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ON THE COVER: Research Administration without Borders sets the path for reenergizing and creating new and improved solutions to building an institution’s capacity for change and to stay relevant in a world that is constantly changing.

In today’s world we are connected without geographical boundaries to limit us and what we can do. Research Administration without Borders takes us to a place where we not only understand diverse perspectives but also how we can relate to them. To be beyond borders is to bridge the gap and to empower ourselves and others to strive and make difference in our ever-changing world.

This issue focuses on what research administrators can do to invent, transform and/or implement changes that makes a difference and/or can be successful in a global world. Adrienne Larmett and Martin Smith focus on recognizing and adapting to the changing environment that is constantly changing.

Heather Beatty Johnston and Robyn Remotique explore “Research Administration without Border Collies.” The article uses similarities and key points such as direction, safety, growth, inclusion and boundaries. Holly Mace discusses the similarities and differences of working abroad in “Take Border Collies.” The article uses similarities and key points such as direction, safety, growth, inclusion and boundaries. Holly Mace discusses the similarities and differences working abroad in “Take a Deep Breath and Grow.” Zoya Davis-Hamilton, Philippa Lehar and Sarah Marina explore “Strategies to Improve Proposal Lead Time.” Research Administration without Borders provides an opportunity where research administrators are unafraid to share ideas, take risk and be a driver for change.

Rosemary Madnick is the Executive Director of Grants and Contracts Administration at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. She oversees the pre and post award functions for the university. Rosemary is activity involved in NCURA. She has served in a number of capacities including on NCURA’s Board of Directors, NCURA Peer Reviewer, Fundamentals Traveling Faculty and as NCURA Magazine Co-Editor. She is a graduate of NCURA’s Leadership Development Institute and the Executive Leadership Program. She can reached at rmadnick@alaska.edu
I hope everyone celebrated Research Administrator’s Day in unique and fun ways this year! As we head into the last quarter of 2019, I have been reflecting on NCURA’s continuing efforts to support and advance the profession of research administration. Throughout this issue, articles will highlight the theme of Research Administration without Borders, so I thought it would be a perfect time to provide an update on NCURA’s participation in INORMS and other global initiatives.

The International Network of Research Management Societies (INORMS) brings together research management societies and associations from across the globe. Its purpose is to enable interactions, share good practice, and coordinate activities between the member societies, to the benefit of their individual membership.

Each member society has its own distinct governance, membership and geographical base. The network enables the officers of the member societies to compare their national or regional issues, and to learn from each other. In regard to participation, the NCURA President serves as a member of the INORMS Council, the Vice President serves as a member of the INORMS Working Group and others (including members of the Executive Committee) represent NCURA on various INORMS subgroups.

Hosted by The Research Manager and Administrator Network Japan (RMAN-J), the next INORMS Congress, Promoting Diversity in Research and Research Management Collaborations: More Trans-National, More Trans-Disciplinary, More Trans-Sectoral will be held in Hiroshima, Japan from May 25 -28, 2020. The INORMS Congress is open to all members of its member societies.

In furtherance of its strong collaborative relationship, NCURA recently entered into a three-year memorandum of understanding with the European Association of Research Managers and Administrators (EARMA) that will provide reciprocal discounts on programs and services to the members of both organizations. We look forward to continuing the wonderful friendship between our two associations.

Globally, we continue to promote research administration as a profession on a worldwide basis. This is facilitated through global workshops, panel discussions, partnerships and fellowships. These activities are also supported by the Select Committee on Global Affairs which actively assists, advocates and advances NCURA’s global strategic agenda and initiatives.

“Globally, we continue to promote research administration as a profession on a worldwide basis.”

NCURA has also made great strides in introducing research administration to countries and geographic regions where the concept was unknown or not well-developed. These activities continue to reflect our commitment to the profession across all borders.

As a global community, research administrators may face geographical, cultural and terminology differences, but as a profession, we are all focused on the goal of advancing the research and creative scholarship of our institutions. This is what brings us together, regardless of the distance between us!

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
The Co-Editors of Research Management Review (RMR) would like to invite authors to submit article proposals. The online journal publishes a wide variety of scholarly articles intended to advance the profession of research administration. Authors can submit manuscripts on diverse topics.

Interested in writing for the Research Management Review?

www.ncura.edu/Publications/ResearchManagementReview.aspx
Considerations for Research Administrators Entering into International Research Collaborations

By Tracey Trujillo

In today’s world of research administration there is an ever-increasing desire to work collaboratively both within the United States and abroad. Principal Investigators (PI) are eager to expand their research partnerships to include research in other countries. There are many moving parts to be aware of when submitting a proposal that involves international research. My goal in writing this article is to identify some of the potential issues that may arise at the pre-proposal stage, proposal stage and award stage and provide some resources to facilitate the process.

General Considerations

The first piece of advice I can provide is to start early. I know, that’s easy to say, right! Review the solicitation carefully. You will need to look for eligibility restrictions because there are some programs that restrict certain countries from receiving funding. There are also some U.S. sponsors, such as the National Science Foundation, that have funding opportunities which contain a U.S. and a foreign component, with different submission requirements depending on which country is the lead. This can also impact which laws take precedence in the event of any disagreement after the agreement is in place. Typically, universities cannot accept the laws of another state, let alone another country.

Another consideration when a U.S. institution is planning to issue a subaward to a foreign entity is whether the foreign entity has a Dun & Bradstreet (DUNS) number. A DUNS number is a unique nine-character number used to identify an organization. Currently, the federal government uses DUNS numbers to track how federal dollars are allocated. If the subaward organization is outside the U.S. and does not have a DUNS number, there are additional steps needed at proposal stage in order to include them in some federal application portals, and applying for a DUNS number will take additional time.

Data Security – Export Control Issues

Too often these days we see news stories of a data breach of some kind or other affecting hundreds if not thousands of individuals. Safeguarding research data while abroad is a very real concern. PIs should always check in with their institutions’ export control offices/officers and information technology departments to be informed of any technology guidelines and/or requirements for international travel. PIs may need to wipe laptops they plan to take on their travels, leaving only very basic information, or potentially install additional security software. If data must be stored locally, it must be saved on an encrypted device. Keeping devices in their possession or physically secure at all times is recommended.

Research administrators who work with international research proposals will want to become familiar (if not already) with the U.S. federal export regulations including the Export Administration Regulations (EAR) Title 15, sections 730-774, of the Code of Federal Regulations (15 CFR 730-774). The International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) is found at 22 CFR 120-130,
implementing Section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 USC 2778). In order to support your research faculty and stay abreast of the latest changes, reading through these regulations periodically will help provide some important information and alert you to potential concerns for export control.

A good reference starting point for export control issues can be found in an article entitled, “A Pre-Award Look at Export Control Concerns,” published in the May/June 2019 issue of NCURA Magazine, authored by Jillian R. Cawley, Christopher Denman and Jessica Buchanan. This article provides a list of questions to consider at the proposal stage to assist in determining whether there is an export control concern. I highly recommend reading this article and adding their short list of questions to your pre-award tool kit.

University of California at Davis has a great overview of export control on its website, with links to ITAR and EAR regulations along with some helpful general information explaining export control issues. https://research.uc-davis.edu/wp-content/uploads/Export-Control-Overview-of-Regulations.pdf

Budget Considerations
When building or reviewing a proposed budget, it is important to confirm that the request and resulting award will be in U.S. currency. If not, the PI will need to consider the impact that changes in exchange rates may have on the budget. If foreign currency is non-negotiable, make sure the PI is aware, check the exchange rate for variances and see if the sponsor will accept a fixed total budget. The PI should be aware of historical exchange rates in order to budget appropriately. Some foreign entities may have differing allowable costs that may be included in the indirect cost base as well as limits on direct costs.

Research administrators and PIs know to be prepared for the unexpected! Think globally! Will your traveling faculty member need additional currency for unanticipated expenses? Explore possible means of compensating local residents by discussing options with your procurement office, departmental accounting office and your sponsored programs office.

Another consideration is payment by a foreign sponsor to the institution. Will you need to use wire transfers to receive payment from the sponsor? Will there be additional wire transfer taxes and/or fees that should be included in the budget? Will there be costs for land access or permit fees in another country where field work will be done?

Another great resource from the University of Pittsburgh, “Considerations for Conducting International Research,” covers a variety of topics including building the proposal, language and culture, timeline, and unique costs, as well other very helpful tips and information for international research: https://globaloperations.pitt.edu/research/planning-considerations

In closing, the last piece of advice I will offer is to consult your Office of Sponsored Programs early and often to utilize their expertise and to facilitate the proposal submission, as well as to head off any potential issues at award.

Tracey Trujillo is a Research Administrator at Colorado State University’s Warner College of Natural Resources. Tracey has more than 27 years of experience in research administration, working in the central Sponsored Programs Office and in two colleges at CSU during her time there. Tracey can be reached at Tracey.Trujillo@colostate.edu

US Funding Opportunities and Management Workshop

On September 24th the Science Diplomats Club (SDC) of Washington, DC and NCURA co-hosted, the first of its kind, a workshop titled “US Funding Opportunities and Management” at the Italian Embassy in Washington, DC for science and technology attaches and counselors. Attended by 35 participants representing 20 different embassies and missions, the event was organized to help science counselors understand US funding opportunities, rules, and regulations.

Dr. Ara Tahmassian, Chief Research Compliance Officer, Harvard University, and Robert Andresen, Director of Research Financial Services, University of Wisconsin-Madison were the featured speakers. They discussed the US funding landscape, the regulatory framework and the need to facilitate more global scientific collaboration.

Illy, an Italian coffee company, donated a coffee machine as a raffle prize for the event. The proceeds from the raffle were donated to NCURA’s Education Scholarship Fund. The event ended on a successful note with requests to do additional similar workshops in the future.

Photo above, left to right: Ara Tahmassian, Harvard University; Claire Chen, NCURA; Stefano Lami Moscheni, Embassy of Italy; Bob Andresen, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Research without border collies. True, the dogs don’t really have much to do with navigating borders; their name comes from the fact that they originated in the region of the border between England and Scotland. Still, the play on words with this issue’s theme made us think about the ways research administrators (RAs) are similar to border collies and what the research environment would be like without us.

Direction
Border collies are perhaps best known for their ability to keep a flock together and moving in the same direction. Much like border collies, research administrators help keep their communities moving toward strategic goals established by their institutions’ leadership. We develop policies and procedures that guide researchers in certain directions, we create checklists that keep faculty headed in the right direction with proposal submissions, and we design programs and incentives that encourage the pursuit of certain paths.

Safety
Border collies help keep their flocks safe from predators and help protect assets like crops from being trampled or eaten by hungry sheep. Safety is also an essential function for research administrators. The policies and procedures we develop and enforce are created, in part, to protect our researchers and institutions from outside forces that could harm them. Our guidance documents and decision trees help investigators make informed decisions about things that impact their research. We work to ensure that no one is caught unaware by disadvantageous sponsor terms or becomes subject to legal action as a result of inadvertently violating federal and state law. Those of us in research compliance protect the human and animal subjects that are part of our research communities by seeing that relevant federal guidelines are followed. In addition, our policies and procedures also serve to protect institutional assets from internal forces. We all know PIs who would give away the proverbial farm to make a deal with an industry sponsor – never mind that they don’t technically own it! Contract negotiators strategize to balance the interests of the investigator with those of the institution to arrive at an optimal final agreement.

Growth
Sheep may give more thought to the border collie’s potential to nip at their heels than they do to her potential to herd them to new grazing grounds, but that’s another essential function for these dogs. A flock that keeps grazing the same depleted pasture will not be nearly as robust as one that has access to fresh forage. The same is true for research, and RAs show the way for new opportunities. Investigators often see ours as the office of “no,” but we know the truth: RAs find creative – and legal! – ways to make “yes” happen. Without the financial management expertise of post-award staff, far fewer sponsors would be willing to award funds in support of the research at our institutions. Without the keen eyes of pre-award staff, far more proposals would be returned without review for non-compliance. Without those who manage research compliance and review protocols, it is likely fewer studies would meet the ethical requirements of sponsors. And, of course, without the dedication and determination of research development staff, our institutions’ investigators would have access to – and be competitive for – far fewer opportunities.

Inclusion
With a border collie on the job, no sheep is ever left behind. The dog helps keep the flock intact by spurring on stragglers and rounding up those who have become lost. RAs also spur on stragglers. We search for those who are lost, reaching out to check on investigators we haven’t heard from in a while. We encourage those who got disappointing reviewer comments to take those comments to heart, tweak the proposal, and resubmit. Finally, we work to remove barriers for those who might not be submitting proposals at all.

Boundaries
Human shepherds rely on their canine counterparts to use their experience and intuition to determine when one of their flock has crossed an unseen boundary and to recognize where their pasture ends and the next begins. Likewise, research administrators – whose unofficial motto is “it depends” – are relied upon to know where the boundaries are. Where does funding cross the line from gift to grant? When does one use a vendor vs. issuing a subaward agreement? What, exactly, are the allowable and allocable expenses that can – and can’t – be included in a budget? Although border collies have a natural instinct for herding, it often takes a lot of time and effort from a human handler to develop a dog’s skills so that she becomes a true partner. Likewise, research administrators devote a lot of time and effort to developing our skills. We are always thinking, learning, and growing so that we can own our place as true partners to our investigators and our institutions. Without us, the research enterprise would be more chaotic and less productive.

By Heather Beattey Johnston and Robyn Remotigue

Royn Remotigue is Director, Office of Research Services, in the School of Public Health at the University of North Texas Health Science Center in Fort Worth. She is a graduate of the NCURA Executive Leadership Program and Leadership Development Institute. She serves on Region V’s Mentoring, Leadership and Professional Development Committee and is an Al-Large Member of the Board of Directors. Royn is a faculty member of NCURA’s traveling workshop SPA II and serves on the Educational Scholarship Fund (ESF) Select Committee. She can be reached at Robyn.Remotigue@unthsc.edu

Heather Beattey Johnston, MA, is Associate Director for Research Communications at Miami University. With broad experience in higher education and marketing communications, Heather currently supports Miami researchers in their efforts to communicate effectively with funding agencies, commercial partners, and other external audiences. She can be reached at johnsthb@MiamiOH.edu
The higher education landscape appears to be changing dramatically. Many colleges and universities are faced with challenges in maintaining enrollment, managing costs, and keeping up with new technology. These are all happening while campus safety, social movements, and socio-economic diversity efforts are underway. Research administration intersects with these changing dynamics when competing for resources. This article outlines important trends in higher education and their impact on research administration, helps you decipher where your institution fits in, and suggests short-term and long-term strategies to succeed.

The Higher Education Landscape
College and universities have been increasingly inundated with new and changing pressures over the past decade including:

Declining enrollments — declining birth rates and migration shifts have contributed to declining enrollments, particularly for institutions in the Northeast and Rust Belt states (Barshay, 2018). In Pennsylvania for example, enrollment declined at 12 of the 14 state institutions in 2018 (Snyder, 2018).

Many institutions expanded their housing facilities, faculty, and student services to accommodate the explosion of students from the Millennial generation, defined by Pew Research as those born between 1981 to 1996 (Dimock, 2019). The subsequent generation, commonly referred to as Generation Z, are said to be larger than the Baby Boomers and Millennials (Miller and Lu, 2018). However, changing social attitudes about the value of a college degree, coupled with an improved United States (U.S.) economy, and restrictions on foreign students have all contributed to reduced enrollment for many institutions.

While demand for the nation’s most elite colleges and universities will continue to grow (Barshay, 2018) over the next decade, regardless of geography, declining enrollments will adversely impact tuition-dependent institutions because of the investments these institutions have made to their facilities, services, and administration. Reduced tuition revenues are contributing to increased scrutiny over resource requests. In more extreme cases, we see the impact in the closing or acquisition of several small institutions, the
discontinuation of programs and majors, and mass early retirements and buyouts in attempt to stay solvent (Toppo, 2018).

Changing demographics — walk around most campuses today and you will observe the current student body is more diverse than ever before. Higher education has focused much attention to diversifying its student body to reflect all people of the world. More recently, institutions have made a significant push to provide access to higher education for students who may not have had the opportunity in the past. Some institutions have eliminated standardized tests as a requirement for admission or moved to test optional, increased recruitment practices in more economically-diverse areas, and increased financial aid commitments to attract ethnically and socio-economically diverse students.

According to a recent Gates Foundation study about post-secondary success (“Today’s College Students,” 2019), the Foundation found that of current students 42% are non-white; 40% are 25 years or older; 62% hold part or full-time jobs; 28% are parents; and 33% come from families who earn less than $20,000 per year.

While colleges and universities welcome the diversity and the richness of experience it brings, they are faced with supporting an equally diverse set of needs (e.g., academic advising, basic subsistence needs). For example, many institutions have started food banks to support what is commonly referred to as “food insecurity”. The depth of support and higher education’s role in providing these resources is more intensive than what may have been anticipated.

As institutions rise to meet the needs of this blossoming student population, they are broadly challenged with meeting the multitude of needs. At a time when resources are being tightly managed, institutions are looking for solutions to meet their students’ financial needs, nourishment, housing, and additional academic advisors, counselors, and the like.

In the for-profit world, financial analysts evaluate how companies grow their revenue and look to see whether the additional revenue cost incrementally more. This same phenomenon is impacting higher education—growing and diversifying the student body appears to be costing more per student than in years past (Leins, 2018).

Rising costs and changing public sentiments — the average cost a four-year degree in recent years, according to the National Center for Education Statistics, has been about $104,000. The same four-year degree 30 years ago was about half that when adjusted for inflation. This means over the past three decades, the cost for a four-year degree has doubled—even after inflation. However, wages have not grown at the same pace; the cost of a degree increased eight times faster than wages (Maldonado, 2018).

The rising cost of a college degree, coupled with graduates paying off student loans, has influenced a public perception. As Millennials face record student debt, both they and their successors continue to question the value of a four-year degree (Mitchell and Belkin, 2017).

University leaders, such as Princeton University President Christopher L. Eisgruber, have advocated the value of a college degree. In his 2018 commencement remarks, President Eisgruber noted that “the average annual return on investment from a college degree is between 9 percent and 16 percent per year for a lifetime.” College is, as he notes, “a long-term investment” (Eisgruber, 2018).

These pressures have compelled senior leadership and trustees to shift their priorities, and resources to maintain and grow enrollment, support the changing student body and their needs, increase completion rates, and reduce the cost of attendance where possible. For many small and mid-sized institutions this also means that some longtime strategic objectives, such as growing extramural research funding, are competing with these new priorities.

Where your institution fits in
There is a common tendency for institutions to benchmark themselves against their peers or aspirational peers. Remarkably, the benchmark schools do not
always neatly align with the institution doing the benchmarking. For example, a state institution with a centralized budget model has different economics than a private institution with a large endowment and decentralized budget model. Sometimes, schools within the same state system have different economics because of program offerings, local competition for students, or other factors that make “apples-to-apples” comparisons become more like “apples-to-oranges”.

Here are some important factors to use when differentiating your institution from its peers:

![Image]

Understanding where your institution fits in will influence whether the current climate in higher education is relevant to your school.

**Impact on Research Administration**
The true cost of research is well documented to be more than what our federal sponsors reimburse us for in the facilities and administrative (F&A) rate. Administration costs are capped at a rate of 26% for institutions of higher education (IHE) and schools with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) as their cognizant federal costing agency typically have a 4.5% difference between the rate proposed and rate negotiated (Needham, 2010). This means, on average, for every direct cost dollar spent on research colleges and universities lose 4.5 cents or more if their administration costs exceed the 26% rate capitation. Who pays the difference?

Many schools rely on gifts and endowments to fund the difference. Academic medical centers may contribute to this shortfall with proceeds from their clinical practices or hospitals. What happens to institutions that do not have these revenue streams to cover the research shortfalls? Because we don’t know the answer to this looming question, we as research administrators can be proactive to become part of the solution.

