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ON THE COVER: Welcome to 2016 and a new year of NCURA Magazine! This is my first edition as Senior Editor, and “Small Starts, Big Finishes.” is a great theme on so many levels. There are some really great articles around this theme.

You’ll find a very nice description of Region VI’s Lead Me program—a mentoring program started at the regional level. It pairs very nicely with a new column from Garry Sanders entitled “Ask the Leadership Coach.” Garry is a long-time NCURA member, and while he’s retiring from the SUNY system, he now does leadership coaching. I’m also proud to introduce a new Senior Administrators column from Susie Sedwick. In this issue Susie explores the administrative burden footprint created at universities.

Perhaps my favorite article is from Tadashi Sugihara on Japan’s performance in the 2015 Rugby World Cup. What a perfect comparison—research administration and rugby! If you’ve ever seen a rugby match, you’ll know it’s a lot of teamwork and I’m sure you could envision yourself in one of those “scrum’s.”

After working through this first edition as Senior Editor, I’m reminded again what a great organization NCURA is and how giving its members are. Co-editors David Smelser, Kris Monahan and Toni Shackle have been terrific in helping me get acclimated to the schedules and cadence. Dan Nordquist, past Senior Editor, is always an invaluable resource and a great friend. I can’t say enough about Marc Schiffman, however. I don’t think the Magazine would happen without him.

Finally, this issue is very special to me for another reason. It is very bittersweet for me as I take on a new leadership role within NCURA. Julie Norris’ passing is a sad moment on a personal level. Julie gave me my first leadership opportunity as chair of the Publications Committee (a committee that was merged into the Professional Development Committee). I still remember Julie asking me to serve as that committee chair — it still remains an honor.

Pat Hawk, Senior Editor

Patricia Hawk has been involved in research administration for more than 30 years. As the Assistant Vice President for Sponsored Research and Award Administration at Oregon State University (OSU), Pat directs the pre- and post-award functions at OSU and serves as the primary signatory authority. Pat has been an active member in NCURA during her career. She has served on numerous national and regional program committees, and has been a presenter at many regional and national conferences since becoming a member 30+ years ago. In addition, Pat has served as faculty on three national level NCURA travelling workshops and as a faculty member for the Global Travelling Workshops. She has chaired two national committees, and most recently served as NCURA’s Vice President, President and Immediate Past President from 2012 through 2014. She can be reached at Patricia.Hawk@oregonstate.edu

To request permission to reprint material from the NCURA Magazine, please send your inquiry to Marc Schiffman at schiffman@ncura.edu and include the issue, name of article and where you are looking to reprint it.

© 2016 National Council of University Research Administrators NCURA Magazine is printed on recycled paper, using Agri-based inks.
The New Year has started off as a busy time for us as research administrators, but isn’t that always the case? As I look through my emails and appointments there are plenty of awards, proposals, reports, audits and questions to handle. There are times when it seems to be more work than I can possibly handle. But taking one item at a time, the work gets done and over time, it’s amazing how much gets accomplished when you look back. I think that’s why the theme of this issue of the magazine “Small Starts. Big Finishes” really resonates with me.

2016 is also a busy year for NCURA. Last fall, the Board of Directors approved a new Strategic Vision 2025 to guide the organization as it moves forward over the next decade. Our goals include continuing to lead in our offerings of the highest quality professional development for research administrators; being actively involved in the global research administration community; remaining financially and administratively strong; and enhancing research administration as a respected profession. These are big, ambitious goals and as I begin my year as President I’m looking forward to start working on strategies to accomplish them.

Professional development is one of NCURA’s core missions. Throughout the year, we offer programming in-person and online to train and educate research administrators around the globe. Our upcoming conferences are two great examples. In March 2016, we are again holding the Financial Research Administration (FRA) and Pre-Award Research Administration (PRA) conferences back-to-back. I am looking forward to seeing many of you this year in New Orleans. This year FRA’s theme is Creating Possibilities. The program committee, led by co-chairs Scott Erwin and Roseann Luongo, has put together an exciting conference of workshops, senior forums, concurrent sessions, and discussion groups on all things post-award.

One exciting offering at FRA reflects our continuing collaborations with our sister professional organizations supporting research administration. During FRA we are presenting a one-day workshop developed through our partnership with EARMA (European Association of Research Managers and Administrators). This offering, targeted towards U.S. institutions, focuses on obtaining and managing European research funds. A parallel offering focusing on obtaining and managing U.S. research funds targeted for European institutions will be offered later this year at the EARMA conference in Lulea, Sweden. As research continues to expand around the world, NCURA will continue its work to assist its members in learning and building networks globally.

Immediately following FRA, the PRA conference, Change, Challenge, Opportunity: Building for the Future, begins. Robin Remotigue, Laurianne Torres and the program committee have a strong line-up planned including a track specifically dedicated to case studies that will offer the opportunity to learn through real-life examples.

Over the weeks and months ahead, you will be hearing about many of the steps NCURA is taking to accomplish its strategic vision. It’s an ambitious set of goals, but they can be accomplished if we start with small steps looking forward to the future. I am excited to be working with all of you as we continue to support NCURA and research administration together.

Robert Andresen is NCURA President and serves as the Director of Research Financial Services/Associate Director, Research and Sponsored Programs, at the University of Wisconsin - Madison. Bob can be reached at randresen@rsp.wisc.edu
In an effort for the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville to provide the best possible customer service to our faculty, the “Faculty Visitation” program was created in September of 2014. This program was originally designed to help bridge relationships between research administrators and faculty as well as provide an opportunity for the staff to meet our PI’s. Through these visits we are able to learn more about their research, successes, and unique opportunities in their respective fields. To date, we’ve had nine successful faculty presentations and two off-site tours from the Colleges of Engineering, Arts and Sciences, Social Work, and Education, Health, and Human Sciences. Because of the program’s success, we are currently scheduling upcoming visits for our program in 2016. This program began as a small idea, but the Office of Sponsored Programs knows it has had a BIG impact for our staff and faculty.

As research administrators, we see proposals, grants, and contracts come and go every day. Sometimes even we forget during the daily grind of paperwork and deadlines that the work we do is important and adds value. Our work contributes to the research achievements on campus and beyond, even if this is often overlooked by ourselves. In this article, we’ll discuss the structure of our program, how it works, and the thought process behind why we do what we do. We’ll also talk further about the benefits of the program, including building/mending relationships with faculty, the contributions to society, and helping faculty become more comfortable speaking in a public forum.

The overall structure of the program is very simple. We invite a faculty member to present each month during an already scheduled weekly staff meeting. This is an added benefit because it doesn’t add any additional meeting time to our already busy schedules. We give our faculty two options for presenting. We do this for the sake of convenience, as well as the fact that some research is better when it’s observed in person versus simply being talked about in a presentation. Option 1 is for them to join us in our staff meeting or Option 2 is for OSP staff to visit them in their office or lab setting. We explain that our goal isn’t to create more work for them. We have found that most faculty already have a similar type of presentation put together. We further explain that our group doesn’t have technical expertise in their field, so the presentation should be at a public forum level. Everyone in OSP has a degree and most of us have an advanced degree. We’re just not experts in their particular discipline. From there, a few emails are exchanged to answer questions and clarify the final details of the visit. The faculty presentation, including the coordination and presentation, only takes about two hours per month to implement. However, the rewards are endless for both our OSP staff and faculty members.

When deciding who to invite, we meet briefly to discuss anything interesting we may have come across during proposal submissions. We decide upon several faculty that we wish to invite and try to schedule a few months out. We extend invitations to faculty within a variety of disciplines to come and talk to us about their research activities. We try not to just focus on the “cool” research that everyone wants to hear about, such as the “Body Farm” and the research that occurs at that facility. We want to understand the aspects of the research that we may not realize impacts our world every day. For example, listening to a PI discuss his research in relation to the Mars
HOWEVER, they were able to identify the victim's bones as often considered a last resort effort. From their bone DNA in only 28 days. Due to the realized there was more work that needed to be faculty member's involvement in 9/11, they soon our faculty visits highlighted the important work and success. Ultimately, this program is a win-win situation.

Not all of our relationships with faculty are formed with positive interactions during the proposal and contract stages. Another added benefit to this program is the ability to mend challenging relationships with faculty through their participation. By showing our interest in their work and taking the time to listen to past concerns, we are able to create a fresh start for future interactions. When we approached one particular faculty member who had been problematic, the researcher wasn't initially sure if there was enough material to constitute an hour long visit. Instead of staying for our scheduled hour, we were there for 90 minutes! In this tour, we were able to view photocopies of every known and available document written and received by a former United States President. By examining these items we also gained a greater appreciation for the difficult duty of transcribing and reading these historic documents through a modern perception. OSP staff enjoyed seeing this research in action, as well as being able to get out of the office for a short period of time.

In addition to building relationships, these visits remind us about the daily contributions our faculty make to the world. For instance, one of our faculty visits highlighted the important work taking place to help identify and reunite the victims of mass casualty events. This research was originally drawn out of the faculty member's involvement in the tragic events of 9/11 and the numerous challenges faced in identifying thousands of victims. After a year of receiving remains and working to identify them through dental records and fingerprints, the team was forced to identify the remaining victims by only DNA. At the time, this was an unprecedented, catastrophic event and the testing of DNA from bones was often considered a last resort effort. However, they were able to identify the victims from their bone DNA in only 28 days. Due to the faculty member's involvement in 9/11, they soon realized there was more work that needed to be done to advance science and the response to mass disasters.

The identification of remains from a mass casualty event is not only critical in providing closure to family members and loved ones but it is vital to understanding the event as a whole. Through our faculty's research, new techniques were created and modified from the traditional handling of mass casualty events. Also, new insight has been reached in regards to which bones of the human skeleton yield the most DNA, for why their research is important. Our faculty don't often get to practice presenting to such an audience, so we certainly view this as a much added benefit. This program has brought OSP and faculty together on a level not seen before at the University of Tennessee. It has allowed us to create more of a team effort attitude between researchers and research administrators. Together, we are able to work toward a common goal for the greater good. It makes us proud to

---

This program has brought OSP and faculty together, on a level not seen before at the University of Tennessee. It has allowed us to create more of a team effort attitude between researchers and research administrators.

---

Jennifer Benson is a Sponsored Programs Administrator in the Office of Sponsored Programs at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Jennifer's responsibilities include proposal development, review, processing, and submission. She can be reached at jennifer.benson@tennessee.edu

Shannon Spencer is a Proposal Coordinator in the Office of Sponsored Programs at the University of Tennessee. Shannon's responsibilities include assisting faculty with the preparation and submission of their grants and proposals and she especially enjoys working with new faculty. She can be reached at stewart16@utk.edu
In previous articles the authors have explored a variety of initiatives at Duke University, with the combined goal of enhanced support to the research enterprise while maintaining highly compliant management of federal dollars. After several years of continuous development, it may be time to step back and consider how a combination of multiple metrics, training classes and certification programs, organizational change and administrative leadership have supported the initial goal. This concluding article poses questions and observations that may be relevant to many other institutions with the same goal.

**Challenges:**
Initially, Research Costing Compliance (RCC) was assigned the task of identifying and developing a set of basic financial metrics - cost transfers, retroactive salary adjustments, salary cap management, etc. – all related to financial post-award compliance and senior leadership management reporting. After significant testing and modifications, these metrics became institutionalized as management tools for accountability among the departments. The challenge was to develop the appropriate level of risk tolerance, with an aim of limiting burden and supporting sponsored research, while maintaining a strong compliance posture. A second challenge was to access the data necessary for metric analysis and integrated management reporting among various financial and administrative platforms. And yet a third challenge was, over a period of several years, to ensure consistency in data collection and analysis as multiple adjustments and fine tuning processes took place. The consistent goal was to ensure data integrity while realizing full utilization/adoptions by departmental managers and leadership.

As the RCC monitoring process expanded, additional metrics were added specific to Duke University’s research program. Multiple analytics related to effort management were developed and added to the RCC portfolio. As these were developed, it became necessary to think through current policy and practice related to each issue. This retrospective review was very insightful, and brought to light internal policies and business processes that required updating to achieve consistency across the university.
The new federal Uniform Guidance (UG) also posed a challenge to the RCC data analytics function. As Duke refined its internal policies to conform to the new UG standards, the data collection and analysis process had to be reconfigured to match these changes, with safeguards built in to ensure that new policies conformed to UG requirements. These monitoring refinements were and continue to occur as the UG is full implemented and as federal agencies continue to clarify policy adjustments through updates and clarifications, and as agency terms and conditions are refined and implemented.

Perhaps the biggest challenge in RCC metric analysis involved understanding the workload of the University’s large complement of grant managers. A minimum workload (80%) was established to identify individuals whose primary function was grant management. Duke developed a workload analysis process (Portfolio Complexity Index or PCI - described in earlier articles) which measures post-award functions based on project complexity and various workload criteria. These data were initially used to help identify primary grant managers and their respective workload/HR assignment. The challenge to this process was complex: several iterations of data analysis were needed to define workload; the complexity of the analysis was not easily explained; and, PCI shifted as projects were funded, ended, and/or the grant manager assignment changed. Ultimately, the process has stabilized by establishing set time periods for data runs, and accepting that changes within that time period had no material impact. A second challenge was addressed by the development of a pre-award PCI as a companion to the post-award PCI already in place. However, how the new PCI will be matched to the previous data is still under discussion.

Opportunities:
One of the most promising opportunities in the almost seven years of building and testing data is now being explored – data integration. As mentioned in an earlier article, RCC also houses the RCC training program – a robust combination of mandatory training, certification programs, continuing education, targeted audience training and professional engagement. The combination of both functions (monitoring and training) in one office has been fortuitous. Duke requires all grant managers to complete a tiered in-house certification program that is matched to job level and functions assigned. Metrics and data are now available at the department level to track completion of training, success rates in training classes, workload and complexity of portfolio and much more. Training outcomes are matched to specific skills, which are in turn correlated with performance metrics.

Using Tableau as a visualization tool, departments can now access RCC financial metric data for detailed analysis, revealing potential root causes for financial performance issues. The Tableau application, coupled with PCI workload analysis and training data, delivers powerful information to school leadership and department managers. Identification of root causes and workload can be matched with training desired, and verification of skills attained.

What does the future hold? With robust, continuing to expand reporting data available, predictive data analysis is now possible. The refinement and fine tuning of years of data can produce trending dashboards for current state analysis, and predictive data to inform management decisions. For example, in depth analysis of closeout dates enables advance planning for workforce deployment, and ensures grant managers have been trained in closeout specifics; analysis of spending patterns provides support for rate of burn analysis and potential budget overruns; training data informs departments as to where and when trained employees will be able to assume additional/enhanced duties; and deadline analysis enables predictability in workload adjustments. And lastly, root cause analysis enables informed measures as to potential issues that can be readily addressed.

Metrics and related data analysis have become the powerful tools for management at all levels. The challenge and opportunity rests with how these are embedded into the organizational structure to ensure accountability…

James D. Luther, MA, is 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 benefits rates, and the Research Costing Compliance (RCC) program. Jim is a regular presenter at NCURA, the Chair of the COGR Board of Directors, and the Co-Chair of the FDP Administrative Burden Subgroup. He can be reached at james.luther@duke.edu

Julie Cole, MA, CRA, is the Director of Research Costing Compliance (RCC) at Duke University. She has held leadership roles in both pre-award and/or post-award offices at Wake Forest University, the University of Florida and other higher education venues. A frequent presenter and workshop leader at NCURA, Julie is currently a member of the NCURA Workshop Faculty. Julie directs Research Costing Compliance in developing and providing dedicated research administration and compliance training and in monitoring financial research compliance at Duke University. She can be reached at julie.cole@duke.edu
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As we start a New Year filled with setting goals and writing New Year’s resolutions, we challenge you to think about how one individual can make a contribution by volunteering within NCURA, beginning with that first small step. Let’s focus on how you can set yourself up for a year of achievement. To be successful you have to be willing to take a chance and make a commitment. Here are ten good reasons to resolve to get involved:

1. You are knowledgeable and have areas of expertise that would benefit the community.

2. You can make a difference by engaging with your colleagues for a shared purpose.

3. Having a sense of purpose contributes to your mental and physical health by improving your mood and reducing stress and anxiety.

4. Volunteering promotes self-esteem, confidence, and personal growth.

5. Volunteering helps solve research administration problems and makes an impact in the community.

6. Volunteering allows you opportunities to hone your communication and time management skills.

7. Volunteering offers you experiences of teamwork and creates avenues for leadership growth.

8. Volunteering offers you opportunities to network with others and possibly vet a new career avenue.

9. Volunteering is actually fun!

10. Volunteering is the perfect way to honor a volunteer who has made a difference in your career.
So now that you know why you should get involved, where do you begin? Fortunately NCURA is a member driven organization with many opportunities to get involved. NCURA’s has Volunteer Central http://collaborate.ncura.edu/volunteer/volunteeropportunities, where volunteer opportunities are posted on a regular basis. This excellent resource allows you to use search filters to find projects and positions that suit your needs and fit within your schedule. 

If you have the opportunity to attend a spring regional meeting or one of the three national meetings (Annual, Pre-award Research Administration, Financial Research Administrators) – get involved. These meetings don’t run themselves; they are actually fueled by the many volunteers who make them happen. Doing something small really makes a huge collective difference in the success of the meeting. Take a look at where you are currently in your research administration career. Even if you are new to the field, you can still make a difference. Being new is the perfect time to volunteer at a registration desk or in the hospitality area at either the national or regional level. If like most busy people, you’re cautious about overcommitting, rest assured that these volunteer opportunities take only a little time but provide great benefit to the volunteer as well as to the organization. Both venues will provide you with lots of networking opportunities. You will find that old and new members alike participate in these opportunities, and you will benefit from conversations with both. You will begin to develop relationships that will grow as you deepen your involvement.

Whenever you attend an annual or regional conference, do not overlook the importance of attending your region’s business meeting. This is where you will meet people who prioritize involvement in NCURA and who will welcome the opportunity to bring others into the fold. You’ll learn the latest news in your region, including its volunteer needs, and you’ll have the opportunity to put names with faces. Consider introducing yourself to your region’s volunteer coordinator. Let him or her know you’re interested in helping and also what your time constraints are. Even though many volunteer tasks are handled through online signups, it is still helpful to the volunteer coordinators to have a chance to speak face to face with those who want to be more involved.

