

INSIDE:

PAGE 2

Cyber-place



PAGE 3

Ask Ann Granters



PAGE 4

Outside the Beltway



PAGE 5

The Margin, A Financial Challenge



PAGES 6-7

Regional Corner



PAGES 8-9

A Conversation with the New Editor of RMR



OPRR Establishes New Expedited Review Categories for Human Subject Research



PAGE 10

Once Upon a Time...



PAGE 11

EARS Symposium II



PAGE 12

Call for Nominations Vice President/President-Elect and Secretary



PAGES 13-22

Advertisements



PAGE 23

NCURA Calendar



PAGE 24

In Memoriam, Harold B. Hunnicutt

ncura

newsletter

A publication of The National Council of University Research Administrators

Revitalizing Research Partnerships— The Theme of Our 40th Year

by Cheryl-Lee Howard



*Cheryl-Lee Howard,
NCURA President*

That old saying that “Life Begins at Forty” doesn’t ring true. My life certainly began well before I turned 40. And NCURA has been alive and vital for all of its 40 years. But 40th birthdays frequently do coincide with turning points in lives and careers. That magic 4-0 has become a traditional time to take stock of

where we’ve been and where we still want to go. Some people prepare checklists of things they always wanted to do. Others start reaping the harvest of years of hard work—watching their children leave the nest or finally getting that great promotion. We go on diets, enroll in classes, start exercising regularly, travel more, read all the great books, contact old friends...in short we do the things that will help ensure success during the rest of our lives. It’s a highly creative and energetic point in most lives.

This year NCURA looks every bit like that classic 40-year-old—we’re making projections, revitalizing, making plans for our future success and strength. In the last newsletter, Immediate Past President Mary Husemoller talked about last year’s Strategic Planning initiatives. This process has created a check list of things which need to happen to ensure that our organization maintains its high quality of services. Each President for the next five years is expected to select a few items from the checklist on which to concentrate effort. This year, we are looking at what I consider some basic building blocks in the areas of financial stability, electronic systems and organizational structure. The Task Force on Strategic Financial Planning and the Task Force on Strategic

(continued on page 11)

NCURA Calls for Nominations for the offices of Vice President/ President-Elect and Secretary

*See page 12 for information
and nomination forms*

STRAIGHT TALK: A PRIMER ON AWARD ADMINISTRATION

April 8, 1999

11:00 am-4:30 pm
(Eastern Daylight Time)

Broadcast live via satellite
from Washington, D.C.

Check out the
program on line at
www.ncura.edu

*See our ad and registration form
on pages 16-17.*

FDP JOINS NCURA IN SPONSORING ERA IV

Andy Rudczynski and Jerry Stuck



Andy Rudczynski



Jerry Stuck

The ERA IV program committee is hard at work putting together another conference on the important topic of Electronic Research Administration. ERA IV will be held in Atlanta, Georgia from August 5-7, 1999 at the Emory University Conference Center. In keeping with NCURA’s theme of building partnerships, we are pleased that we will be partnering with the Federal Demonstration Partnership in sponsoring the conference. We expect to have the involvement

of the FDP institutions and their representatives, both faculty and staff.

Pre-conference workshops, patterned after the very successful ERA III sessions, will be held on Thursday morning followed by the conference opening at 1:00 PM. A plenary session with faculty users of electronic research administration tools is planned for the opening.

Throughout the conference we will have approximately 40 concurrent sessions, with discussion and demonstration sessions and open training labs following. The conference will close on Saturday afternoon at 4:30 PM.

(continued on page 11)

CYBER-place



While we are waiting....

Nancy Wray, Amin Plaisted, John Carfora

About a year ago Bob Killoren, at Penn State, asked how many of us were waiting to implement ERA on our campuses. Lots of hands were raised and may still be raised. Yet we can not just wait. There is much to do before we can decide what ERA process we are choosing to implement, and how best to introduce it within our respective campuses.

Every research office, whether one person or many, needs to assess where they are and where they want to go. A needs assessment that defines current workflow and data collection processes; technologies supporting workflow and data collection; ERA goals and a how to achieve them; current technical support and future needs; and resources to meet our goals will be the tool to get us ready to implement ERA. This is not a simple task. The needs assessment will be a time consuming processes that should have input from various areas within our campuses. It is a task that usually requires a team of creative, enthusiastic individuals that are ready to take on this activity– and to do so in addition to their everyday responsibilities.

Each of you will have to decide how to get started, but here are a few suggestions. First, get support from senior administrators on your campus. A presentation to explain ERA to deans and directors of key areas may help build support for your project. Directors of Computing Services are very important especially since your project will need technical support. In addition, get to know what other campus systems are being developed and where the technology could be transferred to your project, thus saving you development time and resources. A good example would be an electronic routing of online payroll authorizations that requires digital signatures. The method used in this project maybe transferable to the routing and signatures of proposals.

The second suggestion pertains to the creation and organization of your assessment team. Getting representatives from academic departments, faculty, research office, research supporting services, and computing services will bring a wide perspective to the project. By including the various user groups, there is

an opportunity for each group to voice their needs, which may not be apparent from a central administrative perspective. Be prepared to give up what you thought was the perfect design, for it may not work at the department level. The assessment project should be broken down into tasks with subgroups assigned to investigate, assess, and make recommendations to the larger group. Regularly scheduled meetings with action items seem to keep the momentum going. Asking what the process is and why it should continue is important in defining the direction of ERA. This is an opportunity for change, and for changing responsibilities. We can maintain our oversight but let's be creative!

There are at least two key elements to ensure a successful ERA outcome and these elements should be with the project from the beginning of your assessment. One is technical coordination and support, and the other is a training program. Today, faculties are sending proposals via an interactive web that requires training and may require technical support. PDF files work great if the software is loaded on the faculty member's machine, the faculty know how to use it, and they are not using LaTeX or some other non-PDF compatible software. Who currently is providing the support? Is this adequate to meet the needs as more faculty submit proposals electronically? A solution may be an Institutional Training Program responsible for instructing the community on how to use any new system implemented across campus. Likewise, a Train-the-Trainer program that creates a network of knowledgeable users across campus is equally valuable. See what other institutions have done to meet this challenge.

Technical support is essential, and determining who will provide that support will need to be made early in the project. Technical support can be broken into two broad areas—administrative and academic. If your campus has an academic computing group to support teaching activities, they may be willing to support faculty research proposal activities. This group may already have solved PDF issues and be ready to help faculty with their problems. If faculty do not have this support, what other support centers can

be identified to assist them? As we all know, there is nothing worse than a frustrated faculty member at deadline time trying to get the narrative of the proposal saved and transmitted exactly as he or she expects. The importance of this support may need to be communicated to an academic dean assigning the task to the faculty representative on your assessment team. Getting this issue resolved now can only help you with electronic proposals today and in establishing an ERA process in the future.

On the administrative technical support front, how much support is enough? "Front" as in battlefield is a very apt analogy, for moving into ERA is a major effort requiring significant human and material resources. There's a military axiom that says it will take roughly three times as much in human and material resources to advance to a new position as it does to hold the one you have. Well, ERA is definitely a new position. If you currently are receiving half-time (or less) technical support, it would probably be better to have one full-time staff person dedicated to supporting your process, just to "hold your current position". If the axiom is correct, now multiply by three.

