Stefanie Keto: (00:03)
Welcome to SRAI Shop Talk, a monthly podcast spotlighting the people, practices, and evolving landscape of research administration, and the community that works collectively to support it. Whether you are new to the field or a seasoned pro, each episode features insights from experts across institutions, big and small, working in pre-award and post-award, compliance, communication, and everything in between. I'm Stephanie Keto, based at the Office of Post-Award Financial Services at North Carolina State University. This season, we're exploring the theme Bridge Builders, creating unity across roles, generations, and technologies.

(00:50)
Welcome to a special live episode of SRAI Shop Talk recorded on site at the SRAI annual meeting in Hawaii. Today, we're bringing you a two-part discussion on the proposed changes to the uniform guidance and the concrete steps you can take right now. In part one, I'm sitting down with Michael Slocum and Tina Hua. Michael, Tina, thank you very much for stepping away from the annual meeting sessions to share your insights with our listeners. To kick things off, could you both introduce yourselves and give a quick overview of your roles?

Michael Slocum: (01:26)
I'm Michael Slocum, I am counsel to SRAI, I have been for many decades. I'm in private practice in the Northern Virginia area, specializing right now mostly in clinical trial contracts and grants, and representing, again, mostly hospitals at this point, in negotiation with drug companies and other institutions.

Stefanie Keto: (01:54)
All right. And?

Tina Hua: (01:55)
Hi, I'm Tina Hua, I am a Senior Director of Compliance and Regulatory Strategy at Stanford University. And I am very happy to be here today.

Stefanie Keto: (02:07)
I'm very happy that you guys were willing to pause your development of professional knowledge and everything and sharing everything with everybody, to share it with our listeners.

(02:16)
So first off, we are talking about the upcoming uniform guidance changes that are in the hopper with everybody. And so I know it's not set in stone right now, but what are some of the things that you're basically hearing that research administrators need to really pay attention to?

Tina Hua: (02:36)
Well, I think that the biggest thing is that we need to just wait and see. We're at a pause right now while the comments are in, they're reviewing the comments, and we'll see what comes out.

(02:49)
But if you look at the proposals, I think the key things that we need to be concerned about and pay attention to is one, that it becomes regulation, not a guidance. That's groundbreaking and something that has never been seen before.

(03:08)
Another thing that people are talking about that is troubling is the fact that terminations could be in the interest of the agency. And if they no longer match current priorities or the national interest, then the awards can be terminated. That just causes too much uncertainty for people to be able to do their research.

(03:32)
Another, and I guess the third of the top three is that now discretionary awards will be reviewed by political appointees and not be based on the typical people with scientific background to be able to determine who gets the awards.

Michael Slocum: (03:54)
And I think Tina's exactly right, we need to wait and see. And I'm no insider, but I've got to say, I believe that the congressional pushback on this is going to be very... It already has been, but it's going to continue to be very significant.

(04:11)
There are parts of the guidance that are, I think, just going toward contracting, the way contracting has been done for years, terminations being the biggest one. You could terminate for any reason or no reason for contracts, forever. And a lot of the folks that are involved in the process now on the government side are contracting people. They're not historically grants professionals, they're contracting professionals, if at all.

(04:44)
But I do think the most important thing is, Congress has already shown they're not particularly happy with the way this has gone so far. And we've got an election coming up in just a few weeks that's going to change things a lot. I think some of the folks in the administration, like always when there's an election, will be out, whether or not the particular people are involved in this is another thing. I just think we're way too early to be trying to do any kind of response to the guidance so far. It just doesn't make sense.

Stefanie Keto: (05:21)
Yeah. And do you think that there's anything on the legal side that institutions should be watching in particular?

Tina Hua: (05:29)
Are you talking about the uniform guidance or just in general?

Stefanie Keto: (05:33)
Well, potentially with the changes in uniform guidance, or maybe if there's something else that you see brewing on your side of the house.

Michael Slocum: (05:42)
I'll jump in and say I think the most important changes that legal, research administration, everybody should be tracking, at least in engineering schools and other places where it's not just grants but contracts, is the new FAR. I think that's probably going to have massive effects, and that's happening. It's happening even in those parts that are not actually being implemented by regulation are being done with deviations, they're being done with guidance, and they're absolutely changing the contracting landscape from beginning to end. Particularly for, again, I'm thinking engineering schools, the land grants schools and the schools that are really doing hard engineering, they need to be looking at the new technical data, the new data rights. They're picking up the DOD concept and trying to spread that to everybody, and that needs to be on everybody's radar, because it's very technical changes and that's why council particularly has got to be involved. But those are significant changes in who gets what rights and how they're done and all of that. So, I do think more attention needs to be paid to the new FAR than to the, maybe what happens with the UG right now.

