One Step Ahead

NCURA's 43rd Annual Meeting
by Denise Clark and Alice Tangredi-Hannon

J ust in case you missed it, the preliminary program for NCURA's 43rd Annual Meeting is on the web at http://www.ncura.edu/. It won't take you more than a second to realize how outstanding this program is and how quickly you can take part in it. In fact, register on-line by credit card and you will receive a 5% discount on your registration fee.

This year's Program Committee and the NCURA National Office have worked in concert to provide the membership with aspects of previous programs that continue to be draws, yet peppered popular interests with new and dynamic features. The Sponsor News track will, of course, feature the tried and true NIH and NSF Updates, but will also incorporate non-federal sponsors' interests. Concurrent session tracks focusing on compliance, costing, pre-award, post-award, personal growth, technology transfer and intellectual property, and national policy issues will address all of your concerns as a research administrator. The Open Forum series will provide additional opportunities to expand on discussions of concurrent sessions or may be devoted to special interest groups.

by Bobby McQuiston

"Men are from Mars, women are from Venus." Often it seems the same statement may be made about industry and university efforts to establish and maintain productive collaborative research relationships. The goals, objectives, missions and policies of academic institutions and those of commercial entities are so inherently different that establishing a successful collaboration can be a
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2001-2002 Video Conference Series on Compliance kicks off September 6, 2001!

NCURA 2001 Election

Slate is set and polls will open in August

W hen the NCURA Nominating and Leadership Development Committee began to work on its charge of selecting a slate of candidates for this year's election, they realized they had an enormous job in front of them. The number of positions available this year is the largest single election in NCURA history and the number of candidates with outstanding credentials was incredible! Members will be asked to vote for Vice President/President-elect; Secretary; Treasurer-elect; and two At-large Board members. The N&LDC had a pool of award-winning individuals and they thank each of them for their willingness to step forward and serve NCURA.

When voters receive the call to enter the electronic "polling booth," they will see the following candidates presented, along with their biographical sketches and a statement of their goals and objectives:

Vice President/President-elect
x Thomas A. Coggins, University of South Carolina
x Robert A. Killoren, Jr., Pennsylvania State University

Secretary
x Gunta J. Liders, University of Rochester
x Cynthia White, Washington University

Treasurer-elect
x Marilyn Surbey, Emory University
x Laura A. Wade, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston

At-large Board Member
x Sue Keen, University of Arkansas at Little Rock
x Garry Sanders, University at Albany, SUNY
x Pamela A. Webb, Northwestern University
x M. Rinaldo Woods, University of Texas at Arlington

The Nominating & Leadership Development Committee, led by Nancy L. Wilkinson of Emory University, is made up of one NCURA member from each of its seven regions. Many thanks to Nancy and Steven Bernstein, University of New Hampshire; Carey Conover, Northern Arizona University; Gregory Foxworth, Texas A&M University; David M. ayo, University of California, Santa Barbara; Cordell Overby, Michigan State University; Thomas Roberts, Florida Gulf Coast University; and Andrew Rudczynski of the University of Pennsylvania.

continued on page 6
News from the NCURA Board of Directors

by Regina H. White

When the NCURA Board of Directors met in Boston in June, the first agenda item was a continuation of the strategic planning discussion in which we have been engaged this year. Because of its importance to the future of NCURA, I want to update the membership on the progress and outcomes of our June discussion.

Our specific task at this mid-year meeting was to articulate what we believe to be the “mega issues” confronting NCURA, and research administration, over the next ten to thirty years. As defined by the Tecker Consulting Group, which has been assisting the NCURA Board in its strategic planning, mega issues form “a basis for dialogue about the choices facing the organization” and “create(s) regular opportunities for strategic dialogue about the issues facing the industry and the organization”. The mega issues for NCURA range from very specific program delivery and member services questions, through NCURA organizational health, growth and success, and on to the very nature of our organization and of research administration itself.

The questions that relate to program and member services include: how will program and knowledge delivery change within the next 5-10 years? How can we determine what emerging issues our members will need to address within the next 5-10 years? What steps are necessary to support the continuous growth of NCURA (including programming, quality assurance, volunteer capacity, finances)?

Organizational issues encourage us to consider how NCURA can maintain and further its success while there are other organizations competing for its members’ time, talent and financial resources; how we can identify, develop and cultivate partnerships with other groups, both internally and externally; how we promote and encourage leadership and volunteerism; and how NCURA becomes globally recognized.

In a wide-ranging discussion of ideas and vision, the Board agreed that some of the issues that the Board and the membership should begin to examine are those of NCURA’s role in the field of research administration, and in the professional lives of research administrators. Some of the core questions that arise are: should research administration become a “profession” or remain a “field”? Should NCURA become an advocate (the voice) for the field of research administration, or remain a forum for individual voices? As NCURA grows, will membership categories change, e.g., should NCURA’s primary focus remain on issues relating to members at universities, or should the regular membership category be broadened to include those from federal agencies and/or for profit groups?

Many of these “mega issues” defined by the Board will be subjects for discussion in the months and years ahead. There are widely diverse views on many of these questions, and the membership’s input will be extremely important in steering NCURA into the future. Comments and questions may be addressed to any member of the Board, or the Officers. The editors of the Newsletter also encourage use of the Newsletter as a valuable vehicle for discussion of these issues, via “letters to the editor”.

Finally, my deep and sincere thanks to each member of the Board for the time and effort they devote to NCURA, from consideration of what NCURA will look like thirty years from now, to sustaining the absolute excellence of our programs and services right now.

Bravo - job well done!

Regina H. White is the NCURA President and serves as the Director, Office of Sponsored Programs at the University of Vermont.
The agency has also defined key terms, such as "information," "government information," "information dissemination product," and "dissemination." Definitions for these terms are modeled from OMB's Circular A-130, which establishes policy for management of federal information resources.