You now have the core technical support that can work with you to advance to a new ERA position. Whether you eventually decide to outsource major components, build in-house, or build and buy from components available today, your core technical staff is critical to getting the job done.

An area that should not take additional resources, but can move you toward ERA implementation is the assessment of the data being collected. Begin to compare your data requirements with what federal agencies will require to be transmitted. The 194 data set is fairly stable and available on agency ERA web sites. Define the missing elements in your data and begin to collect the information, making sure to regularly revise your current workflow and data collection processes. No matter what system you eventually decide to implement, the data will need to be available.

(Continued on page 7)



Ask Ann Granters

by Bob Lucas

Institute for Scholarly Productivity
San Luis Obispo, California

DEAR ANN: I'm with a federal agency, and there's something I'd like you to pass along to your readers.

I've noticed that some folks need to work on the voice message technique.

Often they lumber through a phone message, mumbling and stumbling along until they get to their phone number, through which they race inaudibly.

The message goes something like this. "I'm, uh, calling, uh, because . . .

I'm was wondering, sort of, is there like information . . . or do you have, say, any policy, or maybe know someone who knows, like how much I can transfer between uh line items on my grant? . . . I uh couldn't find anything in the regs . . . that seemed, well, clear, at least not, uh, here, and so maybe you or someone else could uh think about it and call me if there is a mmm policy?

"If, uh, you can, like, give me a call, my number is 85549578 .

"Uh, thanks. Bye."

They hem and haw through a conversation, and then when they get to the critical part, their phone number, they rush through it in two seconds.

Why do they do that? Come to think of it, I don't even care. Just tell them when they get to their telephone number, the only reason for leaving it is so we can get out our pencil and write it down, not so they can show off how fast they can say it. If anything, this is where they should become even more deliberate.

SLOWER PLEASE

DEAR SLOWER: I know what you mean. I've often had to rerun a phone message three or four times to decipher a spate of numbers.

My suspicion is people do this because they're self-conscious about calling to ask about something they don't know the answer to. When they finally get to something in their message they're sure about, they're so relieved, they reel it off,

almost like they're thinking, "Ho, ho, ho, look how fast I can do this. And you thought I didn't know anything!!"

A warning in this column might help you with this problem. But you might also do what one research administrator has done. On his outgoing phone message he says, "Please speak your telephone number slowly and clearly." When I heard that, I did.

DEAR ANN: A few columns back, you gave advice about how to sort through the equivocal statements in letters of recommendations for a new hire. I thought I would share with you some non-equivocal statements taken from actual performance evaluations:

"His men would follow him anywhere, but only out of morbid curiosity."

"I would not allow this employee to breed."

"She would be out of her depth in a parking lot puddle."

"Works well when under constant supervision and cornered like a rat in a trap."

"This young lady has delusions of adequacy."

"He sets low personal standards and then consistently fails to achieve them."

"This employee is depriving a village somewhere of an idiot."

TOUCHE

DEAR TOUCHE: Ouch! Don't try these at home.

DEAR ANN: I'm at a small university that is just now beginning to write proposals. Some folks are trying hard, but with little success.

There's one guy I feel especially sorry for. He's so late getting into the game, at this point in his career, he has zilch to show sponsors. He's been turned down at least eight times in the last year and a half, and hasn't gotten a grant yet.

I'm beginning to worry he could become so despondent he might do something drastic. Any thoughts about what I might do to help a faculty member who must feel like life is passing him by?

CARING BUT CLUELESS

DEAR CARING: A lot of faculty members perk up when they do something the administration thinks is important enough to send out Federal Express. I know of people who have written proposals simply to have something FedExed. For them, one of the thrills in life is making the 3:30 pickup. (No 3¢ stamp was ever as exciting.) They love to let it casually drop in the coffee room, "I'm pooped. I just got [whatever] off to Federal Express. What a hassle!" Your faculty member might be one of those.

So if you're really worried about his health, play along. Come up with some excuse to mail off something in his name Federal Express. A letter to your congressional representative's office explaining how coming regulations might adversely impact his research, with a copy of the Federal Register thrown in for bulk, could do nicely.

It doesn't matter much what it is, as long as you have something to slip something into a red, white and blue envelope with the glassine window for instructions and his name on the return address.

If he is having a really bad day, you might post it for same day delivery.

This could carry him for a couple of weeks. When the effects wear off, have a friend across the country FedEx him something back. This will give you a month to work with. By then I might come up with something else.

Got questions? Or other things of that ilk? Or, more succinctly, "Got ilk?"

Send your ilk to:

Ask Ann Granters
NCURA
One Dupont Circle, Suite 220
Washington, D.C. 20036

Outside the Beltway

Steven Smartt

It's not often that research administrators have a chance to play an important role in addressing a regulatory development that strikes at core principles of research.

Thanks to some legislative language that was quietly inserted into a congressional funding bill last October, we now have a nice, slow pitch right down the middle of the plate. It's time to go to bat.

I hope this column is not the first place you have read about a proposed regulatory change that would require federal agencies to make available to the public all data produced under federal awards, through the Freedom of Information Act. You may be surprised to learn, however, that many of your faculty and principal investigators are not yet familiar with this development and its potential impact. These researchers may also look to you for advice on what to do as the proposed regulation takes shape.

Normally this space in the NCURA Newsletter is devoted to analysis, if not ramblings, on some aspect of national policy or funding for research. This time I cannot resist offering a prescription for action.

As some readers of this column know, I believe research administrators, especially those in central research support offices, can and should contribute to their institution's efforts to monitor and respond to federal issues. Here's a perfect chance to become involved, although close coordination with your federal relations staff is both useful and wise.

Here are some suggested steps for addressing this issue:

First, become familiar with primary sources and documents pertaining to the proposed regulation. Read the Proposed Revision that appears in the Federal Register dated February 4, 1999, pages 5684-5685. One

way to link to the MB Notice on the Web and to monitor recent developments is through the NIH Web site at <http://www.nih.gov/grants/news.htm>.

The Chronicle of Higher Education has also printed informative articles on this development, including some background on the dispute that prompted this proposed remedy.

Second, formulate a position on the issues and problems presented by this regulation. Among the substantive problems are the potential compromise of confidentiality of research data, especially for research subjects. Proprietary interests of universities and even the industrial co-sponsors of research may be compromised. Premature release of data even before they have been adequately analyzed and the results reported to the public would be especially troublesome. And what use are raw data without a comprehensive explanation of how the data were collected and recorded? These are only some of the problems associated with open access to research data.

Resisting public access to data obtained in publicly-funded activities would appear contrary to serving the public good. It takes a delicate argument to balance the public benefit from the results of research against the risks associated with complete openness of research records.

Next, make certain that someone informs your institution's senior management or, if you are a departmental or center administrator, apprise your chair or director. Write an internal memo summarizing the issue, citing the text of the original legislation (H.R. 4328, The Omnibus Appropriations Bill for FY99, Page H-11178), and the recent Federal Register notice.