Tina Hua: (07:13)
I think something else that we haven't talked about is certifications. There is an ever expanding use of the False Claims Act by the government, and they are putting more certification requirements in a lot of the regulations that come out, in order to use the False Claims Act. So be watching what additional requirements there are that force universities to use and to make more certifications. And make sure that if your university or college or institution is certifying something, that it's true.

Michael Slocum: (07:55)
I think Tina's got a very good point there. Certifications, representations, any kind of statements to the government now puts you at real risk. And the recent huge settlements by large institutions that we can say in retrospect should have known better, indicate exactly how DOJ is approaching this and they're pretty aggressive, I think, right now.

Stefanie Keto: (08:25)
So, what would you say are some of the biggest things that the UG changes might push people to maybe think about more, be more aware about? I know that it's all up in the air because nothing's been put in place, but I know that there's changes to maybe publications and the costs that can be charged. But I don't know about on the legal side if there's anything that could impact it, since y'all both have more experience in the legal arena.

Michael Slocum: (08:58)
Again, I hesitate to pay too much attention to the UG. I do think the restrictions on foreign awards at NIH, it's a massive change. We really had very open science going, particularly with European institutions and Asian institutions, and it's just, what are you going to do about it now? The collaboration, it's there, but it's hard to do compared to the way it was six months ago.

Tina Hua: (09:35)
I absolutely agree. It's this research security trajectory and we are just becoming more and more insular.

Michael Slocum: (09:43)
And the other thing that I do think for those institutions that are entrepreneurial, if you want to put it that way, that there's a problem, there's a real problem with SBIR and STTR, the small business administration and the whole infrastructure there is almost just dead. I mean, getting anything in and out of those agencies is very difficult, if it's possible at all. And where the policy's going, I mean, anything related to diversity has become just a total bugaboo. And so, policies have just flipped on their head. It's like being through the looking glass on this.

(10:39)
And the other side of that, I do think that there's a continuing and growing opportunity. And in fact, I looked, and the DOD went from OTAs of $1.8 billion, sounds like a lot of money, to $18 billion in just a very short period of time. And I don't-

(11:03)
In just a very short period of time. And I don't think, again, I started back in the days when the big engineering schools, the Stanfords and the A&Ms, and the so forth were the big players, now it's all healthcare, healthcare, healthcare. But there's a lot of opportunity, I think, particularly in the OTA area for entrepreneurial universities to pair with industry. And really, if you're going after some research money, particularly engineering research, I think there's a real opportunity there that universities are not yet looking at.

Stefanie Keto: (11:44)
Okay. So, what would you say, or I guess, what would you suggest that institutions and research administration teams should be doing now to prepare for some of these changes that are coming?

Tina Hua: (11:58)
I think that it's a good idea to inventory what you have so that you can see where the gaps are. When we were talking about certifications, make sure someone understands what exactly you're certifying. And then from there, someone's looking at it to see whether or not these certifications are true or not. The same with processes. Michael and I were teaching a research law class yesterday, and I think that's something that the audience agreed with very wholeheartedly. It's really important to understand your processes so that you can make sure that there's no gaps in them. So, I would start with that, especially since we're facing all of this uncertainty with where the UG is going, the [inaudible 00:12:52] revision.

(12:53)
There's a lot of new stuff that's coming down the pipeline, that we are right in the middle of waiting for, and so this would be a good time to just see what we have. And to the extent where you know that there's research security requirements that you have to do, start implementing those too.

Michael Slocum: (13:13)
And the other thing that we talked about yesterday, Tina's office is, she's got a new kind of an office, research compliance strategy. And I think, number one, I think that's a great idea for everybody. But I think the other thing that that indicates is universities generally should be looking at other universities and every other kind of institution, but especially the leading universities, and looking at what they're doing right now to get ready, developing these new kind of positions. And I've always thought that we need more strategic planning at a senior level of research administration. And that includes compliance by far, but in every area.

(14:06)
And Stanford, I think, is always a leading institution anyway, but University of Washington, particularly with their global management, Washington University in St. Louis, again, some of the leading institutions, we ought to be copycats. We ought to be looking and say, they're doing it, why shouldn't we at least think about doing it?

