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As NCURA celebrates its 60th Annual Meeting, it is a time to reflect on how research administration has evolved into a profession and how NCURA has grown to 7,500 members strong. Our members have seen the speed of research discovery and invention evolve from decades to years with the introduction of improved tools and breakthroughs in science. Further, our members have witnessed an ever evolving and complicated regulatory framework for which each must function.

In this issue, we will look back on key issues and trends for research administrators over the past 60 years as we contemplate where we will go in the next 60 years starting with “We’re In This Together Part II” by Ken Lish and Rochelle Ray. They reflect back on a shared goal of NSF expressed in a prior NCURA article to discuss the evolution of the NSF audit process, its utilization of data analytics and a shared vision with research administrators of improved stewardship going forward.

“Why Does Good Customer Service Matter in Research Administration?” by Wendy McDonald reminds us that something as simple as a “friendly smile” is critical in forming the relationships to better support our scientists. Be sure to check it out before flipping over to learn how institutions can leverage the FDP Exempt Wizard 2.0 tool to assist with IRB reviews at a time where reducing regulatory burden with a proposed revised Common Rule remains at the forefront of discussion with Jane McCutcheon’s article.

No area shows more growth than the international efforts by NCURA over recent years. In “Working Across the Border: Musing on the NCURA Global Mentoring Pilot Program,” Cormac Slevin and Jessica Brody share their experiences of the program.

As we celebrate our Diamond Jubilee, it is also fitting to reflect back on research administration and technology transfer activities over the years and to see how far we have come in the profession. “Research Administration As a Profession Part II - The First Wave of Analyses” by Simon Kerridge and Stephanie Scott is a continuation from their work to study and understand how research administration has grown as a profession to support an ever-changing research community. In “The Continuing Evolution of University Technology Transfer,” Susie Sedwick and Fred Reinhart share how universities have evolved to ensure discoveries make it to the market while still supporting missions that must adapt to the educational environment.

Congratulations to NCURA and its membership for 60 great years!
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Congratulations to NCURA and its membership for 60 great years!
MESSAGE FROM YOUR PRESIDENT

By Georgette Sakumoto, NCURA President

As I reflect on my first meeting in the early 1990’s, I am amazed at how much NCURA has grown and accomplished. We have expanded from one national meeting to three major “annual meetings” — with the addition of the Pre-Award and Financial Research Administration conferences. Also, throughout the year, your NCURA staff assists with the planning and organization of multiple professional workshops, webinars, and videos; they coordinate the development of management guides and an internationally-recognized bimonthly magazine; and work to continually support our accomplished global membership. We are a volunteer organization that thrives on the sharing of knowledge with our professional family called NCURA.

Throughout this journey of growth and accomplishments, I am reminded that nothing happens without the dedicated national office infrastructure. Our members provide the topical expertise, and our Executive Director, Kathleen Larmett and Deputy Chief Executive, Tara Bishop, along with the rest of the dedicated NCURA staff, have supported our journey to being the recognized leader in the field of Research Administration.

Kati Barber, Assistant Executive Director
Ivone Wells, Chief Finance Executive
Marc Schiffman, Managing Editor, NCURA Magazine
Latasha Johnson, Senior Manager, Database Administration
Stephanie McJury, Senior Meetings Manager
Julio Hernandez-Ferrufino, Senior Accountant
Steven DeMichele, Staff Accountant
Megan Fornasar, Manager, Peer Programs
Tracey King, Meetings Manager
Claire Chen, Manager, NCURA Global
Emily Ainsworth, Senior Coordinator, Membership and Volunteer Services
Susan McKenna, Senior Meetings Coordinator
Krystal Kirkland, Senior Meetings Coordinator
Dana Gresham, Assistant Coordinator, Membership and NCURA Global Programs
Maggie McCool, Staff Assistant

Your Executive team and Board benefit from the administrative support and insight that the NCURA staff provides to ensure that every program is fully developed, comprehensive, and responsive to membership needs. The NCURA staff play a vital role in providing our volunteer members - from the president to the regional leaders to our conference track leaders - with the requisite tools and support to make timely, informed, and knowledgeable decisions on future programming and policy that will take NCURA into the future. Our seasoned leaders recognize that it will be up to the next generation of volunteer members and NCURA staff to find ways to engage and support the membership. Together, we will have to explore new and creative ideas that respond to the next generation of learners and our global partners needs to provide an environment that embraces borderless partnerships and opportunities.

With the technological advances our profession has experienced, we have come a long way in networking, planning, and communicating via our Collaborate site. I want to recognize the NCURA staff who help us coordinate and organize our events, offerings, and information across time zones and communities. Please join me in thanking the people who help us every day to keep our activities on track and on time.

As we look to the future, we cannot predict how we will conduct business in the next 60 years. Maybe, we will be teleporting ourselves to meetings so that flying will no longer be required. The one thing I know for sure is that our partnership with the NCURA staff will keep NCURA as the globally recognized leader in the field of Research Administration.

Georgette Sakumoto is NCURA President and serves as Contracts and Grants Specialist, Office of Research Services, University of Hawaii. She can be reached at gsakumot@hawaii.edu
Looking back over my 18 years as a research administrator, I am struck by how dramatically the field has changed in terms of processing and compliance, but how stable our guiding principles have remained. Like our predecessors 60 years ago, colleagues in research administration continue to partner with faculty to get great fundable ideas in front of sponsors. We work diligently to ensure solid stewardship of those resources while providing responsive and accountable support.

In the early days of this profession, it was not unusual for individuals to handle grants management duties as an add-on to core work duties, or for part-time clerical workers to perform these functions. At my institution, the first grants coordinator started as a part-time dean’s assistant who handled grant applications. Over a decade, she worked her way into a full-time position with approval to hire additional staff. I became the second full-time staffer in our newly-formed Office of Sponsored Programs. In fact, when I applied for the position I had to look up what “sponsored programs” meant!

At the outset of my career, my hiring manager still stocked carbon paper and correction fluid in the office. We used relics like floppy discs, rolodex cards, and typewriters, and we recorded proposals and awards in our state-of-the-art Lotus computer program, which quickly disappeared when we adopted Microsoft Access. Now it’s on the way out. Before the digital era, record keeping was manual and metrics were minimal.

Technology has certainly moved the profession along. Email serves as a virtual umbilical cord of information and connection between us and our PIs, and Electronic Research Administration (ERA) is an entire industry. Gladly, gone are the days of collating 20 sets of copies, binding them and chasing the express delivery truck down to ensure on-time deliveries. Now we all regularly access our own ERA systems and a variety of sponsor portals: FastLane and Research.gov, eRA Commons, Grants.gov, NSPIRES, and an assortment of proprietary systems. Submission portals have proliferated in the decades since FastLane won us over. According to Thomas Misa, the first FastLane transaction occurred in March 1995 with the submission of a proposal review, and its use became mandatory in October 2000, the dawn of my career. I’ve never known life before FastLane, but the same work was accomplished before its advent; it’s now more automated, high-volume, efficient, and lighting fast now.

Years ago I kept dog-eared spiral bound copies of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) circulars on my desk for quick reference when disputing finer points of direct charging administrative and clerical effort on a “major project” or discussing inclusion of match with PI’s. Then in 2014 the Uniform Guidance (comically dubbed the UG) or 2 CFR 200, consolidated and superseded the earlier OMB circulars into one go-to resource. Navigating through that tome required deliberation and many hallway conversations with colleagues. Getting a handle on the UG also required regular sanity checks with colleagues on the listservs and several webcasts and conference sessions with OMB’s Gil Tran explaining the history, the how and the why. I still grapple with the changes imposed by the UG now that the Procurement regulations are going into effect at my institution. For certain, adopting the UG required rethinking, adding, and tweaking processes, but again, the principals of grants management are unchanged. Now I can’t imagine my workaday world without the guiding concepts contained in 2 CFR 200.

Over the years, numerous federal government regulations also accelerated the pace of change at federal agencies and required nimble updates to policies and procedures in our offices. For example, the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) of 2006 established a searchable database of federal awards and subsequently brought us the requirement to use the Subaward Reporting System (FSRS) tool. Administering subawards used to be fairly easy, in some cases requiring little more than a verified annual A-133 audit. But subrecipient monitoring got trickier over the years, layering on more requirements to verify excluded parties, assess risk, and issue detailed monitoring plans.

Until just two years ago my institution was heavily paper-based and we lagged behind larger institutions in terms of adoption of electronic routing and workflow. Our processes were becoming antiquated. About four years ago we finally moved from requiring a paper internal approval
Happily, an innovative recent graduate had familiarity with such systems in her previous job and wanted to take on the challenge of finding a no- to low-cost option to achieve our goal. Our modest expectation for adopting a form of electronic record keeping was that we would find incremental improvements for standardization of files on our network, thus improving adherence to record retention policies of the university, state, and sponsors. Through independent research she located a zero-cost solution to our paper intensive environment using a standard productivity tool that was already available to us as university employees. By more fully utilizing our existing tools, our pre-award office has adopted electronic record keeping in less than one year, devised a file architecture to standardize all portfolios, and realized significant savings and efficiencies. Extremely satisfied with the success of this initiative, we are now poised for the testing and adoption of our first-ever ERA system. In a climate of austere budgets, finding resources for a system of this sort is now poised for the testing and adoption of our first-ever ERA system. In a climate of austere budgets, finding resources for a system of this sort is the culmination of many years of work. The pace of change within our office and the profession is dizzying and exhilarating. Without robust tools, we simply couldn’t perform our work in today’s environment.

It’s difficult to imagine what developments I’ll observe in the remaining years of my career given the immense changes since 2000. With certainty, continuous change will drive enhancements to our daily processes and challenge us all to stay abreast of the shifting landscape of research administration while grappling with regulatory and administrative burden, hiring and retention headaches and the ubiquitous procrastinating PI. However, our core purpose as facilitators, problem-solvers, and doers remains a constant. We’re the lifeline between our faculty and the agencies that sponsor their best ideas for the ultimate benefit of society. We spend a lot of time with our PIs focusing on crafting compelling Broader Impacts statements in funding proposals. We demand them. As we emphasize the broader impacts of funded research to society it’s important to consider that as professionals we are relevant and impactful too. Knowing we are part of moving society forward is what keeps this work interesting and fulfilling.
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In January 2016, the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) at Texas Biomedical Research Institute (www.txbiomed.org), an independent biomedical research institute in San Antonio, Texas, welcomed a new Director. The office was staffed with four long-tenured Sponsored Programs Administrators. Although the office functioned well, several months of assessing operations, culture and capabilities identified areas for improvement and a wealth of potential to be unleashed. In an environment where we must continuously do more with less, we must inspire our teams and unleash their potential.
Under its new leadership, the office embarked on a trek to revitalize itself, provide an enjoyable work environment and create a high performing team. Along with empowering the team with knowledge, trust and confidence to make consistently sound decisions, we injected several new practices to ensure the team continuously performs at A-level while maintaining the requirement of compliance and ultimate goal of customer service.

As the “heart” of the organization, the OSP balances effectiveness and efficiency with compliance and customer service. Finding that balance is every team member’s responsibility and goal. We’d like to share several of the practices that maintain our team’s high performance and encourage others to consider the possibilities. Warning: leaders must be willing to take risks and modify traditional forms of management. To support pioneering research, leadership and management must be equally innovative.

### Create an Identity

The team completed a strategic planning exercise over the course of two months. This resulted in a vision and mission, core values and goals specific to the OSP. Creating purpose is critical for team members to understand their role in fulfilling that identity. In particular, the values are used for performance evaluations and hiring decisions. Each team member is expected to embody and uphold the following core values: Accountable, Disciplined, Team Player, Collaborative, and Lifelong Learner. In conducting this strategic planning exercise, we reached consensus on why we are here, what success looks like in 5 and 10 years and the beliefs/values that shape how we do our work (Miller, 2015).

### Team Learning

The team is assigned reading material on professional development with set deadlines. Individuals are assigned specific sections of the material they must present to their peers and lead discussion on the ideas conveyed in the literature. Most recently, the team discussed *The ONE Thing*, a book on time management and accountability (Keller & Papasan, 2012). This practice allows team members to understand differing perspectives amongst their peers and provides insight to different work styles. Additionally, the team frequently views current research administration topic webinars provided by National Council for University Research Administrators (NCURA) and other professional organizations.

### Team and Individual Goal Setting

Individuals set personal goals in one-on-one meetings with the Director. The Director ensures they have adequate support and resources to achieve them. Personal goals often include professional development and formal education. As a group, the team sets goals for the office fostering a team effort in reaching them. Examples of group goals include Certified Research Administrator certification, publishing in the field of research administration and practicing social responsibility. The individual and group goal setting is key to creating a learning environment and preventing complacency while fostering development and process improvement, and facilitating best practices and industry standards.

### Team Meetings (Formal and Informal)

Weekly team meetings are early and must include breakfast. Team members alternate on bringing breakfast. Multi-tasking provides an opportunity to create more than an amicable space to congregate. The group makes every minute together productive. Creating these efficiencies within the daily operation in grants, helps manage the workload and keep the work-life balance. Meetings are held to inform each other and discuss changing regulations/requirements, assigned tasks, institute news, operational deficiencies and ideas for improvement, and other relevant topics. Team meetings are helpful in identifying individuals who may be overloaded and identifying individuals who can help relieve some of the workload. Informal team meetings occur frequently in the form of lunching together or an occasional end-of-workday dinner. Some of the best ideas are a result of the informal setting. Informal team meetings build camaraderie and remind us that all employees are people. The rules of all team meetings are to be open, respectful, honest, candid and share airtime. Additionally, it’s worth noting that the Director’s management

### The success of the team is COLLECTIVE; no one ever succeeds or fails alone.
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style, including transparency and consensus, helps the team maintain trust and promotes cooperation. It’s also the reason the team has progressed so swiftly.

Mini 360-Degree Team Evaluations
In addition to the annual performance reviews required by the Human Resources Department, the team partakes in mini 360-Degree evaluations on a quarterly basis. The team sets a couple of hours aside to evaluate themselves and their peers in a non-confrontational forum. Each individual is asked to come to the group evaluation session with three strengths and three areas for improvement. The order for the evaluations is done by lottery. The first individual shares their strengths and the rest of the team takes turns in providing feedback, assurance or general comments. It is not a discussion and the individual can only ask for clarity in statements made by their peers. Once all had a chance to comment, the individual shares their self-evaluated areas for improvement and the process continues as before. Each individual on the team must participate and come to the meeting with their self-evaluation (Sinek, 2017). This exercise helps reinforce the accountability to each other for their individual and team success. It also provides a consistent forum for evaluating success and making quick modifications to improve productivity. This exercise is extremely valuable for pushing individuals out of their comfort zone and demonstrates trust, growth, maturity and ownership of the team’s success.

Team-Building Exercises
Participating in less formal team-building exercises are fun ways to develop camaraderie. The team has participated in a popular puzzle solving exercise, Escape the Room, in downtown San Antonio. This event was easily planned into a half-day retreat that began with lunch followed by a short walk to the event location. Additionally, they’ve volunteered at the San Antonio Food Bank during the holidays. A future event will be taking a tour of the Toyota plant in San Antonio to see efficiency and LEAN activities in action. For these events, the team wears clothing that identifies them as part of Texas Biomed. The events develop camaraderie, demonstrate collaboration with our community and provide visibility for our organization. The team takes pride in representing
Their team mates. We take risks as a team. In discussion and take ownership of their success and the success of their team members. This culture and philosophy ensures that the team members are engaged. The success of the team is collective; no one ever succeeds or fails alone.

If failure occurred, we all failed and we all learn from it. No individual glories or failures. If there is success, it’s because the team succeeded. If failure occurred, we all failed and we all learn from it. The success of the team is collective; no one ever succeeds or fails alone. This culture and philosophy ensures that the team members are engaged in discussion and take ownership of their success and the success of their teammates. We take risks as a team.

Taking Risks Together
A team must take risks when implementing operational improvements. Thoughtful and strategic execution can lead to success. Careless execution can lead to failure. In all instances, modifications can be made to reach the goal. The team works together to discuss ideas for improvement of processes owned by OSP, or that impact our workload. The team assesses the potential impact on external departments/staff and takes necessary steps to communicate ideas and discuss with those individuals. After a thorough assessment with all stakeholders, the team develops a plan of action together and reaches consensus on the best course of action. They reach out to all stakeholders with a proposal and plan of execution. Upon obtaining buy-in from stakeholders, the team executes and closely monitors operations via weekly meetings and open-door discussions. If modifications are needed, they quickly adapt. There are no individual glories or failures. If there is success, it’s because the team succeeded. If failure occurred, we all failed and we all learn from it. The success of the team is collective; no one ever succeeds or fails alone.

Closing Thoughts
These practices work well for our team in our organization of 350 employees. However, we encourage leaders at all levels of any organization to implement practices to create such a culture within their own teams—they must. In larger organizations/teams, implementing such practices with a representative few may be more feasible. Leaders must be willing to take the initial risk of changing management practices in order to create and empower leaders throughout the organization. This can ultimately transform the culture throughout the organization or, at the very least, create a healthy environment for each team and foster optimal performance. Consequently, this strong collegial culture allows team members to maintain a healthy work-life balance in our field of deadlines and short lead times. All of the practices were implemented at little to no cost; however, they require leadership, time, risks, resolve and passion.

In our field, where customers include government, industry, external collaborators, researchers, colleagues and executive administration, we must provide compliance and customer service while balancing effectiveness, efficiency and employee engagement. To support pioneering research, administration must be as innovative and cutting edge as the research it supports. Leaders, be bold; try something new.
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one are the days of typing pools, file rooms and multi-part forms, but we are not completely free of data from that era. As research administration has evolved from a paper forms-based profession to one largely dependent on data in digital formats we have moved into a regulatory world with both great benefits and great threats.

The great threats are evidenced by the recent data breaches that compromise our very identities. The great benefits are seen in the leaps forward in medical research that will likely prolong our lives. Entire fields of study, structures, and processes have evolved from records becoming electronic such as ERM – electronic records management, and IG – information governance (Smallwood, 2013). The information governance concepts strike similar chords to the Uniform Guidance’s internal controls concepts.
What are the requirements?
A Record is a piece of information constituting evidence about the past which is kept in writing, or some other permanent form, such as an electronic record (English Oxford Living Dictionaries, 2018). There are different types of records: active, inactive and permanent; each with differing requirements.

The requirements will depend on the entity type and sponsor terms and conditions. Every entity must follow its own record retention policy which may be stricter than federal requirements. Under 2 CFR §200.333, non-federal entities are required to keep all grants-related documents for three years from the submission date of the final expenditure report. Most federal agencies have similar retention requirements (Office of Management and Budget, 2014; National Institute of Health, 2017; National Science Foundation, 2018).

Many institutions implement retention requirements longer than the federal requirements for a variety of reasons. Many taxpayers believe that the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) requires that records be kept for at least 7 years, but that is only if you claim a loss. The IRS standard record retention requirement is “Keep records for 3 years from the date you filed your original return or 2 years from the date you paid the tax, whichever is later, if you file a claim for credit or refund after you file your return” (2018).

University of Massachusetts Dartmouth (UMD) uses a Record Retention Matrix. Some of the sponsored project financial transaction records are retained for 3 years, but the majority must be retained for 6 years since UMD is a state university. Legal documents are considered permanent (2009).