**Developing Strategies for Success**
The financial collapse in 2008, and prolonged economic recovery, prompted institutions to consider radical, more long-term solutions such as the shared services research administration model. This model consolidates layers of administration into one pooled team to provide lifecycle research administration services from pre-award through award close-out. Institutions who have embarked on this model have invested significantly into the transformation — hiring new people, reorganizing business processes, and reconfiguring institutional information systems to accommodate the new business structure. Some have explored this concept only to decide there may not be cost savings after going through this transformation.

We have the ability to make more subtle, short-term changes to research administration while providing immediate business process improvements with quantifiable savings. Let’s explore some opportunities in terms of your institution’s people, processes, and technology.

**People**
As research has grown over the last 25 years, our profession has seen the change from research administration generalists to specialists. This has been necessitated by the sheer volume increase. A life cycle combined pre-award and post-award office can adequately manage $25 million with a handful of people, but if it balloons to $100 million, then you need more people, who perform less functions, at a greater volume. The table below compares and contrasts specialists vs. generalists:

**Table 1. Research Administrators: Specialists vs. Generalists**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialists</th>
<th>Generalists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Award</td>
<td>Combined Lifecycle Research Administrators (i.e. Pre &amp; Post Award)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies Funding Opportunities</td>
<td>• Shared services combining research administration and department administration functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviews Proposals</td>
<td>• Training and Compliance become responsibilities embedded in other generalist roles or outsourced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grant Writers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Account Set-ups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effort Coordinators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compliance Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You may want to consider flattening your organizational charts; for-profit firms ideally have no more than three (3) levels. You will need to engage human resources and conduct this as an enterprise effort. You should also consult with your information technology group to ensure systems can accommodate new roles. Many schools have effectively used vacancies as an opportunity to phase in change to eventual future state organization, have hired more generalists, have less administrative support, less specialists, and have increased responsibilities and accountability for their staff.

**Processes**
Another trend taking shape, is simply to have your office provide only the core “need to do” services instead of the “nice to do” tasks. Consider the examples in the table below:

**Table 2. Rethinking Business Functions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nice to Do</th>
<th>Need to Do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Assist in preparing a proposal</td>
<td>• Establish Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitor Award Spend Rates</td>
<td>• Establish Award Accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Host Discussion Forums</td>
<td>• Monitor for Allowability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serve on Institutional Committees</td>
<td>• Invoice Sponsors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Submit Financial Reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
From a quick glance at any NCURA program, you will surely find sessions on managing your time. This is not something to take lightly as time can quick escape us and become whole positions when added up. Does your calendar look like a young child’s stacked building blocks? If it does, it may be time to reconsider some long-held conventions about the importance of all of our meetings. How much time do we spend talking vs. doing? Is our time spent being reactive vs. proactive? Can we be too proactive by taking on too many special projects? Are routine meetings held too frequently? Consider starting to block out entire days or half-days where meetings cannot be held. These small changes will become measurable in terms of full-time equivalents when adopted across your entire team.

**Workflows, redundancies, and bottlenecks**

There are opportunities within our workflows where we can also create efficiencies that save resources. Assessing your core business functions can reveal numerous efficiencies. They may not save dollars being spent, but they can free up availability from your existing staff. This improvement saves your institution from spending more on research administration.

Identifying the critical path is important. This allows you to find the most efficient way to get from start to finish while maintaining proper internal controls.

“Assessing your core business functions can reveal numerous efficiencies.”

Evaluate what approvals mean and whether different layers of approvals even add any value to the transaction. Reducing redundancies by determining whether multiple offices repeat steps already accomplished in a process. Finally, bottlenecks are a use of resources. Get to the root cause to understand why processes are being held up and resolving these will make processes flow better.

Consider rethinking traditional roles and responsibilities away from the common matrix and more toward a model that does the following:

- Streamlines duties
- Consolidates roles
- Eliminates functions without value
- Incorporates compliance into procedures
- Creates work efficiencies
- Focuses team on core functions

---

**Introducing AttainRate.**

*Optimize your rate calculation.*

Leverage a solution that learns and grows with you.

*Access your data, anytime, anywhere.*

Navigating today’s complex federal cost policy, grants management, and compliance challenges requires a comprehensive approach that can inspire the best solutions and outcomes for your unique needs.

Introducing AttainRate, a bundled offering featuring a user-friendly, cloud-based F&A platform combined with support from experienced, best in class consultants to help you interpret the dynamic regulatory environment that affects cost recovery rates.

**AttainRate—your holistic F&A cost recovery solution.**

www.attain.com/attainrate
Technology
There are best practices that we can borrow from the private sector in regard to financial systems. Consider adopting best practices and using an “out-of-the-box” solution rather than customizing a system. We can also align system upgrades with organizational redesigns in academic areas.

When using electronic research administration (ERA) systems, evaluate whether we have fully automated by using delivered functionality. In other words, did we buy a system and keep our old paper business processes? It is important to leverage technology to create efficiencies. Sometimes investments are made in partial technology offerings, when we should consider a full ERA suite (i.e. proposal, award, compliance, and funding search engines) in order to truly automate as much as possible.

Any changes to organization structures need to consider management reporting and security roles—these are very important foundations to your information technology. When reorganizing, remember to consider other users of your management reports. A simple change in your department number may throw off numerous reports that track different spending by department number. Security roles are equally important because it may be a major undertaking to reconfigure your security permissions in information systems when changing your department structure. Consider information system roles and limitations when considering any redesigns to your research administration structure.

Conclusion
Research and development unequivocally benefits the public at large. The search for truth and understanding of humanity, in this world and beyond, motivates our investigators. On a micro-level, research enhances our academic programs and the college experience for tomorrow’s graduates. As research administrators, we are charged with protecting our institutions’ reputations, resources, and make them aware of changes in the regulatory environment.

Higher education is experiencing a challenging time. The changing climate may provide opportunities to conserve resources and soften the short-term challenges that many institutions face. To solve a large problem, basic scientists may focus on evaluating individual cells and proteins. Our hope is that some of the strategies in this article can be the experiments for you that yield more significant results. In the spirit of academic freedom, when they do work — publish your results and spread the word.

Adrienne Larmett, MBA, CRA, is a Senior Manager in Baker Tilly’s higher education and research institutions industry practice. She assists colleges in risk mitigation in sponsored research and understanding federal and sponsor regulations guidance. Prior to joining Baker Tilly she held research administration positions at the University of Pennsylvania and Temple University. She can be reached at Adrienne.Larmett@bakertilly.com

Martin Smith has worked in research administration since 2002. He has experience in post-award, financial compliance, accounting, budget, and federal costing topics; having consulted for more than 40 institutions. Martin earned a B.B.A in Accounting from Temple University and an M.B.A in Finance from La Salle University. He can be reached at martin.smith@princeton.edu

“Evaluate what approvals mean and whether different layers of approvals even add any value to the transaction.”
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I’ll start by making a true confession. If you were to try finding me on Facebook, Twitter or Instagram, you would be sorely disappointed. While I have made a personal choice not to use social media (which might beg the question why am I writing an article about social media) it doesn’t mean that I fail to see the value of leveraging it to engage and better serve the research administration community. In fact, what I hope you will gain from my experience is that you don’t need to be a Kardashian or master influencer to use social media to create and support a digital community. All you need is a strategy, some good vibes and a sense of professional fun.

Research administration is a niche profession. While there is a thriving national and international community, highlighting it and being able to connect, share, introduce and even empathize, is exactly what social media is about. As research administrators know, most people fall into this line of work accidentally and stay because of intrinsic motivators. This is why it is more important than ever to leverage ways to continue to build a community and introduce a few fresh faces to this intriguing profession.

I won’t claim to be an expert, but I have been able to leverage social media as a way to secure a student worker and tap into her expertise. Not only did I learn more from her than I ever expected, but through the process of working together, it also introduced her to a profession she never knew about. Working together allowed us to craft a social media plan and implement it in a way that made us more intentional about the work we do and how it could be shared with others. It forced us to reflect on the way the world is changing, how traditional work roles and remote ones are blending, and what it means to feel satisfied in your job by connecting with others who understand the work you do. Social media has also provided a way to publish and share dynamic content by connecting our community to a variety of resources and knowledge.

Sifting through the details of selecting platforms, pitching content and defining a posting schedule allowed our team to gain a lot of insight. Some additional things to consider when developing your social media strategy:

- **Understand your organization’s strengths, weaknesses and opportunities** – Consider your organization’s core competencies, opportunities for improvement, areas of weakness and think about how you are applying your analysis. Are you examining them through operational, customer, stakeholder or staff lenses? How are you interacting with your audiences today and what does that mean as you think about how you want to apply a social media component to your organization?

- **Identify your marketing and communication objectives** – Are you trying to increase brand awareness, community engagement or improve how you deliver your content? Perhaps you are trying to garner awareness for services and value-added activities or increase moral, experience and unity across departments. Maybe you’re trying to provide end-users with different ways to consume information while reducing costs. Whatever your objectives, think them through, as it will also matter when selecting the right platform.

---

**Leveraging Social Media to Support and Engage Your Research Administrator Community**

*By Nicole Joyce*
• Assess your resources, skills and capabilities to produce content in order to achieve objectives – It’s easy to get hyped up about the creative side of launching social media campaigns, but it is critical to think about not only who will create and post content while maintaining a schedule, but also what the business impact will be and how the strategy plays into the broader business needs. Do follows, shares and likes correlate to visits, views, time on page or better customer satisfaction scores?

• Identify the right solution and platform that will support your objectives, whether it is to share, discuss, network or publish – Do you have a current marketing and communication strategy? If so, how does social media play into it? Before selecting the platforms to use, think through and revisit your objectives because, when considering the various platforms, it is important to think through how you want to align the platform to your objectives. Additionally, you might want to measure your effort and what type of metrics are available. This can not only inform your content, but also help you hone your approach.

• Measure and evaluate effectiveness by leveraging platform metrics – Each platform has a form of data and analytics. See what data is available to track and assess and if it provides the analytics you will need to measure your goals. If you are using more than one platform, consider whether you can or want to integrate the content into your own local dashboard.

Social media should not be intimidating. It should not consume your days, nor do you need to be an expert. It should be a way to add to the conversation as we continue to elevate research administrators and all they do. While you might not go viral, in the end it can just be plain fun to enjoy a chuckle at a meme only a research administrator would understand.

Nicole Joyce, MBA, is the Research Administration Training Program Manager for the University of California, San Diego, and has been a training and development professional for more than 10 years. She can be reached at njoyce@ucsd.edu

NCURA to Perform Salary Survey of the Profession

After numerous and continuing requests for salary range information NCURA has decided to take on the challenge of developing a salary survey for the profession.

Anyone who knows the myriad of positions in research administration will understand the massive task developing a survey to capture meaningful information will be. “We realize the first version may not be ‘pretty’ but if you don’t take that first step, you never arrive at the finish line,” said Kathleen Larmett, NCURA’s Executive Director. “Once we have the first survey launched, we know each subsequent survey will be refined.”

NCURA President Tony Ventimiglia added, “Given the amount of times we have seen this requested on listservs and at meetings we are excited about pursuing this opportunity.” Denise Wallen, current NCURA Vice President and President-elect noted, “You asked it, we heard you and we are on it!”

A Presidential Task Force was formed in October and is staffed by members of NCURA’s Board of Directors, along with volunteers with data management and survey expertise, and NCURA professional staff. Larmett added, “We are on a short timeline and intend to launch the survey in June 2020. Watch your inbox for news!”
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A Primer on Clinical Trials (90 pages)
Cost Sharing: An Overview (20 pages)
Compensation – Personal Services: Managing and Reporting Effort (20 pages)
Facilities and Administrative Costs in Higher Education (24 pages)
Establishing and Managing an Office of Sponsored Programs at Non-Research Intensive Colleges and Universities (32 pages)
A Primer on Intellectual Property (20 pages)
The Role of Research Administration (42 pages)
Writing and Negotiating Subawards Under Federal Prime Awards (24 pages)
OMB Uniform Guidance (272 pages)

FOR MORE INFORMATION AND TO ORDER THESE PUBLICATIONS VISIT THE NCURA STORE:
www.ncura.edu/Publications/Store.aspx
In true NCURA tradition this year’s annual meeting was another great success. We had more than 1,700 attendees from 26 countries and it was quite evident during the entire conference that there was a high degree of enthusiasm and active engagement by all.

Dr. Freeman A. Hrabowski III, President of the University of Maryland – Baltimore County, delivered an inspiring keynote speech, focusing on access and diversity in STEM and higher education and sharing his personal life story. Named one of the “Most 100 Influential People in the World” by Time, Dr. Hrabowski set the tone for the conference and challenged everyone to be the best they can be. The conference attendees were ignited to take full advantage of all the opportunities that support their professional development.

As with all NCURA Annual Meetings, this conference provided a rich array of networking and educational opportunities. With more than 230 sessions there was something for everyone — concurrent sessions, panels, forums, discussion groups, breakfast groups, and fast-paced Ignite sessions. The ever-popular pre-conference workshops provided the opportunity for the “deep dive” into cutting-edge topics. We are so fortunate that our expert peer research administrators generously share their knowledge, strategies, best practices, resources and experiences. This year’s well-attended poster sessions allowed members to showcase their research efforts and resulted in four winners.

The annual meeting once again provided outstanding networking opportunities starting with the Sunday night networking event at the Smithsonian National Museum of the American Indian, replete with music and food and then followed by the ever-popular Netzone activities back at the Hilton! Our special Monday lunchtime guests, the Capitol Steps, who are an American political-satire group, had us smiling and laughing at lunch and revived and ready to take part in all the Monday afternoon sessions. Then Tuesday night arrived and what better way to wind down than to dance the night away at Carnivale NCURA-style with your new and old colleagues and friends.

We want to thank our generous members who supported the Education Scholarship Fund through contributions and sales of research administrator greeting cards, and NCURA’s children’s book, The Best Job of All, penned by NCURA’s very own Robert Andresen. We would also like to thank all our sponsors and vendor partners who made the conference richer and more robust with their support and participation. In closing, we extend our sincerest thanks to all those who made this meeting such a success, including the AM61 Program Committee, the session presenters, the sponsors and vendors, the regional leadership, the multitude of volunteers, the NCURA leadership and staff and most importantly, you the members, who attended. We are all truly Building towards the Future…together. Thank you!

Chair and NCURA Vice President:
Denise Wallen, University of New Mexico

Co-Chairs:
David Mayo, California Institute of Technology, and Michelle Vazin, Vanderbilt University

Michelle Vazin, David Mayo, and Denise Wallen
1. Annual Meeting Program Committee Seated: Diane Domanovics, Pamela Webb, Tanya Blackwell, Denise Moody, Rosemary Madnick, Amanda Snyder
Standing: Lametha Musalini, Glenda Bullock, Jeff Ritchie, Katherine Kissmann, Ara Tahmassian, Carrie Chesbro, Denise Wallen, Kris Monahan, David Mayo, Michelle Vazin, Dave Richardson, Mich Payne, Bob Andresen, Brynn Tomlinson

2. 2019 Board of Directors Seated: Katherine Kissmann, Texas A&M University; Tricia Callahan, Colorado State University; Sue Kelch, University of Michigan; Georgette Sakamoto, University of Hawaii; Rosemary Madnick, University of Alaska Fairbanks; Robyn Remotigue, University of North Texas Health Science Center at Forth Worth
Middle row: Glenda Bullock, Washington University in St Louis; Anne Albinak, Johns Hopkins University; Stacy Riseman, College of Holy Cross; Kay Gilstrap, Georgia State University; Denise Moody, Harvard University; David Smesler, University of Tennessee
Back row: Tim Schailey, Thomas Jefferson University; Jeremy Miner, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire; Tony Ventimiglia, Auburn University; Kathleen Larmett, NCURA Executive Director; Denise Wallen, University of New Mexico; Sinnamon Tierney, Boston University (PDC Chair); Robert Andresen, University of Wisconsin-Madison (N&LDC Chair)
Not pictured: Annika Glauner, ETH Zurich; Rashonda Harris, Emory University; Derick Jones, Lundquist Institute for Biomedical Innovation at Harbor-UCLA Medical Center; Vicki Krell, Arizona State University

3. 2019 Executive Committee
Denise Moody, Secretary (Harvard University); Georgette Sakamoto, Immediate Past President (University of Hawaii); Denise Wallen, Vice President (University of New Mexico); Tony Ventimiglia, President (Auburn University); Anne Albinak, Treasurer (Johns Hopkins University); Kathleen Larmett, NCURA Executive Director

4. Award Winners
John Hanold, Pennsylvania State University; Dennis Paffrath, University of Maryland, Baltimore; Shannon Sutton, Western Illinois University; Ara Tahmassian, Harvard University; Susan Zipkin, University of New Hampshire; Rochelle Ray, National Science Foundation

5. David Mayo, Co-Chair; Michelle Vazin, Co-Chair; Dr. Freeman Hrabowski, Keynote Speaker; Denise Wallen, Conference Chair; Kathleen Larmett, NCURA Executive Director
1. Past NCURA Presidents
   Seated: Dave Richardson, Dan Nordquist, Bob Andresen
   Standing: Barbara Gray, Judy Fredenberg, Kim Moreland, David Mayo, Michelle Vazin, Georgette Sakumoto

2. Past NCURA Secretaries
   Seated: Pamela Webb, Denise Moody, Georgette Sakumoto
   Standing: Josie Jimenez, Barbara Gray, Tony Ventimiglia
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   Seated: Heather Offhaus, Shannon Sutton
   Standing: Bob Andresen, Mario Medina
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Supporting Eurasian Research Administration: AN AMERICAN PERSPECTIVE

By Bonniejean Zitske

The central grants office at the University of Wisconsin – Madison (UW), Research and Sponsored Programs (RSP), has engaged in several opportunities over the past few years to host research administrators from Eurasian countries, including Kazakhstan, Russia, and Ukraine. Through various partnerships with NCURA, IREX, the Eurasia Foundation, and its own International Division, RSP has formed relationships, evaluated programs, and provided official recommendations in an effort to develop the profession and expand best practices across the globe. Below is an overview of the relationships formed over the past three years:

August 2016: Konstantin Kokarev, research administrator at Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences in Moscow, Russia through a Eurasia Foundation/NCURA Global Fellowship.

August 2017: Kseniya Danilochkina, research administrator at Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences in Moscow, Russia through a Eurasia Foundation/NCURA Global Fellowship.

December 2018: Dr. Andrei Tolstikov, Vice President for Research at Tyumen State University in Tyumen, Russia through an NCURA Global Fellowship.

February 2019: Dr. Olga Porkuian, President of Volodymyr Dahl East Ukrainian National University in Severodonetsk, Ukraine through an IREX partnership.

June 2019: Olzhas Aralov and Dossymzhan Pernebekov, research administrators at Nazarbayev University (NU) in Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan through the UW International Division partnership with NU.

Each visit brought an opportunity to share best practices and learn from one another. This article outlines some common barriers experienced by Eurasian institutions, as well as techniques for success that formed common themes in nearly all of the conversations. Although this is not an exhaustive study but instead an anecdotal exploration, the bottom line is clear: recognizing shared challenges in order to develop effective solutions is the best way for our colleagues to continue to expand their research portfolios.

COMMON BARRIERS

Tradition, Politics, or All of the Above
Many institutions are striving to become research powerhouses while working within financial and administrative structures that are long rooted in tradition, politics, or both. Some institutions are struggling to establish themselves within the context of a state government that is simultaneously searching for its own identity. Other entities are long-standing institutions that have been steeped in administrative and bureaucratic traditions. Additionally, the funding structures are diverse and complex. Some institutions already have a varied external funding portfolio, while others receive nearly all of their research funds from the state. For example, one institution, which receives nearly all of its research funding from the state, is struggling to diversify its portfolio because the policies and procedures used to administer state funds are not flexible enough to accommodate extramural awards.