OMB is asking whether it should develop specific quality guidelines for information on federal agency web pages by federal agencies. OMB states that context is important in presenting information. According to OMB, sometimes, in disseminating certain types of information to the public, other information must also be disseminated in order to ensure an accurate, clear, complete and unbiased presentation, as with statistical information. The sources of the information should be identified so the public can assess for itself whether there is a reason to question the objectivity of the sources.

Definitions
OMB has laid out parameters for key terms contained in the data quality statute, including the following:

"Quality," "Objectivity," "Utility," and "Integrity"

OMB states that quality, utility, objectivity and integrity are closely interrelated concepts that apply to whether the information is useful to all users, including the public; presented in an accurate, clear, complete and unbiased manner, and protected from unauthorized access or revision. OMB specifically seeks comments on this definition, stating that it wants to know how the definition can be made clearer and less ambiguous for the agency and the public.

Correction Mechanism
Under the proposed guidelines, agencies are directed to develop information resources management procedures for reviewing and documenting for users the quality of information before it is disseminated to the public. A key component of these procedures is agency establishment of an administrative mechanism allowing affected persons to seek and obtain correction of information which does not comply with OMB's guidelines. In accordance with OMB Circular A-130, agencies already have in place information quality standards and administrative mechanisms that allow persons to seek and obtain correction of information that is maintained and disseminated by the agency. If they come up to the new standards, agencies may elect to rely on those existing mechanisms.

Impact on Research Data
Under this proposed guidance it is possible that more research data will become available to the public, depending on agency implementation of the following statement in the Federal Register notice:

"with respect to scientific research information, the results must be substantially reproducible upon independent analysis of the underlying data."

The Circular A-110 revision limited access to research data to instances where agencies used the data in the promulgation of policies or regulations. However, this new data quality law applies to all data "disseminated" by the agencies. To the extent research data or results are used in any agency publication or database, including postings to a web site, they may be subject to the requirements of new data access, analysis, and corrective procedures developed by the agencies under these guidelines.

There are several critical issues not addressed in the proposed OMB guidance. "Dissemination" is defined, but left unsaid is whether simply posting research data, or information based on research data, to a web site constitutes dissemination. Also several times OMB refers to "affected person" as having the ability to challenge government information. This is an important term to define. If an affected person is someone that can potentially be harmed by or benefit from the information, that would be a limiting factor on the amount of information subject to challenge. A related issue is what will constitute a reasonable challenge to the information. For example, does a simple statement from someone that they think the information is incorrect trigger the corrective mechanism, or should a person have to provide at least a minimally plausible argument to start the corrective process?

Congress' specificity in requiring OMB to amend Circular A-110 in the 1999 appropriations bill made it easier to reach a compromise limiting the impact of the revisions. However, with this new data quality requirement and its greater breadth of covered information, OMB has less direct influence on the details of each agency's implementation. Thus it will be critically important for the research community to impress upon agency officials that data resulting from peer-reviewed research meets the standards of integrity, objectivity, quality, and utility.

Tony DeCrappeo serves as the Associate Director of COGR, Council on Governmental Relations.
On June 9-10, 2001, twenty-one representatives of the NCURA's seven regional organizations traveled to Washington, D.C. to attend NCURA's first Regional Volunteers Workshop. Developed in response to a recommendation from an NCURA Board of Directors working group, led by Kathleen Harris of Texas Tech University, the workshop provided training for members likely to be involved with developing regional conferences or managing regional finances.

During the mid-1990s, the NCURA National Office Staff offered meeting planning workshops for regional members during the first day of the National Annual Meeting. This approach proved very difficult, especially for national office staff who were simultaneously attempting to launch the Annual Meeting and, after several years, the meeting planning workshops were discontinued. Nevertheless, the need for such workshops remained and, at its February 2001 meeting, the NCURA board voted to finance a one and a half-day workshop in June, 2001 for up to two representatives from each region. The regions could, at their discretion and cost, send up to three additional members to the workshop.

The first day of the workshop focused on planning and running a conference; the second day dealt with more broad-based financial issues and the responsibilities of regional chairs. National office staff responsible for organizing and speaking at the workshop included: Kathleen Larmett, NCURA Executive Director; Marc Schiffman, NCURA Meetings Manager; and Charlie Ells, NCURA Financial Services Manager. Other speakers included: Jim De Kornfeld, Regional Director, HelmsBriscoe; Vicki Johnson, Director of Sales, WorldWide Accounts, Hilton Sales Worldwide; Michael Schneider, Senior Catering Manager, Hilton Washington and Towers; and Jeff Tennenbaum, Esq., Venable, Baetjer, Howard & Civiletti, LLP.

Response of those attending the workshop was overwhelmingly positive. Comments provided by Steven Williams of Wake Forest University and Secretary/Treasurer of Region III were typical:

"I have been a member of NCURA for four years now and this workshop has been one of the best experiences I’ve had in the organization. The timing of the workshop was wonderful. Each topic was long enough and interesting enough that it held your attention and really left me wanting more. The areas of discussion were excellent for any leader or aspiring leader. From the events checklist to the laws that we are governed by, they were all wonderful. Everyone should take the opportunity to experience this course. The information not only will help with organizational events but it will also assist with university and personal events. This is one booklet of information that will be used over and over again. I can not say enough about the session. Hats off to Kathy and the entire staff for putting this on. The speakers were also terrific!"

"The next thing that was great about this was the chance to interact with all of the leaders from all of the regions. The leadership for NCURA, in my opinion, is comprised of a wonderful group of people. Everyone seemed to have gotten along and really bonded. This helped in making the session even better. From region one to region seven everyone simply connected and brought wonderful input to each discussion. The session provided me with strength in an area that I was concerned about and that is my indicator if a session was effective or not. Glad to have been a part of it and I am sure I will be able to share examples of its effectiveness."