Stefanie Keto: (14:32)
Well, it's about not reinventing the wheel too. So, if you all work together collaboratively looking at this kind of stuff, we share the load of the work, I guess, because we're all looking at new ways to make

things easier. And maybe that could help with maybe not putting a lot of this in AI too, because I know there's some legal concerns with AI as well, which we won't go into today. But I know that that is out there as well. So, well, do you have any other tips and tricks that you want to put out there for anybody else before we sign off?

Michael Slocum: (15:08)
The only thing I would note, there's a poster at the conference here, on the length of time for reviewing clinical trials. And I actually took a picture of the poster, because it was shocking to me how long it was taking for some organizations and individuals to take, given I do this every day. And the poster was about standardizing the process to shorten that time. And I think we are in the Model T age as it comes to AI, and using AI as a tool. And I do think that council's office in particular... I mean, university after university, council's office is known as the black hole, where everything goes into and dies. And I think we really do need to, given understanding of the dangers, I think council, attorneys in research administration, whether you're officially in council's office or otherwise, I think we really need to be looking at how to use these AI tools to increase our speed of response.

(16:26)
Because I do think right now... Like I say, I was just shocked by how long it was taking these folks to process things, that I expect my staff to go through in a few days, and they're taking hundreds of days. And I can't believe that that's acceptable to any institution.

Stefanie Keto: (16:50)
Well, and that would add to cost efficiency too, if you're looking at that ROI.

Michael Slocum: (16:59)
Oh yeah. There is no ROI, if you take 100 days.

Stefanie Keto: (17:01)
100s of day, yeah.

Michael Slocum: (17:01)
The study's over.

Stefanie Keto: (17:03)
Yeah. Well, I like your analogy too that we're in the Model T era. Well, Tina and Michael, thanks for coming and joining us, letting me snag you for a brief second for today, I really did appreciate chatting with you.

Tina Hua: (17:18)
Thank you, it was our pleasure.

Michael Slocum: (17:19)
Thank you. Thank you.

Stefanie Keto: (17:22)
Welcome back to part two of our live discussion from Hawaii, regarding the proposed changes of Uniform Guidance. To keep this conversation going, I'm joined by Marchon Jackson and Stacy Pritt. Marchon, Stacy, thank you so much for taking time away from your annual meeting schedule to join us on the mic. But before we jump into the discussion, could you introduce yourselves and tell us a little bit about your roles?

Stacy Pritt: (17:48)
I am associate vice chancellor and chief research compliance officer for the Texas A&M University system. We are a system of 12 universities and eight state agencies, so 20 members. And within my scope of work, I have a variety of areas of research compliance, oversight of human research, animal research, research and biohazards, also including conflict of interest and research misconduct, and emerging areas, such as AI and research, and even a few other things that are popping up.

Marchon Jackson: (18:20)
So, my name is Marchon Jackson, I'm the special assistant to the AVP of research, at the University of Maryland College Park, and I've been in research administration for 20+ years, and I've worked in a number of institution types and organizations. Just recently worked for Howard University, and also in nonprofit research organization. So, I kind of have a lot of different views on research. And I am a SRAI distinguished faculty member, which I'll just given my medallion at lunch today. And I also, on the COGR board of directors, and I'm looking forward to our talk today.

Stefanie Keto: (19:00)
Yeah. So, am I. So, first question I have for both of y'all is, what are you hearing right now that research administrators really need to be paying attention to?

Stacy Pritt: (19:09)
I mean, I can go ahead and start. And this also ties in, of course, with research compliance, is that there are going to be, and there's proposed to be, more requirements, but these requirements are coming earlier in the proposal life cycle. Rather than waiting until an institution is notified of an award, there seems to be a lot more monitoring, screening, approvals, reviews, et cetera, that are occurring now, and that are expected in the near future, that have to be done even before the proposal is submitted. And then beyond that, even before you can get to the point of the institution being awarded the award, there's going to be even more reviews occurring

at the federal agency level. So, that brings the processes and timelines into the spotlight now, as far as what we have to be aware of in addition to meeting those compliance requirements.