Inflexible and Under-Resourced Systems
Many administrators at these institutions lose time navigating organizational systems and requirements that are inflexible and under-funded. Some institutions have human resources structures tied directly to the state government and are unable to easily make changes that would facilitate research. Additionally, many institutions lack the resources to fund complex, enterprise-wide financial systems, which are necessary to support a strong research portfolio. Another institution struggles to define the job category “research assistant” in their HR titling system, because there is a disconnect between student status, employee status, tuition benefits, and general compensation.

100% Risk Averse
Finally, some institutions struggle to overcome strict administrative requirements that are intended to entirely eliminate risk. Countries that may have dealt with, or are still dealing with, the repercussions of corruption are very cautious about risk and may overcompensate when establishing compliance guidelines. It is critical to recognize the adverse effects of multiple layers of approval when working on timely research projects. A colleague described
GLOBAL TECHNIQUES FOR SUCCESS
Defining the Profession and Recognizing the Value
As NCURA continues to grow its international presence, the title “research administrator” is beginning to denote a global profession. In order to be a competitive applicant for research funding, a PI requires infrastructure to support the fiscal and programmatic requirements that come along with grant funds. Defining the profession means giving it an identity, and therefore value, to those who are already performing the tasks required to support research.

Breaking Down the Universal Language of Silos
It is critical to foster a sense of collaboration across units within the university. Almost everyone who has worked in a large organization has heard the term “silos” referring to groups or units that operate within self-created confines or imaginary barriers. As research administrators, it is vital that we intentionally create relationships across the lifecycle of an award and throughout the institution. In addition to pre-award and post-award staff members understanding the challenges each group faces, it is beneficial to reach out to colleagues in human resources, business services, and student affairs to learn how each unit can work with and support the others. Understanding what motivates units, as well as the compliance structures that affect their work, is a useful tool in collaboration.

“A Unified Goal: Supporting Research Together
A successful research administration structure will see every person involved coalescing around one goal: facilitating research. There are simple ways to turn this abstract idea into a tangible reality. For example, ask a researcher to host a lab visit for research administrators, or host a lunch in the research administrative offices and ask a researcher to come describe their research. Take advantage of any opportunity to tie the phenomenal research being done in the labs to the administrative work performed by research administrators.

Supporting the development of a robust research administration infrastructure is the first step to becoming a world-renowned research enterprise. Without the people, policies, and processes in place to facilitate large-scale research, institutions will continue to suffer from weak proposal development, insufficient contract review, and deficient compliance initiatives. In order to break this unproductive and risky cycle, institutions must invest in the research administrative offices and ask a researcher to come describe their research. Take advantage of any opportunity to tie the phenomenal research being done in the labs to the administrative work performed by research administrators.

Supporting the development of a robust research administration infrastructure is the first step to becoming a world-renowned research enterprise. Without the people, policies, and processes in place to facilitate large-scale research, institutions will continue to suffer from weak proposal development, insufficient contract review, and deficient compliance initiatives. In order to break this unproductive and risky cycle, institutions must invest in research administration, beginning with the incredible people already serving as research administrators on their campuses.

“it is vital that we intentionally create relationships across the lifecycle of an award and throughout the institution”

Notable Practices

Breaking Down Silos
NCURA Peer Reviewers have conducted more than 125 peer reviews at institutions of all sizes and types. While the institutions are all vastly different, one common theme across the majority of the reviews is a need to break down silos which hamper operational effectiveness. The Silo Mentality as defined by the Business Dictionary is a mindset present when certain departments do not share information with others in the same organization. Finding ways to break down silos and increase connectivity, communication and collaboration is important in research administration.

Below are critical questions when learning to identify and break down silos:

First, identify where silos exist. Which areas have information? Which other groups need this information? Does the information exist in easily shared format? Can department use integrated systems to share information?

Who has the institutional knowledge to know why these silos exist?

Many times silos exist because of long standing communication sharing practices that no longer have kept pace with an evolving organization. What precipitated the current approach/practice? What has changed in the institutional environment? As organizations grow, evolve, or have leadership changes, many times silos can develop.

Employ a continuous improvement attitude and approach to the work. Organizations that are consistently evaluating its processes, systems, communication flow are more likely to avoid developing silos (or to fix existing problems). We must ask: Is this still the best way to conduct this work? Are the right individuals involved? Are there ways for streamlining processes? Are there new or other connections that must be made? How can information be shared?

Create a unified vision and work toward common institutional goals (rather than just focus in on individual success). Developing cross-training programs, team projects across areas, and building collegial communication toward common goals will help break down silos.

Develop cross-functional liaisons or cross-functional teams to ensure that research administration is built holistically. The entire institution has a role in the institution’s research enterprise.

Kris A. Monahan, Ph.D., is the Immediate Past Chair of the Select Committee on Peer Review. She has participated in peer reviews and has more than 17 years of research administration experience, spanning pre-award, post-award, and research compliance at small institutions. She is the Director of Sponsored Research & Programs at Providence College.

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

Bonniejean Zitske is the Assistant Director for Research Financial Services at the University of Wisconsin-Madison Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. She has been an active member of NCURA for the past 10 years and is Past Chair of NCURA Region IV. She is currently working on a master’s degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at UW-Madison. She can be reached at bzitske@rsp.wisc.edu
Strategies to Improve Proposal Lead Time

By Zoya Davis-Hamilton, Philippa Lebar and Sarah Marina

Introduction

Research administrators are all too familiar with the challenges that arise from close to the wire proposal submissions. These include immediate and long-term concerns that affect both institutions and researchers. Because of these issues, most institutions have a policy requiring proposal lead time for central review. Many investigators are reluctant to meet these deadlines, wanting to use the extra time to further polish their proposals. This can lead to a situation in which research administrators and faculty are at odds over time to review policies, despite having the same goal of a funded proposal. Below we discuss these tensions and Tufts’ attempts to lessen them.

Review Policies: A Push and Pull

Having insufficient time to review a proposal prior to submission to the sponsor can lead to immediate challenges, such as uploading errors and rejection due to missing or non-compliant proposal pieces. Insufficient time to review can also lead to challenges that are slower to manifest, including increased risk to the institution and to the investigator’s research, if funds are awarded. These institutional risks can be financial—cost share inadvertently committed, F&A rate below what should be budgeted—or compliance related—for example, undetected export controls issues can lead to heavy sanctions. Risks to the investigator’s research include unforeseen restrictions on publication or ownership of intellectual property. An additional and often overlooked challenge is the risk of a delayed project start, due to delayed administrative set up and the need for prior approvals.

To mitigate these risks, most institutions require submission of proposals for review by the central office in advance of the proposal deadlines. Results of a survey of 171 institutions subscribed to RESADM-L listserv in 2014 indicated that most research organizations at the time had some kind of internal policy about the lead time for this review (Miller, 2014). The most common internal submission requirement cited was five working days before the sponsor’s deadline (46%) followed by “between two to four working days” (27%) and “at least ten working days” (16%). The survey also found that it is very common for this internal deadline to be ignored by the investigators and that there were no institutional consequences for non-compliance.

While it is clear that some stretch of lead time for proposal review is needed and that most institutions recognize this, such policies reduce the amount of time investigators have to finalize their proposals. This concern cannot be easily discounted. Many funding opportunities are discounted with short advance notice, collaborations take time to agree upon and document, and teaching and other responsibilities compete for investigator’s time. What are, then, ways to balance the need for review time with investigators’ needs?

Case Study: How we tackle this issue at Tufts

At Tufts University, we have approached this issue in two ways. First, we have worked to make changes in the institutional culture around proposal submission. Secondly, we have leveraged technology around review leading to increased visibility into trends. Below, we discuss these two halves to our proposal review policy strategy.

Changes to Institutional Culture

We began our approach with investigators as the locus of change, using both supportive and policy-driven methods. We communicated with faculty in venues outside of the sometimes heated environment of proposal submission, such as in departmental meetings, using the following messages: research administrator review time is a finite resource, and it is important to use it wisely for the common good.

While research administrators can often handle a last-minute proposal, the more requests they get, the more likely something will be missed. We further expressed this concept using the idea of group immunity. Everyone has emergencies, occasionally needing to submit last minute. Research administrators understand that and work hard to accommodate such circumstances. If, however, faculty routinely submit last minute when there isn’t a need, it leads to the likelihood that someone with a true emergency will not be able to be accommodated. The idea that good citizenship around proposal submission protects colleagues has resonated with many of our investigators.

After listening to faculty feedback asking us to clarify what review entails, and the consequences of late submission, we developed an outline of levels of review, with tiers depending on the amount of time available. When given the full 5-day review period, our research administrators are able to offer a full review. With 2-4 days, a moderate level of review is given. Within the two-day submission time frame, only essential items can be reviewed. We also require extra paperwork for late submissions (routing addendum...
Leveraging Technology
In addition to working with faculty, we are using technology to deliver increased transparency about our proposal submission processes, to assess any success rate impact, and to give a unified structure to submission, where late changes are only allowed to specific parts of the proposal.

“...research administrators and faculty are at odds over time to review policies, despite having the same goal of a funded proposal.”

Our submission policy asks that the administrative and budget portions of a proposal be submitted five business days in advance, while allowing for science sections to be uploaded two business days before submission. This allows for a more careful review of proposal compliance without harshly limiting edits to science content. We use the system to ‘lock down’ (or render un-editable) during routing the budget and other administrative parts of the proposal embedded in on-screen data, while still allowing for the replacement of science documentation.

System-collected data has fueled our capabilities in the area of reporting, allowing us to provide transparency for the research community. Our hypothesis is that the provision of access to compliance and success rate data would serve as an incentive in and of itself to improve performance. Giving credence to this idea, we have already shown an upward trend of average days available for review.

We are using our proposal submission data to analyze success rate in relation to the length of lead time. National Institutes of Health data for the R01 success rates relative to the time from submission to deadline suggests that there may be a disadvantage to waiting until the last day because the last day submissions were somewhat less likely to be discussed in 2015 (Lauer, 2015). It appears that setting a pre-submission deadline (whether it be 2- or 5-days prior to submission) correlates with improved success rates of funded-to-total at Tufts, across both proposed dollars and counts. It does not, however, seem to have a substantive impact on the percentage of change/correction attempts made during submission. Regardless of success rate, additional time to review improves work-life balance for our local and central research administrators and leads to more compliant, better-reviewed proposals. 🙉
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Figure: Shows an increasing average number of days for proposals to be reviewed over time. Excludes change/correction submission timing and proposals submitted after the identified deadline.
Why Does International Research Collaboration Matter?

By Jason Cottam

It’s a small world after all” (It’s a small world, n.d.). The Sherman brothers wrote these famous lyrics to their song from 1962 in the wake of the Cuban Missile Crisis as a message of peace and brotherhood and a reminder to everyone that we share much more than we realize. Flash forward to 2019 and the world is indeed smaller because of technology and globalization. People are now more connected than ever because of video conferencing software such as Zoom and social media platforms such as Twitter and Facebook. Data suggests that the world is becoming smaller, and more researchers are looking to partner with foreign researchers and institutions to better position themselves for funding in an environment where funding is becoming more competitive. A study done by NSF in 2016 shows that between 2000 and 2013 the percentage of publications with authors from one or more countries rose 6% from 13.2% to 19.2% (Witze, 2016). This rise in international research collaboration creates an exciting opportunity for research administrators to get involved on a global scale.

The value of international research collaboration is high, especially when discussing academic output and economic capacity building. With academic output, international research collaboration expands the breadth, perspective, and quality of the academic output of research in the form of publications. Engaging in international research collaborations forces the participants to work cross-culturally which can be a challenge when language, cultural norms, and ethical barriers are present. However, the benefits outweigh the negatives when you consider that these cultural differences are often times beneficial because it introduces different ways of thinking about the problem at hand, which improves the overall credibility of the publication when it includes multiple authors from a variety of different countries and cultures. The success of the large international research effort at CERN (European Organizations for Nuclear Research) is a perfect example of the importance of international collaboration.

CERN is most famous for construction of the Large Hadron Collider that led to the discovery of the previously unobserved Higgs boson, better known as the “God Particle” (The Higgs boson, n.d.). CERN relies on researchers and administrators from around the world to carry out its research mission.

Data suggest that engaging in international collaborations can help build and improve economic capacity of the host country. Developing countries often look to partner with more developed first-world countries such as the U.S. to take advantage of their better positioned relationship with major global funding agencies such as NIH, NSF, DAAD in Germany, etc. One example of economic capacity building occurred with a recent project involving University of Minnesota researchers who partnered with researchers and private business in Chile to study how to control disease in salmon populations through reduced use of antibiotics in salmon by Chilean farmers (Coss, 2018). Chile is the second largest producer of salmon in the world. Controlling disease in salmon is crucial to protect and sustain the health of the salmon population to ensure that the salmon market is protected for the fisherman that rely on the population for their livelihood and for the Chilean government that relies on this chief economic product for global trade purposes.

The preceding examples of the merits of international research collaborations are clear. For the research administrator, this should be exciting and welcoming news to expand the skills required to support research on a global scale. Research administrators have the opportunity to provide expertise and advice to their institutions on crucial international issues including export controls, currency exchange, contract negotiation tactics, and welcoming news to expand the skills required to support research.

NCURA conferences have in recent years expanded their session and workshop topics to include more international research administration issues to help expand the knowledge base of those research administrators who work in or who are interested in administering international research projects. I encourage those NCURA members interested in international research administration to take advantage of these offerings to expand the profession beyond our domestic borders.

“The value of international research collaboration is high, especially when discussing academic output and economic capacity building.”
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“If you’ve seen one sponsored programs office, you’ve seen one sponsored programs office.” This telling mantra is a favorite of ours because it accurately depicts organizational models, processes, and training needs for sponsored programs offices both in the US and abroad.

Building a training program requires thoughtful planning and can result in a number of configurations based on institutional needs, culture, structure and resources. Given differences in key considerations, training programs will look different.

The catalyst to building or enhancing an existing training program is to ensure staff are highly trained on lifecycle issues as well as on internal processes. Programs at non-US institutions may include working with US federal funding agencies and US institutions of higher education. Conversely, domestic institutions partnering with non-US institutions may include a training component on international research collaborations.

Regardless of the configuration, a strong training program provides a framework for consistency, compliance, and best practices — both domestic and abroad. Programs may run the gamut from robust onboarding to unit or campus-wide training and should build on identified institutional priorities and resources for implementation.

When conducting an assessment of training needs and resources, don’t forget to include international concerns.

A few considerations for adding international topics include planning for currency exchange rate fluctuations, training to identify export control triggers, and learning about differences in terms and conditions from foreign sponsors. Include this information in staff trainings so as to be mindful in negotiating terms, corresponding in writing, and submitting deliverables. Additionally, pass along the importance of acknowledging and respecting differing cultural norms; an important understanding for building and maintaining relationships with international collaborators and sponsors.

Because institutions are increasingly thinking about research in a global context, our training programs must be prepared to address challenges in managing research across borders.

Research across borders = training without borders.
European researchers should cooperate with colleagues all over the world. Therefore, the European Research Area (REA) and the Framework Programmes have to facilitate international consortia. Commissioner Carlos Moedas’ agenda for his term speaks about three ‘O’s: Open Innovation, Open Science and Open to the World (European Commission, 2015).

However, it isn’t as easy as simply cooperating when trying to involve partners from outside the European Union (EU) into projects financed by the European Union Research and Innovation Framework Programme Horizon 2020 (2014-2020) (Horizon 2020). The main challenge is the funding of these outside partners. Horizon 2020 only finances their participation in rare cases, and the country of the partner has to have an association agreement with the EU allowing researchers from this country to participate more or less as if they were from an EU country. In fact, association agreements are limited to the neighbours of the EU like the Ukraine, Turkey or Israel. The European Commission tried to negotiate such agreements with other countries like Canada, Japan, Brazil, and many others, but this was legally and politically impossible. Hence, the participation of non-member states or third countries (legal entities in non-European countries, not associated with Horizon 2020) is very low.

Brexit could become a blessing in disguise. Both the United Kingdom (UK) and the EU want the UK to be able to participate in the successor of the current EU Framework Programme particularly since the partners of the UK were important for the success of the successive EU Framework Programmes. However, at present it is a challenge for the European Commission to change the current rules and regulations in such a way they can facilitate the association of third countries.

The European Commission has done some homework and made a list of criteria to open association negotiations, such as having good capacity in research and being committed to an open, market-based economy, democratic institutions, and fair dealing with intellectual property rights. Many third countries are able to meet these criteria, but many, including some leading nations, are not. It remains to be seen whether the European Commission will get sufficient support from the Member States and the European Parliament.

The new associated countries have to contribute to the Framework Programmes financially. How do they do that? Contributing could mean that the size of the GDP of the country relative to that of the EU as a whole determines how much the associated country has to pay. It reads as a fair deal, but it will be complicated in practice. What about legal issues such as intellectual property rights? Legal systems of countries differ which will further complicate participation.

Researchers from all member states want to promote international cooperation in the research community. The EU Framework Programmes can become an effective instrument to do so, starting with the forthcoming Framework Programme - Horizon Europe (2021-2027). Unfortunately, political, legal, and financial issues will decide whether the European Research Area will become open to the world.
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Research Administrators need to be familiar with a myriad of regulations...

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

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

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

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

A GREAT RESOURCE FOR CRA EXAM PREP ~ GET YOUR COPIES TODAY!
www.ncura.edu/PublicationsStore.aspx
A collaborative approach to scientific research and investigation is increasingly more common. Scientists, especially in clinical fields, have found that collaborations allow for researchers to enhance the validity of research completed elsewhere, extend the range and applicability of existing research, and develop partnerships that can contribute to additional research. Programs such as the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS), Clinical and Translational Science Awards (CTSA) have elevated the visibility of collaborative investigations and provided resources to encourage broader participation in research. This trend towards more collaborative research is seen across the research community and includes an increasing number of international collaborations (Wagner et al., 2015).

More than 10 years ago it was reported that nearly 1/5th of medical and scientific papers included international coauthors (Butros, 2008). In more recent reviews, researchers have found that scientific papers (as a proxy for research results) which represent the work of an international collaboration receive a higher impact score than papers published by purely domestic researchers or research teams (Adams, 2013; Wagner & Jonkers 2017). Jonathan Adams, in his piece posted on the nature.com website suggests that great researchers look to connect with other great researchers, regardless of where they happen to be geographically located (2015). He states, “[i]nternationally co-authored papers are more highly cited because the authors are more likely to be doing excellent research.”

Looking at the field of oncology research, it has been demonstrated that international collaborations provide a broad range of benefits (Tang et al., 2019). These benefits include:

1. Expediting the recruitment of diverse patient populations which can lead to more rapid analysis of collected data and demonstration of the value associated with various interventions;
2. Improving the generalizability of findings across genomic, biological, ethnic and socio-cultural backgrounds;
3. Allowing more robust research into rare forms of disease; and
4. Aiding in the collection of data for regulatory purposes that can lead to validation of current treatment protocols, novel combinations of treatments, and the development of treatment for uncommon or unique diseases.

Specific to the area of clinical investigations, programs have been built up to support major collaborations between countries. BILAT USA 4.0, for example, was established with the aim to “enhance, support and further develop the research and innovation cooperation between European Union and the United States of America.” One of the major themes of BILAT 4.0 focused on health – with an emphasis on aging, chronic diseases, infectious diseases, health care, and health promotion. The value of international collaborations in clinical research has led to the development of cooperative trial groups (for example, The European Organization for
Research and Treatment of Cancer), which “now play a central role in leading international investigator-initiated (non-commercial) collaborative trials” (Tang et al., 2019).

