCURA at the regional and national level. My acquired thirst for artistic expression as an author has led me into visually expressing my art. Here is an image of one of my oil paintings that I have named NCURA Collage honoring my volunteer colleagues at NCURA!”

Tom Wilson is the Senior Research Administrator and Assistant Vice President at Rush University Medical Center and Adjunct Professor in the Master of Science in Research Administration at the Rush University College of Health Sciences. Tom is also an artist; his works are an expressive blend of design and color utilizing a mixed media of oil and acrylic paints. He can be reached at Thomas_Wilson@rush.edu
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Reliable Guidance that Will Save You Countless Hours of Research... and Help Keep You in Compliance
Preparing for the Impending Storm of Enforcement Related to Final Financial and Programmatic Closeout

By James D. Luther

Summary
Over the past several years and particularly with the rollout of the Uniform Guidance (Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards), there is renewed focus on timely financial reporting. Many federal agencies are implementing policies and practices to enforce timely submission of final project reporting and associated draw down of funds. Similarly, the focus on programmatic reporting is increasing as well. Universities vary greatly on their readiness to meet this enforcement; for those that are prepared, are adequately staffed, and have adequate IT and reporting transparency to manage this enforcement, the impact will likely be minimal. For others, the impact could be broad and significant and include financial risk, compliance risk, and disruption of business processes at both the departmental and central level and research in the lab. To adapt, these universities may need to restructure and revise core business practices for management of sponsored projects, and revise or create policies, technology solutions, training and monitoring. And it is likely that this will have to happen in a compressed timeframe. There has been an escalation in communication from federal agencies that confirms their commitment to closeout requirements.

This article will provide some context on what to expect as the Uniform Guidance (UG) drives even more enforcement, the background on the renewed enforcement, and one institution’s technology and business process initiatives that are underway to prepare.
Background

While previous decades have seen escalating compliance expectations imposed on universities, recent directives from federal sponsors regarding timely closeout and award management have significantly increased pressure on universities. What is the impetus for this increased concern? Universities are facing added pressure from federal agencies in response to the Government Accounting Office (GAO) reports and the Offices of Inspector General directing higher levels of enforcement for award management. Most notably was the July 2012 GAO report entitled Improving the Timeliness of Grant Closeouts by Federal Agencies and Other Grants Management Challenges in federally funded projects that had not been appropriately closed. The GAO cited some projects that were as late as 5-10 years past closing dates. In tight budget times, the potential of so many federal dollars remaining encumbered and unspent raised concerns across all agencies, and even rose to the level of congressional discussion. Offices of Inspector General began to issue strong directives to the agencies regarding improvement of closeout processes and fundamental award management.

In response, many federal agencies are currently reviewing their grantee oversight models and considering methods to increase levels of transparency and accountability. For example, one agency’s approach has been to implement new reporting requirements, such as subaccount reporting to provide for increased transparency and reimbursement control.

This single change alone - transition to sub-accounting - may require institutions to devote extensive resources to significant technology support, changes in business process, and additional personnel.

Does this mean that federal agencies may potentially begin to deny reimbursement on projects that do not observe a timely 90 day close? It appears that this will indeed be the case, as agency enforcement of this requirement is more strictly imposed.

With a long history of productive agency/institutional partnership, all parties are committed to a timely and effective closeout; however, there may be obstacles within a university that can challenge this process. Some are easily surmountable, but others may have complex facets that require greater levels of coordination, resourcing, and internal policy change:

- Timing issues related to resource workload management (timely closeouts may be a challenge): The conflicting demands on institutional grant managers may be significant and require difficult prioritization among proposal submission, appropriate fiscal management of active projects, and closeout, each task with finite deadlines.
- Complexities of managing subrecipients: International subawardees, or awards that have more complex terms and conditions may pose additional problems in achieving a timely close.
- Institutions may struggle with timing issues related to postings that are entirely driven by the institution’s general ledger or payroll posting frequency which may only occur once per month.
Late postings from service centers, vendors, and service providers may also need to be addressed. The closeout process is complex and can be demanding if adequate personnel and system support are not readily available. Within 90 days, institutions must complete a final financial reconciliation of project expenses, ensure that all programmatic and financial requirements and documentation standards of subawards have been met, verify that effort has been appropriately managed and documented, close down any standing orders, outstanding encumbrances, remove all payroll assigned to the project and manage a final financial reconciliation. The issue is further exacerbated by limitations on resources dedicated to closeout and the variety and inconsistency of project closeout dates.

What, then, are the risks to the institution?

- Financial risk: universities incur a cost but due to other challenges are not able to draw down funds for reimbursement in time;
- Compliance risk: late financial and programmatic reports
- Business disruption risk: pressure research administrators and principle investigators who are challenged to manage competing priorities may ultimately lead to reduced quality of research and reduced productivity.

What role does the new Uniform Guidance play in addressing this issue?

OMB A-110 has long had a requirement for timely reporting but with expanded oversight and attention, the UG is reinforcing and clarifying the requirements. Section § 200.343 of the Uniform Guidance is very clear and states:

(a) The non-Federal entity must submit, no later than 90 calendar days after the end date of the period of performance, all financial, performance, and other reports as required by or the terms and conditions of the Federal award. The Federal awarding agency or pass-through entity may approve extensions when requested by the non-Federal entity.

(b) Unless the Federal awarding agency or pass-through entity authorizes an extension, a non-Federal entity must liquidate all obligations incurred under the Federal award not later than 90 calendar days after the end date of the period of performance as specified in the terms and conditions of the Federal award.

(c) The Federal awarding agency or pass-through entity should complete all closeout actions for Federal awards no later than one year after receipt and acceptance of all required final reports.

To summarize, the guidance reaffirms that all final reports (financial, performance, and other) and liquidation of obligations must occur within 90 days of the end date.

“Transparency, Enforcement and the Cash”: Subaccount Reporting

In response to the GAO report and audit pressure, many agencies are increasing their enforcement of these deadlines in advance of the implementation of the UG. Perhaps most compelling is the NIH announcement of a sweeping change to subaccounting financial reporting. While NSF had previously adopted the requirement that federal drawdowns must be done by individually funded project accounting, this has not previously been
the practice at NIH. NIH announced its plans to transition to subaccounting in September, 2013 but delayed the transition start to 10/1/14. Other HHS agencies like HRSA are also communicating their planned enforcement.

Changing to subaccounting provides greater transparency as to the specifics of individual project financial accountability and also enables the identification of late charging on projects past their closing end date. For institutions that have long relied on a consolidated drawdown process, this change is significant. The transition may require substantial technology support, institution-wide change in business process, and considerable drain on personnel resources. Aside from NSF and NIH, other federal agencies differ in their ability to readily enforce or support this change in financial systems, potentially creating a bifurcated business process at the institutional level.

Depending on the size of an institution’s portfolio, the transition to subaccounting can be a significant business process change that may represent a >30 percent increase in annual FFR submission. Additionally, institutions may have to develop technology solutions to support a code-by-code draw process and may need to significantly increase their draws from 1-5 time/month to almost daily to ensure that there are no inadvertent internal timing issues that would cause the institution to miss the 90 day deadline.

**Duke University’s Approach**

As research administration at many institutions is highly decentralized, it is often challenging to develop institutional solutions to federal requirements that reflect best-practice and still allow the flexibility inherent in individual department culture and business environment. This is especially the case when there is a significant sense of urgency from the government competing with other institutional priorities outside of the research portfolio for resources and priority. The dilemma is further exacerbated when the changes necessary to meet new federal standards will impact university-wide systems, process and policy.

Changing what has been a traditional approach to timely closeout can become quite an extensive scope of work. Thus, prioritizing the risk, understanding upcoming deadlines, and assessing which policy/processes and technology items have the longest lead times, are critical to getting prepared. Following is a very high level summary of the approach that Duke University is taking:

A. Conduct “Readiness” analysis of upcoming end-dates
   a. What are the peak months of activity for closeouts? What are the competing priorities (proposal deadlines, academic & financial calendar)?

B. Identify the transactions/areas that create the greatest risk to an untimely closeout
   a. Are there G/L accounts or types of transactions that routinely cause late closeout? Possibly internal billing for recharge centers (e.g. lab animals and DNA sequencing); is there a consistent pattern of late invoicing from subawardees; is it problematic to manager closeout when faculty are cross-appointed or are “owned” by separate units?

C. Determine if internal business process and policies need to be revised.
   a. Examine the current Closeout Process – What tools are available to support the process, and are there early warning signals in the system to advise if a closeout is in danger of being late?
   b. Peer Invoicing Timeline – If late subrecipient billing is an issue, what measures can be taken to mitigate?
   c. Procurement Terms and Conditions – Is there consistent late invoicing among certain vendors, or is the internal process too slow?
   d. Internal billing (shared resources, clinical systems, student systems, etc.) – What systems can be improved to enhance timely and transparent billing?
   e. Role of Parent – When internal “convenience” subaccounts are established, are the roles and “march in” rights of the parent clear so that internal subaccounts can be “taken over” if necessary to bring the project to close?
   f. Cost Transfer policy – Should this be changed to eliminate late transfers that impede closing?
   g. NCE Management – Is there a process for units to advise early in the project that a NCE will be requested?
   h. FFR policy – Is there a clearly defined policy on FFR revisions, and a system that supports production of the FFR?

D. Evaluate impact on technology – what changes need to be made to:
   a. Sponsored Programs Billing & Reporting Database
   b. Improved LOC Draw process (code-by-code draw and increased frequency)
   c. Tracking of Programmatic and Administrative Reports
   d. Management Reporting to identify chronically slow units

E. Evaluate impact on training & education (faculty and staff)

F. Support from leadership for technology resources and eventual business process change (and associated disruption)
   a. At Duke, we have a weekly meeting of senior leaders that includes the VP Finance, VP Human Resources, Vice Provost for Research, Vice Dean for Research, Executive Vice Dean Administration from the School of Medicine, and the Executive Vice Provost. This group meets twice a month with leadership from all primary research administration offices to address research support opportunities, improvement to technology and reducing faculty burden.
Critical to the success is evaluating the adequacy of functional resources in central offices, departments, and technology support to staff the initiative. Each university may need to ask: Do we need a dedicated implementation team that can assist with the technology and business process/policy work and then assist the departments during the transition.

As you assemble this project plan and associated team, it is critical that you consider the lead time for changes (what is the cycle time to get the necessary allocation of technology resources to make significant system changes), breadth and depth of stakeholder impact, financial risk, faculty burden, and departmental disruption.

Conclusion

The enforcement of the longstanding requirement to submit final financial and progress reports is accelerating at a significant pace and may catch many institutions by surprise. The ability to meet this requirement, and the implementation of subaccounting may require a consolidated and coordinated effort that addresses improvements to technology and changes to business process and policy. Some institutions, such as Duke, are fully acknowledging this and are meeting the requirement with a project team that includes dedicated staff and strong representation from departments to address the compliance and financial risk in a manner that is supportive of the departments’ culture and the faculty research.

Editor’s Note: All, we are happy to hear that NIH will not implement the subaccounts payment policy until Oct. 1, 2015 per NIH NOT-OD-14-103.

James D. Luther, MA., Associate Vice President for Finance & Research Costing Compliance Officer at Duke University. His responsibilities include oversight of the post-award areas for the University and School of Medicine, management of fixed and moveable assets, negotiation of Duke’s indirect cost and fringe benefit rates, and the Research Costing Compliance (RCC) program. Jim is a regular presenter at NCURA, the Chair of the COGR Costing Committee, and the Co-Chair of the FDP Admin Burden Subgroup. He can be reached at james.luther@duke.edu
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GAO Report on Closeouts (July 2012)

- GAO identified more than $794 million in funding remaining in expired grant accounts (accounts that were more than 3 months past the grant end date and had no activity for 9 months or more) in the Payment Management System (PMS)

NIH Domestic Awards to Transition to Payment Management System Subaccounts in FY 2014 (9/3/13) - NIH Notice NOT-OD-13-112

- NIH would transition to SubAcct reporting starting on 10/1/13 (this was subsequently delayed to 10/1/14 by Notice 13-120)
- Final reports are due 90 days after end-date
- PMS “will now hold payment requests for funds in subaccounts for awards that are 90 days or more beyond the project period end date”

NIH Domestic Awards to Transition to Payment Management System Subaccounts in FY 2014 and FY 2015 (September 26, 2013)

- Transition to SubAcct reporting (initially conveyed via 13-112) would be delayed until 10/1/14

Uniform Guidance (Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards), Section § 200.343

- (a) The non-Federal entity must submit, no later than 90 calendar days after the end date of the period of performance, all financial, performance, and other reports as required by or the terms and conditions of the Federal award. The Federal awarding agency or pass-through entity may approve extensions when requested by the non-Federal entity.
- (b) Unless the Federal awarding agency or pass-through entity authorizes an extension, a non-Federal entity must liquidate all obligations incurred under the Federal award not later than 90 calendar days after the end date of the period of performance as specified in the terms and conditions of the Federal award.
- (g) The Federal awarding agency or pass-through entity should complete all closeout actions for Federal awards no later than one year after receipt and acceptance of all required final reports.

NIH Updating Grant Closeout Policies and Procedures to Align with New HHS Requirements (April 24, 2014)

- All reports required for closeout must be submitted no later than 90 days after the project end date.
- Clarifies when Agency can proceed to a unilateral closeout if the grantee is non-communicative
- Includes FAQ’s to clarify aspects of the Notice http://grants.nih.gov/grants/closeout/faq_grants_closeout.htm

Administrative Changes to NIH Domestic Awards Transition to Payment Management System Subaccounts - NOT-OD-14-093 - May 16, 2014

- Implementation for domestic, non-competing awards will occur between October 1, 2014 and September 30, 2015.
- Unliquidated Obligations on the Subaccount Transitional FFR: if there are unliquidated obligations at the end of the first “administratively shortened” competitive segment, these may be reported on the subaccount transitional FFR expenditure data report.
- NIH continues to seek some relief from the DHHS by requesting an additional year for grantees if the grantee is non-communicative

Revised Timeline for Administrative Changes to NIH Domestic Awards to Transition to Payment Management System Subaccounts - NOT-OD-14-103 - July 11, 2014

MARK YOUR CALENDAR NOW!

9th Pre-Award Research Administration Conference
March 2-4, 2015

16th Financial Research Administration Conference
March 5-7, 2015

Walt Disney World Swan & Dolphin Resort – Orlando, FL
Registration Will Open in November
Rx for Research at PUIs: Giving Faculty Tools to Succeed in Research

By Jaylan S. Turkkan

Faculty need protected time to think, collect data, and write

While studies in research-intensive universities (e.g., Mullen, Murthy & Teague, 2008) have found that research assistants and material resources were the leading success factors stated by all faculty ranks, time is of the essence for faculty at SF State. Higher teaching loads and few teaching assistants result in intensive student involvement. To support our time-starved faculty, we provide competitive funding both through non-general-fund sources and through the CSU Chancellor’s Office for 1-2 courses/semester release from teaching for conduct of professional work. Much of this work involves SF State students, with faculty surveys revealing that more than 4,000 undergraduate and graduate students engaged in independent hands-on research and creative projects last year.

The value of undistracted time for writing cannot be overstated. We have hosted writing retreats where faculty are provided a “room of one’s own” within the library for writing space, with support staff such as statisticians and grant editors working with them over a three-day period. These writing retreats are frequently cited by faculty as a best practice of our office.

Faculty need seed funds

In addition to ORSP/SF State’s individual project awards for up to $15,000 and collaborative project awards for up to $25,000, the CSU Chancellor’s Office also provides funding for faculty research and creative activities with a focus on early stage faculty; awards can amount to $8,000. Provost’s travel awards are also available to faculty who are presenting at conferences.

Offices of research and sponsored programs nearly always provide bridge funding when proposal scores are not immediately fundable. Our ORSP’s bridge funding is not a loan, and for this reason is somewhat restrictive in scope. Nevertheless, this has been an invaluable tool to retain research technicians for faculty caught in the latest hard times.

Faculty need affinity

In response to faculty comments that they don’t know who is working in related scholarly areas on campus, we have held three retreats (2009, 2013 and 2014) to bring faculty together across disciplinary boundaries. In each retreat more than twenty faculty-led affinity groups, i.e., interdisciplinary clusters of thematic interest, have met to present data, discuss project plans, and get to know one other. Several affinity groups have gone on to win collaborative project awards.

Currently, SF State is embarking on its first cluster-hiring initiative to catalyze and strengthen already existing interdisciplinary teams of faculty working across colleges. Two Clusters—one in Violence Trauma and Health and one in Big Data—will be the first to hire new faculty. An aim of this initiative is to recruit faculty who are further along in their research careers, enabling them to mentor and lead teams of junior faculty within and outside of the clusters in research projects and extramural proposals.

