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ON THE COVER: For nineteen glorious days, 2,952 athletes hailing from 92 countries captured the world’s attention during the 2018 Winter Olympics in Pyeongchang, Korea. Each arrived with a different back story, but with the same goal to bring home the “gold”. Every two years, we watch in awe as Olympic records are shattered, we cheer our teams who rally from behind for an upset, and we feel anguish for those who gave it their all but fell short. Like Olympians, researchers and research administrators have successes and defeats in their pursuit to capture their own “gold”; whether that be grant funding, cures for medical illnesses or scientific recognition.

In this issue Sunny Thompson explores novel training techniques and methods to build effective teams at PUI’s by enlisting the Three “C’s”: communication, collaboration and cohesion. “Team Building for the PUI: Simplify Your Playbook,” uses the sports analogy as a perfect way to connect with the Olympics to inspire each of us.

Do not miss “Spotlight on Research” where Beth Miller and Dante LaPenta give us a first-hand look at how researchers at the University of Delaware are using innovative and new technologies to improve future Olympians and their jumps. By using biomechanical analysis models, one can see the adjustments they will need to gain more rotation and land that triple axel.

Be sure to check out the grant writing program that Robyn Remotique features in “The WriteStuff.” If you are looking for new strategies and best practices to support your investigators in their pursuit of grant funding, Robyn’s article is sure to inspire you.

In “Scientists Going for the Gold – A Thank You Note to Scientists Who Took Great Risks for Their Achievements,” Sue Kelch reminds us of the “bigger picture.” While it’s easy as research administrators to let the daily grind distract us from focusing on the greater scientific purpose, Sue shares three stories where scientists took great risks for big rewards to land on the moon and cure horrible diseases, such as polio.

While there seems to be ample time before the next Winter Olympics, the next class of Olympians have already begun training with the goal in mind to bring home the “gold” in 2022. Like them, it’s never too early to start to pursue the next grant or process improvement that furthers world-class research.

Angela Wishon is a Co-Editor for NCURA Magazine. She has recently served as the Vice President for Research Administration at UT Southwestern Medical Center where she had oversight of the research regulatory compliance functions. As a licensed attorney in Texas and Colorado, she focuses on Intellectual Property and Regulatory Law. Angela has served as a site visitor for the AAHRPP on NCURA’s Traveling Faculty, as a CTSA Regulatory Knowledge Core Director and routinely presents on research compliance and regulatory topics. She can reached at angela@wishonconsulting.com
Our profession is built on a foundation of providing service and support to ensure our researchers can secure and manage scarce and highly competitive grants. As research administrators, we work collaboratively to assist in the preparation of the proposals and manage the subsequent awards with a high degree of integrity, accuracy, and consistency. It is critical for us to stay informed and up-to-date on the availability and use of new and emerging technologies. Our profession is continually evolving in a fast-paced race for that extramurally-funded “pot of gold.”

One of our golden assets is that we work in a spirit of cooperation and community. We help each other every step of the way through our personal and professional networks that are deeply embedded in the spirit of NCURA. Our mission is to provide these resources to our community and in doing so, NCURA is committed to developing, offering, and assuring the highest quality training, outreach, and services. Your Executive Committee and Board will be evaluating our progress as an organization in achieving our goals set forth in our strategic plan (see Board Meeting Update, page 11). We have revised our workshop training materials to incorporate modern, adult-learning modules and updated our manuals to ensure our learning materials are current. We will be making hard decisions and evaluating our programs to ensure NCURA remains current and competitive as a leader in the development of global training programs. We will be reviewing our Volunteer Central network and working to incorporate diversity in all aspects of our operations.

As we move closer to offering our first education scholarships to Master’s students we will begin exploring the possibilities of developing the research administration field as a globally-recognized profession and career path. NCURA embraces bold moves to get ahead of the curve so members are able to be responsive to the ever-changing climate of research administration.

We are a generous community of colleagues that respect each other’s contributions and efforts as we diligently and enthusiastically support our institutional research. Our commitments to both our faculty and institutions run deep. While our institutions are competing for funding, we, as research administrators, always share our knowledge so we can do our jobs in the most professional, effective and efficient manner. It is a marvelous example of good spirit, generosity, and reciprocal respect. As the ultimate example of teamwork, being a part of NCURA and sharing our knowledge and resources encourages our efforts to assure we will all cross the finish line together in achieving our goals.

NCURA has been supporting the research administration profession for almost 60 years. It is a globally-recognized, well-respected leader in the field with a rich reserve of highly qualified members who eagerly step up to develop programming, share knowledge and build a path to the future. It is an association where members build long lasting relationships and become part of a professional family. As your president, I look forward to being a part of the evolution in pursing the development of pathways to certify the field of research administration globally.

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
REACHING FOR GOLD TOGETHER

Grants.gov, the Community, and Workspace

By Lori Ann M. Schultz
When it comes to application submissions, research administrators are often called on to beat the clock so our faculty have a chance of winning the gold in the form of a federal grant. We rely on tools in the form of systems, processes, and training resources to help manage the application process. Over time, we have seen the baton passed from PureEdge to Adobe, and now to Workspace as the marathon of application submission goes on. We also rely on the team we build—from faculty and administrators to Grants.gov and the agency help desks—to cross the finish line.

Now that Workspace has replaced the legacy stitched-PDF packages, the FDP’s Joint Application Design team (JAD) wanted to check in with the team to see how the transition was going. The JAD issued an informal survey to gauge readiness for the transition to Workspace, and identify areas where the community needed additional help, or had ideas for the future of Workspace. The survey received nearly 100 responses, and showed that many responding users and institutions were using the Grants.gov online resources to make the transition easier. Some results from the survey:

• Are you prepared to stop using Legacy PDF packages?
Nearly 75% of respondents said they were completely ready, or nearly there, when it came to training. When asked how they plan to retrain staff, nearly 86% said that they were rolling the training into existing programs and handling issues and questions on an ad hoc basis.

• What does your organization recommend for submission of applications?
29% of the respondents use a combination of Workspace, FastLane, and ASSIST to handle their applications. More than half of the respondents indicated that if another system was available, they would use it for submissions. Additionally, 35% said they would use their institution’s system-to-system (S2S) solution along with FastLane and ASSIST.

• What do users want to see next?
Respondents want to be able to view the entire proposal as one document with attachments, and have access to different options for managing Workspace roles at their organization.

The Grants.gov team is listening and continues to be a valuable teammate as Workspace evolves and as they hear feedback from users. According to the Grants.gov blog, the next release, scheduled for April 2018, will allow organizations to create custom roles, and set privileges to fit your organization’s needs and application process. This release will also include functionality to view and print attachments. NCUA, Grants.gov, and the FDP JAD team have a number of ways for you to contribute your ideas to keep the team working effectively.

For the long haul:
• Keep an eye on the Grants.gov maintenance and release calendar for information on planned system outages and coming releases: www.grants.gov/web/grants/support/calendar.html.
• Check in to the eRA community on NCURA Collaborate for questions and to share training tips with your colleagues.
• Submit your ideas and best practices proposals for NCURA meetings and conferences and YouTube Tuesdays.
• Email the author and share your knowledge so the JAD team can compile a set of institutional resources to share best practices for Workspace training and use.

None of us is a stranger to change in research administration, but when we work together, the gold is always within reach!

References

Lori Ann M. Schultz is the Sr. Director, Research Partnership Services at the University of Arizona, where her responsibilities include Sponsored Projects & Contracting Services, the Export Control Program, training, and analytics. Lori is a member of the FDP eRA Standing Committee and the JAD team. She can be reached at lschultz@email.arizona.edu

Be an MVP and Stay Involved!
In the short run:
• Remind your users that PDF packages downloaded before 12/31/17 can be submitted until 3/31/18, or the agency’s deadline, whichever is earlier. Better yet, ask them to use Workspace instead!
The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (RSP) at the University of Northern Iowa (UNI) goes for the gold with its annual Scholar Connexus, an example of “speed dating for researchers.” At this fun, energetic event, RSP staff match each participant with a sequence of four conversation partners. “Connexus is a cornerstone of UNI’s research and scholarship development approach,” says Tolif Hunt, Director of the RSP. “In one event, we are able to create research collaborations, inspire new ideas, and pair researchers up with people they should know on campus, such as IP experts or IRB committee members. Not only is it effective, but it is also enjoyable and something that many faculty and staff look forward to every year.”

About UNI
The University of Northern Iowa is a public, predominantly undergraduate institution with an enrollment of close to 12,000 students. There are about 600 full-time faculty and 650 professional and scientific staff. The RSP has nine full-time staff and provides pre-award, post-award, IRB, and research ethics services to the entire campus.

Scholar Connexus by the Numbers
Connexus has been refined each year since it was first offered in 2010. The most recent event, in October 2017, had 49 participants from 30 different departments, offices, and centers. There were about 190 matched conversations, plus the informal networking during breaks - overall several hundred opportunities for people to exchange ideas, get excited about their own and others’ research, and explore potential collaborations! So how do we make it happen?

Recruitment
Participation is solicited through emails, signage, and personal invitations, with particular outreach to new faculty. When registering through a website form, participants are asked what interests they want to share and what interests or expertise they are seeking, as well as general topics they would like to discuss (e.g., grant writing). They are also asked to submit a short bio to be shared with their conversation partners.
Some participants are recruited as Generalists whom we can easily match with many different people. The Generalists for the most recent Connexus were administrators, liaison librarians, the university’s intellectual property officer, a university attorney, a community engagement program coordinator, a proposal writer from the university’s foundation, and center directors with extensive proposal writing and research experience.

Making the Matches
Based on the interests they share, as well as institutional knowledge in our office, each participant is matched with four conversation partners. To visualize the matches, we create grids on poster-size paper, with the name of each participant written in the first column, and four additional columns to represent the conversation times. Each participant’s name is also written on four sticky notes, which can be moved around the grids as we make the matches. We do not match people in the same department, those who have existing collaborations, and those who have been matched with each other in the previous three years. Once the matches are made and double-checked on the posters, they are entered into an Excel spreadsheet, and exported into Word schedules for each participant.

In addition to research interests and areas of expertise, matches can be based on level of experience. There was a lot of positive feedback from new faculty about the opportunity to meet more experienced colleagues, while the established faculty and staff enjoyed learning about the exciting research ideas their new colleagues were bringing to campus.

At the Event
Connexus is held in a ballroom with space for individual tables for each conversation. Participants receive a folder with their schedule, a nametag, and the bios for each of their conversation partners. Tables are numbered and assigned for each conversation, so that people can easily find one another.

After brief opening remarks, participants begin the first of four 15-minute long, one-on-one conversations. There is an appetizer buffet and coffee across the hall, where people mingle during 10 to 15 minute breaks between scheduled conversations. Conversations are typically still going strong when time is called, and often extend into the breaks. The entire event lasts about two hours.

Because we assign conversation matches, last-minute absences could be stressful. Planning for the inevitable schedule changes helps us adapt smoothly. To provide flexibility, a couple of the Generalist participants are designated Stand-Ins and are not assigned matches until the event is in progress. Sponsored programs staff can also be a great choice to fill in. All staff at the event should have copies of the master match sheet, so that they can direct the participants and make adjustments as needed.

Survey Results
After the October 2017 Connexus, participants were invited to give feedback through a Qualtrics survey. Twenty-two people completed the survey, a 45% response rate.

Of the respondents, 82% agreed or strongly agreed that they met with people whose interests overlapped with their own, and 95% agreed or strongly agreed that they met with people they would not have had an opportunity to meet otherwise. Survey results also indicated that 91% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that Connexus encouraged the building of interdisciplinary relationships, and 100% agreed or strongly agreed that Connexus contributed to a campus environment of scholarly exchange, that they would recommend Connexus to new employees at UNI, and that RSP should continue to host the event. Additionally, 64% of respondents said they were moderately or extremely likely to follow up with any of the contacts they made, and 77% indicated that they would be interested in attending Connexus again.

One survey respondent commented: “Connexus is a phenomenal networking opportunity for new faculty and staff.” Another said: “This was the most beneficial event I have attended at UNI since I have been here in terms of my own personal growth and interests. It was great to meet people with similar interests and backgrounds and talk research … I especially appreciated the care that was taken to match me with people with whom I share interests. Thank you!”

Tips & Lessons Learned
Sponsored programs offices can customize a research conversation event to meet the needs and characteristics of their own campus. Even if you start with a smaller event, participation is likely to increase substantially the next time through word of mouth. Some variables to consider in planning:

- Number of participants
- Number and length of conversations and breaks
- Day and time that most faculty can attend
- Available venues and funds
- Matches made, or more informal networking
- Department, college, or university-wide

One lesson learned from our last Connexus was that we could have saved some effort in the matching process by asking participants about current collaborators when they registered. Also, requesting a bio at the time of registration made it more difficult to recruit participants; some people got to that question and stopped. Although it creates an extra step for sponsored programs staff, recruitment might be increased by requesting bios after registration. A reminder email to participants a few days before the event informing them that their partners have been selected minimizes the number of no-shows. Recruiting Generalists and Stand-Ins contributes greatly to the success of the matching and seamless flow at the event.

Conclusion
Hosting an event like UNI’s Scholar Connexus has many benefits for research development and for sponsored programs offices. As a hub for research activity on campus, research administrators can see connections and shared interests that investigators may not be aware of. By creating a space for these introductions and conversations, we can increase the institutional knowledge of research interests across campus, fostering interdisciplinary collaborations. These events are also an excellent way to elicit information on current faculty interests and to promote our services.

Would you like to create a greater sense of excitement, connection, and possibility around the research enterprise on your campus? A research conversation event might be your path to the gold.

Rebecca Rinehart is a Pre-award Specialist at the University of Northern Iowa. An enthusiastic newcomer to research administration, Rebecca previously worked in environmental public health and regulatory compliance, specifically drinking water treatment and hazardous site remediation. She can be reached at rebecca.rinehart@uni.edu
Have you ever felt overwhelmed by all of the rules and regulations in research administration that seem to change frequently? The purpose of this project was to create a community to meet the needs of the Research Administrators in the College of Engineering at Iowa State University.

**Background**

Iowa State University has quarterly meetings for Research Administrators, which are hosted by the pre-award and post-award Sponsored Programs (SP) offices. There are often up to 200 people at each meeting, the size of which diminishes the opportunity for conversation between the presenters and attendees.

In the College of Engineering, the Fiscal Officer holds monthly meetings with the Departmental Fiscal Officers. Some topics addressed in these meetings are related to sponsored research issues, but the meetings are not exclusively focused on SP issues. The Fiscal Officers who attend the meetings are not usually the same people as the Research Administrators for each Department/Center.

Three years ago, our situation was having (1) a SP-specific meeting which was too large and infrequently held to meet the learning and networking needs of our Research Administrators, and (2) an Engineering-specific meeting which was routinely held, but attended by non-SP staff and not SP focused.

**Methods**

The Engineering Research Administrators (ERA) group was initiated by the College’s Fiscal Officer, following requests from Departmental Research Administrators, with support from the Dean and Associate Dean for Research, and organized by two Engineering Administration staff members with SP experience and responsibilities.

From the beginning, it was determined that the meetings would be held monthly. Departmental SP staff members were identified and a survey was disseminated.
Survey Questions and Responses

- What are the three most important topics that you would like to have covered? A sample of the responses follows:
  - Allowable Expenses
  - Award Management
  - Cost Sharing
  - Effort Reporting
  - Financial Reporting
  - Internal Proposal Routing Form (Gold-Sheet)
  - Proposal Submission
  - Subcontracts

- Preference for session format (by number of votes)
  - Lecture & large group discussion (11)
  - Best Practices (11)
  - Case Study (8)
  - Guest Speakers (8)
  - Lecture & small group discussion (6)
  - Lecture only (0).

Topics were selected and assigned to monthly meetings for the Academic Year and Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) were invited as appropriate. In order to assure that participants felt like a team, we printed table tent-style name cards and opened each meeting with a getting-to-know-you question.