It is well known in the research administration community that navigating international research collaborations brings with it a unique set of challenges and opportunities. See NCURA Magazine from December 2013 entitled “Research Across Borders” (Nordquist, Kulage, Smith, and Wilson, 2013) and (Kirk et al, n.d.). However, in addition to these administrative complexities, the national sponsorship and support of these collaborations is becoming more complex and challenging to navigate.

“These complex issues can only be navigated through cross-boundary collaborations at all levels.”

The growth and prevalence of research involving international collaboration can pose challenges to the policies of national governments who are major sponsors of research for the academic community. Investment of public funds into science and research is generally framed as a direct benefit to the domestic populace and a boost to the national economy. According to Wagner, “public spending is accountable to citizens, thus science has retained a national character, even as the sources of knowledge have become more dispersed” (2015). The National Institutes of Health (NIH) notes on its website that it “invests nearly $39.2 billion annually in medical research for the American people” (2019).

Certain policies adopted by national governments may directly and indirectly make international collaborations less attractive for researchers to pursue. This stance toward internationally collaborative research could be a contributing factor which has led to a disproportionate number of clinical research trials being funded by commercial sponsors. In their 2015 review of 119,679 clinical trials, 80% of the international clinical trials were funded by commercial sponsors (Atal et al., 2015). A reduced capacity to conduct international non-industry-sponsored trials could have detrimental implications for the future direction of clinical research (Tang et al., 2019).

National policies intended to protect domestic citizens may also have an impact on international collaborations. For example, according to Tang et al. researchers are concerned that the European Union’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) “may preclude sharing of clinical trial data between countries inside and outside the European Union” and potentially impede research (2019). The GDPR came into effect on May 25, 2018 following a two-year transition period. Although the implications of the GDPR are not yet well understood, several authors have concluded that such regulations could “undermine the potential benefits of open innovation and patient interests, whose high-quality health data is needed in order to develop innovative therapies more effectively” (Minnsen et al., 2019).

Adding to the complex landscape, several federal agencies within the United States have taken public steps to address national concerns about the integrity of research conducted with federal funds. The NIH has identified areas of concern related to international involvement in research (NIH, 2018). The NIH is attempting to address these concerns through clarifying communications and heightened awareness, seeking out areas for change and enhancement of existing tools, and increased monitoring and verification (NIH, 2019) (Lauer, 2019).

Similarly, within the US, the National Science Foundation has issued a Dear Colleague Letter which, after emphasizing the benefits of international collaboration, notes “[o]ur science and engineering enterprise, however, is put at risk when another government endeavors to benefit from the global research ecosystem without upholding the values of openness, transparency, and reciprocal collaboration. Faced with such a risk, we must respond” (2019). Although these policies do not directly impact collaborative research, the broader implications are not yet well understood.

The complexity of these issues cannot be understated, nor easily resolved. Like almost everything in research administration, these issues do not lend themselves to binary yes/no resolutions. To provide the best guidance for the faculty we support, and the institutions we serve, we need to reach out beyond the boundaries of our offices, divisions, or schools and get feedback from various partners and resources. These complex issues can only be navigated through cross-boundary collaborations at all levels. Much like the way investigators have found that research benefits from broad collaborations, we can initiate collaborations which take advantage of the expertise which exists outside our own standard areas of operation.
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Now, before sending an anxious follow-up email: How many days have your institution’s own outgoing subawards been stuck in a similar holding pattern?

Kathleen Kreidler from the University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston (UTHealth) treated those attending the September 2018 FDP meeting in Washington, DC to a thought provoking and refreshingly honest presentation on Subaward Delays (Kreidler, 2018). She offered two years’ worth of internal data on UTHealth’s incoming and outgoing federal subawards, quantifying the time it took to receive and send hundreds of initial subawards on FDP templates, measured from their respective start dates. As the distributed curves of data on Kreidler’s charts began to rise, so did eyebrows throughout the audience. On one hand, this information was interesting. The average difference in processing time between incoming and outgoing subawards differed in this dataset by just one single day. On the other hand, this information was concerning. The average time to send the initial subaward agreement to the subrecipient hovered around 90 days, and the audience cringed while scanning the x-axis towards outliers beyond 120 and even 180+ days. Most importantly though, this information resonated. As someone who also works at a large university exchanging hundreds of subawards annually, it did not take me long to humbly conclude that UTHealth’s numbers looked quite familiar. Despite many tangible efficiency gains from FDP subaward templates and guidance, lengthy processing timelines persist at member institutions across the country. Subrecipients end up bearing increased risk surrounding cost transfers, effort reporting, and unbilled expenses, along with the administrative burden of tracking advance spending and searching for status updates. These complications can even delay the research itself.

Why is everything taking so long?

With their commendable first step, Kreidler and UTHealth sparked immediate interest across the FDP. A working group tasked with looking closely at subaward delays formed shortly thereafter, and discussed anecdotes and assessments from a variety of personal and institutional perspectives over the following months. These conversations gave rise to deeper questions about what may influence delays at every step of the subaward process. The group ultimately developed a comprehensive data collection survey, originally envisioned in

A Collaborative Approach to Reducing Subaward Delays — Part I: The Survey

By Kevin Ritchie
“Some goals of this survey are to go beyond subjective notions of what drives subaward delays...”

Kreidler’s concluding remarks, which is now ready for distribution.

Some goals of this survey are to go beyond subjective notions of what drives subaward delays, to draw out insight currently siloed away at individual institutions, and to assemble robust baseline data on a topic that is central to research administration. This survey solicits responses from individual institutions of all types related to their handling of incoming and outgoing FDP subawards and amendments. Questions range from quantitative inquiries about the number of subawards and processing days, to checklists about how institutions handle compliance requirements, to open-ended prompts about efficiency. This survey structure will allow the working group to generate descriptive statistics, conduct qualitative assessments, and identify patterns across different subaward business processes.

Here is where you can help. We need a high volume of survey responses to yield representative data and conduct meaningful analysis. Aggregated information about subaward delays can inform actionable recommendations relevant to institutions regardless of their particular structure. This virtuous cycle begins with research administrators gathering background information on their subawards, and submitting one consolidated survey response on behalf of their home institution.

Our working group encourages all institutions using FDP subaward templates to participate this fall by completing the survey, and thanks you in advance for your time and effort. We look forward to building on previous FDP successes by exploring new collaborative approaches to streamlining the exchange of subawards, and reducing the risk and burden associated with subaward delays. Stay tuned for updates and results in future NCURA Magazine articles.
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Self Paced! 10 WEEK ONLINE TUTORIALS
Includes Knowledge Checks and Certificate of Completion for the Individual Learner

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

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

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

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

- **A Primer on Clinical Trials Management**
  Focused on Clinical Trials Management, including key administrative, financial, and regulatory issues that arise in planning through close-out. (6 Chapters)

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

INCLUDES UNIFORM GUIDANCE REFERENCES
Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. once said, “An individual has not started living until he (she) can rise above the narrow confines of his individualistic concerns to the broader concerns of all humanity” (Ni, 2014). Research allows for researchers, scientists and faculty members to be concerned with something that is much greater than self. From artificial intelligence, cybersecurity, ecology, hematology and oncology to literacy, teaching and learning, research opens the door to unlimited possibilities leading to broad impact for the greater good of society.

The National Science Foundation (NSF) and National Institutes of Health (NIH) support fundamental research in the sciences, medicine and engineering. These organizations are two of the largest research sponsors in America. NSF’s mission calls for the broadening of opportunities and expanding participation of groups, organizations, and geographic regions that are under-represented in STEM disciplines, which is essential to the health and vitality of science and engineering (Proposal and Award Policies, 2017). NIH’s specific aims for expanding diversity include fostering scientific innovation and discovery, improving the quality of the research, increasing the likelihood that research outcomes will benefit individuals from underserved or health disparity populations, increasing participation of underserved or health disparity populations in clinical studies, and expanding public trust (NIH-Wide Strategic Plan, n.d.). Further, the NIH Policy and Guidelines on the Inclusion of Women and Minorities as Subjects in Clinical Research states, “It is the policy of NIH that women and members of minority groups and their sub-populations must be included in all NIH-funded clinical research…” (NIH Policy, 2001).

It matters not the funding source. What matters is the inclusion utilized in research to influence the most robust outcomes and innovations for the advancement of science. Researchers should think globally when developing hypotheses and methodology, especially when human subjects are involved. Consider the following. Dr. Freeman Hrabowski (2019), AM61 keynote speaker, President of University of Maryland - Baltimore County, posed the question, “What can we do to build diversity in research?” during his speech. As leaders and difference-makers in your institution, you can start by diversifying the demographics of research administrators.

The poster session entitled, Diversity and Inclusion: Beyond Perception, was presented at AM61 in August by the Presidential Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion. The content of Diversity and Inclusion: Beyond Perception (Musalin et al., 2019) describes the demographics of the NCURA membership, as referenced in Figure 1, as well as describes the activities in which NCURA is implementing in an attempt to make the organization more diverse and inclusive. In reference to the demographic makeup, females outnumber males 3.5 to 1. For every three white members, there is one minority member. The generational divide is decreasing though gaps persist as millennials account for 27% of the membership.

In addition, 84% of the membership have a bachelor’s degree or higher. Hence, there is a pressing need to continue scrutinizing the extent to which the rhetoric for diversity and inclusion meets reality and to identify...
mechanisms that facilitate the expression of voice for silenced minorities in today’s increasingly diverse organizations (Theodorakopoulos & Budwar, 2015).

NCURA has made efforts towards being a more inclusive organization. However, much work remains. For NCURA to be an organization known for inclusion, leadership must press beyond traditional boundaries. Inclusion without borders broadens opportunities for everyone. Efforts include encouraging a more diverse leadership and volunteer pool allowing members access to diversify their NCURA experience at varying levels, offering more robust training programs that account for different learning styles, thinking with a diversity lens during peer reviews, incorporating more diversity and inclusion themes throughout the regions, and facilitating healthy dialogue regarding contentious global issues.

As suggested by Dr. Hrabowski, people may be your biggest challenge. Take the limits off of people who are different from you. Expand your boundaries by eliminating bias and stereotypes. Diverse perspectives is a driver for innovation. You have the power to encourage researchers at your institution to expand their thinking. Having a diverse array of research administrators in your office can make a difference in the extended success of your faculty’s research. You have the power to influence how human subjects are recruited. You have the power to influence how to more effectively manage data. You have the power to make the proposal development, budget development or proposal submission process more desirable for faculty. In the words of Dr. Hrabowski, “What you do matters! You matter!”

Regional Efforts
Diversity and inclusion play a major role in research and research administration. NCURA is dedicated to the charge of being a diverse and inclusive professional organization. NCURA has been working to create and promote diversity initiatives at every level of the organization. NCURA has eight regions, making the organization globally diverse. However, each region has a responsibility to its regional membership to practice diversity, equity and inclusion.

REGIONAL DIVERSITY & INCLUSION FEATURES
Region I (by Donna Smith, Region I chair)
Region I started 2019 with a call to the community for interest in participating on a committee. This allowed new representatives to join the reigns via leadership roles on Region I’s ad hoc committees. As the annual regional meeting approached, leadership worked to get a special talent database into the eyes of the community and gain additional applications of interest in helping in any capacity in the region concentrating on self-disclosed ideas of what could be considered a special talent that someone has or likes to do in which the region can call on in the future. Region I is continuing to build the database and they are already using it for regional needs. Leadership continues to push the database each week through e-blasts in hopes of recruiting additional members for positions. Region I also held its Innovation Suite for the second year, which allowed for new presentations, posters and creative displays alike to be immersed into the region. This initiative has brought many new presenters in that region. In fact, a few presenters from last year were able to present in a larger format this year. The region continues to hold networking dinners and workshops at annual meetings for new professionals and emerging leaders. A reception was added to engage volunteers and encourage expansion of responsibilities within the region.

Further, Region I added a volunteer spotlight to the weekly e-blast that highlights a volunteer each month. The idea is to ensure visibility of the many ways members can volunteer on the regional and national levels of NCURA. Region I’s mentor program is ongoing as well as the executive shadow program. The program allows two to three regional volunteers to shadow the advisory board and be mentored by members of the committee throughout the year. This allows volunteers to learn more about the functions of the executive committee and see how meetings are conducted. The hope is to gain additional interest and prepare interested members for roles in the future on the board.

Region III (by Emily Devereaux, Region III chair)
Region III leadership has implemented an official ad hoc Diversity and Inclusion Committee as part of the Chair’s initiative, appointing Laneika Musalini as committee coordinator, to advise the region on diversity and inclusion opportunities and best practices. The committee membership is representative of gender, race, nationality, abilities, and institutional type in order to be inclusive of our 13-state regional membership. This new committee will also serve to advise in diversity and inclusion matters for the joint Region III and Region IV 2020 spring meeting that will be held at Tradewinds Resort, St. Pete Beach, Florida. The 2020 joint meeting will emphasize diversity and inclusion, built around the theme of Expanding the Circle: One Profession, Multiple Perspectives. They will be celebrating the diverse people, institution types, skill sets, and experiences that come together to advance research administration as a profession.
Each region has also invited a member who is an expert on diversity and inclusion to serve as a conference advisor and to help think through how to make sure both regions are inclusive throughout the planning and programming process, not just in theme or in program content. Regional communications regarding advancement in diversity and inclusion have been sent to membership through different media methods and have received positive response. Members and leadership of Region III look forward to a productive year in not only addressing diversity and inclusion matters within the region, but also in providing outreach and education to members to grow both the Region and our members’ development in the field of research administration.

**Region IV (Bonniejean Zitske, Region IV leadership)**

Region IV has identified a Diversity Coordinator for the upcoming spring meeting with Region III and the conference theme focuses on diversity: *Expanding the Circle: One Profession, Diverse Perspectives*. The Diversity Coordinator will review all presentation slides for inclusive content, as one example for how we will be mindful of the theme throughout meeting planning.

During the 2019 Region IV Spring Meeting leadership developed the following programming focused on inclusion:

- **Lunchtime speaker: Mx. Lena Tenney, Coordinator of Public Engagement for the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity at the Ohio State University.** Her talk was titled, “Did They Really Just Say That?!?” and focused on ways to interrupt oppressive behavior.
- **Lunchtime speaker: Dr. Leon McDougle, Chief Diversity Officer for The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center.** His discussion focused on identity development, diversity, and inclusion.
- **NCURA IV Book Group: Examining Tuskegee: The Infamous Syphilis Study and Its Legacy.** This book group discussed systemic barriers in the healthcare system and ways to create access. We also discussed our roles as research administrators when working with studies including vulnerable populations.

**Region VI (by Amanda Snyder, Region VI chair)**

Region VI’s diversity and inclusion efforts include the LeadMe program. It began in 2009 as a Region VI leadership and mentorship program inspired by the national NCURA Leadership Development Institute (LDI) program. LeadMe is designed to cultivate new leaders within the region. The program first expanded to include the Region’s close partners in Region VII. For the past few years, speakers and mentors have included NCURA members from other regions. Moreover, for the 2020 class, the region is excited to welcome a mentee from Region III. The LeadMe experience illustrates how Region VI partners across regions in ways that improve NCURA members’ experiences.

The program itself leverages the diversity of its participants. Mentees, mentors, and mentors-in-training for the program come from different backgrounds and types of institutions. They all bring different experiences to the table. The activities of the program give them the opportunity to share their personal experiences and to learn from one another. Providing this opportunity shows a regional investment in identifying interested leadership talent and helping those individuals to grow into leadership roles, creating a diverse and prepared leadership pipeline for Region VI and other regions.

**Region VII (by Diane Barrett, Region VII chair)**

Region VII is pleased to be offering sessions on diversity at the upcoming Region VI/VII meeting in Seattle, including:

- Leveraging Diversity and Creating an Environment of Cultural Humility
- Equality and Diversity in Research and Research Administration
- Diversity and Inclusion: Driving Positive Cultural Change in Research

In addition, diversity and inclusion will be a focus of other discussions and focus groups. On another front, Region VII has been looking at the region’s demographics and who tends to be in leadership roles. This is a region of Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions (PUI); yet, the regional leadership has been driven largely by the few larger institutions. To that end, the current leadership is working to develop interest from PUI colleagues in running for office. They are pleased to announce that their new chair-elect, Trisha Southergill from Montana Tech, represents a PUI.

The Region VII Professional Education and Development Committee has administered a survey to find out what kinds of training they can provide to all membership. The newsletter now has a PUI corner dedicated to learning more about their smaller institutions as well as a section devoted to particular problems facing PUIs. This effort is being led by a small group of PUI participants.

There is more work to do. Many of their PUI colleagues belong to NCURA but do not engage with the region or on a national level. Leadership in this region will do more to reach out to those institutions in the coming months.
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Welcome to an update from the most recent Board of Directors (“board”) meeting. The board met on August 3rd, 2019, just prior to the 61st Annual Meeting and there were several subjects of discussion that might be of interest to the membership.

• Denise Wallen, President-Elect, presented updates to the board about AM61. The registration numbers were excellent, with more than 1,700 registrants and representation from 25 countries outside the US.

• The 2018 year-end financial statements and 2019 audit were reviewed by the board. As in years past, NCURA remains financially strong. Though the change in net assets was a negative $52,424 for the year, this was wholly due to unrealized investment losses. NCURA’s actual income over operating expense ended the year with a strong $102,335. With a new head auditor this year, a very thorough audit was completed and NCURA was issued an unmodified opinion, which is the highest level of assurance. There were no internal control issues and no material weaknesses or significant deficiencies. This is due to the always-diligent and skilled efforts of our outstanding NCURA finance team.

• You may recall the update that Shannon Sutton wrote about the board meeting in November 2018, where Michael Anderson facilitated a session on “How to Objectively Review Association Products.” The engaging session taught the board the process of evaluating NCURA programs, with the aim to decide whether to continue or sunset programs and products. This meeting, we assessed the NCURA Research Program, which was created to:
  • Support the data-driven needs of NCURA and the profession;
  • Identify, develop, and implement innovative programs for research and education; and
  • Build resources for new partnership programs that support global efforts.

In the beta of this program, eight research projects were funded and several of them are still continuing years after their award ended. The board unanimously passed a motion to continue the Research Program as a permanent program contingent upon the availability of funds, which will be assessed annually.

• The board continues to work on the implementation plan for our diversity and inclusion initiatives that was approved by the board last year. One part of that plan was an expansion of the membership profile data. Please be sure to update your member profile on the NCURA website at www.ncura.edu/MembershipVolunteering/ProfileUpdate.aspx so we can gather as much benchmark data as possible in order to measure ourselves as to where we are now and continue to hold ourselves accountable for change. You are also encouraged to read the NCURA Magazine column “Inclusion Initiatives” that is written by our Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion members. Feel free to reach out to the Task Force with ideas to continue this important focus for our organization.

Feel free to reach out to any member of the Board of Directors or NCURA staff if you have any questions, concerns, or comments!

Anne Albinak is the Director of Research Administration Operations at the Johns Hopkins University’s Whiting School of Engineering. She is currently the Treasurer of NCURA and sits on the Financial Management and Education Scholarship Fund committees. She is also a Lecturer in Johns Hopkins University’s Master of Science in Research Administration degree program. She can be reached at aalbinak@jhu.edu
We live in an increasingly globalized world where technological advances allow for communication and research collaboration across geographical boundaries. More countries are also now able to participate and contribute to knowledge production amidst increased development in research infrastructure and capabilities. Many universities in the Middle East are aiming to capitalize on these changes for the betterment of our societies and research administrators naturally play an integral role in facilitating this process. I work in a university, which is in many ways situated in the “sweet spot” of these developments. The American University of Cairo (AUC) is an institution based in the most populous country in the region, while maintaining a functional link with the United States (U.S.), the most research productive country in the world. The Middle East region in general is undergoing significant growth in research productivity and a large part of this is fueled by international collaborations. According to the 2015 UNESCO Science Report, 67% of scientific papers published in 2008-2014 from Arab states contained a foreign author. Currently, 80% of our externally sponsored research projects at the AUC contain international collaborations and the quantity of these projects grew by 50% in the last 10 years. I will discuss how we managed these collaborations from my vantage point as a research administrator, the challenges we face, and how we aim to improve our international footprint.