Faculty need continuing research skills and grant development

Given the fast pace of change in science and a shared recognition with Principal Investigators (PIs) that research skills diminish when not exercised regularly, during academic year 2013-14 we held a course titled “Research Rx Methodology for Faculty” consisting of more than thirty panels, workshops, colloquia, lectures and demonstrations. Over a ten-month period we offered presentations by federal agency officers (U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; National Science Foundation), workshops on statistics and survey/mapping software, panels on how to manage collaborations and how to do research with sensitive and hidden populations, to name only a few activities. The course was capped by a 3-day Summer Institute of guided grant proposal development, editing and statistical support.
Faculty need seamless pre- and post-award support and lowered administrative burdens

We provide PI support not only from a core location on campus, but also through a satellite office where faculty are the most grant-active. All ORSP grant administration staff are experts in both pre- and post-award functions, unlike many universities who run post-award services through a foundation or business affairs. The unique advantage of SF State’s arrangement is that a PI ideally has the same Grant Administrator from cradle to closeout.

During the pre-award proposal period, frequent communication between staff and PIs, timeline reminders and submission deadline buffer days have been implemented and have proven critical. Factoring into this pre-award timeline is a paid service we instituted four years ago to provide faculty with external pre-reviews of federal proposals, conducted by experts that they name. Behind only the writing retreats, this is our second most-appreciated service.

With respect to post-award, a much-discussed report from 2005 found that among federally funded PIs, approximately 42% of their time was taken up with administrative tasks (Decker, Wimsatt, Trice, & Constan, 2007). A 2014 review found that despite reform efforts in the federal government, this percentage remains unchanged (National Science Board, 2014). Because many PI administrative tasks arise from agency regulatory requirements (e.g., IRB, IACUC, financial conflict of interest, and time and effort reporting), our new Compliance unit corrals all of these functions under one staff member’s oversight. This arrangement has reduced submission-to-approval times of non-exempt IRB protocols by 69%! Combined with aggressive digitization of routing and approvals and use of online forms, we have sought to reduce administrative burdens for PIs to the extent possible.

Seamless support and reduced burdens for faculty can only be achieved through ORSP staff buy-in around key concepts and processes (e.g., satellite offices and the need for pre+post award service). Combining pre- and post-award roles for grant administrators was the most difficult transition. More recently, we found great value in a facilitator/coach working with staff toward team building, airing issues, and improving communications. As a result, staff report that they feel “listened to” and have developed, together with managers, a set of shared values and expectations that are publically posted.

In addition to sending staff to regional and national meetings for skill-building, we also invite staff to teach each other in formal training sessions. Those identified as subject-matter experts (e.g., in contracts) take the lead. Where we lack subject-matter experts, one advantage of being part of a large system is the ready advice that our staff receive (e.g., in intellectual property)—and that we give in turn (e.g., federal funding practices)—to the other universities within the CSU system.

Recognition and ultimate rewards

While it is essential that scholars, creative artists and researchers are noted, cited and awarded by their external peers, faculty also need to sense that someone close to home is paying attention to and appreciates their work. Building recognition, although not a traditional role for ORSP, must be a thread that runs through our activities. Poster sessions on campus, honors and commendations by the Provost, President and Chancellor, and tweets about grant awards all are necessary and elevate all of us.

At SF State, in the end, our faculty development efforts should be pointing toward the ultimate faculty reward outcome within a university—promotion and tenure.
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One of the really nice changes coming with the Uniform Guidance is the ability to use a 10% F&A rate for recipients and subrecipients that do not have a negotiated F&A rate. While NIH currently has a policy that allows use of an 8% F&A rate for entities that do not have a negotiated rate, the Uniform Guidance will allow all agencies to honor this rate. I am very excited to think how much easier this will be for small non-profit organizations we work with and the international organizations with whom we partner. While I admire the detail that goes into creating an F&A rate, I admire even more the opportunity for an efficiency that will help us and the organizations with whom we partner.

There has been a shift in foundation–university relations, where rather than the foundations perceiving themselves as sponsoring university projects in furtherance of a common cause, universities are viewed as service providers with foundations functioning as the procurement agent of those services. Foundations now use agreement terms that are contractual in nature, including over-reaching or inappropriate intellectual property terms and onerous confidentiality and publication restrictions. At the same time, many foundations continue to believe they are “contributing to a cause” as a rationale for severely limiting the F&A reimbursements. We understand that foundations are first and foremost devoted to their mission, as are universities. Our missions are not so disparate so let’s fix this.

If I had my way, modular grants (on steroids) and JIT-thinking agencies would take over the grant world. Think what positive science could happen if experienced researchers could propose projects in $50K direct cost increments plus a Statement of Work. We could strike an upfront deal with agencies to either award the requested increment, or else negotiate a reduction in work scope and smaller increment. Small awards could use the recipient’s negotiated F&A rate automatically applied on top with no exclusions - with our promise to use any extra funding to expand the science. Bigger awards could require detailed budgets at the JIT stage, eliminating 80% of proposal budget work and the perception that an entity’s F&A rate influences selection of the science. Simplify. Succeed.

What I Found on Twitter

@Inc – Leadership Lessons from Maya Angelou bit.ly/1pE2AHZ

@DHSgov - #Cybersecurity Tip: Keep your operating system, browser, and other critical software optimized by installing updates.

@HarvardBiz – Management Tip: Keep Your Meeting from Going Off-Track s.hbr.org/1k5FenY #HBRMgmtTip

@RockTalking – Announcing new NIH biosketch format for FY 2016 applications, which means those apps submitted in Jan 2015 Blog 1.usa.gov/1i8HbEh

@HHSgov – The @US_FDA has launched @openFDA – Providing easy access to FDA public data: open.fda.gov #HDpalooza pic.twitter.com/eS7cBqxxp7

@Argonne - Video: Our own Marius Stan, aka Bogdan from @BreakingBad_AMC, examines unexpected links between science and cinema: http://bit.ly/UfQ1YS

@HarvardOSP - Writing an NSF Grant Proposal: A First-Timer’s Perspective http://ow.ly/xxjrM

@HuffPostArts – Teddy Roosevelt’s son said the president’s coffee mug was “more in the nature of a bathtub” #coffeeaddicts huff.to/1mP61cg

I just started following: @Americans4Arts, @ArtsResearch, @openFDA, @IAmBiotech, and @TEDTalks, and I just discovered the #opendata hash tag.
Congratulations, you are now Chair-Elect of your NCURA region, and your job, as it has already been decided for you, is to plan and execute your region’s next conference. At first it feels much like the honor that it is. This feeling quickly turns into, “What have I gotten myself into,” and then, “I can’t possibly do this—what was I thinking? I can barely manage my own job and family responsibilities, let alone add this third ball to juggle!”

If you are tasked with leading or co-leading your regional conference, take heart: you will survive and figure your way through this. Having just organized the 2014 Region IV spring conference in Indianapolis, I understand the stress and challenges that meeting organizers can face during the year-long process to get a major conference off the ground. To keep my mind focused, I learned some lessons from one of nature’s best organizers: geese! http://lenwilson.us/5-thing-geese-can-teach-us-about-teamwork Here are some very useful strategies that I learned from watching these magnificent birds that can help you get through planning and implementing your next regional conference along with other challenges.
Lesson 1
Know Where You’re Going

During migration, geese have an inherent ability of knowing where they are going.

In meeting planning, the first goal is to establish your vision—that is, the objectives for your conference—and then keep your eye on the prize all the way through the planning. Developing a conference for more than 200 people is a formidable task, but Rome wasn’t built in a day and neither is your event.

At the beginning I was side-tracked with real concerns. My worst nightmare was low attendance, and thus I focused on creating exciting entertainment events to attract attendees. After chasing some half-baked ideas and basically wasting my planning committee’s time, it dawned on me that “if you build it, they will come.” The success of the meeting demanded an exceptional professional development program, period. So that became my objective, and keeping it as my main focus always helped.

After establishing the vision of your meeting, develop a meeting theme and select a keynote speaker as soon as possible so that you can begin to market your program early. The goal is to pique potential attendees’ interest and entice them to register, and a learning-centered theme can help achieve this. Attendees will more readily remember that the focus of your conference is about the “Keys to Success” than “the spring meeting next April.” Choosing your keynote speaker early will provide your audience another level of interest and set the tone.

In addition, take the road less travelled and avoid a canned program. Use previous regional meetings as a model, but keep the content fresh and based on the latest topics and trends in research administration. Also, this meeting is your “baby,” so be sure to put your personal touches on it. One of my personal marks was to develop the first International Track in a Region IV Spring Conference. Not only were there plenty of opportunities to provide interesting sessions, but the 2015 Region IV spring conference will be jointly hosted with the NCURA International Region, so the idea was to get everyone thinking in that direction.

Lesson 2
Fly Together

It is a beautiful sight to see a group of geese flying together in perfect V-shaped formation. Research has shown that as each goose flaps its wings, it creates a strong uplift for birds that follow behind.

Once you have your conference vision and theme in place, select your co-chairs first and then your program committee. Upon becoming Chair-Elect, an NCURA colleague gave me some sage advice: pick people you trust. This couldn’t have been stated any better, and my choice of co-chairs and program committee members all proved successful. My favorite saying became “everyone makes me look good,” and they did. I give them all the credit.

Another suggestion for assembling your program committee: choose people who are different from you, as we all have a tendency to pick individuals much like ourselves. This will help foster challenge and conflict, two often misunderstood techniques. When done correctly, both conflict and challenge can foster healthy and constructive ways to generate ideas and improve methods. Use them both to closely critique and develop a program that would not have happened if you had chosen to do the “same old, same old.”

Lesson 3
Stay in Formation

Geese usually fly in formation. But when one goose falls out of line it struggles, and then moves back into formation to take advantage of the lifting power of the bird in front.

If someone on your team is struggling, offer to help out. You are responsible for the success of the program and for ensuring your team has all the support and resources they need. For example, you may need to ask another team member to help achieve a task, extend a deadline, or eliminate redundancies.

As conferences and programs are developed and begin to take shape, they not only take a life of their own, they also take on the personality of the person in charge. If you are enthusiastic, your team will be enthusiastic; if you are innovative, your team will be innovative. If you’re not projecting confidence and energy, neither will your team.

Lesson 4
Share Responsibilities

While flying in the V-shaped formation, the lead bird eventually gets tired and moves towards the back of the line. Another goose takes its place as it recharges its batteries.

There were times when meeting planning seemed to become either stagnant or fresh ideas too difficult to achieve, as all deadlines were converging at an impossible pace. You are allowed to take a break, for it is much easier to make decisions or come up with ideas when you are rested and refreshed.

For example, if you wake up in the middle of the night and remember something you forgot, it is an indication that you are not getting enough rest, so try not to let sleep be your only form of relaxation. One of my favorite things to do to recharge my batteries is to take a walk as only when I am relaxed do the ideas start flowing. It may seem counterintuitive, but only when you step away from something can you begin to see it more clearly.

It also helps to learn early-on to delegate. For me this is not very easy, as I prefer to roll my sleeves up, know every little detail, and participate in every task. Big mistake. Remember Lesson 2: Fly Together. You selected responsible, skilled professionals to be part of your team, each having unique talents to help organize the conference. These individuals help to fill your knowledge and talent gaps, and you are no good to the team if you are irritable and stifling creativity.

Lesson 5
Honk When You Need Help

Geese are noisy when they fly in V-shaped formation because they are communicating with each other. Oftentimes you will hear geese before you see them.

Communicate, communicate, communicate. It cannot be stressed enough that conference planning requires constant communication in order to succeed. Upon becoming Chair-Elect, I poured over documents from previous meetings and contacted a few long-standing NCURA members for their advice. Each person provided me with the mantras that I needed to build a foundation for a strong and successful program.
And don’t forget: you can’t—and won’t—remember everything. Make checklists and mark tasks on your calendar well in advance of the event so you won’t be surprised when that Banquet Event Order is due in two days. My co-chairs and I posted our checklists and timelines on Google Docs, which was much easier than sending emails back and forth. However, we certainly used email and conference calls for general conversation and updates, and text messages were critical during the conference. We also asked everyone on the program committee to share cell phone numbers so we could get in touch with them during the conference “just in case.”

**Lesson 6**

**Leave No Goose Behind**

Whenever a goose is injured or sick and unable to continue, two other geese fly out of formation to stay with it. They follow the bird down to the ground and help protect their comrade until it is able to fly or no longer live.

About one month before the conference, my chairs and I could finally see the light at the end of the tunnel. Even though the workload increased to an absolute frenzy as we finalized the last details, we were thrilled to see the registration numbers begin to soar and see all of our hard work rewarded.

Arriving in Indianapolis, we knew we had made it, and once the conference began it took on a life of its own. All of the problems we had to fix throughout the planning were tended to and our confidence grew because of that. Sure, there were several times when the auto-pilot had to be turned off and we needed to step in and throw it on manual, but it never took long to switch the autopilot back on and watch everything take care of itself. We were fully prepared down to the last detail so anything that came up was quickly managed. We could now look back and realize that...

**Reflections of the NCURA Annual Meeting**

It was the time of the annual meeting, Many NCURANs were swarming around. Plus or minus 2,000 of them, From research university cities and towns. Among them were DC movers and shakers, From their initialed organizational places. NSF, NIH, USDA, and OMB, Many, many friends and familiar faces. Pat Green was there and Dick Seligman, Both members of long time and term. Their tenacity and contribution, Many colleagues admire and affirm. Some attendees wanted their attire, To be fully in Research Compliance. So they checked with Gil Tran of OMB, For proper Uniform Guidance. And one full of erudite counsel, That old dear, our beloved Ann Granters. Always providing advice and tips, Even instruction for Tuesday’s dancers.

NCURA has 8,000 members or so, From 30 plus countries and nations. And Ty Neffert suggests we’ll soon share the, Federation of Planets’ Administration Regulations.

The first intergalactic Research Administrator, Who knows from where or when. Who might it be? ‘Well twixt you and me, Dave Richardson will move again.

The NCURA leadership team, Vivian, Bob, Josie, Pat, and Michelle. Were on task and everywhere, Even though it was hotter than...

Help of every kind was never far away, Because the competent NCURA staff. Did what needed to be done, With kind words, smiles and a laugh.

And who organizes and directs, This show without any sign of slip ups? It’s NCURA’s Associate Executive Director, Our capable Tara Bishop.
The National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) was established by Congress in 1965 as an independent agency of the federal government. To date, the NEA has awarded more than $5 billion to support artistic excellence, creativity, and innovation for the benefit of individuals and communities. The NEA extends its work through partnerships with state arts agencies, local leaders, other federal agencies, and the philanthropic sector. Colleges and universities can take advantage of NEA programs and resources, from funding to research opportunities.

The NEA’s Office of Research and Analysis (ORA) conducts its own research on the value and impact of the arts in all domains of American life, such as health and well-being, community livability, and economic prosperity. ORA’s recent reports include Valuing the Art of Industrial Design: A Profile of the Sector and Its Importance to Manufacturing, Technology, and Innovation [http://arts.gov/publications/valuing-art-industrial-design](http://arts.gov/publications/valuing-art-industrial-design) and The Arts and Aging: Building the Science [http://arts.gov/publications/arts-and-aging-building-science](http://arts.gov/publications/arts-and-aging-building-science).
The NEA's motto is “Art Works.” But in a research context, how do you measure how art impacts people, communities and a society? It’s a broad question, and the National Endowment for the Arts offers an ambitious plan to “map” the arts to better understand and measure this complex, dynamic system.

How Art Works, a Research Opportunity

Published in 2012, How Art Works describes NEA’s five-year research agenda, framed and informed by a groundbreaking “system map” and measurement model. The report offers a framework for studying research topics critical to a broader public understanding of the arts’ value and/or impact for individuals and communities. The system map helps illustrate the dynamic, complex interactions that make up this particular system and is intended in part to assist researchers interested in applying to the NEA’s funding program Art Works: Research.

Through Art Works: Research, ORA makes awards to support research that investigates the value and/or impact of the arts, either as individual components within the U.S. arts ecology or as they interact with each other and/or with other domains of American life.

In this second year of Art Works: Research, the NEA announced in April that it would award 21 grants totaling $350,000. Projects recommended for support include:

- a study that will evaluate the benefit of a theater-based therapeutic intervention for autistic adolescents and their caregivers, and
- a study to examine the health effects of music, dance, and visual art therapy on older adults in a long-term care facility.

Final reports of projects funded in 2012 from universities including the University of Georgia and Harvard University can be found on the NEA website.

Research, Art and Well-Being – a lesson for research administrators

In a recent June 5, 2014 Arts Work blog post by Sunil Iyengar, NEA Director of Research & Analysis, Sunil explores three recent studies that looked at the impact of arts participation on well-being by a number of prominent social science researchers. One of the studies referenced was conducted by Vanderbilt University’s former faculty Steven Tepper (now with Arizona State University). In “Artful Living: Examining Relationships between Artistic Practice and Subjective Well-Being across Three National Surveys,” Tepper tests correlations between artistic practice (e.g., fine arts, video, music, theater, dance, crafts, gardening, artful cooking, creative writing, designing clothes, and composing music) and well-being measurements in three populations: adults, undergraduate seniors, and former arts graduates.