Look at the Record Retention Workflow for Sponsored Projects Administration sample below and see if this model might be used at your organization for record management:

The full versions of the Record Retention Matrix & Workflow are available upon request.

What are the best practices for record retention?
The Generally Accepted Recordkeeping Principles® are a framework for records management in support of information governance. “Information governance helps organizations achieve business objectives, facilitates compliance with external requirements, and minimizes risk posed by sub-standard information-handling practices” (Association of Records Managers and Administrators International [ARMA], 2013).

There are 8 tenets commonly referred to as “the Principles” which are paraphrased here:

Principle of Accountability = Someone is responsible
Principle of Transparency = Processes are visible
Principle of Integrity = Documents are authentic
Principle of Protection = Privacy is preserved
Principle of Compliance = Laws are followed
Principle of Availability = Documents are accessible
Principle of Retention = What to keep
Principle of Disposition = What to toss

The full definition of the Principle of Retention states “An organization shall maintain its records and information for an appropriate time, taking into account its legal, regulatory, fiscal, operational, and historical requirements.” Those factors determine the appropriate retention period. The concept of risk is also addressed where the presence or absence of records can have a beneficial or detrimental effect on the entity.

The Information Governance Maturity Model (ARMA, 2013) was intended as a quality improvement tool and is an accurate risk assessment tool as well. As the maturity level of an organization increases numerically, the associated organizational risk decreases. The Maturity Model describes the attributes of information governance programs at five differing levels for each of their eight principles as paraphrased in the previous section. For the purpose of this article we will restrict our focus through the lens of the Principle of Retention:

In past presentations we took an informal audience poll and asked how many institutions were at each of the five maturity levels. Most responded that their organizations are at either level 2 or 3. Technology and legal entities tend to rank higher in the maturity model likely because of two factors: 1) much of their data is in digital format and retention policies can be applied via an algorithm rather than manually processed like higher education entities and; 2) storing data has an associated cost and for-profit entities are typically focused on maximizing profits by minimizing costs (McNulty, 2018).

At the end of the retention requirement, proper disposal of the documents is critical. Deleting the data merely moves it out of active status. Deletion is not considered a form of sanitization. The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) has defined three methods of sanitization for media: Clear, Purge and Destroy (2014). Clearing overwrites the data – the paper equivalent is redaction. Purging renders the media unreadable – the paper equivalent is shredding. Destroying renders the media unable to be used again – the paper equivalent is incineration.
As we celebrate the 60th annual meeting and acknowledge the many changes in the industry, it makes sense to think about what stays the same in research administration. The goal remains to support the research community, and there are still more research ideas than funding. One of the most important things that has remained a constant is increasing complexity and demands on the time of the research administrator.

Every year brings new compliance requirements and risks, new funders and new initiatives to support the research mission. When the pace of activity threatens to become unmanageable, what is a research administrator to do? Sometimes the answer is to do less.

Ron Heifetz and Marty Linsky offered the idea of “balcony time”. We spend most of our time caught up in the day-to-day, responding to emails, attending meetings and dealing with the crisis of the moment. Similarly, dancers on a dance floor are involved in the whirl of action. But it can be valuable to step away from the immediate action on the dance floor and spend a few moments up on the balcony, looking down at the action. From the balcony you can see patterns that weren’t apparent when you were on the floor and gain a new perspective.

Taking time on a regular basis to think about the bigger picture is a valuable habit for leaders at all levels. Some of the things to think about on the balcony include:

- How am I spending my time? Where can I have the biggest impact?
- What can be standardized and automated?
- Am I spending time on activities that don’t need to be done, that we could reconsider?
- What longer term goals and objectives haven’t gotten enough attention?
- Finally, what risks and issues haven’t I been paying attention to?

Sometimes a little time out of the middle of things is the best way to be effective when you are IN the middle of things.

Matthew Staman, Managing Director at Huron Consulting Group, has over 20 years of experience in research administration and has worked with institutions across the country. He has been a member of NCURA for over 15 years. He can be reached at mstaman@huronconsultinggroup.com
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Denise Wallen, Research Officer and Senior Fellow, University of New Mexico, has been ratified as Vice President/President-Elect of NCURA. Throughout her 38 years of NCURA membership Denise has been extremely active. She has chaired Region VII, the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee, the Professional Development Committee, the NCURA Research Program, the NCURA International Fellowship Committee, and the International Neighborhood. Denise has also served on the Board of Directors, as Co-Chair of the 59th Annual Meeting, as a Fundamentals faculty member, as a member on the Select Committee on Global Affairs, and as a track leader on many conference program committees. Denise is currently an NCURA Peer Reviewer. Upon her ratification as NCURA Vice President/President-Elect, Denise says, “Thank you for your support and ratification. I consider it an honor to serve as your Vice President/President-Elect and I look forward to the opportunity of working together. We will continue to develop and offer world-class professional development, education and training, and services that meet the needs of research administrators.”

Tricia Callahan, Senior Research Education and Information Officer, Colorado State University, has been elected to the position of At-Large Board Member. Since joining NCURA in 1999, Tricia has been actively involved both regionally and nationally. Tricia has served as Secretary of Region IV, Co-Chair of the 2014 PRA Conference, as a Region IV At-Large Board Member, as an NCURA Peer Reviewer, and as track co-chair for several national conferences. Tricia went through the Executive Leadership Program in 2016. Tricia currently serves as a Fundamentals Workshop faculty member and member of the Presidential Task Force on Accreditation. On being elected as At-Large Board Member, Tricia says, “I am honored and humbled to have been elected as one of the two At-Large Members to the NCURA Board of Directors. I look forward to working with the membership and the board to move the organization forward, supporting research...together. Thank you so very much for your vote of confidence. I can’t wait to roll up my sleeves and get to work as your At-Large representative.”

Robyn Remotigue, Director, Office of Research Services, School of Public Health, University of North Texas Health Science Center at Fort Worth, has been elected to the position of At-Large Board Member. In Robyn’s 17 years of NCURA membership she has made many contributions to NCURA. Robyn has served on the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee, the Professional Development Committee, the Pre-Award Neighborhood Committee, and several national and regional conference program committees. She was the chair of the Presidential Task Force for Educational Programming Needs, was an NCURA Magazine Contributing Editor, and has contributed over 15 submissions to the NCURA Magazine. In addition she is a graduate of the NCURA Leadership Development Institute and the Executive Leadership Program. Robyn is currently a Co-Chair of the 60th Annual Meeting, on the Education Scholarship Fund Select Committee, and a Sponsored Project Administration Workshop faculty member. Upon being elected as At-Large Board Member, Robyn shares, “I am very honored and humbled to have been elected to serve as an At-Large member to NCURA’s Board of Directors. NCURA has contributed so much to my professional development, and I am grateful for the opportunity to serve and give back. I look forward to contributing to NCURA’s efforts to advance research administration, and providing sustainability for the next generation of research administrators.”

Wallen will take office January 1, 2019 for one year after which she will succeed to a one-year term as President of NCURA. Both Callahan and Remotigue will begin serving January 1, 2019 for a two-year term.
INORMS 2018: Supporting Global Research Challenges

By Irina Filonova and Sarah Wong

A successful research enterprise often rests on shoulders of those who work behind the scenes making sure universities run as well-oiled machines. These people are frequently called research management administrators (RMAs), and there is no better place to become acquainted with this diverse professional tribe than to attend an International Network of Research Management Societies (INORMS) congress. The 7th INORMS congress themed Promoting Global Research Management, Supporting Global Research Challenges was hosted in June 2018 by the Association of Research Managers and Administrators (ARMA) in the historical city of Edinburgh, Scotland. In this article, we’d like to share our first-hand experience and personal impressions of this remarkable event.

Recent challenges in research administration

Research is increasingly becoming a global endeavor. Academics from around the world are working together to tackle global challenges society is facing today. This has resulted in the rapid increase of international research collaborations in recent years. This in turn has led to unique challenges for research managers including navigating funding systems for international research, addressing customs laws to support the exchange of research samples and specimens, and providing language support for scholars worldwide. These issues will become increasingly complex as new technologies change the fundamental ways in which research is managed today. Thus, it is necessary for research administrators from around the globe to come together in a forum to discuss these challenges.
INORMS 2018 is the place to be
In 2001, INORMS was created for RMAs to help internationalize the paradigm of research management. INORMS member associations are represented by multinational research management societies including the Australasian Research Management Society (ARMS), the Brazilian Association of Research Managers and Administrators (BRAMA), the West African Research and Innovation Management Association (WARIMA), and of course NCURA. If you’ve never been to an INORMS meeting, simply imagine hundreds of highly-skilled RMAs coming together to share their experiences and best practices of running research enterprises around the world, all while having a great deal of fun. The 7th INORMS congress (INORMS2018) was not an exception. Hosted by ARMA, it was the largest INORMS congress to date, with more than 1,100 participants representing 55 different countries and 17 research management societies. Needless to say, this congress truly represented the “I” in INORMS. This year’s conference perfectly blended both professional and social activities, resulting a truly memorable, enjoyable and enlightening experience that featured a ceilidh, whittling Harry Potter-style wands, and singing along with the INORMS choir.

Being newbies to the congress, we were pleasantly surprised with the variety and depth of the three-day program that consisted of four plenary sessions with world-renowned experts and multiple workshops covering 11 sub-themes. Coming from the Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology (OIST) Graduate University in Okinawa, Japan, we represent two different areas of research management: Irina is a post-doctoral career development specialist, while, Sarah is a science administrator in the President’s Office. Our unique identities within the University allowed us to both experience and learn from the conference differently. As much as we wanted to share all our newly-learned knowledge with the NCURA audience, we decided to distill our lessons learned to three topics that cover use of impact, research development issues, and development of new skills to be successful in our profession.

Assessing your impact
Sessions on public trust and engagement revealed the tenuous relationship between the public and scientists in terms of trust. This volatility was displayed in Japan following the Fukushima nuclear disaster when public trust of scientists was nearly halved. While polls suggest
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that public trust in science in the United States has remained relatively stable over the past few decades, the increasingly vocal anti-science movement may threaten this. As taxpayer money funds a large portion of research, it is important to retain public trust in science. This can be achieved by properly engaging the community through communication, outreach, and inclusion. It is important to remember that communication goes beyond the simple dissemination of information, it requires both conversing with and listening to the public.

As this conference was held in the United Kingdom, the Research Excellent Framework (REF) mandated by U.K. funding bodies, was a hot topic amongst many conference participants. Part of REFs purpose is “to provide accountability for public investment and produce evidence of benefits of this investment,” which includes providing data that demonstrates the quality of research being produced. However, as some sessions uncovered, one must use research metrics with caution. While it is important for institutes to be aware of the relative quality of their research, it is also important to keep the mission, vision, and purpose of the institute in mind when assessing impact. Achieving the mission should be given a higher priority than climbing the rankings for universities.

News from the researcher development world

Regarding researcher development, multiple speakers recommended that scientists should be rigorously trained to adapt to the rapid internationalization of research. In the past, much of the professional training was aimed to deepen a discipline knowledge, enhance intellectual abilities and personal effectiveness (Vitae RDF, Domains A and B; see References); however, going global requires a different, more business-like skillset that also includes understanding research governance and organization (Vitae RDF, Domain C). This means producing excellent research results no longer meets the threshold for international success. Therefore, research leaders also need to be well equipped to understand the different legal requirements, finance management, and institutional infrastructures in collaborating countries. In addition to these competencies, a comprehensive knowledge of cultural diversity is necessary to initiate a global collaboration and successfully conclude it. As a result, research developers should create tools and provide resources to help investigators establish cultural alignments and navigate through the unspoken rules and expectation of another culture.

The evolution of the profession

The expanding scope of research and the increase in governmental oversight brought several challenges to the RMA profession. Many of these revolved around the complexity of the tasks, requirement to achieve new goals, and the need to support both local and global partnerships. As a consequence, an interesting phenomenon — the emergence of “blended professionals (BP)” — has been observed on many campuses worldwide. While this term might be new to some readers, many of us may fall into this category. To simplify, BPs are PhDs who chose to join research administration, yet, they combine administrative work with academic practices. These professionals are called by different names such as impact/engagement specialists, researcher developers, science and policy advisors, etc. and are found in various spaces at universities. Interestingly, despite their unusual job duties and relative freedom, many BPs experience a lack of managerial support and vague career prospects that may cause decreased job satisfaction and an unclear professional identity. This suggests that institutions should create special mechanisms to support these individuals in their professional development to retain this valuable human resource. The emergence of “blended-ness” serves as additional evidence that past skills are insufficient to accommodate the ever-changing research landscape. Thus, similarly to the academics, RMAs must develop their professional identity and expand their skill set by adding cultural intelligence, critical thinking, and leadership. Moreover, we (they) should be more proactive when it comes down to proposing novel solutions to complex problems because, chances are, we (they) might be the only ones in the room with expertise in both research support and administration.

Recent challenges in research administration

Research is increasingly becoming a global endeavor. Academics from around the world are working together to tackle global challenges society is facing today. This has resulted in the rapid increase of international research collaborations in recent years. This in turn has led to unique challenges for research managers including navigating funding systems for international research, addressing customs laws to support the exchange of research samples and specimens, and providing language support for scholars worldwide. These issues will become increasingly complex as new technologies change the fundamental ways in which research is managed today. Thus, it is necessary for research administrators from around the globe to come together in a forum to discuss these challenges and administration.

What’s next?

In the face of disruptive technologies and rapidly-evolving research landscapes, one has to wonder what the field of research management will look like in upcoming years. The “future of work” sessions highlighted potential changes the field may face, such as the automation of administrative tasks through the incorporation of artificial intelligence (AI) and other technologies. This leads to the increased importance of soft skills, such as communication, leadership, and development of interpersonal relationships. It will be especially interesting to listen to the new challenges at the next INORMS congress, which will be hosted by the Research Manager and Administrator Network Japan (RMAN-J) in Hiroshima in 2020. We are looking forward to welcoming you in Japan!
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Resilience—a term we’ve heard frequently in recent times, whether it is regarding politics, the economy, climate and environmental issues, professional or personal situations. Living in Puerto Rico, which was hit by two major hurricanes in a matter of two weeks last September, it comes pretty handy. I work for a public university with a federally funded program focused on addressing coastal and marine issues through a variety of strategies: research, outreach, and education. Combine our already challenging days with major natural events, and our ability to adapt and respond becomes severely tested. In recent months, our staff was relocated within our campus facilities because of damage to our offices, we faced major hurdles with communications both via phone and internet for at least two months, and though we are starting to get back on track, we still haven’t had access to equipment that is critical for some of the work that we perform. Not to mention that we had a major due date within less than a month and a half after the second hurricane and, of course, the many personal issues that my coworkers confronted and continue to manage.
They say everything happens for a reason, so the challenges have not come without great lessons. Resilience regards our ability to recover from major events and return to our original state (a better one, we hope). What does it take to be resilient?

resilience is all about flexibility

Commitment
Whatever your challenge is, it takes great commitment to recover. Imagine having to conduct all your daily home chores with no electricity while the time you dedicate to your job takes most of the hours of daylight you have available. Despite this, our staff showed up. Imagine facing the multiple personal hurdles caused by these hurricanes with the accompanying emotional exhaustion, while simultaneously keeping a positive attitude and helping the many audiences we serve with their own related difficulties.

Perseverance
Never quit! All we need is a clear goal. We define the path or modify it if need be, but we have to keep on going. Some things may slow us down. Tell me about it! That change in software or administrative process; a change in leadership that suddenly makes approvals take longer or everything become more scrutinized; the last minute funding opportunity you wish you could just brush off to continue with everything else you already had on your plate, or even the dwindling amount of available research funding. No matter how fast or slow the pace towards recovery or adaptation to these changes may be, just keep going. Slow progress is still progress.

We would have preferred that Puerto Rico had recovered much faster, more so with a new hurricane season closer than I would like. But we continue to make progress towards improvement and hope for the best.
Hope
The feeling that a goal or the desired state can be achieved is what keeps us going. We have to hope for a better fiscal environment. We have to hope for more opportunities for our researchers to make those wonderful discoveries. We have to hope that research administration gets simpler, or at least that those of us in the field love the craziness. We have to hope that the profession develops to the point when we can say we are research administrators without getting a confused look. Little by little, things can get back on track and we have to hope that all the uncertainty is just something we have to deal with to get to a better place.

Flexibility
The same behavior will usually be followed by the same results. On the other hand, resiliency is all about flexibility. We have to be able to adapt to changing environments. If you find it’s dangerous to live near the coast in hurricane-susceptible areas, you should be willing to move away. If you can’t work from the office you love for six months, take what you have and make the best of it. Work with your researchers! Approve that no cost extension, negotiate those changes in the scope of work, do all that’s within your authority to take that project to the finish line successfully. Within certain boundaries, there is always a degree of freedom to move around. Be flexible and don’t overburden yourself or those around you.

In the meantime, laugh!
Until you get there, enjoy the ride. Eight months after the hurricanes, Puerto Rico still couldn’t report its power system to be fully recovered. Many people were still not able to return to their homes and were living with family members. Too many were waiting for the seemingly endless stream of help that somehow had not yet made it to numerous people in need. But despite the inconveniences, there have been so many people that have met better versions of their neighbors. The collaboration among community members to help the ones that suffered the most has been huge. Youngsters learned there were others nearby that the distraction of technology never let them meet. There were so many conversations that would not have occurred if it weren’t for absolutely nothing to do at 7 pm in total darkness. It has been, at a minimum, awe-inspiring.

In the midst of uncertainty and frustration, make the best of the situation at hand. You may have to cry and scream once in a while, but hopefully you’ll have a shoulder to lean on. Better yet, in some other occasion you’ll be able to provide someone else a helping hand. Enjoy the little things. Laugh at the craziness. Appreciate so many things and people you might have taken for granted. Difficult times are not impediments, they are just challenges, learning opportunities, and inspiring anecdotes in the making.

Yulissa Garcia, PhD, CRA, has performed pre-award and post-award activities for 17 years managing the University of Puerto Rico Sea Grant College Program. She is a Certified Research Administrator and holds dual certifications from Management Concepts. She can be reached at yulissa.garcia1@upr.edu
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Denise Clark, Associate Vice President for Administration and Chief of Staff, Division of Research, University of Maryland College Park is the 2018 recipient of the NCURA Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award. This award recognizes a current or past NCURA member who has made 1) noteworthy contributions to NCURA, and 2) significant contributions to the profession of Research Administration. First awarded in 1994, this award is NCURA’s highest honor.

Denise’s contributions to NCURA are many, spanning nearly 30 years of NCURA membership. Denise has served as NCURA President and Secretary and on the Region II Board of Directors. Denise has served as a faculty member of the Financial Research Administration Workshop, a member of the Nominating & Leadership Development Committee and a member of the Professional Development Committee.

Denise has also served on many regional and national program committees. Denise received the Region II Distinguished Award in 2007 and the NCURA Julia Jacobsen Distinguished Service Award in 2010.

Dick Seligman, California Institute of Technology, shared

For more than twenty years, Denise Clark has been a leader in the field of research administration and has made many long and lasting contributions to NCURA… Throughout her career, Denise has been a mentor and role model to countless research administrators throughout the country. Busy as she is, she always is willing to take the time to work with research administrators, both junior and senior, who seek her advice and counsel.