International collaborations often boost our overall capabilities and provide funding opportunities not available locally. Because of the focus on these types of projects, my staff and I have to be proficient and knowledgeable in multiple types of research administration frameworks. Our knowledge and understanding of our international partners’ and funders’ policies and procedures has to be equal to our knowledge of the local framework. This requires a sense of dynamism and agility in order to successfully navigate the oftentimes increased administrative burden that comes with international collaborations.

One of the challenges we face is the limited size and capability of local research administration networks or ecosystems. For example, the AUC is the only institution in Egypt that is set up to carry out sponsored research in accordance with U.S. federal standards. This is an advantageous differentiator for us, but it also means we cannot reach out to in-country counterparts for recruitment, mutually beneficial exchange of ideas, or sharing of expertise. The workarounds for this are to develop self-contained capacity building and knowledge repository programs, and to leverage international networks like NCURA. Interacting with colleagues through NCURA was greatly beneficial for navigating the challenges of research administration, and I am thankful for the increased focus the organization provides to international institutions.

Our success as a research institution largely depends on sustaining our international footprint. In order to do so, we must keep up to date with the latest developments in our line of business, and be constantly on the lookout for new collaboration opportunities from across the world. Outreach is hugely important, and while many of these collaborations materialize from cooperation between principal investigators, research administrators should, in my view, play an increased role in creating or facilitating these relationships through their networks and contacts. We provide the institutional representation for collaborations or agreements, and thus carry the institutional knowledge and continuity that is integral to forging and sustaining connections with counterparts. What this means from a practical standpoint is we should play an increased role in “showing off” our accomplishments and capabilities by organizing, and disseminating research outcomes and capabilities while keeping an international audience in mind.

I believe the positive aspects and growth opportunities that come with international collaborations far outweigh the associated increased administrative workload. In an increasingly globalized world, success in this area is critical for sustained growth as a research institution. We, here at the AUC, will continue to build our capabilities and hope to further a fruitful discussion on the topic with our counterparts regionally and globally.

Dina Adly Riad, MPA, is the Assistant Provost, Sponsored Programs at The American University in Cairo (AUC). She is a research administrator with 28 years of experience in management and regulatory skills. She can be reached at dinaadly@aucegypt.edu
Why did you decide to pursue a degree in research administration?

**Sarah Browngoetz:** I decided to pursue a master’s degree in research administration when I shifted my career from higher education to a hospital research institute. In that new setting I found that the doctors spoke the language of credentials. Meaning, the more advanced your degree, the more time they would give you. I made two decisions when I realized this, I decided to get back into higher education both professionally and academically.

My research administration body of knowledge has been accrued by NCURA classes, workshops, and conferences, as well as awesome supervisors, mentors, and colleagues willing to teach me how research administration works. This is a pretty typical career pathway and respected within the research administration profession, but an academic credential gives me the ability to show my non-research administration colleagues that I have skills, knowledge, and expertise within their system of measurement. I have yet to earn my degree, but I have already seen the value of this pursuit in my interactions with medical doctors, organizational leadership, and faculty; they may not understand what I do, but they definitely understand what it takes to get an advanced degree. I’ve found that since I’ve started my graduate program I am automatically considered a subject matter expert by my colleagues, and it is delightful.

**Joe Gibbs:** I have been fortunate to be a part of a major research enterprise with motivated academics across many disciplines. Being exposed to high caliber individuals has inspired me to reach for new heights as well. As research administrators, our work hours are spent working toward and supporting a research environment of excellence. For me, that has come to also mean committing to being better equipped to provide support and solutions to my university. My office is seen as one of expertise and advice. Outside study has, and will, help me address my colleagues and campus partners with policy, and practical questions, as well as build my background knowledge and enable a better understanding of the topics we face day-to-day.

**Going forward, how do you see your involvement in NCURA changing as a result of your graduate education?**

**Sarah Browngoetz:** Now that I am back in higher education professionally, I see my involvement in NCURA becoming more active. I am a director of grant development at a community college and I would like help create representation for community and technical colleges within NCURA. I will also be submitting my application to serve on the NCURA Education Scholarship Fund Select Committee and look forward to helping NCURA fund my colleagues who are on a similar educational pathway. One of my professional goals is to develop curriculum and teach research administration within community colleges or universities. My MS in Research Administration will help me sell that idea to my employer but I will need to supplement my educational credential with experience teaching that I hope to gain through presenting at NCURA workshops and conferences. NCURA has been invaluable to me, it is an amazing resource and I am hoping I can give back in this next phase of my career.

**Joe Gibbs:** NCURA is, and has always been, a positive force in educating, developing, and celebrating research administrators. It is my intention to maintain my membership, to participate in NCURA events for the duration of my career, and perhaps one day share what I have learned as a presenter. My goal as I continue my education is to be in a position to return the knowledge that was conferred to me. Keeping the community of research administrators engaged and informed is a meritorious effort that benefits all who share in the experience.
Nearly two years ago, I came across a job posting on the NCURA Career Center website that sounded like it could be interesting: a pre-award research administration job in Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. I was an early career research administrator who immediately thought “this could be fun!” Little did I know what “fun” means when it comes to international research. Fast forward 18 months—my immediate supervisor has retired and I am on a team of two; me handling all pre-award activity and my colleague handling all incoming and outgoing research related contracts for more than 250 faculty. I am one of three research administrators on our campus with experience in the US, and the only CRA. Within my first month of working in Abu Dhabi, I realized that everything I knew…I needed to adjust. Everything I had practiced…did not necessarily translate. And my perspective is just that: My perspective. There is a film quote that states, “There is no truth, only perspectives,” (Parker & Rudolph, 2003) that keeps playing in my mind as I navigate this new path of international research administration.

International research is unique. It often times stretches us as research administrators to think outside of the box; making the impossible, possible, understanding an RFP that was not written in your native language, or navigating a tricky political situation. One of the most common situations here is that there is no formal RFP, a faculty member gives a talk and a member of the community wants to provide funding for their project. While this initially may appear as a gift, suddenly you discover there are terms and conditions, reporting requirements, etc. involved and what could have been a simple situation becomes a formal agreement. Another potential scenario is when you receive an RFP that requires the signature of the head of the institution, the summary is provided in Arabic, and the majority of your faculty (as well as you) do not speak, read, or write Arabic. Or what about the situation when three years into a research project, the country where the project is being conducted is suddenly thrust into political disarray? The team is safe, the project continues, but there is no way to transfer funding to the country due to banks being closed and the devaluation of the currency. Additionally, there are situations when a project is being conducted in another country and the team does not have the funds to buy the items needed to conduct the research.

When working in international research, we quickly learn to adapt. I think as research administrators, we already adapt well to an ever-changing environment. In an international setting, not only are we adapting to an ever-changing work environment, but also to the cultural differences that surround us. As I write this, our university still does not know if we will be working on Sunday due to the moon sighting for the Islamic New Year (we work Sunday – Thursday). This adds another layer of complexity when working in an international environment, knowing when holidays fall in not only the country you’re living and working in, but also the countries that you collaborate with on projects.

All of these unique situations and complexities lead to a fresh and exciting change in one’s career. It also encourages creativity in our roles. I am lucky in that I loved my role at my previous institution. I was blessed with an amazing mentor and friend who taught me the ropes of research administration, I had a great network with which to bounce ideas and discuss issues; however, I left the “comfort” of that world for the unknown. Like many of the universities in the Middle East, we are either associated or part of a network of well-established universities in the US, UK or Europe. While part of a global network of an established research institution, our campus is less than ten years old and still developing its research identity and research administration program. Being able to set expectations, create processes, help educate, and be part of this ever-changing work of research has been amazing experience that helps cultivate an environment of professional and personal growth.

References

Holly Mace, MPA, CRA, is the Pre-Award Grants Coordinator at New York University in Abu Dhabi. She oversees all external pre-award services and manages the internal competitive funding program at NYUAD. She can be reached at bcm8@nyu.edu
Kuali’s innovative compliance software brings conflict of interest and conflict of commitment together in an intuitive user interface that allows anyone—from top level leadership to research assistant—to instinctively complete their necessary forms in one place with one push of a button.
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Three months into my employment as a pre award administrator, I attended the NCURA PRA Conference in Las Vegas. In a session, the speaker conducted a poll of how many years each person had been in the field — and I found myself the minority at ‘less than one year.’ Many folks there had been in research administration well over a decade — and I was appreciative to be there with them and to learn from them. I kept reflecting on the dynamic between veteran and new research administrators. The vets were so willing to help and had a vast knowledge of the history of the field and how much it has grown. The mind reels with all of the advice offered, and it was all very intriguing to me as I made the long journey back to my office in Florida. We are a central research administration office at a primarily undergraduate institution. Currently, we are an office of five individuals: a director, a compliance coordinator, an accountant II (post-award), a grants specialist II (post-award), and myself – grant coordinator II — each carrying our own heavy weights of the cradle-to-grave components of a grant. We have a dynamic that works well. Similar to the family at NCURA, it is like our own little family — in which I am the only millennial. I could not help but wonder, how many millennials are breaking into the research administration field? Do they know about it? Are the Masters of Research Administration programs enrolling millennial-aged or younger graduates into their programs, or are the enrollees the seasoned administrators already in the field? I wanted to shout from the rooftops, “where are my peers?”

As a millennial, I was once told “when you are 30, people will finally take you seriously,” and don’t get me wrong, I know how valuable seniority is to practice, especially when it comes to translating Uniform Guidance. But, if I may change the words slightly to Tina Turner’s iconic hit, “what’s age got to do with it?” In my 28 years, I have worked through jobs diligently and completed a Master’s degree by 24. Yet, as I navigate my way through the higher education industry, especially in research administration, I find I am a minority by my age. My age, I believe, brings a lot of value to the office (of course, before I wrote this, I asked my director to make sure this was true). I came with innovative ideas, optimism, and a blank slate soon to be imprinted with mass amounts of research administration knowledge. I have developed a passion for this field and I want my age-similar peers to engage in it with me.

Age diversity in the workplace is valuable. ‘The practice of multi-generational workplace mentoring offers many advantages. In a mixed-age workforce where companies value knowledge, experience and skill above age, seniority or gender, employees of all ages have the opportunity to teach, share and learn from one another.” (McQuerrey, 2016, para. 5). Each individual in our office, from diverse generations, has their own set of values and skills that all provide necessary input into the dynamic of a functional research administration office. I personally believe that, as a millennial, being tech-savvy will be useful as we journey into an ever-changing technological landscape, and integrate into new systems of coordinating grants. We also have checks
“Age diversity in the workplace is valuable.”

Furthermore, I am also able to connect with the students to let them know how many doors were opened for me just by being involved with research. There’s a language within every generation and I am fluent in mine. If we can attract millennials, and even younger individuals to the field of research administration, I believe the advocacy for and involvement of students in research at higher education institutions would grow exponentially, which could in turn positively affect other university strategic goals, such as retention, graduate and job placement – and those are just some of the benefits. Research administration is the lifeblood of a university, even though it’s not the front and center, flashy advertisement one sees first. Our job is to help coordinate and facilitate the influx of funds for the valuable, life-changing research being conducted by our faculty. If that does not fuel my fire, I don’t know what will. The reality is that the millennial army and the life-changing research being conducted by our faculty. Who would have thought? I am so fortunate to be in this position and relate to students on a subset of their demographics – their age. I find that this experience I have, and the perspective I share being so generationally close to students, gives me a unique advantage when communicating with principal investigators. I can personally attest to the benefits of being able to work in research with faculty as a student, and how it connects students with not only their professor, but also those beyond the university, and developing their work. I offer a perspective of millennials that many think are urban legend. Yes, we want to work!

As a research administrator, one is charged with staying abreast of regulatory changes that may impact faculty, students and research communities. When research crosses the border, the complexities in understanding cultural issues as well as the foreign laws and regulations can grow exponentially. For the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and research administrators who support research involving human subjects, not having the right expertise to review the protocols can make even minimal risk protocols look daunting. Never fear, there are several useful resources that one can utilize to ensure a thoughtful and quality review while keeping the research team compliant.

The International Compilation of Human Research Protection (OHRP, n.d.) is a great place to start. This tool covers more than 1,000 laws that can be easily searched by country or area of research with direct access to the law, regulation, or guidance document. Additionally, OHRP issued last year a Compilation of Guidelines on the EU General Data Protection Regulation that covers the concepts and terminology associate with GDPR (OHRP, n.d.). These two resources are staples for any IRB toolbox to use when evaluating international research irrespective of the institution’s size (small vs. large) or research category (primarily undergraduate institution vs. hospital vs. research university).

Further, the Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences and the World Health Organization have published guidelines that serve as a resource to assist research administrators and research teams engaged in international research. In some cases, they provide ethical review committees for projects coordinated or funded through their respective organizations (CIOMS, 2016).

Finally, the number of accredited, independent IRBs able to support international research has increased over the past several years. While the recent changes to the Common Rule for single IRB reviews do not apply to international research, it has driven the conversation on how to increase collaboration and IRB reliance for international research as well. In particular, independent IRBs are able to provide the expertise for both the science as well as the ethical and cultural competencies needed for research to be conducted and transcending the borders easier than local IRBs (Barchi, 2014).

So the next time a student wants to conduct research abroad or a research team collaborates with international colleagues, no need to fear. With these resources, one’s toolkit can now be borderless.
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Good morning everyone. Thanks very much.

Back on June 10th, I received notification that I was chosen for this award. I had to read the email several times to ensure I understood it was for me. There were a number of NCURA VIPs copied on the note, so I assumed that the note was possibly not addressed correctly, thinking it was for one of my esteemed colleagues, but no, it was for me.

I had to let that sink in. It took a while.

After gathering myself, I replied to the email and communicated my appreciation to my colleagues who nominated me (Judy Fredenberg, Dave Richardson, Pat Hawk, and Bruce Morgan). These are the folks, and many others, that have helped me along the way, and probably won’t stop helping me, patiently helping me. I need all the help I can get. In addition, my boss was copied on the note, WSU Vice President for Research Chris Keane – the one who allows me to be a part of NCURA and is super supportive.

I am honored to accept this award and appreciate the opportunities that NCURA has provided for me to get involved, work with great people, and have impact for research and research administration. Honestly, to get an award like this, the first step is to get involved. NCURA has allowed me to make a difference, but the working with great people part is what you remember most! So…just a few words on people and getting involved.

I started in research administration in 1990 – working as a departmental administrator and then a college administrator, doing all the “stuff” and always connected to grants management. In 1995 I went to the Central pre-award office, after Matt Ronning – the pre-award assistant director at the time, convinced me to apply one more time (I was interviewed twice before, so a lesson, for me, in self-control). The rest of my career has been spent in the central Office of Research - thanks for the encouragement Matt.

My director at the time, Carol Zuiches, is the one who introduced me to NCURA. She sent me off on my first NCURA experience, in 1996, attending Fundamentals in Orlando – Don Allen from the University of Washington and Steve Erickson from Boston College were the instructors. What cool guys, titans in the profession, and what a joy to learn from them. From that point, I said to myself, I’d like to be a Fundamentals instructor – a goal to be involved. So, in 2009, I taught alongside great people, Jilda Garton, Denise Clark, Marjorie Forester, Joe Gindhart, Jill Tincher and others.

Also in 1996 I attended my first NCURA Annual meeting! Lots of people to meet, things to learn, participating in the regional hospitality suites - that’s when I met Russell Brewer who was from Texas A&M at the time, part of the great Region 5. Please note I am sure I met him in the Region VI hospitality suite…huhhhmm. Russell is now a big deal at Stanford, but the things I have learned from Russell and the relationship built, over the years, is well…priceless. Many, if not all, of us have these same experiences.

My very first NCURA presentation was a real hardship…in 1998, Dick Seligman asked Bruce Morgan and I to help him with a subcontracting session…in Hawaii. It was also Bruce’s first regional presentation as well, but it was also one day after Bruce’s wedding. As I remember, Bruce may have been a little late to the session…you gotta love Region VI! Thank you Dick for giving Bruce and I the opportunity to get involved.

At about that same time in the late 90s, the regions webmaster was retiring so I volunteered (important thing to do) to host the regions website and keep it active. Wow – we hosted the page on a Unix box – I learned to transfer files via FTP, code in html, but I got to know a bunch of regional peeps, a very cool opportunity. My group at WSU still host and manage the website, which provides opportunities for them to get involved…which they have. Couldn’t have been involved in NCURA without a great staff back home.

With these initial experiences, I was able to connect with a number of people and start to get involved in many other ways:

Regional committees and leadership – awards committees, nominating committees, program committees, a highlight was being Regional Chair in 2001, much thanks to Terry Manns for helping me along. A man full of kindness and gentleness, for those who knew him. May he rest in peace.

Dan Nordquist and Judy Fredenberg

Dan Nordquist received the 2019 Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award at the 61st Annual Meeting. This is NCURA’s most prestigious award given to the member who has made a significant contribution to the profession and demonstrated noteworthy service to NCURA. The following are his remarks:
I was also very fortunate to work with Csilla Csaplar, Nancy Lewis, Rosie Madnick, Sam Westcott, Mich Pane, Vincent Oragwam, and many others. Regional conferences and all the presentations given for workshops, panels, discussion groups – many memories here with Georgette Saku-moto, Denise Wallen, Josie Jimenez, Vicki Krell, Diane Horrocks, and Judy Fredenberg. A super committed and faithful bunch. Actually, I first met Judy in 1999 at our CDA joint Region VI/VII meeting. She was THE BOSS at this meeting. Talk about getting involved, she was doing it ALL. I was told “it’s Judy from the University of Montana and its best to just do what she says.” I have been doing that ever since!! Thanks so much Judy.

National NCURA service being involved with the N&LDC, the PDC, NCURA Magazine (thanks Marc Schifffman and Derek Brown), the NCURA Board, as well as being an officer – if you want to engage in leadership development, this is the place to learn it, but also experience it. I loved working with all of the committees, the work was great, but the memories made are the people connections – Mario Medina, Vivian Holmes, Bob Andresen, Barbara Gray, Michelle Vazin, Steve Hansen (by the way, a great NCURA Past-President role model for me!), Toni Shaklee, Kris Monahan, David Smelser, Jared Littman, Craig Reynolds, Tony V., and I can’t forget all of the support and help from Kathleen Larmett, NCURA’s Executive Director, and also a great friend.

National, but also global, meetings and presentations – these meetings cannot be pulled off without the great NCURA staff – Tara and Kati and your teams - thanks to all of you (and the great memories – Do It Live! Do It Now! Get Involved, our theme for AM53 – my son Gunnar helped inspire this theme, stand up Gunnar, him and his buddies were on their first road trip and I asked all the “parent” questions, and he interrupted me and said, “Dad, Dad…don’t worry – we’re gonna Do It Live!” Voila, our meeting theme). Annual Meetings need committed leaders to help out; Kallie Firestone and Bruce Morgan did that for the AM53 meeting plus all those on the program committee. As well as all the great research managers around the world in EARMA, those involved with INORMS, other professional organizations, and our own Region VIII (39 countries now represented).

Regarding national presentations, I have presented a workshop the last few years with Pat Hawk and Dave Richardson. Quite a dynamic duo – so much fun working with them and I have learned A LOT. So many great memories! Pat has been doing this work for 35 years! She carried us….well, mostly she carried Dave. Congrats to Pat on her retirement this Fall.