Your office should also consider communicating directly with your faculty and researchers. Either a widely distributed e-mail or a targeted message to a sample of your most active and well respected investigators would be a good idea. Ask them to give you a sense of the impact this regulation would have on the research they perform and ask them what concerns they have about access to their data.

Before April 5, make sure your chief executive or other senior official will write to the Office of Management and Budget within the 60-day comment period to

register your institution's views on this issue. You may need to assume the role of lead person to craft such a letter. Use the time between now and late March to gather input from faculty and others.

Offer to assist the government relations staff at your institution or enlist in a national association's working group to monitor and address this issue, e.g., AASCU, AAU, or NASULGC. These organizations and others provide excellent service in intelligence gathering and shaping consensus. The action on this matter may soon shift to the congressional arena, where one bill already has been introduced to reverse the legislation that set this regulatory change in motion last fall. It will be essential to monitor and follow a collective strategy.

Faculty and researchers should also be encouraged to submit comments to OMB during the comment period. It's important that faculty input be seen as individual opinion, as opposed to institutional views. Ideally, a central repository for copies of any faculty letters would be a good idea. Not only is it useful as an archive and a gauge of the sentiment among your researchers, but also as input to help frame your institutional position and to provide anecdotal examples.

What's the rationale for us as research administrators assuming a role in dealing with this particular issue? Research administrators and their institutions have a stake in this issue. The potential administrative burden for complying with even a small number of requests for research data will present significant distractions as well as costs. A researcher in any field deserves better than to labor under the threat of having to disclose raw data even to well-intentioned parties.

In his State of the Union address in January, President Clinton expressed a desire that Y2K be the last challenge of this century and not the first crisis of the next. Access to research data produced under federal awards has the potential to be the next crisis for researchers.

My hope is that every research administration office will see a clear way to serve their institution and the research community by helping respond to this very serious issue.

Steve Smartt, a Past President of NCURA, is Director, Division of Sponsored Research at Vanderbilt University.



The Margin, A Financial Challenge

F. John Case



F. John Case

In the December/January issue of the *NCURA Newsletter*, John Fini, Chair of the Finance and Budget Committee, wrote a very thought-provoking article entitled "Life On The Margin." The article was intriguing to

me as my duties as NCURA's Treasurer commenced in November. The annual margin relates to the amount of revenue in excess of expenditures that are budgeted (or are actual results at year-end) for a fiscal year. This margin is used to create new programs, expand initiatives and enhance the programs available to NCURA's membership.

The current margin for NCURA's FY99 budget is approximately \$28K. This represents a 2% margin on an annual operating budget of \$1.4 million. The Finance and Budget Committee (F&B) has a legitimate concern, the risk of NCURA operating a national organization on such a tight budget. I agree with the committee, cost reduction is a way to increase the margin and put less of a strain on the reserves that might be needed for the President and Vice-President to take advantage of opportunities and build initiatives for the membership. We need to look at the way we currently do business, and with the help of the whole Executive Committee, identify efficiencies to create savings to the organization. One way is to eliminate various meetings of the Officers, Executive Committee and the Standing Committees and use the new technology available to us, e-mail and the World Wide Web (WWW), to conduct the yearly business activities of NCURA. I am in favor of this type of change, but I would throw a bit of caution to the F & B in this endeavor.

First, the current budget of approximately \$1.4 million includes \$51K of National Committee and ad-hoc task force expenses and \$41K of Executive Committee expenses. This totals \$92K of total committee expenditures for the current year. This represents about 6% of the total operating budget of NCURA. When speaking in terms of the "margin", the 6% represents a significant amount.

If we review the bylaws and require the current committees to meet only the required number of times per year, then there is a possibility to conduct business in a virtual environment, create savings and build the margin.

Second, the Officers recently met and discussed the need to look toward the future of NCURA and decide if a virtual meeting environment is the right way to identify leaders of this organization. In our daily activities on our campuses, we are probably involved in some sort of committee with a chair, facilitator, or leader to guide the committee to its goals. We can observe the committee members in action and identify the people we feel that can take the activity forward and champion its goals. In a virtual environment, this may be difficult. Leadership skills do not always show through an e-mail exchange. We need to keep in mind, there is a limit to the extent business can be conducted virtually.

Lastly, in any organization, non-profit or commercial, the key to success is revenue producing products, services, and keeping the customer happy and "coming back" for more. We can only cut expenses to a certain point (we have yearly fixed costs), and then we need to concentrate on the top half of the budget statement, the revenue section.

That is where I believe NCURA needs to put its efforts. We need to be the most efficient organization we can (through meetings using virtual technologies when applicable) and keep our customers (you the research administrator) happy with our programs and initiatives throughout the year. Our goals for the membership should be to try to minimally increase (or hold fixed) the annual dues and meeting registration cost of the organization. With this in mind, we must look at expanding on our successful initiatives and create new programs that enhance the professionals in research administration. Through new programs, seminars and services offered, we dilute the fixed costs of running this organization over a bigger base of activities. This in combination with new revenue streams, creates a margin that even the nun who managed the inner city health center that coined the phrase, "No Margin, No Mission," would be happy to work with.

The whole NCURA organization, Officers, Executive Committee, the F & B, and the members need to work together to create revenue producing programs. The initiatives that have fixed costs, with a variable revenue stream (depending on attendance or subscription) are the type of activities NCURA needs to further develop. An example of this are the micrographs/monographs produced by NCURA members and for sale to research administrators. These are products already produced and printed (a fixed cost), that can be purchased at any time (the more buyers, the greater the margin). A recent example relates to the new idea of satellite conferences offered by NCURA. The workshop presenters gather in one place (Washington) and the conference is broadcast to as many institutions that would like to subscribe. This results in fixed costs, and a variable revenue stream based on institutional hook-ups. The satellite conference planned for this year is aimed at the whole process of research administration should be a success and hopefully surpasses a conservative revenue budget, which will in turn, increase the margin. This is one idea that benefits the membership greatly, both in a professional development opportunity for you the research administrator, with a minimal cost to the institution (one satellite hook-up fee).

We need to think "outside the box" and look for more ways to train, professionally develop and serve the membership while keeping the margin at a comfortable level. The first steps of cost containment and reduction (where possible) is critical, but for the future of the organization, the products and services we offer our membership will be the driving force behind a sound financial organization. I appreciate the F & B's role in helping in this effort. With the additional help of the Long Range Financial Planning Task Force and the vision and goals of NCURA created through the organization's recent strategic planning effort, this organization should be financially successful and able to serve its membership efficiently, with the right programs to develop the best research administrators on each of our campuses.

F. John Case is the Treasurer of NCURA. He is also the Assistant Vice President and Controller of the Desert Research Institute, University and Community College System of Nevada.



REGION I New England

Nothing much to report from New England. Even though this wasn't a particularly bad winter, warmer weather is on the way and we all have Spring Fever.

Region I members should be on the look out for the announcement and registration packet for the Spring Meeting. Portland should be beautiful in early June, so make plans to attend.

Nominations will be accepted until April 5 for the Bernard McLane Memorial Travel Award Program, which will allow up to two recipients to attend the Spring Meeting this year. If you or anyone in your office can benefit from attending the meeting, please send in a nomination.

