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Greek philosopher Heraclitus noted, “change is the only constant in life” (Mark, 2010). This phrase resonates for many research administrators who feel the impact of the constant barrage of regulatory changes from federal agencies. At the same time, we live in an era where the speed of developing technology happens at an exponential pace. As such, it is easy to see why research administration is an ever-evolving, changing field.

In this issue, Jessica Buchanan, Jillian Cawley, and Christopher Denman explore the world of export compliance facing pre-award specialists and the importance of staying abreast of current requirements when evaluating proposals in “A Pre-Award Look at Export Control Concerns.” John Butzer, Brett Fortier, Cameron McNair, and Marcel Villalobos give a first-hand look at how research administration teams at two institutions completed the task of converting their paper-based offices to paperless operations with their article “Digital Transformations in Research Administration.” In embracing change, their respective offices were able to modernize their work processes and improve efficiency.

In “Mentoring: Pass the Torch to Light the Way,” Isabella DiFranzo and Susan Wyatt Sedwick share their perspectives on how to establish and routinely presents on research compliance and regulatory topics. She can reached at awishon@ghs.org
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Angela Wishon is a Co-Editor for NCURA Magazine. She currently serves as the Vice President for Research Compliance and Administration at Prisma Health. 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 SPA II Faculty, as a CTSA Regulatory Knowledge Core Director, and routinely presents on research compliance and regulatory topics. She can reached at angela.wishon@prismahealth.org
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MESSAGE FROM YOUR PRESIDENT

By Tony Ventimiglia, NCURA President

It is hard to believe but we are not too far away from NCURA’s 61st annual meeting (Building Towards the Future…Together).

I know many regions are just completing incredibly successful spring meetings that I hope whet your appetite for the annual meeting. This issue of NCURA Magazine provides more details for your consideration. Talking about meetings does raise an interesting question – why is it important to participate in NCURA meetings? Engagement in your professional organization has many advantages:

1. Talking to other research administrators keeps you current on federal trends, new systems, best practices, and other exciting developments in the research administration arena.
2. Listening to multiple speakers and participating in discussion groups greatly enhances your overall knowledge of the profession and provides you with tools to take back to your institutions.
3. Taking the time to network with colleagues both new and old helps develop strong bonds with people who actually understand what you do! Having established these long-term professional contacts provides you with a cadre of experts for advice when specific questions arise (I do this often!).
4. You may hear about potential job opportunities that otherwise would have been outside your view.
5. Getting involved in NCURA meetings allow you to practice leadership among your peers by the sharing of knowledge and resources.

From my own experience, it is nearly impossible to reflect on all the benefits I have received as an NCURA member and through my participation in annual meetings; however, the following is just a sampling of my experiences:

• Met great people, many of which have become good friends;
• Learned an enormous amount of information about research administration as a profession; and
• Gained knowledge of various systems, sponsor requirements, technologies and best practices that have enhanced my job and contributed to my role as a research administrator at my institution.

...the more we can do to enhance our knowledge base and support our organizations the better.”

As research administration is an ever-evolving and changing field, the more we can do to enhance our knowledge base and support our organizations the better. Having said that, I had a great opportunity to do just this by representing NCURA at the European Association of Research Managers and Administrators (EARMa) 25th Annual Conference in Bologna, Italy. The conference was sold out with over 900 attendees from numerous countries coming together to address a wide spectrum of topics. It is interesting to note that, while some topics (Brexit, Horizon Europe, etc.) may not be the “norm” for NCURA, there was plenty of overlap in all areas of research administration (audits, pre-award, post-award, leadership development). It was also very refreshing to see that many of the challenges we face on a daily basis are global. I am very happy to have new colleagues to add to my cadre of experts, and I look forward to seeing some of them at NCURA’s 61st Annual Meeting!

Tony Ventimiglia is the 2019 NCURA President and serves as the Acting Executive Director of Research Administration Services at Auburn University. He can be reached at ventiaf@auburn.edu
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n our technology driven workplace, there seems to be an electronic solution to every problem. Across industries, employees look for ways to modernize their work processes by utilizing digital tools. But what does it mean to digitally transform the workflow of a research administration office? How can a completely paper-based proposal and award lifecycle be transformed into a digital process fit for the 21st century?

Recently, the central office research administration teams at the University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) and the University of Arizona (UA) completed the task of converting their paper-based offices to paperless operations. Though both campuses had different Information Systems (UCSB uses ORBIt for contracts and grant tracking and UA uses Kuali Research), organizational structures, workflows, and differing approaches to the project, they accomplished the same goals.

Many factors served as catalysts for the UCSB and UA digitization projects. First, both campuses sought to improve efficiency by streamlining existing paper processes into electronic workflows. Second, the tremendous time and money saved by reclaiming space through the elimination of paper file storage motivated both campuses to move to electronic files. Third, electronic files enabled proposal and award file backup, searchability, and access for remote users. Lastly, the project aligned with the universities’ sustainability goals.

The first step of the UCSB project was converting the existing paper proposal and award files into accessible PDF documents. This consisted of emptying eighteen 10-foot file cabinets and utilizing student workers to scan each file. These students were given written instructions and naming conventions to ensure ease of file identification and use. Closed files were scanned in a similar manner and retained as part of the campus records retention program. Once this process was complete, UCSB research administration staff were able to access any active or closed award file from their computers. As an added bonus, UCSB converted one of the previous file rooms into office space for two employees.

Similarly at UA, team members and student employees converted files using prescribed instructions and naming conventions. An essential part of the conversion was collecting feedback from team members on how the digital environment should function to best serve their duties. The files were saved in a Windows network drive. Commercial digital storage solutions were considered, but the cost savings and simplicity of a network drive supported operation. UCSB had a collection of forms, color coded by their purpose (purple for proposal reviews, blue for award synopses, etc.). The use and purpose of each form was evaluated and considered in light of the new procedures that would be adopted once the workflow became fully electronic. Most of the existing forms were integrated into the existing electronic contracts and grants system. The remainder were converted into fillable PDF documents. Once the in-house conversion of forms was complete, the UCSB Office of Research allowed department level administrators to send over proposal documents...
for review electronically, instead of hand carrying hard copies to the central office. Proposal and award reviews are now conducted utilizing markup tools in Adobe Acrobat Pro. UA also migrated to an electronic operation by evaluating functions of paper-based forms and creating PDF equivalents of the forms. During the process, UA discovered some paper retention processes were relics that had since been replaced by other digital retention solutions. Conversion to a digital environment also doubled as an exercise in process review that will lead to future efficiency.

Using markup tools in Adobe Acrobat Pro was a real sea change in workflow from handwriting notes and comments on proposal and award files. With paper, it was often difficult to read a colleague’s writing and identify when the comment was made. Adobe takes care of this by documenting when comments were made and by whom, all in legible text. For some staff, it was difficult to get used to this new method of markup. UCSB experimented with different equipment configurations of workstations, laptops with styluses, and dual and triple monitors to replicate a physical desktop in the digital world. UA went through similar learning curves, and created checklists to facilitate the transition of working in a digital environment. For example, a digital process comes with an optional checklist that helps the transition of completing the process in the new digital environment.

For UCSB, the last and longest mile of the project was creating the best method to save relevant email correspondence in the new electronic project folders. Saving each email as a PDF, then browsing for the correct project folder to manually place the PDF file in was tedious and time consuming. After researching different email clients and third-party browser extensions, UCSB discovered Google Apps Script. A software developer at UCSB used this resource to create a Gmail add-on that, with one click, saves the email in the proper project folder, along with any needed attachments, and renames the file using project naming convention. UA is currently exporting emails to PDF and saving in relevant project folders, but plans to explore the UCSB tool.

**John Butzer** is a Sponsored Projects Analyst in the Sponsored Projects division of the Office of Research at the University of California, Santa Barbara. He was a co-presenter of the “Paper to PDF” presentation at the NCURA Region VI and VII meeting in Billings, MT Oct. 2018 and can be reached at butzer@research.ucsb.edu

**Brett Fortier** is Director of Information Systems for the Office of Research at the University of California, Santa Barbara. He was a co-presenter of the “Paper to PDF” presentation at the NCURA Region VI and VII meeting in Billings, MT Oct. 2018 and can be reached at fortier@research.ucsb.edu

**Cameron McNair** is a Software Developer for the Office of Research at the University of California, Santa Barbara. He was responsible for integrating the paper processes into the online contracts and grants application. He can be reached at mcnair@research.ucsb.edu

**Marcel Villalobos** is Assistant Director of Postaward Services, Sponsored Projects & Contracting Services, at the University of Arizona. His professional interests include training and outreach, and process improvement. He can be reached at marcel@email.arizona.edu
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In the spring of 2011, a mere eight years ago, I can vividly recall my time studying for the dreadful Certified Public Accountant exam. The four-part, 16-hour exam consumed my life for the next year. Each night after my full-time job as a sales and use tax auditor ended for the day, I would study for the exam. Even on Saturday and Sunday, I spent most of my existence absorbing the fun and exciting accounting topics such as lease accounting, income tax, financial ratios, general accepted auditing standards, and the like. After taking my first exam section, Regulation, I thought I surely failed it and even considered preparing for the LSAT exam in order to become a lawyer.

Fast forward to 2019, where I am now the Director of all post-award responsibilities of the University of Arkansas. My career path definitely changed from where I thought I would be eight years ago.

Research administration, like our careers, is ever changing. Some change is welcomed while other change is painful! As soon as we get our processes and procedures in place, a new regulation is announced or an OIG audit finding is released, once again requiring a change to our policies and procedures. Here at the University of Arkansas, we are undergoing several colossal changes simultaneously. Our previous post-award director retired after working more than 20 years. We also have had numerous employees transition in and out of our central sponsored program offices. The average age of the employees in the post-award office has plummeted from 49 years old to 34 years old. Besides converting all grant documentation to electronic files, we are now undertaking an ERP implementation. In addition, there is also a proposal on the table for combining our pre-award and post-award offices.

While all these changes listed are certainly overwhelming at times, we need to take advantage of the opportunity that change presents to us. How often do we have a chance to hire people we want to work with? Change our entire grant processes to something more efficient? Design a more cohesive process with our partners in pre-award? In order to take advantage of these opportunities, I have focused on three major aspects of effective research administration management: Championing Change, Celebrating Achievements, and Visualizing Goals.

Championing Change
Whenever we implement a change in order to meet a need, we are often faced with fear and hesitation from those individuals the change affects. As most of us have encountered, the fear of the change often ends up being worse than the actual change being implemented! In order to quell fears, it is best to take the time to explain the change being made and how it will make our jobs better. I have found that research administrative personnel are more willing to accept change if they understand why change is necessary and how it will help them improve their jobs. Even the fear of changes necessary for mandatory compliance purposes can be overcome with thoughtful and intentional discussion.

The first meeting we had concerning the university’s transition to a new ERP system was met by strong feelings of fear and uncertainty. Many of our university’s personnel have been using the same system for more than 20 years. The possibility of having to learn an entirely new system to perform their daily tasks was just too much for many people. Many chose to retire to avoid learning a new system. For those of us who did not have the option of retiring, we instead chose how to best react to change and how best to communicate these changes.

It can be difficult for leaders at institutions of higher education to know what communication about change is helpful and what can hurt your team. In order to make wise decisions, I try to think about what changes could be positive for the team, and then communicate those first to create an upbeat attitude around the change. Second, I think about what changes could be construed as negative, and I try to present solutions
Nick Freyaldenhoven, CPA, CGFM, MIS, is the Director of Research Accounting at the University of Arkansas. In this role, Nick is responsible for managing, coordinating, and overseeing all university post award responsibilities of the university. Nick also serves as Program Committee member for the National Conference on College Cost Accounting (NACCA). He can be reached at npfreyal@uark.edu

Nikki Turner, MBA, is the Associate Director of Research Accounting at the University of Arkansas. She is an active member in NCURA Region III, where she will be presenting at the 2019 Spring Meeting on post award administration, subrecipient monitoring, and time management. She can be reached at nt008@uark.edu

Visualizing Goals
Without measurable goals tied to the change that we want to achieve, our office will not be able to move forward successfully. With our new employees, goals are first established through the expectations of their positions and the procedures manual that outlines the everyday aspects of their jobs. As they progress, new goals will be established as a team to create more efficient and cohesive processes throughout the award cycle. Goals are only as good as the follow through, so specific aspects are reviewed at the one-on-one meetings that are held every other week between the associate director and all of the accountants. By keeping the goals at the core of the meetings, they are kept visible to the team and are more likely to be achieved.

Celebrating Achievements
Our research administration team is young in their careers, so every day is an opportunity to learn and grow in their new career. Celebrating small wins by bringing a treat, or even just commenting on a positive aspect of their work, is an important part of keeping employees engaged in their position, as it can be easy for them to be discouraged by the large body of knowledge required to master their jobs. When an employee is mentioned to me in a positive light by a colleague, I make sure to let them know quickly so that the compliment is not forgotten. If my boss is not in the room or on the e-mail, I make sure that he is aware of the compliment as well.

Another great way to celebrate the achievements of your personnel is to publicize their achievements in NCURA Magazine or your local NCURA regional newsletter. Whether it is a new position, a promotion, or an educational goal achieved, employees like to know that others recognize their hard work and dedication to the goal.

“…the fear of the change often ends up being worse than the actual change being implemented.”

Conclusion
Change is an always present part of today’s research administration office and it can be easy to become overwhelmed with all of the issues inherent with any change. As leaders in this field, if we focus on championing change, celebrating small wins, and visualizing goals, we can help our teams navigate the process with confidence.

Sponsored Research Administration:
A Guide to Effective Strategies and Recommended Practices

This two-volume compendium connects the dots to provide context and clarity around complex issues.

 Chapters include:
• Research Compliance
• Subawards
• Audits
• Export Controls
• Administering Research Contracts
• Intellectual Property & Data Rights
• Facilities & Administrative Costs

www.ncura.edu/publications/store.aspx

CONNECT THE DOTS

A GREAT RESOURCE FOR CRA EXAM PREP!
PRA 2019 started off with a real *Ticket to Ride*... Workshop Day! All of us red tag (FRA) and green tag (PRA) peeps supporting research together in one place, just like being back at home. So many PRA Workshops, blazing away teaching, helping, and supporting us with the basics (Fundamentals of Building a Budget) and the not so basic (Leadership Coaching), plus lots of in-between.

Then it seemed to start all over again. On Thursday, NCURA President Tony Ventimiglia kicked us off, Jeremy Miner followed launching us like a *Yellow Submarine*, and I was privileged to introduce our great keynote speaker, Dr. Laurie Santos from Yale, where she talked to us about Happiness. As she encouraged us, please remember to write those gratitude letters, say a meaningful thank you to someone, and maybe even take her free online course, *The Science of Well-Being* (https://www.coursera.org/learn/the-science-of-well-being). Thursday continued with lively and informative sessions, discussion groups, ignites, federal updates, and the many opportunities to network and connect. Plus, lots of LOVE to our Year Long Sponsors for supporting us together and making research happen better, stronger, faster. As a PRA group we give all of our sponsors a BIG, meaningful thank you (think Dr. Santos).

Speaking of connecting, I (Dan) had an NCURA member, Rebecca, track me down to ask me questions about the Uniform Guidance and subcontracting - she was definitely having *A Hard Days Night*. So, my guy Derek Brown and I jumped in to help because *Don’t Let Me Down*, is in our DNA. Talk about being grateful! Rebecca can now go back home with solid answers. That’s how we help each other.
I completely believe stories, just like Rebecca’s happened a lot over our time in the Mirage. It’s more than Lucky #13 isn’t it? All You Need is Love! Plus being odds-on-favorites to Learn, Connect, Lead.