Tepper concludes that the findings yield “strong support that artistic practice is associated with higher levels of life satisfaction, a more positive self-image, less anxiety about change, a more tolerant and open approach to diverse others, and, in some cases, less focus on materialistic values on the acquisition of goods.”

Other NEA Funding Opportunities and Resources

Also of interest to research administrators are NEA’s other funding categories. In the Art Works category, the field of presenting and multidisciplinary works offers funding for university performing arts venues and exhibition spaces. The Our Town program supports organizations for creative placemaking projects that contribute to the livability of communities and place the arts at their core. Information on all of these funding opportunities is available at arts.gov

To help applicants navigate the NEA’s funding programs, the agency has created an archive of webinars covering the how-to’s of applying to the NEA’s Art Works funding category. Organized by art discipline and field, these webinars are at http://arts.gov/videos/webinars

The National Endowment for the Arts has a lot to offer—funding programs, research, publications, and active social media platforms featuring great stories from around the country. Please join us at http://arts.gov
Jo Ann Smith, Tom Wilson and Marianne Woods have been appointed to serve as the new Co-Editors for NCURA’s journal. Research Management Review (RMR) is the scholarly, peer-reviewed online publication which focuses on a broad range of issues affecting the administration of academic research. The RMR provides a forum for the dissemination of knowledge about the study and practice of the research administration profession. Past editors of the RMR include immediate past editor Dr. Jennifer Shambrook, Dr. Pamela Plotkin, Dr. William Sharp, James Casey, J.D., Robert Killoren, M.A., Dr. Stephen Erickson, Dr. Earl Freise and founding editor Dr. Mary Ellen Sheridan.

This is the first time the journal will have Co-Editors. Jennifer Shambrook’s term was marked by a prolific number of articles and 6 volumes being published during her tenure. With the recent beginning of several master’s level programs NCURA has tapped the expertise of three well-respected senior administrators, who are directly involved in these new programs, to help continue a pipeline of quality articles.

When asked about the recent appointment Jo Smith shared: “I am honored to be selected as a co-editor of the RMR journal. I look forward to supporting the RMR journal in publishing studies and information that will continue to advance our professional field and the scholarly pursuits of graduate students in research administration. RMR is instrumental in equipping our readers to be more knowledgeable, effective, and efficient within their research organizations. What a great opportunity to review the newest findings that will help develop leaders in the pursuit of excellence in facilitating and advancing the research enterprise for today and the future.”

Marianne Woods stated: “I am thrilled to be selected as co-editor of the RMR. This is NCURA’s scholarly publication designed to provide the reader with in-depth information and analysis on the topics that are current and vital to research administrators. I think NCURA has selected a wonderful team of co-editors and I look forward to working with them and making a great journal even greater.”

Jo Ann Smith, Ph.D., CRA, is the Program Director of the Master of Research Administration in the School of Public Administration. She has over 25 years’ experience in research grant and contract administration. She has worked in multiple areas of the research enterprise from research development to commercialization. Dr. Smith has lead initiatives on multiple grant proposals and programs with universities, hospitals, federal, state, local, and nonprofit agencies that have collectively resulted in over $100 million in funding. She has worked in both central and departmental offices. For six years she directed a research center with approximately $20 million in research expenditures annually. She earned her Ph.D. in Instructional Technology and specialized in online instructional design and learning. Through the UCF College of Graduate Studies, she provides RCR instruction to graduates and implemented a graduate certificate workshop series in Grantsmanship that is offered to all UCF doctoral students. She teaches several graduate courses that include: an overview of research administration, organizational models & leadership, financial management, grant and contract management, strategic planning, public program evaluation techniques, and research design courses.

Thomas E. Wilson, MBA, has over thirty-five years of experience in research administration. He is the Senior Research Admin-
istrator, and Assistant Vice President at Rush University Medical Center. He also has an appointment as Adjunct Faculty in the Rush University College of Health Sciences, and is the Associate Program Director for the Master of Science in Research Administration Program at Rush. He has had a number of scholarly publications and has served as Co-editor and Contributing Editor for *NCURA Magazine*. His responsibilities have included all aspects of pre-award and post-award research administration and he has been a member of National Council of University Research Administrators since 1987.

Marianne Rinaldo Woods, Ph.D., J.D., is the Director of the Master of Science Program in Research Administration and a faculty member in the Department of Government, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, Advanced Academic Programs at Johns Hopkins University. She has over 30 years of research administration experience. Prior to her current position Dr. Woods was the Senior Associate Vice President for Research at The University of Texas at San Antonio. In this position she was the Chief Operating Officer for the Division of Research reporting to the Vice President for Research and was responsible for oversight of all aspects of research including Sponsored Programs (pre and post award); Research Integrity; Research Support; Commercialization, Technology Transfer and Innovation. Dr. Woods also served as the Research Integrity Officer for the University and was the Institutional Official for the IACUC, IRB, Conflict of Interest in Research and Intellectual Property, and Institutional Biosafety Committees. Prior to UTSA Dr. Woods was Associate Vice President for Research at the University of Alabama.

Dr. Woods served for six years on the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR) Board of Directors and on the Contracts and Intellectual Property Committee. She also served two terms on the Board of Directors for the University Industry Demonstration Partnership (UIDP) out of the National Academy of Science and was a member of the University Industry Research Roundtable. Dr. Woods has been very active in NCURA. She is the 2009 recipient of NCURA’s highest honor, the Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award. Dr. Woods is an NCURA faculty member for SPA II and a member of NCURA’s Peer Review Program. She is also the former co-editor of the *NCURA Newsletter*.

Marianne Rinaldo Woods, Ph.D., J.D., is the Director of the Master of Science Program in Research Administration and a faculty member in the Department of Government, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, Advanced Academic Programs at Johns Hopkins University. She has over 30 years of research administration experience. Prior to her current position Dr. Woods was the Senior Associate Vice President for Research at The University of Texas at San Antonio. In this position she was the Chief Operating Officer for the Division of Research reporting to the Vice President for Research and was responsible for oversight of all aspects of research including Sponsored Programs (pre and post award); Research Integrity; Research Support; Commercialization, Technology Transfer and Innovation. Dr. Woods also served as the Research Integrity Officer for the University and was the Institutional Official for the IACUC, IRB, Conflict of Interest in Research and Intellectual Property, and Institutional Biosafety Committees. Prior to UTSA Dr. Woods was Associate Vice President for Research at the University of Alabama.

Dr. Woods served for six years on the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR) Board of Directors and on the Contracts and Intellectual Property Committee. She also served two terms on the Board of Directors for the University Industry Demonstration Partnership (UIDP) out of the National Academy of Science and was a member of the University Industry Research Roundtable. Dr. Woods has been very active in NCURA. She is the 2009 recipient of NCURA’s highest honor, the Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award. Dr. Woods is an NCURA faculty member for SPA II and a member of NCURA’s Peer Review Program. She is also the former co-editor of the *NCURA Newsletter*.

If you are interested in submitting an article or case study which is relevant to the administration of research, please visit the [http://www.ncura.edu/PublicationsStore/ResearchManagementReview/AuthorInstructions.aspx](http://www.ncura.edu/PublicationsStore/ResearchManagementReview/AuthorInstructions.aspx) for the Instructions for Authors.

---

**See the latest issue of the scholarly journal**

**Research Management Review**

LeaderBeing: Critical Reflections on Context, Character and Challenge in the Culture of Research and Its Administration

Research Management in Portugal: A Quest for Professional Identity

Using a Client Survey to Support Continuous Improvement: An Australian Case Study in Managing Change

Science Research Group Leader’s Power and Members’ Compliance and Satisfaction with Supervision

The Toll of Workplace Bullying

Leadership and Research Administration

Attributes of Successful Leaders in Research

The Importance of Trust in Leadership

Book Review: *The Martian’s Daughter - A Memoir*

Book Review: *Long Fuse, Big Bang*
As a full service accounting and advisory firm, Baker Tilly focuses on: sponsored research compliance and consulting, risk advisory and internal audit services, and special investigations.

Baker Tilly serves over 150 higher education institutions nationwide. Our experienced professionals specialize in the complexities of sponsored research programs and awards. Our work with numerous research institutions has allowed us to develop grant and contract administration consulting services based on industry best practices. We recognize the competing priorities from which institutions must choose and are adept at navigating the complex culture found in college and university settings. With over 1,700 professionals, Baker Tilly serves clients nationwide.

Connect with us: bakertilly.com/higher-education

© 2014 Baker Tilly Vichow Krause, LLP.
Baker Tilly refers to Baker Tilly Vichow Krause, LLP, an independently owned and managed member of Baker Tilly International.

NEW OFFERING! MASTER OF SCIENCE IN RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Whether you are a current or aspiring research administrator, advance your career with this new, entirely online, interdisciplinary program at Johns Hopkins University:

> Earn a degree from the nation’s first research university, and the World's leading academic institution in total research & development expenditures.
> Develop proficiency in the management of sponsored research programs, including policy development and compliance reporting.
> Customize your degree to become a subject matter specialist in two of three concentrations: administration and facilitation; financial management; and compliance, legal, and regulatory issues.
> Learn from the most renowned experts in the field.

Apply today: advanced.jhu.edu/researchadmin
You may be wondering why you, as an NCURA member, should contribute to the Education Scholarship. This is a way individual members can make a difference for NCURA members to have access to high quality professional development. Every member has had the opportunity to utilize NCURA’s resources for their professional development. We all know how valuable it is to interact with our colleagues and friends to problem-solve and stay current on the ever changing regulatory landscape. We also understand how scarce resources are to financially support those activities. The Education Scholarship will be a vehicle for providing some of that support to NCURA members so they benefit from professional activities and are prepared to move forward as educated employees and NCURA members to serve our organizations. Donating to the Education Scholarship Fund is truly an opportunity to make a difference for the future.

NCURA’s Education Scholarship Fund was created in 2012 through a challenge gift from Jerry Fife, a former NCURA president and long-time, very active presenter and mentor. His challenge to NCURA members was to match or exceed his gift for use as funding to ensure NCURA members have opportunities for continued professional development. A Task Force was created a little more than a year ago to design a strategic plan, identify how matching funds would be raised, establish eligibility standards for receipt of awards, and communicate with NCURA’s membership about the Fund.

Members of the Task Force are senior NCURA members and leaders who believe the future of NCURA lies in maintaining a professional research administration population. Members hail from across the country and from diverse research administration specialties. A strategic plan is under development with timeline for fund raising activities and increased visibility, and award criteria. Please feel free to contact any member of the Task Force for more information.

Three years ago I gave NCURA a gift of $5,000 to initiate a scholarship fund. The intent of this gift was to seed the fund in hopes of it growing to the point where it was large enough to be self-sustaining where the fund provided sufficient earnings to fund scholarship(s). My instincts are that we’ll need a fund of approximately $100,000 to accomplish this.

My logic in starting the fund is my belief that university budgets are becoming strained to the point that many research administrators are not provided the opportunity to develop professionally. NCURA provided me this opportunity and helped me develop as a leader, public speaker, and provided the forum for me to develop professional networks with leaders in research administration. I’d like for others to have the opportunity that I experienced.

The NCURA Education Scholarship Task Force has set a goal to have the fund reach $35,000 by the end of this summer. Currently the fund is at $21,647. It is my hope that we can reach this goal. If we do so, I’ll personally donate $1,000 so we can reach $36,000.

Please join me in contributing to the development of the future of our profession.

Has NCURA made a difference in your professional life?

Mail your tax-deductible check to:
NCURA Education Scholarship Fund, 1015 18th Street, NW, Suite 901, Washington, DC 20036
THE SCIENCE
We are suffering from information overload. We receive information equivalent to 174 newspapers every day (Alleyne, R. Welcome to the Information Age-174 Newspapers a Day® The Telegraph. February 2011) Combining relevant images with your text dramatically increases how much your audience remembers by (Krum, R. (2014) Cool Infographics. Indianapolis, IN: John Wiley & Sons Inc.)

It is less complicated for the brain to process infographics than pure text.

650%

WHY?
- Complicated ideas become easy to understand
- Long articles can be presented as short stories
- Greater retention of information
- Eye catching

INFOGRAPHICS MAY BE USED FOR:
- Process Outlines
- Timelines
- Annual Reports
- Research Reports
- Guides and Manuals
- Organizational Charts
- Responsibility Charts
- Strategic Plans
- Resumes

BUT I AM NOT A DESIGNER!
Formula for a Successful DIY Infographic = Consideration + Inspiration + Perspiration

Get out of your comfort zone and remember that even the masters had their critics. Take advantage of free tools (see HELP above) and review books (see references below).

What about the cost?
Professional agency: $150-$250 / hour
Student: $10 - $20/hour (plus benefits)
Do It Yourself: $0 (assuming that your time is provided in-kind)
An infographic is a visualization of data or ideas that tries to convey complex information to an audience in a manner that can be quickly consumed and easily understood.

**TIPS**
- Keep it simple and relevant: focus on key message
- Less is more
- If appropriate, use humor to create an emotional connection
- Don’t plagiarize
- Don’t forget your university graphics guidelines

**HELP**
- Piktochart.com
- Vengage.com
- Infogram
- Canva.com
- Microsoft Publisher
- Istockphoto.com
- Visual.ly

**EXAMPLES**
- http://ezramagazine.cornell.edu/winter11/CoverStorySidebar3.html

**HOW**
1. Understand your audiences’ information needs.
2. Define the story you want to tell.
3. Keep in mind the 5 W’s (and one H): Who (audience), What (purpose and key message), When (relevance), Where (source of data), Why (importance), How (easy to understand).
4. Define your introduction, the main event or ah-ha moment, and the conclusion (or call to action).

**Maja Marjanovic**, MBA, CRA, is the Director of Sponsored Programs at Purdue University Calumet. She can be reached at maja.marjanovic@purduecal.edu

**Kristin Sarver**, MA, CRA, is the Associate Director of Sponsored Programs at Purdue University Calumet. She can be reached at sarverk@purduecal.edu

**Mike Pearson**, is the Graphic Designer & Web Developer for the Office of Research and Graduate Studies at Purdue University Calumet. He can be reached at mdpearso@purduecal.edu

Established as a College of the University of London in 1948, and becoming an autonomous university in 1962, the University of Ibadan (UI) is the oldest university in Nigeria. The University currently has more than 26,000 students, almost 50% of whom are graduate students. Its graduate school is one of the largest in Sub-Saharan Africa, producing 200 PhDs every year. With more than 1,500 faculty members, it was the top-ranked university in Nigeria in 2013 according to the country’s National Universities Commission. According to the latest UNESCO Science Report (Schneegans, 2010), Nigeria’s scientific publications are top-ranked in Sub-Saharan Africa, second only to South Africa, with significant focus on clinical medicine and biomedical research. As an indicator of its role in the global research enterprise, Nigeria, together with South Africa and Kenya, had the largest number of internationally collaborative scientific publications in Sub-Saharan Africa. In terms of U.S. federal funding between 2009 – 2013, Nigerian institutions received more than 200 research grants totaling approximately $130 million (www.usaspending.gov) and both the University of Ibadan and Obafemi Awolowo University are recipients of the European Union’s Framework Programme Funding.

Like many state-funded universities around the world, the challenges of the Nigerian University System include inadequate funding due to tight government budgets; a shortage of modern teaching and research equipment; inadequate staff development and low staff morale; and increased demand for and cost of municipal services on the campuses. Despite this environment, the University of Ibadan has invested in new structures to enhance research management and technology transfer activities including the Research Management Office, Office of International Programmes, the Research Foundation, Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer Office and the Centre for Entrepreneurship and Innovation.

As part of the vision of the University of Ibadan is “to be a world-class institution for academic excellence geared towards meeting societal needs”, the University signed Memoranda of Understanding with many institutions within Nigeria, the rest of Africa and other parts of the world (Figure 1). Elements of such collaboration typically include the following: exchange of undergraduate and graduate students; exchange of staff and training; exchange of academic material and information; development of internationalized curricula; setup of joint internships and practical field courses; credit transfer; development of joint degree programmes; development and implementation of joint research programmes.

The University’s curricula have benefitted from these international collaborations, and some have resulted in new academic programmes in the University:

- M.S. in Humanitarian and Refugees Studies
- Master in Information Science
- M.S. in Construction Project Management
- M.S. and Ph.D. in Petroleum, Energy Economics and Law
- M.S. in Child and Adolescent Mental Health
- M.S. in Disaster Risk Management
- A collaborative Ph.D. programme in Economics.
The university recently developed an *Intellectual Property (IP) Policy*. The IP Policy sets forth the rules to harmonize the conflicting interests of stakeholders relating to ownership of IP, distribution of income, marketing, commercialization and licensing of patents and intellectual property developed by University of Ibadan academic staff, administrative and support staff and students. With universities and individual faculty members under increased pressure to quantify research activities and output, the University of Ibadan has produced a *Policy on Authorship of Scholarly Publications* that serves as a framework for pre-empting contentious issues around authorship.