At the end of the year, another survey was developed, distributed, and evaluated as a tool for planning the coming year’s agenda items and to assess the strengths and weakness of the previous year’s program.

**Other Questions:** Where are the opportunities to improve your collaboration with others? What administrative support should we propose to start or stop doing? Are there policies that are difficult to follow? What can the College do to be more successful? How has the ERA group and meetings helped you with the following (increase information sharing on funding and who to call for help, reduction of GoldSheet revisions, simplified backup opportunities with each other to allow for turnover, vacation, sick leave, etc.)? How could we improve this experience for you?

Periodically, special meetings are scheduled to view NCURA videos, Excel webinars, and other training opportunities. Occasionally, a survey is distributed via Smartsheet to solicit interest in a topic and/or allow for sharing of anonymous questions with our SME guests.

**FINDINGS**

**Mentoring:** The ERA group has met for three years and the feedback continues to be positive. Early in this period, there was a lot of turnover and this forum allowed new employees the opportunity to meet their peers and get to know them while learning critical aspects of their jobs. Employee retention within ERA has stabilized somewhat, but this group continues to provide a stable peer/mentor group for all members who wish to participate.

In response to the most recent survey question regarding what is working well, one respondent said, "Just knowing who’s who, from seeing them..."

**FIGURE 1 – SAMPLE SURVEY RESPONSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was not a part of group last year - but it certainly looks like the organization of the ERA group is working well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing tips and best practices in the meetings, sharing documents in CyBox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating an open environment to exchange ideas and experiences is great!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing information and having open discussion dialogue amongst the grant coordinators in the different departments &amp; centers to continue to expand my knowledge, have refresher moments &amp; reminders and to learn new shortcuts and/or different ways of doing our job and assisting faculty with their proposals and sponsored projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The communication between grant coordinators has increased significantly, due to the ERA group, and having COE staff available for input has been quite beneficial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good variety of topics. It’s always nice to go back, get a refresher, and learn how other departments are handling different situations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 2 - AGENDA TOPICS FOR PREVIOUS YEARS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015-2016</th>
<th>Meetings will be held the first Thursday of the month, 9:30 – 11:00 a.m. in 3306 Elings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 5: Grants Hub</td>
<td>March 3: <strong>cancelled</strong> April 7: Cost Share May 5: Excel Tips, GoldSheets, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2: Tuition &amp; Grad Students July – no meeting August 4: Purchasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016-2017</th>
<th>Meetings will be held the third Thursday of the month, 9:30 – 11:00 a.m. in 3306 Elings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 15: Post Award Standard Operating Procedure – review, discuss, &amp; update July – no meeting August 17: Records Retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meetings: The ERA monthly agendas have included a broad range of topics. SME’s have been invited to attend the meetings 2-3 times per year. They are invited to join the conversation, not to bring a presentation. A measure of our success occurred when I was approached by a Central SP office staff member about attending our meeting routinely, the decision was mutually made (between the ERA members, the SP member, and myself) that it would be ok to attend once per quarter, with prior notice to the ERA membership. We’re so glad to have their interest and participation in our team.

Resources: As a group, we have developed a Reference Manual in OneNote, which is continually updated. The ERA Reference Manual is shared with all ERA members via a cloud drive, which allows all users to search for information and edit the contents as necessary. Our goal is to make it the first place to go for answers to your SP questions. When possible, we link via URL to the official location for information so that we don’t have expired information in our manual. However, sometimes we will include a file or an email that can’t be found through a website. This has become an invaluable resource for new and experienced ERA members.

Learning/Training: Throughout the year, we have been able to offer much needed learning/training opportunities to the ERA members, at no cost to the Departments. The primary opportunities have been via SME’s at the monthly meetings. Additional opportunities (not at the monthly meeting) have included webinars viewed as a group. The College paid the fee for the only webinar that wasn’t free.

“It’s important to have the continuity and strong commitment from at least one person...”

Communication: An advantage to creating the ERA group is that we now have a simplified way to communicate SP related issues with all Departments in the College. A group email address has been created and maintained in Outlook. In the most recent survey, 89% of the members indicated that the ERA group/meetings were “Somewhat Helpful” or “Very Helpful” for increasing information sharing.

Leadership: From the beginning, two people co-led the ERA group: One from Engineering Administration for financial expertise and one from the Research branch of the College for pre-award and SP specific expertise. It’s important to have the continuity and strong commitment from at least one person, but backup is essential. This leadership role is included in the job description for these positions, showing the College’s commitment to this group.

CONCLUSIONS
The ERA group has been a valuable tool for its members and the SP community with whom we interact. Based on feedback:
• ERA members are always positive regarding the benefits they receive,
• The internal proposal routing forms that are created by our members have increased in accuracy and timeliness due to opportunities to meet with and learn from the central pre-award office, and
• Members have been energized and supported by the teamwork that is done at the monthly meetings.

Diane M. Meyer, is a Project Management Specialist of the Engineering Research Institute at Iowa State University. She has been in sponsored programs for 19 years. She can be reached at meyerd@iastate.edu

Lisa Lajoie is a Grant Coordinator of Agriculture and Biosystems Engineering at Iowa State University. She can be reached at lalajoie@iastate.edu

Research Administration Memes
www.facebook.com
ResearchAdministrationMemes
twitter.com/resadmmemes
Welcome to our new column where Executive Committee members will inform the membership of key issues discussed during the Board of Directors (“Board”) meetings. Our first Board meeting this year was held February 10-11, 2018 in New Orleans, LA. Highlights include the following:

- The Board reviewed NCURA’s Mission Statement, Core Purpose, and Values which is done on a routine basis. As a result of this exercise, members will see slightly revised language on the NCURA “About Us” webpage in the coming months.

- NCURA’s Envisioned Future for 2025 was originally developed by the Board in 2015 and included detailed goals, objectives, and strategies that would help NCURA reach the 2025 vision within 10 years. Each year, the Board reviews these in order to assess where we are now and what may need to be modified based on competing priorities and initiatives our organization encounters.

- The Professional Development Committee will be developing regional workshop offering guidance as well as exploring ways to identify and engage a wider membership pool of volunteers who have particular subject-matter expertise and can assist in programming needs.

- The Select Committee on Global Affairs has selected Andrea Mosher of Western Carolina University as the recipient of the INORMS Travel Award and Denise Clark of the University of Maryland, College Park as the recipient of the INORMS Award for Excellence in Research Management Leadership. Both awardees will travel to Edinburgh, United Kingdom in June 2018 to attend the INORMS Congress.

- As a result of the feedback provided in 2017 on the revised election process used by the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee (N&LDC) to conduct elections in 2017 (for 2018 officer positions), the Board reviewed the process which included both the original 2015 report on elections and the recommendations of the 2016 N&LDC to move to a one-candidate ballot. As outlined in then-President Barbara Gray’s Message in the NCURA Magazine (May/June 2017), there have been ongoing challenges in recruiting well-qualified candidates with significant leadership ability and knowledge of the organization to run for office. The N&LDC also received feedback about the onerous application process, some excellent leaders who lost a national election would not run again if asked, and participants of NCURA’s Executive Leadership Program, which prepares future NCURA leaders, indicated a reluctance to run for office because of perceived professional damage from public election loss.

Based on the feedback from the 2017 election, the Board recognized that the process must increase its transparency to the membership. Therefore, there will be a proposed change to the Bylaws that will specify that one candidate (versus “one or more”) for each officer position (Vice-President/President-Elect, Secretary, Treasurer-Elect) will be submitted to the membership for ratification (versus “election”). In accordance with the Bylaws, the proposed revision will be disseminated to the full membership, open for discussion at the Annual Business Meeting in August, and distributed for a vote subsequent to the meeting. If the Bylaw changes are approved by the membership, the Administrative Policies will be updated accordingly.

As current president Georgette Sakamoto stated during the Board meeting, “Change is always hard. Those of us who are entrusted with NCURA’s future, understand that we live in different times. What worked in 1959, 1998, or even 2008 does not work well in today’s reality. We, as a Board, are continually gathering information and learning about best practices for governance. We do this to ensure that NCURA is poised and prepared for its next generation of leaders.”

In order to be as transparent and available to our membership on an ongoing basis, we encourage our members to reach out to NCURA’s Executive Committee and/or Board of Directors with any questions or concerns at any time.

NCURA Executive Committee

President: Georgette Sakamoto, University of Hawaii
gsakumot@hawaii.edu

Vice President: Tony Ventimiglia, Auburn University
ventifa@auburn.edu

Treasurer: Shannon Sutton, Western Illinois University
sm-sutton@wiu.edu

Secretary: Denise Moody, Harvard University
denisemoodysfas.harvard.edu

Immediate Past President: Barbara Gray, East Carolina University
grayb@ecu.edu

Executive Director: Kathleen Larmett, National Council of University Research Administrators larmett@ncura.edu

Denise Moody serves as Secretary of NCURA and is the Senior Director of Research Compliance, Research Administration Services, Faculty of Arts at Harvard University. She can be reached at denisemoody@fas.harvard.edu
The relationships between research administrators and university attorneys are among the most important dimensions of university research management. This area will become even more important in the coming years as research management continues to become more legalistic. Thus, improving relationships and discrete interactions are critical. But first, consider these questions within your university context: What is the quality of the interaction? What is the frequency of the interaction? Equally important in considering this issue is the differing size and nature of universities—private, public, research intensive, emerging research institution, large, small, etc. I advocate for a structure and process that works best for your institution.

Contracting and regulatory compliance are two areas where research administrators and university attorneys routinely interact. In addition to standard interactions, you must add new and emerging issues, such as the European Union’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) which will be enforced beginning 25 May 2018.

Immediately below I share observations and suggestions gleaned from over twenty years as a research administrator and attorney. These observations are designed to facilitate a more strategic, productive, and positive relationship. Hopefully, these steps will lead to greater support for faculty and staff conducting sponsored research.

Here are the observations and suggestions:

• What is the research culture at your institution? Is it one of facilitation, or one of control? This is a threshold question that reflects the past and present—though not necessarily the future of your institution.

• A thorough understanding of the historical relationship at your institution between research administrators and university attorneys is necessary. Obviously, this is to ensure that optimal working relationships and patterns are continued and, in the case of suboptimal experiences, not repeated. My experience over two decades has run the entire continuum.

• Structure and process for how the two areas (Sponsored Research and General Counsel) interact should be clearly delineated. That topic alone is complex and merits a separate article. An arrangement that is uncertain and opaque will make an optimal relationship difficult to achieve.

• Work with your counterpart to ascertain areas where improvements are necessary. Review the historical “division of labor” if your institution has operated in that fashion. For instance, at some universities different contract types are exclusively handled in legal. Is that still the best idea in terms of minimizing institutional risk and facilitating sponsored research at your institution?

• Schedule periodic meetings with your legal counterparts to ensure that the relationship has minimal pressure points and remains one of active engagement.

• Work with your legal colleagues to co–present to the university community on issues of mutual concern. Contracting and regulatory compliance are two of the most logical areas. In my experience, co–presented events by sponsored research and legal are the most powerful ways to build lasting positive and productive relationships between the offices.

• Avoid lawyer jokes whenever possible, even though that are meant in a humorous way. There is no way to tell with certainty that they will not offend your legal colleagues. Equal respect between the offices is necessary, and I know first hand that research administrators and lawyers have robust senses of humor.

Conclusion
One of the most important relationships in research administration is that between research administrators and university attorneys. Both areas are service units to the faculty, administrative leadership, and academic leadership. University attorneys provide legal advice, but the policy and business decisions are made by senior administrative and academic leaders. With proper planning, constant communication, and fair/equitable dealings, research administrators and university attorneys may have a productive and pleasant partnership. Disagreements do happen, but the above steps should minimize them so that they are the exception and not the rule. Make strong professional relationships between your university research administrators and attorneys a key goal for 2018.

James Casey is a global R&D advisor and transaction attorney based in Washington, D.C. He focuses on transactions and contracts, research development, international research, IP, compliance, and the intersection of law + research management. He is a member of the U.S. Supreme Court Bar and the Wisconsin Bar, and currently serves as a State Bar of Wisconsin delegate to the ABA House of Delegates. His extensive NCURA service includes inaugural Senior Editor of the NCURA Magazine, Editor of the Research Management Review, Chair of the International Neighborhood, and two terms on the board of directors. James has received the NCURA Distinguished Service Award and is a Life Fellow of the Wisconsin Law Foundation. He may be reached at lawrev@hotmail.com
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Creating an effective team can be challenging regardless of an institution’s size and operations model. Predominately Undergraduate Institutions (PUIs) come with team building challenges, but the same principles apply. When creating a new team, or even streamlining an existing one, consider a simplified approach by taking a lesson from the average basketball coach.

**Define the Goal.** A basketball coach knows the object of the game is to score as many points as possible by getting the ball into the basket. All other strategies employed to assign team roles, design plays, and communicate during the game are in pursuit of scoring more points than the other team. Similarly, one of the most crucial factors for building an effective team in the business world is knowing the goal. Myriad articles across professions and disciplines discuss this universal importance. Put concisely, “The most distinguishing characteristic of a team is collective vision towards the accomplishment of goals” (Kumar and Adhish, 2014, p. 208). Setting goals is especially important for research administrators because with varying institution sizes and structures, knowing your team’s responsibilities and how those outcomes are measured is key to determining effectiveness.

Research administrators at PUIs may find goal setting overwhelming because they tend to have a wider range of responsibilities than those at larger graduate and research focused institutions. In even the smallest institution, defining goals should still be the first step toward creating team structure and processes, and could arguably be more important in this case. Consider the _one-stop shop_ administrator at a small institution who leads most, if not all, grant processes for both pre- and post-award. Specific goals are crucial to knowing team makeup. For example, two pre-award goals could be to cultivate proposal development by offering grant writing assistance and application assembly. Knowing these goals tells the administrator that team members should include at a minimum the faculty PI, an individual who can draft or assist in editing the research strategy or like component, and someone who will assemble the proposal for submission. The writer/reviewer and the application preparer could be one person at a PUI, but stating the goals gives the team leader a base for identifying key players and roles.
Identify & Analyze Team Members. It’s important to note you can’t take steps to make your team more effective without considering the team’s composition. One recent article notes team composition is the starting point for building a high-performing team (Keller & Meaney, 2017). Ask the following questions: Who are or who should be the key players on your team? What do they do best? How do their skill sets fit into what needs to be accomplished? And how can their skills enhance your team’s effectiveness?

A good coach learns which players are best suited for specific positions. This helps them assign roles and learn who needs more practice in some areas. They probably don’t want the tallest and slowest player posted up at point guard. Instead, that player with longer arms and a dominating presence has skills perfect for playing center and controlling under the basket. Find out what strengths your team members have, and consider reassigning some responsibilities accordingly. Analyzing and considering minor or even major reassignments can be tricky if you’re working with a team that is already in place, but is essential for building a new team or reorganizing operations. Team member analysis is beneficial even when reorganization is not the intent. You can identify areas where members could use additional training and gather details to help design better processes and communication strategies.

“...defining goals should still be the first step toward creating team structure and processes...”

For the small PUI administrator, team members might not be neatly contained in an individual grants office or department, but instead could be spread across major units such as the development office, accounting, and academic affairs. Players could be at both the institution and department level, while working to reach pre- or post-award goals. This is the case at Texas Lutheran University (TLU) where in lieu of a central office of sponsored programs, we’ve taken a cross-departmental team approach for pre-award actions. Key members include: The Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, Finance, and Development, the Director of Academic Grants, the Director of Corporate and Foundation Relations from the Development Office, and the Controller and Grant Analyst both representing Financial Services. TLU identified these team members after outlining institutional goals related to the pursuit of grants. Taking this a step further, two underlying goals are to ensure faculty perspective is present in decisions about grants development and communication lines remain open between faculty and grant-related administrators. The Director of Academic Grants is an appointed Faculty member who serves as the liaison between faculty researchers and the other grant team members. This helps shrink the ubiquitous faculty-administration communication gap. Everyone stays in the loop regarding faculty interests that could lead to future proposals and during active proposal submissions. In this PUI team example, identifying members and analyzing strengths didn’t come from the viewpoint of a supervisor evaluating a subordinate. Instead, TLU considered how individuals’ primary positions fit into the picture for pre-award goals, and worked to define the development process from there.