April 5 is also the deadline for nominating a worthy individual for the Region I Merit Award. There are many people who have contributed to the field of research administration in the New England Region who deserve to be nominated. The 1999 recipient will be announced during the Spring Meeting.

Since there isn't much news, I thought I would remind you of the hard-working individuals who serve as New England's regional representatives on NCURA Standing Committees. They all deserve our appreciation for their extra efforts.

Finance and Budget: Louise Griffin, University of Massachusetts, Lowell

Membership: Bill Corbett, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute

Nominating: JoAnn Moretti, Harvard University

Professional Development: Norm Hebert, Brown University

Publications Committee:
John Carfora, Dartmouth College

Select Committee on ERA:
Steve Dowdy, MIT; Dick Keogh, Rhode Island College

Sally S. Tremaine is Region I Chair and Associate Director in the Office of Grant and Contract Administration at Yale University.

REGION III Southeastern

With the Spring Meeting quickly approaching, Region III members are busy preparing for what promises to be an event-filled week. This year's meeting, "Shining Light on Research Administration," will be held May 15-19, 1999, at the Sea Palms Golf and Tennis Resort in St. Simons Island, Georgia. Preliminary information regarding the meeting, accommodations, and transportation arrangements can be found on the Region III web site.

One of the highlights of this year's meeting is a new concurrent session, "Lifepreserving Techniques for the Newcomer" developed by the Professional Development Committee. This addition, combined with the other concurrent and plenary sessions and discussion groups, makes the regional meeting an excellent training tool for those new to the field of research administration. This is a great opportunity for supervisors to provide their new staff members with well-rounded preparation for their new position.

Other committees have been busy as well working on various issues related to research administration and NCURA membership. The Electronic Research Administration Committee, chaired by David Wright (Emory University) is gathering information on the Y2K compliance of research administration software. The information will be posted on the NCURA home page. A hyperlink to the data will be located on the Region III site.

The ad hoc Membership Committee has broken into three working sub-committees that will review issues relating to the role and scope of regional membership. The effort, lead by committee chair Kathy Sukanek (University of Mississippi) will explore functional issues such as recruitment and retention of new members; assessment of regular activities like the

travel award; and structural issues including the possibility of regional membership. The committee will submit a report regarding these topics at the Spring Meeting.

Dawn B. Stein is the Assistant Director, Division of Sponsored Research and Training, University of North Florida.

REGION IV Mid-America

Greetings to all Region IV members, new and old. Region IV is in the midst of preparation for the NCURA Region IV Spring 1999 regional meeting to be held May 1-4, 1999 in St. Louis, Missouri. The theme selected for this year's meeting is St. Louis: Gateway to Research Administration in the New Age and the program has been developed to meet the wide range of interests of research administrators from the newcomers to the "old timers".

Come early for the special National Workshop on May 1 and stay through adjournment on May 4. Pat Conway, Sarah Starr, and Samantha Westcott are bringing to St. Louis their successful National Workshop, "Training, Public Speaking, and Professional Electronic Presentations." And, on Sunday morning you can attend one of three outstanding workshops presented by your Region IV colleagues. Paul Simon, former U.S. Senator from Illinois is featured as Plenary Speaker. Senator Simon is now a professor at Southern Illinois University where he is serving as Director of the Public Policy Institute at the Carbondale Campus.

There will also be NSF, NIH, DoEd, and EPA updates offered plus concurrent sessions on most aspects of pre- and post-award administration including electronic research administration. Roundtable discussions will again be offered on Monday and Tuesday mornings, allowing for more focused conversation among smaller groups. On a lighter side, we are continuing the tradition of holding one event off-site. A riverboat cruise down the ol' Mississippi River with a buffet and music has been planned for Monday evening.

Watch for detailed meeting updates on our Region IV web site located at <http://www.udmercy.edu/ncura4/stlouis.htm>.

The meeting will be held at the Regal Riverfront Hotel (<http://www.regal-hotels.com/stlouis>) in downtown St. Louis. Registration materials will arrive in early March. The program committee welcomes you to come and join us in St. Louis where

the Arch touches the sky. Meet new contacts, keep abreast with the latest in research administration, and enhance your skills and services. See you in St. Louis.

Ann McGuigan is a University Research Coordinator in the University Research Office at Illinois State University.

REGION V Southwestern

Plans are well underway for the Spring meeting in Tulsa (May 16-19, 1999). We are working on over 25 concurrent sessions and plan a variety of workshop topics that will fit everyone's needs. Initial brochures and registration information will arrive shortly!

Congratulations to Alyson McCarty (Southwestern Oklahoma State University). At the new member's reception during the national meeting, Alyson won the regional drawing for a free registration to our Spring meeting. As well, Marcia Davis replaced Scott Smith on the Membership Committee. Vicki Cox now serves on the Publications Committee, replacing Greg Foxworth.

Thanks to all of you that attended the national meeting! We had an incredible showing with (approx.) 50% of our region registered, including 25 first-time attendees! Let's keep up the great work as we look toward the regional meeting. It's not too late to send in your suggestions, or volunteer to help (just e-mail ssmith@ouhsc.edu).

Until next time, best wishes for a happy and healthy new year!

Scott R. Smith is Region V Chair-elect and Sponsored Programs Administrator, The University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center - Tulsa.

REGION VI Western

The preparations for the Region VI/VII Spring Meeting in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho have reached a crescendo. The site and the facilities for this meeting on Lake Coeur d'Alene are exquisite. A dedicated program committee has toiled for months to provide a program that meets the expectations of all, from the newcomer to the senior administrator. Pre-meeting activities will commence with the golf enthusiasts participating in the Fourth Annual Golf Tournament organized by Hal Gollos, Jean Montano and Brian Farmer, Chair of Region VII. The meeting will begin with five half-day workshops presented by a distinguished group of faculty, followed by two days of concurrent sessions, roundtables, award presentations and an evening cruise on the lake! Make sure you check the the web page for late breaking meeting news.

The Region VI homepage has moved due to the resignation of our webmaster, Dave Dungan, who has taken a new position. A very special thanks to Dave for all his outstanding work on the homepage which has greatly facilitated communication within the Region. During the interim, the homepage will be maintained by Dan Nordquist at Washington State University.

The region's Helen Carrier Fund has provided partial funding for a FastLane Practicum just prior to the March NSF Regional Workshop in California.

These regional funds are available to support professional development activities for our members. Please contact me if you are interested in hosting such an event.

See you at Coeur d'Alene!

Carol Zuiches is Region VI Chair and Director, Office of Grant and Research Development, Washington State University.



(Continued from page 2)

All of the above sounds practical, but how do we get the resources? This is probably the biggest challenge and there is no general solution. In fact there may be no solution at all. Part of the assessment will be to realistically look at the resources available to this process. Getting the support of senior administrators and faculty may help establish this project as a priority at your institution and help identify funding for the project. If additional resources can not be added, then the assessment team needs to decide what can be accomplished with existing resources.