NCURA members attending the workshop included:

**Region I**
- Steven Bernstein, University of New Hampshire
- Louise Griffin, University of Massachusetts Lowell
- Vivian Holmes, Harvard Medical School

**Region II**
- Betty Farberman, St. Johns University
- Ann Holmes, University of Maryland College Park

**Region III**
- Timothy Conlon, University of Virginia
- Phillip Myers, Western Kentucky University
- Stephen Williams, Wake Forest University

**Region IV**
- Don Boydston, Rush Medical College
- Deborah Galloway, University of Cincinnati
- Byron E. Helms, University of Illinois at Chicago

**Region V**
- Sondra Ferstl, Texas Woman's University
- JoAn Howeth, University of Oklahoma Norman Campus
- Lisa Thompson, The University of Tulsa

**Region VI**
- Patricia Hawk, University of Oregon
- John Terence M anns, California State University, Sacramento
- Cece M anocehri, California Institute of Technology
- Dan Nordquist, Washington State University

**Region VII**
- Judy Fredenberg, University of Montana
- Josie Jimenez, New Mexico State University
ONR Introduces AdminWeb
by Lambert McCullough, Howard Gershen and Gerald Smith

The Office of Naval Research (ONR) has recently released a new world-wide web application called AdminWeb. This application was developed to facilitate the close out of research grant documentation. Unlike prior versions of AdminWeb, which only displayed expiration dates and documentation status for grant awards processed by the Office of Naval Research, this latest version of AdminWeb also provides mechanisms for performer sites to submit close out documentation for those awards via the Internet. In addition, submission of that close out documentation can be monitored by ONR Field Officers and accepted by ONR Program Officers via AdminWeb.

“Implementation of AdminWeb will allow the funding agencies of research, performers and ONR’s post award personnel the ability to instantaneously obtain the status of any required report. More importantly, it will enhance our ability to provide better customer service relative to closing individual awards” says Mr. Lambert McCullough, Director University Business Affairs and Project Sponsor for AdminWeb.

This version of AdminWeb is the latest step in a larger effort by the Office of Naval Research to provide electronic means of award notification (AwardWeb), voucher submission (PayWeb), and award close out (AdminWeb). The first two systems (AwardWeb and PayWeb) are already on-line and accepting web visitors from schools around the world. AdminWeb is currently undergoing beta testing with a group of fourteen schools from around the U.S.

Each school and ONR Field Office in the beta testing program has been encouraged to visit the website and examine details of awards for which they are responsible. The website is protected by user id and password and three different roles (Performer, Field Officer, or Program Officer) are assigned per user, with two sets of privileges (“View Only” and “View and Update”; only the latter can submit documentation via AdminWeb).

A performer using AdminWeb can track awards approaching expiration, request a “no funds extension” and submit final reports via AdminWeb where ONR has been delegated mechanisms for performer sites to submit close out documentation to DTIC, the Defense Technical Information Center. (Email notifications sent by AdminWeb to ONR Program Officers notify them of the submission of a FTR by a performer.) Additionally, Program Officers can examine AdminWeb-submitted final property reports and view NFEs.

Negative Patent reports and positive or negative Property reports can be submitted as well. Future capabilities will include an interface with the Federal Commons’ Edison website for submission of positive patent reports.

ONR is working with NASA, AFOSR and ARO on the next version of AdminWeb. Future plans include allowing Performers to submit final reports via AdminWeb where ONR has been delegated administration responsibilities.

Currently, however, there are more than enough benefits when using AdminWeb for closing out awards from the Office of Naval Research, including:

- Facilitating timely submission of reports by the Performer
- Immediate notification by ONR that reports have been received
- Reduced award administration overhead

For more information about AdminWeb, please go to: http://www.onr.navy.mil/adminweb/

If you are interested in joining the beta testing program, visit: http://project.sciencewise.com/onr/

Lambert McCullough is the Director, University Business Affairs for the Office of Naval Research, Howard Gershen is the Project Manager for the Office of Naval Research, and Gerald Smith is the Regional Director of the Office of Naval Research – Chicago.
challenging, frustrating and difficult process. With the goal of fostering increased industry-university collaborations, the Research Collaboration Initiative ("RCI") has released a report which examines cultural differences and the critical issues that must be resolved in order to cultivate and increase the number of successful partnerships between institutions and industry. The RCI report, Working Together, Creating Knowledge: The University-Industry Research Collaboration Initiative sets forth a number of recommendations for making collaborations more effective. The RCI report is the result of a two-year study initiated by the Business Higher Education Forum, a partnership of the American Council on Education and the National Alliance of Business.

The barriers to success and the critical and complex issues which must be addressed by each participant in order to increase successful collaborations are analyzed by the report. Intended as a guide and to set the foundation for improving dialogue and greater understanding of the issues between the parties, the report also includes recommendations for best practices for both universities and industry.

The report addresses such challenging issues as:

Intellectual Property: the report notes that the ownership, value and use of intellectual property is the most challenging and difficult area of negotiations with respect to sponsored research agreements. When federal funding is involved, the Bayh-Dole Act provides for universities to own the resulting intellectual property created by the university. The report addresses why each party desires to own intellectual property and presents each party's perspectives regarding the issue of pre-setting royalty rates or other compensation prior to creation of an invention under the research.

Also discussed from the perspective of both parties is an issue of major importance and of increasing discussion in sponsored research: namely, the issue of granting rights to "Background Intellectual Property". These are rights to intellectual property owned by the university, but which were developed with funding from other sponsors and not from funds of the industrial partner.

Confidentiality: The freedom to exchange ideas with colleagues and publish results of research for the benefit of the public is a long-established tenet of academia and must not be placed at risk as a result of a research collaboration. Universities must protect these freedoms on behalf of their faculties and students; however, industry has legitimate needs to protect its proprietary information and to secure protection of intellectual property rights resulting from the research.