And I don’t want to forget all of my NCURA friends that are my career coaches, marriage and family counselors, retirement and financial advisors, travel buddies, fishing buddies, home designer consultants, foodie peeps, - lots of goodness here!

From these career highlights, you saw that I focused on the people. NCURA is made up of GREAT people and I thank all of you for helping me earn this important award. Couldn’t do without you.

Lastly, the folks I couldn’t do it without, my family. Would you please stand? My sons Gunnar and Titus, my daughter Meleah, AND my lovely wife Carolyn, who, I’m convinced, is much better liked by all my NCURA friends than I am. Thanks for supporting me in all of these NCURA activities.

Thanks again to you all!
The spirit of going beyond borders and exploring uncharted fields has been embedded into human being’s blood since the very beginning of our history. Consider the first migrant from ancient Africa to other continents, the Silk Road connecting Asian and Mediterranean countries in the 2nd century B.C., and the transatlantic route established by Cristóbal Colón in the 14th century. All of these and many other human efforts have helped shaped our world into one more and more intertwined community.

While new technologies, especially in transportation and communication, are dramatically increasing the global mobility of people and tangible goods, they are also restructuring the world and our living communities by establishing new ways for us to share intangible resources, to work together, and more importantly to think differently using a broader and interconnected perspective. Even just decades ago, engineers may have never imagined they could draw a product blueprint and have it produced in days or even in hours at a factory located on the other side of the globe. Surgeons may never have believed they could see and operate on a patient from thousands of miles away just by using a computerized system housed at their own hospital. Now, thanks to modern technologies and growing collaborative efforts, all these unimaginable things have been realized in today’s world. Such developments also have helped make globalization, a concept developed in the 1980s, widely materialized and then become a general trend in many aspects of our lives.

Globalization, in combination with fast evolving technologies, is benefiting us by providing easy mobility of human resources, broad access to global resources, fast sharing of new information, active exchange of different cultures etc., all of which are blurring the traditional boundaries between countries, cultures and peoples. While this trend provides facilitating tools to support the development of many occupations, it also puts up challenges that we may never have expected before. The university research administrator, a key interface bridging a university’s daily research activities with other relevant fields, is at the front line of such challenges. When we witness a piece of news sent by a small handset going viral in minutes through so-called social networks and realize that a manmade artificial intelligence can mimic or even surpass certain abilities believed to be unique to human beings, we are already at a fork road struggling to decide not only how to empower ourselves through such changes to better support research practices at our home institutions, but also how to balance our work within and beyond previous borders.

Research without borders

Current research projects are more and more focusing on issues that go beyond geographical, cultural and ethical boundaries, and research teams are often comprised of people from different geographical and cultural origins. From the good side, while broad scope topics such as climate, new energy, public and health help bringing in more research resources, diversified personnel also inspire more dynamic interactions of different thinking which are believed to be one of the driving forces for technological innovations. By planning around topics that have greater global impacts and broad interests, we can better encourage interdisciplinary and international collaborations, which allows more efficient utilization of limited internal and external resources. On the other hand, such research activities do generate more administrative responsibilities. While the coordination and management complexity is often increased due to more partners involved, we are also facing extralegal and execution process risk due to different and sometimes uncertain foreign policies and legislations. In addition, when working with a foreign background project, research administrators sometimes have to face issues that are not directly related to research management, which are often caused by spontaneous and mostly unintentional cultural and ethical conflicts. For example, it is no longer rare for a research administrator to spend hours explaining the local routines to a foreign employee or a visiting researcher given that faculties and students with foreign backgrounds have exceeded 50% at...
some leading world universities. While such high percentages may be unintentional since talents are naturally attracted to universities with excellent academic standings, current university ranking systems and money-draining expansion plans do play an encouraging role for some universities to boost up these numbers. Although such development has generated significant benefits both academically and financially, what driving effects it may play in the long term are still in question when being highly internationally homogenized becomes a routine at most of the institutions, and we are again no longer able to differentiate each other through cultural and ethical compositions.

**Partnership without borders**

In recent history, the scarce and hard-to-balance internal resources and fierce competition for external support are persistent challenges for research administrators, which makes us realize that in many areas what one research team or institution can do is often limited. Led by highly integrated world markets and more issues with global interests, an increasing number of research projects require the involvement of partners from different fields to provide necessary resources and expertise. We are then forced to form well-planned strategic partnerships with other institutions to generate synergistic developments. Mega-projects, such as SKA and ITER, that involve dozens or even hundreds of member entities from all over the world, are extreme examples of this trend. Often even at a much smaller scale, a project may need interdisciplinary collaborations and partnerships from multiple external sources. With fast expanding collaborations in most of the fields on campus and limited financial and human resources becoming the bottleneck, a campus-wide optimization of collaborative resources is becoming necessary. This challenges our research administrators to conduct more strategic planning in seeking productive partnerships, to be more adaptive to flexible collaboration modes, and to be more broadly and efficiently connected with internal and external academic, business and government contacts. In response to the above challenges, Tsinghua University (Beijing, China) designed and implemented a Global Strategic Academic Partnership Program in 2016. The program first identifies the university’s internal academic development needs and key priority directions and then matches them with the academic development goals of other world leading universities through joint workshops and administration level discussions. When the specific academic interests are aligned from both sides, a strategic academic collaboration plan supported by a joint seed fund is initiated to facilitate broad and in-depth faculty and student exchange and collaboration. The program has both sides providing equal value of financial investments and forms supervision organizations at both administrative and academic levels. This ensures general oversight of the program implementation at the university level and allows periodic adjustments of strategic collaboration fields based on individual project execution and feedback from involved faculty and students. In the meantime, by being open to the collaboration format of each individual project funded by the seed fund, the program provides enough flexibility for the research collaborators from both sides to be more creative in project designing in the selected fields. The program has been unexpectedly well received by many administrators and researchers at different universities. Up to date, 13 universities across the world have established such strategic partnership programs with Tsinghua.

**Value without borders**

Research is the key source of new knowledge for us to comprehend and improve our living world, and its value shall not be limited to academia or confined within a physical campus. With increasing expectations from the public and private sectors for universities to play a more significant role in technology innovation and social value creation, research administrators are urged to consider more about the upstream and downstream of the full value chain of a research project. This requires us to bring key stakeholders together in the early stages of a project to identify core players for each major steps and to streamline the full process. In such cases, research administrators’ roles are no longer limited to direct planning, organization and management of a project. In addition, we will have to take research-based talent cultivation, technical and social evaluation, business development planning, etc., into consideration during the life span of a research project to support the development of an ecosystem that helps maximize the value generated from the research itself. With new technologies and tools making the distribution of large amounts of information so conveniently fast, we find ourselves located in the core of this ecosystem as a converging point where the crucial information and value are collected and dispersed.

As always, we cannot predict how research administration will change in the future. But by riding on the leading tide of technology development, we shall always be ready to embrace any coming changes and strive to bridge the gap between research and its value realization beyond any limiting borders.
The Case for Public Impact-Focused Research

By Sandra A. Brown, Janet E. Nelson and Sarah M. Rovito

Institutions of higher education influence individuals, economies, and societies in profound ways – and public and land-grant universities in particular have an obligation to serve the public and contribute to the greater good. Many universities are heeding this call to improve their local communities, our country, and the world by pursuing multidisciplinary research initiatives aimed at solving or mitigating complex, societally-relevant problems.

The Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU) launched the Public Impact-Focused Research (PIR) Initiative in 2018 with the intent of galvanizing additional research in service to society at APLU’s 239 member institutions. Leadership of the APLU Council on Research recognized that many universities were actively engaged in research designed to serve society as part of their charge as public institutions, yet lacked an overarching framework to leverage expertise, share best practices, and optimize return on investment. The PIR Initiative seeks to bring together multiple, previously uncoordinated efforts – including Grand Challenges and Highly Integrative Basic And Responsive (HIBAR) Research – as a national movement and to describe a common framework capable of empowering more institutions and faculty to undertake such research.

The PIR Initiative encourages universities to expand their public impact-focused research portfolios; to develop a common vernacular for describing such efforts, highlighting best practices, and showcasing impact; to foster new community and industry partnerships; to identify and eliminate barriers inhibiting PIR; and to strengthen and mobilize public support for this type of research. All of this is done within the context of strengthening and integrating support for fundamental research – which is vital to advancing science and scholarly and creative activity across disciplines and improving societal well-being.

APLU calls for the adoption of the term “Public Impact-Focused Research” as an overarching concept for a growing number of forms of research and engagement already underway. The PIR initiative can assist institutions in conveying to various stakeholders how basic and applied research conducted on university campuses serves the public. APLU believes that universities should intentionally engage in PIR and seek to address associated barriers.
PIR is taking place on campuses big and small. From UCLA's Sustainable LA and Depression Grand Challenges to Oklahoma State University's Tier 1 Research Initiatives to Southern Illinois University's efforts to mobilize technology to transition the local coal economy, PIR can be adapted to fit the priorities, expertise, and culture of any campus.

A successful PIR initiative requires careful customization and consideration of a university’s unique circumstances at critical decision points, such as identifying PIR themes and implementing PIR. This necessitates taking into account campus culture, the scale and lifespan of a PIR initiative, and direct and indirect goals. A university needs to decide whether to employ a “top-down” or “bottom-up” approach for identifying PIR themes, along with whether and how to use a competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) during the selection and implementation process. Once a theme is selected, a university needs to focus on areas for strategic implementation, including administrative structure and support, accountability, communications, and community engagement. The campus culture at some institutions may encourage more organic approaches to supporting investigators who are already inclined to do PIR-related projects, such as setting aside funding to supplement other kinds of grants and providing institutional recognition for noteworthy PIR achievements.

“The PIR Initiative also can assist in conveying how basic and applied university research serves the public.”

A key attribute of PIR is engagement with community partners and accountability to the public, as PIR is dependent on outside stakeholders to identify societal needs and potential outcomes. PIR can be most impactful when the research community takes the time to go beyond the borders of a university and ensure that such initiatives are designed with the public in mind. While a comprehensive framework for measuring long-term community engagement and impact in a PIR context does not exist, some institutions do measure the impact of their public engagement, and many APLU members are interested in improving their ability to describe the public impact of their research. APLU and its members are interested in working with the NSF-funded Center for Advancing Research Impact in Society (ARIS) and other partners to build more robust frameworks and methodologies.

The PIR Initiative also can assist in conveying how basic and applied university research serves the public. The most familiar form of communication needed for PIR is the use of evidence-based methods where members of the research community reach out to public audiences to connect significant discoveries to the everyday lives of people. Investing in communications – both human capital and tools – and weaving communications training into the fabric of institutions is imperative for ensuring that PIR initiatives taking place on campuses are shared broadly. Raising the profile of the direct connection between university research and kitchen table concerns is essential.

Several barriers and challenges do exist to implementing and carrying out PIR initiatives at universities. These include securing sustainable funding, recognizing the value of PIR and cultivating a culture that promotes PIR, and creating metrics for assessing the success of PIR initiatives. Research funding has always played an important role in spurring new research directions and new fields of study; and support from federal funding agencies, along with university seed funding and private local investment, will be key to fostering additional PIR. Broadening promotion and tenure (P&T) policies and guidelines to recognize the value of PIR and taking steps to encourage PIR across disciplines also are necessary. Developing widely-accepted guidelines and methodologies for quantifying the benefits of PIR will assist universities in making the case for these changes.

The APLU PIR Initiative can serve as an avenue for leveraging university-based basic and applied research in response to complex and intractable societal problems. Engaging in research and broader initiatives that involve key external stakeholders and putting the knowledge generated by universities to work is essential to improving society.

The authors wish to thank Angela Phillips Diaz at the University of California, San Diego; Scott Slovic at the University of Idaho; and Howard Goldstein and Sheila Martin at APLU for their many contributions to this article. General inquiries about the PIR Initiative may be sent to pir@aplu.org.
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On May 25, 2018, the European Union General Data Protection Regulation (EU GDPR), a significant change in the laws governing data privacy, came into effect. The EU GDPR unifies the requirements in the EU to protect an individual’s data. The regulations offer individuals the ability to access, rectify, and erase personal data, as well as have the right to object to or restrict processing. Failure to comply with the rules could result in fines starting at 10 million Euros. The requirements apply to entities within the EU, as well as outside entities that provide goods or services within the EU (Intersoft Consulting, n.d.). Since EU GDPR does not take into account citizenship, this would allow for the regulations to apply to anyone located in the EU to the same protections. Article 9 of the EU GDPR places further limits on special categories of personal data including racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, or trade union membership, and the processing of genetic or biometric data for the purpose of uniquely identifying a natural person and data concerning health (Intersoft Consulting, n.d.). EU GDPR also prohibits similar use of data concerning a natural person’s sex life or sexual orientation (Intersoft Consulting, n.d.).

The challenge for researchers administrators is the personal information that researchers gather from individuals for myriad reasons through electronic methods where the location of the individual is unknown. While not all institutions of higher education have a physical location in the EU, many have programs that target enrollment of international students. With programs directed at EU citizens, the data protection rights could be conferred upon the data collected from individuals while located in the EU.

For research administrators that work with the regulations for human subject research, there must also be consideration of any online research activities, such as surveys or recruitment, that fall under these regulations. Principal investigators should also consider these regulations when designing and conducting longitudinal studies where study participants could travel to the EU or reside in the EU during the study period. Longitudinal studies using follow up surveys with personal questions or fitness trackers linked to the research participants are regulated by EU GDPR data requirements.

In order to remain exempt from the EU GDPR jurisdiction, many researchers have inclusion/exclusion requirements for research participants to not reside or travel to the EU during the study period. In the long run, this may negatively impact research results since we are excluding a regional area of individuals from US based research studies.

Higher education administrators, especially research administrators, must find better ways to seamlessly incorporate the GDPR requirements for improved data protection.
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"NCURA’s was the most detailed and thorough external review we have received. It was objective, incisive, and provided recommendations the university will act on to improve our research administration."
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NCURA Member Milestones

Rashonda Harris is now the Director, Research Grants and Contracts Operations at Emory University.

Patricia Hawk, Assistant Vice President for Sponsored Research and Award Administration at Oregon State University, retired in September after more than 35 years in research administration. She has served NCURA in so many roles including as an officer in two regions, NCURA President, traveling workshop faculty member, PDC Chair, and NCURA Magazine Senior Editor. Pat was recognized as a NCURA Distinguished Educator and was the recipient of the Julia Jacobsen Distinguished Service Award.

Cindy Hope is Director, Office of Sponsored Programs at Georgia Institute of Technology, effective October 1.

Katherine Kissmann is now Director of Research Contracts for Texas A&M University.

Jennifer Ponting is now Executive Director of Sponsored Programs at the University of Chicago.

Lillie Ryans-Culclagger is now Director of Contracts at Southern Research.

Roger Wareham is now Director of Grants Research at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay.
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I faced two mysteries when I made the jump from a tier-one research university to a learning health system: “What is a learning health system and how does research fit in?” Denver Health (DH) is a learning health system that is focused on providing service to an underserved and diverse patient population in urban Denver. As such, DH continues to strategically develop its footprint in research, recognizing it is a key component to providing the best possible care to an underrepresented population.

As a safety-net hospital, DH is uniquely positioned to inform gaps in order to improve health care quality, reduce disparities, and advance equity. However, being a safety-net hospital means “spare” dollars are hard to find, and investment in the research enterprise can be a heavy lift. Therefore, DH has focused strategically on investing in three primary areas of research operations:

**Infrastructure development:** Research is not new to DH. The central research administration office (known as SPARO) has existed for many years. While research grew organically for decades, it often lacked a strategic focus. DH leadership and the board decided to add an executive-level Office of Research to house SPARO and the Center for Health Systems Research. The Office of Research has also provided the research enterprise with executive-level support and focus that did not exist previously. Dr. Romana Hasnain-Wynia was appointed as Chief Research Officer (CRO), and her first step was to establish needed research infrastructure. Her focus on infrastructure has led to the addition of some much-needed positions as well as the implementation of a number of key systems, including an electronic grants management system (GMS).

With the support of DH leadership, SPARO has added a Clinical Trials Services team, providing principal investigators with a “one-stop administration shop” for clinical trial expertise and assistance. Additionally, the Office of Research is currently engaged in building a professional development track for research administrators to establish both a path for growth and expectations for professional development.

**Investigators:** Improved tools and resources. An electronic GMS is useful for both researchers and administrators, but it is not the only new resource DH has recently launched. Effective tools provide a foundation for researchers to increase their productivity. DH is now focusing on providing investigators’ access to an online medical library, as well as access to a direct funding opportunity system. Another tangible example of support provided by the DH Office of Research is the new “Junior Investigator Pilot Program.” The program provides $25,000 each to three investigators twice a year, allowing early career researchers to more fully develop potential funding ideas with pilot data. The intent of this program is to enhance the recipients’ likelihood of receiving external funding and eventually build a significant research portfolio.

Finally, DH has invested in an internal Quality Improvement Review Committee (QuIRC). The QuIRC is fully authorized by our institutional review board (IRB) to issue quality improvement
(QI) determinations for projects that reside at the periphery of research or that require a non-research determination for publication purposes, in lieu of an IRB determination. At time of publication, the QuIRC has reviewed 82 proposals and only 4 were referred to our IRB for a human subjects determination. The QuIRC has a streamlined internal process that allows clinicians and investigators to submit their QI proposals for review to a more appropriate review body, rather than sending non-research proposals to the IRB.

**Time Investment:** Increased training and education. SPARO has significantly increased offerings of campus-wide training opportunities. Within 2 years, SPARO has gone from a smattering of training on compliance, budgeting, and NIH proposals, to a far more substantial training portfolio. Clinical Trial financial review, contracting requirements, GMS user training, and CRA prep courses are just a sample of the additional instruction available to investigators and their staff. The additional coaching has helped increase the autonomy of research staff and has improved communication between SPARO and the research teams.

DH’s efforts in research have not gone unnoticed. DH was selected to be one of four case studies highlighted in an AHRQ (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality) report of learning health systems (LHS). AHRQ supports health care delivery organizations, helping them to evolve as learning health systems, ensuring people across America receive the highest quality, safest, most up-to-date care. DH was the only safety-net hospital selected. As the case study points out, “becoming an LHS is an iterative journey characterized by strong leadership, effective use of data in the clinical setting, and both a culture and workforce committed to continuous learning and improvement” (Denver Health, 2019); all steps taken by DH in its research journey.

So what is a LHS and how does research fit in? **Mystery solved:** a LHS is a health care organization in which “internal data and experience are systematically integrated with external evidence and that knowledge is put into practice” (Denver Health, 2019). DH both exemplifies the importance of research in a LHS as well as its impact when research results are put into practice. By focusing on infrastructure development, improved tools and resources, and increased training and education, DH has strategically poised itself to provide an excellent environment for cutting-edge research that focuses on improving and reducing disparities.
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any U.S. researchers have overseas colleagues or are perhaps approached by an overseas colleague (or a potential colleague) wishing to engage in collaborative sponsored research. Some notices of funding opportunity (NOFOs) or requests for proposals (RFPs) may allow or even require international collaborators. While most developed research educational institutions overseas and those in many developed countries share similar standards of responsible research that we have in the U.S., understand the various compliance issues we must meet, and have access to some sponsored programs staff who can provide guidance, many universities in lesser-resourced or developing countries have not been able to make the necessary investment in professional administrative staff who understand best practices in research principles, Uniform Guidance, budgeting and accounting standards.

This understandable, but unfortunate, situation generally results in missed or impossible collaboration possibilities and an inability to list the overseas researcher as a Co-PI or even as a subcontractor. Sponsored research (SR) administrators in U.S. universities need to have confidence that there is an overseas counterpart who understands the world of SR, communicates promptly and factually, and is able to provide the certifications, reports, receipts, and other data that our sponsors — and good management practices — require. Such parallel “infrastructure” is required even for viable grant proposals, much less for successful multinational research collaboration.