As you can see, there is much to be done to prepare for ERA implementation. Take advantage of the experiences of other institutions. Some institutions that are further along have posted their progress on their web sites. We can learn from their progress. The Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) has a task force that is establishing a communication web site to post information on business requirements, technologies available, and ERA vendors. Watch for the NCURA ERA "Cookbook" that describes various complexities of ERA solutions. Attend workshops or presentations on ERA so that you can communicate to your community the changes that are coming. Preparing for ERA begins now.

Nancy Wray, Amin Plaisted, and John Carfora are all at Dartmouth College. Nancy Wray is Senior Associate Director in the Office of Grants and Contracts; Amin Plaisted is a Senior Programmer/Analyst; and John Carfora is Assistant Director in the Office of Grants and Contracts.

Regional Meetings

April 17-20

Region VI & VII Joint
Spring Meeting
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho

April 18-20

Region II Spring
Meeting
Pittsburgh,
Pennsylvania

May 1-4

Region IV Spring
Meeting
St. Louis, Missouri

May 16-19

Region V Spring
Meeting
Tulsa, Oklahoma

May 16-20

Region III Spring
Meeting
St. Simons Island,
Georgia

June 6-9

Region I Spring
Meeting
Portland, Maine



A Conversation with the New Editor of RMR

Bob Killoren, Pennsylvania State University

Bob Killoren is the new editor of the RMR Journal. With over twenty years of NCURA membership, he has served on the NCURA Executive Committee and is a past Chair of Region II. Bob is the Assistant Vice President for Research and Director of Sponsored Programs at Penn State University.

Bob, having just been appointed the new editor of RMR, can you tell us why it's important for associations like NCURA to have a professional journal?

Research administration is a very complex profession. There are so many regulations to keep up with, rules seem to be changing all the time, and there always seem to be multiple interpretations to every rule. In addition, technology is having a great impact on how we do business. Ensuring that we have the best electronic tools to help us serve our faculty better is always a challenge. Finally, things are happening too fast and furious to give us any time to just think about things, to reflect on what we're doing as research administrators, why we're doing it, and how we do it.

A professional journal can help us deal with this complexity. We can learn the why's and how's of our profession. For instance, articles can not only keep us current with changing regulations, but help us understand them better and learn how to use these rules as the tools of our trade! A good professional journal can also influence rulemaking with thoughtful pieces on the hot issues of the day by the most knowledgeable experts in the field. I think a journal should also help us to keep abreast of the latest advances in the field—especially emerging technologies, electronic tools, and business management techniques that we can use to do our jobs better. A journal can also serve the profession by challenging us to think more about who we are and what we do. It can give insights, put things in perspective, summarize, delve, encapsulate, crystalize, focus...all those things that we just don't seem to have time to do on our own while we're putting out fires!

One last comment on why we need a professional journal... we have some of the best and brightest people working in higher education today in this profession we're in. We need a forum to show that off a bit—to let the world know what research administrators do and how we contribute to important research that universities are performing, research that improves our society and makes our world a better place to live in. We have a lot to offer the university community too, especially about how to work more efficiently and effectively. Because of the federal pressure to cut back on the administrative costs of research, we've learned valuable lessons about doing more with less... lessons we can and ought to share with others.

Were there any special reasons that compelled you to take on the daunting task of RMR editor?

Well, I have to admit... I've always wanted to be the RMR editor, and I truly welcome this opportunity to serve. I'm humbled, though, by the fact that I'm following in the footsteps of some of the really great professionals in our field—like Mary Ellen Sheridan, RMR's founding editor—people who have helped shape the profession and made it what it is today. Talk about a daunting task! I just hope that I have the time and the energy to do the job well. I tell you, I've never seen a busier more dedicated bunch of people than

research administrators! I think they'll be doing my job if I can help them use their time better by providing the information they need in a clean and concise manner.

Of course, I can only do so much as editor. I'm going to need lots of help... volunteers who are willing to tackle some tough writing assignments, who have the talent to communicate effectively on some terribly complex issues, who share a desire to work a little harder for the good of the profession! Volunteers, too, who want to help out on the editorial board... selecting topics we need to hear about, deciding how the RMR can communicate more effectively, and doing the mostly thankless, yet extremely important job of reviewing articles.

OPRR Establishes New Expedited Review Categories for Human Subject Research

Carey L. Conover

The Office for Protection from Research Risks (OPRR) and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) have simultaneously published a revised list of categories of human subject research that may be reviewed through the expedited review procedure. An expedited review procedure consists of a review of research involving human subjects by the IRB chairperson or by one or more experienced reviewers designated by the chairperson from among IRB members, rather than by the full IRB.

New categories of expedited review have been added and several of the previous categories have been combined. Of particular benefit to Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) are the enhanced expedited review categories concerning the collection of blood, a list of examples of procedures that qualify for expedited review, and the inclusion of general guiding principles.

In November of 1997, OPRR and FDA requested written comments on proposed changes to the expedited review list. OPRR and FDA received a total of 108 comments. These comments guided agency decision making and resulted in the final notice published in the Federal Register of November 9, 1998.

Several changes have been made in the specific research categories for which the expedited review process is now appropriate. One important example of this is found in the area of blood collection.

Critical issues to be assessed by the IRB include consideration for the age, weight, and health of the subjects in light of the amount of blood to be collected. Guidance is provided on the frequency and amount of blood collection for projects eligible for expedited review. Expedited review of

What are your ideas about future issues of the journal?

While I of course want to encourage research administrators to share what they've learned with their peers, I want to also open up RMR to people of other fields who have something to contribute to our understanding of research administration and the research enterprise. There are university faculty around the country, for instance, who are doing some groundbreaking research on the effects of cost sharing on research productivity and competitiveness, who are studying how the Internet has altered business practices, who are analyzing the effects of legislation on the transfer of technology. I think all of these topics would be valuable subjects for research administrators to read about. I would also like to present some thought-pieces on how the legislative process affects research and how the university community can affect the legislative processes. Perhaps some of our colleagues from governmental affairs offices can share some thoughts with us.

I think some "how-to" articles would not be out of place in a professional journal. There are a number of electronic tools, for instance, that could be presented in articles to show us how they can be used in research administration. And how about statistics? Research administrators are always being asked to provide university executives with reports on how their institution is doing in research. I, for one, would like to see some articles on what reporting mechanisms are most effective; what statistical tools can I use to better forecast funding trends, to identify up-and-coming faculty or departments, to normalize data to really show who my most productive research faculty are; how can I measure whether or not changes I'm making in business processes are more effective or efficient, what statistics can I use to show my administration how well my office is doing, or conversely, how poorly we are doing now but how much better we could be doing with a little investment!

I would also like to see RMR tap into the people who know how the regulatory processes work. Perhaps an interview with some of the OMB (Offices of Management and Budget) people who are the movers and shakers in the "circular" world, or how about an article about accountability from an inspector general, or an opinion piece from someone in the Office of Research Integrity.

Well, you see, I've got lots of ideas. Maybe some of them will, and if I'm lucky only a few won't pan out. I hope to be able to call on Steve Erickson, my immediate predecessor as RMR editor, a lot for help. He's already been of invaluable assistance to me... maybe he'll be able to guide me through some of the more treacherous waters!

Any thoughts about an electronic version?