Marti Dunne, New York University, says

Denise has a highly nuanced command of the rules and regulations governing federally-sponsored programs. She is one of my “go-to” people when I need an interpretation of an arcane-ly-worded clause or a defense to an audit finding. She is generous with her time and has never failed to respond to me when I need advice. More importantly, she is one of the most vivacious presenters I have ever witnessed or worked with…. It is a feat to be an expert in these matters; it is a triumph to be able to communicate them to others in a humorous and easily digestible manner.

Denise’s colleague Wallace Loh, President of the University, Maryland, adds

In her decade in this position, Denise’s leadership has helped UMD achieve record successes in research funding, dramatically expanded our research partnerships, and brought new life to our knowledge transfer and commercialization operations. … To put it simply, Denise’s work has been transformative, building research connections and empowering colleagues. With her 30 years of experience, she confidently navigates the regulatory waters, and helps colleagues—inside and outside our institution—to do so, as well.

Pamela Webb, University of Minnesota, contributed

I have known Denise since 1996 and had the great good fortune to invite her to be my co-chair for NCURA’s third national ERA conference in 1998. Her passion, commitment to excellence, and “all-in” attitude was immediately apparent in that event— and has persisted ever since. Her desire to create new models of excellence for conveying and educating fellow research administrators is apparent in everything she does.

Tim Reuter, Stanford University, says

She is the ultimate ambassador of research administration. She is committed to ensuring that the membership of NCURA and FDP facilitate research by providing excellent service to our faculty. But also that we continually strive to work with our sponsors to improve the entire research process and that we provide relevant, interesting, current professional development to all research administrators across the globe.

On receiving the award, Denise states,

I am honored to be recognized by my peers with this most prestigious award. Over the past 30 years, I have seen our profession grow from its infancy, and I am delighted to have been part of the transformation of Research Administration into a true career and a recognized profession. The satisfaction of influencing others in the navigation of the challenges of managing sponsored programs keeps me engaged, motivated and excited. I thank the members of NCURA for giving me the opportunity to both learn from the best and recognized experts in the field and train others, building on real life case studies and experiences.

Denise Clark will receive the Award for Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration on Monday, August 6, 2018, at the 60th Annual Meeting Keynote Address.
This year the NCURA Nominating and Leadership Development Committee selected five veteran NCURA members to receive the Julia Jacobsen Distinguished Service Award. This award recognizes members who have made sustained and distinctive contributions to the organization.

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

THE 2018 AWARD RECIPIENTS ARE:

**Mario Medina**, Manager, Finance and Administration of University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio. Mario has served as NCURA Treasurer, Chair and member of the Financial Management Committee, and as Chair of the Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion. Mario has also served as a past and current member of the National Board of Directors, an *NCURA Magazine* Contributing Editor, a webinar presenter, and as a presenter at both regional and national meetings. As a recipient of this award, Mario states, “I am extremely appreciative of this award from NCURA and proud to receive this award from an organization that has helped me grow professionally and personally, so to be recognized by my community of peers and friends is an incredible honor. Finally, I also believe that our purpose in life is to contribute in some way to making things better so that to me is the meaning of those three dots (…) in the NCURA’s message of ‘Supporting Research… together’ and its making a difference one member at a time.” Mario also shared a quote by Bobby Kennedy, “Few will have the greatness to bend history itself: but each of us can work to change a small portion of events, and in total: of all those acts will be written in the history of this generation.”

**Bruce Morgan**, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research Administration, University of California, Irvine. In his nearly 25 years of NCURA membership, Bruce has served on the National Board of Directors, as the Chair of Region VI, as the Chair of the Nominating & Leadership Development Committee, and as a member of the Professional Development Committee. As Region VI Chair, Bruce was instrumental in beginning Region VI’s Lead Me mentoring program. Bruce has served on NCURA’s Global Working Group, and as a faculty member for the Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration Workshop and the Level II: Sponsored Project Administration Workshop. Bruce served as Co-Chair of the 53rd and 55th Annual Meetings, has been on several other program committees, and has made many presentations at both regional and national conferences. Bruce shares, “I’m thrilled to be receiving the Julia Jacobsen Distinguished Service Award. My involvement with NCURA has been one of my great professional passions. The educational programming and professional development activities that NCURA offers makes it a world-class professional association. It’s provided me with the knowledge, tools and a vast network of colleagues and friends that have enabled me to better serve UCI and its faculty. I’m very fortunate that UCI values the benefits derived from its employees engaging in all aspects of NCURA’s activities, programs, organization and governance. Without UCI’s support and encouragement, I wouldn’t be receiving this award, and for that I’m truly grateful.”

**Twila Reighley**, Assistant Vice President for Research & Graduate Studies, Michigan State University. During her 35 years of NCURA membership, Twila has served as a member of the Board of Directors, as Chair of the Professional Development Committee, and on the Nominating & Leadership Development Committee. Twila was a Co-Chair for the 59th Annual Meeting, has presented at many regional and national conferences, and has written several articles for the *NCURA Magazine*. Currently, Twila is a faculty member for the Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration workshop. As a recipient of this award, Twila adds, “I’m truly honored to join the cohort of Distinguished Service Awardees. NCURA has been very important to me during my
30+ year career in research administration. I have gained so much from volunteering with the organization which included learning from others, developing new skills, and making things work. My thanks to NCURA and the many colleagues who have been an inspiration to me.”

Robyn Remotigue, Director, Office of Research Services, School of Public Health, University of North Texas Health Science Center at Fort Worth. Robyn has been an involved NCURA member for 16 years, serving on the Board of Directors, as a member of the Professional Development Committee, the Nominating & Leadership Development Committee, and as an NCURA Magazine Contributing Editor. Robyn was the Chair of the Presidential Task Force for Educational Programming, the Co-Chair of the 2016 Pre-Award Research Administration Conference and has served on several other program committees. Currently, Robyn is a Co-Chair of the 60th Annual Meeting, on the Education Scholarship Fund Select Committee, and a faculty member of the Level II: Sponsored Project Administration Workshop. In response to the award, Robyn says, “I am both privileged and honored to be a recipient of the Julia Jacobsen Distinguished Service Award. I have been given the opportunity to be surrounded by so many outstanding NCURA colleagues who have been instrumental in my professional research administration growth. In return, it has been a pleasure to give back to this organization and help promote the importance that it plays in advancing our field.”

Suzanne Rivera, Vice President for Research and Technology Management, Office of Research Administration, Case Western Reserve University. In Suzanne’s 16 years of NCURA membership, she has served on the Board of Directors, on the Nominating & Leadership Development Committee, and as Chair of the Education Scholarship Fund Task Force. Suzanne was a faculty member of the Level II: Sponsored Project Administration Workshop, was an NCURA Magazine Contributing Editor, and has served on many national conference program committees. Suzanne is currently a member of the Select Committee on Global Affairs. Suzanne shares, “It is a tremendous honor to be selected for this award. I’m especially humbled to be included in the same group as the other awardees this year— every one of them is a treasured friend, colleague, and role model to me. To be in their company as a recipient is the highest praise.”

The Distinguished Service Award recipients will be recognized at the upcoming 60th Annual Meeting before the Keynote Address on Monday, August 6, 2018. Please join us in thanking them for their service and their contributions!
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The Joseph F. Carrabino Award, established in 2003 by the NCURA Board of Directors, is named after the late Joe Carrabino, NSF Grants Officer. This award recognizes a current or former Federal partner who has made a significant contribution to research administration, either by a single project, activity, or innovation, or by a lifetime of service. The NCURA Nominating and Leadership Development Committee selected Cynthia Dwyer as the recipient of the 2018 Joseph F. Carrabino Award.

Cynthia Dwyer is the Outreach Coordinator, Office of Extramural Research at the National Institutes of Health. Each year, Cynthia leads and manages the NCURA NIH full-day workshop at the Annual Meeting. Cynthia brings creativity to each year’s workshop, incorporating fun new themes into the important content. Cynthia has a longstanding commitment for developing and maintaining strong partnerships with universities. She is also responsible for managing outreach and training activities, including coordination and planning of OER webinars and assisting grantee institutions with presenter requests for special events.

Michelle Bulls, Director, Office of Policy for Extramural Research Administration, National Institutes of Health, shares:

For the last several years, Cynthia has successfully led and managed the NCURA NIH day where the staff can network, obtain technical assistance, and meet with key stakeholders within NIH staff. By utilizing creative themes, Cynthia removes barriers by creating a safe and fun learning environment conducive for sharing and receiving information with our partners about NIH grant policies and processes. She is the only individual I know who can collide policy and fun to make for an adventurous learning session for the participants! If the logistics of one event annually was not challenging enough, in 2017, Cynthia managed two NIH NCURA days simultaneously. She coordinated one at the NCURA 59th Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C. and another on NIH’s campus in Bethesda, Maryland for NCURA’s International Region VIII. While seemingly challenging for some, for Cynthia, this was business as usual.

In her own words, Cynthia says,

It is such an honor to be receiving the prestigious Joseph F. Carrabino Award from NCURA. The past 18 years of my career have been spent working for the NIH and supporting its incredible mission. I value the opportunities I’ve had to partner with so many amazing individuals at NIH, NCURA and in the extramural research community – collaborating, supporting, and learning from one another – with the ultimate goal of making the world a healthier place for all. Ralph Waldo Emerson said, “Nothing great was ever achieved without enthusiasm.” I am just one, among so many enthusiastic individuals, driven by the desire to continually improve our community’s relationship with one another and communicate about NIH grants in a creative and meaningful way for today and a better tomorrow. I am truly humbled.

As recipient of the 2018 Joseph F. Carrabino Award, Cynthia will be recognized at the 60th Annual Meeting before the Keynote Address on Monday, August 6, 2018.
Reserach universities and hospitals have a vested interest in the legal, ethical, compliant, efficient, and effective administration of sponsored research. Obtaining and managing sponsored research is a remarkably daunting responsibility. The integrated layers of sponsored research administration not only necessitate support staff, as evidenced by an ever-increasing career field, but they also require robust tools and systems. With increased competition for limited funds, more stringent rules and regulations, and higher scrutiny, the roles of research administrators present growing and evolving challenges. Luckily, the rise of the internet and electronic products and services for business processes did not pass over the field of research administration. The hardcopy, paper-based processes of the past have been replaced by systems from vendors that promise to reduce administrative burden and increase efficiencies. While there are many well-known (and a few less known) vendors that offer promising solutions to the challenges of research administrators, there is little documented evidence that these systems actually fulfill their promises. To address this information gap, in partial fulfillment of my Master of Science in Research Administration degree from Johns Hopkins University, I conducted an empirical study of current eRA systems to assess how well they deliver on their promises to improve and facilitate research administration.

I surveyed research administrators from both academic and medical institutions with varying research program sizes across pre-award, award, and post-award processes. The survey was designed to gather insights on the performance of eRA systems in fulfilling their promises to improve and facilitate research administration. The survey included questions on the effectiveness of the systems in improving different aspects of research administration, such as the quality and integrity of data, transparency, and security.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promises</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the quality and integrity of data</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide adequate transparency</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide adequate (or improved) security</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and improve legal, ethical, and regulatory compliance</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase proposal success rate</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamline processes</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce redundancies of efforts</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage and support inter-institutional collaboration</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate collaboration</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide appropriate and meaningful customization</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce administrative burden</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Tanya Marlaine Blackwell
post-award, and compliance offices. I received and analyzed 160 responses to the survey; of them, 57.5% reported that their institution utilized an external eRA system. These 92 respondents provided honest and unbiased feedback on how well their institution’s eRA system delivered on 11 of the most common promises made by eRA vendors by ranking each promise from 1 (Greatly Fails to Fulfill Promises) to 5 (Greatly Exceeds Promises). Collectively, the systems were found to adequately rise to the challenges presented to and experienced by research administrators. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to calculate the average of each promise and to determine if there was statistical variance between each of the promises.

The first observation from these results is that the average rating of how well the eRA systems fulfill the individual promises range between 2.95 and 3.50, for an overall average of 3.22. Based on the scaling and the associated numerical assignment, eRA systems as a whole adequately fulfill their promises. The different values would indicate that the systems perform better in some areas than others, and the ANOVA test proved this to be true. Thus, a Tukey-Kramer test was used to identify which promises were better fulfilled than others. Pairwise comparisons were made to assess which promises stood out. These results show that there are only four statistically different ratings of the promises fulfilled by eRA systems as evaluated by research administrators. From these two tests, it has been determined that:

- eRA systems do better at improving the quality and integrity of data than fulfilling promises to reduce administrative burden.
- eRA systems do better at improving the quality and integrity of data than fulfilling promises to provide adequate and meaningful customization.
- eRA systems better fulfill promises to provide adequate transparency than reducing administrative burden.
- eRA systems better fulfill promises to provide adequate transparency than providing appropriate and meaningful customization.

Although the other categories had different calculated means, the ANOVA and Tukey-Kramer test have helped determine that there is not a statistical difference between them. Only those differences noted above were statistically verified. All promises were found to be adequately fulfilled. Time could have been a factor in how well these systems performed. As such, a Chi-Square test was used to analyze the four categories that demonstrated differences. Based on the Chi-Square tests performed, there is no statistical evidence in the data that the length of time an institution has had an eRA system influences the research administrators’ perception of its performance, in the four areas evaluated.

Despite the “adequate” rating of the promises, over 20% of respondents indicated that the following promises were not applicable to their respective systems: increase proposal success rate, facilitating collaboration, and encouraging and supporting inter-institutional collaboration. While the “Not Applicable” ratings were excluded from the statistical analysis, it is important to note that many of the respondents felt these promises were not fulfilled by the system if they felt it was not applicable. Further analysis of the data shows that of all the promises, the systems performed best when it comes to improving data quality and integrity and providing adequate transparency. Based on the number of respondents that ranked the individual promises as “greatly exceeds,” eRA systems perform well with providing adequate transparency and reducing the redundancies of efforts. Similarly, the systems performed least favorably in providing appropriate and meaningful customization.

Regardless of the vendor or the system employed, based on the results of this research, eRA systems have been found to adequately deliver on their promises to improve and facilitate research administration. Driven by the needs of the industry, eRA systems have been specifically designed to address common struggles and difficulties faced by research administrators. As institutions work hard to identify ways to assist researchers with the arduous and burdensome tasks associated with applying for and managing sponsored research, eRA systems promise to offer valuable tools to accomplish this goal. Until now, very little unbiased information about how well these systems deliver on their promises was available for institutions that are in the market for an eRA system. My thesis research project provided an empirical assessment of eRA systems and found them to be adequate in fulfilling the 11 key promises. Institutions desiring to keep up with the changing demands and challenges of managing sponsored research should consider investing in an eRA system; however, expectations for the reduction of administrative burden and customization should be moderately and realistically tempered. Vendors of eRA systems should continue to work closely with research institutions to ensure that the systems and updates adequately address the struggles faced by research administrators and evolves as the industry does. However, at this current time, the results of my research project are very promising and should meet research institutions with enough confidence to invest in an eRA system to facilitate and meet their sponsored research administration goals.

The systems perform best when it comes to improving data quality and integrity and providing adequate transparency.
We’re In This TOGETHER!

Volume II

By Ken Lisb and Rochelle Ray
Five years ago, the Inspector General for the National Science Foundation (NSF), Allison Lerner, wrote an article for this magazine titled *We’re In This Together!*, focusing on the shared goal of the NSF Office of Inspector General (OIG) and the research administration community of ensuring the integrity of federally funded science. Although that goal is just as important today, the partnership between NSF and NSF OIG is also critical to ensuring research integrity.

The public’s confidence in federally funded scientific research is undermined when funds dedicated to research are misused. Both NSF and NSF OIG play important and complementary oversight roles in detecting and preventing fraud, waste, and abuse, as well as promoting economy and efficiency in NSF’s programs and operations. In this jointly-written article, we’ll take a deeper dive into NSF OIG’s audit process, NSF’s role in resolving audit findings, and how NSF and NSF OIG collaborate during the audit resolution process to ensure the best possible outcomes for the public.

**Evolving Audit Process**

Over the past several years, NSF OIG has used a data analytics approach to conduct audits. As a result, NSF OIG more effectively identified high-risk awardees, oversaw 100 percent of all transactions and awards on each audit, and focused audit samples on the highest risk transactions within its universe. Although this audit process expanded NSF OIG’s oversight and provided valuable insights into cost-related issues across the awardee community, the fact that audit objectives only allowed for incurred-cost audits limited the auditors’ ability to explore the root causes of why questionable costs were charged to NSF awards. Additionally, NSF OIG relied on the services of Independent Public Accounting (IPA) firms to augment its audit capacity. Using IPA firms had been (and continues to be) a useful tool, but the contracts with the IPA firms were rigid and only allowed for incurred-cost audits. Further, rather than conducting their own audits, NSF OIG staff were spending too much time training and monitoring the work of the IPA firms.

Looking ahead, NSF OIG will be changing the way it uses data analytics throughout the audit process. While NSF OIG will continue to use data analytics to identify high risk awardees, it is constantly updating and modifying its risk model. In coming years, NSF OIG will place a greater emphasis on overseeing institutions that had not been identified as high risk in earlier versions of the model. Such institutions could include low- and mid-range NSF-funded institutions.

As with the risk model, NSF OIG will also be changing the way it uses data analytics in individual audits. Unlike prior audits, the future audit process will be more flexible and will enable the auditors to tailor their approaches to specific issues they identify at each institution. NSF OIG will also deploy resources differently. First, NSF OIG staff will conduct more audits in-house. This will help NSF OIG staff maintain and grow their skills as auditors and will allow for greater control over the audit process in general. Second, for audits IPA firms conduct, NSF OIG will implement a new contract that allows for the flexibility to address the unique risks identified at each auditee.

With the new audit process, every audit will start with a survey phase so the auditors can become familiar with the auditee’s overall grant management environment (see Figure 1). Potential steps in this process could include reconciling general ledger information to cash drawdown requests, reviewing policies and procedures, conducting onsite walkthroughs, and tracing transactions through their lifecycles to understand and assess the associated internal controls.

Once the auditors conclude the survey phase, they will assess the strengths and weaknesses of the auditee’s grant management environment and determine the next steps. Paths forward include initiating an accounting system audit, incurred cost audit, internal control audit, or customized audit based on identified risks — or, if it’s determined that the auditee has an exceptional grant management system, terminating the audit. For example, if the auditors identify weaknesses in the auditee’s accounting system during the survey phase, they will conduct a full accounting system audit. Although these new audits might not look like NSF OIG’s past “data analytic audits,” the auditors will still use data analytics to maximize oversight.

*Figure 1. Future Audit Process*
Once the auditors choose a path and complete the fieldwork, they will begin the reporting phase. As in prior years, the reporting process will include three distinct steps:

1. eDiscussion Draft Report — an informal report used to receive the auditee’s comments on inaccuracies, misstatements, misleading statements, etc.
2. eOfficial Draft Report — a formal report to which the auditee responds in writing.
3. eFinal Report — issued to NSF to resolve the findings with the auditee. It includes the auditee’s formal written response in its entirety. Additionally, the Inspector General Empowerment Act of 2016 requires that the audit report be transmitted to Congress and posted to NSF OIG’s website within 3 days of issuance.