We kept working right on through Friday, and nearly wore Jeremy and myself out, but our wonderful PRA 2019 Program Committee and fantastic presenters kept us singing Here Comes the Sun!! More and more to learn, and more connections made. I even heard love was in the air and a marriage proposal happened! Talk about great memories being made during our first time in Las Vegas.

A big shout out to the NCURA conference staff, for all of their Eight Days a Week hard work for NCURA members - Tara, Kati, Stephanie, Susan, Emily, Tracey, Stevie-D, and Krystal. Also representing the NCURA organization, Marc (Magazine), Megan (Peer Programs), and Claire (Global). And, to Kathleen Larmett, NCURA Executive Director - what a great team who are always so much Help!

PRA 2020 in Puerto Rico will come up fast, so remember the challenge Jeremy and I shared at Thursday’s lunch, if there’s a workshop, concurrent session, or discussion group that you really want to hear but it hasn’t been listed on a program yet, then you must present it. And where better to demonstrate your spirit of volunteerism than at PRA 2020? See you there!

And, above all, THANK YOU ALL for participating, engaging, and loving PRA 2019 and making it such a great success.

PRA 2019 Conference Co-Chairs,

Jeremy Miner  
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire

Dan Nordquist  
Washington State University
BETTER. STRONGER. MORE EFFICIENT.

NCURA PEER PROGRAMS
Peer Review Program
Peer Advisory Services

Peer Assistance by Research Administrators
For Research Administrators

Whether you work at a research institution or a predominantly undergraduate institution, the importance of providing quality services to your faculty in support of their research and scholarship is undeniable. NCURA offers a number of programs to assist your research administration operations and to ensure a high-quality infrastructure that supports your faculty and protects the institution.

Following a recognized model of academic program review, an NCURA Peer review provides an objective assessment of your sponsored programs or research compliance operations. Experts in research administration will visit your campus and provide detailed feedback, validation, and recommendations.
Export control laws (ECLs) are federal regulations and laws that govern how information, technologies, and commodities can be transmitted to anyone internationally, including U.S. citizens abroad, or to foreign nationals in the United States. In recognition of America’s higher education mission to advance and disseminate knowledge, U.S. government agencies with export control regulatory oversight carve out special provisions whereby research without limitations on publication or participation at U.S. universities is excluded from the regulations. This is often referred to as the Fundamental Research Exclusion (FRE). However, even with these exceptions, university activities may still fall under the ECLs, and many universities accept contractual restrictions in sponsored research projects that fall outside the FRE, which need to be identified on a case-by-case basis.

**Know Your Institution And Its Policies. Does Your Institution:**
- Have an export compliance officer?
- Accept restrictions on publication?
- Accept participation restrictions based on country of origin?
- Perform classified work?

The U.S. government places the burden of understanding and complying with export control regulations on collegiate institutions; therefore, it is important for university communities to be aware of what activities are controlled, as well as contractual language that negates FRE. Most universities have few staff dedicated to export compliance, with just one or two full-time export compliance staff, or simply other staff with export compliance duties assigned as a certain percentage of their time. Risks associated with limited numbers of dedicated export compliance staff positions may be effectively mitigated by ensuring that export controls compliance is a shared responsibility across multiple university offices. University-wide awareness of the basics of export controls is the most important method by which to identify and mitigate institutional risk of export violations. Those involved with reviewing proposals and agreements during the pre-award stage are ideally situated to identify and flag potential export control issues and projects that are potentially export controlled prior to the start of the work on campus.

Pre-award specialists should focus on the following common export compliance areas of concern when reviewing proposals and agreements, and they should alert their export compliance staff or other appropriate contact for further review, when necessary. These common questions can be developed into a proposal or agreement export compliance checklist to be used when reviewing each proposal or agreement.

**Does the project have international activities or references?**

Financial dealings/export transactions with, or providing a service to, certain restricted entities or countries may require a license or other authorization from the U.S. government. Therefore, identifying projects with international activities can help determine whether export compliance issues may arise.

- Does the international component of the project involve countries deemed high-risk by the U.S. government?
- Is the sponsor a non-U.S. entity?
- Will the research be performed outside of the United States?
- Is there international travel proposed?
- Are funded or unfunded collaborations with international entities proposed?
- Will there be shipment of equipment, data or research materials to international locations?

**Consideration**

Does your institution have a method to identify high-risk countries and to screen collaborators and countries for restricted/prohibited parties and export licensing requirements?

**Does the funding opportunity announcement provide indicators that the research to be performed could be export controlled?**

Funding announcements may provide clues concerning whether or not the sponsoring agency deems the work to be export controlled. Sometimes, the announcement will state that the agency does not consider the work to be fundamental research; other times, the announcement includes opportunities for both controlled and non-controlled research. For example, take a look at the language included in a DARPA Broad Agency Announcement (BAA): “As of the date of publication of this BAA, the Government expects that program goals as described herein may be met by proposers intending to perform fundamental research and proposers not intending to perform fundamental research or the proposed research may present a high likelihood of disclosing performance characteristics of military systems or manufacturing technologies that are unique and critical to defense.” If your institution wishes the proposed work to be considered Fundamental Research, advise your Principal Investigator (PI) to include a statement in the proposal stating why the scope of the proposed work is fundamental research.

Another indicator that the work might be controlled is if the announcement references the applicability of DFARs 252.204-7012 Safeguarding Covered Defense Information clause. While the inclusion of 252.204-7012 may not apply if the work is eventually scoped as fundamental research by the sponsoring agency, it is important to note the clause at the proposal phase. This way, the PI can determine if they think the work proposed would be fundamental research, and, if not, proactively communicate with the research team and the appropriate IT professionals about the data security requirements imposed by 252.204-7012, so that they can prepare a data security plan to meet the requirements of the clause.
Pro Tip For Fundamental Research
If you are sending a proposal to an industry sponsor that is submitting for a contract with the federal government, include a cover letter that makes clear your university’s position. For example: “Please be advised that University X is a nonprofit U.S. educational institution that conducts fundamental research in basic and applied science and engineering that is widely and openly published and made available to the scientific community. University X reserves the right to negotiate an agreement that will permit free publication of results should this proposal be selected for funding.”

Pro Tip
If your institution has a policy that would prevent acceptance of a publication restriction, suggest a time-bound review and comment period as opposed to approval language.

Does the announcement or agreement include a foreign national restriction or a requirement to provide personally identifiable information of foreign nationals for prior approval to work on project? This issue may come up with BAs for federal contracts or Other Transaction Authority agreements, for instance with the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or the Department of Energy (e.g., DEARs 952.204-71 Sensitive Foreign Nations Controls). For example: “Because the proposed research (or a portion of the proposed research) requires access by Prime Contractor or Subcontractor to critical technology, sensitive unclassified information, For Official Use Only material, or intelligence material, non-U.S. citizens may participate in the resultant contract (or portion of the resultant contract) only if special written permission is granted by the Contracting Officer.” While many universities cannot accept a prior approval requirement for foreign national involvement, perhaps you can negotiate and agree to provide a list of foreign nationals (no approval requirement), if it is within your institutional policies and risk tolerance, and the individuals consent to release this information.

Pre-award specialists can be proactive agents in supporting universities’ export compliance programs.

Pro Tip
Use institutional policy where it exists to justify removal of foreign national restrictions. For example: “University X’s policies prohibit discrimination based on nationality, country of origin, ethnicity, gender, race, or religion. University X cannot accept any award terms or conditions that would restrict any member of the research group, including faculty, students, and staff from the ability to participate fully in all of the intellectually significant portions of the project.”

Pre-award specialists can be proactive agents in supporting universities’ export compliance programs. First, it is paramount that pre-award specialists develop a collaborative relationship with staff having export compliance responsibilities and exchange functional knowledge in their respective areas. Each needs at least a cursory understanding of the other’s responsibilities in order to communicate and collaborate effectively. For example, this can be done formally through professional development, such as NCURA’s Pre-Award Research Administration conference, traveling workshops, or regional and national conferences. This general professional development can be bolstered by institutional training, such as inviting export compliance staff to speak to pre-award specialists or holding a periodic discussion forum, which reflects approaches and policies specific to the individual institution. Building on this foundation, the pre-award specialist can begin to review proposals and agreements through an export compliance lens.

Jillian Cawley is a Senior Associate Director for Pre-Award in the Office of Research Services, University of Pennsylvania. Jillian’s responsibilities include pre-award and non-financial post-award activities. Jillian has worked in research administration for 13 years and is a Certified Research Administrator. She can be reached at jcawley@upenn.edu

Christopher Denman is a Senior Associate Director, Pre-Award in the Office of Research Services, University of Pennsylvania. His primary responsibilities are reviewing and negotiating contracts and managing the research contracting process. Christopher has been a research administrator for 25 years, holds a master’s degree in Research Administration, and is a Certified Research Administrator. He can be reached at cdenman@upenn.edu
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At large universities, it can be difficult for research administrators to connect with each other, especially if the campus is decentralized. As trainers and educators, one of our priorities is to bring staff together, both literally and figuratively. Instant message, email, and social media platforms all make the sharing of information at work quick and easy but at the cost of personal connection. How can we excel in making workplace connections when often as research administrators we find ourselves isolated at our desks conversing with a few clicks on the keyboard? When we begin to feel a sense of distance from ourselves and others, it is time to take some necessary actions to connect. A well-rounded research administration training and development program can assist in providing workplace support and the network necessary for staff to thrive in our field. In turn, regularly scheduled learning opportunities and training can give staff the ability to get up from their desks and out to meet others across campus, helping to reduce feelings of isolation at work.

When we come together to learn, we benefit by sharing unique perspectives and talking through challenges. These individual shared learning experiences can strengthen the larger community of research administrators.

As Harold D. Stolovitch and Erica J. Keeps (2011) state in their book *Telling Ain’t Training*, “A true learning organization is not the organization with the largest collection of training programs or the most courses online. Rather, it is the organization where knowledge is most freely shared through increasingly effective information exchange and collaboration approaches and tools. The sharing of knowledge is a highly social act” (p. 211).

Here are some training and education tips to help you maximize the level of personal connection, collaboration, and engagement at your institution.

**Participant-Centered Learning Models**

Are your learning experiences based in lecture only? Lecture isn’t inherently bad. However, if we bring people together into the same space and we don’t let them talk to each other, we miss a huge opportunity for growth and engagement among staff. Participant-centered learning gives learners the opportunity to meet and connect with each other in the classroom.

Participant-centered environments include group work, discussion, and hands-on activities. We know through the principles of adult learning that adults like to participate actively and contribute toward their own learning. The more our learners make contributions in the classroom, the more they learn.

An added benefit of this learning model is that it allows more experienced learners to share their own knowledge with others. In this way our seasoned staff build confidence while meeting and assisting others, strengthening the community.

**Training Program Ambassadors**

Does your program have a spokesperson or ambassador? Perhaps it is your lead trainer or your training manager. This person should be the one constant throughout your training program, responsible for guiding learners through the program and connecting them with resources and each other. The ambassador should encourage continued participation in the program by seasoned staff while making new learners feel welcome and comfortable joining the community. This person acts as a guru, guide, facilitator, and cheerleader for program learners. When choosing ambassadors for your program, consider looking for the following traits:

- **Professionalism in the field**
- **Passion for the program**
- **Engagement with others**
- **Authenticity in communication**

**Mentoring and Coaching**

Outside of the training needs of new hires, research administrators at all skill and ability levels are looking for ways to connect with colleagues across campus. Consider adding peer-mentorship opportunities to your training and development program. A mentoring program can help support individuals on a continuous basis long after onboarding and can help contribute to increased job satisfaction, personal productivity, and job stability. Mentoring also fills in the necessary on-the-job support that formalized educational programs cannot. Mentors can assist your training goals by helping identify unique training needs and problem solving approaches with their mentees. A mentoring program can help make it possible for mentees to succeed in specific areas where they may be stuck or feel ineffective.

**Research Faculty and Space Visits**

As noted, often as administrators we find ourselves feeling isolated at our desks. Though our work supports a variety of ground-breaking projects, we don’t often get to see the people and the places that work takes place. Through your training and development program, consider offering administrators the opportunity to visit with PIs and research staff in their labs and offices. These visits can help staff find purpose in their everyday work and see the value in their administrative contributions, all while strengthening connections between research staff and administrators.

**Look to Others**

Expand beyond your own university by utilizing the resources available through national organizations like NCURA to build a stronger knowledge base and perspective in research administration. Encourage your staff to attend regional meetings and national conferences. Purchase and hold viewings of webinars to bring expert knowledge to your campus.

As we look to the future, it is clear that we are truly better together. Consider these tips to encourage connection and collaboration at your own institutions. Don’t be surprised to see improved engagement and learning in your local community of research administrators.
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There has been a great deal of talk recently about civility, or more exactly, the lack of civility in American society. Social commentators shake their heads in despair about incivility in social media, cable news, and public discourse. But all of this tongue clucking begs a number of questions. Why should we care? Isn’t civility just being polite? What does it have to do with research administration anyway?

Before we try and answers these questions, some definitions are needed. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, civility is the etiquette of public discourse and public behavior. Whereas politeness is the proper conduct between individuals, civility is the manner of behavior in public or in a group. Civility is public politeness, courtesy, and graciousness. Incivility is public rudeness, coarseness, and crassness. Civility, Supreme Court Justice Arthur Kennedy wrote, “has deep roots in the idea of respect for the individual.”

There are a number of practical reasons, especially with regard to the workplace, why we should care about civility. Civility is necessary so that we can disagree without rancor or hostility. Essentially, civility is the means for managing conflict as well as for managing rude, obnoxious, and even odious behavior. Civility prevents disagreements from escalating and creates opportunities for resolution. Civility accomplishes two important goals: 1) it is the basis for good customer relations and 2) it enables us to co-exist with others, especially in the workplace. As one research administrator aptly stated, “you can’t solve a problem when you’re insulting someone.”

The problem facing all of us is controlling our own behavior and knowing how to cope with the incivility of others when it occurs. First, it would be helpful to understand some of the causes of incivility. Think about how you feel when someone on the highway cuts you off, tailgates your car, or blasts their horn at you. Typically, you get angry. You feel that you’ve been wronged, unjustly treated, or just simply ignored. You feel you have the “right of way” and the other person has disrespected you. Incivility, like road rage, can come from a sense of superiority; that you are right and the other person needs to respect your “right of way.” Conversely, incivility can also come from a sense of inferiority — from feeling powerless, disregarded, and ignored. Also like road rage, impatience, frustration, and stress can provoke incivility.

Given all the stress, pressure, demands, and frustrations of research administration, how can we practice civility? How can we manage the inevitable conflicts inherent in our work? There are a few simple rules. Remain calm. Check your ego. Be respectful. Listen to criticism. Be humble, that is admit you don’t have all the answers or that you may be wrong. Acknowledge that the other person may have a valid point and recognize the other person’s point of view and opinion is legitimate. Try and diffuse the emotion and anger. Clarify the problem, find common ground, be respectful, and be willing to change your own mind.

Ethicist Stephen Carter has said that civility is everyone’s responsibility. We might go a step farther and say that civility is more than a responsibility; it is a necessity for us to operate together in a group. At a local level, civility is a necessity for the workplace to be efficient and effective. Civility allows us to work with our co-workers, bosses, employees, and customers. Civility permits us to work and live together in a group even when we don’t agree or are in conflict. Civility isn’t just a code of conduct. It is a value that defines our humanity.
Building towards the future... together

The 61st Annual Meeting Program Committee has been working diligently for months to plan a phenomenal annual meeting for this year. The program theme, “Building Towards the Future...together” is packed full of must-see information and sessions. There are 14 topical tracks with over 200 learning opportunities. There will also be many wonderful educational and professional development workshops before and after the core annual meeting to participate in, from which attendees can obtain focused information on a myriad of research administration topics. These targeted workshops have been designed with our members in mind. We will have 28 pre- and post-meeting workshops this year, where one can get a deeper dive into a topic or area of interest. The workshop co-chairs have a stellar lineup in store and you will definitely want to tap into these educational and informative workshops for those topics you want to learn more about from experts in the field. In addition to all these great sessions and workshops, NCURA will be hosting a poster session this year with 12 prizes to be awarded, plus one first place for the best new and innovative idea being used by research administrators to support research.