I'd like to have a fully functional electronic version within a year. I think the electronic version may be a little different than the print version, more dynamic and fluid, with lots of connectivity through Internet links and with multimedia functionality, with feature stories that could vary week-to-week or even day-to-day. There's just so much more you can do on the Web than you can do on paper. I'd also like the electronic version to be something that people could look to more often than just a couple times per year. I'd like to provide some real-time news and information—in a magazine setting. I want to talk with our NCURA Newsletter editor, Dick Seligman about what we could do together on the Web in some kind of combined NCURA News & Journal. On the other hand, the paper version is still the mainstay, the permanent record so to speak, of the Journal—the thing we hope researchers and writers will be giving citations to. So until libraries are more comfortable cataloguing and making electronic journals accessible and writers get more comfortable citing e-journals, I think we'll continue to provide a hard copy journal. (But it is awfully tempting to think what we could do with the same budget in a totally electronic medium!)

I'd also like to have the complete archive of the RMR up and searchable on the Net within the next six months. In fact, I'm going to make this my top priority as I get started. More and more people are going to the World Wide Web to research issues. I think RMR needs to be there when people are researching topics such as conflict of interest policies, the Bayh-Dole Act, university-industry research collaborations, etc.

Well, I know my ambitions probably far outreach the time and resources I'll have available, but who knows... with lots of help from all the highly talented and supportive NCURA members we have perhaps I'm not reaching high enough! Any of these folks who happen to be reading this interview can email me with ideas for journal articles or about the future look of the journal (rak9@psu.edu).

some types of research involving pregnant women is now permissible. The guidelines contain new language that addresses the availability of the expedited review procedure for marketed drugs in research.

Taking into consideration comments regarding MRIs and the use of anesthesia and sedation, OPRR determined that expedited review is not allowed for any procedure employing either of these medical techniques. To assist IRBs, several examples of medical procedures that qualify for expedited review are provided.

Collection of data from voice, digital, or image recordings or oral history techniques are now included in the expedited review category. A new category of expedited review identifies three situations in which research that is "greater than minimal risk"

and had been initially reviewed by the full IRB, could undergo subsequent continuing review by the expedited review procedure. And, finally, a new category of expedited review has been added that involves the continuing review of research, not greater than minimal risk, which previously was reviewed by the full IRB.

These new changes from OPRR and FDA offer IRBs an opportunity to review protocols with greater assurance because of the presentation of specific examples of research which qualify under the expedited review process. Additionally, the inclusion of guiding principles will surely aid IRBs when evaluating protocols that fall into the "gray area" of decision-making. Our hats are off to OPRR and FDA for their conscientious efforts geared towards clarification in the human research arena!

For further additional information, visit the OPRR website at "http://www.nih.gov/grants/oprr". To view the full text of "Changes to Categories of Research That May Be Reviewed by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) Through an Expedited Review Procedure," consult the Federal Register for November 9, 1998 (pages 60363 through 60367) at www.gpo.gov/nara/index.html#frbrowse

Carey L. Conover is a Grants and Contracts Administrator in the Office of Grant and Contract Services at Northern Arizona University.

Once Upon a Time...

Earl Cilley

In the December/January Newsletter, we began a series of articles celebrating NCURA's 40 year history. In this issue, we continue "Once Upon A Time" with Earl Cilley's thoughtful views and analysis of the evolution of research administration in the turbulent decade of the 1960's.

In the 1960s, academic research administration was truly a pioneering effort in a management area new to universities. While as suspect as most other management activities in such places, those actually doing the research and teaching were inclined initially at least to give us the benefit of the doubt when we said we were trying to help.

Delivering on that commitment became and continues to be an ever-increasing challenge, but back then most of our sponsored research support came from the Defense agencies and AEC, NSF, NIH, and the major foundations. Awards usually came in the form of grants, excepting some of the Defense ones, which were issued as contract awards where the sponsoring agency did not have legislative authorization to award grants.

In either case, the extent of regulation and oversight was comparatively minor. Most of the time the program managers and technical monitors were content to be in touch with our faculty, get the obligatory quarterly reports, and pay the invoices we generated against the restricted fund expenditure accounts.

The general feeling was that the university people were basically honest and well-intentioned, and that our organizations were responsible and would meet our commitments and obligations, and generally do so timely.

After all, it was in our interest to do so. We had been custodians of restricted funds for decades and were sensitive to our needs to behave in a common sense fashion. Because we were basically in the education business, our faculty undertook research to satisfy intellectual curiosity about the unknown and to provide training opportunities and challenges for graduate students.

In most cases, the colleges and universities were sharing in the costs of doing the work, and the faculty were publishing their results in technical reports and the open literature. It was a reasonably tolerant interaction, and the faculty's sponsors didn't concern themselves particularly with the way the places were run internally in any detail. Once a research award was made, we were assumed to be competent to carry it to a satisfactory conclusion.

As long as those results were satisfactory, reports were sent in, and the charges seemed in line with the general understanding of the work, that was pretty much it. Sponsor auditors oversaw the process, some institutions had resident Government representatives, and in contrast to the present day, it seems almost idyllic. Like many idylls, it was generally not recognized as such at the time, nor was it destined to last.

Not to say there were not disagreements and arguments. There were dunderheads in Sponsorland, and some of the university people were not exactly on top of their responsibilities either. On both sides, there was a lot of ignorance of what exactly university sponsored research was all about, why it was useful and sometimes important to do, what made colleges and universities special and different, and why the parties were engaging in these things.

Most of the problems came out of misunderstandings. Sponsor staff had problems understanding our view, and that of prevailing common law, that grants were conditioned gifts; and that in making them the Federal granting agencies could operate with adequate safeguards under the Grants Act and existing R&D procurement authorities.

Many of the sponsors were used to contracting for research with individuals and companies. When you contract, you are purchasing something specific, at an identified cost, to be delivered at a certain time, with payment subject to review, inspection, and acceptance of the results. And, since the contractor had entered into a contract to procure a particular piece of work, it followed that the contracting party owned the results (in our case, usually a report) and could decide who could see the results and who owned the information. Accounting would be of a job-cost/project-cost nature, as with commercial and not-for-profit research labs.

The imperative for these two rather unlikely partners to get together was not primarily financial. University laboratories in those days, outside of engineering and some of the sciences, were comparatively small. Rather, it was the need for a crash program to find new ideas and develop new applications. This

was thought to be of critical importance if we were to win the Cold War.

Problem areas in those days concerned the status of graduate students, the basis for supporting payment to faculty and students, the lack of standard work weeks, freedom to publish research results without prior sponsor review, and the limitations of fund accounting systems in universities.

Publication and intellectual property ownership issues were particularly vexing issues. The concept of prompt publication of results and the implications for sponsor control and ownership versus requirements for publishable work, for students to obtain an advanced degree or faculty to obtain collegial recognition, were foreign to many of the new patrons of university research, both in Federal agencies and the "mission-oriented" foundations.

The "mission" Federal agencies and the targeted-disease support private foundations in particular were tough to persuade to give up the right to censor reports and control their release. They tended to take the view that since they were paying for the work, they owned the work product and could do with it what they chose.