Define Processes. Once you know the goals and identify team composition, define processes and responsibilities. This could be as simple as clarifying individual roles if you have a process already in
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place. Much in the same way a coach has some go-to plays, you might already know your workflow and processes and simply need to more clearly define who is responsible for what step of the process. This means it’s time to formalize your “plays” by outlining your process.

Defined processes, or workflows, are the business equivalent to basketball plays, and are essential to be effective. They serve multiple purposes. Made available on a website, workflows provide a roadmap for both the team members and the people you serve. They can also help identify trouble areas within the process during evaluation, and be a powerful tool in transitioning from a paper-based office to electronic operations. Outlining a workflow and assigning roles in each step makes not only the entire plan clear, but also illuminates who should be communicating with whom at various stages.

It’s worth noting that your team could have multiple workflows depending on the purpose or goals. In basketball, scoring the most points by the time the final buzzer sounds could be achieved through reaching small goals along the way. For example, a coach could ask the team to execute a play designed to get a specific player open to shoot, or they might utilize a play designed to run more time off the clock once the team has a substantial lead. Regardless of the play, the team members involved know their role and how that fits into the entire play. Similarly, your team members will need to know what different processes apply for achieving different goals when applicable, and which step is their responsibility.

**Execute and Evaluate Enlisting the “Three Cs.”** After you identify team members and outline processes, executing the tasks can be easier said than done. Continual evaluation will help determine if the team is operating effectively, or if updated processes or other adjustments are needed. Communication, collaboration and cohesion are all necessary components for creating a team environment (Lejeck 2017).

The three Cs also provide the framework for evaluation. Is your team reaching its goals? If not, is this due to a breakdown in any of the three Cs? Is there a flaw in the process itself, or is it a matter of practice makes perfect? Having followed the basics of team building, you can measure effectiveness taking a more in-depth look at goals, team members and processes, being mindful of communication, collaboration and cohesion.

In short, keep the following tips in mind as you build or reorganize a team: Define specific goals, identify and analyze appropriate team members, define processes, and evaluate once you execute. Simplify the approach, and increase your team’s potential for reaching the championship of effectiveness.

**References**


Sunny Thompson, CRA, is a Grant Analyst at Texas Lutheran University with previous experience at both UT Health San Antonio and Arizona State University. Her current responsibilities are focused on post-award management as well as grant-related process and policy development for the institution. She can be reached at stthomsp@tlu.edu
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**Check out the latest articles from NCURA’s online scholarly journal**

**Research Management Review**

**Volume 22, Number 1**

- It Takes an Eco-System: A Review of the Research Administration Technology Landscape
- A Measure of Excellence of Young European Research Council Grantees
- Research Strategies for Academic Medical Centers: A Framework for Advancements toward Translational Excellence
- Collaboration in Action: Measuring and Improving Contracting Performance in the University of California Contracting Network
- Research Administrative Burden: A Qualitative Study of Local Variations and Relational Effects
- Academic-Corporate Engagement: Strategic and Organizational Best Practices
- Faculty Member Perceptions of Facilities and Administrative Costs for Sponsored Research at Historically Black Colleges and Universities in Louisiana

Available at [www.ncura.edu/PublicationsStore/ResearchManagementReview](http://www.ncura.edu/PublicationsStore/ResearchManagementReview)
NCURA's past president Robert Killoren Jr. passed away on February 25, 2018. He was 67. Bob was an active member of NCURA joining the organization in 1976. He was a writer and poet by training. He had a distinguished career spanning forty years beginning at the University of Missouri - St. Louis, a long tenure at Penn State and then Ohio State as associate vice president for research. Bob retired in 2013. Over the years he served NCURA in a multitude of capacities including Region II (Mid-Atlantic) chair, Research Management Review editor, moderator for several NCURATV programs, panelist and moderator for countless regional and national conferences, chair of the NCURA Senior Research Leadership Summit (2008) and as president (2003). In 2007 he was the recipient of the NCURA Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration award.

In addition to NCURA Bob was a pivotal contributor to the profession and other organizations including the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR), Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP), Research Administrators Certification Council (RAAC), Society of Research Administrators International (SRAI) and the University Industry Demonstration Partnership (UIDP). NCURA Executive Director Kathleen Larmett shared

Bob Killoren impressed me on many levels. His dedication to the research community and to NCURA are unsurpassed. He was the first NCURA president to really push us to connect with our colleagues outside the United States. Always mindful of the importance of the government-university partnership, Bob brought forward his idea of a yearly NCURA award (the Joseph F. Carrabino Award) to acknowledge outstanding contributions made by federal employees to foster and maintain these relationships. He also had vision when it came to developing relationships between the university and industrial community and launched what is, today, the University Industry Demonstration Partnership (UIDP). A man who could be inspirational one moment and hilarious the next, Bob never hesitated to share his expertise with others and was often the first person to reach out to someone in need. Bob had an unwavering determination to do the right thing and he did so, with humility.

As a gifted writer, teacher and leader he helped advocate and advance the profession of research administration. Long-time friend and Penn State colleague John Hanold shared

Bob Killoren was a hoarder of ideas, words, and artifacts. He spent two weeks cleaning out his desk before leaving Penn State, but that really, only scratched the surface. After he left, I was faced with the unenviable task of cleaning out his remaining files. I found things that no one was meant to ever see: angry diatribes, crumpled up and tossed in the corner of a desk drawer, never to be sent. I also found a lovely, leather bound volume of hand-written poems. Apparently, when the trials of the profession became too much for Bob, he just shut his door and wrote a poem! I shredded the diatribes, boxed up the poems and a few photographs, and mailed them to Bob’s new home. I kind of wish I had kept the poems. I miss Bob terribly, even more so now that I know that I’m never going to hear from him again. But I still have one of his poems, which I’ve kept on my desk for many years now, entitled “Ode to a Stanford Yacht.” Sail in peace, Bob!

The final verse (of five):

The world will never be the same,
Now Stanford’s boat shares Charon’s fame.
O, bow did Stanford play such a fool
To sail a boat on an indirect pool.

Beyond his vast career accomplishments, Bob a deacon, a musician, and a devoted family man. Most importantly, he was a kind and humble man always willing to help others. He touched the lives of so many and was admired in the academic community and elsewhere.

In lieu of flowers, memorial contributions can be made to Catholic Relief Services at www.crs.org
Research Administrators need to be familiar with a myriad of regulations...

Regulation and Compliance:
A Compendium of Regulations and Certifications Applicable to Sponsored Programs

NCURA's comprehensive resource of all the relevant regulations for grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts.

This vital reference distills more than 100 Federal Requirements to help you keep your institution and faculty in compliance. Over 200 pages of important information in an easy to use format that will save countless hours of research.

Chapters include:
- Regulatory Framework
- Antidiscrimination
- Privacy
- Open Government Regulations
- Protection of Living Things
- Safety and Security
- Data and Dissemination
- Employee Directives
- Fraud, Waste and Abuse
- Administrative Requirements Applicable to All Awards

NEWLY UPDATED AND IMPROVED ~ GET YOUR COPIES TODAY!
www.ncura.edu/PublicationsStore.aspx
I promised myself that when I became the boss of our Pre-Award Office that I would lead people by being positive and assertive. On my last performance review, my boss told me that he’s gotten complaints that I’m too bossy. That hurt me. He told me to try to coach people rather than tell them what to do. Ok, so, how do I coach people?

I can help you with your good question. But, first, a minor “rant”: Sometimes I think that there is too much mystery around coaching. When I tell friends these days that I am an executive coach, I think they make many assumptions about what that means. In my next life, maybe I’ll have a job title that is more easily understandable.

So, while trying to answer your question, I’ll try to describe a bit more about what coaching is.

Your question provides fertile ground for a coach to ask you many questions, such as, what was important about the promise that you made to yourself? How did your promise rise to such a significant level in your list of personal aspirations and values? What was your reaction to your boss’s comment—in your brain and in your heart? Does the comment make sense to you in any way? How so? In what ways not so much? Do you somehow feel that you let yourself down? Have you let anyone else down? What would you like to achieve? We might try to reframe your boss’s comments: We don’t know, for example: was the rest of your performance review generally positive? What about your leadership style and approach is working well? What challenges did you note? What would you like to happen? I believe a conversation like this (a coaching conversation) can be healthy and forward moving.

I am going to offer you a couple of basic coaching questions to ask your staff and team members in your daily work. My hope is that this helps you build some new coaching skills and muscles. (No, I don’t do that kind of coaching.) We are going to start small and easy for you to build your confidence as a leader-coach. The hyphenation is intentional. Think of yourself as both a leader and a coach. Starting now.

Here are your magic, go-to coaching questions:

• What are you learning from this?
• What do you suggest you do?
• What do you like about this?
• What is standing in your way?
• How will you know if you’ve been successful?

I chose these five questions for several reasons. They can apply to a range of one-on-one situations. They are short, easy to remember, and provide the person you are asking plenty of room to do their own thinking and reflection. This last part is very important. When your boss suggested that you’re too bossy, it may be that this shows up in how people take responsibility for their own work, whether they come up with their own solutions to problems, whether they feel empowered to act and trust themselves to do the right thing. It may mean that they need more room to develop themselves, their confidence, and their sense of self-worth and efficacy. This is big stuff. Paraphrasing Boz Scaggs, the sad old truth, the dirty low down is that no one wants to work for a bossy boss. People want to work for someone who has good ideas and believes in the organization’s mission, who knows what is important about its past, present, and future. They want to work for someone who is competent, who knows what the organization does and what its key transactions and services are. Most of all, they want to work for someone who is aware of others. I assume that you do a lot of this in your role and that you are succeeding more often than not (Note: coaches take a positive view of their clients’ skills and abilities and potential.)

I always like this quote from Maya Angelou: “I’ve learned that people will forget what you said, people will forget what you did, but people will never forget how you made them feel.”

These five questions are also ones that you could practice almost every day, given the nature of research administration and the number of situations that we handle. Think of how you could ask these questions if a staff member comes to you about a sponsored agreement, an at-risk account, an inter-departmental squabble between administrators and functions, schools, colleges, etc. These are great brainstorming questions to help people solve their own problems, negotiate solutions. Try these questions before offering your own solutions.

You won’t use all five of these questions at once, of course, for every leadership situation you encounter. But, you will likely use one of these for almost everyone you face.

Ok, that’s all there is to coaching, right? Not so fast. Once you have asked questions, the real coaching skill comes into play. It’s a six-letter word starting with L: LISTEN.

So, here’s another list of questions for you:

• What did this person just tell me?
• Could I repeat back to them a gist of what they said?
• What do I sense that this person believes is the most important aspect of this situation/challenge/issue?
• How did this person seem to me—happy, sad, content, angry, mistrustful, etc.?
• What meaning do I draw from what I observe?
• What has this person not said?

This list is shorter, but it is vital. If you can answer these questions, then it is very likely that you demonstrated good non-verbal communication: looking at the person, paying attention to them and not your electronics or to what you plan to say next!

Bottom line for a Leader-Coach: Ask good questions. Listen well. Be assertive and empathetic.

Garry Sanders is an executive coach and graduate of Georgetown University’s Certificate Program in Leadership Coaching. Garry is a long-time research administrator and recipient of NCURA’s Distinguished Service Award. He can be reached at gsanders@assistleadership.com and (518) 588-0992.
ast week, I hosted a colleague from another university undertaking a professional qualification in research management. He wanted to talk about how a central research strategy is actually implemented on the ground. It’s something we all grapple with: how can we turn brave, aspirational words into actions and results? Should we put in place targets? How much control - or even influence - do we have over the work of our academics and researchers?

I was hoping I would learn as much from him as he would from me. I always enjoy talking to those doing similar work at other universities. It gives me the chance to think deeply about what we do, to question our focus, and to learn about what works elsewhere.

The question of how we adhere to and implement the University’s strategy is a very important one. The strategy should, after all, tell us where we are going and give us an idea of how the University wants us to get there.

Well, up to a point. Kent’s University Plan (University of Kent, 2015) sets out a raft of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), but the Research and Innovation Strategy only has the broadest suggestions of how these should be fulfilled.

‘This strategy provides a framework for Faculty and School strategies and for personal academic plans,’ it states. ‘The action points need to be interpreted.’ It does, however, provide ‘a framework for planning in Research Services, Kent Innovation and Enterprise, and the Graduate School.’

This is both a challenge and an opportunity. The Strategy provides a framework for us, but it is really down to the faculties and schools to decide how to implement it. Our role is to support, develop and encourage individuals towards the goals set out through the KPIs.

Thus, we have relatively little power, but a good deal of freedom, and for me this is a real opportunity. Research Services should be a champion and a facilitator of research. Its role is not to wield a stick. Instead, we should get alongside the academics and support them in their endeavours. We should not set targets, but instead encourage behaviours that will ensure that the KPIs set out in the University Plan are met.

How does this work in practice? I took my cue from the 2017 Nobel laureate Professor Richard Thaler (Chicago) and his colleague Professor Cass Sunstein (Harvard Law School). Their 2008 book Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth and Happiness (Yale University Press, 2008) was a counterintuitive take on the behavioural psychology that underlies the apparently rational choices we make.

‘Nudge’, explained Thaler and Sunstein, ‘is any aspect of the choice architecture that alters people’s behaviour in a predictable way without forbidding any options or significantly changing their economic incentives. To count as a mere nudge, the intervention must..."
be easy and cheap to avoid. Nudges are not mandates. Putting fruit at eye level counts as a nudge. Banning junk food does not.

Such easy, cheap - and avoidable - interventions go against a lot of modern university management, which is often based around mandatory individual targets. However, these can have a serious effect on the wellbeing of individuals as well as a corrosive effect on morale more broadly.

An academic at Queen’s University Belfast was recently quoted in *Times Higher Education* as saying that ‘research success is best served in a collegial environment with colleagues collaborating and encouraging each other...setting unreasonable and crude income targets that individuals must meet creates an atmosphere of competition and fear that will be counterproductive and very difficult to overcome.’ (Havergal, 2015).

I believe that the ‘soft paternalism’ of Thaler and Sunstein’s *Nudge* offers a real alternative to income targets, competition, and fear. Soft paternalism is something I have been trying to put into practice at Kent in two ways: increasing the visibility of achievements and success, and putting in place support for those wishing to emulate it.

Thus, to increase visibility I have made sure that our termly newsletter includes details of all those who have received a grant, regardless of size. This is both a recognition of success but also a nudge for those who hadn’t thought about applying, or didn’t even realise it was possible to be successful in their discipline or at their career stage.

I supplement this with more detailed interviews with those investigators who have had a succession of grants and can speak about the benefits that funding has had for them and their careers.

At the same time I instigated a Research Prizes scheme, to recognise those who have performed exceptionally well. It’s a chance to celebrate their achievements and to nudge colleagues into questioning their own. The winners are featured on the University’s website and on posters around the campus.

Leading on from this we try to make it as easy as possible for those who have been nudged to get the support necessary for their own work. We offer informal training through the Grants Factory programme, and advice through the Early Career Researcher Network. In addition, we have in place an internal peer review system through which anyone can get specific feedback on their proposals from colleagues who have reviewed and prioritised hundreds of applications for external funding bodies.

To me, the majority of academics are hardworking and passionate about their work, and want to do all that they can to make it happen. They don’t need individual targets. Rather we should use the freedom we’ve been gifted to change the environmental nudges, to raise awareness and provide support. I hope that in time the culture of research funding will have shifted to such a degree that applying for - and getting - grants will be the expectation rather than the ambition.