Although you may not see yourself presenting now or in the near future, it’s not too early to consider the possibility. When you’re networking at the meeting, keep an eye out for members wearing a red presenter ribbon and strike up a conversation about it. Ask them how long they’ve been presenting and how they got started. You’ll find experienced presenters are glad to share their experiences and offer tips for getting involved presenting.

NCURA also has options for members who have fewer opportunities to travel. Consider participating in one or more of the online communities available through Collaborate. Communities are based on professional interests, such as Compliance, Electronic Research Administration, Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions, and many more. You will even find a CRA study group! As a member of a Collaborate Community, you can share advice and ask for advice while knowing there is this special connection with your peers. These forums are ideal for seeking solutions to problems you encounter and for assisting your colleagues when they reach out for help. You are able to support and assist one another in reaching professional goals. Members share best practices or new ideas with others who are looking for ways to improve their organization or their own career path. Collaborate also provides an opportunity to use peers as a sounding board and to develop relationships with friends and colleagues who share the same interest. By taking only five or ten minutes to offer a colleague your professional opinion or a solution that has worked for you, you can make a difference in someone else’s work day and create new connections that in turn are beneficial to you. Creating professional relationships is important, and this organization provides a special bond with others who understand the profession. Collaborate is a perfect opportunity to enhance your network without travel and within your own time constraints, since you decide how much time to spend engaging on these forums.

There is no doubt that becoming involved in any organization is about devoting time and developing meaningful relationships. In many cases, it is about finding the time. However, involvement in NCURA really does pay back in large dividends. So set a goal to get more involved in 2016, and make that goal realistic and attainable. Then think about what you can reasonably commit to and take that first step. Take a chance in the coming year... Resolve to Get Involved!

Laura Letbetter is a contracting officer at the Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta, GA. She holds a Master of Arts in English from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. Her background includes teaching, editing, and program administration. She began her research administration career in 2004 at Kennesaw State University and is a 2012 graduate of NCURA’s Executive Leadership Program. She can be reached at laura.letbetter@osp.gatech.edu

Rosemary Madnick is the Executive Director of Grants and Contracts Administration for the University of Alaska Fairbanks. As the Executive Director, she oversees the pre and post award functions for the University. Rosemary is actively involved in NCURA both at the regional and national level. She has served in a number of capacities including NCURA Peer Reviewer, 2016 Traveling Faculty, current member of NDC, past Region VI Chair, and presenter to name a few. She is a graduate of NCURA’s Leadership Development Institute and the Executive Leadership Program. She can be reached at rmadnick@alaska.edu.

Robyn Remotigue is Research Manager, Dean of the School of Public Health at University of North Texas Health Science Center in Fort Worth. She has been in the field of research administration for more than 20 years. She is a graduate of NCURA Executive Leadership Program and NCURA Leadership Development Institute. She serves as an At-Large Member of the Executive Committee in Region V. Robyn also volunteers in various capacities at the regional and national level. She can be reached at Robyn.Remotigue@unthsc.edu
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Kris Monahan  
*Director, Office of Sponsored Research and Programs*  
*Providence College*

Being the inaugural director of a start-up sponsored research office is clearly what comes to mind as one of my small starts. Certainly, there is nothing small about taking on the big job of creating a sponsored research office for an institution. I haven’t hit the big finish yet, since the work will never be finished. However, I am making big strides toward helping the institution reimagine the role of research at a liberal arts college and think about how best to promote, support, and recognize both small and larger successes. From a need and risk assessment to day to day operations to developing new policies across the institution, I take small steps alongside and with the help of others to keep moving toward change.

David Smelser  
*Assistant Director, Office of Sponsored Programs*  
*University of Tennessee, Knoxville*

Over the past year our office has taken on many streamlining initiatives to improve the efficiency of the office. One small change we made was to revise our standard Research Agreement. That change has led to very big time savings during our contract negotiations. Our original Research Agreement was used as a starting place for contract negotiations and was the "perfect contract" in the eyes of the University. What we discovered was this contract template seemed to always require negotiation of certain clauses. Ultimately, our goal in contract negotiation is to execute a contract both parties can live with and to get the work started. We revised our Research Agreement to essentially start at the place we always seemed to wind up anyway. This has dramatically reduced the time required to negotiate contracts and has gotten many of our projects up and running much faster.

Pat Hawk  
*Assistant Vice President, Office for Sponsored Research and Award Administration, Oregon State University*

Over the past year, Oregon State University’s pre- and post-award offices embarked on a lean process improvement effort. What started as a process to better align pre- and post-award processes, the effort grew to include both college-level pre-award support personnel and Business Center personnel who provide primarily post-award support at the College level. Our Grant Lean Team also gathered information and received meaningful feedback from a Faculty Advisory Committee. This work has led to a merged pre- and post-award office at the central level. But more importantly, this work has created a real partnership between faculty, college pre-award staff, central administration staff, and Business Center staff. We are now working on implementation plans for value-added solutions, and we’ve changed our name from the Grant Lean Team to the Grant, Processes and Systems (GPS) Team.
The 17th Annual Meeting for Financial Research Administrators
March 6-8, 2016  Sheraton New Orleans

Visit www.ncura.edu to Register
In Search of the Perfect Way to Master Tasks, Technology, and Time Management

By Terri Hall

“Work smarter, not harder” is a resolution many of us make at the beginning of a new year. And like many resolutions, it is difficult to keep. Can we make this year different? I proclaim we take back our work days and put plans in place to feel more in control than chaotic and stressful. But how?

In my never-ending quest for “smarter not harder,” I came across a new model in an article on FastCompany.com titled “How to Craft a Perfect, Productive 40-Hour Workweek” by Laura Vanderkam. I was intrigued. Who works only 40 hours anymore? Isn’t this now a 24/7 work-world? More on the perfect work week in a moment. Let’s start with mastering a work day. I turned to some NCURA members who, thankfully, had ideas to share.

“Our Vice President emphasizes responsiveness,” states Karen Pace at the University of Notre Dame. “A quick, but accurate, response is key - responding to the email in its entirety to avoid additional email exchanges.” As the Director of Policy, Training and Communications, Karen estimates she receives 200 emails a day and uses lists to stay on task. She believes technology - both hardware and software - makes a big difference. For instance, her previous smartphone gave her a red light to alert her of a new text or email. Now she has a new, more expensive phone. “But I have to open my email program to determine whether there’s anything new and I miss that red light.” Sometimes the latest is not the best.

Her tip is the “delete” button. “Delete all you can,” Karen says. “It’s a 24/7 world now rather than an 8-hour workday and we still have to manage it all.”

Yes, the emails keep coming and coming. Gai Doran of Yale University manages hers this way, “First I figure out if it’s something to respond to immediately such as my manager needing an answer. I stop what I’m doing to get her the answer.” Gai is an Assistant Director in the School of Public Health and among her duties is helping faculty with their grant applications. She tries not to print anything and explains, “I have a folder for each PI, and like many research administrators, I hardly ever throw anything out.”
The exception is a “thank you” email on which she’s copied. Those are deleted. “While I believe in saying thank you, or of being thanked, I don’t need to be copied on an email from one person thanking another.”

She’s also efficient in how she communicates. Email isn’t always the first choice. “I pick up the phone if the email exchange has gone back and forth several times. Often, people send you half-thoughts and it takes time to figure out what they are really saying.” She finds that a quick conversation clears up the message and saves time in the long run.

Gai has a whiteboard in her office to keep her eye on deadlines coming up stating: “If I’m mentally looking at the list a couple times a day it triggers me to pay attention to things. I also keep a list on my desk with the status of where things are.”

She adds, “We are a large institution and geo-dispersed. Email communication makes the most sense, but is faceless.” She used to be able sit down with PIs but now she says it’s all by email. She receives 400 emails a day and has “learned to be an efficient, quick reader/evaluator of what the content is and what needs to happen next. I have to decide whether the content should be shared or if tasks should be delegated.”

Her tip for tasks from meetings is to follow-up with a summary to the host confirming her understanding of the action items. Then she doesn’t waste time re-doing tasks if she interpreted them differently.

Brigette Pfister of Virginia Commonwealth University does something similar. She’s the Director of Sponsored Programs in the College of Humanities and Sciences. “If I’ve called the meeting,” she says, “I send a recap and I will put the action items in writing.” If meeting invitations have no clear purpose, “I’ve been known to say I won’t attend because of the workload. Sometimes ‘no’ is the right answer,” she says.

She manages ADHD as well as her time. “When you have this high of a workload, you have to understand what your brain is capable of. Multi-tasking doesn’t work. I have to do one thing at a time and then move on to the next. You must prioritize,” Brigette says. She uses the “Who’s gonna die? rule” to determine which to do first. She keeps a master task list and considers the day a success if she can mark off three items.

Brigette does NOT keep email open all day. “Distractions cause errors in work that you were doing before the distractions,” she explains. She scans her email periodically to see if there’s anything urgent and addresses email a couple of hours at the beginning and end of day.

When she’s really busy, Brigette creates an email auto-response saying she’s “high volume” right now and if it’s an emergency, “to reply with EMERGENCY in the subject line of your email to draw my attention.” She adds that she has received only one message with EMERGENCY in the subject line.

Another tip Brigette offers is telecommuting one day a week or more if you have big things to work on. “You have fewer interruptions and you can concentrate for a block of time,” she says. “Be pro-active and plan. Be conservative about planning your day. Be proud that you got something done.”

Aaah, that magic word done. Is it possible to arrange our days for more done and less stress in only 40 hours? Let’s return to the perfect work week. According to Vanderkam, it IS possible with this formula for high productivity and personal satisfaction:

- **Planning/Strategizing** — Both ensure we are doing the right work. “A productive workweek contains time for figuring out what’s next,” writes Vanderkam. She also quotes Stephen Tang, president and CEO of Philadelphia’s University City Science Center, who advises, “take 30 minutes at the end of the workday to close up your desk, close your screen, decompress, reflect, journal, become really self-aware about what went right and what went wrong, and then tee up the next day before you go home.” Or, Vanderkam suggests “a longer planning and strategizing session on Friday afternoon to set the next week, and then take a few minutes at the end of each day to update the next day’s agenda.”

- **Core Production** — This is what we are paid to do.

- **Speculative/Skill Building** — How many of us take time to learn a new skill or practice new techniques to enhance our skills? Has professional development become a luxury? “Even if you’re very good at your job, you can always get better,” writes Vanderkam.

- **Collegiality** — Invest in building connections by taking time for coffee with a colleague, or a brisk walk to re-energize with some fresh air after sitting for a few hours. How about lunch? How many of us work through lunch and eat at our desks? Instead, get out of the office to allow your brain to rest and rejuvenate.

- **Visibility** — Volunteer your ideas in meetings to increase your visibility and invest in your own network outside your institution. “People who are wise about career management make investments in their external networks, too,” writes Vanderkam. “They ask, daily, what have I done to increase my exposure and broaden my scope?” Activities here can range from participating on an NCURA committee, writing an article, or attending an association meeting and networking to create new connections and strengthen previous ones. Social media networks such as LinkedIn or Twitter are other methods for professional contacts.

- **Open Space** — We cannot escape interruptions and the unexpected crises that occur. By having built-in space for those times, we needn’t feel like we are falling behind elsewhere when we stop to put out these “fires.” In addition, some tasks end up taking longer than expected and this is our buffer zone. If nothing unexpected happens, it’s our lucky day!

There are many options to try. Keep those that work for you and discard the rest. What’s the perfect system? The one you’ll use.

While I do not have a magic wand to lessen your workload, my New Year’s wish for you is that some of these tips will help you make this your best year ever. Maybe even perfect.

**References**
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The interim report of the National Research Council Committee on Federal Research Regulations and Reporting Requirements, released in September and summarized in a companion article in the December 2015 NCURA Magazine issue, admonishes institutions to examine their own policies and procedures to determine which go beyond those “necessary and sufficient to comply with federal, state, and local requirements.” Just as we each have a carbon footprint that quantifies the total amount of greenhouse gases produced either directly or indirectly in support of our daily activities as humans, policies and procedures can increase the administrative load placed on our researchers.

The report urged institutions to assess processes to determine where compliance requirements can be streamlined to ensure effective use of indirect research recovery costs. This would appear to be in response to ongoing efforts by organizations such as the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR) and Association of American Universities (AAU) for recognition that the 26 percent cap on administrative costs is severely outdated. Clearly, that statement sends a message that until the final recommendations of the committee which are expected in the spring of 2016, the focus will be on reducing regulatory burdens in an effort to also reduce the cost of compliance. Time will tell but universities need to collect data 1) that shows the full cost of compliance and 2) that duplicative and unnecessary compliance requirements have been eliminated from the costs.

Institutions should reexamine institutional policies and procedures especially those that are longstanding and have not been revised in the past few years. As a standard practice, policies and procedures should be revisited periodically to assess applicability, redundancy of effort, efficacy, and alignment with current good practices. If the answer to the question of “why is it done this way” is “because that is always the way we have done it,” that should be reason enough to take a hard look at whether there is room to eliminate or revise redundant or outdated procedures.

1. Appoint a responsible person(s) to lead the charge preferably someone with broad research administration experience and with a service orientation. Institutions should consider appointing a faculty co-chair who can be the voice of researchers.

2. Establish a steering committee or primary work group with the authority to make recommendations directly to senior leadership. Again, faculty/researcher representation is critical. Administrative support is critical.

3. Articulate a charge for the committee that clearly defines the mission and authority and sets milestones to ensure the work moves at a reasonable pace.
4. Review the recommendations of the National Research Council committee and the other studies that have assessed and quantified administrative burdens on researchers including the Federal Demonstration Partnership, National Science Board, and Federation of Societies for Experimental Biology (FASEB).

5. Identify the regulations that contribute to institutionally imposed burdens. COGR has informally maintained a list of new and significantly revised regulations and guidance that have been effected since the imposition of the cap over 20 years ago. That list provides an excellent list of compliance processes to be considered.

6. Compile and prioritize an inventory of institutional policies and procedures that should be the focus of the assessment. Consider using a survey or focus groups as a means of collecting information.

7. Based on the data collected, prioritize change areas to identify the implications for change considering the impact on people, ancillary processes and information technology costs. For larger tasks and analyses, the steering committee should leverage institutional expertise through the establishment of subgroups comprised of representation, as appropriate, from central research administration, research compliance, principal investigators, departmental administrators, finance/accounting, human resources, compliance/risk management, and legal offices. Not every subgroup would require representation from each sector but each should support the need for fit/gap analysis and assessments of systems dependencies.

8. Drafting recommendations and revising policies and procedures is just the start of effecting changes that will have meaningful impact. One would think that change that reduces administrative burdens would be greeted with open arms but anyone who has guided an organization through change knows that careful planning is critical to implementing new procedures. Never underestimate the need for educational programming and nurturing those most impacted by the change. Sometimes the training must be focused on “un-training” to get people to let go of the old way of doing things as it is to education on new procedures. Remember, one of the biggest opponents to change are those individuals who consider themselves experts in the “old way of doing thing.”

9. Plan for assessing the impact. It is essential that metrics be identified and methodology for collecting information be considered.

Even without the National Research Council study, the Uniform Guidance has presented us with the perfect impetus for introspectively assessing our Administrative Burdens Footprint, collectively and institutionally. Even in those instances where the Uniform Guidance did not really change the language from its source circular, there is legitimate concern among research administrators that auditors may use this as an opportunity to reinterpret the intent. There are significant changes that mandate revisions to procedures and policies and where the audit risk is uncertain but institutions should be mindful not to overcomplicate and overextend compliance procedures unnecessarily. Institutions should seek opportunities to utilize existing systems and information in compliance efforts.

The micro-purchase procurement threshold is one of the more daunting and potentially the most administratively burdensome changes in the Uniform Guidance. COGR and the FDP have worked collaboratively to make a case for raising the threshold to a more reasonable level but this will be a significant change for both principal investigators and administrative units. Once the final decision on that threshold has been made, principal investigators should be included in discussions on how to implement these new requirements keeping in mind that applying the micro-purchase requirements solely to purchases initially made on federally supported projects may have implications for corrective cost transfers.

Another area of looming additional burden on researchers is found in the new subrecipient monitoring requirements. Research administration offices should seek principal investigator input on the least burdensome ways of ensuring that documentation of technical reports required were in fact received and that subrecipient invoices approved for payment correspond with the amount of work completed. This will require educating researchers of these new requirements.

Where the Uniform Guidance provides new flexibility as in the case of effort reporting, institutions should explore alternatives to the status quo. Institutions have made huge investments in electronic systems for tracking and complying with the after-the-fact confirmation requirements should think outside the box and consider how systems could be realigned to take full advantage of the elimination of the examples acceptable methods of payroll distribution in A-21. Consider how your institution could replicate the project or adapt the certification methodology successfully piloted by the Federal Demonstration Partnership. For more information go to http://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/fdp/PGA_055834.

The National Research Council preliminary report includes recommendations for reducing the burdens for initial proposal submission by relying on “just-in-time” information submission of detailed budgets, compliance assurances, etc. Institutions should take advantage of any resulting flexibilities and lessening of requirements. For example, institutions should not require a detailed budget for proposals to sponsors that do not require one as in the case of NIH modular budgets. At award, principal investigators may be given the option to utilize a detailed budget for account setup as a means of better managing their project budget but modern financial systems should be flexible enough to leave that as a choice, not a mandate.

It is clear that the report recommendations have an expectation for a partnership among regulatory and awarding agencies and institutions on the receiving end. If we hope to reduce the administrative burdens on our researchers and ourselves, it will take collaboration and bold steps. We can help make a difference at our institutions.