When it issues the final audit report, NSF OIG initiates the audit resolution process and a period of advisement and collaboration between NSF and NSF OIG. NSF’s Resolution and Advanced Monitoring (RAM) Branch in the Division of Institution and Award Support (DIAS) is authorized by the Chief Financial Officer to resolve most of NSF OIG’s external audit reports. Upon receipt, RAM formally issues the report to the auditee, along with a letter that provides information on what to expect next in the audit resolution process.

RAM reviews all findings and recommendations in the report, including the auditee’s response and auditor work papers provided by NSF OIG. Using information gathered, RAM develops initial determinations and issues them in writing to the auditee, allowing at least 30 days for a response, and shares them with NSF OIG to ensure both offices have the same information.

Although NSF often reviews existing, alternative documentation to support costs questioned, auditees are expected (and required) to cooperate with NSF OIG audits and timely submit all documentation as requested.

To determine correct management decisions, RAM researches NSF systems thoroughly to obtain a complete understanding of terms and conditions, policies, regulations, and specific circumstances for awards where costs have been questioned. RAM also collaborates with the auditee, NSF OIG, Program Officials, Grants Officers, and cognizant Federal agencies as needed. NSF’s Chief Financial Officer reviews all drafted management decisions before sharing them with NSF OIG for consensus. If NSF OIG disagrees with or requests clarification of the draft management decisions, NSF and NSF OIG discuss the issues. If the organizations agree on the decisions, RAM formally issues the management decisions in writing to the auditee. If the organizations continue to disagree, NSF OIG may escalate disagreement(s) to the NSF Audit Follow-Up Official (AFO), who will make the final decision. RAM then issues the management decision in writing, based on the AFO’s determination.

**Shared Effort in Stewardship**

In 2010, NSF and NSF OIG committed to engage in efforts that recognize their joint roles in responsibility for stewardship of NSF funding. As a result, the offices established the Stewardship Collaborative (SC), which the NSF Director and the Inspector General co-sponsor and support with key management and senior audit staff.

Led by NSF’s Chief Financial Officer, Teresa Grancoveritz, and Assistant Inspector General for Audit, Mark Bell, the SC works to identify, discuss, and resolve areas of concern related to oversight, compliance, audit, and
NSF and NSF OIG committed to engage in efforts that recognize their joint roles in responsibility for stewardship...

Audit resolution to enhance operations and communications between the two organizations. SC members have worked to develop a partnership through joint activities in areas of mutual interest such as training, outreach, and communication. The SC also provides a forum for NSF and NSF OIG to discuss and resolve policy issues, rather than resolving those disagreements through the audit process, which can often impact third-party auditees. In addition, to improve operations, the SC created the Audit Subgroup to allow for real-time discussion of more narrowly focused topics and resolution of specific audit reports and findings.

Over the past 8 years, the resulting strengthened communication and collaboration have improved the audit resolution process. Examples include increased discussion surrounding interpretations of NSF policies and procedures (e.g., senior personnel salaries); sharing of questioned cost details and auditor work papers; open discussions to clarify work papers and audit findings; and greater understanding of critical elements used by NSF in developing its management decisions. With the goal of “no surprises,” these improvements help ensure that NSF and NSF OIG see the same information from the audit stage through resolution, enhance communication and collaboration, and minimize the need to escalate disagreements.

Audit resolution at NSF has been evolving for more than a decade. Although individual audit resolutions were once intense battles of will between NSF and NSF OIG staff, audit resolution has become a cooperative process that provides opportunities to educate and engage in productive discussions about the organizations’ differences in approach to stewardship. Through mutual respect of the imperative roles both play in supporting the NSF mission, NSF and NSF OIG cooperate better, which benefits both organizations’ shared goal of ensuring accountability and stewardship of taxpayer investments.

Ken Lish, CPA, CFE, MBA, is a Supervisory Audit Manager and leads the Grants and Agreements Audit Team in the Office of Audits at the National Science Foundation. He also serves as the External Outreach Coordinator for the Office of Inspector General. Ken joined the NSF OIG in 2009. He can be reached at klish@nsf.gov

Rochelle Ray is Chief of the Resolution and Advanced Monitoring Branch at NSF, where she oversees NSF post award monitoring activities, and serves as a subject matter expert on cost allowability and compliance under federal assistance awards. She joined NSF in 1991 and can be reached at rray@nsf.gov
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Responses:
While the United States (USA) and United Kingdom (UK) had a number of responses, other countries did not in general provide sufficient numbers for robust statistical analysis. Therefore, in order to analyze the data to compare the profession globally, responses were grouped into broad geographic regions in order to increase the volume to enable analysis with a 95% confidence level and with a 5% confidence interval. Throughout our reported results, we refer to this geographic data point as the AnalysisRegionOfEmployment, which is made up of the following regions (see Figure 1):

• Canada
• Europe (excluding the UK)
• Oceania (includes Australia and New Zealand)
• Rest of World (24 other countries from South America, Africa and Asia)
• United Kingdom (UK)
• United States of America (USA)

One of the first questions we asked in the survey was for respondents to self-identify as: Leader ("head of office, or responsible for leading strategic function(s)"); Manager ("subordinate to a leader but responsible for a team or functional area"); Operational ("responsible for undertaking specific duties, with no line management"); or Not sure ("none of these options seem to fit my role"). The responses made up the CurrentRoleLevel variable, an important data point to be used for deeper analyses on how RMAs enter the profession and subsequently, their current roles.

A fifth (20.8%, 559) of respondents self-identified as being in leadership roles, a plurality of 41.0% (1,102) were managers and 35.1% (944) in operational roles. There are also variations in role by region: - a higher proportion of leaders appear to have responded from the USA and the Rest of World, as compared with the other regions. Since respondents had to self-identify as being either a leader, manager or in an operational role, there could be regional differences in this self-identification rather than assuming there are more RMA leaders in these two regions - or perhaps just a higher proportion of leaders responded to the survey in those regions.

We also found that leaders are more likely (32.0%, 179 respondents) to have a CRA (or similar) than managers (22.5%, 248) or operational staff (20.6%, 194). While causality is not claimed - perhaps leaders may prefer to undertake certification as opposed to being promoted due to gaining certification.

There are regional differences (see Figure 2) associated with academic qualifications and degree attainment. Doctorate levels (see Figure 3: 36.5% for leaders as compared to 24.2% and 23.3% respectively for managers and operational staff) may perhaps be associated with higher levels of transfers of researchers into the research administration world. This pattern may be more prevalent in regions where research administration as a profession is newer – but further analysis is needed!

Interestingly, when looking at the proportion of doctorates by current role (Figure 3), and to a lesser extent with master’s degrees, we noticed similar results as with professional certifications noted earlier. It seems that higher levels of study, of any sort, are associated with leadership - this link between academic and professional certification and advancement within the RMA profession is also argued by Smith and Shambrook (2015).
The scope of the dataset (Kerridge and Scott, 2018a) means that many other analyses are possible—for example, analyzing which skills are most needed for different areas of research administration; the differences between age ranges of operational, managerial, and leadership positions; the relative importance of hard skills versus soft skills in the profession; have leaders worked in more institutions than operational staff; and the list goes on and on. The datasets are publicly available in Figshare and can also be accessed via the RAAAP website: https://raaapworldwide.wordpress.com. We also provide details (Kerridge and Scott, 2018b) on how the data were collected, processed, cleansed and analyzed.

While the data collected are fairly comprehensive, they only represent a snapshot in time, it is hoped that a periodic follow-up survey might be conducted in order to start producing a longitudinal dataset about our profession—building on and extending work such as Shambrook et al (2015). Just such an initiative is now underway! An INORMS RAAAP survey taskforce is in the process of being setup to collect longitudinal data about our profession. [N]

References

Figure 1: Responses by Geographic Region of Employment

Figure 2. Proportion of RMAs with academic qualifications, by Region

Figure 3. Proportion of RMAs with academic qualifications, by Current Role Level
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The BILAT USA 4.0 project, funded by the European Union, has the overall aim to enhance, support and further develop the research and innovation cooperation between Europe and USA. NCURA is co-coordinator of BILAT USA 4.0 and ETH Zurich is one of the partners in the project. Within this project, ETH Zurich organized an EU Tour to raise awareness on and promote various cooperation and funding opportunities between Europe and the USA. Faculty were Jennifer Ponting, Director Pre-Award Services, Office for Sponsored Programs, Harvard University and Caroline Jones, Assistant Director of Pre-Award Operations, Office of Sponsored Research, Stanford University as well as Regina Notz, Research Manager, EU GrantsAccess and Luca Wacker, Research Manager, EU GrantsAccess from ETH Zurich. Agatha Keller, Co-Head EU GrantsAccess, ETH Zurich, accompanied them and Karin Dörig, Project Administrator, EU GrantsAccess, ETH Zurich, provided organizational support. It was quite an endeavor to organize the tour as faculty were traveling from Zurich, San Francisco and Boston to Barcelona, Spain, then on to Göttingen, Germany, and finally to London, UK. Workshops were held in Barcelona at the CRG – Centre for Genomic Regulation on May 30th, in Göttingen at the University of Göttingen on June 1st and in London at The Francis Crick Institute on June 4th. Also thanks to the excellent organization from all hosting institutions, the events were very successful.

The workshops attracted great interest and were very well attended at all three locations. In London, all 120 available seats were taken and there was even a waiting list. Content-wise, the faculty taught about finding US funding, different terminology between EU and US, evaluation, compliance and management of US grants, with a focus on NIH. It was a perfect opportunity to promote BILAT USA 4.0 activities such as the Terminology Wiki as well as the Guide for EU researchers about US funding. At all three locations, the audience was a mix of Research Managers and Researchers. This set-up also raised the awareness that submitting and managing a US project is a joint endeavor. Both parties — researchers as well as research managers — should work hand in hand in order to facilitate the process and to ensure compliance.

A plenary session in the morning was followed by parallel sessions for Research Managers and Researchers in the afternoon. Numerous participants at all three locations indicated that they either have ongoing US projects or have been involved in submitting projects.

The main funding instrument in Europe is Horizon 2020, the EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation. There is a vast knowledge about managing EU projects, but many European Universities do not have a critical mass of US projects. Therefore, setting up policies and internal regulations is hard work for little incoming cash. However, it makes it possible for researchers and research managers to understand the funding process in detail and for the organization to comply with the rules.

The faculty did a tremendous job and conveyed the complex content in a very professional and comprehensive way. The participants were happy to have experts from the US as well as counterparts from Europe and approached faculty with many questions. We were also lucky to have a NIH evaluator in Barcelona who clarified the reviewing process.

The high demand for the workshops proved again that there is an enormous interest in learning how to submit and manage US funding. Such workshops are in high demand and many participants asked whether there would be similar workshops in the future. Within BILAT 4.0, there are no further workshops foreseen. However, we identified a potential for NCURA Global Workshops similar to the ones that have been organized in Zurich in 2015 and Vienna in 2017. As the title of this issue suggests, we’ve come very far but we’ve also just begun to fully exploit the potential.
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Nine junior faculty were chosen through an application process to participate in PREPARE. The program introduced faculty to a mentor network, which assisted them in establishing a realistic research agenda, improving grantsmanship skills, seeking appropriate external funding sources, and promoting compliance with internal and external protocols. The overarching purpose of the program was to create faculty advocates for Office of Research staff and to increase successful grant submissions.

PREPARE is adapted from the University of Utah (an R1 institution) Matrix Mentoring Model (Byington et al., 2016), which was designed for clinical and translational science faculty to pursue career development awards (NIH K-awards). The multi-level mentoring matrix puts the mentee at the center of four types of mentors: staff, scientific, senior, and peer.

Staff mentors included Office of Research staff, BCHS staff, and the Belk Library and Information Commons staff, who were available to answer administrative questions. Scientific mentors were identified by the mentees, had shared research interests, were active in their fields, and were available to read the scientific sections of proposals. Senior mentors were research faculty with successful grant-funded research careers who met at least monthly with three mentees to discuss their research, funding opportunities, proposal preparation, and anything else pertinent. Peer mentors were the nine mentees in the PREPARE cohort. An orientation about the mentoring process kicked off the program and focused on how successful mentoring is driven by the mentee, not the mentor. The mentoring relationship was defined as an “enduring personal relationship, a reciprocal relationship that embodies several key qualities” (Johnson, 2007) as outlined in Table 1.

To support the mentor/mentee relationship, articles on grantsmanship were circulated for discussion throughout the program. Mentees met with staff mentors when they had identified a funding mechanism and were ready to develop a timeline to submit a grant.

Each month an education program was presented and a pre/post evaluation related to the education material was administered. Education programs sessions are outlined in Table 2.

Results
After the seven-month program, eight of the nine mentees attended five or more educational sessions. All reported knowing more about the educational session topics when they left when they entered the session. Seven of the nine mentees submitted either an internal or an external grant application, one mentee realized she didn’t have enough publications to submit a grant to an external agency, and one mentee received a large grant from the Department of Education right before her admittance into the PREPARE program. Mentee grant activity will continue to be tracked over the next year.

The PREPARE program was designed to assist
faculty in submitting competitive proposals. However, we found throughout the program that some faculty felt overwhelming stress in balancing the intensely time-consuming, clinical nature of their respective undergraduate and graduate programs with the need to fund, conduct, and publish their research. What they wanted out of mentoring was not necessarily the writing help PREPA RE was designed to provide, but rather the social support and advice about navigating the “soft-skills” of the job, as well as simply connecting with other people who shared their research interests.

The administrative function of an Office of Research that assists faculty in preparing a well thought out, well-written and conveyed program/project is still imperative. Administrative burden has affected all entities, and has added to the burdens of faculty who are balancing increasing demands. Offices of Research have come so far in becoming more versatile and collaborative in offering services, and we’ve only just begun scratching the surface of offering programs like PREPA RE that create advocates for working with the Office of Research and assist the faculty in a larger context, helping them be successful in not only grant submission, but also in their research careers and research development as a whole.
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Table 1. Qualities of the Intentional Mentor and the Mentee, adapted from Johnson’s (2007) On Being a Mentor: A Guide for Higher Education Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Intentional Mentor</th>
<th>The Mentee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is prepared</td>
<td>Is proactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves as a model and offers a safe harbor for self-exploration</td>
<td>Is mindful of their mentor’s goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepts that one’s time and resources are finite</td>
<td>Keeps commitments and deadlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers encouragement and reframing, affirms strengths and potential</td>
<td>Demonstrates openness to feedback responsiveness to coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides direct career assistance</td>
<td>Communicates honestly and directly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes expectations clear</td>
<td>Keeps their expectations reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives practical assistance</td>
<td>Accepts imperfection and admits mistakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates achievement and experience</td>
<td>Always strives for excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expects more from the mentee than the mentee expects from themselves</td>
<td>Accepts increasing responsibility and autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides social and emotional support</td>
<td>Maintains a sense of humor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Listings of Educational Program Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NIH Orientation</th>
<th>Session Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding your Research Session, Part I &amp; II</td>
<td>The first session was an in-depth discussion about funding agencies and how to assess if they’re a good fit for one’s research. It provided an overview of the funding agencies likely to fund Appalachian and introduced opportunity databases and other resources. The second session was a hands-on workshop that provided in-depth training on funding databases in order to assist faculty to search for funding themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposing Writing Overview</td>
<td>An overview highlighting what makes an effective proposal, the abstract, the project description, defining the problem, identifying goals and objectives, basic budget components, sustainability, and identified common grant proposal writing mistakes and pitfalls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Appalachian’s Internal Routing Platform (Presented by Sponsored Programs Staff)</td>
<td>An introduction on how to submit a grant through Appalachian’s electronic internal routing system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with the Library, Part I &amp; II (Presented by Library Personnel)</td>
<td>The first session focused on library services and databases; a scholarly communications overview, depositories and repositories, assessing your research: measures and metrics, Intellectual Property, and technology transfer. The second session focused on online identity, digital scholarship, data curation, and preservation and access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating Science (Presented by faculty from the Communications Department)</td>
<td>Oral presentation skills and written skills were highlighted, focusing on the differences between scientific communication and communicating your science when presenting to different audiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| New Faculty Orientation | PREPA RE participants were paired with an Office of Research staff member to present about the services of the Office of Research. The staff member provided an overview of their division and the PREPA RE participant explained their experience and how they interacted with that particular office. |
| Mock Peer Review | PREPA RE participants submitted a draft proposal or white paper for review. Each was assigned to a primary, secondary, and third reviewer on three different proposals. The group met for a half-day with 15 minutes to review and discuss each proposal, following the format of an NIH scored peer review session. |
What can you learn from living in one country and working as a research administrator in another? I recently changed jobs, moving from the University of Southern Denmark in, you guessed it, Denmark, to Lund University in Sweden and now commute every day to another country. Everyday life in Sweden and Denmark is basically the same in both countries; even the languages are similar enough that we can misunderstand each other in really interesting ways. The same can be said about research management in the two countries; the same political trends — getting as much value for the money as possible — are expressed in similar, but still distinct ways. Thus, different projects in the two countries may have similar consequences for research administration.

Denmark has the highest proportion of private research spending of all countries in the world (Thomson, Poulsen & Borsting 2015). This is a consequence of a unique law prescribing that a majority of shares of every Danish company on the stock market must be owned by a nonprofit foundation. Those foundations — there are about 12,000 of them — must spend their funds for charitable purposes, which includes research. Denmark’s biggest research funder is the Novo Nordisk Foundation (NNF), not a public-funded agency (numbers in: Novo Nordisk Foundation, 2018; Innovation Fund Denmark, 2018). Over the past two years, these private research funders have increasingly focused on the value of their invested money: what is the impact of the research funded by each foundation? This focus on research quality and impact by the private research funders spills over to the public sector since all Danish universities are publicly funded. Private funders have been capturing data to measure impact for the past years, and public agencies and universities are scrambling to follow along.

By the way, if you are a United States research administrator, did you know that most European, and certainly all universities in the Nordic countries, receive a substantial part of their research funding as direct block grants from the government? Having a secure direct stream of funding from the government obviously has a profound effect on how research administration works. Increasing external research income stresses the system, if the increase is not matched by larger block grants. This is an important backdrop to the dramatic growth in external research funding in Scandinavia over the past decades; it is partly an attempt by politicians to exert more control on research and partly a result of the growth of private and international research funding. Both determine how research administration functions, and in Denmark, private foundations are exerting a gradually larger influence on research. Public funds suffered two years ago when the government cut the funding to the two major public funding agencies with 30 and 40 percent, respectively, while, at the same time reducing the block grant by about 10 percent.

In December 2017, a new national research strategy was published: “Denmark — ready for the future”. A “Nobel Prize Pact” between the government and research stakeholders is one notable suggested action. Somewhat in the background, “simpler research administration” is also suggested. This project is still being shaped, and to my delight, DARMA (the Danish research management society (www.darma.dk)) is invited to contribute to this project together with private foundations, public research funding agencies, and other stakeholders. This is, to my knowledge, the first time that simplification of research administration is connected with both impact and research quality in an official document. It is obvious that DARMA’s contribution is welcome because we sit on a pool of knowledge that is unique. Needless to say, this project may have profound effects on research administration in Denmark.