References


**Phil Ward** is Deputy Director of Research Services at the University of Kent. He previously worked at the Arts and Humanities Research Council. He writes an award-winning blog, Research Fundamentals [http://fundamental.blogspot.co.uk](http://fundamental.blogspot.co.uk) questioning and satirising research funding. He tweets as @frootle and can be reached at p.ward@kent.ac.uk
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**NOTABLE PRACTICES**

**Going for the “Gold” Standard**

NCURA standards are often thought of the “gold” standard for effective sponsored program operations. Effective sponsored research operations build efficient sponsored programs processes and proactively create connectivity between sponsored programs operations and other offices on campuses. NCURA Peer Reviewers have seen notable practices in building connectivity of sponsored research across their institutions. These practices include:

- Some sponsored programs offices have standing monthly (or quarterly) meetings with key offices important to the research enterprise, such as General Counsel, Human Resources, Procurement, Environmental Health & Safety, Research Integrity or Compliance.
- Sponsored programs offices can participate in regional academic accreditation visits and as part of an institutional accreditation team meet and work on a team project with varying offices.
- Some offices develop formal education programs on the role of sponsored programs for those in other offices interested in learning more about the sponsored programs functions. (This builds relationships and may create a potential internal pool of applicants for entry-level positions).
- Some offices hold informal Open Houses, while others take their “show on the road” to discuss sponsored research at other administrative staff offices.
- Effective offices also take opportunities to connect with internal marketing and communication professionals to ensure successes are shared and other offices are aware of the impact of sponsored programs.

NCURA Peer Reviewers have found that proactive offices seeking to promote regular, formal and/or informal communication are better integrated and less siloed than other administrative peers.

**Kris Monahan, Ph.D.,** is chair of the Select Committee on Peer Review. She has participated in peer reviews and has more than 16 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 amount of time that faculty spend on conducting their research directly affects the cost and time to produce results. The more time spent on administrative activities related to research means less time spent on the research itself, thus adding to the cost and time of a research project. With the goal of quantifying the amount of time spent on administrative tasks associated with federally sponsored research and identifying areas of administrative responsibility that can be streamlined, the Federal Demonstration Partnership is conducting its third Faculty Workload Survey.

The first survey, administered in 2005, showed that approximately 42% of a researcher’s time was spent on administrative activities while conducting federally sponsored research. The 2012 survey with over 13,000 responses, more than double the responses of the first survey, showed an unchanged mark of 42% of time spent on administrative activities. While the total amount remained the same, the areas where this burden was placed had shifted somewhat.

The results of these surveys have been widely used by other organizations to inform their investigations into the productivity in the American research enterprise and in developing recommendations for maximizing the return on the federal investment in research. The National Academies Committee on Federal Research Regulations and Reporting Requirements and the National Science Board Task Force on Administrative Burdens are two examples. Dr. Susan Sedwick, UT-Austin, in her 2014 congressional testimony, cited many of the results of the surveys, as did Jim Luther, Duke University, in his congressional testimony in 2016.

The 2018 Faculty Workload Survey will be conducted from mid-February through late March, and will build on the success of the first two surveys. The survey has been designed to capture information in new areas to shed more light on areas that can be improved, while also allowing direct comparisons to the previous surveys. There are 106 participating institutions and over 53,000 invitations being sent to prospective faculty participants. The results of this survey will drive many of the initiatives of the FDP in the rest of Phase VI and into Phase VII. You can download the reports from the first two surveys from the Faculty Committee page on the FDP web site at sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/fdp/PGA_055749.

David Wright is currently the Executive Director of the Federal Demonstration Partnership and has been involved in research administration for over twenty years. Prior to this he has worked at the institutional level as well as for the federal government. He can be reached at DWright@nas.edu
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outsourcing technical work to technical experts and researchers within organizations both public and private is a common practice. In part, this practice has developed out of necessity. As research regulatory requirements imposed by sponsors increase the data security standards, universities and research centers find themselves unable to keep pace with the necessary expertise without increased resources. Additionally, there is a greater dependency on networks, information systems and computing environments that are secure and reliable. That dependency has also been shadowed by a perceived need for easy access and the vulnerabilities introduced by ease of access supported by lax Governance, Engineering, Assessment of risks and Risk management. Many organizations across all industries have learned the hard way that the risk of doing business is not always at an acceptable level if they are relying on computing environments, information systems and networks that are easily vulnerable to either internal and external threats.

From the outside we observe, amazed by data breaches at Equifax, the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, Target, Yahoo, Home Depot, Deloitte, Verizon, and Uber. Many wonder: how does this happen in a current day, digital business ecosystem that knows it is under cyber surveillance and attack every moment of the day? Wouldn’t they spend thousands if not millions of dollars to buy the latest security technologies and tools to protect themselves from this type of warfare? Is higher education also a target of cyber-attacks? Yes indeed; of the worst U.S. data breaches reported in 2017, universities and academic medical campuses are among them.

So, what can you do to protect your systems and data? There is a four-point plan and methodology that any organization can execute without jumping the gun to spend thousands, if not millions, on less effective security technologies. These risk management best practices reduce vulnerabilities in people, process and technology by revamping their governance standards, engineering process, assessment capabilities and risk management program to deliver compliance and establish a strong, resilient and secure computing environment with ease of access designed for the right people, with the appropriate access.

**Cyber Risk Management Governance:** Revamp your Risk Management Policy, Process, People, and Procedures.

Cyber Risk Management Governance (CRMG) creates the bedrock and foundation for proper cyber hygiene across your enterprise and throughout the system and data lifecycle. Cyber risk management in concert with IT security management and its underlying security architecture is about more than just implementing a checklist of IT compliance controls or regulatory requirements—CRMG is the managing force of cyber risks thus continuously protecting business operations by establishing and maintaining an acceptable level of risk. Instituting a cyber-risk management practice within your organization will enable a greater degree of separation of duties that is called for under U.S. Government standards and generate a serious reduction in conflicts of interest by separating cyber risk management from the IT and IT security structure. This standard of practice places the cyber risk executive, risk engineer and risk assessor under the enterprise risk management (ERM) structure to create the checks and balances needed. The best guides to use when planning, designing or revamping your cyber risk and IT security governance are the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Special Publications 800-39 and 800-53. These standards were created by U.S. government sponsored taskforces with input and expertise from the technology industry, academia, business and government entities. The foundation of NIST SP 800-39 and 800-53 are also based on International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 31000, ISO 27001, and ISO 15408. These standards are time tested “gold standards” of cyber risk management, security and privacy governance. Best of all, they are FREE. NIST research and special publications such as these are paid for by the U.S. taxpayer.
**Risk Engineering and Systems Security Engineering:**
Secure Applications and providing a Secure Systems Design Life Cycle (Secure SDLC).

According to a study published by Carnegie Mellon University, the importance of risk and requirements engineering is vital to reducing risks from the start of the Secure SDLC (Mead, 2006). There is no surprise that application and systems engineering is critical to the success of any project, large or small. Some studies have shown that engineering defects cost 10 to 200 times as much to correct once the project is fielded than if they were detected during planning and requirements analysis phases. The best guides to use when planning, designing or revamping your Secure SDLC and Application Development Lifecycle are the NIST Special Publications 800-70, 800-128, 800-160, and the federal Application Security and Development Security Technical Implementation Guide (STIG).

**Assessing Risk throughout the SDLC:** From the System Concept, Planning, Analysis, Design, Test, Implementation, Production, Maintenance and Decommission at end of life. Risk assessments of system designs, component configurations, vulnerabilities and implementing continuous risk monitoring is a duty that complements the active defenses and security tools managed by IT Security Operations. The best guides to use when planning, designing or revamping your risk assessment processes are the NIST Special Publications 800-53A, 800-70, 800-84, 800-115, 800-137, and applicable federal STIG and Security Requirements Guides.

**The Risk Management Framework:** How to manage the gaps in IT security design and configuration in order to identify or stop security breaches before they lead to data breaches!

The Risk Management Framework (RMF) includes a disciplined, structured, and flexible process for organizational asset valuation; security and privacy control selection, implementation, and assessment; system and control authorizations; and continuous monitoring. It also includes enterprise-level activities to help better prepare organizations to execute the RMF at the system level. The RMF promotes the concept of near real-time risk management and ongoing system authorization through the implementation of continuous monitoring processes; it provides senior leaders and executives with the necessary information to make cost-effective risk management decisions about the systems supporting their missions and business functions. The best guides to use when planning, designing or revamping your RMF are the NIST Special Publications 800-37 and 800-39.
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NCURA Magazine is seeking applicants for the position of Senior Editor. The Senior Editor helps steer the overall direction of our premier publication. The position works closely with the Managing Editor and Co-Editors in the development and execution of thematic issues, ensuring the timely release of six issues per year, and is responsible for bringing in outside feature articles.

The volunteer position begins summer of 2018. 2018 will be an onboarding period primarily shadowing and working closely with the current Senior Editor and Managing Editor, followed by two years (2019-2020) serving as Senior Editor.

Applicants should be experienced senior research administrators with strong writing and editing skills, a history of NCURA volunteerism, and strong connections within NCURA as well as affiliated organizations (such as COGR, FDP, NORDP, SRA, etc.).

If you have questions regarding the position contact Managing Editor Marc Schiffman at schiffman@ncura.edu or 202-466-3894.
In the October/November 2016 issue of NCURA Magazine, I co-authored an article with my colleague Tony Ventimiglia entitled “Facilitating Faculty Collaborations: Two View Points.” In this article I shared what the School of Public Health (SPH) at the University of North Texas Health Science Center (UNTHSC) at Fort Worth is doing to encourage collaborations and boost proposal submissions. In this article I will share an update and progress we have made at the SPH UNTHSC.

In the fall of 2016, we formed the Dean’s Research Workshop. These are biweekly sessions for non-tenured and tenure track faculty in the SPH with mandatory participation. The purpose is to provide support and guidance to faculty in regard to preparing grant applications. At each meeting, one faculty member makes a 20- to 30-minute presentation on a current grant proposal they are developing. The group then provides feedback. During the remainder of the meeting, each faculty member will provide a brief update on a concept or proposal they are developing.

We completed one year of the Dean’s Research Workshop and then took some time to reflect about what is going well and how we might improve it. We decided to hit the “refresh button” and beginning in September 2017, the name was changed to The WriteStuff (this is not a typo). We wanted the name to be unique and different.

Instead of asking faculty to volunteer, we assign them to a day to present. I also set up face-to-face meetings with faculty to find out what we could do to enhance the meetings. We then established presenter and participant guidance as follows:

**Presenter Guidance:**
- Plan to be on time.
- There is no expectation that presenters must use PowerPoint. Handouts may be a better approach. There is no expectation that ideas must be fully formed or that grant applications are complete. Half-formed ideas and applications in process are the focus of the WriteStuff.
- If PowerPoint is used, it should consist of no more than 8-10 slides.
- The Presentation should not be highly technical and it should focus on funding opportunities, not just on the science.
- Presenters should talk about half the time. Leave significant time for discussion and feedback.

**Participant Guidance:**
- Be present, not only physically but also mentally. Laptops and iPhones can both be distracting.
- Be encouraging. Provide constructive, useful feedback.
- Be on time. This is respectful to those presenting and maximizes time.
- Both on-campus and off-campus individuals with expertise who can provide valuable feedback can be invited to the WriteStuff, and their inclusion may be coordinated prior to the scheduled date.

As for providing a creative and inviting atmosphere, I shared the pictures of the Collaboration Corner from Auburn University with the Dean for the SPH. He liked it and supported some additional changes to our space. As you can see from these pictures it looks quite nice. Additionally, to make it a little more inviting, we provide water and light snacks during the WriteStuff.

Robyn Remotigue is Director, Research Services, School of Public Health at UNT Health Science Center, Fort Worth. She is a graduate of the 2012 NCURA ELP and 2010 NCURA LDL. She serves on the Education Scholarship Fund Select Committee, and workshop faculty for SPA II: Sponsored Projects Administration. She can be reached at Robyn.Remotigue@unthsc.edu
Scientists Going for the Gold

A Thank You Note to Scientists Who Took Great Risks for their Achievements

By Sue A. Kelch

We live in exciting times. Scientists are exploring the universe and bringing back fascinating results from other planets. New discoveries are made with conquering diseases and prolonging life. During these exciting times, it would seem that we should all be coming into work at a gallop; after all, we as research administrators play a significant role in fostering the science and witness the science as it unfolds before our very eyes.

Yet instead, we may get bogged down with the administrative burdens that come with supporting the science as we expertly and methodically negotiate proposal submissions, monitor award spending, and submit the reporting. Rather than embracing the excitement at the start of each day we may instead stare blankly into our coffee wondering if it has cooled off enough to sip.

Should you start to feel overwhelmed with the daily grueling administrative tasks, take a moment to step back and think about those who took great risks by circumventing personal safety for their own discoveries. Let’s take a look at three incredible stories.

We begin with a monumental achievement, landing on the moon.

In the spring of 1961 President, John F. Kennedy announced before a special joint session of Congress the dramatic and ambitious goal of sending an American safely to the moon before the end of the decade. Space exploration was a primary goal in order to maintain national security and to fulfill mankind’s unquenchable thirst for knowledge and fascination with the stars and our own moon (Garber, 2013).

If you’ve been to the National Air and Space Museum at the Smithsonian in Washington DC you will see Mercury Friendship 7 and how startlingly small it is. The size of the spacecraft meant that Mercury astronauts could not be taller than 5 feet, 11 inches. The astronauts joked that “you don’t get in, you get put in” (Paone, 2017).

Yet flights in these “small containers” laid the groundwork for the historical accomplishment of landing on the moon and over the course of history, brave astronauts and scientists have sacrificed much, even their lives. But this was not humankind’s first attempt at going on the moon.

Legend has it, that around 2000 BCE, an early Chinese scientist Wan Hoo, attempted to visit the moon. He designed a wicker chair fixed with 47 large rockets. These rockets were subsequently lit, but unfortunately after a few loud bangs and a thick eruption of smoke, it was revealed that the brave explorer had met his demise. Happily, there is a crater named Wan Hoo on the far side of the moon (Freeman, 2013).

Regardless if fact or fiction, this tale truly encompasses our fascination with our orbiting moon. We move on to the next story, and the scientists who took great risks by experimenting on themselves to treat or cure the human race of horrible diseases and maladies.
Many of us may not have experienced this crippling and potentially deadly infectious disease, but those who do remember recall the fear of how polio could not be contained. Polio is an easily transmittable disease, so there were often quarantines in hopes of stemming the spread. “Parents were instructed to keep their children . . . away from crowds. Bathing suits were locked away in closets, and nobody went to public pools” (Sokol, 1997).

Ultimately, Dr. Jonas Salk was credited with the discovery of the polio vaccine. But this discovery included Salk needing healthy human subjects, and he volunteered himself while recruiting his entire family for a vaccine trial (Garrison, 2001).

We end with a self-experiment that culminated with a Nobel Prize in 2005. Dr. Barry Marshall, an obscure Australian physician, felt that ulcers were a result of an infection and not due to psychological stress, as was the mainstream thought at the time. He suspected many ulcers were the result of an infection from bacterium known as *Helicobacter pylori* and the cure was antibiotics.

Seeing no easy way to test his hypothesis as the bacterium only affects primates, and given the ethical concerns of testing on humans, he decided to gulp a solution himself with the bacterium. He soon became ill and biopsied his own gut, proving the link between germs and ulcers (Freeman, 2013).

So while we recognize those who took risks to advance science, we understand that this type of self-experimentation is not advised or condoned, and touches on the unethical. However, these examples should still bring pause for the research administrator, although navigating through complex guidelines and compliance safeguards is time consuming, it is necessary to ensure safety and integrity.

And my advice to the research administrator who wants to self-experiment? Stick with testing how hot your coffee is.
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The 23rd Winter Olympics will have concluded, but at the time I am writing this article (January 2018), I am hoping for medals for the Japanese women speed-skating team. Japan formed a project team to target medals for them; to demonstrate its seriousness, it reinforced the players’ group performance and carried out hard training. In the 1,000 meters and Team Pursuit just before the Olympics, the Japanese female skate team surprised the world by breaking world records. In comparison, Japanese research universities are now struggling to enhance their research performance. Here, I discuss what is going on now to revive the stagnant Japanese research performance to achieve a future Gold medal.