In many countries government agencies such as a Ministry of Education, a scientific research agency, or other national research or development organization — or even a university’s chief research office/officer (if one exists) — encourages, rewards, or requires local universities to engage in sponsored research and to seek collaboration with researchers in better resourced countries. There are several difficult questions here. How can an overseas researcher identify a potential U.S. or other researcher for intensive cooperation? How can an overseas researcher provide reasonable assurance that he or she has the knowledge, experience and access to local SR expertise so that there is little doubt about compliance and reporting requirements? How can an overseas researcher stand out and appear more competitive and promising as a potential Co-PI or subcontractor? Even if there are good scholar-to-scholar or individual relationships in place, what else is needed to sustain mutually beneficial and intensive research cooperation?

What can U.S. and other research-intensive universities - and the greater research community at large - do to encourage and increase the capacity of otherwise good higher educational institutions with talented researchers who are eager to collaborate internationally?

This article presents a case story that perhaps illustrates on a small scale what can be done to great effect. A number of U.S. universities have had various interactions with Jordanian universities over the years — including faculty research, student mobility programs, joint degrees, and formal exchanges. However, an assessment conducted by the Eurasia Foundation in 2016-2017 concluded that many of these relationships were dormant, resulted in little mutually-beneficial research, or were unidirectional, with mobility flowing almost entirely from Jordan to the U.S. In response to these gaps, and with the support of the Ministry of Higher Education in Jordan and the U.S. Embassy, a small consortium of active U.S. research institutions, in this case several land grant universities, met and agreed to work together. It is important to note that it was actually senior personnel in international affairs offices (either university-wide or in a particular college, such as a college of agriculture — representatives who generally do not exclusively engage in research in one particular area but try to facilitate new programs and networks for their faculty and students in all their departments or colleges) who went to Jordan and met with the Jordanian universities’ international office personnel (and sometimes other key personnel such as deans and chief research officers). On the Jordanian side, this effort came to involve all ten of the Jordanian public universities, which collectively educate approximately 80% of all students in the tertiary sector.

The Public Affairs section at the U.S. Embassy in Amman then arranged for Dr. Mark Johnson from the University of Wisconsin-Madison to serve as a Fulbright Policy Specialist, with the specific mission of analyzing the international relations offices within the Jordanian public universities. Working together, the two governments, along with leading public and private universities, established a new organization, the U.S.-Jordanian University Cooperation Network (UCN), precisely to facilitate such partnerships and cooperation. With the support of the U.S. Embassy, the UCN was to be developed through two linked hubs or secretariats, one at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and the other at the University of Jordan. As part of these organizational efforts, in early June of 2019, Ms. Patricia Parera, together with colleagues from various research units at Virginia Tech, led a week-long research summit on “Innovative and Transformational Ideas to Improve the Development and Policy Response to Forced Displacement,” along with colleagues from Jordan and other countries.

Later that month, the core U.S. members of the UCN (including representatives of Virginia Tech, the University of Florida, UW-Madison, North Carolina State University, and the University of Arizona), met in Amman to participate in a capacity building workshop. This event included more than 120 participants, both senior leaders and research faculty, who met with the goal of strengthening strategic and long-term collaborations between
U.S. and Jordanian universities. This workshop, “Building Capacity for International University Cooperation and Research Collaboration,” was designed precisely to build up NCURA-style professional leadership in the area of research administration with a special focus on cross-border cooperation. The conference and workshop were sponsored by the U.S Embassy in Jordan and hosted at the University of Jordan in partnership with North Carolina State University’s Global Training Initiative. The Network invited experts from NCURA to participate in the workshop and to assist with the agenda items related to research administration and compliance.

On the first day of the meeting, Jordanian government representatives and university leaders made commitments to provide support to enhance international collaboration among U.S. and Jordanian universities and to advance joint research, expand academic exchanges, and strengthen the quality of higher education and research in both countries. UCN has been working with all the leading public universities in Jordan to establish a number of resources including a database of research projects and contact information for lead faculty and academic staff.

The three-day event, held in Amman from June 24-26, was attended by more than 120 representatives from UCN participating institutions and included a series of discussion panels on a variety of topics such as campus internationalization initiatives and competitive advantages; methods of internationalizing campuses and how to build professional capacity to achieve sustained international partnerships; institutional research priorities and opportunities for international partnerships; and strategies for research collaboration with government and industry. The workshops also included focus group discussions for identifying specific research initiatives that the Network can advance for funding opportunities around cluster topics identified by network institutions. The panel discussions were followed by a number of interactive sessions on building a university “ecosystem” for successful grant prospecting, proposal writing and research management.

In a keynote speech, Dr. Tahmassian discussed the globalization of the academic research enterprise and the importance of international collaboration to overcome many pressing issues such as climate change, food security and public health; how Jordan’s long academic history and its current investments in science and technology will contribute to advancement of its “knowledge economy”; and the positive role the UCN can play in fostering collaborations that will be necessary for universities to lead such developments.

The UCN leadership adopted an innovative approach in introducing the NCURA part of the workshop by starting with an on-stage interview format in which Ms. Patricia Parera, from the Language and Culture Institute at Virginia Tech, interviewed the NCURA members and presenters: Dr. Ara Tahmassian and Dr. Fadia Homeidan. The interactive session included a Q&A on the background of each participant; an overview of NCURA’s history, principles and training programs; ways to identify specific grant prospects; and the necessity of institutionalized and ongoing professional development of professional staff to support grant and research management.

Drs. Homeidan and Tahmassian followed with a series of presentations on research administration and compliance including: how to build a campus culture for successful grant prospecting and proposal writing; how to establish incentives and create win-win scenarios for cooperation; how to identify potential research funding; budget development; how to cultivate partnerships and “market” your proposals; and how to support compliance, monitoring and evaluation that aligns with international standards. Some in the audience seemed a bit wary of giving up their established practices, or more informal existing arrangements, but both Drs. Tahmassian and Homeidan emphasized the vital importance of professionalized administration.

Overall the presentation sessions were highly interactive with the Jordanian audience fully engaged in discussions and planning for follow-up activities.

**Conclusion**

The UCN is an example of a highly valuable network. It not only has institutional support for participation, it is also led by a number of interested and motivated volunteer individuals from both the U.S. and Jordanian institutions. NCURA’s participation in the conference and the workshop was well received by the workshop participants, and the sessions emphasized the need for Jordanian universities to develop and implement a comprehensive research administration program at their institutions if they are to be successful in internationalization of their research enterprise. As an organization whose mission is “advancing the profession of research administration through education and professional development programs, the sharing of knowledge and experiences, and the fostering a diverse, collegial, and respected global community,” NCURA’s partnership with the UCN on this workshop was a natural fit, and we hope that this partnership will continue as Jordanian faculty and universities continue with developing their research administration infrastructure.
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THE GLASS ESCALATOR IN RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

By Sarah Tetley and Helen Leech

The Research Management and Administration (RMA) profession is heavily dependent upon its female workforce. Internationally, 77% of all RMA staff are women, with surprisingly little regional variation. This gender imbalance becomes less pronounced in leadership positions, however, with 28% of roles occupied by men, despite their only constituting 22% (1% did not indicate gender) of the overall workforce (Kerridge and Scott 2018).

Do men make better leaders? Or is something else going on…? We know that these gender patterns are not unique to RMA. In nursing, teaching and other traditionally “female” professions, men have consistently been found to reach leadership positions both more quickly and in greater numbers than their female counterparts – a phenomenon that researchers have dubbed the glass escalator (Williams 1992). One reason for this is that women are much more likely to work in part-time positions than men, usually due to their taking a lead when it comes to family caring responsibilities. This, then, limits opportunities for women for personal and professional development, which can negatively impact their career advancement. As women fill 86% of all part-time roles within RMA, we wanted to explore if the glass escalator was also present in our profession and for the same reasons.

Understanding the issues
First, we designed a short survey drawing upon the evidence from other sectors of peoples’ experiences of part-time working. Comprising both checklist and free-text questions, we tested it out with colleagues internally and received full ethical approval from our university ethics committee, before sending it out to RMA staff in the USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the UK via the respective RMA membership organisations – thank you NCURA, CARA, ARMA and SRA International. The survey hit peoples’ inboxes in April and May 2018 and by the end of May, we had attracted 379 “hits” and captured 224 complete returns. (We designed the survey to exclude anyone who hadn’t worked in a part-time role, so assume that the missing 155 responses are largely from people who have only ever worked full-time – but more on this below.)

We were incredibly heartened that people also contacted us directly to tell us about their experiences of part-time working. This both provided some incredibly rich additional data, as well as confirmed our beliefs that the questions we were asking were important and timely.

In parallel to our survey development, we applied to run a workshop at the 2018 International Network of Research Management Societies (INORMS) conference. We wanted to use the conference as an opportunity to present our survey data and to engage in conversation with RMA colleagues about how generalisable the findings from our data were (given that we “only” had 224 responses); and to get their views on next steps.

What we found
Perhaps unsurprisingly, given what we know about the general make-up of the RMA workforce, of the 224 responses we received, 92% were from women. Unfortunately, because we didn’t capture respondents’ gender until they had completed the full survey, we don’t know if the 155 or so people who began the survey and then didn’t complete it and/or were excluded because of their lack of part-time working experience, were male or female. Knowing the answer to this would have been useful to best understand our study demographic and is certainly something we would address going forward.

What was more surprising, though, was the geographic spread of responses. Of the respondents, 82% were from the UK, 11% USA, 3% Canada and 3% Australia and New Zealand. Did the higher response rate from the UK reflect something different about the nature of work, and peoples’ experiences of it, within the UK? We weren’t sure, so set out to address this through our conference session.

In addition to being predominantly female and UK-based, our study participants were also typically aged between 35 – 54 and had worked for more than 5 years in RMA. Most commonly, respondents had held part-time positions between 1 and 5 years. When asked about their reasons for working in a part-time capacity, the overwhelming response was for caring responsibilities (Figures 1 – 4).

So much for the descriptives. What did people actually tell us about their experiences?

Feeling “left out”
Incredibly, over a half of all respondents had experienced feelings of exclusion and isolation due to their part-time status. In some cases, they had even been actively excluded from certain activities or positions, including promotions. More commonly, however, respondents reported regularly missing out on opportunities for feedback, participation or networking (formal and informal) because events were scheduled at times when they weren’t at work, as the following comments illustrate:

“Missing out on various social functions or networking opportunities held after hours or on days off has meant I’ve had less exposure to meeting the right people. I’ve consequently been left out of consideration for working parties or other development opportunities. I’ve also been overlooked for participation on panels.”

What research participants said…

Feeling left out after hours
“Missing out on various social functions or networking opportunities held after hours or on days off has meant I’ve had less exposure to meeting the right people. I’ve consequently been left out of consideration for working parties or other development opportunities. I’ve also been overlooked for participation on panels.”
“Roles in committees are only available to full time staff”

“Over the years, I have often experienced situations when I have not been considered for additional responsibilities or new projects. These were always given to the full time team members”.

“Decisions were made and actions taken while [I was] away from the office”

Worryingly, several respondents reported that they were treated differently from their full-time colleagues, due to some colleagues’ perceptions that if they ‘only’ worked part time they couldn’t really be fully committed to the organisation, or that they otherwise lacked ambition, as these comments demonstrate:

“[There is a] general feeling of not being serious about your job as you are part time - indeed ‘jokingly’ described as a slacker”

“I was often told that if I wanted to progress in my career that I would need to consider full-time positions”

“I feel like I’m taken less seriously because I work part-time and that my company are doing me a favour by letting me reduce my hours.”

“I felt like I was considered less-committed to the office culture and my work due to taking my hours down.”

### Declining opportunities

Just under a half of all respondents had declined development opportunities because of their part-time status. When asked for the reasons why, caring commitments again featured heavily, as did issues of time. These opportunities were typically scheduled outside of a persons’ working hours/days; and/or the individual was concerned about the impact taking time out for training would have upon their workload, again, as these comments reveal:

“I often can’t attend an event as I have childcare responsibilities”

“I regularly decline training opportunities as they are not offered on my normal working days”

“I find it harder to justify to myself taking 1, 2 or more days out of my (working) week now I work 3 days a week than when I was working 5 days a week, and worry about the backlog of work I’ll return to”

“I missed things that happened while I wasn’t in the office, didn’t know things, and spend far longer having to catch up on emails which had come in on non-work days. There were some meetings that I felt I could not attend - like general staff meetings - because they would cut into my working day too much in comparison to colleague who worked full time.”

“trying to do a full-time job in a part-time role, meant much less time for lunch breaks, and general ‘catching up’ time.”
Going that extra mile
This latter point leads in to the next major finding from our study: that people who work part time regularly reported working for longer than their contractual hours out of a sense of duty to their organisation/team. While the same could also be argued for many full timers, the difference for part timers is that they felt an extra obligation to be flexible, often rearranging commitments outside of work, so that they could meet the needs of their team (or to access opportunities), even though it meant they worked for longer and effectively without compensation, as these comments show:

“I constantly had a case of ‘part-time guilt’ and worked on my days off and evenings to compensate for this”.

“I officially work a 28 hour week, however I always check emails after hours and at weekends”

“I work many extra hours after work and depending on the deadline will come in on my day off or on weekends as a sense of duty”

“I work more than full time and am paid for part time work. And my employer and line manager see that as normal. I also pay childcare to be able to attend meetings outside my core hours so I’m working unpaid and paying for childcare”

“I work Mon. - Thurs. with Fri. off. Frequently there are departmental meetings/training/activities/events that are scheduled on Fridays. So often times I make a choice to come in because I feel I will not be viewed as part of the team albeit I am not being compensated for my time.”

Some respondents were keen to point out that it was their choice to work the extra hours, viewing it as a form of “credit” that they were banking for a rainy day.

“It is my choice. No-one would make me do this…along with my willingness to check my emails on an off day comes a lot of goodwill and flexibility when I need it. Such matters are complex”

Yet, the majority felt that they gave over and above to their roles and that, regrettably, this was very rarely appreciated or even noted.

To INORMS2018
When we presented our data at INORMS2018, we found that these findings also resonated strongly with many members of our conference audience, whose demographics, bar nationality, also very closely reflected our survey panel. Thus, 90% of our audience was female; the majority were aged between 31 and 50; and, 25% were currently working in part-time roles. Importantly, 70% reported feelings of being left out; and 70% also reported declining development opportunities, with the biggest single determining factor here being the time it would take away from their day job.

It is significant that our conference audience was distinctly international – 55 participants from 19 different countries covering 5 continents. This is in stark contrast to our survey data which was UK-dominated. This tells us that there are world-wide problems faced by part-time workers within RMA, which prevent them from gaining access to development opportunities and career advancement. Given that these part-time roles are almost always held by women, we can also conclude that women in RMA are being unfairly disadvantaged relative to their male colleagues.

What next
Overall, our data pointed to the higher education sector really struggling to properly accommodate part-time workers, from the basic scheduling of social events and development activities though to the allocation of tasks. This trend is also reflected somewhat in the terms respondents used to describe the approaches to flexible working available to them in their organisations, e.g., compressed hours, flexitime, flexi-hours, job share, school hours, v-shaped hours, work at home, and work/life balance. There is clearly no shortage of initiatives, but their implementation has so far been flawed.

We want to continue to engage with the worldwide RMA community to better understand different approaches to enabling part-time working within the profession. Our survey was limited to English-speaking nations only (though some did creep out into the non-English speaking world). We would like to address this by developing revised survey instruments that can be administered more widely.

We would also like to engage with institutions who have cracked this issue. What did you do? How did you do it? What have been the outcomes?

Equally, we would like to hear from you if your organisation needs some help to change its approaches. Tell us your experiences, so that we can develop a richer picture of peoples’ experiences.

By continuing this work, we hope to identify examples of best practice that can be shared with the RMA profession world-wide, so that, ultimately, we can pronounce the glass escalator officially “out of action” within RMA.

References
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I am a vice president for innovation and research and new to this post. I am a relatively quiet person, sometimes misinterpreted as not willing to share information and keeping too much to myself. I don’t think I’m mean or disrespectful: I just don’t like hearing myself talk a lot! I read a lot of transparency in leadership, yet I know that I need to keep some information confidential (a lot more now that I am in my current role). How do you balance the needs for transparency and confidentiality?

First, congratulations on achieving your new leadership role, and for being so thoughtful about it. I am going to make the grand assumption that you will not be able to achieve all the objectives of this position by yourself and that you will need to work with and through others.

In past columns I have written about David Rock’s book, Managing with the Brain in Mind. One of Rock’s concepts is that part of workers’ feeling psychologically safe in a workplace is knowing where they stand in relationships with others, most especially the boss. So, if you are naturally quiet and, perhaps introverted, you undoubtedly bring many strengths to your role. (See Susan Cain’s book, Quiet for an ode to the introvert!) Use these strengths to support your leadership and to earn the trust of others. Also, be aware that people need connection with their bosses and leaders. If you’re too quiet, some people will not feel that they have any standing or footing with you. How psychologically safe your team and colleagues feel about you will make a large impact on how successfully you lead.

You may wish to ask yourself how the people that work with you know you. How do they know what you value, what is most important to you in regard to the work that you do, what are your primary personal values, and how do you wish the culture of the office to be? You do have an obligation to expressly state your answers to these questions. There is nothing worse for an employee than to have to guess at these things. Most people do not want to inadvertently or innocently trip a wire for you emotionally or somehow embarrass you or themselves or the office or function. Yes, you can lead by example, and yes, you want to walk the talk. And, you need for people to know what the “talk” is. What language do you use to describe your own values and what matters most at work and the work you do? Develop your words to answer these questions and tell them directly to your staff and team. Do not make them guess. Bring some sense of humor and humility when you talk about these topics. Acknowledge that you are still learning to be “you”, as everyone is learning to be “themselves.” Talk about how you view errors, mistakes, and (for extra credit) acknowledge some of your own and how you rectified them, moved forward, etc.

Think of yourself as a personal learner and ask everyone to see themselves in this way. In your role, especially one about innovation and research, you are all learning, experimenting, and growing. This is all about leadership tone. How well and how forthrightly you talk about these matters and will have a large impact on the culture of your office and function and how people see themselves fitting in (or not fitting in). It will also greatly affect your own success because you will need a team that understands and supports and works in alignment with you. Leave bread crumbs for others: let them know how to know you and what matters to you. And, spend the time earnestly to get to know them.

You asked about transparency and confidentiality. The need for confidentiality in business matters makes sense to most everyone. We adhere to professional codes and expectations of our institutions and professions, as well as numerous workplace and human resources requirements. There are benefits of sharing information for the well-being and engagement of team learning. Many employees wish for more candor, understanding, and insight about business decisions, promotions, etc. from their leaders. “Trust us with information” is the unspoken call that many employees yearn to say. Employees wish for more communication and transparency regarding team management matters as it helps build trust, as well as a sense of everyone rowing together as a team. This is especially true in times of crisis or difficult business matters where the rumor mills are going strong. Be forthright in those situations especially. Let people know what they might expect to happen, how they personally may be impacted, and what you need for them to do. Ask them to ask you questions and state what you know, what you can and cannot say, and why this is so.

The comedian Andy Richter has a podcast, “The Three Questions with Andy Richter.” His three questions for his guests are: Where have you been? Where are you going? What have you learned? These prompt very interesting topics. Acknowledge that you are still learning yourself, especially if you are relatively new. “Ask us about the mistakes, and (for extra credit) acknowledge some of your own and how you rectified them, moved forward, etc.” Talk about how you view errors, mistakes, and (for extra credit) acknowledge some of your own and how you rectified them, moved forward, etc.

“So, vice president for innovation and research, here is a version of the “three-question” podcast for you:
• Who are you?
• What do you stand for?
• What matters most to you?