Conflicts of Interest: The report discusses various types of investigator and institutional conflicts that may arise in university-industry collaborations: financial conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment, and institutional conflicts of interest or conflict of mission.

Facilities and Administrative Costs ("F&A"): F&A costs (previously identified as "indirect costs") are those costs which are incurred by the university in support of the research enterprise. Universities enter into negotiations with their cognizant federal audit agency to establish a rate to be assessed appropriately and consistently against awards received from federal and non-federal sponsors. According to recent data, most universities recover only a portion of the total F&A expenditures, ranging from 70% to 90%, and are increasingly facing pressure from both industry sponsors and faculty to accept waivers or to charge less for these costs than allowed by the established federal rate.
The report makes the following recommendations:

Negotiating Agreements:
- Where there is significant interaction and interest and the potential exists for sufficient numbers of agreements with a company, the parties should consider negotiating a “master contract.” Where there is less potential for a master contract, universities should develop “model” agreements for use with single research projects, but should ensure that the terms are appropriate for use with both large and small-medium corporate sponsors.
- Confidentiality agreements should be used only when necessary but, if required, should be executed by the company, the university, and the researchers involved with the project in order that all obligations are understood and the researcher is able to comply with the requirements. Reviews of publications by a sponsor for its proprietary information or to determine and secure protection for intellectual property should take no more than 60 to 90 days.
- Facilities and Administrative costs are legitimate expenses for conducting and supporting the research enterprise. Companies, in most cases, should expect to pay the full F&A rate negotiated by the university with the federal government.
- Ownership, use and control of intellectual property resulting from research collaboration may be negotiated between the parties, who should remain flexible and open during negotiations; however, in most cases, universities should retain ownership. According to the report, the most important question is whether the corporate sponsor has the ability to commercialize the results for the benefit of the public. The copyright policies at universities should be reviewed and revised, if necessary, to provide for licensing rights to commercial partners on terms that are similar to the licensing rights provided for patents.
- Contentious licensing negotiations between partners should be avoided during negotiations for the research project. Pre-setting royalty-rates may result in problems for universities due to federal tax regulations covering licensing and commercialization of sponsored research occurring in buildings or with use of equipment supported by tax-exempt bonds.
- Legitimate reasons exist for requests from companies for background rights to intellectual property. Similarly, universities have legitimate reasons for not providing these rights; however, where appropriate, universities should continue to make a best effort to do so, including close consultation with the faculty to confirm that all obligations are able to be met.

The Report makes the following recommendations with respect to Best Practices for Universities:
- Successful collaborations must be based upon the willingness, interest and enthusiasm of the individual faculty member to participate, and upon the matching of the research strengths of the university with the industry research opportunities. A proper credit during the hiring, tenure and promotion processes should be given to university researchers who collaborate with industry.
- Coordination between the various offices that support university research should be improved and if possible, co-located. The president of the university should set the positive tone for collaborations and align incentives to encourage teamwork and promote research collaborations.

The Report makes the following recommendations with respect to Best Practices for Industry:
- Companies should encourage internal champions of research collaborations to identify university researchers who share research priorities and with whom they wish to partner. To facilitate the process, companies should consider establishing a central coordinating office or unit to expedite and make communication with the company research organization as easy as possible.
- Companies should endeavor to incorporate and integrate the results of university research collaborations into their products and service development process where appropriate. Involvement of business units, appropriate management of the collaboration, and planning for turnover of key personnel is important to achieving success of the collaboration. Whenever possible, students should be involved in the collaboration. Similar to universities, corporate evaluation and reward systems should be modified as necessary to give appropriate credit and rewards for the establishment of internal and external interdisciplinary teams. Ultimately to be successful and achieve the desired results, a long-term commitment is required by corporate leaders.

The following members of NCURA assisted the Forum by reviewing the RCI’s initial documents and identifying best practices: Mareda Weiss, The University of Wisconsin-Madison and Chair of the working group; Mark Doremus, The University of Wisconsin-Madison; Steve Erickson, Boston College; Bobby McQuiston, The University of Texas at Austin; Marianne Rinaldo Woods, The University of Texas at Arlington; and NCURA Executive Director, Kathleen Larmett.

The new report may be read on the Web site of the American Council on Education (http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/index.cfm?pubID=230)

Bobby McQuiston serves as the Associate Director, Office of Sponsored Projects for the University of Texas at Austin.

MILESTONES

Alice Tangredi-Hannon left the position of Director, Office of Research Administration at Brown University. Her new adventures began on July 30th, as the Director, Office of Research Administration at Thomas Jefferson University. Alice, when WAS Thomas Jefferson President of the United States?

Michelle Christy has been promoted to the position of Director, Office of Research and Project Administration at Princeton University, effective July 1, 2001. Michelle was previously Associate Director at Princeton, and she succeeds Al Sinisgalli in this position.

Gary Thompson joined Harvard University on July 1, 2001 as the Associate Dean for Compliance. Gary previously served at NIH as the Director of the Division of Grants Compliance and Oversight within the Office of Policy for Extramural Research Administration. (See Gary’s article on the NIH Proactive Grants Compliance Program in the December/January edition of the N newsletter.)

We wish all of you success in your new endeavors!
REGION I
New England

It’s summer here in New England and by the time this newsletter reaches Region I desks most will be either just coming back from vacation or just beginning them. This is the time when we begin making preparations for upcoming Region I activities in the fall, winter, and spring, and we have been busy.