Marchon Jackson: (20:15)
Absolutely. And I'm thinking in their broad buckets of changes that we've been seeing in a lot of different association work, and a lot of different conversations at the conference. The first one is, everyone's looking into obviously the proposal [inaudible 00:20:36] changes to Uniform Guidance. Within that wider framework change, there could be a number of things institutions have to prepare for. Also, there's been a lot of terminations and award conditions put on institutions, and they're having to make very hard decisions on what type of research to support. And what do you do in the case you do get a termination? Do you support faculty? Who bears those costs? Do you go after closeout costs?

(21:12)
So, there's a number of things I think folks are thinking about there. And then also, lastly, I would say the topic of payments have been coming up, believe it or not. A lot of people have seen there's been an increased burden in terms of having justifications when you submit bills to the government, and they are rejecting invoices or short paying them, and institutions are having to kind of modernize how they're handling their receivables with the federal government. So, that's another major area that affects the bottom line too.

Stacy Pritt: (21:47)
And I wanted to add on this focus on being overly broad in scope, let's say, on some of these topics, we're not receiving agency guidance in the normal...

(22:03)
... agency guidance in the normal timeframes that we're used to, that framework has shifted. We've seen a few areas where there's a few more areas to come, in particular in life sciences research and research using biological agents or biohazards, that the policy or the requirements are coming well before any particular agency guidance. And that does make it difficult to fully understand what is included in these more sweeping changes and the very broad language. And I've also heard it this morning in a session that some people think that we aren't going to get agency guidance. Some things may come out of determinations made by the courts, if there's lawsuits. Some of it may come just by hearing things from the agencies through proposal denials and that information then flows throughout the research community.

Marchon Jackson: (23:07)
Yeah. I guess the only other thing I could add too is I did a workshop on Saturday for uniform guidance and what to be aware of. And one of the things a lot of the participants had questions on and that I kind of focus on is the proposed changes are essentially halted until December 11th, but institutions should start thinking about not necessarily changing everything for the proposed changes, but preparing in case things do change. Are you aware of who on general counsel you would talk to evaluate can I accept this term and condition at our institution? Or in the case of flattening all the agencies to follow this uniform grants regulation is what they're retitling it and taking away all the agency guidance. So think about how we treat NIH very differently from NSF, from USDA. So if you're an institution that has a nuanced system that usually handles NIH money this way, what happens if you have to change that? Can you update your system very quickly? Can you make sure that you're following the guidance? What would be the process?

(24:32)
And also, the other piece of it is a lot of institutions that are bigger, I've seen this issue, they become so decentralized. So then it becomes also like, are you ready to train and do you have communications set up quickly enough to make sure all these different kingdoms on your campus all speak the same language and follow the new guidance correctly?

Stacy Pritt: (25:00)
And even on the systems, that's a really important point, institutions may not have fully mapped out their systems. They may not be fully documented and they actually may not know who makes certain decisions. And so that's significant if institutions don't have all of that information together or in one place or just known, so that they could progress to make the changes necessary. And also too, with these shorter timeframes and putting more of those reviews and approvals, et cetera, at that proposal at the time of submission, that's a framework shift for research administration. And so, what used to work can't necessarily be relied on in certain areas moving forward.

Stefanie Keto: (25:51)
Yeah. And going back to what you were saying, Marchon, I was just in a session about weak SOPs. So they were talking about how do you have your SOPs and policies guided? And this kind of talks what you were saying as well. And someone in the audience said, "Well, that's where you should have ambassadors at every unit." So going back to the decentralization, maybe an institution could institute like an ambassador program, so that there is a person at every place that could then be pulled into a meeting and then just say, "Hey, rapid fire, we need to put all this stuff out and boom- boom-boom."

Stacy Pritt: (26:32)
And now is the time to start socializing the changes with research faculty and staff and others. They might be hearing certain things through the media or even internally with the institution, but we're in a period of rapid change in timelines and in volume and in scope. And so, they may not know everything that's coming down the line that may impact their research.

Marchon Jackson: (27:00)
Absolutely. And it kind of aligns with part of my new role. I just recently transitioned back to Maryland and one big project that our campus leadership has been working on is creating shared services, which is why I was really interested in the podcast with Marcos and the other two colleagues you had, one from NYU and I can't remember who the third one was, but they have really good information. But the idea is we do want to centralize some aspects of what's happening out there. And this is one of the areas that I'm focused on is not only creating a good pre and post award centralized model for our larger schools, but the training and communication piece for faculty and department folks because every kingdom has different levels of communication and training availability.