International collaborations between faculty and researchers at the University of Ibadan and their colleagues from other parts of the world have provided opportunities for us to increase our research output through more publications in peer-reviewed and indexed journals, a larger number of Ph.D. graduates, and more patent filings. In addition, our faculty members increasingly have the opportunity and the means to attend international conferences in their respective disciplines. However, a major challenge in the past 20 years that we have faced in international collaboration is the frequent disruption of the academic calendar due to industrial disputes between the university administration and the staff unions. It is hoped that the situation has now stabilized. In some cases, the collaborative linkages have been relatively dormant due to the lack of funds, though the agreements are in place.

The *Research Policy* of the University of Ibadan provides guidelines for research activities that will ensure excellence and integrity in the conduct of research. The *Ethics Policy* is part of the Research Policy of the institution produced with generous funding from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. The University of Ibadan affirms that excellence in research, teaching and learning, professional conduct and services cannot be achieved without sound ethical standards. The aim of this policy is to strengthen the awareness of ethical principles and issues in the conduct of research, thereby specifying the obligations of researchers, sponsors and the beneficiaries of research.

The core values of ethics at the University of Ibadan are based on principles enshrined in the Nigerian constitution and the National Health Research Ethics Code (NRHEC). This policy covers ethical issues in research, teaching and learning as well as in professional conduct and services. In order to adequately implement this policy, the University of Ibadan has created four new Research Ethics Committees (URECs):

- Social Sciences and Humanities Ethics Committee (SSHREC)
- Animal Care and Use Research Ethics Committee (ACUREC)
- Plant Use and Conservation Research Ethics Committee (PUGREC)
- Science and Technology Research Ethics Committee (STREC)

This is in addition to the existing Health Research Ethics Committee (HREC). In addition, the policy includes the Ethics of Teaching and Learning (ETL) and the Ethics of Professional Conduct (EPC).

The core values of ethics at the University of Ibadan are based on principles enshrined in the Nigerian constitution and the National Health Research Ethics Code (NRHEC). This policy covers ethical issues in research, teaching and learning as well as in professional conduct and services. In order to adequately implement this policy, the University of Ibadan has created four new Research Ethics Committees (URECs):

- Social Sciences and Humanities Ethics Committee (SSHREC)
- Animal Care and Use Research Ethics Committee (ACUREC)
- Plant Use and Conservation Research Ethics Committee (PUGREC)
- Science and Technology Research Ethics Committee (STREC)

This is in addition to the existing Health Research Ethics Committee (HREC). In addition, the policy includes the Ethics of Teaching and Learning (ETL) and the Ethics of Professional Conduct (EPC).

The West African Research and Innovation Management Association (WARIMA) was inaugurated in Lagos, Nigeria, in November 2006. It is a professional body for research management staff in the West African sub-region. It operates at an institutional and international level, as well as across the research value chain, from research management through innovation to research commercialization. WARIMA is a member of the International Network of Research Management Societies (INORMS), and it has held an annual Workshop and Conference with themes such as Fundamentals of Research Management, Accessing International Research Funds, Institutionalizing Research Management in the West African Sub-region, Enhancing Research Productivity in African Universities, and Contemporary Issues in Research and Innovation Management in Africa. The theme for the most recent conference in April 2014 was ‘Networking: A Key to Advancing Research Management and Innovation in West Africa’. The 8th Annual Conference will be held at Elizade University in Ilara Mokin, Nigeria, in November 2014.

Nigeria is Africa’s largest economy and most populous country. (World Bank).

200 [U.S. federal] grants totaling $130 million

Clearly, there remain obstacles to research in a developing country such as Nigeria such as the shortage of human, institutional and financial resources, the relatively low priority assigned to research, the current absence of a national research funding agency, and the impact of cultures, religion and norms that undermine ethical requirements such as informed consent. However, these challenges are not insurmountable as Nigeria is Africa’s most populous state (170 million) and largest economy, and economic growth per annum has ranged between 6-8% over the past decade. Nigerian universities such as UI stand to gain in stature and standing as a relatively young population continues to demand more of its educational and research institutions and the country can increasingly afford to meet those demands.
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Abel I. Olayinka, PhD, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), at the University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria. His responsibilities include coordinating all the academic and research functions in the University. In addition, Abel is the Chairperson of WARIMA (West African Research and Innovation Management Association), which is the professional body for research management in the West Africa sub-region. The association shares best practices, increases the awareness of research and innovation issues in academic and public institutions, and promotes the advancement of science, technology and innovation in West Africa. He can be reached at idowu.olayinka@ui.edu.ng
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In 2008, David Brady and his colleague Caroline J. O’Neill, Associate General Counsel for the George Washington University, wrote an *NCURA Magazine* article addressing issues in international contracting that presented risks to the university. Today, cross-border collaborations abound among academic institutions, and it is time, in this two-part series, to take another look at legal and practical issues related to internationally-funded sponsored agreements.

**U.S. Laws of General Applicability and their Implementing Regulations**

A number of federal laws and their implementing regulations have broader intersections with international contracting than is typical in domestic contracting. Careful consideration of these laws should be made prior to negotiating and executing a contract with an entity outside of the United States (U.S.), or under which activities will occur outside of the U.S.

Unlike activities in the U.S. in which export restrictions are generally limited to the release of controlled technology or source code to foreign nationals, activities under international contracts may include physical exports of commodities, software, and technology, as well as the exportation or importation of restricted services, including services for which a foreign national in the U.S. can provide or receive in the U.S. under a visa authorization, but needs government authorization to provide or receive outside of the U.S.

Table 1 summarizes the applicable laws and their implementing regulations. They include export and sanctions laws, as well as restrictive practice laws and the foreign corrupt practices laws. It is important to understand that these laws require strict compliance, meaning that violators can be penalized criminally for willful or willfully negligent violations, but also civilly, even if there was no intent to violate the law.

The intersection of university international activities and violations of these regulations is not theoretical. Since the 2008 article was published, the authors are aware of many universities which have disclosed inadvertent violations of export and sanctions regulations, self-imposing mitigating remedial measures to avoid repeat offenses. Additionally, there have been two published instances of universities or their employees...
being punished for violating these laws. In 2010, Dr. John Reece Roth, an emeritus engineering faculty member of the University of Tennessee was sentenced to 4 years imprisonment and a fine for criminal violations of the Arms Export Control Act (FBI, 2012). In 2013, the Department of Commerce (DoC) civilly fined the University of Massachusetts at Lowell $100,000 for exporting an atmospheric testing device and related antennae and cables to a Pakistani entity on the DoC’s Entity List without an export license, a violation of the Export Administration Act (DoC, 2013). The case is notable because the items unlawfully exported were controlled at the lowest level of the Export Administration Regulations’ control (EAR99).

Though the conduct of many university activities (e.g., educational, fundamental research) may fall outside the scope of these regulations, contracting with foreign parties significantly increases the probability of a university intersecting with licensing requirements of these regulations. Typically, unless the transaction falls under a general license, a license exception or exemption, or is outside the scope of these regulations, parties are required to obtain a specific license from the regulating agency before engaging in the transaction.

Export and sanction laws regulate the export and in some cases import of commodities, software, and technology prior to engaging with collaborators outside of the United States, or foreign parties in the United States. While exhaustive discussion of these laws and their implementing regulations is beyond the scope of the article, a brief discussion of what transactions are regulated is useful.

**Export Administration Regulations (EAR).** The EAR regulates the export of U.S. commodities, software, and technologies which are “dual use”, i.e., “items” that have commercial uses, but also may have uses for which the government regulates the transaction. Regulated export transactions can include physical exports outside of the U.S., and exports of technology or source code to a foreign national (“deemed exports”). The EAR also regulates exports of items to certain end users and certain end uses. Finally, the EAR regulates exports with certain parties of concern for which there are special export restrictions above and beyond any country specific restrictions. The Department of Commerce maintains web accessible a list of parties of concern.

**International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR).** Implementing the Arms Export Control Act, these regulations apply to the export and temporary import of “defense articles and defense services” listed on the U.S. Munitions List. Regulated transactions include exporting munitions from the U.S., and providing “assistance”, technical data, or military training to foreign parties, in the U.S. or not. Previously the ITAR only regulated items that were specifically designed for military or space applications. However, the ITAR is currently being changed under an export reform initiative to have a more technical specification-based munitions list. On one hand, export reform will make it easier for practitioners to determine whether an item or transaction is regulated under the ITAR, in particular, the proposed rule governing defense services has been narrowed considerably (Department of State, 2013), which will provide greater clarity for universities engaging in contracting with foreign military organizations, defense departments and defense contractors. On the other hand, if an item reaches a performance threshold on the Munitions List, regardless of whether it is intended for military applications, then the item must be treated as a munition.

**Importation of Arms, Ammunition, and Implements of War Regulations.** Complementing the ITAR, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives regulate the permanent import of munitions on a separately managed U.S. Munitions Import List.

**Import and Export of Nuclear Equipment and Material Regulations.** The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) regulates the export and import of nuclear equipment such as nuclear reactors (including some subcritical reactors), uranium fuel production, and various nuclear materials. The NRC also regulates the export to foreign nationals of some software used in the production and use of the regulated equipment and materials.
Assistance to Foreign Atomic Energy Activities Regulations. The Department of Energy (DoE) regulates transactions directly or indirectly involving the production of special nuclear materials, nuclear reactors, and other nuclear fuel cycle facilities outside of the U.S. These regulations are not consistent at all with other export regimes, and require special attention to ensure compliance. There is a proposed rule to harmonize these regulations with the ITAR and EAR, however, a final rule has not been issued (DoE, 2013).

Restrictive Trade Practices or Boycotts Regulations. In recent years, an increasing number of U.S. institutions of higher learning have engaged in collaborative educational and research activities in Middle Eastern countries. A number of these Middle Eastern countries engage in a boycott of Israel (currently boycott participating countries are identified as Iraq, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, United Arab Emirates, and the Republic of Yemen (Department of the Treasury, 2014)). As part of the EAR, the U.S. has identified certain activities of these countries to be restrictive practices, and have prohibited U.S. parties from participating in certain transactions with the governments or entities in these countries. Prohibited transactions include agreeing to, or actually participating in a boycott or blacklist, agreements to, or actual discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, or nationality, and agreements to furnish, or actually furnishing information about business relationships with or in Israel or with blacklisted companies, or information about the race, religion, sex, or national origin of another person.

If your institution engages in collaborations in the Middle East, you need to be mindful of these restrictions. In addition to a prohibition on boycott related activities, there are reporting requirements to the Department of Commerce — even if you do not accept boycott terms and conditions. Finally, in accordance with the Tax Reform Act of 1976, “operations” in boycott participating countries must be reported to the Department of the Treasury.

Foreign Assets Control Regulations. In addition to the many export regulations, under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, the U.S. government engages in trade sanctions against a number of countries, entities, and individuals. Comprehensive sanctioned countries include Cuba, North Sudan and Iran, with Syria and North Korea having substantial but not comprehensive embargoes. Sanctioned transactions generally include the blocking of property, and regulation of exportation and importation of goods and services from the sanctioned country and its nationals outside of the U.S.

Secrecy of Certain Inventions and Licenses to Export and File Applications in Foreign Countries. Many U.S. educational institutions engage in executing license agreements with foreign organizations for ownership or use of intellectual property that is patented or pending patent protection. In accordance with patent regulations, The Departments of Commerce, State and Energy have delegated to the Patents and Trademarks Office (PTO) the authority to issue foreign export licenses for filing or possible filing of foreign patent applications without having to comply with the other export regimes’ licensing regulations. However, from the time when a patent application is filed with the PTO to the time the patent is issued (or otherwise allowed to be made public by PTO), there can be an intersection between patent law and the ITAR, EAR, or DoE assistance regulations (DoC, 2006).

If information in the patent meets the threshold of being “technology” subject to the EAR, technical data subject to the ITAR, or providing “assistance” (DoE), and there is no PTO foreign export license, then the technology/technical data must be exported to foreign nationals or foreign licensees in compliance with the applicable export control regulation. This may require an export license from the applicable regulatory agency if a foreign party is to have access to the information during the period prior to the filing of the patent up to PTO issuing the patent (or other PTO authorization to make the patent information publicly available).
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There is an art to research administration but there is also a lot of science involved. Most of us know the science, but the science alone is like the paint of an artist. A masterpiece cannot be created without art and yet without the artist they are but colors with limitless potential. The following dimensions illustrate the “art and science”:

**People** with the right attitude are the most important dimension of research administration. We all know that if you have good people who are well-led, well-trained, rewarded adequately and who have challenging roles, there will be research administration magic.

**Senior executives** are important. Having a skilled university executive, a VPR who appreciates the skill involved in managing the business of research counts for a lot.

**Systems (IT)** are really important in this age of complexity and diversity. It is impossible to manage such a complex business without an enterprise class research (integrated funding and compliance) tracking system.

**Networking among peers** is a key attribute of a successful research administration. Robust involvement in the research administration associations and university organizations is critical to keeping a finger on the pulse.

**Excellent communication** is the backbone of the success of the delicate relationship between research administration, the researchers, the regulators and the funders.

**Robust business processes** are another key element. Having a roadmap for administrative processes that is quick, direct and easy to understand helps researchers comply in the most efficient way possible.

**Well-structured research policies** enable a successful research administration, and a high degree of compliance to the policies is just as important. The research policies should have an end date and be refreshed on a regular basis.

**Metrics** and continual improvement are very important. Have you identified key performance indicators that define success? Are you monitoring efficiency and continually looking for ways to improve?

**Relationships with research funders:** If you have not reached out (and developed personal relationships) to the program and compliance officers at the funding agencies then you are missing a huge opportunity to improve performance.

**Strategic planning** underpins success in research administration. So many universities have a non-functioning research plan and/or an ORS strategic plan that sits on a shelf and does not guide the everyday operation of ORS and VPR. Make sure the plan lives, breathes and evolves.

**Training and promotion:** Great training, continual learning and constant professional development are all success factors.

**Celebrating together with a sense of team:** At UBC we enjoy regular pizza lunches, staff BBQs and birthday cakes. We enjoy socializing and have a strong sense of team.

**Diversity:** Cultural diversity is a huge advantage in meeting the challenges of research administration artistry.

We know the colors of the artist’s palette. How do we mingle the art and science of research administration to create a masterpiece? The path to creation of the masterpiece involves inspired and visionary leadership and communication skills at every level of the research administration community. Having carried out numerous reviews of research administrations of peer institutions and having spoken to many others who do the same all over the world, these facets of the art and science of research administration are the re-occurring themes. Not surprisingly they are the most difficult to achieve. Good luck in your artistry!
Shaping a New Profession in Higher Education and Research Institutions.

Introducing the EARMA European Certificate in Research Management

By Susi Poli, Jan Andersen, Kristel Toom, and Lars Wilkman
The field of action or the wide range of functions that today’s research managers and administrators (RMAs) perform, has rapidly developed over the past twenty years. One of the reasons underlying this development may be seen in the process of knowledge production, realised through the contribution of Higher Education (HE) and research in particular, to the economy and wellbeing of nations: this trend of development has rapidly transformed the HE sector from a prior ‘protected’ system to a highly competitive environment (Nhlapo & Swanepoel, 2010). Within this challenging environment, research management is acknowledged as a relatively new field of investigation and thus the number of researchers (or ‘insider’ researchers) who deal with issues relating to it is on the rise (Shelley, 2009; Allen-Collinson, 2009; Hockey & Allen-Collinson, 2009; Schuetzenmeister, 2010; Poli & Toom, 2012).

Among the issues that have been investigated, the following stand on the top of the list: the variety of roles and how RMAs have progressively expanded the boundaries of their action (Shelley, 2009); the choice of research administration as a career option, for instance for scientifically trained students (Schuetzenmeister, 2010); the relationships among RMAs and academics, including issues of identification and ‘moral exclusion’ from other university administrators’ groups (Allen-Collinson, 2009). But many more issues fall on the shoulders of RMAs engaged in today’s research and they call for a deeper understanding. In this perspective the meaning of the profession of RMAs has developed and gained importance in all research-intensive institutions, not only in HE (Green & Langley, 2009).

Today’s RMAs, as one of the occupational groups within the HE sector and research institutions, have striven hard to get recognized either for their contribution to the research process, or for their professionalism in managing the increasing complexity of research. There is no doubt that in today’s research environment RMAs hold a wide range of roles and responsibilities (Hockey & Allen-Collinson, 2009). Simultaneously, a more strategic and professional research management has been acknowledged as one of the main gaps to be filled by universities (Green & Langley, 2009); this since RMAs more frequently work on complex projects within a much more complex societal and organizational environment.

RMAs may be considered the models of the new and specialised professionals described by Gornall (1999), namely specialists in research management who deal with the social, organizational, and in addition with the political context of today’s research. Furthermore, among all the professional groups, RMAs may be seen as more blended than other professionals in today’s HE. Blended professionals are those individuals with academic credentials, such as master’s and doctoral qualifications, but also those who have built their expertise in other sectors (different from HE) and then brought it to HE, who are able to perform quasi-academic functions (Whitchurch, 2008). Blended RMAs have been investigated either as RMAs coming from a scientific background or those already in HE who have enrolled in academic pathways later-on in their career (Bertero et al., 2012). Therefore, they perform a wide array of functions in-between academic and professional domains. They also more often go beyond the familiar working spaces shared with academics and occupy new and unexplored spaces in today’s research. These blended RMAs are among the main actors in today’s European as well as international research and the target group of the EARMA European Certificate Programme.