Susan Wyatt Sedwick is a consultant with Attain LLC. She retired from The University of Texas at Austin where she served as Associate Vice President for Research and Director of the Office of Sponsored Projects. She can be reached at ssedwick@attain.com
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A Giant Step toward Successful Administration: What We Can Learn from Japan’s Astonishing Victories in the Rugby World Cup 2015

By Tadashi Sugihara
Summary

Let me start with a totally non-administrative question: Do you know much about rugby? Recently, Japan took part in the Rugby World Cup 2015 and scored a historic victory over South Africa. It seems to me that Japanese university research administration offices and Japan’s national rugby team have something in common: they have both attracted attention, and they each have to deal with considerable competition—in the form of other established administrative offices inside the same university or other kinds of sports in Japan. In this article, I will describe lessons we can learn from Japan’s national rugby team and how we can apply them to make a big impact on university research administration.

Japan’s Defeat of South Africa Was the Biggest Upset of Rugby World Cup 2015

Even those with little interest in rugby may have heard the Cinderella story of what happened at England’s Brighton Community Stadium on September 19, 2015. On that day Japan beat South Africa—one of the world’s elite rugby powers—in the Rugby World Cup. After the victory, Eddie Jones, the Australian who was head coach of Japan’s national team, appeared repeatedly in interviews on Japanese television. Through those repeated interviews, I picked up several points about how he built up Japan’s rugby team—nicknamed the “Brave Blossoms”—after 2012, when he became head coach. Several points struck me during the interviews; and I would like to mention those points in making proposals for how research administration can be improved. I will also indicate some efforts to improve research administration that have been tried at our office.

“Crouch!” Change Your Mindset

Before the game with South Africa, I had honestly never imagined that Japan would achieve anything better than a draw. I remembered how Japan was beaten by New Zealand in the Rugby World Cup in 1995 to the tune of 17 to 145. Yes, 145! So, I thought Japan had zero chance of beating powerhouse South Africa in 2015.

According to Jones, some of the players on the Japanese team felt the same way. Because Japanese tend to be smaller and physically weaker than South Africans, it seemed most people could not envision them winning the scrums. Jones, however, felt that such thinking represented a misconception. Accordingly, he did not accept any excuses for not winning; he changed the players’ mindsets and demanded that, above all, the Brave Blossoms work hard.

Jones got the Brave Blossoms to begin their training at 5 a.m., which he referred to as a “head start”: this involved starting very early in the morning—before anybody else—and putting in a great deal of intense training. Through this training, Jones was able to build confidence in the players’ minds and make them believe they could win games.

Changing our mindset is important in our daily lives when we need to tackle a major problem we have never before faced. We tend to be too easily dissuaded from coming up with good solutions. Usually this is because there is no precedent for the problem. Instead, we should be first confident in ourselves, then try to consider the situation from multiple viewpoints and then make another effort to solve the problem.

“Bind!” Know Your Strength

After their training, the Brave Blossoms no longer lacked confidence. They felt physically stronger than before. I would guess, at this point, they realized they could use their existing skills, for example, in passing the ball, together with the increased physical and mental stamina they had acquired. Against South Africa, the Brave Blossoms could play full throttle until the very end.

When we change our mindset, we can view ourselves from the outside. We are then able to clearly understand the skills we already possess. Of course, it is also important to acquire new skills but, having changed our mindset, we can use the skills that we already have more efficiently than we could have imagined before. We should ask ourselves where our strengths lie—just as the Brave Blossoms were able to use the excellent skills they already possessed to their maximum advantage.

Team performance is always a concern for university administration. To achieve something great, each staff member needs to know his or her strengths and work hard, and then think how these strengths could be used to improve individual performance. The whole is more than the sum of its parts. The whole is not the sum, but the product of the strengths of each team member multiplied together.

Having become physically stronger through hard training, the Brave Blossoms were able to scrummage low. To achieve this, all the players have to bind tightly together and push forward cohesively. When a scrum is formed this way, it is more stable and powerful.

“Set!” Be Bold

The Brave Blossoms developed an original style: possessing the ball and moving forward, being tackled, forming a ruck, and then passing. They repeated this process over and over again not to give a rest to an opponent. You can see this tactic when they scored the winning try to beat South Africa. This form of continuous attack was a new tactic that Japan had never applied before. They controlled the game using creative ideas based on their long, hard efforts and superb skills. They won games by challenging themselves and taking risks.

When faced with the chance to achieve something great, we have to be brave enough to gamble on that chance. Few people may be able to initially understand creative ideas. The
question is whether we stay strong and follow through with our new idea, or stay stuck where we are, upholding the status quo. David Kelley and Tom Kelley at IDEO, a famous design firm in Palo Alto, California, make the following statement on page 2 of Introduction in their book *Creative Confidence*: “At its core, creative confidence is about believing in your ability to create change in the world around you. It is the conviction that you can achieve what you set out to do. We think this self-assurance, this belief in your creative capacity, lies at the heart of innovation.”

**Lessons Learned and a Few Examples from Kyoto**

The lessons I learned from the Brave Blossoms’ World Cup performance can be summarized as follows: (1) change your mindset—always examine a situation from multiple viewpoints; (2) know your strengths—think about how you can maximize your performance through teamwork; and (3) be bold—bet on chances.

In our office, the Kyoto University Research Administration Office, there is atmosphere that allows staff to make proposals on projects that may seem very unique compared with the standard support services given to researchers, although it is sometimes difficult to persuade all the stakeholders at our university of the importance of taking such challenges. For example, we plan and manage the Kyoto University Research Development Program. After applications from researchers are reviewed and accepted, funds in this program are provided to them to start a feasibility study or outsource editing services so that English manuscripts can be submitted to international journals and have a better chance of being accepted.

For your reference, the Research Development Program funded 26 accepted applications in fiscal 2014 for feasibility studies, which amounted to about US$204,000. Through this support, proposals were made for external grants for 21 research projects, and about $2,878,000 for its services was obtained in this regard.

In addition to organizing such funding, the program covers other challenging activities, which involve changing the mindsets of researchers. The name used here—KIZUKI—is a literal translation of the Japanese word for “awareness.” As part of the KIZUKI project, a workshop called Visual Thinking Strategies [http://www.vtshome.org/](http://www.vtshome.org/) is held. One by one, participants view a painting and then share their impressions of the painting with one another. This workshop has a very simple format, but participants soon become aware of how differently each interprets the same image. They can then recognize how this phenomenon could apply, for example, to examining experimental data. How an object appears may depend totally on our beliefs with respect to that object. One of these workshops took place after a lively discussion on whether it is possible to induce serendipity—the ability to discover something new unexpectedly—which also requires that we view a situation from multiple viewpoints.

Finally, we must try to improve ourselves and share good practices with one another. NCURA offers many programs and opportunities to share information at various occasions through direct conversations or through the Internet. Let’s be bold and challenge ourselves to achieve great successes and work hard—just like the Brave Blossoms.

---

**Tadashi Sugihara**, Ph. D., is the Deputy Director of the Kyoto University Research Administration Office (KURA), Kyoto, Japan. He is a neuroscientist and has worked in the Zanvyl Krieger Mind/Brain Institute at Johns Hopkins University, the Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy at the University of Rochester, and the RIKEN Brain Science Institute in collaboration with Toyota Motor Corporation. In addition to management duties, he is currently involved as an interviewer, writer and photographer with K. U. RESEARCH ([http://research.kyoto-u.ac.jp](http://research.kyoto-u.ac.jp)), a Japanese language website of Kyoto University specifically featuring research activities and researchers at Kyoto University. He can be reached at sugihara@kura.kyoto-u.ac.jp
Research Administration has lost a legend.

Julie T. Norris, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs at MIT from October 1994 to 2004 died on November 17th after a period of declining health. Julie shaped the careers of many friends and colleagues during her years of service to higher education. More than an executive administrator, she was definitely an advocate for the profession and a key mentor for all; she meant so much more to every person her life touched.

Kathleen Larmett, Executive Director for the National Council of University Research Administrators summarized Julie’s legacy. In remembering Julie, Ms. Larmett reminds us of some of Julie’s extraordinary contributions to and outstanding achievements in research administration. “Julie Norris served as president of the National Council of University Research Administrators in 1988 and was awarded NCURA’s first Award for Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration in 1994.” In addition to Julie’s unparalleled leadership, she was an outstanding communicator and writer. Ms. Larmett adds, “In addition to numerous conference presentations, she co-authored several publications and was a co-developer of NCURA’s long-running educational program, Sponsored Projects Administration II: Critical Issues in Research Administration.”

Gunta J. Liders, Associate Vice President for Research Administration at the University of Rochester reflects that “not only was Julie Norris a mentor to hundreds of research administration professional through NCURA, she was leader in university associations advocating for the lessening of administrative burden to our faculty and researchers. As such, she was an advocate not only to our profession, but to our scientists. She touched our hearts and ignited our passion for research administration. Her legacy will live on.”

In these days of increased compliance and administrative burden on our faculty and scientists, Jane Youngers from the University of Texas Health Science Center in San Antonio echoes one of many of Julie’s virtues, “Julie was always giving of her time and seeking solutions to issues on both a national and at an institutional level. Her advocacy for lessening the administrative burden not only impacted scientists at her institution, but nationwide. When Julie spoke, everyone listened.”

In addition to her passion for research administration, Julie was also an early visionary on how technology could help manage, streamline and shape the future profession of research administration. Upon arriving at MIT, Julie demanded that MIT would lead the nation in creating a state-of-the-art, research administration system. From that vision, Coeus was born. Even with the passing of Julie, Coeus continues to evolve and our nation of research administrators admire Julie’s dedication to using technology to foster best practices in research administration. Again, Julie sets the gold standard that made MIT the national leader in research administrative software.

Looking back at the extraordinary legacy of Julie T. Norris, we all wonder how the profession of research administration, and our personal lives for that matter, would have been if not for her. She is and forever will be greatly missed.

Stephen Dowdy, Director, Research Information and Systems, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Prior to World War II, extensive scientific research at colleges and universities was minimal with the exception of agriculture related research initiatives that were funded by the federal government and managed by individual scientists (Beasley, 2000). As World War II became imminent, university and industrial scientists were organized to apply their scientific and engineering expertise to the war effort. In 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed Dr. Vannevar Bush as director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development (OSRD). Bush was a distinguished scientist who is credited with laying the groundwork for the establishment of the National Science Foundation. Bush argued that the federal government should significantly invest in science and ensure free rein of investigation by scientists into topics of their choice. These influential sentiments were paramount to the expansion of research and development activities at colleges and universities throughout the United States.

After World War II research activities at colleges and universities began to steadily increase. External support for research in higher education institutions grew exponentially during the 1950’s and 1960’s (Spriesterbach, 1975). As a result, colleges and universities were forced to pay more attention to the development of mechanisms for identifying funding sources, developing and submitting proposals, receiving awards, monitoring expenditures, and submitting reports to various sponsoring agencies. In 1959 a small group of university administrators recognized that it was time to look beyond business and fiscal matters and into the broader aspects of research administration (Wile, 1983). According to Wile, the first official meeting of the National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA) was held on January 26, 1960 at the University of Chicago with forty-five (45) persons attending representing forty (40) institutions from across the country. As a result of this meeting, the formal creation of NCURA can be associated with the birth and formalization of the profession of research administration.

Fast forward to 2015 where the professional field of research administration is comprised of thousands of people representing the majority of higher education institutions around the world. While the profession began with very few research administrators, it has grown to encompass thousands of people with constantly changing, increased, and varied responsibilities. As a result, professional organizations and institutions have created a number of different training and educational programs focused on serving the research administrator. In the Roberts (2005) study research administrators overwhelmingly reported positive or extremely positive experiences with professional development.
opportunities offered through NCUR A and the Society of Research Administrators International (SRAI). Such opportunities have grown with the expanding professional field and have been responsive to the constantly changing environment, regulatory requirements, technological advancements, demand, and need.

In 1993, and in conjunction with the SRAI, the Research Administrators Certification Council (RACC) was formed and still exists today. The primary purpose of RACC is to certify that an individual through experience and testing has the fundamental knowledge to be a professional research or sponsored programs administrator (Research Administrators Certification Council, 2015). Between 1993 and 2005 five-hundred and one (501) research administrators achieved certification with a seventy-one percent (71%) pass rate (Roberts, 2005). Since 2005, RACC created two additional forms of certification focusing specifically on pre-award and financial matters. All included, there are currently 2,407 active RACC certifications in some form (Research Administrators Certification Council, 2015).

Some postsecondary institutions had the foresight to recognize the need to establish formal certificate and/or Master level degree programs to serve those employed in the professional field of research administration. In 2005 Cleveland State University initiated a Master’s Certificate program in research administration with the help of a grant award from the SRAI, and in 2007 the Medical University of South Carolina initiated a Master of Science in Research Administration program. Both programs were short lived due to low enrollments, logistical confinements, and bureaucratic barriers. Establishing formal certificate and/or degree programs at institutions of higher education is often time consuming. Accomplishing implementation of new graduate degree programs can be especially difficult due to detailed justification requirements, significant research and analysis, approval requirements at various levels, and scrutiny throughout the process. Smith & Torres (2011) detail the process for the University of Central Florida in establishing a new Master of Research Administration degree program.

In 2008, the NCUR A issued a call for proposals for Planning Grants for a Master’s Degree in Research Administration. In response to technological advancements, and since the profession comprises primarily working adults located all over the world, there was a requirement for any proposed program to be offered in a complete virtual format. The planning grant call for proposals was followed in the fall of 2009 with a call for Implementation Grants for a Master’s Degree in University Research Administration. NCUR A ultimately made one award of $45,000 to the University of Central Florida.

As demand for Master level degree programs in research administration grew, so too have the number of programs being offered by institutions of higher education. Some programs existed prior to the NCUR A call for proposals and continue to exist today. If you have an interest in advancing your education through earning a Master level degree at an institution of higher education, the tables below provide basic information about each program as a starting point for exploration.

Currently, seven postsecondary institutions in the United States offer Master level degree programs in research administration. Five of the programs are focused on the broad aspects of research administration (Table 1), and two of the program s have a specific clinical focus (Table 2). All of the degree programs require approximately thirty-six (36) credit hours or the equivalent of forty-six (46) quarter credit hours. In collecting the data presented in the tables below, each institution was contacted in the early months of calendar year 2015 and again in November 2015. The primary purpose for contacting each of the listed institutions was to confirm that the data collected is accurate, the basic elements of

---

**Table 1: Postsecondary Institutions Offering Master Level Degree Programs (Broad Focus)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution &amp; year program established</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th>Delivery Mode</th>
<th>Estimated Cost to complete</th>
<th>Students Enrolled</th>
<th>Students Graduated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel College (Not reported)</td>
<td>Jeff Seo <a href="mailto:seoje@emmanuel.edu">seoje@emmanuel.edu</a></td>
<td>Face-to-face &amp; on-line</td>
<td>$24,112</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Florida (Fall 2011)</td>
<td>Dr. Jo Ann Smith <a href="mailto:Jo.Smith@ucf.edu">Jo.Smith@ucf.edu</a> 407-823-3945</td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>$25,775</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University (Fall 2011)</td>
<td>Denise Schafer <a href="mailto:Schaf1dr@cmich.edu">Schaf1dr@cmich.edu</a></td>
<td>Face-to-face &amp; on-line</td>
<td>$18,360</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush University (Fall 2012)</td>
<td>Dr. Bill Hendy <a href="mailto:Chs_admissions@rush.edu">Chs_admissions@rush.edu</a> 312-942-7120</td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>$27,232</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University (Summer 2014)</td>
<td>Dr. Marianne Woods <a href="mailto:MWoods9@jhu.edu">MWoods9@jhu.edu</a> 202-663-5987</td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>$41,544</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>None to date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
each program, and to provide general information for interested individuals to begin their own review and assessment of each program. There is no endorsement or institutional preference toward any institution listed. The order in which institutions are listed is based solely on what is believed to be the program initiation date for each currently existing program in reverse chronological order. It should be noted that each institution listed is different in terms of Carnegie Classification and/or specific academic area in which the Master level research administration degree program is offered. Interested individuals are strongly encouraged to engage in their own research to determine admission requirements, regional institutional accreditation, specific program details, and the overall best fit for them.

The contact information presented is the most current available found by the authors. Delivery mode represents the way in which the degree program is offered by an institution (Face-to-face and/or on-line only). The estimated cost to complete the degree is based on the current advertised tuition cost per credit hour and/or quarter hour at the particular institution. The estimated costs reported are believed to be an accurate estimate of the actual cost to complete the entire degree program as of November 2015. Tuition costs often change, and interested individuals are strongly encouraged to conduct their own research to determine the actual current cost at a particular institution. Finally, the number of students enrolled and number of students graduated represents what has been reported to the authors by institutional contacts.

In summary, the intent of this reporting is to provide a starting point for interested individuals to engage in their own research pertaining to Master level research administration degree programs offered. A simple internet search using the name of the institution coupled with “master degree in research administration” will reveal more details in regard to each program.

In conclusion, the professional field of research administration began small, but has evolved into an extremely important and large group of dedicated individuals, professional organizations, and institutions worldwide. The 2015 Demographic Profile of a Research Administrator (Shambrook, 2015) indicates that more research administrators possess a Master level degree than a Bachelor’s as their highest degree earned. In order to compete for the best jobs in the future, current trends indicate that it may be beneficial to possess at least a Master level degree. The growth of the profession has led to the creation of graduate level degree programs focusing specifically on research administration. There are currently seven such Master level degree programs offered in the United States. As the profession continues to grow, it may be in the best interest of many to engage in their own research and explore the many educational opportunities available.

Table 2: Postsecondary Institutions Offering Master Level Degree Programs (Clinical Focus)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution &amp; year program established</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th>Delivery Mode</th>
<th>Estimated Cost to complete</th>
<th>Students Enrolled</th>
<th>Students Graduated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walden University (Fall 2007)</td>
<td>Margaret Ann Skelton Margaret.skelton @waldenu.edu</td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>$28,215</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Washington University (Not reported)</td>
<td>Max Matthews <a href="mailto:mjmathewss@gwu.edu">mjmathewss@gwu.edu</a></td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>$19,872</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Greetings NCURA Colleagues,

We are just weeks away from the 10th Pre-Award Research Administration Conference. If you haven’t already, make your travel plans and pack your bags for The Big Easy, the Crescent City, the Queen City of the South - New Orleans! This conference is jam-packed with great sessions and workshops, and you will be warmly received by many of your NCURA colleagues ready to embrace new thoughts and ideas. Registration is still open, so don’t delay - register today!