(27:56)
So I think institutions in the future, no matter what, because of all these changes, it should give them the signal like, "Hey, even if we don't want to centralize everything, you do need to start thinking about how can I quickly mobilize some form of uniformity across the entire campus?"

Stacy Pritt: (28:18)
And that's very important because you don't want research faculty in one college, for example, to hear a different message than faculty at another college, engineering versus college of science, whatever it may be. Because that inconsistency in messaging can be very detrimental to the research enterprise in general.

Marchon Jackson: (28:42)
100%. And it's kind of scary too. I was thinking about it in the workshop we're talking about how NIH has this deviation. Everyone else is saying, okay, de minimis is 15% now. They're saying, "No, no, no, we're going back to 2017. It's 10%." Can your system handle both those percentages? And the other piece is when they're routing proposals, if your institution is decentralized where a college may have its own AOR, they may certify it one way, another college may certify another way, but your school now has inconsistent proposals being submitted to the government. So it's a real issue with all these changes and trying to keep up with, okay, is it this version, is it 2024? Are we going to do these things that they proposed in 2026? You do need to have some level of consistency.

Stefanie Keto: (29:39)
Right, right. Well, it also kind of leads to, I know we've done some podcasts earlier this year about succession planning, right? So making sure that, and this also kind of falls into that, right? So what happens when that one individual who's doing it right leaves? Now, is there enough continuity that can lead to that succession planning for the next person?

Stacy Pritt: (29:58)
Yeah. What kind of knowledge do they hold, institutional knowledge that maybe hasn't been adequately documented or mapped out or transferred to other individuals?

Stefanie Keto: (30:08)
I met a girl earlier today who took over an office and it was her and five new people. And she said they had nothing documented and they don't know how to do anything. And I was like, "Oh, let me offer you some pointers, but I don't know what else to do for you other than maybe talk to your IT folks."

Marchon Jackson: (30:29)
Geez. No, it's serious. And it's catching up with us. I think as a field, we're still formalizing research administration. So people are learning on the job or they get the old-fashioned training with, "Oh, this is the way we've always done it here at XYZ university." But to your point, SOPs, processes, systems, this is the time to start mapping it out because this will be a seismic shift in basically how the government is approaching handing out billions of dollars. And I don't know if everyone's prepared for that.

Stefanie Keto: (31:13)
True.

Marchon Jackson: (31:14)
And that could put a lot of people at risk.

Stefanie Keto: (31:16)
Well, and then on the back end of everything, I think that the word that everybody doesn't like to hear is audit, right? So then, all of this feeds into the audit scope on the back end, especially the systems piece, right? So that is a very good point that maybe that might come up, maybe the weak policies might come up, maybe the undocumented stuff or maybe documented incorrectly. All of that could feed into additional issues that are out there.

(31:45)
So what do you think will have the biggest impact on our day-to-day moving forward as research administrators?

Marchon Jackson: (31:52)
I'd say day-to-day, it's already hard enough where I think administrators, like I love your example with the new person with five new people. It's hard enough to keep up with all the changes. And I think with just the rapid amount of change that's happened since 2024, I think that's going to be hard to keep up from a pre and post-award perspective. If I'm responsible for pumping out a hundred proposals and all of a sudden our institution's like, "We got to pump out 200," now we're putting a burden on a newer population of administrators who really aren't getting additional resources to not only do all of that pushing, but then they have to stop, attend conferences like this, maybe attend webinars, start reading UG, propose changes. There isn't really enough time for them to digest all these changes...

(33:03)
... time for them to digest all these changes and do their jobs. So I feel like the daily work is going to get really hectic next year. I do think there will be some changes. I know it's paused. I don't know if everything will be in there, but even if it's a third of it, it's going to be a lot of work for people.

(33:27)
I have heard some sessions on people using AI to assist with the additional workload, but I don't think the AI can actually teach people how to manage the changes. Like you were saying, did you map out your systems? Do you know your SOPs? Do you know who to talk to?

Stacy Pritt: (33:43)
Right.

Marchon Jackson: (33:43)
So all of that combined, I think is going to add a lot of stress for people in the next year or two, just trying to adopt all these changes.

Stacy Pritt: (33:53)
Well, a couple things on that. I went to a session earlier today about using AI for research operations. It was a good session. And the speaker really had some excellent points. Yes, the use of AI can reduce your workload. So then your capacity grows either for the same work or to do higher level work, more deep thought. And so that was really good. But he reiterated AI agents or bot or whatever it is have to be continually trained. And so we are in a time of a lot of change, a lot of nuance, things like that, so somebody's got to be on top of the training and the management of those AI tools, otherwise they will become out of date.