Meanwhile in Sweden, the same focus on research quality and impact is approached in different way. Private research funding does not play
nearly as big a role in Sweden as in Denmark, and policy decisions tend to happen through large public consultation processes. Two parallel consultations concern the distribution of the block grant, and the quality assurance of research quality evaluations at universities. The latter gives me a headache but makes sense when Swedish logic is applied. The block grant discussion focuses on allowing universities to mix funds for research with funds for education, two streams that are strictly separated at present. Research administration and management is not directly addressed in either consultation, as it is in Denmark, but you do not have to read much before you realize that there are implicit assumptions that the administrative staff is expected to carry a substantial workload — but no reasoning around how many resources will be needed.

These trends in both Sweden and Denmark converge on the concept of “impact”: what effect does research have in society? How can the impact of research be captured in a systematic and meaningful way, across all disciplines? All eyes are turning to the United Kingdom (UK) that introduced a method to capture impact by case stories in their Research Excellence Framework 2014 and turned “impact” into a discipline of its own. Can that be used outside of the UK?

To conclude, research administrators in both Denmark and Sweden will still be working with proposal development and project management, but the sets of processes and tasks are very likely to grow and diversify substantially over the coming years. The presence of a community of professional research managers and administrators has probably never been more important than now. And that’s a good thing.
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In a world of healthcare pay for performance and consumerism, where does clinical research patient care fit into this mix? And second, with shrinking margins and skeptical hospital administrators, how does research continue to advance the science of patient care to carry us into the future?

These are a couple of the questions that have us on our toes. While the task of strategically positioning your organization may seem daunting, this new era of pay for performance and consumerism may just work to the advantage of the research community.

Pay for performance (P4P) as a concept has been around for many years. In 2005 the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) listed P4P as a major priority for its current administrator. In fact, P4P, not dissimilar with research itself, “represents a fundamental break with traditional thinking about provider payment” (CMS, 2005). Research generally enjoys this same quest for what works better whether it is a new drug, a new technique or device, etc. CMS defined its P4P strategy as providing “the right care for every patient every time” (2005). Again, this goal is very consistent with the goals of most research, which strives to determine what is the right care for every patient, and how to make it happen every time. Additionally, the supporting tenets – safety, efficiency, effectiveness, patient-centeredness, timeliness, and equitability - of the ‘right care model’ are also consistent with research missions (CMS, 2005).

So - how can we, as research champions, harness these similarities and use it to promote forward progress?

Consider first that payers, including Medicare, are certainly interested in efficiency and cost savings. To the extent your clinical research trial can offer therapeutic benefit as well as have the research sponsor bear some of the cost of the care, suddenly a win-win situation occurs for all parties. The patients receive the utmost state of the art care, the providers are able to provide the care they believe is best for the patient, the payers reduce their costs and the research sponsors advance the medical field forward. Certainly, avoiding the scrutiny of Medicare’s national and local coverage determinations as well as other payers’ coverage determinations will provide greater efficiency for providers, payers, and consumers. Avoiding these expensive treatment costs, including the associated administrative costs, while providing state of the art care could simply catapult your clinical research trial division to ‘rock star’ status.

As the support team for clinical research, it is our job to change the narrative and begin to educate payers on how much money could be saved by embracing clinical research. Imagine a time where the payers are actually encouraging patients to participate or going even further by providing incentives for patients to join trials. Once they understand how

This new era of pay for performance and consumerism may just work to the advantage of the research community
much this initiative could save the payers, they should be eager to agree and pay those medically necessary items not reimbursed by the trial. Consider, for example, the savings that could be achieved from avoiding the cost of a chemotherapy agent. Had the patient not been offered the trial, the standard of care regimen would have been sought, approved, and paid. The payer would have had no choice but to provide the cover-
NCURA Peer Programs exists because of the dedication, expertise, and commitment of nearly 60 nationally recognized research administrators. These individuals are carefully selected and appointed by the NCURA Board of Directors for their broad knowledge, expertise, experience, and national reputation. These leaders in research administration have brought insight, recommendations, and expertise to nearly 150 institutions. NCURA recognizes and appreciates these leaders for their time, talent and contributions. They make research administration stronger one institution at a time.

Salute to the Peer Programs Reviewers

Bob Andresen  Urmila Bajaj  Lois Brako  Glenda Bullock  Wesley Byerly  Pamela Caudill  Thomas Coggins
Aurai Dade  Kathi Delehoy  Elizabeth Demski  Diane Domanovics  Mary Ellen Fortini  Valera Francis  Tracey Fraser
Judy Fredenberg  Joyce Freedman  Joe Gindhart  Barbara Gray  Julie Guggino  Todd Guttmann  Christina Hansen
Marie Louise Harrell  Patricia Hawk  Mary Louise Healy  Christa Johnson  Brenda Kavanaugh  Peter Koch  Steve Lichtenstein
These Peer Reviewers bring to your institution an understanding of best practices in models of operation and environments similar to your own.

NCURA Peer Programs offers a number of programs, framed by Standards, to assist your research administration operations and to ensure a high-quality infrastructure that supports your faculty and protects the institution.

Learn More: ncura.edu/InstitutionalPrograms.aspx
The Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) is a partnership between federal agencies and research universities whose purpose is to streamline federal regulatory burden while retaining good stewardship. In a widely publicized Faculty Workload Survey of FDP Institutions, faculty reported spending 42% of their time on the administrative tasks associated with receiving federal funding. The largest burden involved human and animal subjects. Protection of subjects is paramount, but for research involving minimal/no risk to participants it is perceived that IRB review and oversight may not add real value.

This position is consistent with the interpretation of 45 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 46 pertaining to research involving human subjects that identifies several activities that meet the definitions of research and human subjects but are considered to be of such low potential risk to the participants as to be exempt from regulations detailed in 45 CFR 46. These regulations do not have any requirements about who is qualified to make a determination that a project is exempt from the regulations. The proposed new regulations stated that a smart form, or wizard, would be an acceptable tool for permitting investigators to self-determine exempt status. Although removed from the final rule, due in part to a lack of a widely used tool, the regulatory environment now supports use of a wizard for making exempt determinations.

Prior to the publication of the Advance Notice of Proposed Rule Making (ANPRM), we developed a smart form (wizard) to allow investigators to self-determine exempt status. The FDP conducted a proof-of-concept demonstration with 10 institutions participating. The goals of this demonstration were: to develop a tool that was acceptable to federal agencies and IRB staff/boards, to make it easy for investigators to use, and to have a mechanism to identify situations that require additional review. These latter, “it depends” situations, include potentially vulnerable populations or subject pools where the investigator has a non-research relationship with the subjects. The demonstration had extremely promising results, but also showed where there were issues with self-determination. Preliminary findings of the proof-of-concept were published in August 2017 in the NCURA Magazine.

Based on the original demonstration, the wizard has been revised. One of the findings is that the best use of a tool is for research in conventional classroom setting, research using survey/interview/questionnaires and research using identified secondary use data. Other categories of exempt research are best served by having a human review.

A second finding was that there are numerous “it depends” situations that also complicate the use of an automated tool, and while it does not mean that the project cannot be exempt, it does mean that subjects are best served by having human review. As the mission of the FDP is to reduce burden, excluding projects that cannot use the wizard should
The Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) Faculty Burden Survey (2012) received over 12,000 responses from active faculty and found that 42% of their research time was spent on administrative tasks. NCURA has standards and a review program for effective sponsored programs and regulatory and research compliance operations at both the unit and central levels. One important area of focus in these reviews is the approach an institution takes to engage faculty and reduce faculty burden. NCURA Peer Reviewers have seen notable practices in reducing faculty burden. Some of these practices include:

1. Institutions coordinate sponsored programs and research compliance programs to prevent duplicative, redundant, or conflicting requirements by various offices or oversight committees. This may occur by convening a campus-wide committee to examine faculty engagement and burden.
2. Institutions proactively think from a faculty perspective, consider burden on faculty and develop new approaches to manage burden.
3. Some institutions invest in developing talented support staff with access to professional development from NCURA to help faculty meet their requirements.
4. Effective institutions will ask faculty directly for their perspectives. Faculty feedback loops are established through working groups, task-forces, regular brown bag lunches, or other easy-to-interact informal gatherings. Feedback is not only gathered, but it is documented and recommendations are assigned to an individual responsible for following up and reporting back to faculty.
5. Faculty groups, such as a faculty senate or research advisory group, are engaged at the earliest stage of policy and process development to identify areas for streamlining and minimizing duplication.

Reviewers have found that those institutions that are proactive and seek to promote regular, formal and/or informal communication are more likely to reduce faculty burden while maintaining compliance.

Jane McCutcheon, DDS, PhD, is Associate Professor in the College of Dentistry and Faculty Liaison for Compliance in the Office of the Senior Vice Provost for Research at New York University. At the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP), she is Co-Chair of the Human Subject Subcommittee. Questions about the demonstration can be submitted to Jane at jamm2@nyu.edu

Kris Monahan, Ph.D., is a member of the Select Committee on Peer Review. She has participated in peer reviews and has more than 15 years of research administration experience, spanning pre-award, post-award, and research compliance at small institutions. She is the Director of Sponsored Research & Programs at Providence College.
The first few months of leadership can be key in setting tone and direction for new managers and their supervisors. For example, are you perhaps making notes and keeping track of the kinds of questions and advice the new leaders are seeking? Do you notice any patterns? Do they seem to be asking the same questions? What are the differences in style and approach for these two new managers? What are the differences in the types of questions they ask, and how they ask them? When are they most comfortable in their actions and decision-making? When are they less comfortable? What are you learning about their development in their new roles, as it may impact your own plans for their training and mentorship? You may be realizing the two individuals are not necessarily equally prepared or confident in their own leadership. That’s not unusual, of course. It just means you will need to be a different leader with each of them, to supervise each a bit differently… situationally.

You may also be sensing more awareness about your leadership style, not only the development of your new managers. What are you learning about yourself in this process? I don’t know whether this is a new organizational structure you are implementing, or whether you are replacing individuals who may have moved on to other roles. That may impact the type and frequency of questions you encounter.

Overall, I think it is great you noticed this pattern of your staff members asking you for advice and solutions to their daily work issues. This is because you are now able to address this behavior with some strategies that, hopefully, will transfer the responsibility for completing their work to them directly.

Let’s talk about one strategy. The management consultant and former MIT professor, Edgar Schein, has published widely about the leadership strategy of asking questions instead of telling people what to do. One of Schein’s classic responses to requests for advice is the following phrase:

“If I understand you correctly, what matters most to you right now is ______? Based on that, I wonder if you might want to ______?”

What I like about these sentences is it puts the onus on individuals to articulate the values and priorities they believe should guide action. The phrase “what matters most to you” is key. The sentence implies the advice-giver has already learned something about the advice-requestor’s inclinations and values and priorities. It prompts a conversation about values and priorities… before advice is given. Have a values conversation with your managers. This will allow you to discuss with your managers what are the most important values you wish your office to uphold in making decisions and taking actions in compliance matters. Ask them their views first. How do they wish people be treated, and how do they want compliance matters to be researched, determined, and communicated? See how far apart you may all be. Ask them to bring proposed solutions to you rather than just questions or requests for advice. Let them do their own thinking and test their proposed actions with you for a bit, until you are all more comfortable and trusting of their independent work. Whatever reasons led to your promotion of these individuals should also be reflected back to these managers. Remind them of the confidence you have in them, and how you want them to feel and be autonomous in their work. That’s a key ingredient in most of our work days and lives.

Help your managers be their best autonomous selves.
Have you ever wondered which came first: research administration or technology transfer? Without a doubt, the 1945 publication of Vannevar Bush’s report to President Franklin Roosevelt, *Science: The Endless Frontier*, is a pivotal moment in the history of both professions; but technology transfer can trace its roots back several decades earlier. A search of literature reveals that the first transfer of university-developed technology can be traced to 1907 when University of California, Berkeley professor and inventor Frederick Cottrell sought to license his electrostatic precipitator, a device useful in preventing pollution from smokestacks in the San Francisco, California area. His initial approach was to donate his patent interests to the university to fund research, but there was reluctance to accept such a gift on the part of the university. As a result, Cottrell used the proceeds from licensing his technology to establish the Research Corporation in 1912. Research Corporation was the second foundation established in the US and was the first organization dedicated solely to the promotion of science (Research Corporation, 2017).

Records of early technology transfer successes are as sparse as the number of universities with established patenting offices prior to 1945. Quaker Oats’ interest in University of Wisconsin professor Harry Steenbock’s technology that increased the amount of vitamins D and A in food led to the establishment of the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation (WARF) in 1925. Here again, the University of Wisconsin was not interested in pursuing patents, viewing patenting and licensing activities as senseless distractions for university faculty who should focus on the core teaching mission of the university. Ultimately, the university leadership acquiesced to allowing a group of alumni to take the patenting and licensing responsibilities as long as the university was held harmless. And that is how arguably one of the most successful university technology transfer operations got its name and its start. (Kauffman, n.d.).

In those early days, technology transfer took two linear paths: horizontal (basic research leading to further applied research and development at the institution) or vertical (transferred to an external agent for development and licensing). Other notable technologies that predate publication of *The Endless Frontier* are rubber research at the University of Akron, which was highly valued by the automobile industry; and research arising from Agricultural Experiment Stations at Land/Grant institutions.

In 1977 the National Science Foundation (NSF) demonstrated a model for what became the Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) program championed by Senator Ted Kennedy. Initially, universities were strongly opposed to the diversion of precious research funding to the program. In 1992, President Ronald Reagan signed the Small Business Technology Transfer Act establishing a government-wide SBIR program at all federal agencies with research and development budgets exceeding $1 billion and initiated the Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) program that required awardees to work with institutions of higher education (NSF, 2017).

The Society of University Patent Administrators was formed in 1974 by university research officials and its first annual meeting in that year was attended by less than 75 professionals. In 1986, the organization changed its name to the Association of University Technology Managers which is now an international organization with membership exceeding 3,200 professionals working in institutions of higher education, research centers, hospitals, industry, and government organizations.

The Bayh-Dole Act of 1980 altered the landscape for technology transfer at universities when it harmonized federal policy to encourage non-profit organizations to take the lead in commercializing inventions and technologies arising from federally funded research. This landmark legislation altered the way that U.S. universities viewed technology transfer and in the two decades following its passage, more than 155 universities established offices responsible for the technology transfer. In those early decades, those offices were focused on patenting and licensing and it wasn’t until the late 1990s and early 2000s that universities, and state leadership, began to consider the role of the university in economic development.

That shift, with a reduced focus on one-off transactions, has led to what is now a vision for “innovation management” that has drastically expanded the breadth of activities assigned to university technology transfer offices and requires a much more comprehensive approach across multiple university units. For that reason, most universities are reconsidering their approach to commercialization efforts and realigning reporting lines to ensure coordination of efforts that are essential to success.
Leading university organizations have increased their efforts to provide guidance to institutions of higher education. The Association of Public Land-Grant Institutions (APLU) published *Technology Transfer Evolution: Driving Economic Prosperity* in 2017, urging institutions to rethink their approach to holistically manage and support innovation not only through managing technology, but also by supporting the innovation ecosystem through educating students on the value and mechanics of entrepreneurship; supporting new ventures through investments; incubation and mentoring; and coordinating efforts to focus on relationship building with the economic drivers in our communities (APLU, 2017).

Looking at the most recent reports and literature regarding this shift to a broader innovation focus, it is clear that effective innovation management in academic technology transfer and commercialization requires institutions to:

- Utilize a holistic approach to both internal and external interactions, focusing primarily on effective relationship management.
- Create a comprehensive ecosystem with all required elements that support commercialization such as internal gap funds, entrepreneurship incentives and training for faculty and students.
- Manage conflicts of interest in a way that is tailored to licensing and venture creation.
- Provide startup incubators and technology parks, seed, angel and venture funding connections, concierge portals, and co-location opportunities for companies.
- Strategically combine and effectively manage the benefits of both “centralized” standards and control, and “distributed” operations tailored to the goals and needs of various institutional units.
- Revise institutional policies to align with entrepreneurial activities and provide the necessary framework for consistency and standards, but with flexibility in implementation and procedures for units when appropriate.
- Articulate goals and performance metrics tailored to the needs of different colleges, institutes and departments as some value licensing income or startups, while others are more interested in industrial partnerships or research funding support.
- Maintain adequate staffing within the technology transfer and commercialization operation to ensure that licensing managers can evaluate each invention’s potential for commercialization, selecting those which justify investment of time and funding.
- Operate with minimal legal oversight with attorney approvals needed for a short list of agreed issues (e.g., risk management, equity agreements or litigation) and allow authority to be pushed into the ranks for faster decision making by individuals directly involved with a particular transaction.
- Operate entrepreneurially and aggressively while still carefully maintaining and safeguarding core academic principles such as freedom to publish, managing conflicts of interest, adhering to compliance standards, and preserving student protections.
- Work with industry in a manner that fosters a reputation as a preferred partner with the ability to work “at the speed of industry” when necessary and to deliver expeditious turnaround times for decisions and agreements.
- Provide inventors with transparency and timely communication regarding their technologies and the commercialization process and design all processes to minimize time commitments of faculty, staff and student inventors.
• Provide administrative staffing adequate to ensure accurate record keeping; sound financial accounting of expenses, revenue and disbursements; and proper compliance with applicable regulations regarding federal reporting, export control, conflicts of interest, and institutional policies.
• Create and follow standard operating procedures to provide a benchmark to monitor turnaround times, accuracy of data in a central database, and guidelines for handling both routine and unusual situations.
• Maintain strong links to state, local and regional economic development.

The history of technology transfer in the United States has followed a course that began with a realization that the government needs to support basic research, and that ideas are often worthy of protection in order to ensure taking an investment risk. The nonprofit academic sector and commercialization for-profit sector need to learn to work together in order to have successful commercialization, and that the parties need to get beyond simple transaction on goals and activities to something more holistic and relationship driven. Attaining these standards will require a collaborative approach with other units beyond research including offices for advancement and corporate relations and alignment with academic initiatives aimed at helping students gain the skills needed to think and compete in an entrepreneurial environment. This will require elimination of silos that are barriers to translating university technologies into societal benefit and a cultural shift that the “turf” and credit should be shared, and positive outcomes celebrated by the institution, not a single unit.
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Harnessing the Power of Energy:
Entrepreneurship at the American University of Beirut and the Role of the Office of Grants and Contracts

By Tara Nehme and Diala Daoud

For the second year in a row, the Hult Prize Challenge was held at the American University of Beirut (AUB) through the Center for Research and Innovation (CRInn). CRInn serves as a hub for emerging creative and innovative entrepreneurial AUB students, staff, and faculty members and functions under the Office of Grants and Contracts (OGC). CRInn provides guidance to AUB entrepreneurs across their journey of transforming their innovative business ideas into scalable businesses. The latter is achieved by (1) connecting members with mentors, investors, and fellow entrepreneurs, (2) hosting customized workshops and inspiring talks, (3) collaborating with various AUB faculty and student groups to build a vibrant entrepreneurial community, and (4) partnering with external players making a mark in the entrepreneurship ecosystem.

The Hult Prize is the world’s biggest engine for the launch of for-good, for-profit startups emerging from universities across the world. Operating for nearly a decade now, the movement has deployed more than 50 million dollars of capital into the sector and mobilized more than one million people to rethink the future of business as it continues to breed disruptive innovation on college and university campuses across more than 100 countries.