We will be kicking off the meeting officially on Monday, August 5th, with this year’s keynote, Dr. Freeman Hrabowski, III. Dr. Hrabowski is the President of the University of Maryland, Baltimore County. Since 1992, Dr. Hrabowski’s research and publications have focused on science and math education, with a special emphasis on minority participation and performance. He chaired the National Academies of Science, Engineering and Mathematics’ committee that produced the 2011 report, Expanding Underrepresented Minority Participation: America’s Science and Technology Talent at the Crossroads. He was named in 2012 by President Obama to chair the President’s Advisory Commission on Educational Excellence for African Americans. Dr. Hrabowski is truly an inspirational figure in the higher education community, and you will want to come see him at the conference to hear his fascinating story and learn about his dedication to getting the African-American youth in this country engaged and positioned for success in the fields of math and engineering.

But wait, there is more! Not only will you get to attend the various concurrent sessions, discussion groups, workshops and breakfast round tables, as always NCURA is making sure you have many opportunities to network and catch up with colleagues from across the country and around the world. Some of the highlights include a reception on Sunday evening at the Smithsonian National Museum of the American Indian and a visit by the Capitol Steps at Monday’s luncheon. The 61st Annual Meeting will also include numerous exhibits you’ll want to visit along with the NCURA bookstore, so you can stock up on those great educational publications and notable NCURA goodies to take back to campus. As is tradition, there will be regional hospitality suites at night and the regional and national business meetings during the conference.

The networking opportunities reach an all-time high on Tuesday evening. After a satisfying day full of wonderful educational and professional development sessions, there will be a great opportunity to relax and mingle with your friends and fellow research administrators at Tuesday night’s extravaganza. Get ready to join the fun as you enter the world of NCURA’s version of “Carnevale”!

You will not want to miss this, so plan your calendar accordingly.

AM61 is going to be one for the record books, so get ready. Come learn, expand your network and enhance your knowledge to better serve your faculty and campus. We look forward to welcoming everyone back to the Washington Hilton in Washington D.C. August 4 - 7, 2019 to begin “Building Towards the Future...together”. See you there!

2019 NCURA VP/President-Elect
Denise Wallen
University of New Mexico

AM61 Co-Chairs
David Mayo
California Institute of Technology
Michelle Vazin
Vanderbilt University

To register visit www.ncura.edu
The OAR Model for Research Administration: Ownership, Authority, and Responsibility

By Sarah Marina, Laura Lucas, and Zoya Davis-Hamilton

Management of research administration enterprises varies across institutions. Ideally, responsibility for the preparation, submission, and management of sponsored projects is managed in concert. Coordinated management allows for efficient use of resources and responsibilities, shared education of research administrators, and cohesion within the research administration enterprise.

While some institutions have an integrated research administration function, often research administration is split into several groups, reporting through separate divisions with differing leadership and goals. Even within units that do coordinate, research administration tasks such as signing authority, proposal preparation, and budget management are unevenly shared across roles. Research administrators may have the responsibility for a task, but not the authority to enforce rules related to the same task. This can lead to questions of authority and responsibility that are challenging for research administrators and confusing for researchers.

When a research administration structure isn’t unified, additional steps must be taken to ensure that all groups are working together toward the common goal of submitting and administering sponsored funding. We suggest following the Ownership, Authority, and Responsibility, or OAR model in these cases. We discuss the model, how to implement it, and potential challenges below.

Concept of OAR
The goal of OAR is clarifying roles and empowering constructive action across the research administration enterprise despite differing goals and lack of physical proximity. The acronym stands for:

- **Ownership**: assuming a duty to coordinate and follow through to completion
- **Authority**: the power to independently choose a course of action and make a decision without additional authorization
- **Responsibility**: having an obligation to perform or complete a task; being accountable for something within one’s power/control

Each component is designed to help research administration staff determine their role in, and contribute proactively to a given process. For example, while only some central pre-award staff have the authority to sign proposals on behalf of the university, all local research administrators have ownership of the preparation of proposals in the research administration system. Local and central research administrators are jointly responsible for ensuring that proposals are submitted in a timely and compliant manner.

“...the purpose of OAR is to propel the research enterprise forward in partnership.”

In rowing, an oar is a tool to propel the boat forward, in concert with others. In the same way, the purpose of OAR is to propel the research enterprise forward in partnership. Ownership, authority, and responsibility do not exist for their own sake but are tools for the purpose of achieving important goals collaboratively.

One might think an oar should be grasped at the center. In reality, this piece is fixed to the boat by an oarlock, a brace that acts as a fulcrum transferring the power of the rower to the blade of the oar in the water. Similarly, non-research administrators might think that decision-making authority—the middle component of the OAR model—should be grasped as the most significant source of power. In reality, power ultimately comes from ownership, or the duty to perform a necessary task to completion, which anyone participating in a process can assume. Further, the blade of the oar, the end that meets the water, is ultimately what propels the
boat. Likewise, it is individuals reliably meeting their day-to-day responsibilities who propel the research enterprise forward.

The OAR model designates each type of contribution as vital. It clarifies each research administrator’s role in a process by calling on each person to ask three key questions:

• What ownership can I assume in this process to perform a necessary task through to completion, even if I don’t have decision-making authority or accountability for this task?
• For what parts of this process do I have decision-making authority, and how can I use that authority to help move the process forward efficiently and effectively? How can I use my authority to honor and amplify what others are contributing?
• For what tasks have I been assigned responsibility, and how can I be accountable in performing these tasks reliably and well?

Staff can reflect on these questions individually and discuss these questions together as work is performed. Executives can consider how to align ownership, authority, and responsibility most effectively across processes, functions, and units, as we discuss below. Leaders can celebrate the efforts not only of those with decision-making authority or assigned responsibilities, but also of those who step up to take ownership and add value beyond these formal expectations.

Ultimately, OAR empowers each person participating in a process to contribute proactively and to move the process forward to its successful conclusion, much like a rowing team moving swiftly together across an expanse of water.

Implementation and Potential Issues
Successful job performance typically includes assuming ownership for tasks assigned to a role. Task ownership is a straightforward concept in which tasks are completed and largely controlled by an individual employee. It becomes more challenging when assigned tasks and/or control over the essential parameters are not fully in the person’s job description. This is very common in research administration. For example, during the preparation of a grant proposal, information may need to be obtained from institutional offices with competing priorities. Research administrators also do not control the investigator’s timeline, including providing details necessary for building the proposal in the required format.

Ownership in such circumstances takes the form of assuming a duty to coordinate and follow through to proposal completion, including proactively identifying the required application parts, and creating a timetable for completion of those parts and a series of follow-up actions to ensure steady progress through the timeline. This is the opposite of passively waiting to receive the proposal information and the “it’s not my job” attitude. In other words, ownership requires active engagement with the proposal process and commitment to its timely completion. An individual contributor can cultivate and deploy such engagement independently, often without explicit permission from the management or their supervisor. It is a duty of the manager to encourage, cultivate, and celebrate the ownership approach.

Ownership goes hand in hand with authority — the power to independently choose a course of action and make a decision without additional authorization. Formal authority is typically bestowed by virtue of one’s position and stemming from roles and responsibilities at the institution. Some examples of research administration authority are the ability to formalize workflows, approve transactions, determine if a funding source is a gift or a sponsored award, or sign an expenditure report.

Responsibility, the final component of OAR, is an obligation to compete a research administration task. This might include a responsibility for preparation and submission of invoices to the sponsor, to perform subrecipient risk assessment, to maintain documentation of committed cost share, to ensure that expenses are allowable, or the responsibility to coordinate Uniform Guidance audits.

Ideally, responsibility and authority are aligned, cultivating ownership of tasks and leading to better staff engagement and growth in professional skills (Davis-Hamilton, Marina, 2018, para 5). In practice however, individuals responsible for tasks may not be the ones authorized to sign off on the transaction. For example, those who review a proposal or an award agreement may not be the ones authorized to commit the institution to submission of a proposal or acceptance of the award. In those circumstances, it is up to the institution, its management and the institutional leadership to work towards better alignment.

Complete alignment of responsibility and authority may not be possible, such as when research administration duties are shared by staff that report through different channels, some outside of central research administration. In such environments, instead of making decisions from the top down, all parties must work together to find mutually agreeable solutions to common problems, working together to meet individual and shared goals. The buy-in into the concept of the OAR model from institutional leadership is helpful for succeeding in a team environment and avoiding overlaps and gaps in providing service to researchers.
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Recently, an increased focus on subrecipient monitoring has more agencies asking to see what type of risk assessment we perform on proposed subrecipients during the selection process. Creating a risk-averse collaborative relationship with an external entity starts at the proposal stage. We ensure that the subrecipient is eligible to receive funding under the proposed federal program, determine the classification of the activity (services vs. subaward), and develop a plan to manage the relationship so that we meet program requirements.

Eligibility
Federal agencies require pass-through entities to follow federal standards for responsible contractors when issuing subawards under 2 C FR 200 or subcontracts under the Federal Acquisition Regulations. A pre-award risk assessment can prevent post-award surprises. Risk assessments should identify a subrecipient’s eligibility to receive federal dollars; identify and mitigate any potential conflicts of interests; and ensure the subrecipient has the skills, facilities and an adequate business model to ensure programmatic and financial compliance.

A subrecipient’s eligibility to receive federal funding can be verified via the government’s System for Award Management (https://sam.gov/SAM). Active exclusions to receive federal funding will be identified on a subrecipient’s record. In most cases, the record also provides representations and certifications for compliance with federal regulations and statutes. If needed, agency-specific representations and certifications should be received during the proposal stage. For example, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration requires representations and certifications. In addition, Department of Defense solicitations include agency-specific representations and certifications. Regardless of the agency, you should always require the subrecipient to assert data rights to any background intellectual property that may be used on the project.

These documents, in addition to publicly available audit reports, can help in determining if the subrecipient has adequate resources to carry out the scope of work as well as the business and management system to comply with government rules, regulations, and statutes. Nonprofits who expend more than $750,000 of federal dollars annually have a single audit on file at the Federal Audit Clearinghouse Image Management System (https://harvester.census.gov/facdissem/SearchA133.aspx). This report will identify whether the subrecipient is low risk and also provide a list of the types of federal awards it receives.

Relationship
Next, is the relationship truly that of a subrecipient, or is the other party a contractor (aka vendor) or a consultant? Determining the correct classification at the time of proposal can prevent a budget shortfall. For example, at Georgia Tech, based on our indirect costs rate agreement, we add the first $25,000 of a subaward to our modified total direct cost base.
for resident instruction projects, but charge indirect costs on the total cost of a consultant. In addition, institutions must treat costs consistently, in accordance with federally-approved accounting standards. Therefore, during the post-award stage and prior to issuing a subaward, it is important to verify the relationship and consult with the Principal Investigator and the department to resolve any misclassification. Keep in mind that not proposing the appropriate type of relationship in the first place may adversely affect the project's budget and in most cases will require sponsor approval prior to budget reallocation. The subrecipient and contractor relationships are described in the Uniform Guidance at 2 CFR 200.330. Look for further guidance on your institution’s website, or visit Georgia Tech’s resource page (https://osp.gatech.edu/subrecipient-determination).

Plan for Management
Pre-award considerations should include past performance information, the need for any human or animal protocols, export control issues, verification of adequate facilities to perform the work, whether the subrecipient relationship makes sense logistically, and whether there has been a meeting of the minds about the expected outcomes. Examples of issues that may arise post-award are: 1) award terms or requirements unacceptable to the subrecipient, for example, security clearances or publication restrictions and 2) miscommunication about technical expectations and availability of funding to carry out the proposed scope of work and programmatic outcomes. Managing project performance is essential for meeting program goals. Define roles and responsibilities for investigators and for department and central administrators to address and document subrecipient monitoring requirements, including program activities, invoices and expenditures, compliance oversight, and reporting. Georgia Tech’s guidance on post-award considerations for managing a subaward can be viewed at https://osp.gatech.edu/subrecipient-monitoring.

“Creating a risk-averse collaborative relationship with an external entity starts at the proposal stage.”

How do we reduce post-award frustration when working with subawards? Conduct a thorough pre-award risk assessment, verify that the other party is a subrecipient under the federal definitions, communicate expectations, and develop a plan for continued monitoring through the life of the subaward.
Universities in the United Kingdom, like those around the world, vary widely in terms of size and structure. Some of us are embedded within Research and Innovation Service departments with hundreds of colleagues while others are the lone warrior providing research support to an entire institution. No matter size, we face the same challenges in providing quality support to our academic communities.

One such challenge we face as a community is ensuring we are up to date with changes to the external landscape and understanding the implications they have on our capacity to support our academic communities. Higher education is one of the most globally volatile and dynamic sectors. Therefore, there is a need for us to make certain that we are not only aware and have knowledge of shifts in external policy and funding, but that we have the necessary skills and networks in place to ensure we are able to succeed.

The vitality of the landscape is one of the reasons I love working in research development, and having worked in this area for a number of years now, I know I am not alone in this enjoyment. We love the whirlwind! However, we are only able to experience this enjoyment if we’re still able to perform at the top of our game.

I don’t remember the first day I started to build my own professional networks as a research administrator. In my first research administration post I was supported to complete a Certificate in Research Administration with the Association of Research Managers and Administrators (ARMA) (https://arma.ac.uk), where I met colleagues at workshops, but at that point I didn’t truly understand how important networks could be. It was when I started to attend conferences and was introduced to senior external colleagues that I began to see just how coming together as a community could help support us in the delivery of our roles.

In the UK, the power of coming together to share practice is well evidenced through the work that ARMA has facilitated in relation to the Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF). Announced in 2015, GCRF is a £1.5bn agenda funded through the UK aid budget to support research to tackle the world’s most pressing challenges in the Global South (www.gov.uk/government/publications/global-challenges-research-fund). This fund presented a series of new challenges for the Research Management Administration (RMA) community, in terms of issues such as due diligence with partners and to how to best support academics with equitable partnerships and proposal development. Recognising that the community required support to succeed in this arena, ARMA has led various events, including technical workshops and good practice exchanges, which has brought together RMA professionals from across the UK to help increase knowledge and develop the necessary skills for this initiative.

I attended the International Network of Research Management Societies (INORMS) (https://inorms.net) conference in 2018 in Edinburgh, which was a thriving gathering of research support colleagues from around the world, it was exciting to be part of. What was so interesting was that despite the different geographical contexts and international funding landscapes we work in, we face the same challenges! Therefore, having opportunities to come together and explore the mitigation of risks and breaking down of barriers is crucial, and innovative practice can...
thrive if we share practice across institutional and geographical boundaries.

Durham University is a key member of the Coimbra Network, established in 1985 as “an association of long-established European comprehensive, multidisciplinary universities of high international standard committed to creating special academic and cultural ties in order to promote, for the benefits of its members, internationalisation, academic collaboration, excellence in learning and research, and service to society” (Coimbra Network, 2019). While the Network hosts several academic-led working groups, it also hosts professional service forums such as the Research Support Officer Working Group. This provides a platform for research support staff from the 39 members to come together to share best practice regarding Horizon Europe (https://ec.europa.eu/info/designing-next-research-and-innovation-framework-programme/what-shapes-next-framework-programme_en), research impact and open access (for example).

Such opportunities are valued as driving innovation within our institutions.