EARMA’s European Certificate has been developed with the aim to equip today’s RMAs with the set of skills needed to effectively engage in the European research environment and optimize their contribution. The target group of participants for EARMA’s European Certificate may include European RMAs as well as all other professionals engaged in European framework programmes (e.g. partners from other sectors). This large target group comes as a consequence of the more competitive and challenging international dimension introduced by Horizon 2020.

The EARMA qualification has been developed as a response to the complex and rapidly evolving setting, which can be described as a multi-player and international arena for research (Andersen, in press; Newman and Poli, 2014). In fact, players come from different HE or research institutions, countries, and consequently different systems of HE. EU bodies, the industry sector, non-profit organisations, consultancy but also several others contribute to this complexity. In this multiple-player arena it is obvious that all players do not perform alike; for this reason, the modules of the training programme have been developed to enable participants from different working practices and cultures to easily grasp the European framework of research. Cross-cultural understanding is key in today’s research management and RMAs are expected, much more than in the past, to be prepared to liaise with a heterogeneous group of partners.

EARMA’s qualification has been shaped in collaboration with the UK Association of Research Managers and Administrators (ARMA) using its framework of professional development that has mapped RMAs’ tasks, and then developed the set of skills needed by RMAs to carry out these tasks more effectively. Furthermore, the certificate is part of a suite of three professional qualifications, which also includes the EARMA European Certificate in Research Administration (ADMIN) and the EARMA European Certificate in...
Research Leadership (LEADER). Figure 1 outlines the target group of each certificate: once the programme is finally settled, a certified training that goes from the time of entering the profession to that of becoming leaders or senior experts in the field will be offered.

The certificate aims to improve the overall ability to support excellence in research across the research lifecycle and deal with a range of different EU funding schemes. The mandatory units of the two-year long Management qualification scheme include: (1) Developing and Implementing Policy and Strategy, (2) Gender Dimensions in Research and Research Management, (3) Managing and Supporting the Development of a Project Portfolio, (4) Understanding the International Research Environment and (5) Working with Management Information. In addition, participants can choose from a set of optional units: (1) Developing New Funding Opportunities, (2) Managing Legal and Regulatory Requirements, (3) Optimizing Unit and Organisational Performance, and (4) Supporting the Development and Implementation of Organisational Systems and Processes. Out-of-the-box are the modules that deal with gender in research (Horizon 2020 stresses the gender dimension), the understanding of the international research environment with its set of implications and challenges (e.g. cultural issues and conflicts that may arise), but also working with management information, among others.

This certificate may be the gateway to recognition of the profession of research manager in the HE sector as well as in research institutions, since it is approved by Ofqual and regulated through the common qualifications and credit framework (QCF), building on ECTS-credits (European Credit Transfer System) that is fully acknowledged throughout Europe. The qualification has links with the main professional associations of RMAs in Europe and internationally.

Although recognition of the research manager profession of is far from established, we use the definition of a profession as a ‘degree-level education with ongoing training and a mutual calling’ (Moore, 1970), but also a set of common and shared values. Research manager can be seen as an ‘emerging profession’ (Langley, 2012), and EARMA’s qualification is intended to be a driver for professional recognition.

---
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According to the list provided by the Japanese Cabinet Office, seven out of twelve ministries in Japan and their office come together to provide a competitive research fund. The total budget for the fund for the fiscal year of 2014 is about 407 billion JPY (about 3.9 billion USD), and over 80% of it is granted by MEXT, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science & Technology. This is done mostly through its two agencies, The Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) and The Japan Science and Technology Agency (JST). Please remember these names.

The fund comes from Japanese tax revenue, therefore the vast majority of it is intended for Japanese researchers working in Japanese institutions. Even becoming a co-PI or a sub-awardee is not an option for non-Japanese researchers in most programs. (They are not so explicitly mentioned, so I had to look through many guidelines for different programs to verify.) However, if the researcher belongs to an eligible Japanese research institution, s/he is welcome to apply, with a little issue of gathering information and having your English application reviewed by non-English-native judges, let alone the complicated, often Japanese-only, online application system.

Is there any positive news at all?

Well, Japan has been trying hard to promote international research exchange and collaboration. The above-mentioned JSPS is very good for sending/inviting researchers to/from Japan. Also, both JSPS and JST have started conversation with overseas funding agencies, such as the National Science Foundation and the European Commission, about funding collaboratively on joint research.

Such funds may not directly pay your research bills, but matching funds should make working with Japanese researchers a bit easier.

Moreover, JSPS and JST have offices overseas, so you may be able to talk to them directly. I will list them below, so please check them out for more specific opportunities.

Keiko Okano, Ph.D., University Research Administrator at Kyoto University in Kyoto, Japan, is a graduate of The University of Tokyo and University of California, Berkeley. She can be reached at okano.keiko.3v@kyoto-u.ac.jp
James Thurber is always enjoyable to read, but *The Secret Life of Walter Mitty* has long been my favorite of his stories. I didn’t see the movie, and I probably won’t. It’s hard to beat words that make me laugh out loud. I read it back in the day when I had more than a few silly daydreams of my own. For instance, I desperately wanted to be Mr. Spock or his brilliant child (Speck?). I equally desperately wanted to be the young amazing percussionist for John Denver. Believe it or not, those two are probably the least embarrassing, and they are embarrassing enough.

But, now that the movie is out, I have been tickling myself thinking about *The Secret Life of a Research Administrator*. I suspect that I am not the only one with these same fantasies:

1. It is Friday afternoon of an NIH deadline and I am putting on my jacket to go home early because every PI had their proposals in by Monday.
2. All of these proposals are in because the university policy states that they must be at the central office at least 5 days early, so of course they are.
3. All of my ongoing negotiations have resolved themselves this week with nary a squeak from anyone about language, including IP and jurisdiction.
4. After helping Professor Meanswell seventeen times with his budget, he arrives unexpectedly at my desk with a large bouquet of flowers and an even larger box of dark chocolate.
5. Grants.gov works better than FastLane.
6. The PI who tried to get by with purchasing “feminine hygiene products” on her p-card and calls it an “emergency medical expense” is hired by some other university.
7. I receive a call from a colleague at FDP yelling “Effort reporting has been abolished by the Supreme Court!”
8. Congress decides to keep its nose out of the research enterprise and increases funding to the agencies by 100%.

I am sure you are guffawing by now, but there is more:

9. All sponsors, federal and non-federal, decide to use the same data set, and only that data set (no add-ons) for all proposals.
10. PIs make sure that all expenses are accrued before the grant ends.
11. After several months, receipts suddenly turn up for the $21,000 a PI spent in personal cash in Africa and charged to an NSF grant.
12. The university finally realizes that the research infrastructure is sorely lacking enough staff and tells us to go hire all of the people we need.
13. Cost sharing has become a federal crime.
14. The graduate student that actually backed a rented jeep into a lake in Mongolia turned out to be the figment of a fitful dream. I woke up and ‘poof,’ it never really happened. Right.

Woo boy, we are just getting started, aren’t we?

15. I did NOT receive an A-133 audit report from a subrecipient that began with: “The [institution] does not have adequate systems and procedures in place to ensure that the federal funds it administers are properly accounted for and expended in compliance with regulations.”
16. The Omnicircular is condensed to 15 pages, and is in large print to boot.
17. The auditors that are hired by the OIG arrive actually understanding what it is they are doing.
18. All Program Officers are on top of the regulations and never think to ask for fringe benefits to be removed because it will stretch their grant dollars farther.
19. There is one F&A rate, and only one, that covers all sponsors.
20. IRBs and IACUCs are no longer needed.
21. FFATA? What is FFATA?

Well. This could go on and on, couldn’t it? So, best to put my coffee and daydreams away for the day. Have you noticed that the best stories we share are often those incidents that were the least funny at the time? Thank goodness for each other.

---

Diane Barrett has been in research administration for 29.99 years. After those formative years at various institutions, she now works as a Senior Research Administration consultant for rSmart, where she enjoys helping other research administrators make grants management easier. Her mother still does not understand what she does.
NCURA Global Fellowship –
Why a U.S.-Based Research Administrator Should Consider Applying

By Jesse J.K. Szeto

Have you ever wondered what to do when a researcher walks into your office with a $400,000 grant denominated in Euros or Japanese yen? Or perhaps you have signed off on a subagreement allocating a portion of an NIH grant to an institution in another country – does the subrecipient institution understand how to document effort properly, and will the investigators understand how to abide by the financial conflict of interest rules that they have signed off on?

It is a situation like these that persuaded NCURA member Leslie Schmidt from Montana State University to apply for an NCURA Global Fellowship in 2011. Accepting an almost $400,000+ grant from the University of Copenhagen and dealing with European Commission research grant rules for the first time seemed like good reasons to visit the origins of the funds as well as to understand the collaborating institution’s systems and mindset. The president of her university, like many other U.S. institutions, was on the lookout for “non-traditional” sources of research funds, especially as U.S. federal research funding has remained flat at best, and many state budgets have slashed support for higher education and research. In addition, the European Commission has allocated more than $100 billion for research funding through Horizon 2020, and U.S. institutions have been particularly singled out as a potential growth target for collaborating with European institutions. If your university has not already received a grant or otherwise participated in a European Commission-funded project, chances are that that will change in the near future.

At the same time, researchers in the U.S. have increasingly found that world-class research partners may very well be in different countries, and collaboration often requires sub-granting U.S. federal funds to institutions that may not have much experience with U.S. federal grant regulations. Of course, it is the prime recipient institution that is in the end ultimately responsible for the outcome of the project and for documenting the proper usage of grant funds, including any and all subrecipients. How, then, can a U.S. research administrator gain greater understanding of how partner institutions are interpreting and implementing the grant requirements and ensuring compliance with applicable regulations? One way to do this would be to use the NCURA Global Fellowship as a “site visit” to an institution and/or a country that your institution currently works or will work with in the near future.

For Linda Mason from Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, Oklahoma researchers and the state university system were interested in greater collaboration with researchers in the UK, and her fellowship to Brunel University in Uxbridge, UK (near Heathrow Airport), was useful for her to foster connections between Oklahoma researchers and Brunel University researchers. Her two-week visit included a presentation by her to Brunel University administration and researchers, involving both Vice Presidents for Research of Oklahoma University and Oklahoma State University, and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. It also gave her a chance to meet with representatives of UK research boards and directors of research centers. These and other meetings resulted in establishing direct alerts from Linda to Brunel University whenever appropriate international collaboration opportunities come up. At least one collaborative team between Dr. John Jiang of The University of Oklahoma and Dr. Garreth Taylor of Brunel University, both professors of electrical engineering, have pursued and received funding for research on small electricity grids.

Then again, sometimes it takes going to another country and situation in order to see with fresh eyes how issues might be addressed at your own institution. That was part of Jeremy Miner’s experience when he traveled from the University of Wis-
The application process for the NCURA Global Fellowship is a simple and effective process that ensures a potential Fellow has the requisite experience and institutional support to make the most use of the Fellowship experience. The requirements are:

✔ Minimum 5 years of experience in research administration.

✔ Minimum 5 years of active membership in NCURA. This can be waived if the applicant’s own institution agrees to serve as a Host Institution for a future NCURA Global Fellow.

✔ Institutional support as demonstrated by a Letter of Commitment from the applicant’s institutional leadership.

✔ Credentials and the ability to travel outside the applicant’s own country.

Potential applicants can find out more and download the application form from NCURA’s website: http://www.ncura.edu/MembershipVolunteering/Programs/NCURAInternationalFellowship.aspx

In the young history of the NCURA Global Fellowship program there have been a total of 15 fellows from among a wide range of institutions, including research-intensive universities, PUIs, and mid-sized research universities. What is common about these universities and the Global Fellows is their recognition that the research enterprise is no longer a “domestic affair”. In fact, it never was, but the increasingly global reach of scientific research, the coordinated research programs negotiated between funding agencies in different countries, and large-scale research framework programs that actively encourage and require research consortia to cross national boundaries have made this increasingly apparent. NCURA Fellows have had host institutions in Austria, Israel, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, and the UK. NCURA currently has two active Global Fellowship programs with two sister research organizations: (1) EARMA (European Association of Research Managers and Administrators) and (2) SARIMA (Southern African Research & Innovation Management Association). New Fellowship programs are in the works, and with the advent of NCURA’s Region 8 (International Region), it is fully possible that NCURA Global Fellows may undertake their fellowship while being hosted by a fellow NCURA member in a different country.

Just talk to any of the 15 NCURA Global Fellows — the fellowship is a life-changing, eye-opening, and career-enhancing opportunity. While researchers often travel internationally to conferences and workshops for professional development, this program is one of the few that is exclusively for research administrators to strengthen their professional expertise.
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By Charlene Blevens

The HHS Office of Inspector General recently released a select cost audit of a Florida university. The university was chosen for audit based on their high level of HHS funding and because prior audits conducted by HHS OIG and the Florida Auditor General contained significant findings.

The OIG auditors sampled a total of 222 transactions of which 74 were considered unallowable. On the basis of the sample results, the auditors estimated that, of approximately $24.8 million in transactions, the university charged at least $6.4 million in unallowable transactions and related facilities and administrative costs to HHS awards during fiscal years 2010 and 2011. The university disagreed with the overall findings. The majority of sampled costs related to NIH awards.

**Administration and Clerical Costs**

Twenty-seven questioned transactions were for salary costs for administrative and clerical work such as ordering supplies, performing general information technology work, and supervising data collections. The auditors’ position was that these costs should not have been charged directly to the award because they involved salaries of administrative and clerical staff, and neither the nature of the work performed on the projects nor any other circumstances justified any unusual degree of administrative support or showed that the employees were necessary for the performance of the awards. The basis for their findings was Circular A-21, § F.6.b. (2).

University officials disagreed with most of questioned costs on the basis that the administration and clerical costs were associated with specialized technical/programmatic employees who were also working on major projects which were an “unlike circumstance”. Many of the questioned costs were associated with a very large, multi-site, international diabetes-focused clinical trial. In the budget justification the university expressly stated that the project’s size, scope, and complexity reflected the “unlike circumstance” of a major project in which clerical and administrative expense could be charged. In another large, multi-site international clinical trial, the university specifically budgeted for a dedicated system administrator to help manage massive amounts of data.

The OIG responded that the documentation provided showed that the employees’ administrative activities were not related solely to the project to which their salary was charged. Rather, the employees’ administrative duties benefited multiple activities and they could not determine the percentage of effort the employees spent on administrative activities because the university’s effort reports did not reflect time spent on administrative tasks.

**Other Salary Related Questioned Costs**

Three questioned costs related to payments that the auditors found were in excess of the employees’ supported salary rates. The findings related to documentation standards in 45 CFR § 74.21 (b) (7). They included a retroactive salary increase, extra compensation in which the university had sponsor approval which was paid at time and a half and a $24 charge related to overtime. The university concurred with the extra compensation to the extent the approved extra compensation was paid at time and a half and did not seek recover for the $24 in overtime. The university’s position on the retroactive compensation was that they had provided ample documentation. The auditors did not concur.

Two questioned costs related to graduate school compensation that was in excess of NIH guidelines. One of the questioned costs related to an employee who was a student at the time of the proposal and later rehired as an Other Professional Services. The OIG questioned the cost on the basis that the documentation did not show that the employee was not a student at the time of the transaction. The second questioned cost was for a graduate student’s compensation that was within the allowable limit but exceeded the rate of awardable compensation. The university’s stated they had used rebudgeting authority, within NIH guidelines, to re-budget the funds to pay a higher compensation level. The auditors responded that the university did not provide any additional evidence to show that the work performed justified the pay in excess of a first-year postdoctoral stipend therefore, the amount paid was not reasonable. They referenced NIH guidance which allows institutions to re-budget funds to charge more than the awarded amount, provided that they observe the cost principles requiring reasonable compensation and that graduate student compensation will not be considered reasonable if it is in excess of the amount paid to a first-year postdoctoral scientist at the same institution performing comparable work.

The auditors also questioned salary for an employee hired for the sole purpose of distributing key chains for a large diabetes related clinical trial. University officials said that the university’s contract required it to engage in public relations efforts, including the use of incentive items such as key chains to encourage individuals to participate in a clinical trial. The OIG took the position that items such as key chains are equivalent to promotional items and unallowable and that university officials did not address the reasonableness of having an employee whose sole duty was to distribute these key chains. Since promotional items are unallowable, the compensation paid to any individual to distribute such items would also be unallowable (Circular, § J.1.f. (3)).

The last questioned cost was a terminal leave payout at 100 percent to the grant for an employee that had worked exclusively on the project for the period of time required to accrue the amount of leave in which the university paid her. The auditors stated that the university did not provide documentation to support its assertion that the employee’s leave was accrued working exclusively on the award.