The 2018 theme, ‘Harnessing the Power of Energy’, focused on startup ideas which could transform into a social enterprise. The six dimensions ripe for transformation through energy-powered innovation included:

1. Connectivity,
2. Mobility,
3. Farming, food, and agriculture,
4. Water collection, storage, and transport,
5. Health and the human experience, and
6. Education.

The 2018 Hult Prize Challenge encouraged students to extend their reach (search across campus, throughout their city, and around the world to find the energy-driven technologies that are not realizing their potential to propel progress) and get out of the building (find users and learn about their needs, prove how energy can enable new capabilities).

OCG and its units serve the startups in attracting and managing their research and development funding and protecting their intellectual property.

The challenge was deeply aligned with the framework for progress set by the Sustainable Development Goals of the United Nations as each dimension area of the 2018 Challenge was directly tied to one or more of the goals.

In order to encourage and empower students to think outside the box and participate fiercely in the 2018 competition, the CRInn and Hult Prize AUB campus director, a hand-picked AUB student (Ms. Daoud), held various events centered around the theme and the competition itself. This included but was not limited to ideation sessions, talks by energy leaders addressing problems in their space and pitching workshops that empowered students to think and express their ideas like exceptional startup founders. AUB succeeded at mobilizing more than 250 students over the past two years to compete in the Hult Prize.

AUB’s winning team, YallaBus, made it among the top six teams in Lebanon in the national finals and rocked the crowd in Shanghai coming in second place at the regional finals.
Using the Global Positioning System (GPS) tracking and data mining, YallaBus is digitizing and unifying the public transportation sector under a single platform all to help users get from A to Z and bus owners organize their fleets and increase their revenues. They do so by installing GPS trackers inside buses across existing networks and then digitally mapping this network by tracking daily movements from both a time and location perspective. Commuters enter their destination, choose a bus, buy a ticket, and will instantly receive real-time directions of when and where to wait for a bus. Bus owners are offered a unique tool that helps these owners manage and optimize their fleets as well as increase their revenues.

**Innovating Green Technology (IGT)** ranked second at AUB with their latest product, PRO-Shield, but made it to the national finals where they competed and won first place. The team will head to London to join an acceleration program and will have the chance to compete for the $1,000,000 prize in New York City later this year. Both YallaBus and Pro-Shield will also receive the opportunity to compete for $250,000 in prize money in Lebanon.

IGT is tackling green energy problems starting with those of solar water heaters. PRO-Shield is the first solution capable of solving the overheating problem faced worldwide by residential solar water heater owners. It is a covering mechanism mounted on any solar water heater regardless of its size, type and brand, protecting it against the hazardous effects of overheating and as a result, enhancing its renewable energy reliability and efficiency.

Dr. Fadia Homaidan, director of OGC, Technology Transfer Unit (TTU) and CRInn at AUB, has been the driver behind this wave of change. She was named a ‘changemaker’ by the team at the Hult Prize Lebanon as she ‘has been instrumental in our ability to engage AUB’s students and scale the Hult Prize platform on their campus. Her efforts have been fruitful as a team representing AUB (team PRO-Shield) finished first place in our semi-final event…’

OGC and its units serve the startups in attracting and managing their research and development funding and in protecting their intellectual property. CRInn will continue to provide the competing teams/startups with its array of services including training programs, mentoring and coaching sessions, specialized workshops and events, bootcamps, media exposure and networking and pitching events with industry and investors to help these startups turn their ideas into successful businesses.

---

**Tara Nehme** is an entrepreneur and a public speaker. She is the founder of ticklemybrain (TMB): a platform that matches individuals and businesses with creative consultants to meet writing and editing requests. She is also the Lead Startup Support at CRInn at AUB and consults for various other organizations in the startup space. She can be reached at tara@ticklemybrain.com

**Diala J. Daoud** is the PR and Communication Officer of CRInn at the AUB. Ms. Daoud previously served as the Hult Prize AUB Campus Director. She is currently a media studies graduate student. She can be reached at atdd50@aub.edu.lb
By their nature, research administrators are strong, resilient individuals. Having said that, constant changes in the field, coupled with daily challenges, can be wearing. Just like a rubber band loses elasticity with use, the consistently changing environment of research administration, along with everyday trials and tribulations, can wear on our fabric.

How then might we overcome, adapt, and recover while remaining strong and advancing the profession? Trainers Tricia Callahan (Colorado State University), Carrie Chesbro (University of Oregon), Tolise Dailey (University of Colorado-Boulder), and Roseann Luongo (Harvard University) share tips on how they stay grounded on the shifting sands of research administration.

Connect with others. (Carrie)
When we are busy, our focus is often on our tasks and to-do lists which may keep us from seeing the big picture. Maintaining a big-picture perspective can help us prioritize and stay motivated. A key to refocusing for me is by connecting with faculty, staff, and students. Making time for a lab tour, joining a public talk, stopping by a student research forum, connecting with a colleague, or reading a recently submitted progress report helps keep me grounded and engaged.

See challenges as learning opportunities. (Roseann)
By embracing changes in the field, we unveil opportunities to develop in place, refine current processes and expand our skill sets. Regulatory change can be a great opportunity to review existing policies and processes, while assessing gaps, overlaps, and risks. Changes in regulations can also provide us with new projects that will require us to learn new things. Stretching beyond our current roles to broaden our expertise will prepare us for the next chapter in our profession while helping others around us grow.

Make time to refresh. (Tolise)
As trainers we are not meant to know everything, but we must stay current on what’s happening in the ever-changing research administration landscape. How might we continue to build our knowledge base while keeping fresh and helping research administrators grow? We do so by continuing to educate ourselves and exploring new avenues of learning. In addition to keeping up on core content and institutional policies, we can refresh by attending “train the trainer” sessions, filling our minds with new ideas while allowing space for creativity to blossom. In my office I have a quote taped to my laptop that sums this up perfectly, “What we do for ourselves stays with us, what we share with others lives on.”

Be realistic. (Tricia)
One of my graduate mentors drilled into me “Better is the enemy of good.” By this she meant to impart the need to distinguish between perfectionism and doing our best. Productivity and flexibility may be impeded by setting exceedingly high or unattainable goals. Persons rigid in their mindset often experience higher levels of anxiety and job fatigue, while those who simply strive to do their best remain strong when faced with new challenges. Be realistic in the expectations you set for yourself and others. Doing so may help you achieve the work-life balance essential to staying grounded.

In summary.
Taking a moment to connect with others, while being open to new challenges, making time to refresh, and setting realistic goals will go a long way in helping research administrators remain strong and renewed. No matter how far we’ve come in training our faculty and administrators, we’ve just begun.
In 2015, the Office of Sponsored Programs Administration (OSPA) at the University of Missouri made the leap from paper files to electronic files. Transitioning approximately 2,500 to 3,000 active grant files, plus many more proposal and closed grant files was not easy. There were many factors to consider, decisions to make, and parties to engage. In this article, we will share our implementation challenges, lessons learned, and success stories, as well as our case for change.

With paper filing, we found that documents often got misplaced or misfiled. Locating lost files and sharing documents was challenging, and refiling was time consuming. Each file contained the final proposal, invoices, financial reports, subcontracts, and any related correspondence that staff deemed important to include in the file. On occasion, we had to recreate lost files and were often able to do so because we had most of the documents stored in various places electronically—such as our email boxes and shared drives. We found that more often than not, we were able to recreate our physical files from various electronic sources, which got us thinking: could we move to an electronic document storage system?

Perceptive Content (formerly ImageNow) is used across the University of Missouri four campus system for organizing and managing records for accounting, human resources, and student records to name a few. When we decided to explore the possibility of electronic document storage for OSPA, we knew that there was already a system in place at our institution, so we requested a consultation with our Division of Information Technology (DoIT). In the initial meeting with DoIT, we gave them a tour of our office to show them how we stored our physical files. We also shared our processes for routing awards from preaward to postaward and how we indexed our files to correspond with the identifiers assigned by our financial system, PeopleSoft.

After meeting with DoIT, we decided to talk with other departments that had successfully transitioned from paper to electronic filing using Perceptive Content. All were extremely satisfied with Perceptive Content and their decision to move to electronic filing. They shared with us some of the challenges they faced early on, and some of their wins along the way.

We made the decision to proceed, but we knew that the shift to electronic filing would not be without challenges. Many of our processes were built around our paper filing system. Making such a major change meant a shift in culture for our office. We appointed an implementation committee that included stakeholders from different areas of the office. The goal was to work together and build an infrastructure and processes to implement Perceptive Content and remove all paper files within a stated timeline. Generating buy in from staff and allowing staff to build the product and processes was key to a successful implementation. We emphasized that change can be challenging and that we can choose to approach change in two ways: 1) we could drag our heels, complain, and find many reasons why change will not be successful, or 2) we could become facilitators of change, identify the benefits of our goals, and become ambassadors of change. The committee accepted the challenge, began to brainstorm and find a path to becoming paperless.

We challenged our staff to imagine a storage system that included no paper files. The idea was met with very little enthusiasm. Change can be difficult and there were many reasons developed that indicated a paperless system would not work. However, through discussions with staff we identified some advantages that already existed that might help us be more efficient. For example, most proposals are sent to our office electronically and then submitted to the sponsor electronically, our communication is electronic through email, and we email invoices and financial reports to sponsors. A single electronic repository made good sense, and soon our team was on board.

We worked closely with DoIT to create a workflow within Perceptive Content that closely mirrored our file routing process. Under the paper filing system, our preaward staff would set up our award in PeopleSoft, and then physically carry the file down the hall to for compliance checking. Once the compliance check was complete, then the postaward staff would take the file, review it, and then put it on a shelf to be filed away.
Within Perceptive Content, we created queues that allow our preaward staff to upload an award and join it with the proposal. Then the preaward staff routes the entire file forward in workflow to our Compliance queue, where the reviewer ensures the award is accurately captured in PeopleSoft. Once the check is complete, the full file is routed to the postaward team. Anyone with access to the OSPA workspace in Perceptive Content can now view a complete file from his or her workstation.

Perceptive Content has afforded us some flexibility that we did not have with our paper files. For example, we are able to share files across functions—our Controller’s Office, Accounting Office, Export Controls Office and Conflict of Interest Office can easily access our files from their own computers. In the past, they had to request copies of documents from OSPA, so we would scan and email documents to them. OSPA is able to control who can access files, and we work closely with DoIT to obtain access for those who need it.

Electronic file storage allows us to search documents for key terms using the keyboard shortcut (CTRL+F), so if we are looking for something specific in a file, we no longer have to leaf through dozens of pages to find what we need. Additionally, we have more ways to search for files. For example, our paper files were organized by PeopleSoft assigned project number. We had some awards with multiple project numbers, so we created cross reference cards, but we had no ability to search by sponsor, sponsor award number, or PI. With Perceptive Content, we were able to work with DoIT to create application plans that allow for linking between the electronic file and PeopleSoft. With the click of a button, we now have the ability to search for not only PeopleSoft identifiers, but also PI name, sponsor name, sponsor reference number, and other key identifiers.

Because of the linkage between Perceptive Content and PeopleSoft, as long as the data is entered correctly in PeopleSoft, there is no risk of a data error in Perceptive Content, therefore we no longer lose our files. We can always find what we need within Perceptive Content.

The initial cost to our office was less than $10,000, which included purchasing licenses and compatible scanners. It was a small price to pay. We now have a system in place that includes electronic documents only, is easily accessible by appropriate parties, and has saved a tremendous amount of personnel time. In addition, the implementation allowed different functions of the office to work together as a team and understand the needs of each other to develop the best and most efficient process. Three years later, we cannot imagine life before electronic document routing and storage.

Craig David is Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs Administration at the University of Missouri. He has worked at the University of Missouri OSPA for nine years in both preaward and postaward functions. His email address is davidcr@missouri.edu

Jamie Szabo is the Associate Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs Administration at the University of Missouri. She has worked at the University of Missouri OSPA for nine years in both preaward and postaward functions. Her email address is szaboj@missouri.edu
For the past three years, an NCURA Task Force has been working on the concept of accreditation for sponsored programs and research administration. The idea of accreditation for research administration was first suggested in 2005 by an NCURA Committee that created the Peer Review Program. The idea lay dormant until 2015 when President Michelle Vazin appointed the current committee and charged it with the task of developing a concept of accreditation for research administration. Below is an update on the progress of the Task Force along with an explanation of some of the basic concepts of accreditation.

**What is accreditation?** Accreditation is a form of self-regulation. Regulation of sponsored programs is central to our profession. It protects the public, the sponsor, and the institution while providing accountability to the public. Regulation, however, does not have to be accomplished solely by government. In fact, self-regulation is one of the strongest traditions in American society and has proven to be an effective and efficient means for establishing standards of accountability for fairness, quality, ethics, and competence. While self-regulation exists in many professions and industries, self-regulation through a system of accreditation is strongest in higher education.

In research administration, accreditation would be a self-regulated process that assures the public and funding agencies of the quality and competency of an institution to manage sponsored programs. In providing this assurance of quality, accreditation identifies effective practices in the profession and provides the foundation for continuous improvement. 

**Accreditation is a process of assessing if an institution meets the standards of quality to effectively manage sponsored programs.**

**How is accreditation different from an audit or from NCURA Peer Review?** Accreditation and Peer Review are complementary, yet mutually exclusive programs. Accreditation is recognition that an institution’s management of sponsored programs meets a set of defined standards. Peer Review, while using similar standards, is designed to address the specific needs and problems of an institution by identifying operational issues or inefficiencies and recommending actions to address those areas. Unlike accreditation, Peer Reviews are often in response to an institution that has a specific concern and is seeking recommendations...
on how to best address that issue. An institution may want to undergo a Peer Review prior to preparing its application for accreditation; however, a Peer Review is not a required step in the process of accreditation.

Audits and accreditation have different purposes and approaches. Accreditation is a process that assesses whether an institution has the systems, resources, and structures necessary to effectively manage sponsored programs. An audit, in contrast, is a test at a transactional level to see if an institution is meeting regulatory requirements and if an institution is performing the tasks as stated in its policies and procedures. The audit process results in a report identifying specific findings, weaknesses, or deficiencies that an institution must address to meet regulatory requirements. The accreditation process results in an external confirmation that the institution has the necessary competencies in place.

Why do we want or even need accreditation? Colleges, universities, and hospitals are a few of the institutions that subscribe to some form of independent self-regulation through accreditation. They do so to assure the public that the quality of their service meets certain national standards. It is important to know, for example, that in selecting a college for your child that the institution is accredited. For research administration, the public has the right to know that the institution receiving the funds is acting as a good steward of those funds. Accreditation would provide that assurance.

Additionally, sponsoring agencies demand accountability for the use of their funds. They do so through audits and through the imposition of regulations. Accreditation of sponsored programs could address some of the needs for recipient institutions to provide accountability to sponsors. In turn, sponsors could use the evidence of accreditation to reassure legislators, donors, and other stakeholders that their funds are being properly managed. Equally important, accreditation may help relieve the regulatory burden for recipient institutions.

Accreditation of sponsored programs also serves the profession of research administrators. Accreditation of institutions and their programs require a process of assessment and continuous self-improvement. Likewise, accreditation of sponsored programs, by holding an institution to a standard of quality, encourages the ongoing improvement of research administrators, a key part of NCURA’s mission.

What exactly would be accredited? The administration of sponsored programs and research can involve a complex set of offices and units that directly and indirectly support the management of grants and contracts. Consequently, the Task Force decided that the scope of accreditation would be broadly defined as the program of research administration, instead of the accreditation of a single office, whether central or departmental. Please note that accreditation is recognition of the quality of an institutional program. It is different, therefore, from credentialing or the certification of an individual.

What would be the benefit of accreditation? Accreditation in higher education has proven to encourage self-improvement. We expect that the first benefit of an accreditation program would be continuous quality improvement of the administration of sponsored programs. It would sustain regulatory compliance and maintain quality operations by promoting best practices in the profession.

The Task Force hopes that the second benefit of accreditation might be regulatory relief. The OMB (Circular A-119) encourages federal agencies to participate in voluntary accrediting organizations, arguing that accrediting entities increase the likelihood that the standards meet the needs of the public. We believe that after proving the validity of accreditation, the OMB and federal granting agencies may provide regulatory relief to institutions with accredited programs of sponsored programs and research administration, which in turn would save institutions money.

How would accreditation work? The accreditation of sponsored programs and research administration would operate in a fashion very similar to academic program accreditation. Institutions would apply for accreditation and prepare a self-study addressing the accreditation standards. After reviewing the self-study, a site visit team would conduct an assessment and make a recommendation to an accreditation council which would make the final determination. Although NCURA is fostering accreditation for sponsored programs, the long-range plan is to spin this activity off into an independent council with an autonomous governing board and budget. Like other accrediting entities, this council would be composed of institutions of higher education and other appropriate non-profits.

What’s next? The Task Force recently completed an “alpha” test of the accreditation standards and the review process. Our special thanks to the California Institute of Technology for their service as an alpha site! After making adjustments and revisions based upon what we learned from the “alpha” testing, we will move to “beta” testing in 2019. We will request the Federal Demonstration Partnership to assist NCURA with this phase of the testing. After making the appropriate revisions to the process, we anticipate launching the program in 2020.

As the NCURA Task Force moves forward with the concept of accreditation, we would like to know your questions and concerns. Please feel free to contact any of the Task Force members with your questions.
Mentorship is a two-way street. Cormac Slevin (New York University, NY) (NYU) and Jessica Brody (University of Melbourne, Australia) (UoM) walked the road together in the new NCURA Global Mentoring Program. The 6-month pilot program began with twelve participants from around the globe, led by four facilitators from the University of California, San Francisco. A Business Process Improvement (BPI) project was a key aspect of the program. Leveraging the expertise of the USA-based mentors, the BPI was developed and led by the international mentee to improve a process at his or her home institution.

When Cormac and Jessica started the Program, the mentorship duo agreed to support each other through professional development and institutional collaboration. Along the way they deepened their personal understanding of leadership while exploring the challenges of cross-continental partnership and the benefits of starting an international network. How they came to those conclusions was all a part of the journey:

Q: Did you know what you wanted to work on going in or did it evolve over time? How did you manage the collaboration?
CS: There was a program kick-off at last year’s NCURA Annual Meeting where we met with our partners to come up with a manageable BPI project that could be implemented and evaluated in a short amount of time. Jessica came into the program with a really good sense of what she wanted to get out of it and was able to articulate clear goals, which was really key. Her goals for developing better compliance for her team working with foreign awards and contracts was really well aligned with a process that I had been developing in my own office, so I think we both left that meeting feeling really energized.

JB: Going into that first meeting with a handful of well-considered ideas on improvement areas was a blessing and a curse. On the one hand, Cormac and I had some flexibility in identifying a mutual project. The downside is that I had to normalize the chosen project back at work. This required significant time in engaging key stakeholders. It set the project back about 6 weeks. At the start, Cormac and I had frequent email communications and regular video meetings to discuss strategies for moving the project forward. Eventually, we arranged a video conference with some of my colleagues to better facilitate the BPI.