Decline of Research Performance of Japanese Research Universities

The research performance of Japanese universities has been declining. For example, in the Times Higher Education World University Rankings, the only universities within the top 200 are the University of Tokyo and Kyoto University. The University of Tokyo had secured first place in the East Asia region for a long time, however, the National University of Singapore (NUS) has recently taken over the spot, which shook the Japanese media. Now, the University of Tokyo is far behind NUS. Also, the research paper citation index — the Field-Weighted Citation Impact (FWCI), of overall Japanese papers is below the global. The FWCI of the University of Tokyo is about 1.3, much lower than the world’s top-class university group. The Japanese government joins Japanese universities in struggling to determine what kind of countermeasures should be taken to address such a rapid decline in research performance at Japanese universities.

There are 86 national universities in Japan. Many of them are comprehensive universities, of which seven universities are called the Old Imperial Universities — the top ranked Japanese research universities. Other national universities dispersed throughout Japan formed a group of the second largest universities in each region to support research, education, and social contribution together with the regional society and industries. The problem is that the performance of the second largest group is also declining.

Among Japanese universities, the University of Tokyo is the largest in both budget size and the number of faculties. The University’s budget declines exponentially for the second largest university – Kyoto University. Interestingly, about 150 years ago, the University of Tokyo and Kyoto University were established as an Imperial University after the Meiji Restoration. At the time, Kyoto University was set at 60% of
Activities of the network have been highly evaluated and recognized, and the success of the network led MEXT to initiate a new network, “the Research University Consortium Japan (RUC).” NINS has been acting to contribute to the new network as a managing institute.

Program for Promoting the Enhancement of Research Universities and Research University Consortium

Under these circumstances, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) started the Program for Promoting the Enhancement of Research Universities (PPERU) five years ago to save the universities from the fatal state and strengthen the research performance. This subsidiary program supports not only the seven Old Imperial Universities but 22 other universities and research institutes.

The PPERU calls for universities and research institutions to hire highly specialized research management personnel, which is University Research Administrator (URA). I have been working as a URA for 5 years in the National Institutes of Natural Sciences (NINS) that was also adopted by the PPERU. NINS is a collaborative research institution called an Inter-University Research Institution Corporation, and our mission is to contribute to strengthening the research performance of universities. After being adopted by the PPERU, NINS established the Research University Network of Japan with 25 universities and research institutes that aims to create a mechanism for the members cooperatively and voluntarily to enhance research performance. Particularly, by collaborating with American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), the network achieved outcomes such as strengthening international information dissemination capabilities from Japanese research universities and played a part in improving the international recognition of Japanese universities. Activities of the network have been highly evaluated and recognized, and the success of the network led MEXT to initiate a new network, “the Research University Consortium Japan (RUC).” NINS has been acting to contribute to the new network as a managing institute.

Research University Consortium — Aims and Activities

The RUC was established in August 2017 under the leadership of MEXT, and it includes the 22 PPERU adopted universities. Currently, 33 organizations are members, and it plans to expand membership in the future. The aim of RUC is to strengthen the research performance by providing an opportunity for discussion on common obstacles to promote research performance such as (1) development of a better research management system with URA, (2) proposal for unbiased research performance metrics, and (3) effective dissemination on research activities in Japan. To discuss the issues, we have formed three task forces to facilitate the discussion about each issue and will consider another task force as necessary. RUC is willing to share the information on the discussion inside RUC with others through the RUC Japanese website.

Improve Research Performance of Japanese Research Universities

In this way, RUC aims to improve the overall research performance of Japanese universities for not only the high-profile research universities such as the seven Old Imperial Universities but also the group of the second-largest research universities.

From my perspective, the enhancement of the overall research performance of Japanese universities cannot be achieved simply by giving additional funding to the small group of universities. We simply cannot foretell where scientific pioneer works and innovation will occur. It is all up to a person. For example, Professor Shinya Yamanaka, who won the Nobel Prize in Physiology and Medicine on IPS cells, was a medical doctor at Kobe University, which does not belong to the aforementioned seven Old Imperial Universities. He succeeded in making IPS cells at Nara Institute of Science and Technology (NAIST) and became a highly recognized researcher. Although he was a professor at Kyoto University when he was awarded the Nobel Prize, there is no doubt that Kobe University and NAIST bred him and his research. Without personal experiences at Kobe University, could he have decided to devote himself to a life as a researcher? If NAIST had not given him a chance to start his experiment as a principal investigator, could he have tested his hypothesis that leads him to his pioneer work?

To conclude, improvement of overall research performance of Japanese universities is now a critical issue and the new consortium of Japanese research universities, RUC, is taking the lead to promote nationwide discussion on this issue. The activity of research management specialists such as URAs and how the URAs’ activity must be enhanced to help a university maintain and even enhance its research performance will be important points to be discussed in RUC. Whether or not stagnant Japanese research universities can revive and show great performance in research and contribution to the society depends on us. If we want to get gold medals, we must aim high and work hard to provide professional supports for researchers as URAs!
Although the CSU Libraries began working on initiatives to support RDM in 2011, one of the more visible actions administration took was to hire Dr. Tobin Magle in 2015 to serve as the Data Management Specialist. Since that time, she has taken on the role of Cyberinfrastructure Facilitator, and the library is in the process of filling her former position. Dr. Magle began her career as a microbiologist but eventually took a position as the Biomedical Research Support Specialist at the Health Sciences Library at University of Colorado, Anschutz Medical Campus prior to coming to CSU. Dr. Patrick Burns is in the unique position of being both the VP for Information Technology at CSU as well as the Dean of Libraries. He also heads CSU’s Information Science & Technology Center (ISTeC) and chairs the Information Technology Executive Committee Advisory Council. As Assistant Dean for Digital Library and e-Publishing Services, Dawn Paschal oversees CSU’s digital collections and institutional repository services, which includes supporting RDM and data sharing. She also co-chairs ISTeC’s Research Data Management Committee and provides other leadership in support of CSU’s research and learning programs.

How do CSU’s libraries support research data management (RDM)?

Tobin Magle: Teaching, consulting, and facilitating data submissions. I teach general classes about data management best practices and automating data cleaning and analysis using the R programming language. I consult one-to-one about data management concerns with individual researchers. I’ve also taught faculty how to use tools like the Open Science Framework to share data with collaborators. I give advice about how to write good data management plans for research proposals and I facilitate research data submission into the CSU digital repository.

What efforts have been the most and least successful, and why?

Tobin Magle: The Data and Donuts and Coding and Cookies series have been successful, because the people who come to it “opt in” and it doesn’t take as much convincing about whether we should be worried about research data management. The harder part has been getting embedded in the curriculum or at least doing sessions in departments and colleges. It’s much easier to teach RDM in the context of a discipline than it is to keep things generic. Optimally, PhD students would be exposed to this material early on in their research, but it’s hard to get people to give up class time. We have gotten a steady stream of
research data into the digital repository since I have been here. Somewhat surprisingly, there has been little resistance to implementing small changes that make research data more “preserved” such as using generic file formats and readme files. However, we don’t currently have a minimum standard of quality for research data records, resulting in variable quality.

I’ve also been pleasantly surprised at the number of people who ask for one-to-one help organizing their data during the research process. It’s not overwhelming but the people who ask do seem to value the advice.

**What are the big challenges the library is tackling right now with supporting RDM and data sharing?**

**Dawn Paschal:** I would say capacity. It is obvious from talking to faculty and researchers that they really need the education and support for best practices in research data management. At the same time, data management is relatively new to librarianship, so librarians and staff need to grow their own skills in this area, and we need to recruit and hire more people with a research background. The other major challenge is the social engineering piece. Faculty are understandably still protective of their data, and are not familiar with IP (intellectual property) as it relates to data, so they are not keen to share it. Fortunately, federal compliance helps advance this more quickly.

**Are there other university libraries that are successfully supporting RDM? Can you identify a few things that they are doing right?**

**Tobin Magle:** Purdue, Georgia Tech, University of Michigan and the University of Minnesota have ample staffing and defined regulations for data quality going into their repositories.

**Any advice to other libraries who want to get started with supporting RDM and data sharing?**

**Dawn Paschal:** Staff at all levels need to be flexible and realize that libraries are moving toward a future where we are managing the data produced at the beginning of the research lifecycle, in addition to the finished products that result from analysis/interpretation of that data (e.g., scholarly journal articles). Managers and leaders should work with staff to secure buy-in for moving in this direction. Staff need to be flexible and willing to learn new skills in this area.

Libraries should also be receptive about hiring non-librarians with advanced degrees and a research background, as they can jump-start research data management and sharing as a new activity. Libraries and non-librarians can learn from each other as part of an effort to build a program. Target graduate students for research data management support and gradual culture change; they are often the ones managing data in labs and they are usually willing to learn. They are the researchers of tomorrow.

**Where is the country right now in terms of federal funder mandates for data sharing and management?**

**Tobin Magle:** I would categorize the funder mandates in the US as mixed. NSF requires data management plans, but doesn’t enforce follow-through. NIH requires manuscripts to be open access, but not raw data, which does not address the reproducibility crisis. That said, I think they’re doing what they can with limited resources.

**Do you anticipate any near future changes with regard to federal funder mandates on data sharing or management that will affect CSU?**

**Patrick Burns:** We are responding to CUI mandates (controlled unclassified information). We are building structures to secure private data in anticipation of needing a particular level of security.

**What are a few simple things researchers can do to manage their data better?**

**Tobin Magle:** Mostly think about it AT ALL. Usually the experiments are well planned, but there’s no standard operating procedure for how to handle the data after it is collected, and everyone does their own thing. Using standards at the very least within their lab group would be a huge improvement.
If you haven’t mentioned this already, what are some of your favorite RDM/sharing tools or resources?

Tobin Magle: The Open Science Framework and DMPTool are great. ORCID for author disambiguation is key.

Why should researchers manage and share their data? What are their obstacles?

Tobin Magle: Researchers should manage and share their data because it’s largely tax-payer funded, and funding per researcher has been dropping rapidly. Thus, we need to be more careful about what is funded, making sure the analysis and conclusions are sound, based on the data, and reusing research data where possible. This is already happening in fields where there are few data creation sites (like particle accelerators in physics) and data that cannot be replicated (like climate data).

Patrick Burns: Researchers are protective of their data. We want faculty and researchers to be able to decide how open to be and with whom to share, while still meeting funder mandates. Faculty are also not comfortable with sharing raw data. Another obstacle is that it is a lot of work to share data. A basic question is how do you sustain the work and cost behind sharing and maintaining data? Sustainability really is a big issue. The solution we have come up with is collective-collaborative.

Dawn Paschal: Getting enough support and education. Their time is precious and capacity to assist them needs to grow. It’s not always clear to researchers what data should be shared. They tend to struggle with that. For some researchers, the network is not robust enough to move data around and shipping it on a hard drive is still the best option.

How can research administrators help their libraries support RDM?

Tobin Magle: Fund it with overhead money. At this point with so much digital data, data storage and preservation should be like heat, water and electricity. Plus most institutions state that they own the data, so they should provide the researchers who act as data stewards the resources to do their jobs well.

Patrick Burns: Make sure they can let faculty know that the library has resources, such as templates for data sharing. Create a data manager position and a digital repository. All of these initiatives need to be a collaboration with the CIO or equivalent because if you are going to support RDM and data sharing/storage, you need to know how to store, when, and where.

Can you elaborate on what coordination between the Office of the VP for Research and the Libraries would look like?

Dawn Paschal: At this point we are building bridges by sharing information and collaborating to move forward steadily in building research data management services. The Dean of Libraries/IT and the OVPR agreed to create a campus-wide Research Data Management Committee...
under the auspices of ISTeC. I chair this committee (and am co-chair of ISTeC’s Research Advisory Committee, the RAC). There is OVPR representation on the RDM committee, which seeks input from the OVPR as needed. For example, we discussed various aspects of the research data policy that went into effect in early 2016, the data storage and network enhancement project, and ORCID. The committee reports to the OVPR annually on its activities.

In addition to chairing those two committees above, I am a member of the Council of Research Associate Deans, which functions under the auspices of the OVPR. I help keep information flowing back and forth between these groups as needed, and monitor activities I hear about.

Where do you want CSU Libraries’ RDM support to be in the next 5-10 years?
Tobin Magle: I want there to be more staff. We are currently in the search process for a Data Management Specialist to fill my old position, but more than that would be welcome. We could then specialize in different areas (instruction, preservation, analysis, etc.) and provide a variety of sessions that are also more specialized.

Patrick Burns: Holistic, integrated, comprehensive, and accepted by the faculty—ensconced and part of our culture. Research reproducibility will be important for higher education in general, not just libraries and VPs. I also think it will be important for datasets to be associated with their publications and not just stored somewhere on its own, but having a DOI (digital object identifier) for each data set will be a positive development. Also, researchers want some walls to their data, which is a valid concern. It may be more important to associate data not just with a publication, but also with a point-person who can provide some context to the data.

Parting Thoughts
The growing importance of managing and sharing research data creates a golden opportunity for research administrators and libraries to collaborate on initiatives that improve RDM support and move universities toward a culture of research. Such collaborations might come in the form of joint committees, new technology, or informed policy changes. Yet it also comes by way of the smallest interactions. As a librarian who works directly with students and faculty, I can show a sophomore where to find lab protocols that will ultimately help with reproducibility, tell a graduate student about ORCID, or I can purchase a faculty-requested e-book on systematic reviews for the library. Collaboration can happen everywhere, and I call that a win-win.

For further information on CSU’s Research Data Management services visit: https://lib.colostate.edu/services/data-management

Heidi Zuniga is a Science Liaison Librarian and Associate Professor at Colorado State University’s Morgan Library. She is currently working on support and scholarship related to open educational resources, open access, and data sharing. She can be reached at Heidi.Zuniga@colostate.edu

References


infoReady

MORE SUCCESS. LESS BUSYWORK.
InfoReady software automates competition, review, and approvals processes. Scale your vital programs with InfoReady.

REQUEST A DEMO: email sales@inforeadycorp.com
Establishing Roots, Extending Branches:

A Partnership from the Coast of Tanzania to Tiny Rural New Hampshire to Cosmopolitan San Francisco

By Regnier A. Jurado, Georgina Lopez, Nana Mgimwa, and Jill Mortali
The Baobab tree dominates the landscape of Tanzania and is a source of food, water, and health remedies. Like the Baobab tree, research administration at Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences (MUHAS) in Dar es Salaam (DAR) has been working to deepen “roots” and grow “branches” of services to researchers. MUHAS has established a collaboration stretching across the globe from the coast of Tanzania to the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) to Dartmouth College. Since 2013, MUHAS has worked with Dartmouth and UCSF to strengthen its Office of Sponsored Projects (OSP) to support HIV research through two NIH Fogarty grants. MUHAS is now leveraging the knowledge gained through the partnership to branch out to share knowledge across Tanzania by developing partnerships with five other Tanzania institutions.

By 2008, researchers from the institutions had been collaborating for decades. HIV is estimated to affect 1.4 million people in Tanzania or 5.1% of the population, and had been a priority for the three institutions, resulting in 26 collaborative projects at MUHAS. While they were obtaining good research results, MUHAS faculty had to fend for themselves in preparing proposals, managing awards, and navigating the complexities of regulations. The researchers recognized that advancements at MUHAS could be facilitated by developing institutional capacity and a skilled research administration team in DAR.

In 2010/11, MUHAS and UCSF, with funding from the Gates Foundation and NIH, conducted a stakeholders’ survey of problems affecting research projects. The survey revealed considerable need and demand for capacity building in pre- and post-award grants management, ranging from support in preparing proposal packages to streamlining budgeting and procurement. As a result, Nana M gimwa was hired in 2010 as the sole member of the newly formed sponsored projects office. As Nana explains “My career in MUHAS began in April 2010. I was employed as grants and contracts officer for the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation funded Academic Learning Project (ALP). MUHAS was working in collaboration with UCSF. During my recruitment interview one of the Principal Investigators for ALP, Prof. Sarah Macfarlane, said something I always remember: ‘we are not expecting someone who knows everything about managing grants, but someone who can be trained and develop in the field.’ I thought, this is where I want to be; the place I can be molded to suit the purpose.”