New Update
We are pleased to share that James Hulbert, Contracts Manager for Pre-Award, Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (PCORI), will be joining us at PRA to conduct a concurrent session and a follow-up discussion. This is will be a great opportunity for many of us to get an overview of the PCORI application process as well as their various funding programs. We are sure to gain inside knowledge that will help us better prepare interested PIs at our institution.

Networking Opportunities (even for those who are introverts!)
PRA will be full of opportunities to network. We start with a networking wine and cheese reception on Wednesday evening (March 9th). This will be a great opportunity to meet and get acquainted with other members. On Thursday evening, we also offer the popular dinner groups where attendees can sign up and Dine Around Town with other members. This is a great way to network with colleagues and get a chance to try a restaurant outside of the hotel.

Track Highlights
The Professional Development Track has some really exciting sessions, including those with discussion groups tied to concurrent sessions to do a deep dive on the subjects. These include “So You Think You Want to Be a Consultant,” led by research administrators who have moved into the world of consulting, and “Practical Leadership in Research Administration,” which will highlight applying five practices of exemplary leadership. We will offer a session on pursing a master’s degree in research administration; a session entitled “Being an Introvert in an Extroverted World” for improving communication across the campus; another entitled “Developing Yourself for a Leadership Position”; and one on editing techniques for those who do not consider themselves proposal experts.

We are very excited to offer an International Track with both an operational and a strategic focus on cultivating and managing global opportunities in research administration. Session topics include global funding opportunities, partnering with international subrecipients, and the development and implementation of successful international collaborations. Discussion groups will delve into contracting, subaward topics, and NCURA’s global fellowship program. We hope you can join us in expanding our horizons across the globe.

Whether sponsored by the Federal Government, industry, or foundations, clinical trials present unique challenges for the research administrator. The Medical/Clinical Track offers sessions geared towards clinical research administrators and those who are considering a career in that area. The sessions include presentations on federal regulations, clinical research management, maintaining clinical trial reports and records, negotiating agreements, compliance, and financial reporting. Whether you are a novice in your role as a medical/clinical research administrator or a seasoned veteran, we have a session for you.

The PUI Track at PRA has it all, from seed funding scenarios that can really make a difference in getting research off the ground, to the importance of consulting with an external evaluator in the proposal development process! Join us for the incredible collaborative feat of bringing large, complex proposals together --AND-- managing an office of ONE. These sessions and overarching process, including peer review, strategic planning, and eRA-solutions for the PUI are just a glimpse of what is included in this year’s PUI PRA track.

New this year at PRA is the Case Study Track. Participants in past PRA meetings have asked for more in-depth case studies, similar to those embedded in many workshops, to be made available to conference attendees. Using a discussion group format, we’ve taken the idea from the popular “What Would You Do” questions on NCURA Collaborate and come up with eight sessions based on the PRA tracks (e.g., Departmental, Compliance, Professional Development). The facilitators of the discussions will lead the group through real-life scenarios, using critical thinking to address problems and helping the group understand how to handle similar situations that may crop up in their workplace.

The 10th PRA Conference is going to be an event you do not want to miss! We look forward to you seeing you there – embracing the change, challenge, and opportunity of all that is research administration!

Yours in Building for the Future,

Robyn and Laurianne

Greetings NCURA Colleagues,
The impact of research at PUIs/the impact of PUIs on research

By Penny J. Miceli and Janet Albarado

When the family of one of the authors was young, the wing of the local children’s museum devoted to human perception was a favorite destination. The exhibit featured a “crooked house” which looked normal when peering through its windows from outside, but whose deceptive angles and incline inside sent visitors tumbling. With perceptions challenged, it required focused effort to reorient one’s self and stay upright. Tumbling aside, trying a new perspective or viewing things from a slightly different angle is a worthy goal.

The theme of this issue of NCURA Magazine has us reflecting upon the assumptions society often holds about research, where it happens, and its impact. As research administrators at a predominantly undergraduate institution (PUI), it also has us reflecting upon why we do what we do where we do. Sometimes seemingly small things can add up for a big impact.

Where does research happen, and what difference does context make?

When we think of our national research enterprise and where it happens, it is natural to think about the many “big” research universities across the country—those with doctoral programs and very high research volumes. These institutions have long held research and the production of new knowledge as central tenets of their missions, and are one of the primary ways in which the US invests in the national research enterprise through its deployment of federal research and development dollars. But in the midst of all of that big impact, it is important to ask…Is that the entire picture? What else are we not seeing?

The publication Partnerships for Emerging Research Institutions: Report of a Workshop (National Research Council [NRC], 2009) cast a light upon our nation’s research enterprise from a different angle. The report reminds us that to focus too exclusively on the research universities would be to miss important opportunities:

Emerging Research Institutions [ERIs] (master’s colleges and universities, baccalaureate colleges, and tribal colleges) constitute one-third (1,463) of the 4,392 institutions of higher education that are listed in the 2005 Carnegie Classification system…and they enroll over 30 percent of the U.S. post-secondary student population. In addition, excluding the associate colleges, they enroll the largest number of undergraduates and the largest proportion of the minority student population…Many workshop participants shared the belief that ERIs potentially can contribute more significantly to innovative research and must play a more prominent role in sustaining the nation’s technological competitiveness. However, the research universities receive 83 percent of total federal obligations for research and development (R&D), according to NSF FY 2005 data… (p. 2-3)

The authors go on to discuss the benefits of research to students at ERIs, the variety of challenges faced by researchers in these contexts, and suggestions for overcoming them so that these institutions, their faculty, and their students may more fully contribute to the nation’s research enterprise.

The report resonates with our experience here at Keene State College, a predominantly undergraduate, public liberal arts institution which has been working in recent years to grow its research culture, capacity, and administrative infrastructure. Ascribing to the teacher-scholar model, one of Keene State’s key drivers for investing in and growing our research enterprise is the synergy between teaching and research. The practice of faculty engaging undergraduates in research specifically as a means of encouraging deeper learning is associated with positive student outcomes (Kuh, Chen, & Laird, 2007). These opportunities make a difference, and our students tell us so:

The opportunity to conduct biological research, funded by nationally competitive grants from NSF and NIH, engaged me in my major more than I could have thought when I first began at Keene State. The opportunity to conduct this work allowed me to make connections in the science community and present relevant research to other students and scientists throughout the state. (Keene State College Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, unpublished student survey results, 2015)

We now also know from our participation in the 2014 National Survey of Student Engagement [NSSE] that by the time they are seniors, Keene State College students are more likely to have worked with a faculty member on a
research project than their peers at similar institutions (NSSE, 2014). Our grant portfolio is modest compared to research universities, but the impact on our students and our educational mission is big.

**Building research capacity at non-research intensive institutions: The Role of Research Partnerships**

As would have been predicted by the NRC report (2009), the cultivation of research partnerships has been essential to producing these desired outcomes. Federally funded state-wide networks spearheaded by the research universities of our state are allowing PUIs like Keene State College to further advance our research enterprise, adding up to a big impact at the local, state, and federal levels. New Hampshire INBRE, funded by the National Institute of General Medical Sciences’ IDEA program, is one such network providing direct support for top quality biomedical, behavioral, and health science research at PUIs, increased research training opportunities for undergraduates, and enhanced research collaboration around the state. Similarly, New Hampshire’s EPSCoR program is building STEM research capacity, and represents another opportunity for faculty at PUIs to collaborate with researchers around the state. These networks have had a significant impact on both our faculty and students, and we are a different institution than we were just five years ago in part because of them.

Forming these networks does require buy-in, however, from both senior leadership and faculty. People “on the ground” have to share a vision of the research culture they hope to build at their institution and in their state, and why it is mission-centric to do so. Yes, it is about advancing science and the public good. But, the biggest public good of all is preparing the next generation of researchers, and that includes the sizeable portion of students enrolled in institutions other than our nation’s research universities. Fostering a campus climate that supports faculty scholarship and research is essential to making that a reality.

**Building research capacity at non-research intensive institutions: The Role of the Sponsored Research Office**

At Keene State and at most PUIs, research administration is centrally located without dedicated research support at the department level. Our pre-award specialist not only tends to central office issues such as compliance with federal regulations and institutional policies but functions like a departmental research administrator would at larger, more research intensive institutions. In terms of capacity building, this dual role and the research development support it provides allows our sponsored projects office to have a significant impact on both institutional and faculty research goals. By strategizing our outreach to faculty and providing comprehensive proposal development support, we are able to capitalize on capacity-building programs like NH-INBRE and EPSCoR. Keene State faculty who participated in these partnerships have been well-positioned to successfully apply to federal programs and receive independent funding for their research.

Key to our faculty cultivation strategy is thinking about a single proposal not in isolation but within a Principal Investigator’s research trajectory. We talk with faculty about their overall research agenda and help them strategize their scholarly goals for the next several years. One does not have to be an expert in the faculty’s field to provide this support—asking questions and expressing genuine interest provide an excellent springboard for a fruitful and inspired conversation. For faculty who are new to grant-seeking or starting new lines of inquiry, we look for smaller grant opportunities like fellowships and travel support to fund collecting and analyzing pilot data or to provide time for writing, especially for faculty in the humanities. A key to building our campus research culture is making it as inclusive as possible, so that faculty from all disciplines share a sense of collective purpose emanating from the teacher-scholar model. These funding opportunities help position faculty to apply for larger grants, often federal, with increased confidence and a greater chance of success.

PUI faculty typically carry a heavy teaching load, and helping them manage additional grant planning and writing activities is an important part of the support we provide. We try to help faculty balance interest and capacity so they do not feel overwhelmed or defeated by the grants process. Starting with smaller funding opportunities is an important way to bring faculty along, demystifying the grants process while helping them manage the activities required to complete the submission. We want faculty to have positive proposal submission experiences so they will continue to pursue grants even as the funding landscape becomes smaller and more competitive. Our approach, therefore, is necessarily high-touch and driven by a high level of customer service, regardless of the size of the grant or the recovery of indirect costs. These small but significant investments in our faculty have a big impact: growing individual research agendas, increasing our institution’s impact on undergraduate scholarship, and contributing to the research vitality of the state and the nation.  

---
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BRING NCURA TRAINING TO YOUR CAMPUS!

WORKSHOPS OFFERED:

- Level I: Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration
- Level II: Sponsored Project Administration: Critical Issues in Research Administration
- Financial Research Administration
- Departmental Research Administration
- Export Controls
- The Practical Side of Leadership

For more information contact Stephanie McJury Meetings Manager mcjury@ncura.edu
NCURA Awards First Research Grants

In 2015 NCURA decided to launch a beta program and invited proposals for its Research Program competition. The purpose of the NCURA Research Program is to create opportunities for NCURA members and faculty to pursue excellence in inquiry focused on research administration. Proposals were invited, but not limited to, supporting the data-driven needs of NCURA and the profession; identifying, developing and implementing innovative programs for research and education; and building resources for new partnership programs that support global efforts.

We received numerous meritorious proposals and like so many funding competitions we were not able to fund all proposals. We were pleased to be able to fund four proposals.

In December 2015 the Review Committee deliberated and discussed the submissions. The following proposals were approved for funding.

Heather Cody, University of Texas Health Sciences Center at Houston, “RE-Tool, Research Efficiency Tool”

Simon Kerridge, University of Kent, “Research Administration as a Profession”

Lisa Mosley, Arizona State University, “Model Policy Development to Reduce Administrative and Faculty Burden”

Jo Ann Smith, University of Central Florida, “Retention and Turnover of Early Research Administrators”

Please join us in congratulating our colleagues on their awards. We look forward to hearing about the outcome of the research projects in future magazine articles and conference sessions.

New Workshop Debuts in Palm Springs

NCURA debuted its latest professional development offering, Research Administration: The Practical Side of Leadership workshop in December at the beautiful La Quinta Resort. The program, developed and led by nationally recognized leaders, focuses on the practicalities and techniques necessary to direct sponsored program areas and provides a common direction for those interested in expanding and enriching their career paths. This workshop assists participants in understanding the skill sets that will help them direct an office of research administration, take on an expanded leadership role, or advance to a position as a senior staff member. The interactive program explores leadership and management, goal and priority setting, education, and communication issues.

Great information for leaders and managers! Speakers were knowledgeable of subject matter and provided real-life case studies for productive discussions. Take away: Leaders are learners.

Thank you for launching this program; it is a welcome addition to NCURA’s portfolio of conferences. Speakers were great and I particularly liked the case studies.

The goal and priority setting has already proven very useful!

For more information and workshop agenda visit www.ncura.edu/Education/TravelingWorkshops/SeniorLevelLeadershipWorkshop.aspx
NCURA Peer Programs.
Helping provide solutions in the complex world of research administration.

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

NCURA Peer Advisory Services
Research administration expertise brought to your institution to provide assistance in improving your research administration operations: Research Strategic Planning Service, Focused Analysis Service, Directed Education Service.

NCURA
supporting research...together

For questions or further information or to obtain a copy of the National Standards contact peerreview@ncura.edu or call (503) 364-1847. Learn more about the Peer Programs: http://www.ncura.edu/InstitutionalPrograms.aspx
I appreciate your question because it reminds us that leadership transitions are more than someone leaving a job, recruiting a replacement, and then everything and everyone continues just as before. We know that leadership transitions are rarely simple and easy. Yet, they are numerous! Think of the continual flow of new leaders at all operational levels of universities, colleges, and research institutions across the world.

Now, back to you and your question. A key principle in coaching is to have agreement between coach and client about the coaching topic. Unfortunately, I don’t know the answer to the very first question I would ask you, which is “You don’t know what to do about . . . what?” Getting that question answered, and probing a bit, will help you define what concerns this situation is bringing up for you.

I can only make assumptions about the story you are telling. So, better to ask you questions: “What are your expectations about this transition?” “What in your opinion would be successful for the institution and for your successor?” “Are there any differences in those definitions of success?” “What understandings do you have with your successor regarding any ongoing involvement or mentoring?” “What emotions describe how you are feeling about this transition?” Perhaps you feel a sense of loss from leaving your old job and colleagues, but that may be a wide assumption on my part. Other questions: “What is your stake in this transition?” “When will you know that transition is ‘done’ for you?” “Have you celebrated this transition in any way?”

I am also curious about your experience with past leadership transitions, or if this is your first experience. What have those previous transitions been like for you?

I also sense that you may feel a need to communicate or intervene in some way, and I would ask you if that is true. And, if so, what drives your need? What would you hope to accomplish by communicating or intervening? Who or what purpose does that serve? How significant to the institution are the people issues and business changes that you disapprove? (Notice that I did not ask about their significance to you.) Are major institutional risks at play here?

Your communications with people approaching you and how you communicate with them about this transition is also key. Your question is likely prompted because you know, intuitively, that your words and actions could matter a great deal, especially for the office and the new leader’s ability to succeed. I am curious how you are aware of your power, how you hold it, and what your thoughts are about using it.

I assume that we do not have to debate the merits of change, because it happens anyway. We learn to adapt and then adapt again when the next change happens. Some change is random, and other change comes from intentional planning and execution. A good leader influences an organization so it changes productively and in ways that advance the institution’s mission and the lives of the people it serves. And, as the song goes, that is a beautiful thing. I will assume that you can point to times during your leadership of the sponsored programs office that you were truly transformational and helped move the university’s sponsored programs activities forward. It is now someone else’s turn.

There are likely multiple stories and motivations as part of your question. I imagine that some readers are saying (or singing) to themselves, “Let it Go.” Others may be thinking that you are a citizen of your institution and are looking out for the office and individuals, perhaps some of the employees were those you have hired and mentored? Maybe some will think that you have residual concerns about leaving your former role? Some may wonder that, perhaps, you are making yourself too available to those offering criticisms of your successor, and thereby condoning such indirect communication that should be made directly to your successor? Others may be concerned that there is a potentially major institutional risk at issue and it is appropriate for you to speak up.

It is likely that a few of these narratives and explanations (and others) are at play and that these coexist with each other. This is true of all people. Transitions do have natural cycles, beginnings and ends, so laying out expectations in advance is a good practice. Frequent communication is needed because of natural human concerns about change.

And, coaching is about moving a client forward with healthy reflection and intention. That is what I wish for you. In the spirit of the theme of this month’s *Magazine*: Start small by reflecting about your own intentions in this transition. ■

---

Garry Sanders is an executive coach and graduate of GEORGE-town University’s Certificate Program in Leadership Coaching. Garry is a long-time research administrator and recipient of NCURA’s Distinguished Service Award. He can be reached at gsanders@assistleadership.com and (518) 588-0992.

---
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Managing Horizon 2020 Grants: the Experiences of the University of Michigan and Harvard

By Ryan Lankton and Jennifer Ponting

By now, many U.S. research administrators are aware of Horizon 2020, the European Commission’s 2014-2020 grant program totaling €77 billion (approximately US$95 billion). In fact, articles in previous issues of the NCURA Magazine (Jan/Feb 2014 and Mar/Apr 2014) have introduced the opportunities available for U.S. researchers to participate in European grant programs. Since then, the European Commission has awarded its first tranche of awards and more than 40 U.S. institutions are part of consortia that have successfully applied for and been awarded Horizon 2020 grants. Furthermore, NCURA had organized a highly successfully workshop in August 2015 in order to provide updates on U.S. participation in Horizon 2020 as well as practical tips on how to apply for those who may not be familiar with the application process.

As a part of this workshop, NCURA invited two of its members from the University of Michigan and Harvard University to describe their experiences in applying for and managing Horizon 2020 grants. In fact, U.S. research administrators have at times been hesitant to engage with European grants due to their unfamiliarity with the terms and conditions as well as the “work-arounds” they might need to do in order to acquiesce to the template Horizon 2020 agreement.

With this in mind, we will cover the following two issues in order to shed light on two U.S. universities’ experience in Horizon 2020:

1. What are the differences and potential areas of concern for U.S. institutions regarding Horizon 2020 versus U.S. federal awards?
2. What is one model for dealing with the jurisdictional and liability issues inherent in the template Horizon 2020 agreement?