**Non-Salary Questioned Costs**

Sixteen of the questioned were costs related to the purchase of laboratory supplies from a vendor in which the university also had two other agreements one of which was a sub-contact for bio-sample repository services. The laboratory supplies were purchased under an agreement established so that clinical trial sites could order and directly receive necessary laboratory supplies. The auditors questioned the treatment of purchases as vendor costs rather than subcontract costs. The auditors questioned the company’s treatment as a vendor when the substance of the work performed by the company was central to the work of the award and the company had responsibility for dealing directly with other subcontractors, giving them a decision-making role and responsibility for program com-
Eleven transactions were questioned in which the university charged shipping fees without documenting that the costs were allocable to the grant. The documentation did not track the destination or contents of the shipment therefore; the shipment could not be tied to the award. According to 45 CFR § 74.21(b)(7), recipient financial management systems shall provide for accounting records, including cost accounting records that are supported by source documentation.

Four Specialized Service Center transactions were questioned because the university did not provide a schedule of rates or a cost basis for its telecommunications center and did not always document the allocation of animal center costs on the basis of usage. University officials agreed that one telecom service center transaction was unallowable. However, officials believed their methodology for allocating research animal per diems was sufficient to support the costs claimed. The officials said that the investigators’ allocation methodologies were reasonably designed to charge projects in accordance with the proportional benefit each project received. Documentation that the university provided showed that the awards’ investigators split an invoice from the service center between multiple awards on the basis of percentage allocations. However, the investigators did not describe the method that they used to arrive at those percentages. The investigators listed several factors that they said were considered in making the allocations, but they did not describe their allocation methodology.

Transactions for general-use supplies such as toner, computers, and tablet computers, were questioned. The auditors stated that these costs should have been treated as F&A costs and not charged directly to the award. University officials argued that the Circular (§ C.3.(a)) allows it to direct charge certain non-salary costs that are normally treated as F&A, citing section D.2. which contains provisions that would allow it to directly charge certain costs normally treated as F&A. For the computer purchases, the university stated that the sponsor accepted the budget, which included the purchase of the computers and the computers were used solely on the award and were therefore allowable. The auditors did not agree stating that in making its argument, university officials did not consider whether the costs were necessary for performance of the award (the Circular § C.3.(a)). Notwithstanding the sponsor's approval of the budget, university officials did not provide documentation to show that the university used the computers solely on the award and, therefore, did not adequately address why the 17 computers should be directly charged to the award.

Other costs questioned included a charge for media consulting that the university paid without an agreement that specified either the service to be provided or the rate of compensation in violation of the regulations (Circular § J.37.b.(8)) and a donation to a non-profit and promotional items used for outreach efforts which are both unallowable (the Circular §§ J.15.a. and J.1.f.(3)). In its response the university stated that it had located the agreement which included a detailed scope of work and information on the costs charged. The cost was also addressed in a progress report. The auditor’s responded that the additional documentation did not include a signed contract with deliverables and that donations and promotional efforts were unallowable.

Another questioned cost centered on a contract the university had with a lab ware supplier that included a handling fee in the cost of the items; however, it routinely paid extra handling fees to receive partial shipments rather than ordering a full shipment. The university did not provide a justification for partial shipments. The auditors noted that one consideration for reasonableness is whether the type of cost is generally recognized as necessary for the conduct of the organization or the award performance (Circular § C.3.(a)). The university did not comment on this finding.

Finally the auditor’s questioned the purchase of fiber-optic cable without justification showing that it was used for the performance of the award. (Circular § J.31.c.). The university agreed that a portion of the transaction was unallowable to the extent the space cables were a contingency cost.

Charlene Blevens, CPA is the Director of Post Award Operations at the University of Miami. She is a Certified Fraud Examiner. She has worked in the financial area in both the public and private sector in various capacities for more than 23 years with more than 11 years’ experience at universities in research. She has presented at the NCURA, FRA, SRA and NACCA conferences. In addition she is the author of the Summary of University Audits, Settlements and Investigations located on the National Conference on College Cost Accounting (NACCA) website at www.costaccounting.org. She can be reached at c.blevens@med.miami.edu
A researcher’s external financial interest is not always a threat to research because it can also reflect opportunities that ultimately support the public good and the university’s research mission. The challenge facing universities is how to protect the objectivity of the research while also encouraging those beneficial opportunities. In addition, since each situation is unique, identifying and managing the potential conflict of interest (COI) requires developing a clear understanding of the situation and working with the disclosing individual (the person with the financial interest) to address the potential issues.

At the University of California, Irvine, a committee of faculty members from different academic disciplines reviews financial interests to identify and manage those that appear to conflict with an investigator’s research. The committee’s review meets the requirements of COI policies and protects the researcher by providing oversight from an objective third party. The four main components of our committee’s approach to managing financial interests are Collaborate, Educate, Analyze and Manage.

**Collaborate** — Disclosing individuals are the experts on their research projects while our committee and staff members are experts on COI issues. Therefore, encouraging collaboration between all parties, united by the desire to support research, facilitates the review process to address potential conflicts. When possible, we meet with researchers interested in developing outside financial interests to address proactively the committee’s concerns by discussing the researcher’s goals, the applicable disclosure requirements, potential conflicting interests, and possible solutions. We also have strong working relationships with other campus offices related to research (i.e. Sponsored Projects, Institutional Review Board, and the Technology Transfer Office) to coordinate the reviews and identify financial interests that require disclosure.

**Educate** — An effective training program establishes awareness in researchers about the different types of COI policies (i.e. university, state, and federal), the purpose of these policies, and—most importantly—the available university resources to address any issues. Our researchers complete a University of California developed online COI training that includes the relevant policies, procedures, and contact information. We also hold workshops at department and staff meetings to refresh the faculty and staff’s understanding of COI policies and procedures. These efforts highlight the committee and office’s support for research while also encouraging faculty and staff to consider COI issues as they develop their research plans.

**Analyze** — To address the unique characteristics of each situation, the COI committee and staff analyze every financial disclosure to identify potential risks to the objectivity of the research and any steps taken by the researcher to manage those risks. First, our staff conducts a pre-review of each disclosure and works with the disclosing individual to address potential questions the committee may have to facilitate the committee’s review. Then, the committee conducts the formal review of the disclosure, closely evaluating the study design, the disclosing individual’s role and influence in the study, the nature of the financial interest, the status of the company, the involvement of human subjects and/or students, etc.

**Manage** — UC Irvine’s standard practice for all related disclosable financial interests is to require public disclosure in publications, presentations, and informed consent documents (for human subjects research) related to the research project to promote transparency. In light of any unaddressed risks, the committee would require additional safeguards or, in cases of an apparent conflict of interest, a management plan. The committee and staff work with the disclosing individual to implement appropriate safeguards to mitigate those risks. In the rare situations where the conflict cannot be managed sufficiently by the safeguards, the management plan may be to eliminate the conflict by requiring the disclosing individual to divest or reduce the financial interest or be removed from the project.

Examples of safeguards include:

- Add a non-conflicted, independent faculty member (not under the supervision of the disclosing individual) as a co-investigator;
- Have a non-conflicted, independent statistician analyze the data;
- Disclose the financial interest to students.

Together, these components are essential to our management of conflicts of interest. The best scenario is one in which the disclosing individual acknowledges the apparent conflict and proactively implements measures to protect the research from any potential bias related to the financial interest. But the nature of conflicts is such that it is not always possible to recognize when one’s judgment may be influenced—even in the most subtle of ways. Therefore, the most important advice for university researchers interested in developing outside financial interests is to contact the COI office before acquiring the financial interest so the COI staff can help identify and address the potential COI issues.

**Nadia Wong, MPP, MSW, is the Conflict of Interest Administrator at the University of California, Irvine (UCI). She is responsible for collaborating with the Conflict of Interest Oversight Committee to review and manage the financial interests of UCI’s researchers.**

Nadia can be reached at nadiaw@uci.edu
WHAT’S IN A Name?

By Tricia Callahan

The power of a name has long been immortalized in poetry, mythology, prose, religious and other ceremonies. Countless books are on the market for soon-to-be parents citing the etymology and history behind thousands and thousands of names. A recent search in the book department on Amazon.com yielded 125,407 results of books on baby naming, some books touting over 100,000 names from which to choose!

Similar to the power of a name, the power and value of a title, especially in higher education, is of utmost importance. Between our BAs, BSs, CPAs, CRAs, DMDs, EdDs, DPAs, DVMs, LDs, MAs, MFAs, MDs, MDivs, ODs, PhDs, (the list goes on and on, with over 80 listed on the NSF FastLane site alone), those well-earned titles are important-and rightfully so. Also important is how individuals are identified or named in proposals. Proper identification helps reviewers to understand a person’s or organization’s role on the project. For instance, who is ultimately responsible for the direction of the project? Can more than one person assume leadership of the project? Why is it important to differentiate between consultants, vendors, and subaward organizations?

Elementary, you might think, but not always. Often investigators need our assistance in specifying how people should be identified in the proposal and in the proposal budget. To help clarify, below are some commonly used titles that appear in grant proposals, along with definitions and examples to help our investigators distinguish between appropriate titles or designations.

Principal Investigator (PI): The PI is often the lead scientist for a given project. The primary PI on a proposal or contract serves as the point of contact for that proposal or application. Often times the sponsoring agency will define the qualifications of a person who can serve as a PI. Additionally, institutions often define who can, as well as who cannot, service as a PI on a proposal for their institution.

Project Director (PD): At times, the PI and PD designations are used interchangeably. For instance, the NIH often uses the term PD/PI to represent “…the individual(s) judged by the applicant organization to have the appropriate level of authority and responsibility to direct the project or program supported by the grant.” There are times however, that a proposal might have a PI and a PD, with the PI acting as the fiscal representative for the grant, while the PD oversees the daily operations of the project or of a specific program.

Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI): More often than not, investigators forget that “co” signifies jointly or together. The term Co-PI implies a sharing of responsibility, and thus a sharing of scholarly credit for a given endeavor. Some agencies allow for multiple Co-PIs. Within the last few years, the NIH prohibited the use of Co-PI and opted in favor of a PI with co-investigators or a multi-PD/PI option. Investigators choosing the multi-PD/PI option are required to develop a leadership plan that outlines the roles and responsibilities of each PI, the fiscal management of the funds by each PI, the processes for making decisions on the scientific direction of the project, as well as allocation of resources, how data will be shared among investigators, ownership of intellectual property and publications, and procedures for resolving conflicts should they occur.

Co-Investigator (Co-I): The label “Co-Investigator” started being used more frequently when the NIH stopped allowing the use of Co-PI and encouraged instead the use of either multi-PD/PI lead projects or co-investigators. According to the NIH, a co-investigator is “An individual involved with the PD/PI in the scientific development or execution of a project…”

Senior Personnel: Often times the terms “senior personnel” and “key personnel” are used interchangeably. A senior or key person is an individual who contributes to the scientific development or execution of the project in a substantive and measurable way. Senior or key personnel are often given titles of principal investigator, project director, co-principal investigator, and co-investigator.

Key Personnel: (a.k.a., senior personnel). I recently read what I thought was a very telling, succinct exclusion definition of “key personnel.” According to PCORI (Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute), “…anyone who could be replaced without significantly affecting the direction or conduct of the project should not be listed as key personnel.” So when a faculty member asks, “Should I list my graduate student as key personnel?” you can ask “could any graduate student with similar training and qualifications fill that role?”

Other Personnel: The “other personnel” category is used to capture personnel who are not senior or key to the proposal. These are usually people who are not committing any specific measurable effort to the project and can be replaced without significantly affecting the aims of the project. Usually graduate students, undergraduate students, postdoctoral fellows, lab technicians, IT professionals, and clerical support are included in the “other personnel” category.

Participant: I once had a faculty member list his travel, travel for his graduate student, and all of his undergraduate student travel under “Participant Support” in an NSF proposal. His reasoning was that they had to travel to conduct the research, thus their travel costs should fall under “Participant Support.” Luckily for me, NSF has a very tight definition of what they consider “Par-
So, what's in a name you might ask?

“...That which we call a rose
By any other name would smell as sweet.”

-Romeo and Juliet

25,281: Number of NIH reviewers.
92% participated in review meetings and
8% reviewed by mail only.

73,636: NIH applications peer reviewed.

244,065: Total number of NIH reviews.

36,475 Number of NSF reviewers.
37% were on review panels and
63% reviewed by mail only.

48,999: NSF proposals reviewed.

187,512: Total number of NSF reviews.

Note: All data are from FY 2013.

Consultant: A consultant is an individual (or company) hired to provide a professional service or give professional advice for a fee. Typically consultants are not officers or employees of the performing organization and use their own equipment/materials (though some exceptions may apply).

Patient(s): For granting purposes, a patient is an individual or individuals who have or have had the condition under study. The category of “patient” may also include patient surrogates or caregivers.

Subawardee: It is often necessary to distinguish between a subaward organization (a.k.a., subawardee) and a vendor for reimbursement or procurement purposes. A subaward organization is one in which individuals (or an individual) from that organization are contributing to the scholarly or scientific conduct of the project as described in a statement of work for the organization. Often times the key personnel listed in a subawardee budget are included as PIs, Co-PIs, or co-investigators on the grant proposal.

Vendor: A vendor differs from a subaward organization in that they are a distributor or merchant who provides goods and services to many different purchasers. Vendors typically operate in a competitive environment, and while their goods and services contribute to the operation of the project, they do not contribute to the scientific conduct of the project.

While the list above is not 100% comprehensive, it does cover a good deal of the commonly used terms typically found in grant proposals. As always, it is of utmost importance to check your sponsor's guidelines and terminology definitions before adopting the use of any nomenclature (i.e., stick to your sponsor's terminology). Careful selection of the appropriate term will help define the roles that a particular individual or entity will play on the project.

Tricia L. Callahan, M.A., Director for Proposal Development at Miami University in Oxford, OH, is a graduate of NCURA’s Leadership Development Institute, a 14-year member of NCURA, and a current member of the NCURA Peer Review Counsel. Tricia oversees all training and education programs at Miami U., while assisting with pre-award and post-award non-financial activities. She can be reached at callahtl@miamioh.edu
According to dictionary.com, “Art” is: “skill in conducting any human activity; the principles or methods governing any craft or branch of learning: the art of something, the craft, trade, or profession using these principles or methods. Of skilled workmanship, execution, or agency.” Synonyms are: knack, facility, technical skill, skillfulness, know-how: craft, technique, skill; procedure, method, way; fine points, subtleties.

Research Administration is a complex profession. Difficult to describe to the layman, the faculty we serve, and to our families. To some faculty (a small but vocal minority), we can be viewed as the red tape, bureaucracy in the flesh, or the hindrance to the progress of research and the work they are trying to accomplish. Some of these misunderstandings and assumptions are easily made given the recently released faculty administrative burden survey indicating 42% of faculty time is spent on administrative tasks. Compound this with the F&A costs tacked onto each research dollar spent, there is an obvious problem to efficiency. But herein lies the point – there is a balancing act we must undertake between transparency, accountability, compliance, and audit risk with the efficient progress of research. We balance this everyday and it is core to the complexities we face. There is our daily reality and the perception others hold – these are often far apart from each other. This is just one example of the varying perspectives on our profession, it is this balancing that takes tact, strategy, and creativity all to affect a very important function in our nation’s vitality. It is an art – in and of itself.

What is our profession? What is it that we do? Not in the obvious, but in the abstract. We should think of ourselves, not as a function or a means to an action, but as artisans – creators, engineers of systems, and contributors to solutions. If symbolized into a medium of art—as a painter, our painting would be a collage of colors and shades of gray; as a composer, a symphony with various types of instruments timed in structure; as a writer, a Shakespearean tragedy or comedy. We are not mired in paperwork checking boxes. There is no technology to replace the true craft we perform.

For examples in the art of our profession, if informed of an audit coming to campus, internal controls, training, and support documentation are important tangible items for passing an audit, but the intangible items of managing the engagement, crafting of responses to questioned costs and communicating with the auditors are critically important to managing or removing audit findings. Here we must balance intent, subjectivity, and interpretation using skills of persuasion. Our deep understanding of audit, accounting, communication, law, etc., all play a part in this dance.

When crafting a policy for the institution, we must look to the regulations, review best practices and consider setting compliance requirements based on university resources and its environment. This must be balanced with administrative burdens on ourselves, staff and faculty. Moreover, we must mitigate our audit risks if we include policy statements above and beyond what is required in the regulations. Setting this balance, tweaking these dials just right, takes great precision and wisdom. Moreover, its affect on stakeholders: the organization, upper administration, faculty, and our staff is tremendous.

The importance of the use of “should” versus “shall”, “and” versus “or” when negotiating an agreement or crafting a policy takes critical thinking. The knowledge and depth one must posses to manage these responsibilities and mitigate the liability of the institution is often learned over years of experience.