Given the level of competition around research publications and research funding, some may be concerned that colleagues hold back and are not fully sharing practices or exploring solutions to challenges that the community faces; however, I do not find this to be case. When opportunities are offered for the RMA community to come together, we grab them with both hands and jump in.

In the UK, we’re seeing this more as funders face pressure to be more transparent and move away from “favoured” partner models of engagement with only select universities. More open Town Hall and regional events are being opened up which bring together colleagues to explore funder and scheme-specific issues collaboratively. Debate in the UK also focusses on diversification of funding, especially in terms of funding coming out of the “Golden Triangle” of institutions in the South East, with a driving force behind the importance of “place” and how different institutions in areas are coming together to deliver excellent research.

While we are stuck in this somewhat never-ending competitive research ecosystem, I cannot stress enough how important it is that we come together as a community in order to thrive. The UK awaits the outcome of Brexit, as well as the Augar Panel (Department for Education, 2018) which is reviewing higher education finances, both of which will have momentous impact on the UK higher education sector. I know we are not alone in facing significant challenges, and RMA colleagues from around the world will be facing similar issues. It has never been more important to be part of a wider professional community, and moving forward with certain changes on the horizon this will only become more essential.
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Increasing Efficiencies: Getting Your Work to Work for You

In today’s competitive research environment, innovation and collaboration are key themes. Our researchers are asked to do more with less and so are we as research administrators (Chun, 2010). Making use of available technologies can help you to create efficiencies in your routine operations and drawing from others’ experience can lead to improve processes.

Consider where you spend your day. Review the following examples and think of similar instances in which you can identify challenges and find solutions.

Scenario 1: Approval Signatures
Research administrators live in a world requiring documented approvals. Reducing time spent on printing, flagging, routing, scanning, and sending documents can be accomplished by the use of an electronic routing system or document signing application. Multiple signers can be notified and secured in one click rather than toting papers across campus or sending multiple emails.

Scenario 2: Task Management
Keeping oneself organized and on task is often a challenge. Many calendars are filled with placeholders for upcoming activities and projects needing to be done. Work with your system to create trackable tasks for deliverables. Outlook Tasks is a great way to accomplish this. Here you can name a project, define a due date, track progress, rank as a priority, assign to others if help is needed, link to documents, and record milestones in the notes section.

Scenario 3: Cultivating a Network
Many of us seek best practices based on what other similar offices are doing (Chun, 2010). We have all gone out to the internet to see how another research office addresses a topic, sets a policy, or manages a process. You can be more intentional about how you gather this information if you use your NCURA connections, including NCURA’s Collaborate networking platform, to build a network of colleagues you can reach out to when questions arise. A robust list of personal contacts can serve you well when an issue arises and you need to know what works. Actively maintain this list to cultivate relationships that are reciprocal so you, too, are viewed as a leader in your field.

Even in the face of limited resources, you can create small changes that will streamline your work performance. By implementing solutions, whether novel or borrowed, you can find an approach that ensures your work works for you.
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Most of us have faced challenges in our career. Challenges like a persistent error in a proposal due in twenty minutes, a first-time parent experience coupled with a demanding full-time job, or deciding over myriad possible career paths. Moments like these can feel like a search for light in a sea of darkness. If we are lucky, a more experienced colleague may be around to quickly spot the source of the error and enable us to submit the proposal right before the deadline, give us tips and tricks learned along the way on work/life balance, or help us analyze the various career opportunities lying ahead based on one’s experience.
ny experienced person passing the torch to light our way can be a mentor. A mentor doesn’t have to be our role model whom we try to imitate completely. A mentor can be a trainer, a trusted adviser, a connector, an advocate, a cheerleader, or a friend who lends a hand to aid us in navigating to our destination. Mentoring can be done on an informal basis through interactions with respected colleagues, but structured mentor/mentee relationships can result in lifelong investments by mentors in the professional development of the next generation in our profession. And who knows, these relationships may result in lifelong friendships.

While the value of a mentor is commonly recognized across industries, mentoring can be especially valuable for research administrators. Research administration encompasses a vast body of knowledge from federal regulations to institutional policies and procedures and beyond. One common phrase in our world is “it depends.” Decisions can be very situational. Different circumstances warrant different approaches. On top of that, the issues on the table are often time sensitive. A good mentor points us in the right direction and guides us in managing complex situations and sensitive relationships using their experienced intuition and wisdom. More importantly, sometimes encouragement and the message that he or she believes that we have what it takes can really keep us motivated in our pursuit.

What makes a successful mentor? Heathfield (2019) identified 15 characteristics of a successful mentor in choosing mentors for a formal mentoring program for an office, but these have relevance for selecting a professional mentor that goes beyond training and orientation for a new employee. When selecting a professional mentor, look for individuals who not only have the requisite knowledge in the profession but familiarity with the culture of the profession; a broad network of effective collegial collaborations as evidenced by their standing in professional circles; effective communication skills including listening, written and verbal acumen; and emotional intelligence with a sense of humor. Mentors must be willing to provide honest, reflective, and constructive feedback and guidance to their mentees. A professional mentor should be an ally and not someone whose ego gets in the way of the mentee’s professional growth. A truly valuable mentor wants a mentee who exceeds his or her own accomplishments.

How do you find a mentor? Mentors are everywhere. They can be a more experienced colleague who is willing to answer our daily questions at work, a top leader in the industry who we meet at a professional gathering, a former professor or supervisor, etc. It is important to have a diverse group of mentors with different backgrounds and experience. Having multiple mentors is like having a personal board of directors to guide us as the CEO of our own life and career (Clark, 2017). Colleagues at the same institution may help us see the big picture we are part of and collectively push projects forward. A mentor outside of our institution may help us expand our horizons and allow us to share our questions and concerns honestly without being concerned about the interpersonal relationships at work. A mentor outside of our industry or profession may help us put our work into perspective and inform us of alternative career paths of which we might not otherwise be aware. Some people come across mentors organically. They meet people on their professional or personal paths or reach out to those they admire to develop mentor/mentee relationships. But we can also search for mentors via formal mentoring programs.

While many universities have their own mentoring programs, professional associations also provide mentoring opportunities such as NCURA Region II Cheryl-Lee Howard Mentor Me Program and SRA International JRA Author Fellowship Program.

Cole (2018) advised mentees of what to look for in seeking mentors. Finding the right “fit” is important. What do we want to learn and do well one day? Do they “walk the walk” in areas that interest us? Are they someone we respect and would love to develop a long-term relationship with? Can we take the responsibility of our own professional development and commit to bring value to our mentor in the exchange for their guidance and support? Do they see our potential? Are they interested in investing in us? Do they care about us as human beings? Mentorship is a two-way street in both investments and growth. Both parties must be equally vested in making the relationship work. A mentor must be willing to push the mentee, and the mentee must be willing to stretch one’s horizons beyond his or her own comfort zone. Good mentors truly care about their mentees and want their mentees to succeed. It is not just saying he or she has mentored someone; it is truly investing in their mentees’ success. In return, mentors gain just as much as the mentee, such as getting fresh ideas and renewed enthusiasm from mentees who are often much more technologically astute.

How do you get the most out of your mentor? After finding a mentor, it’s critical to further develop and maintain the mentor/mentee relationship. As a mentee, we need to clarify up front what we need from our mentor, and be specific and mindful of our mentor’s time. When collaborating on a joint project, under promise and over deliver. Come to work with enthusiasm, excitement, and eagerness to move projects forward (Chopra and Saint, 2017). Mentors are busy and rely on the mentee to touch base periodically. A good mentor enjoys hearing from a mentee and appreciates a mentee who respects their time by 1) scheduling formal time to communicate via telephone, teleconferencing, or at professional meetings; and 2) having and providing an agenda for those interactions in advance. Mentors are going to respond best to direct questions, to mentees who come at it with preparation, and to those who make the effort to stay engaged. Showing initiative to keep a mentor involved in career choices and coming to calls with an agenda and/or a list of questions is imperative. In the end, we will never move up much on the coattails of a mentor but through our own initiative, intelligence, and intuition - knowing when to make the move.

From the Mentee: I have been very lucky to have mentors who are not only successful in their own career but also loving, caring and committed in developing next generation talents. Susie particularly has been a great inspiration and excellent mentor to me. I’ve always remembered the moment when she said, “You have what it takes” to me. That moment plays again and again in my head as I boldly take on new challenges in my career. I am grateful to her and everyone who have believed in me and supported me in my pursuit.
Remember, a mentor does not have to look like you or even have your same family situation. They may not be of the same gender, ethnicity, etc. Look for a mentor who has a sincere interest in the profession and who collaborates on presentations and publications with a variety of colleagues, not just a small circle of friends.

From the Mentor:
For me, when I recognize talent, aptitude and attitude, it is a no brainer to invest in someone’s professional growth and agree to be a mentor. The “reward” is in watching your mentee flourish and become the research administration professional you thought they could be. Bella is a great example of why I eagerly mentor. My legacy is more tied to the lives I touch than the things I have accomplished myself.

Mentoring matters. Don’t be afraid to ask, and if someone offers to serve as a professional mentor, be proactive. Don’t expect the mentor to take full responsibility for the relationship. Together, mentors and their mentees can assure a bright future for the profession of research administration.
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I think it can be very difficult to work in any office which appears to us to be “toxic.” Lots of questions occur to me. I would ask about your own definition of “toxic” and how that might compare with others in the office. I would ask about the leadership of the office and what has been the tenure and pattern of office and individual behaviors over time. What is a good day at work for everyone in terms of business relationships? And, would others in the office see things the way you do? Do others view the situation as unusual or abnormal?

Your topic falls under the general category of office culture. So, culture is about questions such as: How do people work together to get business done? What are the levels of dignity and respect? Who speaks and who listens to whom? What are the levels of trust?

I like to suggest to clients that they do a culture survey before launching into initiatives such as coaching, more focused leadership, or team training. Without such data, training or coaching interventions can often feel like they were launched along the lines of “ready, fire, aim.”

There are several tools on the market to help teams and leaders get a good handle on culture issues. My go-to tool in this regard is The Leadership Circle Culture Survey: https://leadershipcircle.com/en/products/leadership-culture-survey. The results of such surveys should be made available to those who participated in the survey as a measure of trust and transparency. Many leaders require some encouragement to do so, and most decide that they will either send out the results broadly or produce an accurate summary of survey findings. Most of the tools are web-based and moderately priced.

With survey results in hand and a coach to guide the leader and team through the findings, a leader and team can set about prioritization. They may decide to work on building trust through team exercises and projects that cross functional areas. They may decide that decision making is too opaque or dictatorial in nature and set about developing new patterns and approaches. They may learn that the team wants more informal means to learn about each other and their personal styles and work preferences.

There may also be comments and recommendations about leadership functioning. Some of those comments may be challenging to read or hear. But it is important for leaders to remember that it is better to have these discussions openly; after all, these comments are already being said quietly, or in the parking lots out of earshot of leaders. That is much more damaging to office culture than having the opportunity to respond to critical feedback openly.

Many leaders dislike appearing vulnerable, so anonymous surveys can bring up fear. Read anything by Dr. Brené Brown to help uncover and reframe thinking about vulnerability in leaders.

So, what can you do as an administrative assistant to help improve your office’s culture? Plenty. First, bring your own positive and self-directed optimism and energy to work. It will be contagious. Second, do you have a positive relationship with your boss? Can you work to develop that relationship? If so, then you might have an opportunity to ask your boss: “I have noticed that our office culture can be difficult at times. Have you noticed that?”

That may very well start the conversation that eventually leads to something constructive happening to improve your office’s culture overall.

And, for those leaders reading this column: Please do not overlook the observations and comments of each member of your team about culture.
These critical needs most prominently include valuing and supporting international collaborations in research and education and the scholars and students from around the world who contribute to our academic mission. This inclusiveness and diversity in our research communities is vital to advancing education and research.

As noted in a recent March/April 2019 article in NCURA Magazine, universities should review their policies and procedures, educate their communities of any changes, and continue to encourage communication between researchers and administrators (Millsaps, 2019). But as important as these steps are and will continue to be, it is equally important to consider that initial raindrop behind the ripples of this conversation. In other words, while the practical implications of federal agencies’ heightened scrutiny are necessary to manage, we must not forget to step back and consider why these agencies are engaging on topics relating to foreign influence. Understanding certain aspects of a sponsor’s focus can further guide and inform a university’s response in the midst of an uncertain regulatory climate. To do this, it is critical that the community maintains vigilance in this space as the issues and communications continue to unfold, whether they be through agency community, evolving interpretations, and/or audits that are underway by National Science Foundation (NSF) and National Institutes of Health (NIH).

The overall federal concern remains unchanged: certain foreign students, scholars and sponsors could pose a potential threat to university research, specifically federally funded research; yet nuances to this concern are emerging through agency communications, policies, and guiding principles. For example, the FBI, a law enforcement and national security protection agency, is concerned primarily with the safeguarding of our nation’s intellectual property (IP). To that end, they are focusing on potential loss of IP, whether that is by scholars visiting the U.S. or U.S. scholars going abroad.

The Department of Defense (DOD), charged with maintaining the nation’s defenses, is similarly concerned with securing the nation’s defensive and offensive capabilities. Recent communication from DOD is seeking to comply with the provisions of the FY19 National Defense Authorization Act through the establishment of a pilot program, in which select universities have been asked to identify all individuals connected to a grant. It is uncertain at the moment if that pilot will expand.

The Department of Energy (DOE), which has the responsibility to oversee the nation’s nuclear capabilities and the nation’s energy grid, stands as the only department with its own division of counterintelligence. Therefore, DOE has concerns regarding protecting intellectual property but also scientific integrity, much like sponsors such as the NIH and the NSF These agencies want assurances that the research being conducted with federal funds is not similarly being supported or supplemented by other entities, including undisclosed foreign entities. Hence, there is also growing emphasis being placed on Other Support/Current & Pending documentation and further clarification provided regarding what does or does not constitute a foreign relationship, therefore requiring prior approval.

So, what do these facts tell us about federal sponsors and the ongoing conversation about foreign influence? It reminds us that agencies are primarily concerned with two things: the proper disclosure of relationships to ensure no overlap of financial support, science or commitment; and the protection of IP. These sponsors want to know that the research community is able identify foreign components and properly report those relationships, and that the community is taking necessary steps to safeguard the IP generated through federally funded research.

These conversations are not new, nor are the reporting mechanisms through which the federal government is seeking to gather information. However, federal sponsors are highlighting the critical role Other
Support/Current & Pending and Collaborators and Affiliates documents play in appropriate reporting and disclosure of relationships. Let’s take a closer look at what the NIH currently identifies as a foreign component. Per the Grants Policy Statement (GPS) (NIH Grants Policy Statement, October 2018), a foreign component is defined as: “the performance of any significant scientific element or segment of a project outside of the United States… whether or not grant funds are expended. Activities that would meet this definition include, but are not limited to:

1. The involvement of human subjects or animals,
2. Extensive foreign travel by recipient project staff for the purpose of data collection, surveying, sampling, and similar activities, or
3. Any activity of the recipient that may have an impact on U.S. foreign policy.

Examples of other grant-related activities that may be significant are:
1. Collaborations with investigators at a foreign site anticipated to result in co-authorship;
2. Use of facilities or instrumentation at a foreign site; or
3. Receipt of financial support or resources from a foreign entity.”

As an institution considers the application of this definition, there are subtleties that are subject to interpretation. Critical to this definition is that the term “significant” and the phrase “outside of the United States” require grant administrators and PIs to critically determine the relevancy of the activity in question to the project in question. Again, sponsors are concerned with ensuring that there is no overlap of financial support, scientific inquiry or commitment. It is reasonable to use that concern as an analytical lens for determining the appropriateness of disclosure.