Horizon 2020 versus U.S. Federal Awards

While the landscape is improving, it can be somewhat challenging to take full advantage of the funding opportunities presented by the Horizon 2020 program. Until general best practices can be developed, research administrators and other university officials will need to devise their own ways to tackle the challenges presented by the Horizon 2020 program’s unique set of risks and responsibilities.

Key Differences

Numerous aspects of Horizon 2020 grants differ in significant ways from standard U.S. federal grants. This brief article cannot get into deep details; however, the issues listed below are among those that warrant careful attention and consideration.

1. Governing law and jurisdiction. These grant provisions are set by legislation and not subject to change through negotiation. For U.S. institutions, the grant agreement will be governed by EU law, supplemented as needed by Belgian law. Belgian courts have been given sole jurisdiction in disputes over the validation, interpretation, or application of the grant agreement. U.S. federal grants, in contrast, are silent on governing law and jurisdiction.

2. Access rights to background technology and results. Unlike U.S. federal grants, grant recipients are required to authorize use of their background technology and project results when a consortium member needs them in order to implement that member’s grant actions. Such use must generally be
authorised on a royalty-free basis. In addition, for a period of one year after the project ends, use must be granted under fair and reasonable conditions when a consortium member needs the beneficiary’s background technology or results in order to exploit their own grant results.²

The grant agreement terms governing these obligations are quite broad and somewhat vague. Thus, grant beneficiaries are encouraged to refine their rights and responsibilities under the grant agreement. To this end, it is worth considering the following.

• As defined, “background” is potentially everything that the institution holds, not just what the institution owns. Beneficiaries should consider limiting access rights to background technology that is specifically enumerated in the consortium agreement.³
• “Results” constitute anything derived from the grant action.
• Requests for access must be formally made in writing. The subsequent authorization allows the requesting party to use but not to sublicense the technology. The right to request access may extend to all or certain affiliates of a consortium member.⁴
• Requests for access are evaluated on the basis of need. However, “need” is not defined within the grant agreement, and so the parties to the collaboration should define “need” in the consortium agreement.
• Early termination of participation by a beneficiary does not excuse that beneficiary from its obligation to provide access to its background technology or results. Once a beneficiary accedes to the grant agreement terms, it is obligated to provide access to its background technology and results as outlined in the grant.

Read the annotated model grant and consortium agreements. These annotated models provide a wealth of knowledge to potential program beneficiaries.

Protection of the results. For a period of four years after the project ends and similar to U.S. federal grant requirements under the Bayh-Dole Act, beneficiaries must proactively take adequate steps to protect those results under the grant which are reasonably expected to have commercial value.⁵ Beneficiaries are also required to coordinate with the EU and other consortium members before licensing or disseminating the results. They must affirmatively address the legitimate interests of all members of the consortium. Beneficiaries are free to choose the means of protecting their results and to seek reimbursement from the EU for such activities, but failure to adequately protect the results can lead to assumption of ownership of the results by the EU.⁶

Promotion of the grant action and results. Unlike U.S. federal grants, Horizon 2020 grant beneficiaries are required to develop and implement a comprehensive plan that effectively promotes the beneficiary’s actions and results under the grant. The plan is also expected to communicate the EU’s role in funding the grant.

Joint and several liability for technical implementation. Under the grant agreement, consortium members are made jointly and severally liable for the technical implementation of the grant action. If a consortium member drops out of the collaboration, the remaining members will be required to complete all the deliverables outlined under the grant. This is in contrast to U.S. federal grants in which the prime recipient is solely responsible for the implementation of the grant action.

Financial statements and payments made in euros. Financial transactions will be conducted in euros, leaving U.S. grant beneficiaries responsible for the costs associated with the currency conversion and the added administrative burden of providing the converted financial statements.

Indirect recovery rate. Unlike the rates regularly negotiated between a U.S. federal agency and a university, beneficiaries are entitled to recover a flat rate of 25% of the eligible total direct costs, less any costs related to (a) subcontracting, (b) in-kind contributions incurred by third parties but not used on the beneficiaries’ premises, or (c) providing financial support to third parties.

Recommendations

While best practices are being developed as a whole, U.S. institutions are advised to take the following steps to help reduce the risks and administrative burden posed by Horizon 2020 grants.

• Promptly register the institution in the Participant Portal and designate a legal representative, as required for access to the online system used to conduct formal communication and administration of grants. The registration and validation process can take weeks to complete. The process is a precondition to formally accepting a grant, and a beneficiary has only thirty days after the grant is issued to formally accept it in the Participant Portal.
• Read the annotated model grant⁷ and consortium agreements.⁸ These annotated models provide a wealth of knowledge to potential program beneficiaries.
• Begin negotiating the consortium agreement early. Discussions concerning the consortium’s proposed work plan should address the details of access to background technology, narrowing the scope of the background technology implicated by the consortium and defining the meaning of terms such as “need.”
• Seek reimbursement for all allowable direct costs⁹. This mitigates the financial burden of the program’s extra responsibilities, such as paying to protect research results, and also maximizes the amount that will be recovered under the program’s flat rate of indirect cost recovery.
• Use the many resources available to Horizon 2020 program participants. One of the greatest resources is the knowledge and experience of consortium members from the EU who have participated in many similar grant programs. The coordinating beneficiary is often the most experienced member of a consortium.
Harvard Global: One Management Model for Horizon 2020 Grants

In 2012, Harvard University established Harvard Global Research and Support Services, Inc., known as “Harvard Global,” a non-profit corporation affiliated with the President and Fellows of Harvard College. The primary purpose of the new organization is to administer overseas operations on behalf of Harvard University, by providing common infrastructure, processes, and tools to operate its non-profit academic and research endeavors internationally. As a secondary function, Harvard Global also acts as a direct awardee (or, using the EU nomenclature, a “beneficiary”) of sponsored grants with certain onerous and non-negotiable conditions, when there remains a compelling reason to accept the award. As described herein, many awards under Horizon 2020 include significant indemnification obligations and subsequent financial risk which cannot be removed or mitigated. In order to provide access for faculty and participate more fully in Europe’s research funding landscape, Harvard University has chosen to route most Horizon 2020 participation through Harvard Global.

The application, receipt and management of all grants accepted by Harvard Global are overseen by Harvard University’s Office for Sponsored Programs. Despite its legal separation, Harvard Global follows many of the same policies and practices as Harvard University, and as such, grants and awards cannot violate typical values including academic freedom and integrity. For grants under Horizon 2020, Harvard Global is a separately registered entity in the Participant Portal and is the signatory for both the Grant Agreement and the Consortium Agreement. As part of its internal process, Harvard Global enters into secondment agreements with Harvard University that outlines the roles and responsibilities of University staff and/or researchers related to all grant activity at Harvard Global.

Although the establishment of a separate legal entity is complex and not without administrative burden, the Harvard Global model is beneficial: supporting international activity and encouraging the acceptance of more complex research funding. Through Harvard Global, Harvard University has limited the financial risks of participating in Horizon 2020 and has developed significant expertise in the management of EU grants. Harvard Global designed training for faculty and staff and also created compliance measures and internal controls for researchers and departments that enable them to navigate a complex and unfamiliar system. Faculty interest and involvement in the Horizon 2020 funding landscape has been steadily growing since 2012.

There are many funding opportunities available to US researchers that often result from the strategic and advantageous research relationships formed while conducting an EU project. Although managing the awards through Harvard Global does require additional administrative commitments and effort to properly steward these awards, the model has created more opportunity and advantages to faculty and researchers.

Faculty interest and involvement in the Horizon 2020 funding landscape has been steadily growing since 2012.

Other Resources

Other resources available to U.S. researchers and research administrators include the following:

- Bilat USA 2.0 website: [www.euusscienceandtechnology.eu](http://www.euusscienceandtechnology.eu)
- Harvard Global website: [www.harvardglobal.org](http://www.harvardglobal.org)
- Presentations from the NCURA Workshop on Horizon 2020: [www.ncura.edu/Global/BilatUSA2015Horizon2020Horizon2020Workshop-AM57.aspx](http://www.ncura.edu/Global/BilatUSA2015Horizon2020Horizon2020Workshop-AM57.aspx)
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2. Beneficiaries can agree on different terms for accessing background technology or even a different length of time for allowing access to background technology or results, though the default is royalty-free access to all background technology and for the period of up to one year after the project ends. (See Articles 25.3 and 31.3 of the Horizon 2020 Model Grant Agreement).
3. Article 24.1 of the Horizon 2020 Model Grant Agreement does allow participants to identify and limit what specifically is the background technology that will be accessible to other consortium members.
4. Articles 25.4 and 31.4 of the Horizon 2020 Model Grant agreement does allow participants to limit the access rights of some or even all affiliated entities.
5. Article 27.1 of the Horizon 2020 Model Grant Agreement places specific limits to this requirement.
6. See Article 26.4 of the Horizon 2020 Model Grant Agreement for details on when the EU may assume ownership.
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The Nominating and Leadership Development Committee is pleased to present the opportunity for all members of NCURA to nominate (or self-nominate) candidates to serve as the next leaders for our organization. We urge you to consider individuals for the following important positions:

- **Vice President/President-Elect**
- **Two At-Large Board Members**

NCURA provides many opportunities to volunteer within our professional organization—currently at a membership that exceeds 7000! By expanding your involvement, you are afforded a wealth of enriching experiences. Being active and involved in NCURA can be as simple as considering whom to nominate for these positions, and then making that nomination. In addition, if you are interested in these positions and would like to submit your name for consideration, we are waiting to hear from you.

For a detailed description of the current responsibilities of these positions as well as this year’s required nomination materials for each position, please visit: [http://collaborate.ncura.edu/volunteer/volunteeropportunities](http://collaborate.ncura.edu/volunteer/volunteeropportunities)

Terms of these positions will begin on January 1, 2017.

---

### 2016 NCURA Awards

The Nominating and Leadership Development Committee is pleased to announce the Call for Nominations for the 2016 NCURA Awards.

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

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

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

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

**Catherine Core Minority Travel Award** This program supports travel-related costs to attend the NCURA Annual Meeting for up to four individuals from under-represented groups who would not otherwise be able to attend this meeting.

**Deadline for all award nominations: March 23, 2016.**

Please email award nominations and applications to: awards@ncura.edu

For more information on the awards, please visit [www.ncura.edu/MembershipVolunteering/Awards.aspx](http://www.ncura.edu/MembershipVolunteering/Awards.aspx)
The Very Hungry Caterpillar by Eric Carle is one of the most well-recognized children’s books and a favorite of many generations. It teaches children that the transition from a small caterpillar to a beautiful butterfly doesn’t happen overnight but that the caterpillar must be nurtured and fed, and that with time the change will happen. The same idea translates to successful businesses and, in this case, the development of the Post Contract Office (PCO) at Karolinska Institutet in Sweden.

Karolinska Institutet (KI) is the largest medical university in Sweden. It consists of 22 departments which are decentralized. The administration of scientific projects primarily occurs in each of the departments but is supported by the central administration. In 2004 it was recognized that a central support function for the departments’ externally financed projects was needed in the area of administration. Three people were recruited to the Post Contract section of the KI grants office in 2004 and from 2004-2011 more expert staff joined the office to build competence and support for financial administration of scientific projects funded by the European Union. During this time KI was a recipient of many EU grants but only a few coordinated projects were administered at Grants Office.

At the end of 2011 KI received an informal email from the European Commission noting a systemic compliance error and as a result of this communication the University Director made a strategic decision to establish a new compliance position at the KI Grants Office. Eva Björndal was appointed as the Compliance Coordinator and, like in nature, the caterpillar began its evolution.

From the end of 2011 to the first half of 2012 the Compliance Coordinator and the Internal KI Auditor conducted internal reviews at the KI departments. This review confirmed irregular adherence to financial rules and regulations. A second round of review that focused on the European Research Council grants was conducted in the first part of 2013. At this stage there were discussions regarding centralization of the administration of EU grants, however, a decision was made to “sell” project administration services to the departments on a voluntary basis to support their compliance with EU requirements.

In February 2013 one department at KI, the Department of Microbiology, Tumor and Cell Biology, decided to trial a pilot idea to pay for financial administration services from PCO. The department continued to administer projects to comply with the KI and national regulations but the compliance with EU regulations was managed at PCO. This initial trial was a success and led to a domino effect with 12 KI departments paying for EU project administration services from PCO within just over two years. The office also started to provide administration support for some NIH projects.

In the summer 2014 the EU conducted an audit of KI and the findings showed a systematic error regarding internal invoices within the departments not administered centrally. Not only did this confirm the expertise of PCO, but also revealed the need to improve EU compliance in these departments. This finding, as well as others regarding personnel costs, resulted in the Vice-Chancellor taking a decision in April 2015 for mandatory EU administration by PCO.

A formal PCO team was formed in August 2013 and this team has been steadily growing ever since. Today PCO is a dynamic group of people with expertise in many areas of financial project administration. The team currently consists of 13 people and PCO is actively recruiting personnel to be able to support the increasing number of departments and projects that will be centrally administered. A planned step-wise transition of the administration is currently underway and will take some years to implement.

The transition from a small support structure to a large well-functioning specialist office has not been without challenges. Eva Björndal, the Head of PCO likens the experience to building a plane in flight – definitely challenging but extremely exciting. While the team continues to grow the administration of the international projects at KI is continually improving. The success of PCO is a result of hard work and enthusiasm, as well as a well-functioning team of people striving to improve the success of KI. Right now the caterpillar is being nurtured and growing and soon a fully grown butterfly will emerge, with the PCO effectively administering all EU projects at KI.

Laura Plant Fuentes is a Grants Specialist at the Karolinska Institutet’s Grants Office. Laura’s responsibilities include supporting and writing applications to international agencies, specifically the European Research Council. Laura can be reached at Laura.Plant@ki.se
A t every NCURA meeting over the past decade, I have participated in at least one conversation about the “graying of research administration,” or the inevitable progression of our heavy hitters in the field toward retirement. This is, of course, a natural progression. Many retirees continue to contribute to the profession by way of mentoring, consulting, financial support, advisory service, and more, well after their days of submitting proposals and managing grants are over. However, there is a recognized need for newcomers to our still-evolving profession. Most people stumble into research administration, as I did, and few outsiders even know what a research administrator does!

This presents us with a big goal: attract newcomers to our fledgling profession, and keep them growing in the field! Just as every journey starts with a single step, there are many small things we can do in order to progress toward our lofty goal.

**Step 1: Attracting Newcomers**

To begin actively recruiting newcomers to research administration from other fields, it helps to understand job seekers’ behavior. CareerBuilder.com surveyed over 5,000 job seekers and over 2,000 hiring managers for their 2015 Candidate Behavior Survey, and discovered something we already know: money talks. The search for a higher salary is still the key reason why most people enter the job market. These results are echoed in other recent surveys, too. As we are all too aware, our budgets are often extremely tight, and it can be very difficult to offer a salary that is competitive with what other institutions are paying their research administrators; never mind competing with other fields! But before we give up hope, it’s important to remember that job seekers are often willing to forego a larger salary in exchange for other factors: work-life balance, flexibility, good organizational culture, and competitive benefits. We can’t always control the funds we have available to pay a new hire, but we can certainly control some of the other important factors.

Attracting newcomers to research administration, then, requires two key things:

- Visibility of both the profession and the open job opportunities, and
- Clear, well-written position descriptions that address what job seekers are looking for, allowing potential applicants to envision themselves as research administrators.

Increasing the visibility of research administration is a slow process, but one that has begun to pick up steam. As more research administrators become active in social media, and more research administration topics are featured in popular culture (a la *The Big Bang Theory*), more people will begin to at least recognize the concept, if not the reality, of the profession. Doing your part to increase the visibility of the profession may be as simple as volunteering to present at your local school’s Career Day! To achieve visibility for hiring purposes, though, we must be diligent in getting our message out to potential candidates. A simple newspaper ad is no longer sufficient to bring in enough qualified candidates. Often, a multi-faceted scheme of advertisements, social media posts, and online outreach still doesn’t generate a good candidate pool. That’s where the position description comes in. If posting an opportunity on multiple platforms isn’t working, the problem may lie in the position description itself. The CareerBuilder survey indicates that the top two factors candidates look for in position description are clearly defined job duties and responsibilities, and a defined salary range. Are our position descriptions specific enough? Too specific? Our terminology in research administration can be intimidating, especially to newcomers, so particularly for entry-level positions, less may be more. Writing a good position description takes time, but it pays dividends in the form of better quality candidates, easier decision making during the hiring process, and ultimately, better job performance from the chosen candidate. If you’re having trouble crafting a position description, it can be very helpful to reach out to experienced NCURA colleagues at other institutions.

**Step 2: Finesse the Hiring Process**

Once a pool of candidates has been identified, there are other factors in the process that are often neglected, to our peril. One such factor is the candidate’s experience throughout the application and interview process. We’ve all had the experience of applying for a position, only to receive a generic “A candidate has been chosen” message months later, or worse, no communication at all! It is vital to treat all candidates with respect, even those we do not choose to interview. Our organizational culture also shines through during the hiring process, for better or for worse. Smart job seekers can spot a toxic environment right away, and may decline an otherwise acceptable offer as a result. Office culture is critically important to both hiring and keeping good employees - but that’s another article!

The clear, detailed position description should be a central tool in selecting the best candidate for the job. Using the specific skills identified in the description, you can create a rubric or checklist against which candidates can be evaluated. It is also wise to incorporate a skills test in addition to the interview process for front line employees both at the entry and intermediate levels. Many times, the skills test results can change the direction of the final decision! If the interview process identifies more than one great
candidate, look for other research administration opportunities at your institution that may be a good fit for the individual. This works particularly well at larger institutions, and can help create goodwill between units or campuses, while providing a good experience for the candidate as well.

So, to summarize the hiring process, we must carefully advertise our positions for maximum exposure, offer potential candidates what they are looking for, ensure that their initial impressions of both the institution and the field as a whole are good ones, and thoughtfully and carefully choose the best candidate for the position.