Q: What led to the success or what barriers existed for the collaboration? Do you feel like you accomplished your goals?
CS: I think early on we had to spend a lot of time trying to understand some pretty significant differences in how our offices were structured. One size really doesn’t fit all when it comes to supporting research administration. When Jessica and I had a conference call meeting with her Contracts Team, a lot of the details in terms of process became even more of a barrier – it was a really productive conversation, but it underscored how much our model would need to be tweaked to meet the needs of not just Jessica’s team, but also all the other teams that they interact with.

JB: Overall, I was satisfied with the result. Looking back on our original project, I would say we reached about 50% of the original goal during the 6-month timeframe. What we really achieved was laying the groundwork for a collaboration between teams that is now bearing fruit. In fact, this month we’re finally testing a new process and it’s better than I could have hoped. I attribute the meeting with Cormac and my UoM colleagues as a key turning point in the project. We were able to use his experience as a mirror to our own. It really provided some clarity on the pain points we were trying to address. Before that point, it was difficult to represent the needs of all the parties in my personal discussions with Cormac. Afterward, it was easier to move the collaboration forward on all fronts.
Q: In retrospect was there anything about the collaboration that surprised you?

CS: The program included a series of professional development sessions geared towards improving skills necessary to developing a good mentoring relationship. One of those sessions was based on the True Colors personality assessment and I think Jessica and I were both really surprised at how closely our personalities aligned with types that were almost diametrically opposed. I don’t know how we got on as well as we did the whole time! It took a while for both of us to get used to each other and get a better sense of when to let ideas roll and when to step in and provide more focus. I think that assessment in particular left an impression on me and made me reflect a lot on what I value and how I communicate with others professionally.

JB: Honestly, I couldn’t believe how much work it took to be relevant to each other in our day to day roles—it was like trying to have a long-distance relationship. Struggling to find a balance between effective communication and develop a sense of camaraderie over email was a real challenge. As Cormac says, one size does not fit all. That came across clearly in the project we chose to work on. Cormac had helped develop NYU’s AFAR (Advisors on Foreign Activities and Research) review committee (a campus-wide initiative). To implement those lessons on a smaller scale within the time frame of the Program demanded attention and creativity. I’m not sure I expected that level of difficulty.

Q: Were there any major takeaways from the experience?

CS: The program was separated into “mentor” and “mentee” roles, but for us those roles were very fluid. Jessica and I are at similar points in our careers, but she actually has more supervisory experience. We developed a willingness to share the mentor role, which required us to develop a lot of confidence in each other’s experience in a short amount of time. I think that came through when Jessica showed trust in my input on her project. The success of our collaboration really hinged on our honesty with each other and a willingness to create a mutually beneficial experience.

JB: For me, the experience highlighted the importance of staying outcome-oriented. The project touched on an intersection between six teams and we were all attacking a solution from different angles. It became clear early on that real success could only be accomplished by coordinating efforts. My team wasn’t best placed to lead the project to success, so Cormac and I moved to a supportive role and made ourselves available as a resource for the leads. We were able to remain flexible and humble, which would not have been easy if the focus was on anything other than obtaining a good result.
Let's get down to the basics. No, I’m not talking about basic science, although the basics of how we treat individuals does affect a component of basic science. I’m talking about the basics of reputable human interaction that comes in the form of customer service.

I’m sure many of us research administrators did not start our employment endeavors in research administration. We started somewhere in high school working at the local mall or the neighborhood burger joint. What was one of the first rules we had to adhere to? You guessed it, customer service!

Whether we are working in the central office or at the department level, we as research administrators must be constantly conscious of the fact that we are serving a customer. The customer could be the PI we are working for, the sponsor, or even our colleagues in a different department. How hard is it to treat each other with respect and dignity? We are all in this research adventure together and in order to achieve our professional goals, we must keep the customer in mind.

If you google “customer service” a plethora of links will show up. You will see anywhere from 6–45 principles of customer service pop up, all claiming to be the end all be all. Personally, I think it all boils down to common sense. However, for the sake of research, I will discuss a few concepts of what I have found to relate to research administration.

First and foremost, I believe friendliness is the key to building a good relationship with your PI. Who wants to work with a crabby research administrator? Not me! Your attitude is key when coming across as a friendly person. No matter how a PI treats you, always speak with a smile and warm attitude.

Your responsiveness is another key component of good customer service. We are all busy with many projects, however, responding as quickly as possible will let our PI know that we have their best interest in mind and will be accessible to them. Which brings me to another good quality, accessibility. The PI will definitely feel more at ease knowing they can reach us by email, phone, or just a drop by at the office. However, being accessible doesn’t mean they can reach us at all hours of the night. There should be respect from the PI as well and that respect is something that can be developed and practiced through a positive customer service relationship.

Accuracy is key in demonstrating to the PI that you are thorough and diligent in checking on compliance issues. Being accurate the first time around saves many headaches of going back to correct what was neglected. Efficiency can attribute to accuracy as well. Being efficient will save the PI from hours of double checking on compliance issues, etc. If you as a research administrator demonstrate your good qualities of being reliable, this could be a huge relief to the PI.

Last but not least, I believe we as research administrators should be transparent to the PI from day one. Knowing what to expect and what not to expect will clear up any issues that may transpire throughout the whole proposal process.

So why does good customer service in research administration matter? We are all here for one reason, the very core of what we do. We are here because research matters. Making the proposal submission process as seamless as possible is gratifying to all parties involved. I know from experience that a PI is so happy when you can put them at ease letting them know that you are there for them throughout the process and that they can rely on you for guidance on all of the compliance areas that should be investigated. When a PI knows they can rely on their research administrator, they can focus on what matters most, their research. Remember, a friendly smile is the start of a positive successful relationship!

References
www.userlike.com/en/blog/customer-service-principles
www.iei.liu.se/fek/frist/722g60/gruppernas_artiklar_och_presentationer/1.149265/GruppD3-DeterminantsOfServicequality_arRobertJohnston.pdf

Wendy McDonald, MRA, is a Grants and Contracts Specialist III at The University of Texas at Dallas. She recently received her Master’s in Research Administration from the University of Central Florida. Having over 20 years of experience in community development, she is fairly new to Research Administration. She enjoys the challenges and rewards research administration has to offer.
Ruth Arauz, BS, CRA, is now the Operations Coordinator for the newly formed Research Support Services Center at Texas Biomedical Research Institute in San Antonio, TX.

Debra Booth is now the Business Systems Director, National High Magnetic Field Laboratory at Florida State University.

Julie Guggino, Director of Research and Sponsored Programs at Central Washington University in Ellensburg, retired from CWU in April 2018, after more than 30 years of service. Highlights of Julie’s career include serving on NCURA’s Board of Directors in 2017-18 and chairing Region VI in 2009.

Debra Booth is now the Business Systems Director, National High Magnetic Field Laboratory at Florida State University.

Peter Koch is now Director, Research Administration at the MetroHealth System in Cleveland, OH.

Tonya Pinkerton, PhD, CRA, is now the Director of Grants Accounting at Vassar College.

Jonathan Scudder, BS, MS, MBA, CRA, is now the Manager, Sponsored Programs Administration for the newly formed Research Support Services Center at Texas Biomedical Research Institute in San Antonio, TX.

Deb Shaver is now Assistant Vice President of Research Administration and Director, Office of Sponsored Programs at the University of Idaho’s Office of Research and Economic Development.

Sinnam on Tierney is the now the Finance & Grants Manager at CARB-X (Combating Antibiotic Resistant Bacteria Biopharmaceutical Accelerator) at Boston University School of Law. She also currently serves as Vice Chair of NCURA’s Professional Development Committee and as a DRA Traveling Workshop Faculty.

Do you have a milestone to share? 
Email schiffman@ncura.edu
he NCURA Education Scholarship Fund provides support to members who seek graduate education in research administration. The fund began just five years ago, when two longtime members planted a seed with their generous contribution and a shared belief in the future of our profession. That seed was nurtured through ongoing donations and fundraising efforts across the entire organization. The research administration community’s efforts came to fruition this year when the inaugural recipients were selected through a competitive process.

NCURA is pleased to present the first two awardees, Amanda Tan of Boston University Medical Center, who is attending Emmanuel College, and Sylvia Bradshaw of Dixie State University, who is attending Johns Hopkins University.

Amanda learned about NCURA through her colleagues at work. Excited about the opportunities to network and grow professionally, she browsed the website for upcoming events and volunteered at a regional workshop. She met like-minded colleagues from whom she gained valuable insight, chose to participate in her region’s mentorship program, and co-authored an article in NCURA Magazine.

When asked why she decided to pursue a degree in research administration, Amanda replied, “I am highly intrigued by the relationship between scientific research and administration, and how it advances our nation’s research enterprise. I was pleased to learn about the master’s program at Emmanuel College because it aligned well with my goals. The timing was right for me to pursue a master’s degree, and I was adamant about learning leadership and management skills from experts in the research administration field. Studying research administration is fulfilling because the subject is a true interest of mine, while the curriculum guides me towards developing skills relevant to this growing profession.” Her commitment to the profession has also grown as a result of her program of study. “My graduate education has prepared me to think strategically and thoughtfully about my career path and my role as a community member,” Amanda said. After graduation, Amanda plans to deepen her involvement. She is interested in leadership opportunities, presenting at conferences, and creating media content.

“I look forward to growing as a research administrator with NCURA’s community,” she adds. “I hope to be involved in developing new tools and technology for research administrators and to shape the direction of our profession in upcoming years. There are so many ways to contribute to NCURA’s community, and I look forward to discovering where my contributions will be most beneficial.”

Scholarship recipient Sylvia Bradshaw learned about NCURA through her mentor at work. He encouraged her to start getting involved and to attend Fundamentals. After only three weeks in the field, she registered for her first regional meeting. She was grateful for her mentor’s advice and enjoyed the experience immensely: “I remember volunteering for the welcome table on my first day, wanting to immerse myself in this organization and get to know the people who I’d rely on to get me through my new assignment and career. I found a welcoming support from every person I met. Stunned by the collegiality of those in attendance, I knew I’d found a place where I could confidently grow.”

The fact that her institution was relatively new to receiving external funding for research is one reason Sylvia was inspired to pursue a degree in research administration. She wanted to expand her own knowledge as well as support the growth of her institution. “I placed my bet that a Johns Hopkins degree would solidify confidence in my ability to navigate a cultural shift towards increasing research activity.”

Like Amanda, Sylvia anticipates her involvement in NCURA increasing as a result of furthering her education: “I thoroughly enjoyed the learning process and feel a desire to share as others have so willingly shared with me.” She adds, “NCURA has given me an ever-expanding network of professionals who I want to emulate by both their extensive knowledge and service rendered. I truly do hope to ‘pay it forward’ as so many others have done for me.”

Please join NCURA in congratulating the first ever Education Scholarship Fund recipients! ☀️
Too often in administration we become stagnant in our thinking and our problem-solving, often seeking collaborations that to fit into convenient, known constructs,” notes Tiffany Blackman, Senior Director of Pre-Award Services, Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard University. As a recent fellow for the NCURA — Eurasia Foundation fellowship, Tiffany spent two weeks at the European University at St. Petersburg, Russia, engaged in knowledge sharing between two different cultures of research administration. The NCURA Global Fellowship Program has provided these opportunities for nine years, serving over 50 NCURA members with an invaluable experience, both personally and professionally.

NCURA’s Global Fellowship program includes several joint initiatives between NCURA and our sister organizations that offer $2,000 in travel funds for participants to immerse themselves in a host institution’s research environment. Fellows come from a variety of backgrounds - PUIs, research focused universities and everything in between. In addition to research capacity building and knowledge sharing, fellows have a unique opportunity to build lasting bridges with an international institution.

Tiffany continues, “While I have presented overseas many times and partnered with EU and other international colleagues to share best practices, the experience of this fellowship went a step further – allowing me to gain an intimate understanding of not only the research funding landscape, but the cultural, political and economic drivers behind that landscape.”

Funding opportunities and collaborations exist from sources far beyond our comfort zones. The European Commission through Horizon 2020 made available nearly 80 billion euros to research organizations working in science, industrial leadership, and tackling societal challenges. Researchers strive to push the boundaries of our collective knowledge, a truly universal mission. Restrictions to collaborations born from gaps in cultural understanding or a simple lack of awareness to the available opportunities are an ever-diminishing hurdle, not a road block. Countless institutions across the world are eager for subawards through US institutions that can access our federal funding mechanisms.

NCURA’s international membership continues to grow. Institutions with vastly different research infrastructures look abroad for mutually beneficial relationships, and NCURA Global Fellowships pave the way for hosts and visiting fellows to lay the groundwork of a fruitful collaboration. “The personal connections and information sharing throughout the Global Fellowship experience continue to increase partnerships and collaborations in many fields,” recalls Dawn Underwood, 2017/2018 fellow who visited Europa Media Group, in Budapest, Hungary. In addition to her Hungarian counterparts, Dawn connected with potential collaborators from Israel and even the US through skype and in-person meetings, expanding her institution’s network for future partnerships.

“My fellowship was an amazing experience. It was a unique opportunity to be immersed into another culture, albeit brief, to gain an understanding of their research administration enterprise as well as identify how they navigate common issues and concerns.”

Tamara Hill, Senior Director, Research Administration Services, Emory University 2016/2017 NCURA-ARMS Fellow at Melbourne University, Australia

NCURA Global Fellowship programs have facilitated over fifty fellows who have developed crucial relationships in the past 9 years. New partnerships continue to form as both the desire and capacity for international collaborations grow. The opportunity to surround oneself in a setting outside of their typical experiences brings immense satisfaction and growth, and could be the catalyst for a long-term fruitful partnership. Robert McCarthy of DePaul University visited the Austrian Research Promotion Agency (FFG) for his fellowship. He summarizes his experience stating, “I found myself immersed in both the familiar and the foreign. Commonalities in professional objectives established an immediate bridge. Yet at the same time, the view from that bridge was constantly enhanced as the distinct environment and unique challenges of international research administration became evident each day. Looking back, I’m hard-pressed to find a more gratifying experience in the mutual exchange of knowledge.”

If you are interested in becoming a future NCURA Fellow, please go to our website www.ncura.edu/Global/NCURAFellowshipProgram.aspx. The 2019 NCURA Fellowship Program will start the call for applications in July 2018.
As I was thinking about the theme for this issue of the magazine, I thought about how far we’ve come in research administration, and how far I’ve personally come in my research administration journey. Starting as a departmental administrator, I’m now an Assistant Vice President for Research. It’s a pretty amazing journey, and I realize how important NCURA has been in my journey.

NCURA has a wonderful Executive Leadership Program, and I learned a lot by serving as a mentor and also when I attended the retreat as Past President. I was really impressed by the speakers’ presentations. They introduced the concept of executive coaching to me, and I gave the idea more thought as I started my Assistant Vice President position. I engaged an executive coach, and it was a really valuable experience for me. I’d recommend it for anyone.

Let me share one thing I learned through my executive coaching experience. It’s a concept called the “Thinking Path.” The Thinking Path is one piece of extensive work done by Alexander Caillet, founder of the Accompli Group. The basis for the Thinking Path is that if you want to change results, you have to first change your thinking. His model’s core premise is your thoughts are the base for feelings, behaviors, and therefore, impact the results. To give you an example, you have a special project that needs to be done, and you know two people are capable of doing the project. Your past thoughts may have been to assign special projects to one specific person all of the time. Well, if you change your thoughts, you can change your behavior by assigning this to someone else. You’ve changed results because someone else is now taking on the project. You’ve just created an opportunity for (a) a new challenge for an employee and (b) an opportunity to make sure more than one person knows how to undertake these special projects. Both are exceptional outcomes for you, your employees, and your office. Some might call this a business continuity plan!

This thinking path strategy has also been invaluable to me with certain contentious meetings and discussions. Repetition of changing a way of thinking helps reinforce “there’s more than one way to get to a good solution.”

There are lots of references to this Thinking Path methodology that you can find on the Internet. I found it to be a very useful leadership tool and recommend you consider it too.
Regional Corner

**REGION I**

**New England**

**www.ncuraregioni.org**

[Facebook link]

Hope you are all enjoying your summer, and perhaps some down time to spend with family and friends as well. On to Region 1 news!

Region I Hospitality Suite AM2018: Region I participated in the Netzone again this year. Hopefully you stopped in for some networking with others from our and other regions. We are also interested in hearing your feedback. Do you enjoy being part of the Netzone? Do you have suggestions for participation in the Netzone for 2019? Feel free to email me directly to give me your feedback on the region’s participation (denise.rouleau@tufts.edu).

Congratulations to all our award winners this year. 2018 PRA/FRA travel award winners were Julianne Fowler, Pre-Award Assistant, Southern Connecticut State University and Cristen Yakush, Associate Grants Management Specialist, Connecticut Children’s Medical Center. 2018 Regional Spring meeting travel award recipients were Anna Molineaux, Senior Research Lab Manager Brigham and Women’s Hospital, Julie Demers, Pre-Award Coordinator, University of Bridgeport, and Ellen Bitzer, Grants & Contract Coordinator, University of Massachusetts Amherst. 2018 Annual Meeting travel award recipients were Rachel Girardi, Sponsored Research Coordinator, College of the Holy Cross, Dalila Alves, Sponsored Research & Programs Coordinator, Providence College, and Suna Garcia, Research Administrator, Tufts Medical Center.

Special congratulations to the 2018 Regional Merit Award winners. Denise Moody, Senior Director of Research Compliance, Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences is the 2018 recipient of the Julie T. Norris Distinguished Service Award. Denise’s service to NCURA spans over 14 years and includes multiple presentations, publications, and service on both regional and national committees. She is a 2007 Leadership Development Institute Graduate. In 2016, Denise was awarded the NCURA Julia Jacobsen Distinguished Service Award as well as the Region I Merit Award.

Congratulations to Denise Rouleau (Thank you for this honor!), Research Administration Associate Director, Tufts University for being the 2018 Region I Merit Award recipient. Denise has been volunteering with NCURA since 1998, including presentation and committee service. In 2010 she was awarded the Region I Outstanding Volunteer award. Denise is currently serving as Chair of Region I.

Our 2018 Region I Outstanding Volunteer recipient is Suzanne Araujo, Research Program Administrator in the Department of Emergency Medicine at Rhode Island Hospital. Suzanne has been an active volunteer since 2013 and currently serves as Secretary-Elect for the region.

The Curriculum Committee has been hard at work planning the fall workshop schedule. We currently have two workshops scheduled for the fall. Essentials of Research Administration on September 10, 2018 and Advanced Topics in Research Administration: Beyond the Basics on October 16, 2018. An eblast will be sent when registration is open.

Denise Rouleau, CRA, is the Chair of Region I. She serves as Research Administration Associate Director at Tufts University Cummings School for Veterinary Medicine. She can be reached at chair@ncuraregioni.org

**REGION II**

**Mid-Atlantic**

**www.ncuraregionii.org**

[Facebook link]

I hope everyone is enjoying their summer. Keep in mind, our region will be heading to Ogleby Resort in Wheeling, West Virginia in October. Our program committee has been working very hard these last 8 months and have come up with a fantastic program. Please visit our meeting page on the Region II website for the preliminary program at https://ncuraregionii.org/regional-spring-meetings/spring-meeting. The final program should be out any day now. Please take a look at it and we hope to see you in West Virginia in the fall.