Lastly the “activities” and “examples” mentioned in the GPS should not be seen as an exhaustive list, rather illustrations of scenarios requiring appropriate disclosure. Applying these examples to the realities of a campus environment may lead universities to develop and disseminate further examples of activities that are representative of their environments.

While this definition is specific to the NIH, it may be a reasonable standard to apply to all awards, regardless of sponsor.

Again, this definition is not new, but examining it in light of the ongoing conversations allows the research community to reconsider the current reporting expectations of sponsors such as the NIH. For example, according to the definition, the NIH would expect a grantees to seek prior approval for co-authoring a publication that cites data or is the result of federally-funded research. As reported in Science Magazine, we know the NIH has recently sent letters to researchers at many universities asking those institutions to provide further information on potentially non-disclosed relationships and affiliations with foreign entities, citing several instances of co-authorship. From this, we can reasonably deduce that the NIH is exploring how consistently universities have sought prior approval for publications. Therefore, we expect sponsors to issue clarifications and refined interpretations of when to initiate this process.

In the coming weeks and months, we expect the dialogue between the university community and federal sponsors to continue, as we seek to understand and apply the core principles of the sponsors’ concerns. When it comes to managing foreign activities, and determining the appropriate parameters for reporting and disclosures, campuses should:

1. Review the federal and campus definitions of foreign components with faculty members. If needed, take steps to ensure proper disclosure of activity such as previously non-disclosed data collection and co-authorship.

2. Review the following questions with faculty to determine any need for further disclosure or evaluation by campus administrators:
   a. Are they receiving funding, research support, or an award/prize (such as the Thousand Talents Recognition Award) from a foreign entity?
   b. Are they devoting effort or have a formal relationship/affiliation with a foreign entity, regardless if there is financial support or not?
   c. Do they have research that includes a foreign component that has not been appropriately disclosed in grant applications, other support documents, or conflict of interest disclosure?

For the university community, it will be a time of evaluating ongoing practices and refining our responses to adapt to the wide array of federal agencies issuing statements and policies. Each campus will have to determine the breadth and depth of what comprises a foreign component, weighing the potential risks against the administrative burden of collecting information that are fundamental to the process of collaborative research.

Lastly, it is critical to note these ripples are an evolving paradigm that will be defined by numerous external factors including continued congressional interest, communication from federal agencies, and ongoing OIG audits being conducted by HHS and NSF.
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Just a few weeks ago, one of my daughters, who is in high school, and I were brainstorming unique career ideas. Believe it or not, research administration was at the top of my list. Then, another thought came to my mind during this discussion. How many high school students are aware of the research administration profession? Before my experience working in research administration, I had never heard of it. Was this the case for you?

I recently discovered that the research administration profession occurred by happenstance in a way and was not initially planned. According to my reading, President Roosevelt in the 1940s started funding uncoordinated research projects (Campbell, 2010). Why were the projects uncoordinated, you might ask? There were no specific research guidelines in place. So, please imagine how frustrated the government, the scientists, and all the other stakeholders must have been at that time. This situation catalyzed the research administration profession which shortly came about after that. Therefore, research administration has been around for approximately 79 years. President Roosevelt established the National Research and Defense Council (NRDC) that outlined the first research guidelines from the report generated by the council (Zachary, 1997). Although the profession has existed for nearly eight decades, many people in society have not heard of the profession or do not understand it.

Currently, there are a few graduate programs in research administration at various institutions that are tailored for individuals currently working in research administration. These include the University of Central Florida, Emmanuel College, Johns Hopkins University, Central Michigan University, and the University of Maryland. Research administration, like the world around us, is continually changing. Research administrators are undoubtedly aware of some of these changes. There are economic changes, technological advances, regulatory requirement revisions, and institutional policy and process amendments consistently amongst us. With the changing environment, how do we prepare for the future? Where are we today in developing the next generation of research administrators for the future? Should we strategically create platforms to educate and simply bring awareness to our talented
students in high schools or middle schools who would have an interest in research administration if the information were presented? In my opinion, the research administration profession offers challenging, fulfilling, and rewarding careers. Some of you may agree. On the other hand, a few of you may not. Nevertheless, we should all agree that research administration is vital to research and the world globally. You cannot have research without research administration to ensure that the rules and regulations are followed. It did not take very long for President Roosevelt and his colleagues to come to this conclusion. Research and research administration are inseparable and are dependent upon one another just as research administrators and researchers are. Together, we can better build towards the future in research administration. I believe that with us working together as a team we can bridge the existing gaps in knowledge or awareness between the research administration profession and society. We, the research administration professionals, can plan and implement awareness efforts of these career opportunities to our communities. Some of the awareness can come about through educational workshops, summer camps, and career fairs - to name a few ideas. Also, we can inform our higher education stakeholders of potential undergraduate programs that could be offered.

Furthermore, I think it is a norm to think of the youths when we start focusing in on the future. For those of you that are involved in hiring of applicants for research compliance positions, you are probably aware that the application pools are somewhat slim. It is a little challenging to find qualified applicants who meet most of the requirements. Some of you may have experienced the same scenario in hiring for pre-award and post-award positions, as well. Typically, the potential applicants would have an education and experience in accounting, finance, business or a science discipline. Now, imagine if your applicants had an undergraduate degree in research administration along with the experience; then we would be moving toward a brighter future for the profession.

As mentioned previously, there are presently a few universities that are offering graduate degrees in research administration. While there have been significant efforts and progress made on the graduate level, there is still room for more advancement of the profession at the undergraduate level. Together, we can continue to build towards the future within higher education. We can also build towards the future of research administration by bringing awareness of the profession to our youths in our communities and society. ■
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As research administration professionals, we are often referred to as change agents. Striving to achieve professional mastery is essential as a leader in an ever-evolving and changing field. One critical component is to maintain balance between the profession’s body of knowledge and experience. Achieving professional mastery is a lifelong journey in conjunction with colleagues, mentors, networking, and organizational support, how we perceive our abilities could affect our journey. Albert Bandura defines self-efficacy as an individual’s belief system of their capabilities and competencies to perform a task to achieve a goal (2008). How confident and motivated you are in your abilities when approaching or performing a new task will also give you a sense of your efficacy. Mastery experiences is just one of the four pillars of self-efficacy identified by Bandura (2008). The experiences you obtain from succeeding and accomplishing your new challenges contributes to your mastery experiences. One of the best ways to strengthen our self-efficacy is with continuous mastery experiences (Bandura, 2008). Another important factor to achieve professional mastery is to fully understand your current self-efficacy level and acknowledge potential barriers or limitations. The more proficient the performance becomes with each new task, the more one’s self-efficacy strengthens, keeping you on the journey to achieving professional mastery.

This all sounds great, but how is this possible for us in smaller offices or even operating an office as “one-person” within our PUIs? Daily, we are pushed to give 120% while wearing one hat that comes with multiple roles, priorities, responsibilities, and let us not forget expectations. One common expectation at a PUI is to accomplish more with fewer resources in comparison to our peer research institutions. As PUI change agents, we are required to continuously learn and lead our institutions. Also, while working in our smaller offices, we are often met with new questions and expectations from our faculty, internal colleagues, organizational leaders, and even our external sponsors, thus forcing us to take on new challenges. When faced with new challenges, there is nothing wrong with second-guessing yourself; surprisingly, it is a feeling many of us share and few of us are willing to admit. However, failing to tackle a new challenge is weakening your self-efficacy and not working towards strengthening it. Although the task may be new to you, they are part of the profession’s ever evolving body of knowledge. Some of us may find it difficult to ask, seek, and accept help from others, while in other cases some may not know exactly the right questions to ask or even the correct forum for our questions. Regardless, when in need of new knowledge, it is necessary to seek it out.

First, consider seeking support from your organization. One advantage we have at a PUI is a more direct line of communication with the executive leaders of our institutions. Do not be afraid to admit additional knowledge or possible training is required to accomplish new tasks or expectations. Stand firm with the ideas you present and do not be afraid to push to get it accomplished. Secondly, consider expanding your network. Do not restrict yourself to one specific group or professional organization. Be willing to seek knowledge from similar professionals working in a different environment or setting. We have Uniform Guidance for a purpose. Lastly, consider establishing an informal mentorship with another professional who may share parallel experiences. Informal mentorships can eliminate the boundaries of timelines, expectations, and deliverables. Surprisingly, you may find the most valuable wealth of information and knowledge in the least expected place. Yes, achieving professional mastery by strengthening self-efficacy and maintaining balance can prove to be more challenging for research administration professionals at PUIs, but it is possible!

Reference:

Achieving Professional Mastery by Strengthening Self-Efficacy as a Research Administration Professional

By Shuna H. McMichael

What is your Self-efficacy level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Self-efficacy</th>
<th>Low Self-efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confident in abilities / Believe they will succeed</td>
<td>Low Confidence / Lacks the ability to perform well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hard to achieve mastery</td>
<td>Decreased efforts under difficult situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not give up easily and eager to attempt new and complex tasks</td>
<td>Avoids any new tasks or any tasks perceived to be difficult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“…the most valuable wealth of information and knowledge is in the least expected place”
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Qatar has witnessed considerable growth in the last 25 years in the realm of cultivating a burgeoning art scene. This has been accomplished through the establishment of world-renowned museums, creative art centers and talent incubators. In addition, and in pursuit of its goal to become a knowledge-based economy, Qatar established Education City in 1997, which is composed of a number of American, British and French international branch campuses. The oldest of these campuses is the Virginia Commonwealth University School of the Arts in Qatar (VCUarts Qatar), and that is where I work as Assistant Director of Research. The establishment of VCUarts Qatar is viewed as another element enabling the cultivation and development of local talent in the arts.

In 2006, the Qatar National Research Fund (QNRF) was established. It is considered the premiere public research funding body in the country. Funding is competitively provided along designated pillars or priority themes, one of which is Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities. Having a designated pillar where the Arts have a home indicates a recognition that research in this field is important to the country. QNRF is interested in matters related to cultural identity and heritage, and so this is an area researchers at VCUarts Qatar engage in.

As a research administrator at a relatively young international branch campus, I sometimes have to rely on the experience of the staff and institutional support at my home campus to deal with certain research administration matters. QNRF, however, also provides considerable capacity development support suited to our context. We also pursue professional development opportunities through membership in organizations like NCURA. My involvement in these organizations and their training have certainly enabled me to hone my research administration skills.

VCUarts Qatar is one of many universities physically located together in Education City. This provides a network of colleagues and professionals that is beneficial to everyone involved. We research administrators engage with one another on a regular basis and assist each other to navigate our common challenges. This is especially needed because the research office teams in each branch campus are typically very small. For example, I am the sole research administrator at my university. I enjoy my role, but I am involved in a full spectrum of duties from program administration and financial management (internal- and external-funded research), to ethical and compliance issues. As a result, it is imperative for me to have a network of colleagues locally and internationally to call upon when I need assistance or advice.

Research administration in an art school has its own unique characteristics. For example, research outputs do not have to be books, articles or publications, but rather could be in other forms like art exhibitions or displays. This brings its own set of challenges regarding communicating or assessing the critical metric of impact. How do you assess the value of an exhibition? Can you assign an “impact factor” to a sculpture? You cannot calculate the value and impact of a unique piece artwork like you would for a book that will be sold in the retail marketplace. These are some of the challenges I face when seeking funding for my faculty and during the management and oversight of research projects. The challenges mentioned above can only be overcome with a concerted advocacy effort for research in the arts and a recognition that not all research can be measured with a cookie-cutter approach. The graduates and faculty at VCUarts Qatar are some of the reasons behind the increased profile of the arts in Qatar, but more needs to be accomplished for this growth to be sustainable and prevalent. As a research administrator in an art school, I take my advocacy role seriously, as I firmly believe that the promotion of art is extremely important at a societal and political level. For me, life without art is not life at all! The arts make the world colorful and enrich the human experience!
We focus on anticipating your needs and staying on top of changing government regulations and policies, and then articulating those changes directly to you. With software that’s truly in the cloud, you’re able to activate new features in real time, and automatically update to ensure you are working with the most current information at any given moment.
Philanthropic Funding of Research: A Different Source of Funding, a Different Type of Management

By Saiga Anne Quresbi

Philanthropically-funded, or gift-funded research, has long been a source of support for research projects and programs. As federal funding declines and becomes increasingly difficult to secure, many see philanthropic funding as an alternative. However, when considering this as an alternative source, it is important to understand the differences and implications of choosing this path. There are many concerns in funding research via philanthropic funds. Of particular interest are the actual value of the gift, the impact on indirect costs recovery, and the impact of a lack of pre-award review. This article discusses these concerns, as well as potential mitigation strategies.

Risks

Gift Value
Philanthropic gifts are given in a range of ways and have a range of liquidities, including securities (stock, shares, bonds) and collateral (buildings, art work, and antiques). The securities or buildings are then either sold by the recipient institution, or sometimes buildings are leveraged (e.g., used as collateral for a loan and the space rented to repay the loan). The value of the gift is in terms of the development value for the purpose of valuing the donation on a tax return. The value of the security is determined upon the transfer of ownership to the university. The costs associated with gift liquidation (converting an asset into cash), or any fluctuation in the value of the gift between receipt and liquidation are not taken into consideration. The material impact is that a research program reliant on those funds may have to absorb the loss/gain from the IRS gift amount to the “sell price” of the securities or other items.

Impact on Indirect Recovery
Gift funds have development costs associated with them and may or may not include indirect costs. Not incurring overhead can be a double-edged sword. If the award doesn’t include overhead, more award dollars may support the project. However, if the overall funder mix shifts so that a smaller percentage of awards in a department or university include indirect costs, then central services funded by those overhead costs could be neglected. Post-award support is funded in part by indirect funds from research, so it is important to consider how a research program is funded, possibly directly by the project itself, if it is a large program.

Lack of Pre-Award Review
Gift-funded research is not normally subject to a formal pre-award process. Rarely is a full proposal submitted for a gift-funded research program, and this is again both a good and a bad thing. Positive aspects for Principal Investigators (PIs) include amazing freedom to pivot academically and move depending on where the research takes them. The sponsor will sometimes restrict the research area, but generally the research focus is defined very broadly. Lacking a formal pre-award review process potentially has detrimental or negative consequences. Pre-award review compels the applicant to think through the structure, timeline, and management of a program, including delineating concrete deliverables and a budget that connects the work with proposed outcomes. In a gift-funded program, this does not necessarily happen and can have the effect of “driving the car while still building it.” Not vetting a research program externally may result in unforeseen problems with protocols, hypotheses, the research plan, and a lack of clarity about where the work fits in the current state of research due to incomplete review of existing literature and ongoing projects. In a formal pre-award process, a reviewer may be more familiar with work in the specific area and better able to assess how it might fit into a larger overall funding strategy in that area, or other research that is in process.

A pre-award review of the project management triangle (budget vs. scope vs. timeline) essentially assesses whether a proposed research project can be completed on time and for the budget proposed. While no pre-award assessment is perfect, preparing the timeline and budget and drawing up scopes of work for collaborators brings into sharp focus the costs associated with undertaking research. It also highlights dependencies that might exist between work packages, which may not initially appear obvious.

Furthermore, the structure and oversight of the program may not be robust or appropriate. The full pre-award process obliges the PI to consider the roles of coinvestigators, allocation of responsibilities, and oversight of the full program. This level of planning isn’t required for gift-funded research, and the burden of review can then fall on the university, often transferred to the department, potentially creating tension and additional workload that wasn’t necessarily anticipated. The workload consists of providing review of project structure, providing governance and oversight of the work and any subcontracts, and ensuring the research not

“The tension comes from the freedom of the gift vs. the role of oversight”
only fulfills the intent of the gift, but meets the academic norms of a research project that a department might expect to see. Setting up a review process of a research program is time consuming and expensive, the review isn’t necessarily anonymous, and the reviewer or reviewers are paid by the university or the gift fund, potentially setting up major conflicts of interest. The tension comes from the freedom of the gift vs. the role of oversight. Those who work on gift-funded research and want to use the freedom and flexibility of the gift to pivot don’t necessarily want to engage with an oversight process that can be seen as bureaucratic and slow. At an institutional level, there can be a lack of clarity about the institution’s role in providing oversight. In addition, concern that the flexibility of gift funding (with a lack of pre-award approval) constitutes a risk may manifest as a desire to provide additional oversight.