Step 3: Keep Employees Happy
On the other side of the equation, retention is just as important as hiring newcomers, most notably because of the high cost of turnover. Research shows that much of the employee turnover in the US is preventable. People leave their jobs for better compensation, better opportunities for advancement, and better work/life balance, just to name a few of the top factors. The keys to retaining research administrators are the same as those of any other employee: good supervision, positive organizational culture, competitive pay, a clear career path, and professional development. Often in practice this means supporting an employee’s aspirations to move up. The most promising young research administrators often move up from entry level positions quickly, within 2-3 years. We can create a pipeline of new research administrators if we use this to our advantage. The best employees know their strengths, and they will go for the best advancement opportunity when they feel ready, wherever that opportunity might be found.

Our job as managers is to give our employees those opportunities within the field of research administration (preferably, within our teams). How? Get them active in NCURA or SRAI as soon as possible. Understand that they are a growing commodity, and make sure they know they are valued. Make professional development a priority, including your own as a supervisor. Model professional standards by attending training. Encourage your employees to network with other research administrators and faculty, visiting labs and other offices periodically so that they can see the real impact of their work. Introduce them to the endless possibilities of this profession, and help them be ready for their next big career move!
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I'd wanted to start this article as a summary of sorts of what Research Administrators should know about animal research and compliance. Ironically, this month's theme, starting small and finishing big, is a literal description of the information that began to surface when researching this topic. What we as research administrators come across on a daily basis with Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) approvals, laboratory animals, and grant reviews is merely the tip of the iceberg.

I'd spoken with various people at varying institutions regarding issues of compliance, resources, and other topics of concern when it comes to animal research. These discussions illuminated the fact that there is so much more involved than I had imagined. The main point I'd taken away regarding offering assistance to your investigators on any questions they may have regarding animals – be it compliance or any other topic – point them to your institution's website(s) for IACUC and animal facilities. The “pros” in this field will handle the ins and outs of the in-depth questions your investigators will have.

Federal regulations, numerous guidance documents, and institutional policies shape how an institution addresses the numerous topics involved with research animals and compliance.

So – what are the federal regulations?

The Animal Welfare Act (AWA) was established in 1966 under the U.S. Department of Agriculture and covers the care and use of warm-blooded animals. It requires that the institution register with the USDA every three years and involves at least once annually unannounced inspections by the USDA of facilities and programs for all registered institutions. The AWA was brought about originally to protect pets that were being stolen and sold on the “black market.”

The Health Research Extension Act of 1985 brought about the regulations that we as administrators are likely the MOST familiar with - the Public Health Service (PHS) Policy on Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals. Any institution that receives PHS funding is required to follow this policy (http://grants.nih.gov/grants/olaw). PHS Policy expands upon the requirements of the Animal Welfare Act. The Act also brought about the notion of institutions being responsible for monitoring their own compliance and requires each institution engaging in animal research to have its own IACUC to oversee organizational compliance. Each IACUC must have at least five members, including a veterinarian, a practicing scientist experienced in working with animals, a non-scientific member (lawyer, clergy, etc.), and one member completely unaffiliated with the institution.

For institutions receiving any PHS funding, the IACUC needs to report to the Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare (OLAW) on issues of animal compliance. OLAW is a wonderful source of information for expanding your knowledge on animal compliance – in fact, my “refresher” was watching OLAW's webinar entitled “Research Involving Animals”. I highly recommend this webinar for all administrators, as it is very informative and touches base on all pertinent topics that a research administrator should be aware of when guiding their faculty on the basic issues of compliance. OLAW's website also offers much more in depth training for researchers and their staff.
PHS policy adheres to the *Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals* (National Academies Press) — the “Bible,” if you will, for animal researchers, available for online for free. Though we as administrators would not likely read through the whole thing, or even understand it, it bears mentioning.

**What are your institutional policies? Who do you go to at YOUR institution for guidance?**

While most investigators may never ask you a question regarding animals and compliance — there are those that may. In that case, it does not hurt to familiarize yourself with your IACUC offices and the people that can help your investigators with questions. Most institutions have their own set of policies and procedures which usually adhere to both the AWA and PHS policies. So what should you familiarize yourself with? Robert A. DeAngelis, Ph.D., Protocol Specialist & IACUC Administrator at the University of Pennsylvania, Office of Animal Welfare had suggested some topics below that Research Administrators may familiarize themselves with to provide guidance to their faculty (R. DeAngelis, personal communication, October 23, 2015):

- Know the process for submitting a protocol, including any tips or tricks and common errors.
- Know your institution’s review process and general timing for how long a review takes (which may be different for protocols, amendments, annual reviews, etc).
- Who handles animal transfers? Who handles animal purchases? At both the University of Pittsburgh and the University of Pennsylvania, these are handled by separate departments. Knowing who to send your investigators to for what purpose is a great help.
- What about connecting funding? How do PIs add funding sources to protocols? How do they then choose what funding to use, if they can have more than one per protocol?
- Is there a congruency check done to make sure the grant and protocol are congruent? If so, who does that, and when (at the time of protocol submission, grant submission, JIT, etc.) Both the NIH and the American Heart Association require that the application is reviewed to make sure the proposed research is consistent with the protocol that was submitted to the IACUC to ensure that all processes have been reviewed and approved.
- Is there a safety office that is involved? What is their role in protocol approval, if any?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comparing the Animal Welfare Act and PHS Policy</strong></th>
<th>USDA Regulations / Animal Welfare Act</th>
<th>PHS Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Species Covered</strong></td>
<td>Warm-blooded animals except mice, rats &amp; birds</td>
<td>All live vertebrate animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oversight</strong></td>
<td>Unannounced inspections by USDA; Self-monitoring and reporting by IACUC</td>
<td>Self-monitoring and reporting by IACUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sanctions</strong></td>
<td>Fines, revocation of USDA registration, imprisonment</td>
<td>Restriction of withdrawal of grant funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy References</strong></td>
<td>Animal Welfare Act and USDA policies</td>
<td>“PHS Policy on the Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals” and “Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What are the most common sources of non-compliance?**

Some of the most common sources of non-compliance recognized by OLAW include the following:

- Protocol approval lapses, whether an annual renewal as required or a “de novo” third year renewal.
- Personnel begin working with animals prior to completing required training and prior to being added to a protocol.
- Procedures deviate from those described in the protocol.
- Animals are taken from housing areas to use sites that are not listed in the protocol.

**Straight from the IACUC office!**

Pamela Lanford, PhD, Director of Animal Research Support & Manager, IACUC, at the University of Maryland offers a few pointers for research administrators (P. Lanford, personal communication, October 26, 2015):

- Understand the timeline for submission, review and approval of new protocols and amendments. It often takes a couple of months to get approval (sometimes much longer). Many institutions have a monthly meeting, and a submission deadline falls well in advance of the meeting.
- IACUC protocols cannot be “expedited.” When submitting a grant application, please know that protocols will take the usual length of time to work through approval, regardless of JIT status on the award. (Research administrators can do a limited release of funds until the IACUC protocol is approved.)
- Triennial renewals of a protocol must be consider de novo, and may take as long to process and approve as a new protocol, so begin your renewal submission at least 60 days prior to expiration date.
- If a protocol expires, animals on that protocol may be transferred to a holding protocol (if your institution has one) or could be held without a protocol (but not indefinitely, and some institutions will not allow this). In both instances, all research activities with animals must stop. When placing animals onto a holding protocol, grant funds can continue to pay for basic animal care. If the animals are not placed onto a holding protocol, no PHS funds can be used to pay for their care.
New and Upcoming Changes in Animal Policy

National Science Foundation (NSF): Beginning October 2015, the NSF now requires grant recipients to follow the PHS policy, and report findings to OLAW.


These policies will apply to applications submitted on or after January 25, 2016.

Why do you need to know this information?

Robert A. DeAngelis, Ph.D. summed the topic up quite nicely: “Research is a privilege granted to us by society, not a right, and if the public thinks we are not treating animals as well as we can, they are going to demand we stop using them. The regulations and protocols help ensure that’s the case and that we have documentation to prove it. Animal activists are constantly looking for slip-ups.”
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Most people would agree that education in responsible conduct of research (RCR) is among the best ways to ensure research integrity, including curbing misconduct (fabrication, falsification and plagiarism) and also promoting ethical behavior.

Legislative and sponsor-based programmatic efforts to require RCR education as a means to facilitate more ethical research and foster the public’s trust of research have largely been focused on researchers and trainees, but not for other research personnel. Educational programming specifically targeted for research administrators designed to increase individual competencies and foster individual actions in support of responsible conduct has been largely absent from our institutions, not because of any malice or ill will, but because leadership doesn’t readily connect research administrators to research integrity.

Believing that everyone in the research enterprise has a role to play and has the potential to make a positive or negative impact on individual and institutional research integrity regardless of his or her responsibilities within the enterprise, we developed and piloted a program in July at Vanderbilt University, called Growing Research Integrity Together (GRIT). The curriculum for GRIT was designed to help foster a sense of “we’re all in this together” and thus increasing the personal and professional investment of participants in the integrity of the research enterprise at their institutions while increasing the likelihood that they will engage with faculty members and others in support of integrity. We call this personal and professional investment the Research Integrity Partnerships (RIP).

GRIT was held over three days on the Vanderbilt campus in Nashville including active, workshop style learning including presentations from Vanderbilt faculty members and leadership from both Vanderbilt University and Vanderbilt University Medical Center, all centered on the topic of building bridging between administrators, faculty and research staff members in support of research integrity and featured Elizabeth Heitman, (Associate Professor of Medicine at Vanderbilt University), James Goldenring (Professor of Surgery at Vanderbilt University), Charlene Dewey (Associate Professor of Medical Education and Administration and Internal Medicine at Vanderbilt University), and Doug Adams (Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Arkansas).

Participants included faculty and staff members from more than 15 different institutions in more than 10 different states. It was promoted as a low-cost educational option for those who had small travel budgets, but still wanted exposure to important topics at the intersection of research administration and research integrity.

Prior to the three-day conference, participants were asked to think about the content and identify their own learning objectives. They also completed a self-assessment and took a baseline test of their knowledge of the RCR.

In addition to the lectures, which were designed to address essential questions and stimulate learning, there were panel discussions designed to provide multiple perspectives on issues, group discussions and activities, designed to expand concepts and allow participants an opportunity to actively engage with both the material and other participants while practicing new skills and understanding through problem-solving, idea generation and reflective conversations, special activities designed to expose participants to new material, extend existing understandings and allow them to expose areas of pre-existing understanding and reflective opportunities designed to increase understanding and self-awareness in which participants were encouraged to think about what they were learning and to question any gaps in their own knowledge or understanding.

With an initial conference under our belts, we’re busy refining the material and preparing for a second GRIT Conference in the summer of 2016. Then we’ll be ready to test the material at additional institutions as we develop a participant guide, instructor’s manual and supplemental materials that will be exportable to any academic research institution for use in educating research administrators and nurturing a culture built on RIPs.

Our goal is that any academic research institution will be able to adapt GRIT for its institutional needs. We are actively exploring the opportunity to adapt it with NCURA.

Dr. Sam Gannon is the director of the Vanderbilt Program in Research Administration Development, a nationally known program to education administrative, clinical and other research staff members in the best practices in administration of and compliance in sponsored research programs. He can be reached at sam.gannon@Vanderbilt.edu
Lead Me Mentorship Program: Discovering the Leader in You

How we are formed into a leader is a journey we can initiate at any point in our careers. “Lead Me” is a NCURA Region VI/ VII based professional development program that affords Region VI and Region VII members a constructive environment to explore their inner leader. The program welcomes all types of research administrators, from directors to grant administrators, from a few years of experience to advanced. Lead Me aligns interests between a mentee and a mentor to guide professionals towards their specific aims and goals. Applications are accepted every Spring and the cohort is kept small to enhance success in the program. The program was conceptualized and founded by Linda Patton. Since its maiden launch in 2010, Lead Me has graduated 41 mentees from the program. The benefits are vast and plentiful, but don’t just take our word for it. Here is what participants had to say about their experience:

**Lead Me Mentorship Program: Discovering the Leader in You**

**Why did you join the program and what did you find encouraging about it?**

I joined the program because I saw it as an opportunity for professional development and I had a desire to improve the communication processes in our department. - Irina Cocianu, Assistant Manager, Training & Compliance, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center

I was at a point in my life where I felt I needed a different perspective on where I was and where I would like to be short and long-term as a leader in research administration. - Felicia Mayes, Research Manager, Neurosciences, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center

I joined in 2011 and my reasons were two-fold – 1) participation in an educational leadership to provide opportunity for personal professional growth, 2) mentoring - Stacy Miller, Sr. Grant and Contract Officer, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center

**What caused that self-discovery (aha) moment and what have you done or will you do about it?**

My aha moment came when I connected a situation I had experienced personally that had also been experienced from someone in the group. - Rashonda Harris, Associate Director, Emory University

Finding my cheese was an excellent allegory for some of my past experiences and truly being able to put all of that learning into perspective. I learned that I am responsible for framing my career and working toward the successes I desire. - Theresa Caban, Sr. Contracts & Grants Administrator, Kaiser Foundation Hospital

Who moved my cheese gave me a very clear insight to myself and the way I conduct my home life and work. Due to this self-awareness I strive more to have a balance in each since I found that I was the opposite for each segment of my life. - Erika Blossom, Research Grants & Compliance Officer, California State University, Fullerton

Some of the program aspects challenge you, how did you handle this? The program challenged me to think outside of my comfort zone. I still think to this day that they didn’t realize they awakened a roaring lion within. My confidence in my skills was realized. The Lead Me program, through our leadership project, challenged me to trust in my instincts for the industry. I conquered my fear of public speaking which boosted my confidence level tremendously as an ultimate result. - Derick Jones, Program Manager, LA BioMed

I found it to be challenging when I changed positions mid-way through the program. However the support of the program leader allowed me to continue along to the end. - Rashonda Harris, Associate Director, Emory University

**What are the benefits of going through this program?**

The benefits of the program are seeing early career research administrators grow within their institution and grow within NCURA. - Rosemary Madnick, Executive Director, Office of Grants & Contracts Administration and Mentor/Dean of the Lead Me Program

The networking growth is phenomenal. Learning outside of just getting my job done as well was a very enlightening experience. - Erika Blossom, Research Grants & Compliance Officer, California State University, Fullerton

The program acts as both a mirror and window — much of the studying requires one to reflect on self and past/current behaviors while you have engage with the mentors (window) and see where you can be with the proper attitude and skills. Even as a mentor, I felt the impact of the mirror and window. The program works for everyone! - Theresa Caban, Sr. Contracts & Grants Administrator, Kaiser Foundation Hospital

**What would you tell someone contemplating about applying?**

Take a leap of faith and jump into the program with your mind open to a journey toward self-discovery. If you have an experience even as close to mine, you will develop more confidence as a leader. - Felicia Mayes, Research Manager, Neurosciences, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center

Just do it! It is the best investment that you could make for your career. - Derick Jones, Program Manager, LA BioMed

**What caused that self-discovery (aha) moment and what have you done or will you do about it?**

DO IT! The Lead Me program can change your professional life if you let it. - Theresa Caban, Sr. Contracts & Grants Administrator, Kaiser Foundation Hospital

**The program has changed since its initiation. Do you think it’s still relevant and beneficial today?**

Absolutely! Just like the field of research administration has changed, so must the program in order to be relevant and beneficial. - Rosemary Madnick, Executive Director, Office of Grants & Contracts Administration and Mentor/Dean of the Lead Me Program

Absolutely. I had the privilege to attend the Lead Me presentations at the NCURA Regional meeting in Salt Lake. In my opinion the program has grown...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>University/Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Paul Lekutai</td>
<td>University of California - Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Sanderson</td>
<td>University of Colorado - Colorado Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erika Blossom</td>
<td>California State University - Fullerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandra Purves</td>
<td>Los Angeles Biomedical Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elaine Moya</td>
<td>Loma Linda University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marianne Green Mentee</td>
<td>California Polytechnic University - San Luis Obispo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diane Ross-Nelson</td>
<td>Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nannette Pettis</td>
<td>Kaiser Permanente Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irina Cozianu</td>
<td>Cedars-Sinai Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aimee Knudson</td>
<td>Cal Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angie Karchmer</td>
<td>University of California - Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Bidushi Bhattacharya</td>
<td>Keck Science Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shawn Hoffman</td>
<td>Cedars-Sinai Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raquel Rodriguez</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michelle Campbell</td>
<td>Alliant International University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teeny Ellis</td>
<td>University of California, Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Ludmilla Budilo</td>
<td>LA Biomedical Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesa DeVance Mitchell</td>
<td>Cedars-Sinai Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ray Robles</td>
<td>Cedars-Sinai Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Gellepis</td>
<td>Cedars-Sinai Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Jennifer Teixeira</td>
<td>UC Merced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stacy Miller</td>
<td>Cedars-Sinai Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kirsten Torguson</td>
<td>CA State University, Fullerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winnie Wang</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew Kirk</td>
<td>Cedars-Sinai Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trish Forde</td>
<td>Cedars-Sinai Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felicia Mayes</td>
<td>Cedars-Sinai Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Ella Taylor</td>
<td>Western Oregon University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kristin Martinez</td>
<td>Cedars-Sinai Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perrilla Johnson-Woodward</td>
<td>Charles Drew University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharyl Kasarskis</td>
<td>University of Hawaii Hilo Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cece Manoochehri</td>
<td>California Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Derick Jones</td>
<td>Cedars-Sinai Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heather Kubinec</td>
<td>The Broad Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitali Ravindakumar</td>
<td>Centers for Creative Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rene Remillard</td>
<td>Maseeh College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lead Me Program Graduates with founder Linda Patton (center)**

**Lead Me Program**

Leadership, Education, And Behavioral Development Membership Program.
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Current Investment for Future Productivity Gains

Often times when thinking of working smart, or increasing productivity, the focus seems to be more on shorter term priorities. Instead of focusing on the shorter term, what if instead we focused on longer term priorities to increase productivity? Below are a few tips that have served me well.

1. Make it a habit to ask questions. For example, are you involved in work that is sent to another office for processing? Do you know what criteria that office uses to determine whether a given transaction is able to be processed? Wouldn’t it be great to know? What if all that was needed was to ask the question? Think about how much time could be saved just by knowing the criteria by which any given transaction is judged?