Congratulations to our very own Denise Clark, University of Maryland College Park. Denise was awarded one of the 2018 INORMS Award for Excellence in Research Management Leadership. Denise accepted this award at the INORMS conference in Edinburgh, Scotland this past June.

Region II has begun the process of implementing SubRegional activities for our region. These SubRegions have assigned leaders. To find out who your leader is contact, Charles Bartunek at ctb@umd.edu. Please reach out and get active and get involved with your SubRegion or go to our website for more information. More information to follow on future regional activities.

I am excited that our region has some great opportunities to help you expand professionally. Region II Professional Development Committee is working at providing regional training opportunities for our region. Please visit the PDC section of our website for a current listing of PDC workshops near you! If you want a workshop to come to your area or interested in hosting a workshop at your institution, please contact Rebecca Hunsaker at hunsaker@umd.edu. Any institution hosting a workshop will receive either two free registrations or one free Region II Fall Meeting registration!

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

Dennis J. Paffrath, MBA, serves as the Chair of Region II and is the Assistant Vice President of Sponsored Programs at the University of Maryland, Baltimore. He can be reached at dpaffrath@umaryland.edu
Senior Service Award

Congratulations to David Smelser (University of Tennessee), the recipient of the 2018 Region III Senior Service Award! His passion, dedication, and service to the region are truly invaluable.

In Appreciation of Outgoing Leadership

I would like to thank outgoing Chair, Steve Koogler for his leadership and guidance over the past year. I look forward to working with him as he transitions into Immediate Past-Chair. In addition, thanks to Pat Green for serving as this past year’s Chair Appointed Executive Committee Member. His mentorship and hard work are truly appreciated. We would also like to thank the following Standing Committee Coordinators for their terms of service: Hagan Walker (Honors and Awards) and Tanta Myles (Public Relations).

R3 RAMP

This next year will be an exciting year as we begin the initial pilot for the online RIII RAMP (Research Administrator Mentoring Program) class. We will have 5 students working both individually and as a group with their mentors and the other students to complete an eight module online program that will culminate with a selected activity at next year’s Regional III Spring Meeting in Hollywood, FL. Thank you again to Jamie Petrasek (Virginia Commonwealth University) and Erin Blackwell (University of Central Florida) and their committee for all their hard work in getting this initiative together. Learn more about NCURA RIII RAMP here: http://ncuraregioniii.com/ramp.

New Instagram Account

Region III has a new Instagram account! Come follow us at www.instagram.com/ncuraregioniii to keep up with your colleagues attending regional and national meetings. Whether attending sessions, volunteering, or taking advantage of numerous networking opportunities, Region III flamingos know how to have fun — and we want to share it with everyone!

We look forward to seeing everyone in Washington, DC at the NCURA Annual Meeting, August 5-8, 2018. Until then, keep up with the latest Regional News by connecting with your region (Facebook, Twitter, and our website) and be on the look-out every third Thursday for your Region III e-blast.

Justo Torres is Chair of Region III and serves as Director, Office of Contracts and Grants at North Carolina State University. He can be reached at justo_torres@ncsu.edu

At our spring meeting in Des Moines, Region IV hosted an inaugural book group, using a story that ties directly to our profession: The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks, by Rebecca Skloot. This book generated conversation around privacy, oppression, science, research, and ethics. In May, a portrait of Ms. Lacks was debuted at the Smithsonian National Portrait Gallery. It will be on display through November. If you get a chance while you are in D.C. for the Annual Meeting, swing over to the museum to sneak a peek of this woman, who played such an important role in issues we still think about today.

Speaking of the Annual Meeting, remember to sign up for the Region IV D.C. after Dusk bus tour on Saturday. This tour is free and visits some of the city’s most incredible monuments. On Sunday there will be a newcomers’ reception in room 4101. On Monday a Region IV will organize a dinner group. We will also continue to host the region’s hospitality suite in room 4101 each evening from 9:00 – 11:00 PM.

Finally, don’t forget, National Research Administrator Day is September 25! It’s never too early to start thinking about special ways to celebrate the research administrators in your life!

Bonniejean Zitske is the Chair of Region IV and the Assistant Director for Research Financial Services at the University of Wisconsin – Madison. She can be reached at bzitske@wisc.edu
What a great time we had in San Marcos, TX at the 2018 Region V Spring Meeting – Where the River Runs Through . . . A two-and-a-half-day float towards your research realities. We started our float hitting the rapids right from the start when we opened up the meeting on Sunday night with a dinner and very inspirational keynote message from Mike Matte, Marathon CEO. If you missed the Keynote Speaker, you can view the event at https://youtu.be/ycBrF9-3xXI. The tubers continued into high-energy concurrent sessions, discussion groups, and networking opportunities. We ended our float with a calming overview led by some senior members answering questions.

A special ‘Thank you’ goes out to the 2018 Program Committee for making this a great event:

Genevieve Alvarez, University of the Incarnate Word
 Adrienne Black, The University of Tulsa
 Miriam Colunga, Methodist Healthcare Ministries
 Tribbie Grimm, Texas A&M University
 Ana Hagendorf, University of the Incarnate Word
 Elaine Pearson, University of Houston-Downtown
 Katie Plum, Angelo State University
 Amanda Reitmayer, Texas A&M University
 Robyn Remotigue, University of North Texas Health Science Center at Fort Worth
 Laura Rosales, Baylor College of Medicine
 Sunny Thompson, Texas Tech Lutheran University

This year’s Region V Distinguished Service Award goes to Hollie Schreiber, Director of Sponsored Programs for the Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources at Oklahoma State University. Hollie is a long-time member of NCURA, she has served in several Region V officer roles, was a member of multiple regional committees, has served in the national capacity as a Traveling Workshop Faculty, the Genius Bar, was Co-Chair of PRA’s Pre-Award Track & Departmental Track, and was on the Tech Team at several Annual Meetings. Hollie checks all the boxes when it comes to this Award. Congratulations Hollie!

The Results of our regional elections are in and the following people were elected:
Chair Elect: Katie Plum, Angelo State University
Secretary: Liz Kogan, University of Texas at Austin
At Large Board Member: Tribbie Grimm, Texas A&M University
At Large Board Member: Adrienne Black, The University of Tulsa

Lastly, we are happy to announce that the 2019 Region V Spring Meeting will be held in Houston, TX! Look for more information and upcoming events on the revamped Region V website.

Michael R. Castilleja is Chair of Region V and serves as Grants Accounting Manager at the University of the Incarnate Word. He can be reached at micasti2@uiwtx.edu

With the month of August upon us, we have the opportunity to connect in person with our Region VI colleagues at the NCURA Annual Meeting in Washington, DC. With this being NCURA’s 60th Annual Meeting it will surely be a meeting to remember.

Region VI had two winners for the Catherine Core Minority Travel Award for this year’s Annual Meeting, which is administered by the Nominating & Leadership Development Committee. They are Kimberly Douglas of Cedars-Sinai Medical Center and Richard La of the University of California, San Francisco.

Our region also made two awards to members to support attendance at AM60 under our travel awards program. Charles Hinger of the University of California, San Francisco and Lauren Nicholson of Stanford University each received a Region VI travel award to attend the Annual Meeting.

Speaking of travel awards, the Region VI Awards Committee also welcomes applications from research administrators for the Region VI/VII Meeting this fall in Montana. Like for the Annual Meeting, these travel awards are geared towards those who have not yet attended a NCURA meeting and are meant to offset the cost of attendance at the Region VI/VII Meeting. The awards are intended to assist with registration, hotel, meal, and/or transportation costs associated with meeting attendance.

The Awards Committee is also charged with administering our award recognition program, which provides opportunity to recognize outstanding Region VI members for each the Helen Carrier Distinguished Service Award, the Meritorious Contribution Award, the Barry Dorfman Outstanding Region VI Member Award, and the Linda W. Patton Emeritus Award. Please see the NCURA Region VI website for further information on each of these awards and for how to submit a nomination.

We must thank our Region VI Awards Committee for the continued oversight and administration of our awards programs. For the 2018 year the Awards Committee is comprised of Csilla Csáplar, Stanford University (Chair); Vanessa Azevedo, University of California, Merced; Billy Gellepis, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center; Stacy Miller, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center; Sandra Purves, Los Angeles BioMedical Research Institute at Harbor-UCLA Medical Center; and Vanessa Quiroz Hotz, University of Washington.

Finally, with the prior mention of the 2018 Region VI/VII Meeting, the Region VI & VII leadership and program committee have been working hard to put together a great meeting for everyone. We look forward to meeting everyone in Montana! Further information and details will continue to be released as we move towards the meeting date.

Kevin Stewart is the Chair of Region VI and serves as Associate Director, Industry Contracts at the University of California, Santa Barbara. He can be reached at stewart@tia.ucsb.edu
Congratulations to Angela Valencia, a research administrator at the University of Arizona Health Sciences (UAHS), who has been selected to receive a 2018 Catherine Core Minority Travel Award. This award will support Angela’s participation in NCURA’s 60th Annual Meeting, August 5-8, 2018.

The Catherine Core Minority Travel Award supports travel-related costs to the NCURA Annual Meeting for up to four individuals from underrepresented groups who would not otherwise be able to attend the conference. Awardees receive up to $1,500 toward travel expenses associated with attending the meeting. We’ll be looking forward to meeting Angela at the conference in August!

More on travel awards: Shannon Malone, a Senior Accountant at Fort Lewis College in Durango, CO, and Chelsey Minkler, a Grant & Contract Officer at Arizona State University in Tempe, AZ, are the recipients of Region VII travel awards to support travel to the Annual Meeting. Each will receive $1,000. Congratulations, ladies!

Angela, Shannon, and Chelsey will be recognized at the meeting luncheon on August 7th.

Speaking of the Annual Meeting, Region VII officers are reviewing the Region VII bylaws for updates and those updates will be provided to Region VII members for review prior to the Annual Meeting where they will be presented for approval. The Region VII officers have also put out a call for volunteers to serve on a Communications Task Force to identify ways in which the Region can better serve the needs of its members.

Don’t forget about the Region VI/Region VII meeting this October in Billings, Montana! It’s going to be an exciting event! Come early, stay late, and enjoy all that the area has to offer! For more information, see www.visitbillings.com

Deb Shaver, CRA, is Chair of Region VII and is the Assistant Vice President of Research Administration and Director, Office of Sponsored Programs at University of Idaho. She can be reached at dshaver@uidaho.edu

NCURA Region VIII is compellingly disruptive. Over the past years, our region has harnessed the drive and influence of the NCURA communities of US research administration experts to make sustainable positive change at universities and research institutions throughout the world. We have worked with our US colleagues to shape our expertise and ideas on US grants management and bring them to fruition at non-US institutions. The NCURA events helped us to extend our networks, built new partnerships with experts and global newcomers.

Only when we were asked by our sister organization EARMA (European Association of Research Managers and Administrators) whether we would be interested in a collaboration, we realised that we were not the “new kid on the block” anymore and it was time to try something new. So we agreed on implementing a NCURA track as part of the 2018 EARMA conference that took place in Brussels this April. The overall idea was simple: a track dealing with US grants management outside the US for European newcomers as well as experts. We thought that in times of public institutions’ awareness of the carbon footprint and the significance of internationalization, while at the same time dealing with more and more grants from more and more sponsors, this NCURA@EARMA pilot should be rather timely.

It was. The mutual endeavour was a tremendous success: In over 30 sessions from panel discussions to Pecha Kucha style gatherings, from Speed Dating to Poster PowerPoints, NCURA members fascinated, performed and inspired a vigorously interested audience.

This could not have been done without the efforts of both EARMA and NCURA. In 2017 Region VIII member Simon Kerridge joined the EARMA Annual Conference Programme Committee (ACPC) to represent the interest of our region. Be assured, he did an amazing job. Thanks to Simon’s energy and charming persistence as well as EARMA’s commitment, the NCURA@EARMA track was intelligent, diverse and fully integrated.

As an EARMA attendee, I once again realized the potential of Region VIII to be a catalyst for global initiatives in the area of international research administration, managing academic innovations, supporting scientific ideas and future collaborations. The NCURA track very well captured the achievements of our regional community. It is wonderful to see that the region has made great progress in establishing itself as a platform, functioning as a curator of not only our own ideas and initiatives but also projects and enterprises undertaken jointly with the national office, other regions and sister organizations.

On behalf of the region, a big thank you to Simon and the EARMA ACPC, and to all presenters of this track – thank you!

Annika Glauner is Immediate Past Chair of Region VIII and serves as Senior Research Development & Policy Officer at ETH Zurich and the University of Zurich. She can be reached at annika.glauner@sl.ethz.ch
Seismic Experiments will Test Performance of Innovative Cross-Laminated Timber Structure

Engineering researchers are putting an innovative two-story structure made of cross-laminated timber panels through a series of seismic tests to determine how it would perform in an earthquake.

The tests are being conducted at the Natural Hazards Engineering Research Infrastructure at University of California San Diego (NEHRI@UCSD) site, which is funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF). They will produce data that can be used in the design of a new generation of wood-frame high-rises, such as a four-story parking structure designed for Springfield, Oregon, and the 12-story Framework building in Portland, Oregon. Scheduled to open in 2018, the 90,000-square-foot Framework structure will be the tallest mass-timber building in the United States.

A consortium of universities, agencies and engineering firms is conducting the tests with funding from the NSF, Katerra, Simpson Strong-Tie, Tallwood Design Institute, DR Johnson Lumber Co., the Forest Products Laboratory, City of Springfield, the Softwood Lumber Board, and MyTiCon Timber Connectors.

“The overarching goal of the project is to propose a design methodology for seismic loading for large panels subjected to large in-plane loading, including some consisting of a composite made of concrete and cross-laminated timber (CLT),” said Arijit Sinha, associate professor of renewable materials in the College of Forestry at Oregon State University (OSU).

“Several tests will be conducted at different shaking intensities,” said Andre Barbosa, assistant professor of structural engineering in the College of Engineering at Oregon State. “The three different phases of testing include designs for locations in San Francisco, Seattle, and Berkeley.”

Barbosa, Sinha, and Christopher Higgins, professor of structural engineering in the OSU College of Engineering, are leading the test of the building’s horizontal elements. The three researchers are affiliated with the Tallwood Design Institute at Oregon State, a collaboration between OSU and the University of Oregon.

The tests reflect a range of stresses associated with a variety of earthquake and wind conditions. “Just for reference, the shake-table motions on one of the tests are calibrated to what is expected to occur in a magnitude 9.0 subduction earthquake zone event in Seattle,” Barbosa added.

Researchers will collect data through more than 300 channels in three phases of testing on the 22-foot tall structure. Data will be generated at pre-selected points to measure how the CLT panels bend and how the panels move relative to each other. Researchers are particularly interested in a system that allows the building to rock in response to an earthquake and how the walls and floors interact during shaking.

In a so-called “rocking wall system,” vertical walls are connected to a steel footing by post-tensioned rods that run up next to a CLT wall and special U-shaped brackets on the side of the wall. The rods allow the wall to rock during an earthquake and snap back into its original upright position, minimizing the impact and resulting structural damage.

Other collaborating researchers include Shiling Pei of the Colorado School of Mines, John van de Lindt of Colorado State University, Jeffery Berman of the University of Washington, Dan Dolan of Washington State University, James Ricles and Richard Sause from Lehigh University, and Keri Ryan from University of Nevada Reno. Also participating in the tests are representatives of KPFF Consulting Engineers and WoodWorks, an initiative of the Wood Products Council.

Researchers plan to evaluate larger buildings in the future, including a 10-story tall CLT structure by 2020.

Ongoing activity at the outdoor shake-table of the Natural Hazards Engineering Research Infrastructure facility is live-streamed by webcam at http://nheri.ucsd.edu/video

See full article at... http://today.oregonstate.edu/archives/2017/jul/seismic-experiments-will-test-performance-innovative-cross-laminated-timber-struct
Self Paced! 10 WEEK ONLINE TUTORIALS
Includes Knowledge Checks and Certificate of Completion for the Individual Learner

Register today, and start the first lesson anytime that works for your schedule. You will have TEN WEEKS, from the first time you access the first lesson to complete the course.

- A Primer on Subawards Under Federal Assistance Awards
  An overview of the complex process from drafting and negotiating through review. (10 Chapters)

- A Primer on Federal Contracting
  Understand the contracting process, regulations, negotiations and risks. (14 Chapters)

- A Primer on Intellectual Property Agreements
  A broad introduction to the basics through actual research and licensing agreements, plus negotiation tips. (10 Chapters)

- A Primer on Clinical Trials Management
  Focused on Clinical Trials Management, including key administrative, financial, and regulatory issues that arise in planning through close-out. (8 Chapters)

VISIT https://onlinelearning.ncura.edu to register

Don’t Miss One of NCURA’s Upcoming Traveling Workshops

San Antonio, TX
September 5 – 7, 2018
Financial Research Administration Workshop
Level I: Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration Workshop
Level II: Sponsored Project Administration Workshop – Critical Issues in Research Administration

Charleston, SC
October 15 – 17, 2018
Contract Negotiation and Administration Workshop

Old Town Alexandria, VA
November 8 – 9, 2018
Export Controls Workshop

Savannah, GA
December 12 – 14, 2018
Registration Opening August 2018
Departmental Research Administration Workshop
Financial Research Administration Workshop
Level I: Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration Workshop
Level II: Sponsored Project Administration Workshop – Critical Issues in Research Administration

REGISTER TODAY
www.ncura.edu/travelingworkshops
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NCURA CALENDAR OF EVENTS

NATIONAL TRAVELING WORKSHOPS

Contract Negotiation and Administration Workshop
October 15-17, 2018 ................................................................. Charleston, SC

Departmental Research Administration Workshop
December 12-14, 2018 ............................................................. Savannah, GA

Export Controls Workshop
November 8-9, 2018 ............................................................ Alexandria, VA

Financial Research Administration Workshop
September 5-7, 2018 ............................................................. San Antonio, TX
December 12-14, 2018 ............................................................. Savannah, GA

Level I: Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration Workshop
September 5-7, 2018 ............................................................. San Antonio, TX
December 12-14, 2018 ............................................................. Savannah, GA

Level II: Sponsored Project Administration Workshop
September 5-7, 2018 ............................................................. San Antonio, TX
December 12-14, 2018 ............................................................. Savannah, GA

REGIONAL MEETINGS

Region II – Mid-Atlantic
October 21-24, 2018 ............................................................. Wheeling, WV

Regions VI/VII – Rocky Mountain/Western
October 7-10, 2018 ................................................................. Billings, Montana

NATIONAL CONFERENCES

Financial Research Administration Conference
March 11-12, 2019 ................................................................. Las Vegas, NV

Pre-Award Research Administration Conference
March 14-15, 2019 ................................................................. Las Vegas, NV

ONLINE TUTORIALS – 10 week programs

A Primer on Clinical Trials
A Primer on Federal Contracting
A Primer on Intellectual Property in Research Agreements
A Primer on Subawards

WEBINARS

• Managing Subawards Tips and Tricks – July 26, 2018, 2:00-3:30 pm ET
• Export Controls – September 13, 2:00-3:30 pm ET
• Internal Controls – September 25, 2:00-3:30 pm ET

DEADLINES FOR OCTOBER/NOVEMBER 2018

Submission of Articles to Contributing Editors ...................... August 17, 2018
Submission of Advertisements .............................................. August 22, 2018

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

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