MITIGATION
If an institution pursues a strategy to increase philanthropic funding for research, then concrete steps can be taken in advance to mitigate some of the issues discussed. A policy can be put in place to establish how the gift will be valued, or that an asset must be liquidated prior to establishing research, so the funds available are stable. Other options include the development office absorbing any profit or loss from the liquidation of assets for gifts distributed over a number of years. A policy can also be created to consider indirect recovery rates on gift funds. That policy would then be clear to donors, so they are aware that they are partially or fully funding research infrastructure. If funds will not support indirect recovery, specific donors can be sought to fund infrastructure that might otherwise be covered by overhead. The most difficult issue is the lack of pre-award review, and with it, concerns about governance and oversight. The costs to create a review mechanism might be prohibitive, especially if the gifts are small, or if large gifts funding a major project are rare. An institution might consider paying a foundation or another entity to provide the scientific review and, if volume justifies, employ a staff member to support oversight of these gift funds.

As philanthropic funding continues to fund research and as many seek it to replace other sources of funding, it is important to consider the impact this can have with the following questions:

- Will fluctuation in the value of the gift have to be absorbed by a project?
- How will a change in the overall mix of the funding, as a result of an increase in gift funding, impact indirect recovery overall and the funding of research infrastructure including research post award support?
- What compliance and oversight structure might be added to address the lack of formal pre-award process that in many cases accompanies philanthropic funds?

Whether at the institutional level or in the department or program, the impacts of gift funding and changes to the funding portfolio must be assessed and mitigated. Mitigation can include a policy to establish a value of the gift, setting overhead or indirect recovery rates on gift monies intended for research, and creating a structure for scientific review of gift-funded research.

Saiqa Anne Qureshi, PhD, MBA, is the Manager of Operations for the Center for Digital Health Innovation (CDHI) at UCSF. She is a graduate of the NCURA Lead Me leadership program, and has extensive research management experience in both the US and Europe. She can be reached at SAQ@ucsf.edu
Reflecting on the 20th Annual Financial Research Administration Conference in Las Vegas, we cannot help but smile. Whether it was the humor of our keynote speaker, Bob Stromberg and his message of creatively applying everyday moments in our lives to further ourselves, or perhaps it was the fantastic programming filled with a wide array of sessions, discussions, and panels, or perhaps it was the masses of research administrators consisting of old and new friends descending upon the city that never sleeps? In all, over 1100 attendees came, witnessed, and left Las Vegas with a raised sense of awareness, reinvigorated with a little more education.

We would really like to thank everyone who attended FRA which draws its strength from the diversity of NCURA membership. We would also like to extend a special thanks to the international members for traveling so far and sharing their experience with those of us on the other side of the pond. Our appreciation also extends to the incredible Program Committee for organizing the rich and robust program. Lastly, we owe a huge debt of gratitude to Kathleen Larmett (NCURA Executive Director), Tony Ventimiglia (NCURA President), our NCURA Year Long Sponsors and to the talented NCURA staff who worked collaboratively behind the scenes with the Program Committee to ensure its success.

We hope that you enjoyed our keynote speaker, Bob Stromberg, who showed us how to tap into our own creative energy and emotions in order to identify opportunities to challenge ourselves professionally and personally. The conversations were delightful, the table dealers were unapologetic, and we walked away with a renewed appreciation for the deep caring and commitment that can be found in our profession. There is so much to be learned from sharing experiences and lessons learned in our daily work lives.

The 21st FRA meeting will be held next spring in lovely Puerto Rico. If you have never participated in or attended FRA, please consider doing so. San Juan is waiting for you.

With gratitude while still smiling…

FRA Conference Co-chairs,

Leslie Schmidt
Montana State University

Jeff Seo
Northeastern University
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Intellectual property management is the core of research administration

Since the reform and opening up, China has kept strengthening its investment in science and technology. However, compared to developed countries, the effectiveness of China’s R&D investment is yet to be further improved. The fruitful basic research harvests cannot hide the despair and helplessness in China’s industry. Since increasing attention is paid to intellectual property (IP) in China in recent years, the number of patent applications has been rocketing with more than a million for the first time in 2015 and an increase of 21.5% in 2016. China has been ranking the first for six consecutive years, almost 2.5 times that of the U.S. It is undeniable that the decisive factor of the increasing patents is the policy orientation of the government and scientific research institutions. From the perspective of IP management, because the statistics and use of the patent numbers are simple and straightforward, the true value of patents is neglected. The essence of patents should be the protection of inventions and creations, while the writing of the patent should work for the litigation purpose. Patents separated from essence and purpose will inevitably lose their commercial value. Therefore, the rocketing number of patents will not lead to the vehement rise of scientific research results.

China is currently in a critical period of constructing an innovative country at a high speed in which IP plays an irreplaceable role. IP management is the core of research administration, especially for universities.

Most universities in China still have not set up special secondary organizations for IP or technology transfer management. Even if the organization has been established, the current staff still mainly focus on administrative affairs, instead of qualified with sufficient expertise to judge whether the invention has potential commercial value or to provide value-added services in applying for high-quality patents. Thus, the efficiency is difficult to promote in a short time. At present, the technology transfer is conducted mainly by the scientists themselves, generally without professional knowledge of law, capital and market during the process. In addition, the inadequacy of management organizations and experts can lead to imperfections in regulations. Professors focus only on the innovation of research and generally neglect the application protections of related IP as well as the market promotion. Or the competitors seek loopholes caused by the inadequacy of protection barriers due to the low quality of patents. Eventually, a large number of scientific research results in universities have not been transformed into social productivity timely, and no corresponding economic benefits have been produced.

Future administration is that administrators with inter-disciplinary knowledge and global vision provide the precise service

By borrowing the concept of “Precise Medicine,” we put forward that future research administration should construct the “Precise Service,” that is, services with high quality of personalization and for whole life cycle. Personalization requires diverse treatments for different regions, different disciplines and research results at different stages. As far as technology transfer is concerned, colleges and universities should focus on their own characteristics and disciplinary advantages to form a distinctive direction.

Whole life cycle means two aspects. One is that the service should cover all people from junior to senior so as to meet the need of different stages. The other is that the management and service must be advanced and fundamental, that is, to start from the upstream and source. For example, IP management should include project tracking, patent writing, evaluation, value addition, marketing and negotiation, rather than just providing some consulting services when applying for a patent. As it should be, we could outsource some of the work to service agencies, like patent agencies, legal counsel, venture capital firms and consulting firms.

In precise service, the premise is to establish an organization, the guarantee is to improve the management system, and the core is to cultivate and select professional talents.

Thus, the future research administrator in universities, especially those in charge of IP and technology transfer should:

1. Have at least a master’s degree or a doctoral degree. He or she must be familiar with the whole scientific research process;
2. Have an MBA, law degree or related training experience;
3. Under this circumstance, after years of work, develop legal and commercial judgments to address various issues in IP management and technology transfer;
4. Have a global perspective and relevant professional qualifications, such as the domestic patent agent certificate and the internationally recognized Registered Technology Transfer Professional (RTTP).
What is worth drawing on is that the University of Central Florida and Johns Hopkins University have established a Master of Science in Research Administration, with no requirement for the applicant’s undergraduate major. They also offer regular courses in project and fund management, organization, statistics, courses concerning laws and regulations, business, contracts and other related content.

**RTTP is the effective way to be in line with the international practice**

For China, which is setting off a new round of transfer and transformation of scientific and technological achievements, it is inevitable to be in line with the international practice. RTTP is uniquely recognized in the international technology transfer industry and is certified, evaluated and awarded by the Alliance of Technology Transfer Professionals (ATTP). It is effective in dozens of countries around the world. ATTP was jointly initiated by PraxisUnico, AUTM, ASTP-Proton and KCA in 2002, with 10 members including South Africa, Sweden, Germany, Japan and Turkey. ATTP’s mission is to provide assists from scientific research to technology transfer by unifying, training and strengthening a global system, which consists of primary, intermediate and advanced practitioners. Since RTTP’s initiation in 2002, more than 300 people have passed the qualification test, among whom there is merely one Chinese.

The full process of RTTP’s application provides the practitioners a standard framework system. Its requirements in terms of knowledge, skills, roles, and judgement are in accordance with that of China for IP management and technology transfer in the context of scientific and technological innovation. However, instead of the universities noted with technology transfer such as Stanford University, MIT, and New York University, it is hard to find well-trained talents who are highly valued in the market, skilled in science, law, business, etc., domestically and internationally. Due to the special background, universities have to compete with large enterprises for these talents at a salary lower than the market price. Therefore, we need to find ways to break through the constraints of training, recruitment and salary.

**Conclusion**

Since 2015, the Chinese Government has intensively introduced a series of policies and instructions that encourage technological innovation and the achievement transformation, which has broadened the road of technology transfer, created an unprecedented favorable environment, and mobilized the enthusiasm of all parties. Two aspects need be concerned from the perspective of research administrators: the on-duty personnel will receive more training and learning exchanges abroad, while the long-term personnel reserve will start from universities, and more interdisciplinary talents will be cultivated.

---

**Navigating Regulatory Change**

**Optimizing F&A Reimbursement**

Today’s economic and regulatory pressures are pushing institutions to become more agile and do more with less. To survive in this new, dynamic environment, institutional leadership must continuously assess all resources, ultimately making tough choices. But they don’t have to go it alone—Attain has the proven capabilities to optimize revenue related to F&A cost reimbursement and compliance processes.

**LEADERSHIP TO ENABLE TRANSFORMATION**

Attain’s national reputation as a leader in the higher education and academic medical center communities is unmatched. In a time of significant industry change, Attain has the expertise and solutions to help institutions successfully adapt to this new environment.

*Learn more. Visit us at attain.com.*
Over the past two years the NCURA Presidential Task Force on Diversity & Inclusion worked to develop NCURA’s Statement on Diversity & Inclusion. The statement was approved and placed on the NCURA website in 2018. The executive board and NCURA staff are very engaged with truly making diversity and inclusivity realized at every level of the organization.

It is extremely important to shift the culture of our professional organization and workplaces to recognize, accept, respect, value and celebrate the differences of others, because the faces, abilities and expertise of research administrators, researchers and sponsors are changing. Further, the realm of research is changing as well, which lends itself to a more accessible, diverse research population and richer outcomes.

Shifting the culture means recognizing and owning any personal biases, whether implicit, unconscious or intentional. Research conducted by psychologist Hailey Halvorson proved that we have loads of biases hard-wired into our brains: preferences for people who are similar to us or who are in our group; wariness of those who are different; and a tendency to save mental energy by using short-cuts like stereotypes to fill in the blanks about others (Halvorson, 2015). More so than not, our biases drive our perspectives of others.

As professionals, we cannot afford to be lackadaisical in our perception and decision making. When one recognizes their own biases they become self-aware. Becoming aware of these biases and actively working to create a more inclusive attitude towards people different than you is the correct path to travel. We all must work to build towards the future together by engaging in dialogue; sharing experiences; and advocating for access, diversity, equity and inclusion.

As 2019 chair of the Task Force, my goal is to not only integrate diversity and inclusion into every area of NCURA but to also promote access and equity. The presidential charge for 2019 consist of rolling out the implementation plan for diversity and inclusion, benchmarking revised membership data, developing a volunteer matrix, developing new ways for NCURA to adopt diversity and inclusion strategies for the future, and identifying a Region VIII member to join the Task Force. I am pleased to report that the Task Force is already hard at work on these initiatives. Stay tuned for more exciting information moving forward.

As a final point, a tremendous thank you is in order for the members of the 2019 Task Force. They have jumped right in and hit the ground running on this year’s initiatives. If you have interesting topics or ideas that you would like for the Task Force to consider, please feel free to reach out to any of the Task Force members.
You likely haven’t encountered an “Other Transaction” Authority (OTA) from a federal agency yet, but you may see more of it in your university’s research portfolio in the future. In the past OTA has been used to fund a wide variety of research needs, but we anticipate that it will now be used with greater frequency to fund health related initiatives. It is important for the academic research community to understand what this will mean for the future.

First used at the height of the “space race,” when NASA was issued authority in 1958, Other Transaction Awards (OTA) stand alongside Grants and Cooperative Agreements (Federal Assistance) and Contracts (Federal Acquisition Regulation) as the primary award types that federal agencies use (National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 2014). Most recently, the NIH sought approval to use the OTA to support some Common Fund (CF) Programs.

“CF programs attempt to change the way science is conducted through the establishment of new scientific fields or paradigms, the development of new and innovative technologies that change the way scientists approach their work, or the generation of comprehensive data sets or other resources that catalyze all research and enable discovery” (National Institutes of Health, 2019).

“NIH is using the OT mechanism to enable maximum innovation and flexibility. Enrolling and retaining 1 million or more people from all walks of life into a longitudinal research program are unprecedented tasks. There is no established playbook for success. Using the OT mechanism will enable organizations beyond frequent NIH applicants to propose innovative strategies to communicate with potential participants and increase participant recruitment and retention. Using the OT mechanism will also allow the NIH to engage more than one partner if a combination of partners will provide a fuller breadth and depth of capabilities. Using the OT mechanism will also allow the NIH to engage more than one partner if a combination of partners will provide a fuller breadth and depth of capabilities” (National Institutes of Health, 2019).

An award under OTA is not a distinct mechanism per se; rather, it is an approved use of federal funds which need not conform to standard terms and conditions. These funds are defined by what they are not. For universities, awards under OTA can be perplexing because they are negotiable and flexible — the federal agency has the ability to design an award mechanism to maximize the potential for innovative solutions—no two awards are exactly alike. Awards issued under OTA are:

- Not grants, nor are they cooperative agreements, contracts, or Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADAs);
- Not subject to the FAR or 2 CFR 200;
- Not subject to the: Competition for Contracting Act, Limitation on the Use of Appropriated Funds to Influence Certain Federal Contracting and Financial Transactions regulations, Procurement Protest regulations, the Anti-Kickback Act of 1986, the Walsh Healy Act, the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and the Buy American Act, to name a few (Halchin, 2011; National Institutes of Health, 2019);
- Neither Procurement Integrity Provisions nor the Bayh-Doyle Act are automatically applicable to these funds. Intellectual Property (IP) rights, and all other terms are fully negotiable under this mechanism; and
- Not necessarily subject to the standard review processes: for example, the NIH’s Director is allowed to use non-standard peer review to assess scientific and technical merit (National Institutes of Health, 2015).

A federal agency petitions Congress for OTA. Once a federal agency has this authority, the agency (and any entity that a federal agency might contract to manage OTA funds) is tasked with determining the business model to accomplish the approved OTA purpose. Congress has issued this authority to: National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), Department of Defense (DoD), Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT), Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Transportation Security Agency (TSA), and Department of Energy (DOE). Most recently, the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS): National Institutes of Health (NIH) obtained this authority in 2016 (National Institutes of Health, 2015). It’s important to remember that each agency uses its OTA differently. NASA and TSA, for example, are two agencies with broad OTA powers, and use this authority for several different types of procurement activities (Government Accountability Office, 2016).