Be sure that everyone working with you knows these answers unequivocally.

Garry Sanders is an executive coach and graduate of Georgetown University’s Certificate Program in Leadership Coaching. Garry is a long-time research administrator and recipient of NCURA’s Distinguished Service Award. He can be reached at gsanders@assicitleadership.com and (518) 588-0992.
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March 2 & 3
Financial Research Administration Conference (FRA)

March 4
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Pre-Award Research Administration Conference (PRA)
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Program and Hotel information will be announced mid-November
As I write this article, we just returned from the Annual Meeting in DC. Thanks to the entire NCURA staff team, our Region I officers and volunteers who worked to make the meeting a success. Some highlights:

Ara Tahmassian, Harvard University, and Susan Zipkin, University of New Hampshire, were each recognized with Julia Jacobson Distinguished Service Awards!

We participated in the Education Scholarship Fund Raffle; thank you all who sold and purchased tickets!

Suzanne Araujo, Rhode Island Hospital, and Amanda Gozzi, Tufts Dental Medical School, represented us at the Poster Session!

Our travel awardee, Elisa Ziglar, University of Vermont, was recognized at the Luncheon.

The NetZone Carnival Game Room theme was a smashing hit. Larry the Lobster presented awards each night; top winners posed for each game (see Facebook for photo fun). Kudos to our staff who brought the room to life for all to enjoy!

**2020 ELECTION RESULTS:**

Chair-Elect: Eva Pasadas, Northeastern University
Treasurer-Elect: Danforth Nicholas, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Secretary-Elect: Heather Dominey, Brown University
National Board Rep: Denise Rouleau, Tufts University

Congratulations to your newly elected Region I Officers! Thank you to Kris Monahan, Chair, Providence College, and the Governance Committee for putting together an outstanding slate of candidates.

The 3rd FREE Networking Event was held on September 22nd at the Smoke Shop at Assembly Row which included a Celebration of Research Administrator Day (9/25). Thank you to Lisa Mosley, Chair, Yale University, and the Professional Development Committee for organizing this growing event.

By the time you read this article, two of our fall workshops, Essentials in Research Administration, and Advanced Topics will have been presented by our amazing faculty: Danforth Nicholas, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Denise Rouleau, Tufts University, and Krista Carmichael, Harvard University; Jeff Seo, Northeastern University and Roseann Luongo, Huron Consulting. Here’s to falling ahead with refreshed knowledge!

**CURRICULUM ON THE HORIZON:**

Clinical Trials workshop, November 13, 2019
RADG, December 4, 2019, Topic TBD

Thank you, Curriculum Committee, chaired by Eva Pasadas, for your hard work organizing our educational offerings all year!

Stay integrated: via eblasts, website updates, tweets and posts on our Region Facebook page: www.facebook.com/ncuraregioni

Donna Smith is Chair of Region I and serves as Senior Research Administration Manager in the Department of Molecular Biology at MGH Research Institute. She can be reached at dsmith23@mgh.harvard.edu

With summer behind us, Region II’s sights are focused on our joint Regional Meeting with Region VIII in Jersey City, NJ. Months of hard work by our program committee, led by Adam Greenberg and Sandy Collier, have produced an exceptiona and diverse program, and we look forward to seeing everyone at the Westin Jersey City Newport.

Looking ahead, as was announced at the Regional Business Meeting at AM61, next year’s Regional Meeting will be held at the Hotel DuPont in Wilmington, DE, in October 2020. Keep an eye on our website and Facebook page for more information, including how to become a part of that meeting’s program committee and help shape the event.

Region II’s steering committee has also had preliminary discussions regarding future meeting sites, and, specifically, the creation of a standard rotation that would ensure that each of our six states hosts a Regional Meeting on a regular basis. (While included in our Region, Washington, DC, hosts the Annual Meeting each year, and thus would be considered on an ad hoc basis.) Being able to focus on a particular geographic location from the get-go will facilitate the efforts of the Region’s site selection committee, and provide the membership a level of certainty that should make budgeting travel expenses somewhat easier.

Speaking of the Annual Meeting, Region II was proud to boast several recipients of awards presented in Washington, DC: Julia Jacobson Distinguished Service Award
John Hanold, The Pennsylvania State University
Dennis Paffrath, University of Maryland, Baltimore

NCURA Distinguished Educator Designation
Marianne R. Woods, Johns Hopkins University

Additionally, Region II awarded a Travel Award to Stefan Brooks, from the Research Foundation of the State University of New York, to offset expenses incurred in his registration and attendance at the Annual Meeting.

Congratulations to all!

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
2019 Elections. We are excited to announce the newest members of NCURA Region III’s executive committee!

- **Chair-Elect:** Scott Niles, Georgia Institute of Technology
- **Secretary:** Kathleen Halley-Octa, Georgia State University
- **Treasurer-Elect:** Marc Haon, University of South Carolina

Scott will become Chair-Elect at the close of the 2020 Spring Meeting. Kathleen and Marc will begin their terms on January 1, 2020. Thank you to all our candidates for their service and dedication to Region III!

**Distinguished Service Award.** Congratulations to the winner of this year’s Region III Distinguished Service Award: **Carpantato (Tanta) Myles** (The University of Alabama)! Tanta is a valued member of Region III and has made outstanding contributions to the field and NCURA. In response to winning the award, Tanta stated, “I am honored to have been nominated and selected by my peers… I must say that it was a pleasant surprise! I have gained so much from my NCURA membership, and I feel that it is my duty, my obligation, and also a privilege to give back to an organization that means so much to me.”

**Region III at AM61.** Region III took AM61 by storm with more than 50 presenters, workshop faculty, and program committee members sharing their expertise with the NCURA community. Members donated a total of $845 to the Education Scholarship Fund through the Regional Raffle and spare change jars. Region III’s generosity paid off when Michele Davis, Tonya Foster, Louise Wensford, Karen Coleman, Kathleen Hally-Octa, Samantha Hickson, Leerin Shields, and Rodney Granec all won prizes in the raffle!

**Spring Meeting.** Region III and Region IV will be teaming up to host the 2020 Spring Meeting at the TradeWinds Island Grand Resort in St. Pete Beach Florida, April 26-29, 2020. The theme for the meeting is “Expanding the Circle: One Profession, Diverse Perspectives.” We will be celebrating the diverse people, institution types, skill sets, and experiences that come together to advance research administration as a profession. If you are interested in presenting, visit our Region IV website to learn more: www.ncuraregioniv.com/conferences.html.

Stay Connected. As always, don’t forget to keep up with what’s going on in the region through the Region III Members Collaborate NCURA community, as well Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram!

**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

Happy Fall NCURA Region IV! Thanks for checking out our Regional Corner. We have updates on our amazing spring 2020 Joint Meeting with Region III, Region IV shout outs, and more!

**Region IV on the National Level:** Region IV is well represented at the nationally. NCURA Board members include [Glenda Bullock](mailto:Glenda.Bullock@umich.edu) from Washington University in St. Louis and [Sue Kelch](mailto:Sue.Kelch@umich.edu) from University of Michigan – Ann Arbor, as well as Presidential Appointee [Jeremy Miner](mailto:Jeremy.Minor@wisc.edu) from University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire. We also have wonderful committee representation. [Robert Andresen](mailto:Robert.Andresen@uw.edu), University of Wisconsin - Madison is Chair of the Nominating & Leadership Development Committee, and [Diane Hillebrand](mailto:Diane.Hillebrand@und.edu), University of North Dakota, is Vice Chair of the Professional Development Committee.

Additionally, at AM61 we celebrated several Region IV National award winners. [Shannon Sutton](mailto:Shannon.Sutton@wiu.edu), Western Illinois University, received the [Julia Jacobson Distinguished Service Award](mailto:Julia.Jacobson@uwec.edu). Craig Reynolds, University of Michigan – Ann Arbor, received the NCURA Distinguished Educator Designation.

**Run for the Region IV Board!** Visit our website [www.ncuraregioniv.com](http://www.ncuraregioniv.com) to learn more about how you can nominate someone or yourself to run for the Region IV Board. Serving on the Board is a great way to get more involved in NCURA on both the regional and national front. Feel free to reach out to any of the current board members for more information. Nominations are due by January 2020.

**Region IV Traveling Workshops:** Sponsored Research Essentials. We will bring two half-day workshops, as one full day, to your institution! Orient your local research administrators in the most essential aspects of pre-award and post-award administration, from budgeting to submission to award management, reporting, and closeouts. Contact [Patience Graybill](mailto:patience.graybill@wustl.edu) to learn more about hosting a workshop at your institution!

Last, but not least, join us in St. Pete Beach, Florida, for the 2020 **Spring Meeting.** “Expanding the Circle: One Profession, Diverse Perspectives!” Mark your calendars for April 26 – 29, 2019. The meeting will be held at the Tradewinds Island Grand Resort in conjunction with Region III. We will be celebrating the diverse people, institution types, skill sets, and experiences that come together to advance research administration as a profession. If you are interested in presenting, visit our Region IV website to learn more: [www.ncuraregioniv.com/conferences.html](http://www.ncuraregioniv.com/conferences.html).

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](mailto:n.nichols@wustl.edu)
It was a pleasure to see more than 140 of you at the Annual Meeting in August, including a significant number at our regional business meeting. At that meeting we were excited to recognize our Region V Joan Howeth National Travel Award Winners, Karina Patino-Guzman (UT Health-San Antonio) and Melissa Robinson (Texas A&M University-Commerce). Additionally, our own Duc Tran (UT Southwestern) received one of the national Catherine Core Minority Travel Awards. Congratulations to these individuals, and a special thanks to Immediate Past Chair Michael Castilleja (University of the Incarnate Word) for overseeing the travel award nomination and selection process.

As announced at the Annual Meeting in Washington, DC, the Region V 2020 Spring Meeting will be held April 26-29, 2020, in Fort Worth, TX. By the time you read this article, you should have already received an announcement about the host hotel and the meeting theme. If you are interested in serving on the program committee or contributing to the meeting in any other way, please email our Chair-Elect, Becky Castillo (UT MD Anderson Cancer Center) at Bcastillo@mdanderson.org. And, if you’re interested in volunteer opportunities for the meeting or other times during the year, contact our Volunteer Coordinator, Susan Hurley (Sam Houston State University) at sdhurley@shsu.edu.

Finally, this past year the national board announced NCURA’s commitment to diversity and inclusion. Region V’s Executive Committee wholeheartedly supports these efforts. At the last spring meeting, some of the small steps we took to make the meeting more inclusive were including microphones in all meeting rooms so all attendees could hear presentations, engaging all interested volunteers in program planning regardless of whether they were brand new members or had been with us for a long time, and providing a variety of networking venues to provide a comfortable setting not only for the extraverts among us but also for introverts. But, as with any efforts to improve organizations, we know we can do better. If you have specific ideas for how we can do a better job of providing opportunities for and including all of our members in regional activities and communications, please email me one of the other Regional Officers. We want your feedback, both positive and negative, to ensure we provide the best experience possible for all members.

Katie Plum is Chair of Region V and serves as Director of Sponsored Projects at Angelo State University. She can be reached at katie.plum@angelo.edu

Regional meeting time is upon us! Thanks to everyone who has worked so hard on the program and logistics for the meeting in Seattle October 27th – 30th. The meeting has its own page with the most current information on the newly updated Region 6 Website: www.ncuraregionvi.org

One part of the regional meeting that is always exciting is the final presentations by our LeadMe mentees. The LeadMe Mentorship Program is a one-year leadership and professional development that helps to grow leaders for NCURA. The Program is in its 10th year and was inspired by and adapted from the NCURA National Leadership Development Institute. Members accepted into the program as mentees are each paired with a mentor who supports the mentee in identifying leadership and professional development goals and objectives. With assistance from their mentor, the mentee formulates a Leadership and Professional Development (L&P) Plan. The plan includes a Personal Best Project that typically aligns with a situation or issue at their home institution they can work to improve, streamline, and/or optimize. This project provides them the opportunity to apply the leadership theories and skills covered during the program.

The LeadMe Program participants explore leadership topics through reading assignments, discussions, and presentations from leaders across the NCURA membership.

At the regional meeting, all mentees will present their Personal Best Project, focusing on how they applied leadership practices during their project. Mentees will present Monday, October 28th in the afternoon. Check the regional meeting app for times and location.

Region 6 Mentees:
Kenia Aviles, Kaiser Permanente
Shannon Chi, University of the Pacific
Exie Leagons, Kaiser Permanente
Patrick Lennon, University of Washington
William Tocki, University of Southern California

Region 6 Mentors:
Derick Jones
Allison Weber
Brigidann Cooper
Manilyn Matau
David Scarbeary-Simmons
Sandra Purves
Theresa Caban
Heather Kubinec

Region 6 Mentors in Training (MINTs):
Cristi Williams
Rosemary Yang
Akilah Pruitt

LeadMe is a fantastic opportunity to expand your leadership knowledge, explore your own leadership style, and hone your leadership skills with a project that will benefit you and your institution. Want to learn more? Reach out to LeadMe Chair, Derick Jones at derickjones@labiomed.org or LeadMe Co-Chair, Nancy Lewis at Nancy.Lewis@research.uci.edu.

Amanda C. Snyder, MPA, is Region V Chair and Associate Director in the Office of Sponsored Programs at the University of Washington. She can be reached at acs229@uw.edu
Was this a great annual meeting or what? Region VII had nearly one-fifth of our region show up at the meeting! We organized our very first Region VII-only activity, a night trolley tour of DC, with 40 members and a great driver/guide. Big thanks to Natalie Buys for her efforts. We also enjoyed regional hospitality sharing with our friends in Region VI, and I must say that our jackalope headgear was enjoyed by many and there are some outstanding photos on the Region VI and VII Facebook sites.

We enjoyed good attendance at our all-region business meeting. Rather than hear committee reports, we sent all reports and the agenda out prior to the meeting so we were able to spend most of the time discussing where we are going strategically as a region, our finances, and our solid and continuing close relationship with Region VI. We wanted to have this strategic discussion because we know that many people can’t attend all meetings and must choose between the regional and the national meetings.

Now, we are headed full tilt towards the Region VI/VII meeting in Seattle. Please checkout the website at ncuraregionvii.org for information. One thing to note: All Region VII members are welcome and encouraged to attend the Sunday morning strategic planning session. It is a time of growth for the region and we want to be thoughtful about the direction we head. One of the questions we have been asking ourselves is, ‘What is the purpose of the regions?’ In this age of instant communications across distances, how does a region stay relevant? How does a region with the large geographical footprint and small number of institutions stay connected with members? How do we recognize members? What will we do to ensure we are enabling succession planning in a way that is both fun and meaningful?

The combined Region VI/VII Site Selection Committee for 2020 has also chosen an exciting site for that meeting – TUSCON! We have contracted with a fun facility. Watch the website for more information.

In the meantime, check out the Region VII website and newsletters at ncuraregionvii.org!

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
App State researchers scale Mount Everest to conduct climate research as part of National Geographic expedition

By Linda Coutant

BOONE, N.C. — From April to June, as part of a robust effort to improve understanding of and resilience to the impacts of climate change on mountain systems, National Geographic and Tribhuvan University led what is likely the most comprehensive single scientific expedition to Mount Everest. It included two faculty researchers from Appalachian State University: Dr. Baker Perry and Dr. Anton Seimon.

The expedition team conducted groundbreaking research in five areas of science that are critical to understanding environmental changes and their impacts: biology, glaciology, geology, mapping and meteorology.

Perry, a professor in Appalachian’s Department of Geography and Planning, served on the expedition’s meteorology team, installing the world’s two highest operating weather stations that will provide researchers, climbers and the public with near real-time information about mountain conditions and help continuously monitor the upper reaches of the atmosphere.

Seimon, a research assistant professor in the Department of Geography and Planning, served on the expedition’s biology team, examining soil samples and glacial lakes to better understand the range of life surviving on Earth’s highest peaks. The team also installed four biodiversity monitoring systems that make up one of the highest Global Observation Research Initiative in Alpine Environments.

Filling critical knowledge gaps

As part of the expedition, the multidisciplinary team achieved the following:

- Installed the two highest weather stations in the world (at 8,430 meters and 7,945 meters).
- Collected the highest-ever ice core sample (at 8,020 meters).
- Conducted comprehensive biodiversity surveys at multiple elevations.
- Completed the highest-elevation helicopter-based lidar scan.
- Expanded the elevation records for high-dwelling species.
- Documented the history of the mountain’s glaciers.

In a June 13 panel discussion as part of National Geographic’s Explorers Festival, Perry said of his team’s weather station installation at more than 27,000 feet, “At the balcony, perched on the southeast ridge of Everest, we found a tiny outcrop of rock and were able to successfully — in a very small area — install the highest weather station in the world. Our Sherpa team was incredible in this effort. They had trained and we had practiced this — and I think their brains worked better at that elevation than ours do — and they were absolutely phenomenal in that team effort.”

Baker said he was impressed with the resiliency of the entire team. “We faced a lot of challenges — 90% of us faced sickness at some point, (and) there were other challenges brought on by the weather that compressed the number of summit days — and to achieve the successes we did was a remarkable testament to the strength of our Sherpa team, our science team, our media team and our Nepali support staff and our partners at Tribhuvan University.”

According to National Geographic, studies have shown that the glaciers of the Hindu Kush Himalaya, where Mount Everest is located, are rapidly disappearing due to increasing global temperatures. The extreme conditions of high-elevation mountain ranges have made studying the true impacts of climate and environmental changes nearly impossible. As a result, there are critical knowledge gaps about the history of these glaciers and about future impacts that their disappearance would have on the lives and livelihoods of the more than 1 billion people in the region who depend on the reliable flow of water these glaciers provide.

“Climate change is one of the biggest challenges facing humanity and there is still much to learn about how it’s already altered the world, from the deepest parts of the ocean to its tallest mountains,” said Jonathan Baillie, executive vice president and chief scientist at the National Geographic Society. “By harnessing our 131-year history of exploration and venturing into some of the most extreme environments on the planet, we will fill critical data gaps on the world’s life support systems and drive solutions to assure that they can continue to fuel our future.”

Documenting change through storytelling

The Everest expedition is part of National Geographic’s new Life at the Extremes program and is the first in a series of Perpetual Planet Extreme Expeditions. The expeditions aim to explore and better understand some of the most extreme environments on planet Earth. The scientific research conducted by the expedition team will be complemented by coverage on NationalGeographic.com and in National Geographic magazine.

For the full story visit https://today.appstate.edu/2019/06/14/expedition
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NCURA CALENDAR OF EVENTS

REGIONAL MEETINGS
Region II (Mid-Atlantic)/Region VIII (International)
October 16-18, 2019 .................................................................Jersey City, NJ
Region VI (Western)/VII (Rocky Mountain)
October 27-30, 2019 ........................................................................Seattle, WA

NATIONAL TRAVELING WORKSHOPS
Contract Negotiation and Administration Workshop
December 4-6, 2019 .................................................................New Orleans, LA
Departmental Research Administration Workshop
December 4-6, 2019 .................................................................New Orleans, LA
Financial Research Administration Workshop
December 4-6, 2019 .................................................................New Orleans, LA
Level I: Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration Workshop
December 4-6, 2019 .................................................................New Orleans, LA
Level II: Sponsored Project Administration Workshop
December 4-6, 2019 .................................................................New Orleans, LA

WEBINARS
• Research Development for Research Administrators: Understanding, Mapping and Leveraging Assets
  October 22, 2019, 2:00-3:30 pm
• Metrics for Post-Award/Research Finance
  November 5, 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

NATIONAL CONFERENCES
Financial Research Administration Conference
March 2-3, 2020 .................................................................San Juan, PR
Pre-Award Research Administration
March 5-6, 2020 .................................................................San Juan, PR

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