The RADG meeting dates for the upcoming season have been set. So mark your calendar for October 18 and December 12, 2001 and January 23, March 13, and May 30, 2002. Our RADG meetings will be held, as in the previous year, at the John Hancock Conference Center. The dates have been placed on the Region I website and as in the past each meeting announcement and registration form will also be posted to the website approximately one month prior to the meeting date, earlier if possible. This is a new season and we are looking for topic areas that you would like presented. Let me know by email if you have a topic area of interest, would like to host a meeting, or serve on a panel.

The Spring 2002 meeting is moving along. The Co-Chairs for the meeting are Ben Prince, Meyer’s Primary Care Institute and William Corbett, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute. Our meeting location will be Newport, Rhode Island and our dates are April 28 – May 1, 2002. We have just completed negotiations with the Newport Marriott who will be the host hotel for the meeting. The Co-Chairs have been putting together their program committee and welcome volunteers. We will keep you posted as the program comes together.

As you may recall we need a few good people in Region I to step up to the plate and represent the Region both regionally and nationally. We have openings for a Chair and Treasurer of Region I and a Region I representative to the National Board of Directors. Position descriptions have been posted to the Region I website. A notice will go out shortly from Steve Bernstein, Chair of the Region I Nominating Committee and Region I representative on the National Nominating and Leadership Development Committee requesting nominations for these positions. Some nominations have already come forward and have been forwarded to Steve and his committee. Speaking of committees we are also looking for region one members to volunteer to participate on the Region I Nominating Committee. This is a great way to become involved. If you would like to help out send Steve Bernstein an email.

By now everyone should have received an electronic copy of the Program for the upcoming NCURA Annual Meeting in November. What seemed a distant thought is now moving toward us with great speed. The program looks fantastic so plan now to attend.

In closing, have a great rest of your summer!

Bill Corbett is Chair of Region I and is the Director of Research Administration, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute.

REGION II
Mid-Atlantic

At our Spring Meeting in Hershey, Pennsylvania, Region II hosted 150 research administrators. We worked hard, played hard, and had more than our fill of Hershey’s Kisses before the three-day event was over. The Program Committee, led by Denise Clark of Cornell University and Charlie Kaars of SUNY Bufalo treated us to an inspirational and thought-provoking workshop on leadership and its many faces, sessions on Responsible Conduct of Research, and a variety of concurrent sessions. The hospitality suite held a standing-room-only crowd.

We are now looking forward to next year’s program, and welcome all suggestions and volunteers. If you would like to be involved with the energetic and hard-working group that is planning the 2002 meeting, which will take place in Ithaca, N.Y., please contact Charlie Kaars, Program Chair (kaars@research.buffalo.edu) or Anne Geronimo, Program Co-Chair (ageronimo@gradschool.umd.edu). If you do not have much time to devote to planning, but would like to help out at the meeting with hospitality, registration or membership activities, please feel free to contact Charlie, Anne, or Betty Farbman at bettyregion2@aol.com

The Steering Committee is also discussing some by-laws revisions that it would like to propose to the membership, and we will be contacting you in the coming months for review of these proposals. Revisions include the creation of a Chair-elect position, as well as the creation of separate positions for Secretary and Treasurer, which have historically been combined in Region II. If you have any comments or suggestions, please forward them to Betty at the above email address.

Enjoy the rest of the summer, and we’ll see you in November.

Betty Farbman is Chair of Region II and serves as the Director, Office of Grants and Sponsored Research at St. Johns University.

REGION III
Southeast

Approximately 150 Region III members attended the Spring Meeting held at the Lago Mar Resort in Fort Lauderdale, Fl, and presided over by Chair Olivia Pope (Florida State University). The theme of the meeting was Riding the Waves of Change: Compliance and ERA. Highlights of the meeting included workshops by: Julie Norris and Jane Youngers, What Post-award Needs to Know about Pre-award; Julie Cole and Pam Whitleck, Professional Development; Jerry Fife, Fundamentals of Compliance; and National Secretary Pamela Webb, Planning Ahead – Electronic Tools that Aid in Achieving Compliance. Steve Smartt, Midge Gardner and Carl Frantz gave an update on what universities can expect in their dealings with President Bush and the 107th Congress. In addition to agency updates, there were sessions and roundtables on research magazines, benchmarking, and merging pre- and post-award offices. When a family illness prevented a scheduled presenter to attend the meeting, Martha Taylor and Tony Ventimiglia (Auburn University) stepped in at the last minute and gave excellent presentations on Acrobat© iPDF forms and NSF Fastlane, respectively. A special thanks to both of them is in order.

NCURA National President Regina White presented a plenary session about NCURA’s upcoming year of meetings and training activities. Thanks for being with us and keeping the membership well-informed Regina!

The meeting was attended by 35 first-timers who got to know each other and the members at the Newcomer’s Session given by Deborah Walz (University of Central Arkansas), Pat Buenemeyer (James Madison University), Tim Atkinson (University of Arkansas Children’s Hospital), Jenny Bradley (Roanoke College), Stephen Williams (Wake Forest University),
and Phil Myers (Western Kentucky University).

Many thanks to the ERA Committee headed by Dave Battey (College of Charleston), Pamela Napier (Western Kentucky University), and Nick Perez (Georgia Institute of Technology), for providing technology support to all of the sessions without a glitch.

Regional Officers for the upcoming year are: Chair-Phil Myers, Western Kentucky; Chair-Elect-Tim Conlon, University of Virginia; Secretary-Treasurer-Stephen Williams, Wake Forest University.

Many thanks to all of the Program Committee for making the Lago Mar meeting a success. Working with Chair-Elect Phil Myers on the Committee were Richard More (Coastal Carolina University), Rosemary Ruff (Auburn University), Rebecca Sharpe (Middletown State University), Bonnie Smith (Western Kentucky University), Sara Smith (North Carolina State University), Mary Watson (Valdosta State University), Doug Backman (University of Alabama), and M. J. Carver (University of North Carolina-Wilmington).