(34:43)
And then you also have to constantly look at your return on investment for the use of AI because, and I know this from some discussions even at my... Well, I'm at, the system, even from my employer, AI tokens, the AI use, that's only going to get more expensive and so you have to plan for that escalation and price.

(35:05)
And then going back to what you were talking about on the workload and the burden as well, you've got to shift to more requirements of proposal combined also with shorter proposal timelines, which we haven't talked about yet. I mean, I've seen some 30 days, I've heard from our grants group, they've seen some at three weeks. So all of the work that research administrators have done for years now to streamline, to decrease administrative burden, to provide that customer service, to really support researchers through that life cycle. And part of that, especially for big organizations is establishing timelines to ensure that all the checks are done and things are submitted correctly, that really disrupts that significantly. So I think that's going to be a huge challenge from however the organization is structured, that hits at all levels, just managing that shift.

Marchon Jackson: (36:09)
Yeah. And not to deviate too much, but I was in the AI session too and I appreciated the approach this individual's institution took. And we're in our infancy stages at my current institution. It's just really me and another person who are trying to put the base kind of framework in for how are we going to use this thing?

(36:35)
But I learned from the session, it is really important that you have a dedicated person or persons who's doing what Stacy said. They have to continuously assess, does this language model really produce the output that doesn't have hallucinations, doesn't do things that we didn't intend it, but then also is being used in a uniform way. And I think that's the fear I have with what I think is going to happen because they did say, "Okay, everybody who's using AI, raise your hand." And everybody's using it. They're like, "Who used it a month ago, a week ago, five minutes ago?" Everybody's raising their hand.

(37:19)
So that's scary because I don't think we have a uniform framework for how to use it and tools that are standardized back to the whole centralizing communications. We need to centralize how it's being used so we're not producing all these wildly different things across our campuses to deal with this problem. But I think AI is definitely going to be used to deal with this. There's just no way around it.

Stefanie Keto: (37:53)
And there's going to have to be a lot of governance, probably like you were mentioning institutionally based governance.

Stacy Pritt: (37:58)
And institutions really struggle on what that governance is going to look like. Many institutions have policies now, many institutions don't. Some of them have been into some discussions, for example, with the Association of Public Land Grant Universities, they hold periodic discussions and a lot of institutions are, what are we going to do here? Where is the starting point? And it's changing rapidly too.

Stefanie Keto: (38:33)
And that's where that relationship with general counsel is going to be, make sure you got your lawyers ready.

Marchon Jackson: (38:39)
Ready to go. Ready to go.

Stefanie Keto: (38:41)
Right. Yeah. Yeah, they're going to be your friends. Well, I want to say thank you to both of you for letting me pull you away from your professional development and speaking, both of you are speaking and presenting. So I appreciate you taking the time to step away from all of these additional things [inaudible 00:39:01] to talk to us and share your knowledge and information that you have with our listeners. I greatly appreciate it.

Marchon Jackson: (39:07)
Thank you.

Stacy Pritt: (39:08)
Thank you.

Stefanie Keto: (39:09)
What a fantastic set of conversations live from the SRAI annual meeting in Hawaii. I want to extend a massive thank you to Michael Slocum, Tina Hua, Marchon Jackson, and Stacy Pritt for letting me pull them away from the annual meeting to share their expertise for the upcoming changes with uniform guidance.

(39:29)
Gathering at the annual meeting really proves how vital it is for our community to connect and learn from one another. If you couldn't make the trip to Hawaii, SRAI has you covered with the upcoming Encore series. Running from November 3rd to March 30th, this webinar series brings 19 of the best sessions from the annual meeting straight to your screen every Tuesday at 2:00 PM Eastern.

Whether you register for individual topics or decide to join the full series, it's your best chance to access the latest insights from Honolulu. Register today at sraiinternational.org.

(40:06)
A huge thank you as always to our wonderful podcast team and everyone who continually contributes to enhancing this podcast. We are proud that this platform brings together people, ideas, and new opportunities in research administration. The conversation doesn't stop here. We would love to hear from you. Please submit your suggestions for future episodes of SRAI Shop Talk to shoptalk@srai.org. Thank you again for listening to this episode. Don't forget to subscribe and help grow our community by sharing. I'm Stefanie Keto and I'll catch you on the next episode.