We are empowered agents with significant responsibilities at every level. We are builders of models, designers of systems, salesmen, the front line, the tactician, the scapegoat, the expert, the solution, the problem, the cook, the cleaner, and the helper. Again, we wear a number of hats and pull from a variety of educational backgrounds to perform these roles. I believe our profession’s complexity is starting to be recognized and represented in the new Research Administration degree programs at a number of major universities. The existence and growth of these programs are testaments to our craft.

How we present ourselves, as professional artisans of a broad and complex job sector, is key; it takes skill to be in the middle of what is seemingly everything. We are the artists to the research enterprise and our profession is the method for movement of all parties in the infrastructure.

Jeremy Forsberg has over 20 years of experience in Research Administration. He has served in multiple capacities involving sponsored projects, technology transfer, regulatory compliance and electronic research administration. As the Assistant Vice President for Research at the University of Texas at Arlington he is responsible for the Offices of Grant and Contract Services, Regulatory Services, and Technology Management in addition to developing and implementing various institutional research strategies. He serves as the Designated Official for Export Control. Jeremy is actively involved in NCURA. He served as Chair of Region V in 2011. He currently serves on the Board of Directors as well as a workshop faculty for Sponsored Project Administration Level II. Jeremy is a graduate of the 2013 NCURA Executive Leadership Development program. He can be reached at j.forsberg@uta.edu
NEH funding for research on the Shroud of Turin as art, icon and relic

By Susan Meikle, university news and communications, meiklesb@MiamiOH.edu

Andrew Casper, assistant professor of art at Miami University, has been awarded two grants for his research on the 16th- and 17th-century artistic conception of the Shroud of Turin.

Casper — a specialist of Renaissance and Baroque art of southern Europe — received a Franklin Research Grant from the American Philosophical Society (APS) and a National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Summer Stipend.

The NEH summer stipend will support Casper’s continuous full-time research this summer on his book project, “Shroud of Turin as Art, Icon and Relic in Early Modern Italy.” His research looks at how early-modern devotional manuals draw from contemporary art theory to portray the Shroud’s imprint of Christ’s body as a divine work of art.

The APS research grant will fund his travel and related expenses to conduct research in Italy accessing key documents and period texts in the northern city of Turin, where the Shroud has been kept since 1578.

The Shroud of Turin as Art, Icon and Relic

The Shroud of Turin is a 14-foot linen sheet that displays life-size imprints of the front and back of what many believe is Jesus Christ’s body. Believers since the medieval period have revered it as the very burial cloth that wrapped his crucified corpse and still today regard the traces of blood preserved on it as authentic physical remains, said Casper.

The Shroud’s first public exhibition after its transfer to the city of Turin in 1578 initiated the period of its most heightened and unprecedented devotional enthusiasm, lasting through the following century. Its emerging preeminence catalyzed the mass production of dozens of devotional...
manuals and graphic reproductions for the purpose of perpetuating its cult following.

No historical study has yet utilized these sources to explore the Shroud’s prominence at this time, according to Casper.

His research will show how these texts and engravings reveal “hitherto unexplored intersections of theology and art theory in portraying, verbally and pictorially, the Shroud as an artistic image, though one divinely crafted out of Christ’s blood.”

Casper’s examination of the Shroud of Turin will culminate in a book “that fundamentally alters our understanding of one of the most notorious religious artifacts in existence,” he said.

He is the author of numerous essays and articles on 16th-century icons and the religious paintings from El Greco’s Italian period.

He recently published Art and the Religious Image in El Greco’s Italy (2014), the first book-length examination of the early career of El Greco, one of the early modern period’s most notoriously misunderstood figures. Casper uses El Greco’s early paintings to advance new ideas concerning the conception of religious imagery after the Council of Trent (1545-1563).

Casper also received a grant from Miami’s office of international education’s Philip and Elaina Hampton Fund for Faculty International Initiatives for his research on the Shroud of Turin.

In the last five competitions the NEH Summer Stipends program received an average of 960 applications per year. The program made an average of 80 awards per year, for a funding ratio of eight percent.

Casper received his doctorate from the University of Pennsylvania in 2007. He joined Miami as visiting assistant professor in 2007 and became assistant professor of art in 2009.

The original story can be found here: http://miamioh.edu/news/top-stories/2014/06/casper-neh-grant-turin-top-story.html
If you want to share a “cool” project idea, please email Danielle Anthony at danthony@wsu.edu
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**Attain is a clear path forward.**

With a legacy of more than 30 years helping colleges, universities, and academic medical centers improve their strengths and capabilities and optimize operations, we’ve honed a successful approach and the proven solutions that enable progress.

In today’s new regulatory environment, we provide the expertise and perspective to help you navigate OMB Uniform Guidance and regulatory compliance matters for continued success.

In partnership with our clients, Attain delivers quality analyses, recommendations and research administration services that yield effective and accurate cost recovery, compliance performance, and the transformation to advance and achieve your mission.

To learn more about us, visit [www.attain.com](http://www.attain.com).
We’re eager to work with you.

---

Our experts have experience negotiating from both sides of the table—delivering the highest quality advice from both Federal and university perspectives.
YOUR INSTITUTION COULD BE AT RISK

Your institution is awarded millions of dollars of federal research grants every year, are your financial compliance issues in order? Is your administrative infrastructure in place? If not, getting future grant awards might be difficult.

RACS is here to help. We perform analytical and compliance reviews to help you put the correct organizational structure in place today, as well as the policies and procedures to keep you compliant for tomorrow. In addition, we identify your staffing requirements, training needs and all the tools and reports you need to maintain the highest level of accountability.

The RACS assessment will provide a detailed report showing you how to minimize communication breakdowns among your staff, eliminate research faculty complaints, increase your service to the research community, and maintain audit compliance. Or if you prefer, RACS can implement our findings to ensure proper execution and ongoing compliance.

For more information or to initiate a pre- or post-award functional assessment, contact Charlie Tardivo today.

RACS
RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION CONSULTING SERVICES

(216) 403-8176
FAX (216) 221-8066
GRANTSRESEARCH@YAHOO.COM

Visit us at booth #307 at the NCURA Annual Meeting

Electronic Research Administration (eRA) Software in the Cloud based on Kuali Coeus

Launch a Private Ekualiti Software Trial with Vivantech’s 1ClickLaunch
vivantech.com/ekualiti-trial/

Save Time
Reduce administrative burden and spend more time on research

Deliver Results
Streamline research administration lifecycles with an integrated system for proposals, awards, and compliance

Reduce Cost
Pay no licensing or annual maintenance fees, and avoid restrictive vendor lock-in

Vivantech, Inc. 2020 Camino del Rio N. Ste. 700 San Diego, CA 92108 619.298.4824 ext. 24
This is Piet Mondrian’s Red Mill.
I saw this painting in person at the Gemeltsmuseum in The Hague. Its postcard image now hangs on my refrigerator in Boston. I am always struck by its minimal use of color and the pure functionality of its subject. Like research and administration, the mill conjoins nature and technology.

Vivian Holmes, Director, Sponsored Research, Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard

Title: No. 14, 1960  By Mark Rothko
What I like about Rothko’s work is that at first glance, the big blocks of color look so straight-forward and simple. But as you look closer, you notice all of the finer details and how the colors blend together or separate—it’s much more complicated than your initial impression. I think the same thing can be said about research administration—what seems simple at a first look can actually be much more interesting when you get into the details.

Robert Andresen, Director of Research Financial Services, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Title: Jimson Weed  By Georgia O’Keeffe
I enjoy O’Keeffe distinctive style, which is simple and beautiful.

Nadia Wong, Conflict of Interest Administrator, University of California Irvine

Edible Research Art — A University of Tennessee Health Science Center faculty member created these cute and yummy cookies to reward the sponsored projects office for a successfully negotiated industry agreement.
The Art of Research Administration

By Ty M. Neffert

When I think of art, I consider the variety of mediums available that I personally appreciate and enjoy: paintings in water color or oil, photography, sculpture, video, live theatrical productions, fine cuisine . . . the list goes on and on.

However, when an area of study is referred to as “an art,” it’s more difficult to recognize as such and one is allowed considerable liberties in self-definition. Per the title of this monologue, I intend to describe the profession of research administration as an art. My flexibility of interpretation may be best illustrated by paraphrasing an infamous quote from Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart: The art of research administration, like pornography, is hard to define, but I know it when I see it.

Once the veil is lifted and recognition dawns, connoisseurs of research administration experience visceral reactions of appreciation and enjoyment when contemplating the art. We feel a warm glow all over, particularly when such contemplation is accompanied by two or three fingers of fine Irish whiskey, neat.

Many of you, dear readers, share the appreciation and enjoyment of an institutionally-approved proposal cleanly submitted well before the deadline, or receipt of an agreement with detailed and acceptable terms and conditions and full F&A, or a tidy project file neatly labelled with black ink on a crisp white label. While I’m dating myself with the latter, I can’t help but share that back in the day Livlonenproser University’s attention to file preparation and maintenance was so stunningly impeccable and pristine that it was file …. ecstasy. Even now, my knees weaken when I recall with pride the rows of matching ecru five-drawer cabinets containing color-coded-by-sponsor hanging files, two-hole punched to perfection with nary a rogue sticky note. Such attention to detail, such unsullied consistency, put to shame Hyacinth Bucket’s postage stamp positioning on Keeping Up Appearances.

Once the veil is lifted and recognition dawns, connoisseurs of research administration experience visceral reactions of appreciation and enjoyment when contemplating the art. We feel a warm glow all over, particularly when such contemplation is accompanied by two or three fingers of fine Irish whiskey, neat.

Many of you, dear readers, share the appreciation and enjoyment of an institutionally-approved proposal cleanly submitted well before the deadline, or receipt of an agreement with detailed and acceptable terms and conditions and full F&A, or a tidy project file neatly labelled with black ink on a crisp white label. While I’m dating myself with the latter, I can’t help but share that back in the day Livlonenproser University’s attention to file preparation and maintenance was so stunningly impeccable and pristine that it was file …. ecstasy. Even now, my knees weaken when I recall with pride the rows of matching ecru five-drawer cabinets containing color-coded-by-sponsor hanging files, two-hole punched to perfection with nary a rogue sticky note. Such attention to detail, such unsullied consistency, put to shame Hyacinth Bucket’s postage stamp positioning on Keeping Up Appearances.

NCURAbly Pedantic
NCURAbly Pedantic is written by long-standing NCURA members, all under pseudonym protection.
Five procurement methods are authorized in Section 200.320 (a) through (f) — note (e) was accidentally excluded as a typographical error: (1) small dollar purchases, (2) informal competition, (3) formal, advertised sealed bids, (4) competitive proposals, and (5) sole source procurements. A-110 did not identify these five specific methods, nor were there prescriptive rules around procurement methodology. For example, Section 200.323 (a) includes a new requirement to “make independent estimates before receiving bids or proposals”. The process for meeting this requirement is unclear, and there is no further guidance regarding this requirement. Section 200.323 (b) requires profit to be negotiated as a separate element on all sole source procurements. This implies that the requirement applies to all sole source orders above $3,000. This could cause significant delays to the ordering process and ultimately to the timely receipt of goods and services by researchers, as this was not required in the past; simply that some form of cost/price analysis be performed.

Contract Provisions (Appendix II)

Your institution’s grant terms and conditions which apply to contractors (formerly called vendors) and are attached to contracts, will require revision to reflect the updated “Contract Provisions for Non-Federal Entity Contracts under Federal Awards” (Appendix II to Part 200). Many of the same provisions have been carried forward from the A-110, but note that four new contract provisions are required: (A) remedies for breach of contract terms, (B) termination for cause and convenience, (K) procurement of Recovered Materials (200.322), and (H) mandatory standards and policies relating to energy efficiency.

COGR and others are seeking clarification from COFAR on some of these requirements. Stay informed of updates on these clarifications by checking the COFAR website frequently, and keep current with the other relevant professional associations that your institution belongs to, as they may have articles and webcasts on the Uniform Guidance. Also consider engaging with your internal teams as appropriate, to assist with interpreting how the new requirements may intersect with existing institutional, local or state rules.

If you haven’t already, start preparing for the changes by working with your process partners and stakeholders, in order to make the transition to the new rules as seamless and efficient as possible for your faculty and staff. **If staff and leaders on your campus responsible for Property and Procurement are not already aware of and involved in the discussion of the new Uniform Guidance, share this article and get the conversation started today!**

Finally, watch for upcoming articles in the *NCURA Magazine* covering effort reporting and F&A rate implications. Both sections of Uniform Guidance are likely to impact most of our institution’s practices, policies and potentially our systems.

---

**Erin Fay** is Assistant Director of Equipment Inventory at the University of Washington. She has been involved in higher education financial accounting and equipment management for over 10 years. She is a CPA and received a Bachelor of Arts in Business Administration from Washington State University. She can be reached at erinfay@uw.edu

**Carla Helm** is Associate Director of Procurement Services at the University of Washington. She has been involved in higher education procurement for over 25 years. She holds a lifetime C.P.M. (Certified Purchasing Manager), and has participated at the regional and national level of the National Association of Educational Procurement. She received a Bachelor of Arts in Zoology from the University of Washington. She can be reached at chelm@uw.edu

---

**Collaborate Superstar: Stacy Leslie**
Associate of Financial Accounting, McNeese State University

As someone new to university research administration, NCURA’s Collaborate website has been a valuable resource. Not only does the website help me stay current on legal issues and revisions to federal and granting agency policies and procedures, but perhaps more importantly, the site also allows me to ask questions, brainstorm, and monitor trends and topics of importance at other universities. My colleagues freely share their knowledge and expertise, and through Collaborate, I am quickly building a large network of peers that I can rely on as I navigate the challenges of research administration.

Join the conversation at: [http://collaborate.ncura.edu/home](http://collaborate.ncura.edu/home)
Lesson 7
If you're not having fun then you're not doing it right.

It was a pleasure to work hard as a team and be rewarded with an exceptional turnout. We received many compliments that this was a great meeting and attendees were happy to be involved. Finding joy in working hard is infectious and perpetuates itself, and many positive comments were given during the meeting about the strong program and abundant opportunities for networking.

I’m not so sure that the geese taught me that if you’re not having fund then you’re not doing it right, but if you follow these simple guidelines that geese can teach you, you too, will achieve success. Throughout the whole planning my colleagues all supported me and asked if I was still surviving (or one person put it, do you still have hair?). My comment was always “this is so much fun!” And it was. Use that mantra as your compass as you navigate each hurdle and remember what geese can teach you.

What Geese Taught Me...
Continued from page 39

we supported each other every step of the way. Our common goals and sense of purpose had created the trust and energy we needed to complete the task and create a meaningful program.

Sue Kelch is a Senior Research Financial Specialist in the Department of Otolaryngology’s Kresge Hearing Research Institute at the University of Michigan. She provides financial oversight for the departmental research and institute. She has been a member of NCURA since 2007 and is currently Chair for Region IV. She also served on various task forces and the Communications Committee. Sue can be reached at suekelch@umich.edu
You want the BEST

YOUR sponsored program operation.
YOUR faculty's productivity.
YOUR risk management.

Use the BEST

OUR experienced research administrators.
OUR National Standards.
OUR established program.

NCURA Peer Review Program

NCURA Peer Review: delivering to you the BEST review of your operations

The only research administration review program that has established National Standards reflecting characteristics of effective sponsored program operations. NCURA Peer Review is a parallel administrative process to an academic program review.

For questions or further information or to obtain a copy of the newly revised National Standards contact peerreview@ncura.edu or call (503) 364-1847. Learn more about the review process by visiting http://www.ncura.edu/InstitutionalPrograms.aspx
Dear Region I friends,

Summer…it’s finally here. For me, it usually means shorter commutes, long weekends and a nasty farmer’s tan. For most of us, the work does not cease. Research continues, grant deadlines loom, and we persist in fighting the good fight. The summer is also a good time to reflect on the past academic year and also to anticipate projects and initiatives for the upcoming one. More importantly, the summer is a good time for me to update my IPod! Out with the old and in with the new. So, I say “hello” to tracks from Pharrell Williams, John Legend, Paramore, Calvin Harris and even Michael Jackson. And who is behind this angelic voice coming from an apparently very young Ariana Grande?? No, I am not becoming a dirty old man, just in case if you were wondering.

The 2014 Region I Awards were announced at the Spring Meeting in Mystic, Connecticut. Heartiest congratulations to the following deserving Region I recipients:

Distinguished Service Award (this award goes to someone who has made a significant contribution to the region over a very, very long time – rumor has it that the region is contemplating renaming the award after Pat, the official Godfather of Region I!)
Patrick Fitzgerald, Harvard University

Merit Award (the name of the award speaks for itself, and this year’s awardee was certainly worthy following her extensive service to the region)
Karen Woodward Massey, Harvard University

Outstanding New Professional (ambitious, rising star, unlimited potential)
Elizabeth Haney, Wyss Institute, Harvard Medical School

Outstanding Volunteer (selfless, dedicated, unsung hero)
Alison Wellman Smith, Harvard University

Spring Meeting Travel Awards
Janet Albarado, Keene State College
Kayla Carroll, Worcester Polytechnic Institute
Alexandria Ferreira, Tufts Medical Center
Denise Rouleau, New England School of Acupuncture

The Spring Meeting was highlighted by the poignant and sincere remarks from Dr. Karen Antman, Provost of the Boston University Medical Campus and Dean of the School of Medicine, about the current state of federal funding of research and how research institutions are dealing with the realities of limited funds.