New committee chairs for 2001-2002 are Tim Conlon (Program); Greg Thompson, (Hospitality); Dave Battey (ERA); Carl Frantz (Professional Development); Mary Watson (Site Selection); Deborah Walz (Nominations and Elections); Bonnie Smith (Membership) and Rosemary Ruff (Newsletter). For those who have consented to Chair these committees — a round of applause. Please contact the chairs through the Region III web site committee pages to lend your talents to the committees.

A conference current human research issues and solutions: Regulatory overview & Hot Topics (June 21-22, 2001) was sponsored jointly by the Medical University of South Carolina and the Office for Human Research Protections in collaboration with the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the Department of Veterans Affairs, South Carolina State University, Trident Health System, the Ralph J. Johnson VAMC, and the College of Charleston. Participants got an overview of federal regulations with special emphasis on hot topics and solutions to problems encountered in the performance of research involving human subjects. As an added bonus, the conference location, the Mills House, provided participants with a spectacular view of Charleston’s Historic District and a “trip in time to a delightful antebellum house” where each guest room is furnished with period furniture.

Rosemary Ruff serves as the Associate Director, Office of Review and Compliance at Auburn University.

### REGION IV

**Mid-America**

To ensure every vote counts, Region IV members approved a special re-election process at the Spring 2001 annual business meeting. Our Nominations Committee reports that the following members now hold the newly elected position of:

**Chair-elect:**
Deborah Galloway, University of Cincinnati

**Treasurer:**
Byron H elm, University of Illinois at Chicago

**Elected Members:**
Joanne Altieri, University of Kansas
Mary Laura Farnham, University of Nebraska

**Representative to the National Board:**
Ed Herran, Indiana University

**Chair-elect runner-up:**
Don Boydstun, Rush Presbyterian

With these positions filled, members of the 2001 Region IV Board of Directors are:

**Chair:**
Jim Maus, Washington University

**Chair-elect:**
Deborah Galloway, University of Cincinnati

**Treasurer:**
Byron H elm, University of Illinois at Chicago

**Secretary:**
Glenda Luecke, Washington University

**Immediate Past Chair:**
Kathy Taggart, Creighton University

**Elected Members:**
Susan Toler, Loyola University of Chicago
Deborah Vetter, University of Nebraska Medical Center
Joanne Altieri, University of Kansas
Mary Laura Farnham, University of Nebraska-Omaha

**Region IV Representatives to the National Board:**
Jamie Caldwell, Loyola University of Chicago (term ending December 31, 2001)
Ed Herran, Indiana University (term beginning January 1, 2002)

**Chair-elect runner-up:**
Don Boydstun, Rush Presbyterian

The first course of action by the Region IV Board will be to begin planning for the professional development needs of its members. To stay apprised of the continuous changes in our profession, N CURA members count on learning with and from their colleagues at national and regional meetings. “The field of research administration is too complex to do this alone,” says Jim Maus, Region IV Chair. “At N CURA meetings, we’re counting on receiving updates and insights from agency representatives and colleagues from other institutions.”

Recognizing that volunteers are critical to addressing the professional development needs of its members, the Region IV Board of Directors is calling for volunteers to help plan and implement the Spring 2002 Annual Meeting. “We need members to present workshops and concurrent sessions, lead roundtable discussions, and coordinate the many tasks required to hold an effective meeting,” says Debi Galloway, Region IV 2002 Program Committee Chair. Volunteering? Simply contact Debi Galloway at debi.galloway@uc.edu.

Deborah Vetter serves in the Sponsored Programs Administration Office at the University of Nebraska Medical Center.

### REGION V

**Southwestern**

Six members were elected to the Executive Board of Region V this spring: Joan Howeth, University of Oklahoma; Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect; Alyson McCarty, also of the University of Oklahoma; Secretary; Allen Soltow, University of Tulsa; Regional Representative to the N CURA Board of Directors, effective January 2002; and three Regional Executive Board members: Matt Berry, University of Oklahoma; Brett Henry, Texas Engineering Experiment Station; and Lisa Faulkner, Oklahoma State University. These new officers join Sondra Ferstl, Texas Woman’s University, Chair; Susan Krause, Texas Children’s Cancer Center/Baylor College of Medicine; Immediate Past Chair; Lisa Thompson, University of Tulsa, Treasurer; and Kathleen Harris, Texas Tech, Regional Representative until January 2002.

Sondra Ferstl received the first N CURA Region V Distinguished Service Award as well as a certificate signed by Governor Frank Keating making her an honorary citizen of the state of Oklahoma! Travel awards to attend the regional meeting were made to Vicki Fusco, University of Tulsa; Ron Rogers, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston; and Nicki Clarke, University of North Texas Health Science Center at Fort Worth.

The Region V publications committee is working with those who presented at the regional meeting in Oklahoma City to post a copy of their slides on the Region V website.

continued on page 11
Bill Quirke, in his book *Communicating Corporate Change* notes: “There used to be only two certainties in life, death and taxes. Now there is a third, change, and continuous change at that. Having to manage change is not new; what is new is the pace and extent of change. Lift the lid off almost any business today and there will be a host of initiatives under way... all demanding scarce time and attention and all of which are urgent priorities. Merely staff complain of initiative overload, and pray for respite from change and a chance to consolidate.”

Our daily work environment has become increasingly complex. FastLane and the Federal Commons, cost accounting standards and A21, conflict of interest and protection of human subjects, rats, birds and mice, instruction in responsible conduct of research (don’t forget ITAR!), and electronic proposal submission to foundations would certainly be enough to make us revisit our processes and workflow. Now add to those external pressures the fact that your institution may have adopted new administrative systems, or may be in the process of developing such new systems which, by the way, are expected to lead to cost savings.