OTAs have been used for generations; however, their use by DOD and NIH is increasing. The DOD has this authority under the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, which establishes a preference for OTA agreements in the execution of science and technology prototyping projects. The NIH has OTA for its Common Fund Programs, which include innovative cross-cutting initiatives requiring the participation of two or more institutes or centers. The NIH wanted “…greater flexibility to identify and engage nontraditional research partners, or to engage traditional partners in new ways, and negotiate terms and conditions that will concentrate their efforts, spur innovation, and facilitate collaborative problem solving,” (Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014).

NIH OTA funded opportunities can be recognized by the “OT” designation. The NIH Grants Policy Statement does not apply to these awards; instead, there is a separate and distinct set of terms and conditions for NIH OTA awards. The terms and conditions are much less prescriptive than either...
Over the past six decades we have seen the exponential growth of science and technology including our understanding of human biology, interactions of environmental ecosystems, the origins of the cosmos, and witnessed the information technology revolution. While our scientists have led this revolution; quietly and, in the background, research administrators have helped in developing proposals and managing awards. This support has evolved as the science has changed. As research administrators, we have come together for sixty years to share our experiences, learn from each other and advance research administration. With the globalization of research, AM61 is another opportunity for us as NCURA's global members to join hands in building the new future. We are as ready as ever to face the new challenges ahead of us and inspire the next generation of research administrators to join the journey to this bright future!

Over the past eleven years, NCURA Peer Review has seen that the most effective research administration operations are the operations that employ flexible and dynamic processes and continuous improvement. Healthy research administration offices adapt and change as the regulatory environment changes. Some ways that offices remain nimble are:

- Always staying on top of the most recent regulatory changes.
- Having regular, ongoing assessment and strategic planning to consider short and longer term goals.
- Considering possible scenarios and developing proactive action steps based on several outcomes.
- Pay attention to the political, social, and cultural dynamics surrounding research to ensure the office is ready for change.

Ara Tahmassian, PhD, is chair of the Select Committee on Peer Review. He is the University Chief Research Compliance Officer at Harvard University. In this role, Dr. Tahmassian is broadly responsible for the oversight of the review, development, and implementation of policies related to research compliance activities across the University. He can be reached at Ara_Tahmassian@harvard.edu
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2 CFR 200 or the FAR. For example, the Financial Management and System Standards states:
“Awardees must have in place accounting and internal control systems that provide for appropriate monitoring of award accounts to ensure that obligations and expenditures are reasonable, allocable, and allowable. In addition, the systems must be able to identify unobligated balances, accelerated expenditures, inappropriate cost transfers, and other inappropriate obligation and expenditure of funds, and awardees must notify NIH when problems are identified. An awardee’s failure to establish adequate control systems constitutes a material violation of the terms of the award” (National Institutes of Health, 2015).

It is hard to say at this point in time if OTAs represent a landscape change, or if OTA will remain as a fraction of how research is funded. If more federal funds are to be allocated to OTA, then it is imperative that the research community be at the forefront of this change. OTA offers great potential for reducing administrative burden, but it also poses risk for universities which may not be administratively equipped to neither compete for, nor manage these funds.

The Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) has formed an OTA Working Group to identify the challenges higher education faces with OTA agreements. We want to build a knowledge base in how agencies decide to implement their Other Transaction Authority, and we want to better understand the common issues you face when negotiating these awards.

Whether you work at a research institution or a predominantly undergraduate institution, the importance of providing quality services to your faculty in support of their research and scholarship is undeniable. NCURA offers a number of programs to assist your research administration operations and to ensure a high-quality infrastructure that supports your faculty and protects the institution.

Please contact NCURA Peer Programs:
NCURA Peer Advisory Services and NCURA Peer Review Program at peerreview@ncura.edu

Michael Kusiak is a Research Policy Manager at the University of California, Office of the President in Oakland. He serves as the FDP Administrative Representative for the University of California system. He has worked in various research administration and policy roles within the UC system since 2001 and works extensively within the federal research policy space, particularly indirect cost recovery. He can be reached at Michael.Kusiak@ucop.edu

Sarah J. White, MA, Ed.M, is the Associate Vice Chancellor for Research for the University of Tennessee Health Science Center, where she oversees pre-award and post-award activity. She has over 20 years of broad and deep experience in research administration and can be reached at white82@tennessee.edu
leadership skills are the foundation that promote open communication between coworkers. Improving management competencies could impact research on numerous levels within an organization. As part of a continuing education program, leadership skills seminars provided to research administrators can further develop leadership abilities. Alternatively, some may ask, why is it required to attend such a seminar if the person is not in a position of charge? The answer is simple. An organization could benefit from the team members attending a leadership skill seminar and not just their leader.

The accepted notion for the term ‘leader’ is someone that directs or commands a group of people. On the other hand, a ‘peer’ is a coworker who shares similar responsibilities within the same group. Moreover, having significant leadership skills should be considered as inclusive and not exclusive. It is necessary for an organization to acquire a leader who recognizes each team member’s involvement and wants to thrive.

A similar analogy for thinking of a highly functioning work team, is to think of the term ‘leader’ as a member of a basketball team. Even though the particular group has the best player of the season, if each member of the team is not performing to its highest potential, the team may still lose. Now, the question remains, do you want to be known as the best player on a losing team or the captain of a winning team? A leader will identify ways to improve each member’s skill set.

In contrast to a leader, someone who is simply a boss will tell others what to do and not explain how to do it. Therefore, a ‘boss’ might not be aware of a colleague’s specific abilities much less their goals and aspirations. There are many different types of ‘bosses’ throughout an organization, but only a few would strive to become a leader eager to influence others. Another crucial skill set of a leader is to foster empathy in the workplace, which can augment performances that cross cultural boundaries.

Recognizing ways in which a research administrator can improve their leadership strategies is essential to the job. One way is through the advancement of effective, transparent communication among teams. Open and transparent communication enhances a team’s productivity and promotes ways to exchange information in the workplace. An essential criteria for effective verbal communication is not only the leader exhibiting confidence with every decision they make but also appreciating the teams need to inquire about and discuss issues that may arise.

A leader in research administration strives to incorporate inventive ways to develop trust and personal accountability in the workplace. This may include formulating strategies and administering policies which require the analytic problem-solving skills of the leader. Using such skills can build trust and serve to redistribute the leader’s ‘power’ to promote cultural change while being aware of interpersonal conflicts.

A good leader uses the word ‘we’ instead of ‘I’ when working with members of the team. This simple change in language can create an impact in the research office that serves to diminish the traditional pyramid structure – boss at the top and workers at the bottom. Hence, its use among employees represents organizations willingness to see tasks as a group effort, creating a positive environment for improvement.

“A LEADER will find ways to IMPROVE each member’s SKILL SET.”

A tool one can use to foster input from employees is the annual distribution of an anonymous questionnaire to evaluate the team’s performance including the leader’s performance and to obtain recommendations on how to improve the workplace. This questionnaire can provide insight on the employees’ views, their feelings toward working together, and can be used to make necessary changes.

A good leader also leads by example, demonstrating how the team can resolve issues amicably, how collaboration outside of the department can strengthen the department, and how complex issues related to grant and contract development can be resolved. A good leader serves as a guide to alleviate the complexity of coordinating efforts in proposal development and administration. A good leader serves as a liaison between the Principal Investigator, the Sponsored Projects Office, and the funding agency.

In summation, an organization should provide leadership skills to all of its employees in order to enhance each team member’s abilities and to promote a work environment which nurtures success.

Nancy Yanira Pérez Torres, MD, is currently enrolled in the Research Administration M.S. program at Johns Hopkins University. She received a B.A. degree in Psychology from the University of Puerto Rico and her M.D. from the University Iberoamericana, Dominican Republic. She is a former advocate for U.S. Customs and Border Protection Explorer Leadership Program. Nancy’s research interest is to ensure patients safety in compliance with international research law guidelines on infectious diseases.
A few months ago, an exciting opportunity presented itself to NCURA Global when an invitation from the Tokyo Institute of Technology arrived. This proved to be a tremendous opportunity as NCURA Global continuously seeks to be the foremost provider of professional development, knowledge, and leadership in the global research administration and research management community. In addition, NCURA offers professional development through top-notch research administrators and partnering with sister organizations to build the requisite infrastructure for the global research enterprise.

NCURA has hosted workshops in Europe, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia focused on the fundamentals of research administration, including best practices in grant proposal preparation, U.S. funding opportunities for international researchers, and how to manage U.S. federal grants. These workshops also serve as venues for forming research collaborations and partnerships while enabling research administrators to develop their professional networks. The aim of each workshop is to provide participants with the opportunity to learn research administration through a combination of formal presentations, case studies, and group discussions.

The invitation from the Tokyo Institute of Technology made NCURA’s latest internationally-offered workshop possible. Dr. Charles DaSalla, a university research administrator, organized the two-day offering presented by Kim Moreland, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research Administration, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and Toni Shaklee, Assistant Vice President for Research, Oklahoma State University. Originally established as the Tokyo Vocational School in 1881, the campus moved to Okayama in 1924 and became a degree conferring university in 1929. Today, Tokyo Tech is the top national university in Japan for science and technology with more than 10,000 students, 1200 faculty and 600 administrative and technical staff.

Presented in March at Tokyo Tech’s Okayama campus, the specially tailored workshop focused on applying for, receiving and administering U.S. federal grants and contracts. The audience was made up primarily of members of the faculty, including several international faculty members, as well as some of the more than 20 university research administrators (URAs) at the institution.

“My colleagues and I just want to thank you both again for coming from so far to share your expertise with us. It was truly a unique opportunity. I learned a great deal, and the faculty and URAs we’ve heard from so far feel the same,” said DaSalla.

A luncheon meeting with Dr. Osamu Watanabe, director, Office of Research and Innovation and executive vice president for research, provided an opportunity to discuss the differences and similarities in grant administration in the U.S. and Japan. The URAs at Tokyo Tech have specialties ranging from project planning to grant management, industry collaborations, intellectual property, international collaboration and research communications. Concerns at Tokyo Tech about the variety of tasks assigned to URAs, the best way to recruit individuals to the positions, and establishing a career ladder for URAs mirrored those often expressed by U.S. university administrators.

NCURA has provided training and educational programs in more than 17 countries, including Austria, Belgium, China, Cuba, Germany, Italy, Japan, Qatar, Russia, Saudi Arabia, UAE and Zimbabwe.
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It’s hard to believe that by the time this is published our spring meeting will be over! Many heartfelt congratulations and thank you to our program committee for a meeting which ran like a newly oiled machine! Back to the Basics: Practical Solutions reminded us to revisit our roots and ensure our foundations are reinforced and we are refreshed with knowledge and insight.

As we move forward in the year, we will reflect on that notion. Our bylaws and administrative policies were last reviewed in 2016, thus it is time to revisit both to ensure they are foundational strong and align with the organizational mission while being nationally and regionally sound. The Governance Committee is leading the review and will help develop and centralize committee SOPs for us. Additionally, the Advisory Committee will review position roles and responsibilities descriptions to ensure the same.

Others organizing other professional development, networking, and events across the region too. The PDC will announce the early fall networking event soon and the Curriculum Committee has laid out the fall offerings already, mark your calendars.

**September 5, 2019 | Partners Healthcare Assembly Row**

**Essentials in Research Administration (9:00am-4:00pm)**

**October 11, 2019 | Partners Healthcare Assembly Row**

**Advanced Topics (9:00am–4:00pm)**

**November 13, 2019 | Partners Healthcare Assembly Row**

**Clinical Trials (9:00am–4:00pm)**

**December 4, 2019 | Partners Healthcare Assembly Row**

**RADG (4–6pm)**

We held our Emerging Leaders and New Professionals Programs again at the spring meeting, thanks to the PDC and VMC for organizing both events! Leadership is discussing continued ways to engage membership in volunteerism and leadership. While we have begun to build a strong foundation, we need members to come forward and to run for positions - maybe this is YOUR year to run? A call for nominations will be open shortly for interested members who will run for office. Whether as an elected position or a volunteer at the registration desk, Region I is always looking to engage more members.

We are only as connected as we integrate ourselves - keep your eyes peeled for eblasts, website updates in addition to our posts on Twitter and our Region I Facebook page.

Donna Smith is Chair of Region I and serves as a Senior Research Manager at Massachusetts General Hospital Research Institute. She can be reached at chair@ncuraregioni.org

The year is quickly progressing and the passing of each day brings us that much closer to our Regional Meeting in Jersey City, NJ, October 16-18, 2019. Our Program Committee, ably led by Chair Adam Greenberg and Co-Chair Sandy Collier, is working hard planning the various sessions, and, because we are pairing with Region VIII, extra attention is being paid to topics that have a global component. Additionally, our free Wednesday workshops have been devised to address a broad spectrum of research administration issues so that there is something for everyone.

While the Program Committee is focused on the substantive details of the meeting, they also are looking at ways for attendees to interact with one another and take advantage of the location’s proximity to New York City. For example, our Thursday night event will be a harbor dinner cruise along the Hudson and East Rivers that promises incredible views of the Manhattan skyline. The Committee exploring local events and activities bookending the meeting dates in which attendees may have interest, with the goal of coordinating group meetups for sightseeing tours and dinner groups. As always, the most current information can be found on our website, but please don’t hesitate to reach out to Adam with any questions at adam.greenberg@asrc.cuny.edu

Before our Regional Meeting, Region II members will be seeing each other at the Annual Meeting in August. Last year, we hosted a reception at an off-site location, as well as set up dinner groups at local eateries, both of which were met with resounding approval. Our Volunteer Committee is currently investigating similar activities for this year’s conference and will publicize as we get closer. If you have any suggestions, or would like to participate in the planning activities, please reach out to our Regional Chair-Elect, and Chair of our Volunteer and Membership Committee, Katie McKeon at kpetrone@umd.edu

Speaking of receptions, Region II hosted an event for members during the FRA and PRA Conferences in Las Vegas. Turnout was exceptional, and, besides facilitating a networking opportunity for our residents, we also gave away several prizes, including a free registration to this year’s Regional Meeting. Thank you to everyone who attended, and we look forward to hosting similar functions in the future.

Finally, as a reminder, be sure to check out the webpage of our Professional Development Committee to see where we’ll be teaching next, as well as a current listing of our workshops. Don’t forget - host institutions receive two free registrations to their workshop!

Charles Bartunek, JD, is Chair of Region II, and is the Director of Collaborative and Corporate Research Contracts at Children's Hospital of Philadelphia. He may be reached at bartunekc@email.chop.edu
Region III’s spring meeting has come and gone, and, as reluctant as the attendees were to leave the beach at Margaritaville, we’re confident that everyone left refreshed with new ideas to bring back to work. The Region III Program Committee put together more than 70 workshops, concurrent sessions, and discussion groups covering a wide range of topics and levels of experience. We’d like to recognize Program Committee Chair Emily Devereux and Co-Chair Danielle McElwain, as well as the Committee Track Chairs: Hagan Walker, Rob Roy, Laura Letbetter, Rachel Simpson, David Smelser, Cindy Hope, James Denney, Tanta Myles, Kathleen Halley-Octa, Lacey Rhea, and Scott Niles. Their tireless work ensured the meeting was a success! In addition, we’d like to thank our Volunteer Coordinator, Lacey Rhea, and all of our great members who volunteered at the meeting and helped to keep things running smoothly. If you’re interested in volunteering at a meeting or on a Region III Committee, check out our website to learn about how to get involved: http://ncuraregioniii.com/volunteer.

The end of the spring meeting is also the beginning of new leadership in Region III. From our Executive Committee, Justo Torres, Region III Chair from May 2018 – May 2019, will become Immediate Past Chair with Emily Devereux becoming Chair through May 2020. Laura Letbetter will assume the position of Chair-Elect as Emily steps down from that position. In its inaugural term, Rob Roy will serve as the Past Treasurer Advisor. This non-voting position was created to provide guidance and expertise to the treasurer and treasurer-elect as needed. Celeste Rivera-Nunez will be rotating off as the Social Media Committee Coordinator while Ken Carter will rotate off from the Surveys and Evaluations Committee Coordinator position.