In the early days of the office, Nana was able to achieve significant progress including implementing standard operating procedures to guide the office, establishing functions to manage pre- and post-award including project accounts, procurement, and supplies management.

To further grow the operation, the partnering institutions applied to the NIH Fogarty Center’s Global Infections Disease Research Administration Development Award for Low-and Middle-Income Country Institutions (G11). The award, received in April 2013, was a turning point that mobilized resources to develop capacity at MUHAS, including support for the development of training materials and conference travel. During the past four years, this global collaboration has resulted in faculty and administrators from institutions and research projects in the US and in Tanzania receiving training sessions in research administration to support research administration in their respective institutions.

“I needed to create that trust from researchers that I can be of help and not taking total control of their science.”

Senior faculty researchers from each institution along with experienced research administrators have been actively engaged in the collaboration. Monthly conference calls have been consistently held over the past three years. During these calls, MUHAS provides updates on the developing infrastructure and identifies training needs. Each of the institutions contribute ideas and track key milestones and achievements and plan next steps.

The collaboration has strengthened research infrastructure at MUHAS through training strategies and providing direct support to establish capacity: focused training of three research administrators to become trainers of trainers; online mentorship from Dartmouth and UCSF; and onsite workshops and video-conferences. In addition, two multi-day workshops have been held in Tanzania. MUHAS administrators have visited Dartmouth and attended and presented at the professional meetings of the National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA) and other US and international professional groups. Direct support at MUHAS has included assistance to reorganize the OSP and recruitment of additional staff.

Research administration capacity at MUHAS has developed beyond OSP. The OSP organization at MUHAS is part of the Directorate of Research and Publications (DRP), an office comprised of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), Office of Sponsored Projects (OSP), Intellectual Property Rights (IPR), and Research Development (RD). Developing research policies and guidelines has been key to furthering capacity, including: Research Policy and Guidelines, Institutional Repository Policy, Conflict of Interest, Time and Effort Compensation, Institutional Overhead Facilities and Administrative Costs, and Professorial Research Chairs Policy.

Asking Nana about her biggest challenges, she indicates change management and establishing trust. “Centralized research administration was a new thing in MUHAS. It was not easy to get people who know a lot of things change to having other people help. I needed to create that trust from researchers that I can be of help and not taking total control of their science.”

When did Nana and others know that the office had succeeded in establishing trust? She says “Processing, submitting a successful grant proposal! This means that there is a working system in our institution. Researchers are coming for advice in administrative matters of research. Having a contract signed and seeing projects run successfully to close out is a major achievement. Working with other administrators, accountants
and procurement officers towards a common goal has helped in pushing research administration at MUHAS forward. MUHAS is now becoming a center of learning for other institutions in Tanzania. Our ability to establish this system with limited resources is remarkable."

“<br><br>It was great teamwork...”

Among the many ways that the office now supports researchers: distributing funding opportunity announcements; internal training and mentoring; and regular meetings with researchers. A significant milestone was the recent submission by MUHAS of an NIH grant application for D43: Patient Centered Outcome Research (PCOR) grant proposal to NIH.

In addition to successful proposal submissions, the MUHAS research administrative team (now expanded to include a procurement officer and an accountant) has planned, coordinated, and held a three-day workshop. This workshop “What Reviewers Want: Research Training in Writing Successful Grant Application” included a training from both MUHAS faculty and research administrators. Participants came from across Tanzania to improve their research skills and learn from MUHAS.

In discussing the partnership, Nana focused on a few highlights: “Meeting the collaborating institutions’ team of research administrators and developing a training program that works in our setting. Presenting at NCURA and SRA. It was great being able to share challenges and achievements of north-south collaboration and understanding that this can be a module for other institutions. We jointly successfully submitted the G11 grant application. It was great team work.”

In summary, the efforts of MUHAS, the UCSF and Dartmouth partners, and the NIH funding has resulted in establishing a strong foundation/roots at MUHAS. The recent effort to extend the branches to other Tanzania institutions is further evidence of the success of the partnership. As Nana said, “The major achievement so far is with limited resources, establishing MUHAS OSP as a reliable support unit for research activities and also being a model for other institutions in Tanzania.”

These Projects have been made possible by the generous support of the National Institutes of Health, Fogarty Center G11TW009577, and G11TW010352.

Regnier A. Jurado, is Director of Research Management Solutions, Office of Research and Economic Development at Florida International University and can be reached at juradora@fiu.edu

Georgina Lopez, is Director of Finance & Administration, AIDS Research Institute, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Global Health Sciences, University of California, San Francisco and can be reached at georgina.lopez@ucsf.edu

Nana Mgimwa, is Senior Administrative Officer-Grants Management, Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences and can be reached at georgina.lopez@ucsf.edu

Jill Mortali, is Director, Office of Sponsored Projects at Dartmouth College and can be reached at jill.mortali.dartmouth.edu.

With the close of 2017, NCURA wishes to thank and acknowledge the ongoing chair of the Select Committee on Peer Programs, David Mayo, California Institute of Technology, who served as chair of this Select Committee for the past year. Rotating off the committee will be Gunta Liders, University of Rochester, who served the last three years as Vice Chair, Chair, and Past Chair and Mary Louise Healy, Johns Hopkins University.

Kris Mounah, Chair Providence College<br>Ara Tashianian, Vice Chair Harvard University<br>David Mayo, Past Chair California Institute of Technology

Judy Fredenberg<br>University of Montana<br>Rosemary Madnick<br>University of Alabama, Birmingham<br>Dave Richardson<br>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Peggy Lowry, Ex Officio<br>Oregon State University (retired)<br>Denise Wallen, Ex Officio<br>University of New Mexico
The life of a sponsored project can feel like a five-act play, with the Principal Investigator serving as the main actor and the Research Administrators playing minor and major supporting roles. As in any critically-acclaimed play, there also must be a well-written script supporting Research Administration. It is possible that even the best director could not take the place of a well-written script, as the basis for a play’s success rides on the words, structure, and flow of the script and its subscribed character roles. In providing staff with written roles and responsibilities, you give them a script by which to perform their daily work to the best of their abilities.

In a time when the landscape of Research Administration is evolving due to the implementation of eRA systems, funding climate changes, and new federal regulations, the defining of Research Administrators roles and responsibilities has never been more important. As the roles of Research Administrators remain broad in scope and require more expertise due to increasing regulatory complexity, ensuring Research Administrators have roles and responsibilities they understand and can point to as a foundation for their day-to-day activities is a powerful tool in creating a footing of quality and trust among a Research Administration office staff. A transparent and accessible document for staff, faculty, and students to reference regarding the roles and responsibilities of the Research Administrators at their organization provides all parties an infrastructure within which to collaborate. The initial development of roles and responsibilities may take many months. The document should be actively managed as a living document, which requires ongoing review and revision to meet the evolving roles of staff. The act of developing the roles and responsibilities of individual positions will assist in highlighting the gaps in responsibilities across the organization and will provide insight into the volume of work each role supports.

As a whole, Research Administrators are a passionate bunch, interested in science and the researchers they support. At the heart of it all, I imagine most Research Administrators find a deep sense of purpose in their roles and want to ensure they are living up to their responsibilities. Providing clear guidance as to the roles and responsibilities of staff may be the single most effective measure contributing to staff job satisfaction. Research administration requires collaboration with others at any level, and within a large research organization, the collaboration required to see a project from proposal to closeout can be dynamic and complex. When staff know their specific job function, it ensures everything gets done and conserves staff energy. In a recent survey I conducted for my Capstone Project at Johns Hopkins University, roles and responsibilities stood out as a common theme among eight different Research Administration personnel from different organizations and office structures. Within a small diverse sample group of Research Administrators, all sought clear roles and responsibilities, creating a finding that actively defining roles and responsibilities is a constructive exercise for leadership to invest in.

Essentially, we all want to understand and perform well in our role during the play. We don’t want to be at a loss for our lines, overshadowed by another character’s part, or booed off the stage for a lackluster performance. We want to be given an opportunity to rehearse our lines and stand in the spotlight with confidence when it’s time for our act. At the end of the project, we want to stand on stage with our cast members and take that final bow to a round of applause from those we serve and support.

Kaitlin Thornton, MRA, has worked as a Clinical Research Coordinator and Senior Grant Officer in both the private and public sectors. She recently received her Master’s in Research Administration from Johns Hopkins University. She loves the ever-changing challenges of research administration. She can be reached at Kaitlin.Thornton@colorado.edu

“Most Research Administrators find a deep sense of purpose in their roles...”
During our many years in research administration, Derek Brown and I have been through several bosses – a fact that came to me the other day when a colleague asked, “How have you successfully handled working for so many bosses in your career?” I told the colleague that Derek and I LOVE having new bosses! Upon reflection, I quickly added, “Well…I shouldn’t be so hasty. I better talk to Derek first.”
Derek appreciated that I took a breath and “counted to 10” so we could discuss the question thoughtfully, in order to provide our colleague a more complete answer, which ended closer to this: Derek Brown and I have been working at WSU for a combined more than 40 years, counting our student hourly jobs at WSU Housing, fixing up dorm rooms in the Summer, and the WSU Creamery making and selling Cougar Gold cheese. We have been here, living in the Palouse, so long simply because we love it. We have also had a lot of bosses in those 40 years. We are currently on our eighth Vice President/Provost for Research since we started in the Office of Research.

Now, in your experience that may be many or it may be few, but here at WSU it is now enough for people to take notice and ask questions.

So, we put our heads together and tried to come up with our “secret sauce” (just practical tips really) for making it through these transitions. We have broken them down below into various sections and have bolded our main considerations on each:

1. **Embrace change and be flexible (even when you do not want to):** This is the area where you can make or break a duty, job, and career. Even though it is hard sometimes, **go outside your comfort zone and be willing to grow.** Always **plan for bumps** in the road because they are inevitable. During this journey, **don’t make it about yourself.** Count to 10 if you have to and do your best to **be low maintenance.**

   **“Anticipate their needs and be one or several steps ahead of them.”**

   *Specialist).* **Demonstrate your value** and become irreplaceable. We have found that **embracing technology** has really kept our staying power. For example, we can quickly move around that keyboard and database to demonstrate our value by providing numerous reports with just a few clicks. Then, don’t be afraid to **sing your own praises.** Be soft about it, but they need to hear that beautiful music.

2. **Develop a relationship:** It is ok to **get to know and connect** with your boss. We aren’t talking about having them be the godparent of your kids, but professional bonding is ok! **Be a great communicator** and ensure the boss is in the loop - **no surprises.** They, and others, love it when you are **real and approachable** (emotional intelligence). It is important to **be available,** as bosses hate it when they can’t get an answer. Be available by phone, email, text message, and really at any time of day unless you have agreed with your boss that certain times are off limits (e.g., family vacation). **Be a team player, do your best not to suck up,** and **know your role** in the organization. Don’t be something you are not.

3. **Get results/get stuff done. AKA be the “Go To”:** Bosses love it when stuff gets done, that is why they hired us! **Doing what the boss says** is actually a big deal. **Anticipate their needs** and be one or several steps ahead of them (like Radar on M*A*S*H). It is important to **stay focused** – Facebook, Twitter, web-surfing, Instagram, Snapchat, etc. can bend your focus (unless of course, you are a Social Media Communications Specialist). **Demonstrate your value** and become irreplaceable. We have found that **embracing technology** has really kept our staying power. For example, we can quickly move around that keyboard and database to demonstrate our value by providing numerous reports with just a few clicks. Then, don’t be afraid to **sing your own praises.** Be soft about it, but they need to hear that beautiful music.

4. **Demonstrate leadership:** Leadership is a big deal, because your boss wants to leave you in charge to do #3 (i.e., get results) - and if you do well then more responsibility is coming! **Take responsibility** when projects go well and also when something goes wrong (avoid pointing fingers and work to address the issue and identify ways to prevent it from happening in the future). **Lead by example** to help motivate your colleagues; if you are enthusiastic, they will be enthusiastic. Even if you are grumpy about extra pressures and workload, avoid complaining. Some people are born leaders, but **leadership can be learned** in many ways including seminars, workshops, webinars, books, and volunteering in a professional organization. These methods can ensure you will be **well connected.** Our boss loves it when we can list five or 10 institutions we can call (or have already called in anticipation) and get an answer or find a new best practice, quickly.

Each of our eight VPRs have appreciated that we deliver on the items above and that is what keeps us Cougs. Or, at least with a job for a few more months. Phew!

We hope this helps answer our colleague’s question on how we have successfully handled working for so many bosses, and any questions you may have. The underlined points above have worked for us… for the time being.

---

**Dan Nordquist** is currently the Associate Vice President for Washington State University’s Office of Research (OR). He oversees the pre-award office, research reporting, conflict of interest, OR information technology, and supports strategic initiatives that promote WSU’s research agenda. Dan is a NCURA Past President and is currently NCURA e-Xtra’s Sr. Editor. He can be reached at [nordquist@wsu.edu](mailto:nordquist@wsu.edu)

**Derek Brown** is currently a Research Operations Administrator for Washington State University’s Office of Research Support and Operations. He began as an Office Assistant, advanced to Grant and Contract Specialist where he helped implement WSU’s electronic proposal routing and approval process, served as a Sub-Award and Reporting Administrator, and is now in his new Operations Administrator role. Derek has been at WSU since 2005 and is a past Treasurer of NCURA Region VI. He can be reached at [derekbrown@wsu.edu](mailto:derekbrown@wsu.edu)
As meeting co-chairs, we are honored to be working with an outstanding program committee who is working hard to schedule sessions for the Diamond Anniversary (60th) annual meeting.

Be prepared for a meeting that will be the best of the best of what NCURA annual meetings provide to the membership. We are bringing back some NCURA traditions and creating some new ones. Wherever you are in your research administration career, this conference will offer opportunities to enhance your knowledge, skills and abilities as a research administrator. You will find rich content offerings in the pre- and post-conference workshops that will be held on August 4th, 5th, 8th and 9th. The workshops are focused on professional development that you can take back with you and apply on the job. Many of the workshop offerings are being transformed for deep-dive training in areas across the spectrum of research administration. We are pleased to be offering workshops across the career span from beginner to senior administrator and are very excited about this year’s workshops!

The theme for this year’s conference is Demonsract Resilience and Advancing the Profession which accurately describes research administrators. With the many changes that we have experienced, we have maintained our flexibility and resilience to change and always look to the future, providing the best resources for members. It is also a thrilling time for the annual meeting because it is the DIAMOND Anniversary and we have much to celebrate!

**HERE ARE THE MANY REASONS THAT YOU WILL WANT TO ATTEND THE DIAMOND ANNIVERSARY MEETING:**

**DEDICATED** presenters, program committee, volunteers – Attendees will have access to presenters with specific expertise from across the world. Look for volunteer opportunities as we get closer to August!

**INNOVATIVE** presentations, partners/vendors – Along with the many fabulous presentations being offered, this year will provide an opportunity to connect with vendors in a new format.

**AMAZING** program, events – What better way to celebrate the DIAMOND anniversary than with live music and dancing on Tuesday night! We are super excited to have Soul Source and the No-cost Extensions return to share their musical talent with us. For some, this will be a new experience, and for others we will be able to relive many memories with the band.

**MEMORIES** to be made – From what you have read so far about this year’s DIAMOND Anniversary, you can tell that many memories will be made at this meeting. Seeing old friends and making new friends are all part of the experience.

**OPPORTUNITIES** to learn, network, reminisce – The program committee and the many volunteers are dedicated to make this an opportunity for members to reconnect, learn, and network with others.

**NETWORK** with old and new friends, the NetZone, social events – If you are new to the annual meeting, you are in for a treat with new networking opportunities being offered. Several of the Regions are participating in the NetZone again this year (in a new location) while some are hosting traditional hospitality suites. No matter your home region, take the opportunity to connect with friends and make new ones!