There is no doubt that changes are required in the way we do business. The processes and solutions that worked in the past create bottlenecks and complaints today. But while you may clearly see how changes will make life better for you, your staff and your customers, unfortunately it isn’t as simple as Jean Luc Picard saying “Make it so!”

Refining a business process to make it more efficient may involve not only the elimination of intermediate steps but also changes in the responsibilities of more than one department. Even with the support of senior management, getting the changes to work will necessitate both leadership and diplomatic skill.

William Bridges and Susan Mitchell in their article “Leading Transition: A New Model For Change,” discuss the internal process people must go through in accepting a change and the role of a leader in assisting in this process. They call this internal, psychological process “transition” and have identified three stages in the process: Saying Goodbye, Shifting Into Neutral and Moving Forward. They point out that during a major change you are not just asking people to give up a personal preference, you are asking them to let go of what feels like their world of experience - their sense of identity. But even after people let go of the old way of doing things they find themselves in a very unnerving state, the Neutral Zone. This is the stage when people are uncertain about how to do their new tasks, there is confusion about how things will work and there is often a great deal of shared complaining about the new system. Not surprisingly concerns arise about the personal impact, (rewards and punishments), of reduced productivity and increased mistakes as new tasks are learned.

Asking people to Move Forward and embrace an entirely new way of doing things which puts their sense of competence and value at risk requires all of your management and persuasive skills.

In July of 1999 I had an opportunity to put these concepts into practice. My university implemented a suite of new administrative systems: general ledger, human resources, payroll, purchasing, accounts payable, and grants. As if that weren’t enough, roles and responsibilities with respect to processing various transactions were shifted from one central office to another or from central offices to departments. Skills acquired over many years were made obsolete overnight. The challenge was not to get people to give up the old central system - it simply vanished! The real challenge was to get people to give up the old way of doing things and to embrace the new.

During the transition I found that my own role underwent a transition as well. As I asked people to say “Goodbye” to the old system, my task was to explain the change, why it was needed and how it would be accomplished. Then I had to provide emotional support in the “Neutral Zone”, which permitted recovery of self-esteem as new skills were learned. Finally, as people moved Forward and embraced the new system, I needed to employ logical and analytical skill.

Below I share with you some of the principles I found important in successfully leading my office through this exciting and difficult time, and which I will rely on again as we go into our first round of “upgrades”.

**Open Communication:**
- Explain the need for change
- Provide accurate information so staff don’t rely on rumor
- Be prepared to listen and care about the concerns of staff and colleagues.

**Consultative decision making:**
- To the extent possible given the situation, involve the staff in determining how things will be done; what changes will be made

**Building Teams:**
- Recognize and use the strengths of your staff
- Be willing to reassign tasks without regard to longevity in the job

**Professional Development:**
- Assist staff to gain the skills necessary for the new environment
- Be willing to provide time away from the office to attend training sessions

**Review Reward Structure**
- Recognize that old measures of productivity may no longer be applicable.
- Maintain respect for non-workplace life through flex-time, telecommuting etc.

**and last but not least,**
- Maintain Your Sense of Humor and Exercise Schedule.

Suzanne K. Polmar is Director, Grant and Contract Administration, Yale University.

**References:**
Look for this information soon at http://research.utmb.edu/ncura/. In the meantime, take a look at the photos on the website of members enjoying the baseball game and attending the banquet.

JoAn Howeth, Lisa Thompson, and Sondra Ferstl attended the Regional Leadership Training in Washington, D.C. planned by the NCURA staff. JoAn took advantage of the occasion to meet with the chair of Region III to discuss the Spring 2002 joint meeting in San Antonio. That meeting will be held May 5-8 at the St. Anthony Hotel, one block from the Riverwalk. Plan to be there.

Sondra Ferstl is Chair of Region V and Associate Dean for Research, Texas Woman’s University

REGION VI
Western

“Summertime. and the livin’ is easy” or so the old song goes. But for a number of the region VI committees, summer is a very busy time.

The Nominating Committee is gearing up to prepare recommendations for a new set of officers for our region. This year we will be selecting a Chair-elect, a Secretary/Treasurer-elect, and a member of the Regional Advisory Committee. The committee’s recommendations will be forwarded to region VI members in mid-August. Then members will have thirty days to suggest additional candidates and an election will be held in late September. Those elected will take office on January 1st.

The Travel Awards Committee shortly will be sending out an announcement soliciting nominations for Travel Award recipients. Two members from our region who have not had the opportunity to attend the annual meeting will be eligible for a $600 travel award to experience the NCURA annual meeting in Washington, DC this November.

Dan Nordquist, Terry Manns, Pat Hawk, and Cece Manoochehri attended the NCURA Regional Volunteers’ Workshop June 9th & 10th in Washington, DC. This was a really fabulous session. All of us learned a great deal and came away even more impressed than before with the knowledge, experience, and helpfulness of our national headquarters’ staff.

While we have only recently completed our 2001 joint region VI-VII meeting, it is not too early to begin planning for our 2002 meeting. While region VII will be in charge of the program, or region has been busy with site selection and other logistic arrangements. Hawaii was our members’ choice for the 2002 meeting. Pat Hawk, our Chair-elect with assistance from Georgette Sakamoto and Jim Brett have reviewed various proposals and options. Kona has been selected as the site location. We will be meeting at the Keauhou Beach Resort in Kailua-Kona. The dates are April 14th through April 17th; the rate will be $109 per night. All region VI and VII members should mark their calendars and make plans to attend this meeting.

Terry Manns is Region VI Secretary-Treasurer and Director, Research and Sponsored Projects, California State University, Sacramento.

REGION VII
Rocky Mountain

Region VII has requested electronic nominations for a new member-at-large, replacing Denise Wallen, and new secretary/treasurer, replacing Josie Jimenez. The election process will be done electronically so be sure to update your information on the national website.