The quite different view and atmosphere in university laboratories caused many, many problems. In the main they were problems of two cultures, each unfamiliar to the other; learning how to work together, effectively if not always harmoniously, and to get knowledge discovered and communicated and students educated to help continue the search for knowledge.

Back then we felt quite put upon by the DoD Joint Letter on costing (a somewhat arbitrary but comparatively simple set of accounting rules, later to be superseded by OMB Circular A-21). And then NSF started putting out "Important Notices" on an increasing number of subjects, giving the Foundation's view of how various housekeeping and policy matters were to be treated as far its grants were concerned. And NIH issued similar guidelines and fiats, ever expanding in detail and subject matter.

(continued on page 13)



...from the cover

Revitalizing Research Partnerships

(continued from page 1)

Systems Planning will work on initiatives and milestones identified last year. The Task Force on Minority Participation is attempting to identify barriers to full minority involvement in NCURA. This year's Executive Committee will work with our consultant to look at the overall structure of the organization to ensure that our organization is as efficient and effective as possible, while utilizing the talents of all of our membership.

And what talents we have! Just take a look at our conference and workshop offerings.

FDP JOINS NCURA

(continued from page 1)

This year, in designing the program, the committee will be linking several concurrent sessions with common themes. Our aim is to target audiences with different levels of knowledge and enable them to take several concurrent sessions in a series to get a full understanding of a topic. For example, we are planning sessions on connecting databases to the Web for introductory, intermediate and technical audiences.

Because of our partnership with FDP, we will also have sessions relating to FDP working group topics. Examples of such topics will include standardized federal funding opportunity documents, Electronic Routing Systems (following up on the EARS symposium to be held just before ERA IV) and Federal Commons development.

Because Electronic Research Administration concepts and implementation are maturing, we will be having more sessions on post-award administration and implementation sessions for small and medium size institutions. Another innovation will be to present some Cookbook solutions that will build on the NCURA ERA cookbook initiative.

Several popular training labs from last year will be repeated and new ones will be instituted.

Finally, Nancy Wilkinson and Pamela Webb are putting together an EARS II Symposium on August 4th, in the vicinity of the Emory University Conference Center that will help kick off nearly a weeklong extravaganza of electronic research administration topics. Enough to satisfy even the most avid ERA administrators among us!

Anyone who has attended ERA I through III will be happy to hear that there will be an ERA IV this year in Atlanta. We have teamed with the Federal Demonstration Partnership to open new possibilities for program topics. We also are offering a live video teleconference geared to local campus training needs in the award management arena. Because of the regulatory and compliance aspects of this session, the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR) is partnering with us on this groundbreaking event. The Fundamentals Workshops are oversubscribed for the third year in a row, and we are again

exploring the possibility of adding a fourth site this year.

The year has just begun and already creativity is high, business is booming, and activity is feverish. Watch for continuous progress throughout the year. NCURA remains a work in process, and we think you'll like many of the innovations that will appear as we prepare to move beyond 40!

Cheryl-Lee Howard is President of NCURA and Assistant Dean for Research Administration, Homewood Division at the Johns Hopkins University.

The ERA IV Program Committee includes:

Andy Rudczynski, Rutgers University, abr@orsp.rutgers.edu,

Carole Oglesby, University of Florida proginf@nervm.nerdc.ufl.edu

David Wright, Emory University dwright@emory.edu

Dola Haessig, University of Missouri haessigd@research.missouri.edu

Ellen Beck, UCLA EBECK@srnet.ucla.edu

Erin Lindsay, Caltech erin.lindsay@caltech.edu

George Stone, NIH gs60a@nih.gov

Gerald Stuck, NSF gstuck@nsf.gov

Jon Peterson, Colorado State University JPeterson@research.ColoState.EDU

Kathy Larmett, NCURA Office larmett@ncura.edu

Nancy Wray, Dartmouth University Nancy.J.Wray@dartmouth.edu

Ron Splittgerber, Colorado State University rsplittgerber@research.ColoState.EDU

Tara Bishop, NCURA Office bishop@ncura.edu,

Vonda Durrer, University of Virginia vd9k@virginia.edu

Please contact us at our e-mail addresses to provide suggestions or visit NCURA at www.ncura.edu and watch as we build the program live on the web.

Andy Rudczynski and Jerry Stuck are the Co-Chairs of the ERA IV Conference. Andy is Associate Vice President for Research Policy and Administration at Rutgers University. Jerry is Deputy Director of the Division of Information Systems at the National Science Foundation.

EARS Symposium II

NCURA and the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) are pleased to announce that planning has begun for another symposium focused on issues surrounding electronic approval and routing. NCURA and FDP will host the symposium on August 4, 1999 in Atlanta, one day prior to the ERA IV conference. Pamela Webb and Nancy Wilkinson will serve as the EARS Task Group Co-Chairs.

Using a plenary format, participants will hear the latest from both university and federal officials regarding electronic approval and routing systems. The NCURA and FDP web sites, along with the NCURA Newsletter, will continue to provide program details as they become available.

Registration will be structured to allow interested individuals to register for the EARS Symposium alone or in companion with their ERA IV registrations. Fees will be managed separately from the ERA IV conference, but will be kept minimal as they were for the original EARS Symposium. We look forward to seeing you in Atlanta.

Call for Nominations Call for Nominations Call for Nominations

VICE PRESIDENT/PRESIDENT-ELECT AND SECRETARY

The beginning of each year marks the occasion for setting in motion the steps for identifying future leaders for NCURA. This year the offices to be filled are Vice President/President-elect and Secretary.

JoAnn Moretti, Chair of the Nominating Committee, encourages NCURA members to be proactive in the process by nominating those individuals in our ranks who have demonstrated the commitment and capacity to assume these leadership roles.

The Nominating Committee is seeking experienced research administrators who, through extensive service at both the national and regional levels, have exhibited a comprehensive understanding of NCURA's mission and its operations.

The Vice President/President-elect, as an executive officer, assists the President in the conduct of the affairs of NCURA and has the responsibility of overseeing the coordination of the Annual Meeting (planning, preparation, and execution). In the event the President is

unable to serve, the Vice President will undertake the President's duties. The Vice President after a term of one year, which begins at the conclusion of the Annual Business Meeting, succeeds to the Presidency.

The President serves as the chief executive officer and is responsible to convene meetings, appoint committees and direct the activities of NCURA. The President serves a one-year term that ends at the conclusion of the Annual Business Meeting.

The Secretary, an executive officer of the Council, is the officer responsible for preparing the minutes of the Executive Committee meetings, which take place in November, February, and June. The Secretary also serves as the ex-officio member of the National Membership and Publications Committees. In addition, the Secretary is responsible for special assignments as directed by the President.

According to the NCURA Bylaws, the Nominating Committee must select at least two candidates for each office. Careful consideration will be given to those individuals whose names have been submitted for nomination. The Committee will meet in May to select the final slate.

The deadline for receipt of nominations is April 16. Please send nomination forms (provided below) to NCURA, One Dupont Circle, Suite 220, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Any questions regarding the nomination process or selecting nominees can be directed to your regional representative to the Nominating Committee. The Committee members are: JoAnn Moretti, Region I; Garry Sanders, Region II; Kent Walker, Region III; Pat Conway, Region IV; Sondra Ferstl, Region V; Mary Nunn, Region VI; Kathi Delehoy, Region VII.