NCURA President, Vivian Holmes, also came “home” and graced us with her influential presence at the Spring Meeting. Overall, a great group of volunteers came together, once again, to put together a fantastic experience. We are truly blessed to have so many that are willing to give so much.

On June 11th, the Region I Curriculum Committee led by Kirsten Pennarun and She1la Batelman put forth an RADG called “Building Bridges to Navigate Organizational Structures.” Leaders from Tufts University, Baystate Medical Center, Partners Healthcare, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center and Boston University served on a panel that openly discussed their various organizational structures and their attempts, successful and unsuccessful, to create efficiencies in the administration of research. Afterwards, the fifty plus attendees held their hands and formed a human bridge in the parking lot. We want to thank Emmanuel College for hosting the event and for being a wonderful partner with the Region. Please note that starting in September, the RADGs will have a new home. Please look to our website for updates.

That’s it for now, Region I. I leave you with the memorable words from a song that had a major impact on my adolescence: “I wanna rock right now…I’m Rob Base and I came to get down…I’m not internationally known, but I’m known to rock the microphone…” (Rob Base & DJ E-Z Rock, “It Takes Two”).

Jeff Seo is the Chair of Region I and serves as the Director of Research Compliance at Harvard Medical School. Jeff can be reached at jeff_seo@hms.harvard.edu.
The Hilton is within walking distance to many of Baltimore’s most visited attractions and overlooks Oriole Park at Camden Yards, one of the nation’s finest baseball stadiums. It is next door to the Camden station of the Marc Train for Washington, DC commuters as well as the light rail line from Baltimore’s Penn Station and the Baltimore-Washington International Airport. If you are interested in being on the Program Committee or would like to volunteer at the meeting, please contact Anne Albinak or Ted Fehskens (Johns Hopkins School of Public Health).

Elections! Thank you to everyone who participated in the officer election survey that went out in May. As noted, the regional elections have been moved up due to the change in the National Annual Meeting dates. Although regional officers don’t start their terms until January of each year, there are workshops and other opportunities that occur simultaneously with National that are important for the newly elected officers to attend. You’ll receive an e-blast notifying you of your newly elected officers soon!

And speaking of National, we are looking forward to seeing you all for an exciting 56th Annual Meeting (August 10-13, 2014) in Washington, D.C.! As in previous years, we will be offering a host of activities to encourage networking and socializing with regional colleagues, such as a newcomer’s reception, a Professional Development Committee mix-and-learn, dinner groups, and the hospitality suite and commuter’s lounge (#2101). Watch for upcoming e-blasts with more details! I’d also like to congratulate our National Travel Award winners. This year’s recipients are: Kira Bokalders (Carnegie Mellon University) and Louise Forman (Rutgers University). Congratulations! If you would like more information on our regional awards, and how to apply, visit our website: http://ncurarregionii.org/awards

Also, be on the lookout for more traveling workshops coming your way! Our Professional Development Committee has been hard at work signing up new hosts for our existing workshops; and also designing new offerings based on your requests and new developments in our field. Of particular interest this year is our new OMNI Circular half-day workshop, to help prepare us all for the “Uniform Guidance” coming this December to a Circular near you! Currently we have the following OMNI workshops scheduled:

- **Temple University**, 9/26, 9am-12pm. Registration deadline is 9/19!
- **New York University**, 9/30, 9:30am-12:30pm. Registration deadline is 9/23!
- **Montclair State University**, 10/3, 9am-12pm. Registration deadline is 9/26!

If you don’t see a workshop in your area, we can always come to you! Did you know that host organizations receive two free registrations to the next Region II conference? For more information on our workshops and becoming a host institution, visit our website: http://ncurarregionii.org/pdc

If you’d like to learn more about maximizing the benefits of your Region II membership, exploring ideas for enhancing professional development and programming, or volunteering at regional and national activities, feel free to contact me directly or through our website: http://ncurarregionii.org/contact

I hope everyone is enjoying their Summer! Don’t forget to follow us on Facebook at: https://www.facebook.com/groups/ncurarregionii and Twitter: @NCURAREGIONII

---

_See the full document for the rest of the content._
NCURA Region III has partnered with Custom Ink (via their Booster fundraising service) to offer a great t-shirt for only $20! All of the proceeds from these t-shirt sales go directly to support the NCURA Education Scholarship Fund. These shirts are available for a limited time only (orders must be placed on or before August 31st). Show your Region III pride and help support a great cause!

Here is the link to place your order:
http://www.booster.com/ncuraeducationscholarshipfund?utm_source=FTSBemail

Region III sends congratulations to the individuals listed below who recently received their CRA certifications:

Erin Blackwell – University of Central Florida
Ladonna Bullman - Mississippi State University
Amanda Coveney - University of Central Florida
Alexandra Credle – Virginia Commonwealth University & State University
Lloyd Douglas - University of North Carolina @ Greensboro
Donna Frazee - University of West Florida
Kelley Gentry - University of Florida
Maggie Hassan - Emory University
Tonia Lambert - University of Florida
Mark Lynam - Tennessee Technological University
James Mazzulla - University of Florida
Linnea Minnema - University of Tennessee College of Nursing
Terry Moore - University of Florida
Lore Parran - Emory University
Ginny Pellam - University of Central Florida
Mary Wood - University of Mississippi
Bonnie Wright - Florida State University

We look forward to seeing our Region III travel awardees at the National Annual Meeting! Congratulations to Natasha Stark (Georgia State University) and Victoria Dean (Eastern Virginia Medical School)

It is with a heavy heart that we report the passing of Sheila Maureen Kelly Tice on May 13th. Maureen was a dear friend to many, a NCURA member for many years and worked at the St. Jude’s Medical Research Hospital in Memphis.

You can now follow us with the rest of your social media friends and contacts on Facebook at NCURA Region III and on Twitter @ncuraregioniii

“I need to start this article with the above quote, as it rings entirely true for me and I hope for you as well. The opportunities to become involved with NCURA are as varied as the people who volunteer, and there are ways you too can make contributions! Becoming involved with NCURA is highly rewarding and validates you as a research administrator. And NCURA recognizes those who are involved!”

Read on …

The Region IV Spring is not only a professional development and networking opportunity. It is also a time for us to reflect on our membership and recognize their achievements. This year we had two recipients of the Distinguished Service Award, Jeremy Miner, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire and Craig Reynolds, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor.

Here is what colleagues said about Jeremy Miner:

Jeremy is a consummate professional. He is quick with praise and thank you’s for all those around him. He is an active NCURA member at the national and regional levels, serving on committees, presenting workshops and concurrent sessions, and serving as an advisor, mentor, advocate and sounding board for his colleagues.

Here is what colleagues said about Craig Reynolds:

Craig is one of the rare individuals who has made a name for himself at the National level yet continues to be a force within our Region. He quietly, unassuming and bumbly works in the background to make the people that are on the dais look good.

Sue Kelch accepts the gavel from Jeremy Miner to become Region IV Chair

REGION IV
Mid-America
http://www.ncuraregioniv.com

https://www.facebook.com/pages/Ncura-Region-IV/134687746605561

Bill Lambert serves as Region III’s newsletter contributor and is Assistant Dean for Research Administration at Emory University’s Rollins School of Public Health.
working to provide Region IV members with the quality professional development experience we have all come to take for granted; and through it all is thoughtfulness and composed, and exerts as a consensus builder.

We wish to congratulate both Jeremy and Craig on receiving their well-deserved awards.

Winners of travel awards include Anna Taylor from the University of Michigan School of Dentistry (Spring Travel Award) and Becky Hackett from The University of Notre Dame (National Travel Award). Congratulations to our travel award winners!

Congratulations are also in order to all elected for the Region IV Board, they include: Kirsten Yehl, Northwestern University (Chair-Elect); Bonniejean Zitske, University of Wisconsin (Treasurer-Elect); Tricia Callahan, Miami University (Secretary); and at-large board members Katherine Durben, Marquette University; Lori Kaser, The Ohio State University; and Greg Luttrel, The University of Notre Dame. (Note that per our organizational by-laws, as the runner-up for Chair Elect, Greg Luttrel will serve a one-year term as an At-Large Board Member.)

I would like to extend sincere appreciation to all our members who volunteered to run for elected office and a thank you to those members who serve on the Board. We appreciate your willingness to serve. We would also like to thank out-going Board members Michelle Schoenecker, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (Secretary) and at-large member Kevin Roberts, Mayo Clinic for all of their hard work on the Region IV Board.

As for the National Board, Region IV has multiple members serving including: Bob Andresen, University of Wisconsin (Treasurer-Elect); Heather Offhaus, University of Michigan (Treasurer-Elect); and Board of Directors David Lynch, Northwestern University; Craig Reynolds, University of Michigan; and Beth Seaton, Northwestern University.

And although the election outcome for National will be final by the time this comes to print, Region IV had three candidates on the slate, including: Bob Andresen, University of Wisconsin (Treasurer-Elect); Joanne Altieri, University of Chicago; and Glenda Bullock, Washington University (Board of Directors).

If you attended PRA or FRA, you should be proud to know that Tricia Callahan, Miami University and David Lynch, Northwestern University each served as Program Co-Chairs.

Let me finish by saying, these are a few of Region IV members who have made a difference. Have you ever wanted to make a difference? Now you can! We want to hear from you. After the National Meeting we will roll out a membership survey asking you what you think makes a difference and what you would like to see offered.

Enjoy your summer and see you at National!

Sue Kelch serves as the Chair of Region IV and is Research Finance Manager in the Department of Otolaryngology, University of Michigan.

As the deadline for my first regional corner article approached, I was apprehensive. What should I talk about? How will I ever fill the space? What can I say that hasn’t been said before? So I shuffled through my virtual NCURA file and found I actually have the opposite problem; there is so much to talk about!

So, let me start with the congratulations … Congratulations to Dr. Susie Sedwick, our 2014 Distinguished Service Award Winner. Susie (affectionately known as one of the Region V “Divas”) is the Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs and the Associate Vice President for Research at the University of Texas at Austin. Susie is a strong supporter of our region. Her devotion to region V is known to all, and she is very deserving of this special recognition.

I also want to congratulate our newly elected officers. As of the close of the Region V spring meeting, Kathleen Kissmann, Texas A&M University System, is our new Chair-Elect; her main responsibility is to plan the Spring 2015 meeting, which will be held in Houston, Texas, on April 19-22. Starting their terms January 1, 2015 will be: Katie Plum, Angelo State University, Treasurer; Daniel Marangoni, Rogers State University, At-Large Executive Committee Member; and Amanda Miller, University of Texas at Dallas, At-Large Executive Committee Member. Scott Davis, University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, transitions into the position of Immediate Past Chair.

The final congratulations go to Katherine Kissmann, TAMU System, and Sandra Harrod, University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, as the winners of iPad Minis at our business meeting.

Unfortunately, I must share the unfortunate news of the death of Janice Spain Fox. Jan worked for Texas Christian University for 39 years until her retirement in 2008. She was a long-time member of NCURA. Scott Davis remembers her fondly, “I shared a cab with Jan from the airport to the Washington Hilton the last year she attended the NCURA annual meeting. I remember Jan saying as we got closer to the Hilton, ‘The Washington Hilton is like home. We have been coming here so many...
REGION VI
Western
www.ogrd.wsu.edu/r6ncura

Dear Colleagues and Friends,

For this regional corner, Sam and Leslie have decided to join forces since our regions are co-hosting many events at the annual meeting and our upcoming regional meeting. By the time this article gets issued, likely many of us will be partaking in all that the 56th annual meeting has to offer. Look for us at the new member reception, hospitality suite and our regional lunches. We hope you get a chance to bring your families to our nation’s capital and enjoy all that Washington D.C. has to offer.

2014 Regional Meeting Update

Looking ahead to October (5th – 8th) we will be in Reno, Nevada. We are pleased to offer reasonable hotel and registration rates so if your institution is suffering from “budget constraints” as many of us have, this might be the one you can afford. It is also one of the last chances to hear the latest about the Uniform Guidance before going live in December. We would like to invite members from other regions to attend if they wish – we’re a nice and friendly bunch (well, most of the time…we try anyhow) and this could be a great opportunity to come out West! Our program will be ready to roll soon. “Take a Chance!” and join us.

Travel Award Winners Announced

Leslie wants to extend a hearty congratulations to the annual meeting travel award recipients, Dianthony Davis from University of Colorado, Denver and Spencer Thomas from the Huntsman Cancer Institute for Region VII. Thanks to Marjorie Townsend, Sara Streich, Julie Gallegos and Elizabeth Sexton from Region VII for serving on the selection committee.

Sam congratulates the Region VI awardees: Heather Pittman and Christopher Avalos from University of California, Irvine; Lisa Lopez from California State University, Fullerton; and Laurie Mattinson from Sonoma State University. Our Region VI selection committee provides outstanding service to this region. We recognize Michiko ‘Mich’ Pane, Chair, from Stanford University; Cora Diaz, University of California, Santa Barbara;

I want to close by thanking all who attended our 2014 regional meeting in Austin. The final headcount was 202; our second-largest meeting in history. Can we beat that in Houston in 2015? Let’s try!

Hollie Schreiber serves as Chair of Region V and is Manager, Ag Sponsored Programs Administration, at Oklahoma State University.

REGION VII
Rocky Mountain
http://ncuraregionvii.asu.edu

Maren Boyack, University of Alaska; and Stella Sung, University of California, Irvine, for their continued service to this most important effort!

We look forward to seeing you at the annual meeting.

Lead Me expanded to Region VII

We are pleased to announce the merger with Region VII into the Lead Me Program. Traditionally, the Lead Me Program has been the professional development program for Region VI modeled after the national LDI program. We have had 4 years of proven success in grooming leaders for the future of Region VI and national. The expansion of this program will only strengthen the collaborative spirit between regions and continue to ensure there is a depth of groomed leaders in both regions to continue the level of excellence. You may learn more about the program at the Annual Meeting or at the website: http://www.ogrd.wsu.edu/r6ncura/leadme.aspx

2015 Regional Meeting

And finally, we are pleased to announce that Salt Lake City has been selected as the site location for the 2015 Region VI/VII Meeting scheduled for October 4th – 7th, 2015. Furthermore, the selected hotel has extended exceptional rates for the membership with fantastic amenities including free internet service in guest rooms and free parking. An announcement with more information about the meeting and how to book your room will be sent in late summer; however, mark your calendars today for Salt Lake City in 2015!

We hope to see you soon at one of these venues.

Samantha Westcott serves as Region VI Chair and is the Manager, Sponsored Projects Team, The Saban Research Institute - Children’s Hospital, Los Angeles.

Leslie Schmidt, serves as the Region VII Chair and is Assistant Vice President for Research at The Montana State University.
NCURA’s Traveling Workshops head to St. Louis
October 13-15, 2014

Expand and enhance 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

**Financial Research Administration Workshop**
- The inter-relationship between pre and post-award financial research administration
- Costing elements in OMB Circular A-21
- Cash management issues
- Issues relating to service centers
- Close-out requirements
- Audits

**Fundamentals 2.0: 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
- Requires online pre-work (approximately 2 hours)
- Newly reformatted agenda allows for more interactive case studies
- Provides participants with a broad overview of the core aspects of research administration:
  - Compliance Issues
  - Proposal Preparation and review
  - Negotiation and acceptance of awards
  - Financial and administrative management
  - Close-out and audit

Registration and hotel information is available at [www.ncura.edu](http://www.ncura.edu)

[NCURA logo] supporting research...together
NATIONAL TRAVELING WORKSHOPS
DEPARTMENTAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP
St. Louis, MO.................................................................October 13-15, 2014
FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP
St. Louis, MO.................................................................October 13-15, 2014
FUNDAMENTALS 2.0: SPONSORED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP
St. Louis, MO.................................................................October 13-15, 2014

REGIONAL MEETINGS
REGION VI/VII: WESTERN/ROCKY MOUNTAIN
Reno, NV.................................................................October 5-8, 2014

NATIONAL CONFERENCES
56TH ANNUAL MEETING
Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, DC .........................August 10-13, 2014
9TH PRE-AWARD RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION CONFERENCE
Walt Disney World Swan & Dolphin Resort, Orlando, FL ..........March 2-4, 2015
16TH FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION CONFERENCE
Walt Disney World Swan & Dolphin Resort, Orlando, FL ..........March 5-7, 2015

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

DEADLINES FOR OCTOBER/NOVEMBER 2014
Submission of Articles to Contributing Editors ......................September 5, 2014
Submission of Articles to Co-editors ...................................September 12, 2014
Submission of Advertisements ...........................................September 12, 2014

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