Thank you to all our outgoing executive and standing committee members for serving Region III! Your hard work and dedication to the success of Region III are appreciated and we look forward to what you’ll accomplish in your next role. We are also eager to see what our incoming leadership will accomplish, as they have all proven their commitment to the region over the years and are sure to have exciting things in store!

We look forward to seeing everyone in Washington, D.C. at the Annual Meeting. Until then, keep up with the latest regional news by connecting on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, the RIII Collaborate Community, and our website!

Emily Devereux is Chair of Region III and serves as the Executive Director of Research Development at Arkansas State University. She can be reached at edevereux@astate.edu

Greetings! Please join me in congratulating the newly elected members to the Region IV Board. You can learn more about your board at our website: ncuraregioniv.com. Thank you to everyone who participated in the election.

Congratulations to the recent Region IV award winners. The 2019 Travel Awards were given to Bill Courtney and Matthew Leucke, Washington University in St. Louis; Crystal James, Medical College of Wisconsin; Jessica Kurzasch, Indiana University; and John Maurer, Ann & Robert H. Lurie Children’s Hospital of Chicago. The Meritorious Contributions Award went to Iris Dickhoff-Peper from Washington University in St. Louis.

The Region IV spring meeting was held in Columbus, Ohio - we were so pleased to see so many Ohioans! The theme was “The Sound of Compliance: Keeping You on Key and Out of Treble.” Opera singer and neuroscientist, Dr. Indre Viskontas gave an engaging keynote speech exploring her application of neuroscience to musical training. Several Region IV members also got to show off their musical talents! Attendees enjoyed almost 60 sessions, eight instructional workshops, a Concepts Poster Expo, and special guest speakers highlighting NCURA’s commitment to Diversity and Inclusion. There were informal opportunities for networking, including a welcome reception, dinner groups, a newcomer event, and an evening of dancing and giant games on Tuesday night! Thanks to everyone who showed up to make this another incredible NCURA Region IV spring meeting!

It’s never too early to start thinking about next year’s spring meeting! In fact, next year will be our 50th Spring Meeting and we’ll partner with our friends in Region III. Mark your calendar for April 25-29, 2020, when we’ll take a trip to the beach in sunny St. Petersburg, Florida!

If you’re planning on attending the NCURA Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C. this August, keep an eye out for our annual and extremely popular event, D.C. At Dusk. Join your Region IV colleagues and their families on a bus tour around some of our nation’s capital’s most beautiful sites. Hope to see you there!

Nicole Nichols is Chair of Region IV and the Research Administrator for the Computational Biology and Medical Oncology Sections of the Department of Internal Medicine at Washington University in St. Louis. She can be reached at n.nichols@wustl.edu
Hello, Region 6 Colleagues!
We would like to congratulate Treasurer, Randi Wasik, as she has begun an exciting new job opportunity that took her outside of Region 6. Thank you for your service to the region, Randi. Treasurer-Elect, Manilyn Matau, graciously began her term as Treasurer nine months early on April 1st. Thank you, Manilyn, for jumping into the Treasurer position early.

As announced early in the year, we decided to postpone the Regional Meeting in Hawaii until we are able to secure better room rates and site-related costs. This decision left us with the need to choose a new 2020 meeting location. To that end, we established an ad hoc Regional Meeting Site Selection Committee, led by Chair-Elect Vanessa Quiroz Hotz. Vanessa is joined on the committee by Sam Westcott, Lisa Wotrich, and Manilyn Matau, and they are partnering with a Region 7 site selection committee on the 2020 meeting location.

Traditionally, the Chairs-Elect for Regions 6 & 7 choose the meeting sites on their own, in most cases even before their Chair-Elect year begins. With this site selection committee, we hope to provide additional support to the Chair-Elect for this important decision. Later in the year, the Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) will determine whether this ad hoc committee should continue as a standing committee in future years. We should have more to report at the in-person Regional Business Meetings this August and October.

Speaking of the Regional Business Meetings… if you will be attending the NCURA Annual Meeting in Washington, DC in August, please plan to attend our business meeting. It’s a perfect opportunity to hear what your regional officers & committees have been up to, what’s on the horizon for Region 6, and how to get involved. This year, those who attend will have the opportunity to walk away with some door prizes chosen to get you excited for the Seattle Region 6/7 Meeting.

Never attended an NCURA meeting and want to check out the Annual Meeting in DC? Watch for an email blast or check the regional website for information about Regional Travel Awards to AM61.

Finally, please hold the date for our Region 6 & 7 Meeting from October 27th – 30th at the Motif Hotel in downtown Seattle. Registration and program details will be available this summer.

Amanda C. Snyder, MPA, is Region VI Chair and Associate Director in the Office of Sponsored Programs at the University of Washington. She can be reached at acs229@uw.edu

Looking forward, we are approaching the 2019 NCURA Annual Meeting in Washington, DC taking place August 4th-7th, 2019. The officers are in the process of preparing our regional events, so please keep an eye out on our call for volunteers. You can find the latest information on our regional website at www.ncuraregionv.com or check us out on Facebook and Twitter. We look forward to seeing as many of my fellow Region V Mustangs in Washington, DC!

On a personal note, serving as Chair has been one of the most valuable experiences I have had in Research Administration and in my personal ambition toward service. I would like to thank everyone for all your kind words, guidance and support during this past year. I truly appreciate it. I am also proud of our membership and I know, as I pass the torch, Katie Plum (Angelo State University) will continue to succeed as she leads us through our next adventures. Thank you!

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

Region V, the Research Administrators have landed!
As you receive this month’s magazine, we will have recently wrapped up our 2019 Region V spring meeting in Houston. It was such a great feeling, meeting and visiting with each of our attendees. Katie Plum and the program committee truly did an amazing job!
We would like to thank all Region V members for serving as volunteers for the meeting, and we extend special thanks to this year’s program committee:

Gillian Bautista, University of Houston
Niki Bertrand, Southwestern University
Mona Bisase, Houston Methodist
Cory Blackwell, Texas Tech University
Beth Cammarn, The University of Texas Medical Branch
Greg Chu, University of Houston
Cory Davis, The University of Texas at Austin
Jeffrey Garza, Texas A&M University - Kingsville
Lizette Gonzales, Texas A&M University - Kingsville
Tribbie Grimm, Texas A&M University
Margie Harper, CHRISTUS Health
Anise Hawkins, The University of Texas at Austin
Susan Hurley, Sam Houston State University
Liz Kogan, The University of Texas at Austin
Vanessa Lopez, The University of Texas at Austin
Diana Luna, Texas A&M University - Kingsville
Francis Regalado, Texas A&M University - Kingsville
Kate Solis, St. Mary’s University
Angela Wishon, Wishon Consulting

Looking forward, we are approaching the 2019 NCURA Annual Meeting in Washington, DC this summer. The officers are in the process of preparing our regional events, so please keep an eye out for our call for volunteers. You can find the latest information on our regional website at www.ncuraregionvi.com or check us out on Facebook and Twitter. We look forward to seeing as many of my fellow Region VI Mustangs in Washington, DC!

On a personal note, serving as Chair has been one of the most valuable experiences I have had in Research Administration and in my personal ambition toward service. I would like to thank everyone for all your kind words, guidance and support during this past year. I truly appreciate it. I am also proud of our membership and I know, as I pass the torch, Katie Plum (Angelo State University) will continue to succeed as she leads us through our next adventures. Thank you!

Michael R. Castilleja is Chair of Region VI and serves as Grants Accounting Manager at the University of the Incarnate Word. He can be reached at micasti2@uiwtx.edu
Region VII is pleased to introduce our new website at www.ncuraregionvii.org. Please check it out! This has been a labor of love for a small communications group that has also been responsible for our first two regional newsletters. We have received some very nice feedback about both.

Results for Region VII’s ad hoc election are in. We are delighted to announce that we have a new Treasurer-elect, Chelo Jorge from Colorado State University. She will spend the rest of the year learning the ropes from Treasurer Jennifer Lawrence. By splitting the previous secretary/treasurer single position into two positions and implementing a 3-year treasurer rotation, we will reduce the tremendous load that the combined position has had to carry. This change is a direct reflection of the availability of more volunteers than we have had before, and we are thrilled to have this new capacity.

The Site Selection Committee, consisting of Chair Liz Grinstead and members Nicole Quartiero, Jennifer Lawrence, Judy Fredenberg, and ex officio Ashley Stahle have begun meeting with our Region VI counterparts on the Region VI/VII meeting for 2020.

We have also started a small working group that is talking about outreach to our very large Region VII PUI community and are continuing to look at creating six regional ‘clusters’ of institutions that are within a 200-mile radius. This is a work in progress, and I hope to have more to report by our next regional corner.

In other news, we are hard at work with Region VI on what is already shaping up to be a fantastic regional meeting scheduled for October 27-30 in Seattle, Washington. We are excited about The Motif, the boutique hotel that is working with us and happens to be only two blocks from Pike Place Market. We have all of the co-track chairs identified and are starting to put together a committee to help with logistics.

Speaking of logistics, we are looking into having a Region VII event at the annual meeting. For a nominal fee, we are working to see if we can take our members on a 3-hour night tour of DC. More information and a survey to see who would like to go will be forthcoming. Plan to wear jean jackets and cowboy boots in true Region VII pioneer fashion. I also want to mention the importance of everyone coming to the Business Meeting, which we are renaming the All-Region Meeting. Every person that attends will have a chance to win their very own jackalope! Hope to see you there!

Diane Barrett is Chair of Region VII and serves as Director, Office of Sponsored Programs at Colorado State University. She can be reached at diane.barrett@colostate.edu

It is a great honor to serve as Chair Elect of Region VIII in 2019. Honestly, I hesitated to be a candidate because I know others who are qualified and viable candidates. But I also thought since I have been supported by many great NCURA fellow members, becoming Chair Elect of Region VIII would be the first step to return something small to the NCURA community. Here, I’d like to appreciate the members who encouraged me to become Chair Elect and I will ask all of you for your continuous support. I am very excited to work with the Region VIII Board members and have been enjoying it so far.

I have also been serving RMAN-J, which is a sister organization of the URAs in Japan (Research Manager and Administrator Network Japan). Though it is still young, the number of participants at its annual meeting is increasing every year. In September 2018, the meeting was held in Kobe for two days, inviting the then-President Georgette Sakamoto, and David Richardson from NCURA, the number of participants was 696.

Among the organizational members of RMAN-J, Hiroshima University has become the host institution of INORMS 2020. In Region VIII Board, we are going to discuss a possibility to hold the 2020 regional meeting in Japan before or after INORMS 2020 which is going to be held on May 25th to May 28th. Our President Tony Ventimiglia kindly brought up this idea at the Council Meeting of INORMS on February 25, and it was approved. As a member of the Program Committee for INORMS 2020, I will follow this up and share the information with you.

In the meantime, please save the date of the fall regional meeting with Region II for your 2019 activities. It will be held at the Westin Jersey City Newport, NJ October 16 to 18!

Tadashi Sugihara is Chair Elect of Region VIII and serves as the Manager of Grants and Research Collaborations Section, Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology Graduate University (OIST), Okinawa, Japan. He can be reached at tadashi.sugihara@oist.jp
Building towards the future... together

In 2016, NCURA launched a beta research program to provide opportunities for NCURA members to innovate and pursue excellence in developing and sustaining critical partnerships and support the data-driven needs of NCURA and the profession; develop and implement innovative programs for research and education; and build resources for new programs that would support global efforts. We recognize that the primary purpose of research is to inform action, to prove a theory, and contribute to developing knowledge in a field or study.

NCURA assembled a board-appointed review team that developed the request for proposal, the rubric for which the proposals would be scored, and the agreement terms between NCURA and the funded institution. The proposed research activities included the collection and acquisition of new data and/or in-depth analysis of previously existing data. The call for proposals included such topical areas as public policy issues and research administration; advancement of technology transfer in research administration and associated challenges and obstacles; and analysis of both domestic and global research enterprise models.

A peer review team consisted of highly experienced research administrators with extensive knowledge both in research administration and research inquiry. The team reviewed and scored the proposals using a published matrix of the following five areas:

1. Purpose/Focus of Project: purpose or focus of project is clearly explained and aligns closely with NCURA’s vision;
2. Problem Description/Needs Justification: project addresses an important problem or high need area within research administration;
3. Design/Methods/Analysis: conceptual framework, research design, methods, and analysis are well developed and appropriate to the research questions;
4. Broader Impacts: proposal explains the broader impacts of the research for the NCURA membership and the research administration profession; and
5. Dissemination Plan: proposal explains a plan to disseminate research results.

The calls for proposals issued in 2016 and 2017 resulted in funding the following eight (8) proposals to the NCURA member Principal Investigators (institution names reflect funded institution names and may not include the Principal Investigator’s current affiliation).

- Heather Cody, University of Texas, Health Sciences Center, Houston, “RE-Tool, Research Efficiency Tool”
- Simon Kerridge, University of Kent and Stephanie Scott, Columbia University, “Research Administration as a Profession”
- Lisa Mosely, Arizona State University; Jeremy Forsberg, University of Texas, Arlington; David Ngo, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center; “Model Policy Development to Reduce Administrative and Faculty Burden”
- Jo Ann Smith, University of Central Florida, “Retention and Turnover of Early Career Research Administrators”

To date, NCURA funded researchers have disseminated their results through publications including NCURA Magazine and Research Management Review, presented at several conferences, and participated in the NCURA Annual Meeting Poster Session. While many of the projects have already concluded, all will wrap up by Summer 2019.

Upon conclusion of the beta program this summer, NCURA’s next step is to evaluate the impact of this research for our membership and assess the future funding of the program.

- Karen Fletcher, Appalachian State University, “PREPARE: A Mentoring Program to Develop Research Advocates”
- Mary Catherine “MC” Gaisbauer, University of California, San Francisco, “Global Mentoring Program for Research Administrators”
- Katy Hendry, University of West Florida, “Increasing the Odds of the Return on Investment”
- Jennifer Ponting, Harvard University, “The Problem with Contracts: A Triage Solution for Business Agreement Transactions”
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NCURA CALENDAR OF EVENTS

NATIONAL TRAVELING WORKSHOPS

Contract Negotiation and Administration Workshop
May 29-31, 2019 ................................................................. Baltimore, MD

Departmental Research Administration Workshop
May 29-31, 2019 ................................................................. Baltimore, MD

Financial Research Administration Workshop
May 29-31, 2019 ................................................................. Baltimore, MD

Level I: Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration Workshop
May 29-31, 2019 ................................................................. Baltimore, MD

Level II: Sponsored Project Administration Workshop
September 4-6, 2019 ......................................................... Chicago, IL

REGIONAL MEETINGS

Region I (New England)
April 28-May 1, 2019 ......................................................... Portland, ME

Region II (Mid-Atlantic)/Region VIII (International)
October 16-18, 2019 ......................................................... Jersey City, NJ

Region III (Southeastern)
May 4-8, 2019 ................................................................. Hollywood Beach, FL

Region IV (Mid-America)
April 28-May 1, 2019 ......................................................... Columbus, OH

Region V (Southwestern)
April 28-May 1, 2019 ......................................................... Houston, TX

Region VI (Western)/VII (Rocky Mountain)
October 27-30, 2019 ......................................................... Seattle, WA

WEBINARS

• Organizational Conflict of Interest
  May 21, 2019, 2:00-3:30 pm ET

• Foreign Influence in Research
  June 11, 2019, 2:00-3:30 pm

• Designing a Training Program for Your Institution: Techniques, Tips and Tools
  June 18, 2019, 2:00-3:30 pm

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

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