The deadline for receipt of nominations is April 16, 1999.

NOMINATION FORM-VICE-PRESIDENT/PRESIDENT-ELECT

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ADMINISTRATORS

Please feel free to duplicate form.

Due in NCURA Office by April 16, 1999

I would like to nominate for VICE PRESIDENT/PRESIDENT-ELECT:

Name _____ Institution _____

Qualifications and comments for your nominee: _____

Please print or type your name _____

(Your name will be held in strict confidence)

PLEASE SUBMIT TO: Tara Bishop, NCURA, One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 220, Washington, D.C. 20036

NOMINATION FORM-SECRETARY

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ADMINISTRATORS

Please feel free to duplicate form.

Due in NCURA Office by April 16, 1999

I would like to nominate for SECRETARY:

Name _____ Institution _____

Qualifications and comments for your nominee: _____

Please print or type your name _____

(Your name will be held in strict confidence)

PLEASE SUBMIT TO: Tara Bishop, NCURA, One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 220, Washington, D.C. 20036

Once Upon a Time

(continued from page 10)

Each sponsor had its individual regulatory quirks and challenges.

But while the issues were significant, and the lack of consistency caused very real problems and great pressures on the universities to give in so the research could go on uninterrupted, life was comparatively simple. But now, good heavens, we are up to the Circular 130s, and maybe more?

There were people in both constituencies who worked to improve communications with each other. Eventually, John Lordan at OMB emerged to lend a degree of consistency to the various Federal agencies' rules and regulation of university research. COGR was established. Wally Wahlstrom, succeeded in time by Howard Wile, Reagan Scurlock, and Milton Goldberg, provided informed advice and coordination to the research universities' efforts to explain themselves to their Government research sponsors.

The research business officers began to meet, and NCURA formed, as did SRA, and the medical business officers began to meet to exchange views as a section of AAMC. Bob Rosenzweig went to the AAU to help explain

the university community to its Washington-based constituency.

As patent and publication issues began to become more numerous, university staff began to specialize in intellectual property and in turn formed a group, as did those in the other specialized management areas that came into being to support the continuing growth in the volume of sponsored academic research and development.

Thinking back, as novices in R&D management, we got a lot of help from people like E. P. Bledsoe ('The Tennessee Fox') and Howard Wighton at ONR; Paul Barron, Bill Fee, Elmer Havens, Bob Michelitch, Will Kener and Bob Boyden at NSF; the many agency contract officers who tried to educate us about their procurement regulations; and NIH's Institute Grants Officers and their staffs.

We tried to work with them to find ways to make the different Federal sponsors' practices, policies, and legislative mandates sufficiently consistent so we could comply as institutions, without building separate systems for each. And most important, without sacrificing the freedom of inquiry, intellectual argument, and open literature publication of ideas and results, that have made the colleges and universities such rich and productive venues.

From the Joint Letter, the Grants Act, and the NSF Important Notices, we evolved in the 1960s and 1970s to mandatory documented cost sharing; effort reporting certifications; Cost Accounting Standards Board regulations; and standards for safeguarding human subjects; employee hiring, benefits and discrimination; research animal care; hazardous materials and waste controls; patent licensing; subcontracting; property management; and research-related exports.

Those are the ones that come to mind. And I am sure I am repressing a number of others, and ignorant of still more.

Truly, it has been amazing to see what has happened to the academic research programs over these past 35 years. Incredible advances have been made in science, engineering, and medicine, and with them the evolution of sophisticated and expert corps of research administrators and technical specialists, both to support the structure that makes it possible and to preserve the intellectual freedom that have enabled it all.

Earl Cilley is Research Administrator Emeritus from Stanford University. He can be reached via e-mail at Earl.Cilley@Stanford.edu.

NCURA Calendar

April 8

Straight Talk: A Primer on Award Administration
Broadcast live via satellite from Washington, DC

April 17-20

Region VI & VII Joint Spring Meeting
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho

April 18-20

Region II Spring Meeting
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

April 26-28

Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration
Portland, Oregon

May 1-4

Region IV Spring Meeting
St. Louis, Missouri

May 16-19

Region V Spring Meeting
Tulsa, Oklahoma

May 16-20

Region III Spring Meeting
St. Simons Island, Georgia

June 6-9

Region I Spring Meeting
Portland, Maine

June 21-23

Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration
Albuquerque, New Mexico

August 4

EARS Symposium II
Atlanta, Georgia

August 5-7

Electronic Research Administration IV
Atlanta, Georgia

November 7

Workshop '99
Hilton Washington
Washington, DC

November 7-10

41st Annual Meeting
Hilton Washington
Washington, DC



NEWSLETTER DEADLINES:

April/May

Submission of Articles: *April 2, 1999*

Space Reservation for Ads: *April 2, 1999*

Submission of Display Ads: *April 9, 1999*

The National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA), founded in 1959, is an organization of individuals with professional interest in problems and policies relating to the administration of research, education and training activities at colleges and universities.

Editor:

Richard P. Seligman,
California Institute
of Technology

Phone: (626) 395-6073

Fax: (626) 795-4571

E-mail:

seligman@sponsres.caltech.edu

Managing Editor:

Kathleen Larmett

E-mail: larmett@ncura.edu

Associate Editor

for Regional Activities:

Tara E. Bishop

E-mail: bishop@ncura.edu

Production

Barbara S. Amster

E-mail: amster@ncura.edu

The NCURA Newsletter accepts advertisements for products and services pertinent to university research administration.

In addition, display advertisements (including those for position openings) only will be published. The minimum rate is \$200.

For additional information, please contact the NCURA office at:

- Phone: (202) 466-3894
- Fax: (202) 223-5573
- E-mail: info@ncura.edu
- Website: www.ncura.edu

Advertisements should not be construed as official endorsements by NCURA.

Changes of address should be reported to:

NCURA

One Dupont Circle, NW,
Suite 220

Washington, DC 20036

In Memoriam

We are sad to report the passing of NCURA Past President, Harold B. Hunnicutt.

Hunnicutt, Professor Emeritus of Arizona State University, died at his home after a long illness on January 27, 1999, at the age of 71.

A member of the Rocky Mountain Region (VII), Hunnicutt served as NCURA's president in 1977. During his presidency, he and his Executive Committee moved to establish a Washington office for NCURA. Another major thrust of his presidency was the establishment of a Commission on Minorities and Women. The Commission was formed to look at ways of increasing positions of leadership for women and minorities in both NCURA and the profession.

Among those survived by Dr. Hunnicutt are his wife Kay Hartwell-Hunnicutt; his daughters Holly Hunnicutt and Lisa Martens and his sons Cody Hunnicutt and David Ligon.

Memorial contributions may be made to The Hunnicutt Future Educators Institute c/o ASU Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa, PO Box 872611, Tempe AZ, 85287-2611



One Dupont Circle, NW
Suite 220
Washington, DC 20036

First Class
U.S. Postage
PAID
Merrifield, VA
Permit No. 870