2. Listen. Once you’ve asked the questions, engage in active listening. Rephrase or reframe what was said to increase understanding. Focus not only on what was said, focus on what wasn’t said. Often times, engaging in active listening will help in understanding the unspoken truths. This leads to increased productivity, as we begin to understand process flow and work flow at our institutions and how best to accomplish key tasks.

3. Become an active citizen at your institution. Are there working groups? Are there speakers? Employee Resource Groups? If you are in a central office, can you take a lab tour in a department that you administer? All of these are ways to become involved at your institution and support your colleagues. One of the many benefits in supporting your colleagues and becoming involved is you will build relationships and support that will translate into increased productivity.

Although all of these suggestions take an upfront time commitment, the benefits are far greater than the initial investment.

Have a Work Smart tip to share with your colleagues? Contact Co-Editor David Smelser at dsmelser@utk.edu

How has this program enhanced your career?

It’s made me a more thoughtful leader and manager for my staff and my institution. - Nancy Lewis, Director of Sponsored Projects, University of California Irvine

The program enhanced my career by helping me find more personal satisfaction in my work and the work of others. It increased my opportunity for advancement as evident by my promotion to research manager overseeing three departments and it showed me how to serve as a role model to others. - Felicia Mayes, Research Manager, Neurosciences, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center

My career improved tremendously within my organization and beyond. I went from being a post award accountant to managing a research institute doing cutting edge whole genome sequencing. In addition, I am now serving as chair for Region VI for 2016. It was the volunteer spirit that was instilled into me that allowed me the ability to grow within the organization. I encourage everyone to take full advantage of volunteer experiences, even if you cannot attend conferences. You have a part to play in making not only the Lead Me program success but the organization as a whole. - Derick Jones, Program Manager, LA BioMed

This program is a great stepping stone for those wanting to discover more about themselves or the next step in their career. It allows for open discussion on your active career goals and may enlighten you on leadership strategies. Lead Me is chicken soup for the career soul. Join us on the leadership journey. To learn more about the Lead Me Program check out http://www.ogrd.wsu.edu/r6ncura/leadme.aspx or contact us directly.

Diane Ross Nelson is a Grants Development Specialist at Charles R. Drew University. She joined NCURA in 2010 and is a 2015 Lead Me graduate. She can be reached at dianelson@cdrewu.edu

N. Elaine Moya, MBA, CRA, is a Financial Analyst III at Loma Linda University. Elaine joined NCURA in 2009 and completed the Lead Me program in 2015. She can be reached at emoya@llu.edu

Nannette Pettis, MPA, CRA, Contracts & Grants Administrator at Kaiser Permanente Southern California, provides PIs with lifecycle support for extramural funding. Her research administration career began at Caltech in 1999. Her background includes proposal, award administration and management. She joined NCURA in 2002 and is a 2015 Lead Me graduate. She can be reached at emoya@llu.edu

Sandra Purves serves as Project Coordinator for the Institute for Translational Genomics and Population Science at Los Angeles Biomedical Research Institute. Sandra joined NCURA in 2011 and is a graduate of the Lead Me Class of 2015. She can be reached at spurves@labiomed.org
Still using your Magic 8-Ball to guide you?

Contractor or Subrecipient? Reply hazy, try again
Do we need to have a data use agreement in place? Very doubtful
Is this FAR clause acceptable? Signs point to yes
Will we need an ITAR export control license? Ask again later

Upgrade to the Guide.

SPONSORED RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION: A GUIDE TO EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES AND RECOMMENDED PRACTICES

The two-volume comprehensive resource covers the full range of issues impacting the grants lifecycle with over 20 chapters written by national experts. This compendium includes essential research administration principles and practices, sample policies and procedures, practical tools, and extensive supplementary materials.

Chapters include:
- Research Compliance
- Subawards and Subrecipient Monitoring
- Export Controls
- Administering Research Contracts
- Interacting with Auditors
- Pre-Award Administration
- Intellectual Property and Data Rights
- F&A Costs
- Special Issues for PUIs
- International Research Collaborations
- Post-Award Administration
- Regulatory Environment
- Special Issues for Academic Medical Centers
- Training & Education
- Sponsored Programs Assessment
- Leadership and Staff Development

For more information and to purchase the Guide: www.ncura.edu/PublicationsStore.aspx
Region I Colleagues,

I’d like to introduce myself as the incoming Region I Chair for 2016. My name is Kris Monahan, director of sponsored research & programs at Providence College. I am so excited to serve alongside your other regional officers and members of the advisory board. The 2016 Regional officers include: Michelle Auerbach (Immediate Past Chair), Jill Mortali (Chair-Elect) David Barnett (Treasurer), Frederic Majnoun (Immediate Past Treasurer), Rob Kirsh (Secretary), Elizabeth Haney (Secretary-Elect), Treasurer-Elect (election soon to be complete), Susan Zipkin (Board Representative).

It takes the effort of many to continue our signature programs (mentor program, Executive Shadow Program, top-notch professional development offerings such as workshops and Research Administrator Discussion groups, and the Annual Regional Meeting). My goal for this year is to ensure Region I continues to be YOUR NCURA, offering programs, networking opportunities, and professional development to exceed member expectations. With a targeted emphasis on engaging new and different members and developing opportunities for emerging leaders in research administration, your 2016 elected officers and advisory board seek to make Region I a strong, vibrant, and cohesive and FUN region.

You’ll be asked for feedback and participation at various times throughout the year and I encourage each of you to provide honest feedback. Feedback is a gift that your NCURA leadership can learn from. We welcome your guidance, help and support. Region I wants to offer programs and services for all members from the new professional to current and aspiring managers to those like me with some gray hair and many years of experience.

Region I has been active these past several months holding a networking event at Emmanuel College, Boston MA, holding our annual Research Administrator Discussion Group (RADG) and holiday party and providing workshop offerings such as Budgeting with Excel. The coming year will continue with a strong and organized plan for Research Administrator Discussion Groups and more opportunities for involvement and networking.

Save the dates Monday, May 2 - Wednesday, May 4, 2016 for the Region I, Spring Meeting at the Sea Crest Beach Hotel in North Falmouth, MA. Pre-Conference Workshops will be offered Sunday May 1, 2016.

The Spring meeting co-chairs are Jill Mortali of Dartmouth College Louise Griffin of University of New Hampshire. Along with a program committee of nearly twenty individuals, the co-chairs will bring you what is sure to be one of the most memorable regional meetings yet. Think gorgeous. Think beach. Think fun. Think the CAPE. They are planning more than 40 sessions including federal updates, plenary sessions, discussion groups, and fun networking activities. Registration will open in late February. You’ll want to register early. This will be the place to be in May!

Kris Monahan is the Chair of Region I and serves as Director of Sponsored Research & Programs at Providence College. She can be reached at chair@ncuraregioni.org

It is hard to believe 2015 is has come to a close and 2016 has begun. As I look back on this past year, I want to take the time to thank our Chair, Jill Frankenfield, who not only served as the executive leader for the Region, but also assumed responsibilities of the role in 2014. After working under her leadership, it is apparent how dedicated she was to NCURA and Region II. I am enthusiastic about our outstanding line up of officers for 2016 that include: Tim Schailey (Chair-Elect), Mary Holleran (Secretary), Charles Bartunek (Treasurer-Elect), and Jen Rosa (Treasurer). I look forward to working with each of them as well as the Region II membership in my role as Chair of the Region in 2016.

The Program Committee is busy planning for its Region II 2016 spring meeting in Philadelphia, PA May 1 – 4, 2016. The call for proposals is now open, and we are confident the meeting will provide excellent sessions to help us excel in our current roles while providing the highest quality leadership and support to assist our faculty and institutions.

Region II continues to offer Professional Development Workshops to institutions in the Mid-Atlantic region. These workshops have been well received by those institutions within the region that have hosted, and the feedback has been excellent. If you are interested in hosting a workshop or would like additional information regarding a workshop please contact Tim Schailey at Timothy.Schailey@Jefferson.edu.

On behalf of our Region II Chair Jill Frankenfield and myself as Chair-Elect, thank you to all the Region II officers who have completed their terms, the numerous volunteers, and the membership for a great 2015. It has been a pleasure partnering with you and I look forward to future NCURA endeavors in 2016!

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://ncuraregionii.org/contact

Don’t forget to follow us on Facebook at: https://www.facebook.com/groups/ncuraregionii/ and Twitter: @NCURAREGIONII

Erin Bailey is Chair of Region II and serves as the Chief Financial Officer for the Clinical and Translation Science Award at University of Buffalo. She can be reached at ecdn@buffalo.edu

Kris Monahan is the Chair of Region I and serves as Director of Sponsored Research & Programs at Providence College. She can be reached at chair@ncuraregioni.org
We hope you enjoyed the holidays and are ready for all the activities we have planned for the Region III Flamingos. The 2016 Spring Meeting is just around the corner; be sure to keep informed about the meeting at http://ncurarregioniii.com/springmeeting.php. This year, we will be meeting at the Hilton Sandestin Beach Golf Resort & Spa in Miramar Beach, Florida. Region III Flamingos will come together for professional development and networking under the theme, “Building Teams, Breaking Down Barriers” April 30 – May 4, 2016. Striving to address the ever-critical need of working collaboratively, this year’s spring meeting will help us all learn how to enhance efficiency and accomplish goals through partnerships. Through workshops, concurrent sessions, and discussion groups, we will share experiences and network with fellow Research Administrators at a meeting you do not want to miss!

A few things to keep in mind as you prepare to attend and make the most out of this experience:

- **Registration is open. Take advantage of the Early Bird discount!**
- **Reserve your room now to take advantage of the conference rate.**
- **Register for pre-conference workshops to enhance your conference experience.**
- **Watch for opportunities to buy your Region III T-Shirt.**
- **Consider applying for a travel award.**
- **Don’t forget to volunteer!**

Join the Executive Committee in welcoming Debbie Smith as our new Regional Secretary and saying good-bye to David Smelser. Let us also extend a warm welcome to Rob Bingham-Roy as our Treasurer-Elect. We look forward to serving with Debbie and Rob during their terms; we know that they will contribute to the Region’s success in a meaningful way!

Looking for ways to get involved in the Region? Check out volunteer opportunities at http://ncurarregioniii.com/volunteer.php. If you are interested in getting involved with any of these committees, please reach out to our Volunteer Coordinator, Sandy Barber at sandra.barber@business.gatech.edu. In anticipation of a busy but productive 2016, we will definitely need your time and talent to make this year another successful collaboration across the southeast.

Stay informed of what is happening in the region by signing up for the Region III Monthly e-Blasts sent out on the Third Thursday of every month. Archives of these newsletters are located at http://www.ncurarregioniii.com/monthly-newsletter-archives.php. In addition to our webpage, LinkedIn, Facebook, Twitter, and Regional Corner, these monthly newsletters will keep you abreast of important news and information.

Tanya Blackwell serves as Region III’s magazine contributor and is a Contracting Officer at Georgia Institute of Technology.

Happy New Year Region IV! The new year always makes me pause and think. It’s such a great time to reflect on experiences and start forming the vision that drives us through the next year. Two themes come to mind as 2015 comes to a close and we head into 2016: Data Driven Decision-making and Friendships. Two seemingly unrelated themes, that I foresee coming together in 2016.

Many of us in research administration have been inundated with data and metrics this past year. The data just keeps coming faster, but few administrators have really been able to harness the power that the information can offer. Few of us are asking the right questions of the data and few of us have the tools and training in analysis to make sense of the metrics. So what’s missing? Empowerment and creativity, both of which we get from our NCURA family.

For years I’ve heard NCURA members talk about their professional relationships made through NCURA as friendships. There is power in a community like this, where trust is already built and creativity can flow. This is the year I foresee our community coming together and defining new directions in research administration. The data is there, just waiting for us to ask questions, just waiting for the creative spark, the wonder. We’re the right group to do this.

Get ready for the spring meeting!

With change in the air, keep an eye out for information on the spring meeting coming up in Kansas City! Our keynote speaker will talk to us about “The Heart of Change” and the theme around Exchanging Talents offers plenty of opportunities to share ideas. From our program committee:

- “Exchanging Talents through Guidance” will be the theme for the Region IV meeting in Kansas City, May 1-4, 2016. Excitement surrounds the compiling of a program that you won’t want to miss. There are plenty of things to see and do in Kansas City: Kemper Museum of Contemporary Art, American Jazz Museum, Kansas City Zoo, Powell Gardens, and the World Series Champions Kansas City Royals baseball team plays at home May 2-4.
- Session topics are being organized, registration will open in mid-February, and the first Concepts Expo will be unveiled. Watch your email for information and volunteer opportunities.
- Our keynote speaker, Dawn Kaiser, is an Inspirational Speaker & Joy Refueiler. Her topic will focus on the Heart of Change: Leading a Successful Team Transformation.
- Diane Hillebrand, Chair-Elect
- Michelle Ginavan Hayes, Logistics Co-Chair
- Shannon Sutton, Program Co-Chair

So as we enter 2016, I’m interested to see if the vision comes to fruition. It’s really not fortune-telling; there is a theme of change in the air both nationally and regionally. It’s up to us to make change happen, and drive the future of our organization. Wishing you all a happy and healthy 2016!

Kirsten Yehl is chair of Chair of Region IV and serves as Administrative Director, Institute for Public Health and Medicine at Northwestern University. She can be reached at k-yehl@northwestern.edu
IS ONE OF YOUR PERFORMANCE GOALS TO FINALIZE A TRAINING PLAN FOR NEW EMPLOYEES?

NCURA is your partner!

NCURA’S LIFECYCLE OF THE AWARD SERIES, running through June 2016, will provide the onboarding help you need in these critical areas:

- January 20, 27, & February 3, 2016
  AWARD NEGOTIATION

- April 12, 2016
  AWARD MONITORING

- May 16, 2016
  COMPLIANCE

Now available on demand!

DEVELOPING YOUR INSTITUTION’S ONLINE TOOL BOX
A must for every institution!

PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT

BUDGETING

Reviews of this informative series:

“Excellent program for pre-award administrators!”

“The presentation was lively and fresh.”

“Engaging speakers and materials.”

“I liked the discussions where we were able to hear how different universities handled the areas that were discussed.”

“The real-world examples were very helpful!”

This outstanding group of faculty are developing the nuts and bolts of what your new and current staff need to know.

Julie Cole, Duke University
W. Scott Erwin, Texas State University
Tracey Fraser, Smithsonian Institution
Samuel Gannon, Vanderbilt University Medical Center
Stephanie Gray, University of Florida
John Harold, The Pennsylvania State University
Patricia Hawk, Oregon State University
Cynthia Hope, The University of Alabama
Martin Kirk, University of British Columbia
Roseann Luongo, Harvard University
Rosemary Madnick, University of Alaska Fairbanks
Tolise Miles, University of Colorado Boulder
Craig Reynolds, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor
Jeffrey Silber, Cornell University
Janet Simons, University of Maryland Baltimore
David Smelser, University of Tennessee
Joseph M Smith, University of Maryland, College Park
Sandy Sward, Montana State University
Pamela Webb, University of Minnesota
Samantha Westcott, Childrens Hospital Los Angeles

Each area of the Lifecycle Series will have a multi-hour learning experience which you can participate in “live” from your computer and will also be available on CD Rom, and MP4 for the onboarding and ongoing education needs on your campus.

Registration Information available at
www.ncura.edu
Every story has an end . . . but in life, every ending is just a new beginning. —Author Unknown

Research Administration lost a pioneer of our profession, Julie T. Norris passed away on November 17, 2015. Julie’s career spanned four decades and shaped the careers of many Region V members. She was an advocate for our profession providing leadership, career guidance and mentoring.

Julie began working at the University of Houston in 1973. She served there as Assistant Vice President and Director of Sponsored Programs from July 1981 to September 1994. After leaving Houston, Julie served as Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at MIT from October 1994 to 2004 and then worked for Huron Consulting.

Julie was NCURA Region V Chair from 1981-1982 and was the Regional Representative to the National Executive Committee from 1984-1985. Julie also served NCURA on the national level as Treasurer, Vice-President and President. In 1994, she was awarded NCURA’s first Award for Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration. In addition to her service to NCURA, Julie served as the Chair of COGR from 1994-1996.

Julie was respected by federal government officers and her research administration peers across the country and served as a mentor and inspiration to many of today’s most recognized research administrators. Region V’s Susan Sedwick was strongly influenced by Julie. On Julie’s passing, Susan commented, “Countless people will tell you how Julie touched their lives with her wisdom, generosity and friendship and I count myself as one of those. What made her so rare is that her reach was to our entire profession.”

We are honored that Julie established her roots as a research administrator in Region V. We hope that her dedication and service to our region will continue to be an inspiration to all who follow in her footsteps.

As we welcome in the New Year we welcome the opportunity to make this YOUR YEAR to get involved in Region V by volunteering at the upcoming annual regional meeting. The theme is Research Administration: Innovating Today and Defining Tomorrow and will be held at the Hilton DFW Lakes Executive Conference Center in Grapevine, Texas. Save the date and join us April 24-27 for an excellent opportunity of professional development. If you are interested in presenting a session, contact Shelly Berry-Hebb at sberry@tamu.edu. To volunteer, contact our Volunteer Coordinator, Beth Milam, at bmilam@tamu.edu

Thomas Spencer from UT Southwestern is looking for active members serving on regulatory committees to share their experiences about research administrative burden. He will be sharing his results at the regional meeting. If you are interested in participating in his survey, please contact him at Thomas.Spencer@UTSouthwestern.edu

We want to hear from you! If you have reached a new milestone, changed positions, received honors or earned credentials, please email me at kkissmann@tamu.edu

We wish you a very happy and healthy new year!