**DELIGHTFUL** surprises – Which we cannot share yet, or they would not be a surprise but be sure not to miss the Monday luncheon on August 6th for a “very special guest.”

Stay tuned to learn more about the meeting as it unfolds in upcoming issues of the NCURA magazine.
Recent articles have pointed out that a significant problem in biomedical research is that “surgeon scientists” are becoming an endangered species (Keswani et al., 2017; Suliburk, Kao, Kozar, & Mercer, 2008). My biochemistry MD PhD advisor earned his PhD in nuclear receptor biology at University of Chicago at the same time that a Nobel Laureate surgeon Charles Huggins was continuing investigations in hormone dependence of prostate cancer growth (Hansson, Moll, Schultheiss, Krischel, 2016; Morris & Schirmer 1990; Walsh, 2012). Unfortunately, there has been a gradual erosion in surgeon scientist funding from the NIH and discretionary sources, which makes it increasingly difficult to fund compliance, regulatory and other infrastructure functions required for surgical subspecialty departments. This is occurring simultaneously with mandatory and competing demands for laboratory compliance oversight, grant preparation, or even physical space oversight. This places additional burdens on burgeoning surgeon scientists, which are insurmountable for many departments. A challenging environment results where even simple items like effective grant submissions are difficult to achieve. This further decreases enthusiasm of surgeons to pursue bench and other translational research that formerly provided scientifically oriented surgeons challenging and diverse careers. The purpose of this article is to examine the barrier of energy-consuming necessary infrastructure that need to be adequately supplied for a nurturing research environment and compliance for subspecialty surgeon scientists.

When I came to the department of Otolaryngology our department had two NIH program project grants in hearing diseases and sciences. We had published findings that constituted some of the early work in head and neck cancer tumor immunology as well as other areas of head and neck cancer and other research. We performed this work in an independent research division that remained fully NIH funded and occupied about 8000 square feet, including core facilities. This infrastructure provided dozens of residents and international fellows with Masters and PhD mentorship over thirty years. Out of financial necessity, much of this disappeared over time in a fashion similar to what is described in many articles on the decline of the surgeon scientist. To bring attention to one component of the problem - research personnel infrastructure - we sought to investigate our staffing model. The goal was to analyze and provide information for the administrative infrastructure required to keep a smaller research program active; compliant with countless evolving regulations; and a place where medical student, resident, fellow, and faculty can successfully complete scientific projects and execute grant funding. We performed a needs analysis to better understand appropriate staffing levels of scientific compliance and related functions for our department laboratories. We decided that it would be a good idea to form a focus group of highly experienced research administrators to assess the needs in a simple fashion and provide feedback.

**Methods:**

We first examined the level of technical and administrative oversight necessary for investigators in our department. We examined the personnel needs for research infrastructure from the time it operated two longstanding NIH/NIDCD program project grants in 1993. We analyzed how much time was allocated, in FTEs, from the P-01 grants until the grant that NIH program folded in the early 2000s. We also examined additional time studies from 2003 until 2016. We categorized the infrastructure needs for 5 department principal investigators with basic/translational laboratory programs of 3-5 personnel (technicians, fellows, and students). Importantly, we segregated out the strictly technical components performed by technicians, scientists, and PIs from infrastructure components (ensuring animal...
compliance, DEA regulations, building remodeling, maintenance of floors, copy machines, safety checks, chemical or radiation disposals, etc.). Once the administrative infrastructure tasks were identified, we supplied this list of tasks as a job description to a focus group of eight management level administrative personnel at our medical/graduate school and organizations including a private medical school and two NCI designated cancer centers. We specifically queried each focus group member for them to assign a percentage of full time equivalent (FTE) for the level of oversight required for that job description.

**Results:**

For a research division our size (five principal investigators with laboratory space) the focus group agreed that a 10% position is necessary for safety oversight of the laboratories as well as other lab safety items in the department. For example, we operate a cadaveric temporal bone lab for trainees where there is formaldehyde, phenol, etc. which requires scientific oversight. There was agreement in the focus group that about a 20% FTE was required for regularly occurring infrastructure tasks. These tasks typically include items like onboarding fellows, residents, and students several times yearly and changes in IACUC animal protocol requirements, DEA requirements for animal anesthesia, chemical handling, etc. There was also agreement in the focus group that intermittent variable tasks needed to be accounted for. These items would include “one offs” like lab remodeling, compliance issues with training lapses, and yearly requirements for maintenance (painting, floor waxing, etc.). Our own time studies and the focus group indicated that at least 20% of an FTE was needed for these intermittent variable tasks for a research program of our size. When specifically queried, four members of the focus group estimated a requirement (for our current infrastructure), that between 0.5 and 2.0 FTE would be needed for these personnel tasks in their respective divisions (mean 1.25 +/- 0.87 SEM FTE; n=4).

There was agreement that increasing demands of safety, compliance, IACUC, etc. required knowledgeable personnel for modern safe laboratory operation. One thing we did not ask of the focus group (but which ensued after the data was collected) was how these items are actually paid for when they are required. Some of the members suggested that various chargeback or “re charge” mechanisms could occur. There was some consensus that hourly rate chargebacks could be derived from grant indirect cost recovery or other discretionary funds for subsuming the cost in a centralized department research infrastructure like ours. At the conclusion of the focus group, we took the recommendations and assigned a 0.5FTE for these services to one of our senior technical employees. This way we could ensure accountability and adequate capacity for infrastructure support for our researchers. Further, we now have a template for potentially setting up a charge back system for when these items come up in the future (e.g. recruiting new surgeon scientists).

---

**TRAINING TIPS**

**Top Project Management Tools Used by Training Specialists**

We asked our training specialists to put together a list of project management tools they have found to be useful in helping them collaborate with their research community. What they came up with can assist in streamlining operations, managing projects, enabling collaborations, and effectively disseminating information:

**Asana (University of Colorado Boulder)**
Asana is a project management tool that brings individuals together on specific tasks and is ideal for collaborations among teams within and outside the organization. It stores meeting agendas, notes, attachments, and action items in one place that is accessible to all. The platform is easy to navigate, user friendly and free for teams of up to 15 members.

**Microsoft OneNote (University of Oregon)**
OneNote can help reduce paper dependency and ensure the team is on the same page. OneNote allows individuals to create a notebook-style file with the ability to incorporate other files from existing resources, such as procedure pages, workflow tools, training slides, checklists and meeting notes. The result is a comprehensive, easy-to-access, easy-to-update guide that can be shared across team members.

**Microsoft Teams (Colorado State University)**
Microsoft Teams works a lot like NCURA’s Collaborate, in that one can create groups (or teams) of common interest and share information relevant to that team. Within a team, someone can start threaded conversations around various topics, like upcoming workshops or training programs. Within a team, one can start new conversations, share resources, and have discussions relevant to a particular topic outside the tangled web of e-mail. It is an information-sharing workspace that brings together people, conversations, and files in one place.

**Saba Learning Management System (Harvard)**
Saba Learning Management Systems can be used to track and record training metrics within an organization. This system allows managers to assign training to their employees. The system also allows users to create rules to assign training to specific faculty or staff groups. Training completion status can be tracked; this is useful for both performance and compliance management as well as metrics.

---
Conclusions/Comments

There is agreement that there is a shortage of surgeon scientists at the bench in modern academic medicine. In the current analysis, we found that perhaps the easiest way to get reasonable confirmation of the administrative effort required for this infrastructure for a smaller department is to employ a focus group of capable individuals to give advice. We discovered a number of things with this project. First, we found that laboratory technical oversight includes baseline percentage efforts and variable intermittent items that must be added to the baseline effort to more accurately arrive at “total effort”. The utility of flexibly calculating the hourly wage and benefits was very helpful since this type of chargeback could be easily added as a line item cost for other items. For example, performance contracts with industry or ISO/ESO arrangements will pay for hours of technical support for a scientific project and institutionally derived indirect costs. Conversely, department heads cannot automatically negotiate indirect cost recovery with their sponsored projects for these necessities in subspecialty departments. This type of analysis and chargeback could easily be calculated into a hourly rate structure for ISOs or industry contracts, or as some type of “departmental indirect cost” for several categories of academic or industrial projects. We found that accurate appraisal of these infrastructure functions was an important exercise to appropriately evaluate infrastructure. This should reduce some burdens for young surgeon scientists. In the 1990s, we had 2 FTE for a research program that had roughly three times the number of PI investigators than our current scientific program. This was at a time 25 years ago when the research and grant regulatory environment was administratively simple by comparison. Despite increasing levels of oversight, we are still able to accomplish the task with approximately 0.5 FTE, at a time when administrative burdens have increased. This suggests that our employees can adapt to increasing demands that evolved over time. It is vitally important, though, that these sorts of analyses need to be undertaken in every facet that governs the life of surgeon scientists to encourage their further development in the academic landscape.

References
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Get a closer look at your institution.

ASSET MANAGEMENT AND VALUATION EXPERTISE FOR YOUR ORGANIZATION

Addressing your movable equipment inventory, building componentization, and policies and procedures isn’t just a compliance need—valuation and proper asset management benefits your capital budgeting, as well as financial and risk management reporting.

Our experts, including new addition Kevin J. McHugh, can provide insight into your institution from specific functions to entire systems.
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John M. Carfora, Ed.D., CCEP, RIO, Associate Provost for Research advancement and Compliance at Loyola Marymount University (Los Angeles), will be retiring on June 1, 2018. John was awarded a Distinguished Service Award from NCURA (2007), and served on NCURA’s Board of Directors.

Lindsay Demeritt is now the Director, Sponsored Research at Dell Medical School at UT Austin.

Scott Niles is now a Research Associate/Contracting Officer in the Office of Sponsored Programs at Georgia Tech.

Robyn Remotigue is now Director of Research Services, School of Public Health at University of North Texas Health Science Center.

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

EDITOR’S PICK Travel App Worthy of a Gold Medal  By Angela Wishon

When I went looking for an app on my phone to track my expenses while traveling, I had three goals in mind. First, it would need to have great flexibility to accommodate how I track expenses. My next goal was to have only one app to use that would support both business travel and personal travel. Last, but certainly not least, I wanted a free app without ads or pricey add-ons once I began using.

After trying several, I settled on Travel Expense Manager for Android Phones. For a free app, it has exceeded my expectations and has easily taken the gold medal.

The key feature is that it allows for multiple expense types to be tracked:

- expenses directly paid to an entity, such as airline expenditures;
- expenses that exist only virtually in another app or email, such as Uber or Gogo Air; and
- expenses from a range of categories, from cabs to meals to tips by inspiring others’ imagination.

Other highlights are the ability to track multiple trips at one time; to allow multiple persons to be able to view, add and track expenses; and to export the data to prepare travel reimbursement forms in multiple formats.

One limitation is that you can’t scan receipts into the app. Although most of my business travel as a state employee requires submission of detailed hard copies, this was a feature that I was willing to forego in order to maintain my principle of not paying for apps. Additionally, the app doesn’t yet link to other apps or track the travel arrangements. For this, I will continue to use the app provided by the travel agency. While the ideal situation would be a single app to earn the perfect 10, this app can handle your next trip to the Olympics.

Angela Wishon is a Co-Editor for NCURA Magazine. She has recently served as the Vice President, for Research Administration at UT Southwestern Medical Center where she had oversight of the research regulatory compliance functions. As a licensed attorney in Texas and Colorado, she focuses on Intellectual Property and Regulatory Law. Angela has served as a site visitor for the AHRPP, on NCURA’s Traveling Faculty, as a CTSA Regulatory Knowledge Core Director and routinely presents on research compliance and regulatory topics. She can reached at angela@wishonconsulting.com
Bring NCURA Training to Your Campus!

WORKSHOPS OFFERED:

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

For more information contact Stephanie McJury
Meetings Manager
mcjury@ncura.edu
Spring is finally around the corner, which means it’s time for sunny days, warmer temperatures and our Regional Spring Meeting! The Program Committee has been hard at work finalizing plans for our spring meeting. This year’s theme is *Adventures in Research: Mapping your Pathway to Success.* The meeting “Cruise Ship” will dock for 2 and 1/2 days at the newly renovated Sheraton, Harborside in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. Some colleagues will begin their meeting on Sunday, April 29th with a full day of separately registered workshops. Others will join the crew on Monday April 30th through Wednesday May 2nd we will give attendees access to more than 45 informative and dynamic concurrent sessions, discussion groups, panels and 2 keynote talks covering a wide variety of hot topics lead by speakers from FDP/COGR, NIH, NSF, OHRP as well as regional speakers of the set tracks: Hospital, Pre-Award, Post-Award, PUI, Leadership-Development, and Compliance. Our cruise director will offer various activities including a scavenger hunt as well as region favorites: yoga and fun runs. New this year is a kickboxing session that is sure to get your heart pumping! Plenty of networking opportunities await as well. Be sure to stop by the “Innovative Exchange Suite” on Tuesday afternoon where you will find presenters sharing tips, best practices, and sound advice on being successful in our region/field. Make sure to register early to take advantage of the early bird discounts. If you are interested in learning more about the conference, contact the Program Committee at springmeeting@ncuraregioni.org. There will be many opportunities for volunteering for the meeting. Look for announcements to come via eblasts, or contact Laura Friedeberg, VMC Chair at vmc@ncuraregioni.org.

Nominations for this year’s recognition awards to be presented at the spring meeting will be opening soon! Awards given include the Julie T. Norris Distinguished Service Award, Merit Award, New Professional award, and the Outstanding Volunteer award. The nomination procedure will be announced in an upcoming regional eblast.

Finally, I would like to welcome this year’s Executive Shadow participants Rachel Rice-Ackman (Dana Farber) and Adam Carter (Jackson Laboratory). The competitive program selects individuals who desire to learn more about regional leadership, and provides the opportunity to shadow the advisory board and learn the roles of elected officers and committees. Congratulations to this year’s participants and thank you to their mentors.

I hope you see you soon at the Sheraton, Harborside in Portsmouth, New Hampshire!

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

---

When this regional update comes out, I am hopeful that the cold icy weather will be behind us! Spring is always an exciting time to think about new beginnings and professional growth. Thankfully, it is time to thaw out from this past winter and start anew. 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 Region II website for a current listing of PDC workshops near you! If you want a workshop to come to your area or you are 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!!

Another exciting program that was developed in our Region is the Cheryl Howard Mentor Me Program. This year, the following Mentees working with our Region 2 Mentors are: Katie Faulstich, Maryland Institute College of Art; Elliot Frank, University of Buffalo; Adam Malisch, St. Mary’s College of Maryland; Kelly Mountcastle, Johns Hopkins University; and Vibeke Svensson, American University. Thanks to Jennifer Harman, Bryan Cacciotti, Jared Littman, Erin Bailey and Magui Cardona for being such great Mentors and to Mary Louise Healy for leading this fantastic program.

This will be the first year that our Region II annual meeting won’t be held in the spring. We are headed to Oglebay Resort in Wheeling, West Virginia in October. Volunteers are needed for our Region II annual meeting, which will be held on October 20-23, 2018. We are in the midst of planning for this meeting and we need volunteers, please contact Char nel Bohn at bohncm@rwjms.rutgers.edu. If you would like to volunteer on one of our many other committees, please visit our website at: http://ncuraregioni.org/volunteer-opportunities-for-ncura-region-ii-members/volunteer-opportunities-form/

Don’t forget to follow us on Facebook at www.facebook.com/groups/ncuraregioni and Twitter @NCURAREGION II.

*Dennis 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 dpaffrat@umaryland.edu*
Please help us congratulate our newest Region III members on obtaining their CRA or CFRA credentials: Carla McClendon (Florida State University) and Marie Penn (University of Tennessee). Great job! We wish you continued success in your professional development. Congratulations to Scott Niles for starting a new position as Research Associate at The Georgia Institute of Technology.

Looking for professional development? A great opportunity for continued professional development is participating in the Regional Meeting, and Region III is excited about our fast-approaching spring meeting! The theme for the meeting is Together Towards Tomorrow: Shaping the Future of Research Administration. There will be sharing of knowledge and experience as we join one another May 5 – 9 in historic Williamsburg, Virginia, at the Kingsmill Resort. If you have not already registered, it’s not too late! Registration information is available on our web page: www.ncurarregioniii.com/springmeeting.php The Program Committee worked very hard to put together a series of workshops, presentations, and discussions that will help us all enrich our knowledge about research administration.

Remember that volunteering is an excellent way to make the best of your NCURA membership. Through volunteering you will not only support the organization, but you will also have the potential to help shape the future of NCURA in Region III, develop leadership skills, build connections, add to your professional contacts, and expand your network. The experience will build your skills and increase your professional capital. You will be in a position to share your expertise. Volunteers are recognized and earn a sense of personal accomplishment. Begin volunteering at a regional meeting, which is always a great way to get started and will help move you into serving on a committee or even a leadership role. If you would like to volunteer, please contact our Volunteer Coordinator, Bruxanne Hein at bhein@georgiasouthern.edu Visit our website for additional details about the various opportunities available.

Steve Koogler, MBA, is Chair of Region III and serves as Assistant Director, Office of Research and Commercialization, at the University of Central Florida. He can be reached at Steven.Koogler@ucf.edu

Happy Spring! I look forward to spring because I get to see all of the bulbs I planted in my yard in the fall peek through the snow with pops of color. It reminds me of the effort that we put in to projects comes to fruition in beautiful ways. We see new growth in the leadership of Region IV too. This is my last column; Bonniejean Zitske from the University of Wisconsin-Madison will become the new Region IV Chair in April. I want to thank the region for this opportunity. I have enjoyed every minute of it. I have learned a lot and have met truly outstanding individuals with enormous talent.

Although election results for the upcoming Region IV board will be announced shortly, please start thinking about running for a board position next year. We will be seeking nominees for the Chair-elect position, two At-Large member positions and for a Representative to the NCURA Board of Directors. Job descriptions are posted on the Region IV website. In addition, there is a great article, “Is running for an officer or board position right for you?” posted at www.ncurarregioniv.com/is-running-right-for-me.html.

**Nourish. Discover. Grow.** Join us in Des Moines for our 2018 Spring Meeting and make history as we bring our regional meeting to Iowa for the first time. Dr. Terry Wahls, a clinical professor of medicine at the University of Iowa Carver College of Medicine has an incredible story of self-healing through proven researched methods based on mitochondria, diet, and multiple sclerosis. She has received funding from Direct MS of Canada and the National Multiple Sclerosis Society of America.

Also, join us for a Region IV Book Club! The spring meeting will feature a session devoted to examining *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks* by Rebecca Skloot. If you’ve already read it, wonderful! If not, get yourself to a library or bookstore so you can join in a conversation that gets to the very heart of human subject protections.

Finally, stay tuned for the results of the 2018 Region IV Survey! The Membership Committee designed this survey so that you could tell us what Region IV does well, what we could do better, and what new or different opportunities you’d like to see for members to learn, grow, and succeed. Your insights into the strengths of this region and opportunities for improvement will ensure Region IV keeps YOUR NEEDS in focus and promotes professional growth and development with YOUR GOALS guiding the way. Results will be posted on the Region IV website.

Katherine Durben is the Chair of Region IV and serves the Executive Director of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at Marquette University. She can be reached at Katherine.durben@marquette.edu
As we move into spring, hopefully our members have registered for the Region V 2018 Regional Meeting. This year we are proudly located in San Marcos, Texas, where many enjoy tubing down the San Marcos River which rises from the San Marcos Springs, home to several endangered species like the Texas Blind Salamander, and as you can imagine, the scenery is second to none! We have also secured a beautiful hotel for this meeting.

Michael Castilleja and the Program Committee have been working hard for many months to ensure that the meeting is not only educational, but also fun and provides plenty of opportunities to network with colleagues. We are happy to share with you that due to successful contract negotiations, we have negotiated a lower registration fee this year! Michael has indicated that he is shaking up the standard meeting agenda this year, so head on over to the website and check out all the information.

Be sure to download the Guidebook App to your phone or tablet. Both Regional and National meetings utilize the Guidebook as an online tool to deliver session materials and updates.

Congratulations to Cheryl Anderson, Director, Pre-Award Administration in the Office of Sponsored Programs Administration at UT Southwestern Medical Center. Cheryl was chosen as the Region V representative for the National Nominating and Leadership Development Committee (N&LDC). Members of the N&LDC are responsible for identifying future leaders within NCURA.

Dr. Kathleen Harris has retired as Sr. Associate Vice President for Research at Texas Tech University. Kathleen was an active member in Region V and served in many important roles, including Region Chairperson and Regional member to the National Board of Directors. Kathleen has been an excellent role model for Region V members. I know I personally recall the 2012 Spring Meeting in St Louis as one of the best in a long time with her influence. I speak for the region when I say that we will miss her leadership, knowledge and good cheer!

Do not miss out – there are still opportunities for volunteering in San Marcos! We can always use more help. To learn more about what opportunities exist, please reach out to John Valenta at John.A.Valenta@uth.tmc.edu

We look forward to seeing everyone there with your floaties!

Thomas B. Spencer, PhD, MBA, is Chair of Region V and the Assistant Vice President for Operations & Compliance for Academic and Administrative Information Resources at UT Southwestern Medical Center. He can be reached at Thomas.Spencer@UTSouthwestern.edu

For the 2018 year, one of the main initiatives for Region VI is the transition of our website to its own independent web address and domain. As we finalize the transition from the Washington State University address, I would like to recognize and thank Dan Nordquist and his team (including Darren Bystrom, Derek Brown, Shawn Clabough, Monte Sutton, and others over the years) for all the years of supporting Region VI activities. For those who may not be aware, our NCURA Region VI website has been hosted by our colleagues at the Washington State University for over 20 years. Dan and his team have constructed and continuously supported regional meeting programming, volunteer activities, elections, awards, bylaws changes, LeadMe activity, and much more. Darren, Derek, Shawn, Monte, and others have always been quick to respond to inquiries and requests, and have provided a much-needed tool and resource for the Region along with a high level of service and attention to detail. The group was awarded the well-deserved Meritorious Contribution Award at 2017 Region VI Meeting in Portland last November, in recognition and appreciation of their support and service to our Region.

On a separate note, by the time this article goes “live,” I expect the call for proposals to be out for our 2018 Region VI/VII Meeting. As previously announced, this year’s meeting will be held in Billings, Montana, from October 7th – 10th. This will be our first time holding our regional meeting in the State of Montana, and I look forward to us all joining our research administration colleagues in “Big Sky Country!” We invite session proposals for all program tracks and at all levels, as we look to continue to strike the programmatic balance of offerings for all levels of experience level in research administration overall, as well as within specific subject areas. In addition to the meeting program itself, we intend to incorporate additional networking opportunities building on the success of the dinner groups at the 2017 Regional Meeting in Portland. More details, including volunteer opportunities, to come as we ramp up for registration rollout.

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
For Region VII, 2018 kicked off with the news that Sarah Martonick, Post-Award Manager at the University of Idaho, was selected to participate in the LeadMe program.

Additionally, three Region VII participants recently graduated with the 2017 LeadMe class and were honored at the Regional Meeting in Portland Oregon last fall:

- **Carly Cummings**, Utah State University
- **Lisa Anaya Esquibel**, Colorado State University
- **Bernadine Sadauskas**, University of Arizona College of Medicine

Congratulations to these individuals! Lisa and Bernadine will return in 2018 as Mentors-in-Training (MINTs) and we have a Region VII Mentor returning for 2018 as well, Tolise Dailey from University of Colorado, Boulder.

Adapted from the successful NCURA Leadership Development Institute designed by Gale S. Wood, Consultant, the NCURA Region VI Education and Professional Development (E&PD) Committee has put together a modified program to strengthen and increase the number of new and emerging leaders that serve our profession and NCURA at the regional and national levels. The one-year program focuses on providing educational and professional development experiences to selected Mentees. Region VII members are welcome to participate in Region VI LeadMe program in both Mentee, MINT, and Mentor roles.

In other news, Region VII officers held their first meeting of the New Year on January 19th. The main topic of discussion: the Region VI/Region VII conference to be held in Billings, Montana, October 7-10, 2018. The call for proposals for presentations and workshops will be coming out soon — watch for it and plan to join us at the conference!

Deborah Shaver, CRA, is Chair of Region VII and is the Director, Office of Sponsored Programs at University of Idaho. She can be reached at dshaver@uidaho.edu

In this article we would like to highlight the benefits of volunteering with an example from one of our members. Eva Björndal from the Karolinska Institutet is one of our star volunteers; she is a past Chair of the Region VIII Board and a current member of the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee (N&LDC) and the Select Committee on Global Affairs (SCGA). Eva has kindly explained what it’s like to fill her new role as the international representative for the AM60 Program Committee:

I was very excited when the NCURA President-Elect, Tony Ventimiglia, contacted me during last fall to see if I would be interested in being part of the Program Committee for NCURA’s 60th Annual Meeting. What a great opportunity to work with my NCURA peeps and to plan this very special meeting!

Together with Janet Simons at the University of Maryland, I was asked to organize the global track. Janet and I know each other from other NCURA events and it is a joy to work with someone so friendly, knowledgeable and organized. After the call for session proposals was closed, Janet and I received a list from the NCURA office with the submitted proposals and we were happy to learn that we had received some really good session proposals, but with a total of nineteen sessions to be filled, we still had quite a few slots open. That’s when our work to identify topics and recruit speakers started. The global track will have some topics aimed at international participants, some for US participants with an international interest, and some that are aimed for both.

In December 2017, the Meeting Chairs and the full Program Committee met in DC to discuss the overall program, including all of the proposed sessions and potential overlaps. Some sessions were moved between tracks to fit better in the overall program and speakers and topics for sessions that still were not filled were identified. It was a very efficient and successful planning meeting and personally it was the first time I was in U.S for only 24 hours. Well worth the trip though!

Did I mention this is going to be NCURA’s Diamond Anniversary Annual Meeting? Make sure you come along and join this dazzling NCURA event — and celebrate an organization that sparkles by its very nature…

Happy Anniversary NCURA and hope to see you all in August!

Julie Ward is Chair of Region VIII and serves as the International Research Manager, UNSW Sydney. She can be reached at julie.w@unsw.edu.au
Sharpening that Competitive Edge

UD biomechanics analysis helps skaters reach their powerful potential

By Beth Miller and Dante LaPenta

Olympic competitors aren’t born. They’re crafted through years of practice, defeat and perseverance.

That’s why more than 60 young figure skaters - including top United States competitors - have made their way to the University of Delaware’s ice rinks seeking a competitive edge in the unique biomechanical analysis done by Jim Richards, distinguished professor of kinesiology and applied physiology in the College of Health Sciences.

Richards and his research team use an array of 10 cameras over a testing area to capture data from reflective markers placed on skaters. As they attempt challenging jumps, the cameras capture their precise positions, the speed of their rotations, and their time in the air.

“We’re only looking at what they’re doing in the air,” Richards said. “Almost every skater has the rotational energy to complete the jump. It’s what they’re doing in the air that keeps them from being successful.”

Consider that the triple Axel requires three full rotations in the air and a quadruple jump requires 3 1/2.

“They have to get into their tightest position within a specific time period,” Richards said. “For a triple or quad, that’s within the first revolution.”

Coach Debbie Minahan uses video to analyze skaters’ techniques, but was excited to have access to this level of analysis for Will Annis, who won the 2017 U.S. juvenile boys championship and was second at the Eastern Sectional Figure Skating Championships’ intermediate men’s competition.

“I thought this was an incredible opportunity that wouldn’t be offered anywhere else,” she said. “For Will - working on all of his triples now - it seemed that it would be valuable to have that feedback to get a more consistent repetition out of the jumps. The hope is that the information that we receive helps stabilize all of them and then he’ll be able to move into triple-triples.”

Will who has a tendency to go too far to the left side on some jumps, said “this will help my air position, so it should help solve that problem.”

He was one of several young national-level competitors to have their jumps analyzed in a visual 3-D computer program Richards developed with Tom Kepple, chief science officer at C-Motion Inc.

“Tom Kepple, chief science officer at C-Motion Inc.

Richards explains that the adjustments aren’t easy for skaters and most tend to conserve their momentum. They get comfortable doing a jump at a certain speed and get nervous if they need to ramp it up.

“It feels to some that if they spin faster than this, they will be out of control,” he said. “They don’t know how to land it.”

Once skaters understand the biomechanical principles, they work to adjust to a new, higher-level normal.

“They have to get used to hitting that new spin rate,” Richards said. “So you start with a safe jump and kids get it pretty well. If they’re diligent, it takes them from two or three weeks to a couple months to get it.”

Richards meets with every skater and coach to show preliminary results and explain the models before providing written reports and video files.

For 12-year-old Ilia Malinin, who has two national championships to his credit (winning the juvenile level in 2016 and the intermediate in 2017), Richards showed Ilia and his father/coach, Roman Skorniakov, how a few adjustments to his good timing and jump height would provide the spin rates Ilia needs for triple Axels and quads.

“I liked this,” Ilia said. “And I think I should improve. I like the challenge a lot and this helps me get ready for other jumps.”
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BUILD A BETTER, STRONGER, MORE EFFICIENT OPERATION WITH NCURA PEER PROGRAMS

Following a recognized model of academic program review, an NCURA Peer Review provides an objective assessment of your sponsored programs operations. Experts research administrators will visit your campus and provide detailed feedback, validation, and recommendations. The dialogue and discussions are opportunities to identify, and at times enlighten, misunderstandings or misconceptions about research administration.

Peer Reviews are conducted using National Standards that represent the core and vital functions of sponsored programs regardless of size and type of institution.

Learn more about NCURA Peer Programs:
peerreview@ncura.edu
http://www.ncura.edu/institutionalprograms.aspx
NCURA CALENDAR OF EVENTS

REGIONAL MEETINGS
Region I – New England
April 29-May 2, 2018 ...........................................................................Portsmouth, NH
Region II – Mid-Atlantic
October 20-23, 2018 .......................................................................Wheeling, WV
Region III – Southeastern
May 5-9, 2018 .................................................................................Williamburg, VA
Region IV – Mid-America
April 15-18, 2018 ..........................................................................Des Moines, IA
Region V – Southwestern
May 6-9, 2018 .................................................................................San Marcos, TX
Regions VI/VII – Rocky Mountain/Western
October 7-10, 2018 ........................................................................Billings, Montana
Region VIII – International
April 16-18, 2018 .........................................................................Brussels, Belgium

NATIONAL TRAVELING WORKSHOPS
Departmental Research Administration Workshop
May 21-23, 2018 ..........................................................................Philadelphia, PA
Financial Research Administration Workshop
May 21-23, 2018 ..........................................................................Philadelphia, PA
Level I: Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration Workshop
May 21-23, 2018 ..........................................................................Philadelphia, PA
Senior Level Workshop: Research Administration – The Practical Side of Leadership
May 22-24, 2018 ............................................................................Hollywood, FL

NATIONAL CONFERENCES
60th Annual Meeting
August 5-8, 2018 ..........................................................................Washington, DC

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 – Available on Demand
• Public Access: Practical Ways to Assist Faculty to Comply with Public Access Policies
• Rigor and Reproducibility for the Research Administrator
• An Overview of the New Research Terms and Conditions
• Outside the Box of Effort Reporting: Past, Present and Future
• CUI, FISMA & NIST: Regulated Research Data
• The New World of Single IRBs
• The Revised Common Rule: New Opportunities and Challenges
• Understanding the Administratively Complex and High-risk Business Objective of Cost Sharing
• Developing Policies and Procedures
• Data Transfer and Use Agreements
• Managing Sponsored Research Risk in an International Environment

DEADLINES FOR MAY/JUNE 2018
Submission of Articles to Contributing Editors .................March 9, 2018
Submission of Advertisements ........................................March 14, 2018

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

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