Katherine V. Kissmann serves as the Chair of Region V and is Director of Contracts and Grants at Texas A&M University. She may be reached at kkissmann@tamu.edu

We are peacock proud and honeymoon happy to have Region VIII join us for our regional meeting this year. The officers for Regions VI, VII & VII are working feverishly to plan an amazing conference experience for all at the Grand Wailea Hotel in Resort on the Island of Maui, Hawaii. The conference is slated to begin the weekend of October 1, 2016 through October 5. This year we are expanding our course offering to include two Saturday full day workshops. The first is a senior leadership forum geared toward our senior leaders seeking leadership enhancement tools. We have already secured some of our industries top representatives to instruct this workshop and it is guaranteed to provide a wealth of information for senior level attendees.

In addition, we are proud to announce that we are partnering with ICON (Industry Contracts Officers Network). It’s a California-based, grassroots informal network of industry contracts officers, with seasoned and senior officers and university leadership with responsibilities for contracting with industry. We will have a full-day industry contracting workshop for newer research administrators involved in/interested in industry contracting. The goal is to create an immersive workshop weekend for attendees involved in (and/or interested in) contracting. We will have a contracts workshop on Saturday, then two half-day NCURA workshops on Sunday that have complimentary contracting subject matter, but which can be applied to a broader array of funding types. We are super excited about this partnership and we are all looking forward to expanding our educational offerings to our clinical attendees. Calls for proposals are currently open. The preliminary program and registration will be open and available the last week of April, 2016. Plan now.

We are working feverishly with our Regions VII and VIII program leads to make sure this is an outstanding conference. The theme chosen for this year is Connecting the World through Research Administration. What an amazing theme, for an amazing meeting, to be held in an amazing location. What can be better than taking research administration to the beach. Please stay tuned as the room block and preliminary program will be available by the end of April. We have worked out deals with Hawaiian Airlines for discounted flights and we are working with ground transportation companies to get discounted rates for the conference as well. We are making this as affordable as possible. The room rates alone are fantastic. Pack a bag and come join us on the beach for RMHawaii2016.

Derick Jones is Chair of Region VI and serves as Program Manager, The Institute for Translational Genomics and Population Sciences at LA BioMed. He can be reached at derickjones@labiomed.org
With the start of the new year, many create New Year resolutions to help change something in their lives. From adding more exercise to changing eating habits, or whatever you feel you need to change in your life including a need to change a behavior. How many times have you made a New Year resolution? Many of us start out strong and determined to keep the resolution only to find we taper off by the spring. The difficult part is maintaining the resolution. Does that mean you have failed if you don’t keep it? Absolutely not. Perhaps it means the target or goal was made without an actual strategic plan on how you will accomplish and/or maintain your resolution.

Let’s look at the actual definition of resolution. Merriam-Webster (2015) defines resolution as an act or process to solve or provide an answer to something. Using this definition as a starting point you have to ask yourself, “what processes or issues do I need to address and how will I solve them?” This can be either for personal reward or professional gain.

Which is better: long-term or short-term resolutions? Obviously, long term resolutions mean a longer commitment, and also tends to be the one that falls by the wayside. It takes a great deal of effort to maintain, and in our business we all know how time and energy zapping that can be. Short-term goals tend to be the quickest and easiest to accomplish. This is largely due to the smaller time frame required to successfully achieve the goal. That’s not to say, however, long term goals should be forever cast away. It simply means start small and work yourself up to the larger resolution. Or, take the large resolution and break it out into segments. As each segment is completed it puts you closer to the long term goal.

In my office, instead of calling things resolutions, I label them wins. The term win is associated with success or a positive gain. See the difference between resolution and win? Using the term “win” already gives the ideology of accomplishment, whereas resolution instantly implies conflict. By having small wins in your pocket, it will eventually grow into a larger win. Try it out this year and see how quickly people embrace the positive.

We are planning our next regional meeting and using this technique of small wins. It is amazing how much we have already accomplished for the October meeting. It also allows us to think more outside the box. By using the matrix of small goals/wins it allows us to become more flexible, especially as we find out what works and what does not. Also, if something does not work, we only have to go back a minor step which is easier to fix and is less time consuming.

Speaking of our meeting, save the date! Come join us and say “Aloha” to beautiful Maui on October 2-5, 2016. Calls for proposals are now out.

Happy New Year! Across the globe people have no doubt been busy making resolutions. We hope one of those was being more involved in the NCURA international region. Have you looked at our website recently? Thanks to NCURA member, Barbara Slattery, there have been quite a few updates to the website, visit: http://ncuraintlregion.org. A highlight is information on the upcoming NCURA joint regional meeting with Regions VI and VII, October 2-5 in Hawaii. We also start the year welcoming new board members to the NCURA international region. Eva Björndal (Chair), Annika Glauner (Chair-Elect), Susanne Rahner (Treasurer), Bella Blah (Secretary), Siegfried Hue mer (Treasurer-Elect) and Bryony Wakefield (Past-Chair). We would like to take the opportunity to thank Melinda Heron for her role as Secretary in 2015. During this time we coordinated our first regional awards, committee elections and travel award to the annual meeting – many thanks Melinda for your help and support in implementing these initiatives. We would also like to thank Agatha Keller who has represented the region on the National Board of Directors for the last two years. Agatha is known to many of you for her significant contribution for the development of the international region and for her exceptional guidance and advice through Collaborate – thank you. To everyone, we hope that you start the year, looking forward to the many wonderful activities that NCURA has to offer, and if you haven’t yet, register to attend the annual meeting and VI, VII & VIII regional meeting.

Best wishes,
Julie Ward and Bryony Wakefield

Julie Ward serves as the Region VIII Reporter and is International Research Manager, Division of Research, at the University of New South Wales, Australia. Bryony Wakefield is Immediate Past Chair of Region VIII and serves as the Director, Research Development in the Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences at the University of Melbourne, Australia.

Marj Townsend serves as Region VII Chair and is the Research Advancement Manager for the School of Life Sciences at Arizona State University. She can be reached at Marj.Townsend@asu.edu
Always racing against time? Stop.

Huron can help.

Our approach frees you to focus on your mission.

As your partner, Huron can help with eliminating manual processes, task redundancies, and inefficient systems. We develop comprehensive solutions that incorporate people, process, and technology—including proprietary software solutions that can be customized and implemented to fit your needs.

Huron’s expertise spans:

- Research administration (pre-award office, post-award office, IRB, IACUC, and clinical trials management)
- Research compliance, risk mitigation, and investigation support
- Research strategy and planning
- Facilities & Administration and cost recovery

LEARN MORE TODAY: www.huronconsultinggroup.com/researchenterprisesolutions
Joyce H. Ferland, MBA, is now the Administrative Director, Research Radiology at Massachusetts General Hospital. Joyce is responsible for setting administrative direction (policies, procedures, systems, etc.) and to direct a wide range of research issues including financial, personnel, operations and regulatory, facilities and systems issues, long-range planning and project development for the basic, clinical and outcomes research programs of the Radiology department. Joyce is a senior research administrator professional and a frequent presenter at NCURA. She has a strong background in higher education institutions, hospitals, as well as for-profit and nonprofit organizations in the areas of sponsored research administration, financial management and financial compliance. She can be reached at jferland1@partners.org

Jodi Ogden is the new Vice President, Research Administration at Children’s Hospital Los Angeles as of November 9, 2015. Jodi was formerly the Associate Vice President of Sponsored Projects Administration at The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston. At CHLA, reporting directly to her will be the Sponsored Projects Office, Research Finance, Research Compliance, Clinical Trials Budget and Contracts as well as the Center for Innovation.

Do you have a milestone to share? Email schiffman@ncura.edu

GROW YOUR NETWORK with NCURA’s NEW Membership Profile

Your colleagues are looking for you!

Have you selected your areas of responsibility and expertise in your member record? Update your profile so your colleagues can find you.

- Go to www.ncura.edu
- Click on “My Dashboard”
- Click on “Update my Information”

Find the colleague you need to contact!

Search for your colleagues by area of expertise and responsibility in the online member directory.

- Go to www.ncura.edu
- Click on “Member Directory”
- Search over 100 criteria to find just who you need

Each quarter in 2016 NCURA will be drawing for a $100 American Express Gift Card from those that have completed their membership profile.

Take a moment and complete yours today!

Need assistance?
Contact us: (202) 466-3894

Emily Ainsworth
Coordinator, Membership and Volunteer Services
NCURA
ainsworth@ncura.edu
The Canadian Association of Research Administrators turns 45

CARA is turning 45 in 2016 and we have a lot to celebrate. Our membership has grown dramatically over the last few years and we now boast 1000 members. This increase can be explain in part as a result of the growing number and quality of our professional development programs, advocacy activities, and a culture of innovation.

Here are some of our recent achievements:

**Professional Development:** With Canada being large and travel budgets small, our members needed accessible educational opportunities throughout the year. Thus, CARA rose to the challenge, particularly in the last two years, by establishing a robust webinar program with 100 webinars offered in 2015. In addition to paid registration, we offered 18 free webinars on a variety of topics that were suggested by our members. We also repeated presentations that were popular in previous years so members could take an average of at least two free webinars each month.

CARA and the National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA) have already co-organized selected webinars and in 2016 will provide webinar registration discounts to each other’s members.

CARA, in collaboration with another international partner, the Association of Research Managers and Administrators (ARMA) (UK), launched its Certificate in Research Administration (CRA) program. The first cohort started in November and was oversubscribed. Developing a formal qualification program has been a long time goal of CARA as per its members’ desire to enhance their knowledge and be recognized for their skills and expertise. The second cohort of the CRA and the first cohort of the new Certificate in Research Management (CRM) will start this spring. In keeping with CARA’s commitment to bilingualism the certificate program may be completed in French or English.

In 2013, CARA established a mentorship program that continues to grow and impact research administrators across the county. We survey participants annually and this activity is one of our most highly rated initiatives.

**Resource Library:** CARA established an electronic resource library for its members in 2014. Members share a myriad of resources with their peers. The platform is used by our 13 special interest groups (SIG) and members upload articles, templates, checklists and other resources related to their scope of practice. The platform also archives meeting minutes, newsletters, policies, annual reports, financial statements and other CARA information of interest to our membership. Members may follow various folders to receive updates as new resources are added.

**Communications:** CARA built a new website in 2015 [https://cara-acaar.ca/home](https://cara-acaar.ca/home). The site includes much more information than previously presented and is updated daily with new job postings, webinars, volunteer opportunities, and more. CARA also established a LinkedIn group that is open to all research administrators. We invite you to join and to follow us on Twitter as well.

**Conferences:** Our 2015 annual and regional meetings had record attendance and we were delighted to welcome two representatives from NCURA, Bob Andresen, and Denise Moody. Our 2016 national conference will be in Vancouver B.C. and we look forward to again hosting Bob Andresen on behalf of NCURA. Having NCURA and other sister organizations send representatives to our conferences affords us the opportunity to share ideas, connect with peers internationally, and identify ways we can collaborate for the benefit of our all our members and the research enterprise in general.

**CARA Connection Newsletter:** CARA started a bimonthly newsletter in 2014 and we continue to welcome contributions from international experts as well as our own members. If you would like a chance to publish in the CARA Connection, please email us at executive_director@cara-acaar.ca

As CARA continues to grow and deliver services to our members and the larger community of research administrators globally, we anticipate our collaborations with sister organizations like NCURA will continue to expand. We consistently aim to provide our members with excellent and diverse learning opportunities and we encourage them to expand their networks internationally.
Photonic “sintering” may create new solar, electronics manufacturing technologies

By David Stauth

Engineers at Oregon State University have made a fundamental breakthrough in understanding the physics of photonic “sintering,” which could lead to many new advances in solar cells, flexible electronics, various types of sensors and other high-tech products printed onto something as simple as a sheet of paper or plastic.

Sintering is the fusing of nanoparticles to form a solid, functional thin-film that can be used for many purposes, and the process could have considerable value for new technologies.

Photonic sintering has the possible advantage of higher speed and lower cost, compared to other technologies for nanoparticle sintering.

In the new research, OSU experts discovered that previous approaches to understand and control photonic sintering had been based on a flawed view of the basic physics involved, which had led to a gross overestimation of product quality and process efficiency.

Based on the new perspective of this process, which has been outlined in Nature Scientific Reports, researchers now believe they can create high quality products at much lower temperatures, at least twice as fast and with 10 times more energy efficiency.

Removing constraints on production temperatures, speed and cost, the researchers say, should allow the creation of many new high-tech products printed onto substrates as cheap as paper or plastic wrap.

“Photonic sintering is one way to deposit nanoparticles in a controlled way and then join them together, and it’s been of significant interest,” said Rajiv Malhotra, an assistant professor of mechanical engineering in the OSU College of Engineering. “Until now, however, we didn’t really understand the underlying physics of what was going on. It was thought, for instance, that temperature change and the degree of fusion weren’t related – but in fact that matters a lot.”

With the concepts outlined in the new study, the door is open to precise control of temperature with smaller nanoparticle sizes. This allows increased speed of the process and high quality production at temperatures at least two times lower than before. An inherent “self-damping” effect was identified that has a major impact on obtaining the desired quality of the finished film.

“Lower temperature is a real key,” Malhotra said. “To lower costs, we want to print these nanotech products on things like paper and plastic, which would burn or melt at higher temperatures. We now know that is possible, and how to do it. We should be able to create production processes that are both fast and cheap, without a loss of quality.”

Products that could evolve from the research, Malhotra said, include solar cells, gas sensors, radiofrequency identification tags, and a wide range of flexible electronics. Wearable biomedical sensors could emerge, along with new sensing devices for environmental applications.

In this technology, light from an xenon lamp can be broadcast over comparatively large areas to fuse nanoparticles into functional thin films, much faster than with conventional thermal methods. It should be possible to scale up the process to large manufacturing levels for industrial use.

This advance was made possible by a four-year, $1.5 million National Science Foundation Scalable Nanomanufacturing Grant, which focuses on transcending the scientific barriers to industry-level production of nanomaterials. Collaborators at OSU include Chih-hung Chang, Alan Wang and Greg Herman.

OSU researchers will work with two manufacturers in private industry to create a proof-of-concept facility in the laboratory, as the next step in bringing this technology toward commercial production.

This information also appeared on Oregon State University’s News and Communications: http://oregonstate.edu/ua/ncs/archives/2015/dec/photonic-%E2%80%9Csintering%E2%80%9D-may-create-new-solar-electronics-manufacturing-technologies
As meeting co-chairs, we are thrilled to be working with a dynamic “dream-team” Program Committee to bring you NCURA’s 58th Annual Meeting on August 7-10, 2016 at the Washington Hilton in Washington, D.C.

AM 58 promises not to disappoint! We are building on some tried and true traditions and sprinkling in some creative and innovative twists. Whether you’re new to research administration, in the process of building a successful career in the field, or richly experienced, you’ll find pre- and post-meeting workshops on August 6 and 11 that will expand your knowledge and help you hone your skills. We’re also planning concurrent sessions and discussion groups covering a wide breadth of research administration topics including federal agency program and regulatory updates, research development, pre- and post-award, departmental, predominantly undergraduate institution (PUI), compliance, contracting, and international issues. These offerings will be designed to ensure there is something for novice research administrators, current and aspiring managers, senior research administrators and everyone in between. Back by popular demand, AM 58 will offer spark sessions (short takes on important topics) and office hours (consultation with experts regarding a specific institutional issue), as well as vendor exhibits and refreshing opportunities to network with colleagues.

The AM 58 theme, *Experiencing Today…Envisioning Tomorrow*, acknowledges the challenges research administrators currently face that require unique knowledge and skills and an appreciation of the culture and context in which we operate. At the same time, it predicts a continued evolution of the profession that will demand both broader and more specific knowledge, more finely tuned technical and soft skills, and expanded collaborations to capitalize on as yet unforeseen opportunities. We especially encourage attendees to use this annual meeting as an opportunity to think toward the future and explore sessions that are tangential to their current job responsibilities but could help them prepare for their future.

Stay tuned as the Annual Meeting program unfolds. It will be a time of reconnecting, learning, networking, volunteering, and collaborating, interspersed with some fun and entertaining events!

L-R: Cindy Hope, Barbara Gray and Kris Monahan
TRAVELING WORKSHOPS

San Diego, CA

San Diego, CA

San Diego, CA

NATIONAL CONFERENCES

Financial Research Administration Conference ....................March 6-8, 2016
New Orleans, LA

Pre-Award Research Administration Conference ..................March 9-11, 2016
New Orleans, LA

58th Annual Meeting ..........................................................August 7-10, 2016
Washington, DC

REGIONAL MEETINGS

Region I – New England ..................................................May 1-4, 2016
North Falmouth, MA

Region II – Mid-Atlantic ....................................................May 1-4, 2016
Philadelphia, PA

Region III – Southeastern ..................................................April 30-May 4, 2016
Miramar Beach, FL

Region IV – Mid-America ..................................................May 1-4, 2016
Kansas City, MO

Region V – Southwestern ..................................................April 24-27, 2016
Dallas, TX

Regions VI/VI/VIII – Western/Rocky Mountain/International ......October 2-5, 2016
Maui, HI

VIDEO WEBINARS

Life Cycle of the Award Series
- Proposal Development (3 Part Series) – Available On-Demand
- Pre-Award/Budgeting (3 Part Series) – Available On-Demand
- Award Negotiation and Acceptance (3 Part Series – Jan 20, Jan 27, Feb 3)
- Award Monitoring/Award Management – April 12, 2016
- Compliance – May 16, 2016

See website for details

PROGRAMS AVAILABLE ON-DEMAND

Going Global: What Your Institution Needs to Know about Managing Research Without Borders
Crowd Funding: An Enormous Opportunity at Your Fingertips
Creating the Cohesive Team Your Office Needs to Thrive
The Right Metrics: Choosing, Measuring and Evaluating Metrics to Drive Performance Success in Your Office
Is it a Gift or a Grant and other Critical Funding Mechanism Clarifications Your Staff Need to Know
Save Your Institution Millions: Mitigating Institutional Risk of Research Misconduct

ONLINE TUTORIALS

Visit our website for enrollment periods.
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 MARCH/APRIL 2016

Submission of Articles to Contributing Editors ..................January 22, 2016
Submission of Articles to Co-editors ...............................January 27, 2016
Submission of Advertisements .................................January 27, 2016

Additional information for authors can be found at: www.ncura.edu/PublicationsStore/NCURAMagazine/Submissions.aspx

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