Region VI and VII hold their spring meetings jointly and every fourth year meet in Hawaii. We will be in Kailua-Kona, April 14-17, 2002. Region VII will primarily be responsible for planning the meeting program and if you have ideas for session panels and workshops, please contact Judy Fredenberg, fred@selway.umt.edu, 406-243-6670.

In an effort to reduce meeting costs by booking meeting sites as early as possible, the two regions are considering planning meeting locations several years out. Sites under consideration include Colorado Springs, CO (2003), San Francisco, CA (2004), Salt Lake City (2005), Maui, HI (2006), Tucson, AZ (2007), Las Vegas, NV (2008), Albuquerque, NM (2009) and Oahu, HI (2010). If you have any thoughts about these locations or suggestions for other sites, contact Judy Fredenberg (fred@selway.umt.edu) or Dan Nordquist (nordquis@wsu.edu). Of course, members from other regions are always welcome to attend our meetings!!!

Wilma G. (Winnie) Ennenga serves as the Director, Office of Grant and Contract Services, Northern Arizona University

NCURA’s Regional Chairs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region I</th>
<th>Region IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Corbett, Dana Farber Cancer Institute</td>
<td>Jim Maus, Washington University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region II</td>
<td>Region V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Farbman, St. John’s University</td>
<td>Sondra Ferstl, Texas Woman’s University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region III</td>
<td>Region VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Myers, Western Kentucky University</td>
<td>Dan Nordquist, Washington State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region VII</td>
<td>Judy Fredenberg, University of Montana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional Corner continued from page 9
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ile potentially subject to additional modifications, including simplification of the research-related requirements and delay in the compliance date, the final privacy regulations promulgated pursuant to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (“HIPAA”) were effective as of April 14, 2001 with a compliance date of April 14, 2003. The privacy requirements under the final rule regarding the use and disclosure of patient-identifiable information by providers, including academic medical centers and faculty practice plans, are highly complex, potentially unworkable and will require significant expenditure of resources by affected parties. Of particular concern are the special rules governing uses and disclosure of patient-identifiable information for research purposes.

**Key HIPAA Privacy Concepts**

In general, the privacy regulations prohibit certain entities, including providers that transmit electronic health information in connection with a standard transaction (e.g., claims payment, coordination of benefits), from using or disclosing “Protected Health Information” (“PHI”) without the patient’s permission unless expressly permitted by the regulations. PHI means individually identifiable health information created, held or transmitted by a covered entity (i.e., providers, health plans and clearinghouses) in any form. De-identified information is not subject to the privacy regulations. Because the privacy regulations apply only to providers, health plans, and health care clearinghouses, researchers are not subject to the privacy regulations by virtue of their research activity. Instead, the HIPAA privacy standards apply to research activities only when providers or health plans either use PHI collected by virtue of their health care activities for their own research purposes or share their PHI with a third party-researcher. Under the HIPAA privacy standards, a covered entity cannot use or disclose patient identifiable information for research purposes without specific patient authorization unless subject to one of the exceptions under the special rules for research.

The HIPAA regulations adopt the Common Rule that is a systematic investigation, including research, development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to “generalizable knowledge.” Knowledge may be generalizable when it can be applied to a population either inside or outside of a covered entity. In addition to satisfying the consent requirements under the Common Rule, a covered entity under HIPAA is permitted to use and disclose PHI for research purposes only under the following circumstances: with individual authorization; with IRB or privacy board approval; for reviews preparatory to research; or for research on decedents. The requirements applicable to each of these circumstances and other implementation concerns are discussed in greater detail below.

**Individual Authorization**

The HIPAA privacy requirements for patient authorization are more stringent than existing research consent standards. The regulations require that the specific authorization form, which must be signed and dated by the patient or the patient’s representative, contain the following requirements:

- description of the research purpose
- description of the specific PHI to be used or disclosed in connection with the research
- the identity of the persons, entities, or classes of persons using or receiving the PHI
- an expiration date or expiration event (e.g., the termination of clinical trials)
- a statement that the patient/patient’s representative may revoke their authorization (and the process for doing so) except to the extent the covered entity has relied upon the authorization (e.g., inability to use information would frustrate ongoing clinical trial)
- a statement that the patient/patient’s representative may refuse to sign the authorization
- a statement that the patient/patient’s representative has the right to inspect or copy the PHI unless doing so would frustrate an ongoing clinical trial (e.g., study involves use of a placebo)
- a statement that the PHI may no longer be protected under HIPAA once disclosed to a non-covered entity and may be redisclosed by the recipient
- description of any remuneration received by the covered entity in exchange for using or disclosing the PHI

If the research includes treatment of the individual, the authorization also must describe the extent to which the PHI will be used for purposes of treatment, payment, or health care operations, and refer to any separate general consent signed by the patient/patient’s representative and privacy notice provided to the patient/patient’s representative. While it is acceptable to condition research-related treatment upon the execution of the authorization, a provider cannot condition the provision of non-research related treatment on the receipt of the authorization to use or disclose the individual’s PHI for research purposes.

**IRB Approval**

Where individual authorization for use or disclosure of PHI for research purposes cannot be practicably obtained, the covered entity nevertheless may use or disclose PHI for research purposes if such use or disclosure is approved by an IRB or “privacy board.” This IRB review process is significantly different than current IRB review of research proposals, which focuses on patient health risk as opposed to the privacy risk of the use or disclosure. In addition, whereas IRB review under the Common Rule is limited to review of research involving human subjects, HIPAA requires IRB approval or patient authorization for use or disclosure of PHI even if the research does not involve human contact. In making the determination that the researcher can use or disclose the PHI without obtaining patient authorization, the IRB or privacy board must make the following determinations:

- that the use or disclosure of PHI involves no more than a minimal privacy risk to the individual;
- that absence of an alteration or waiver of individual authorization will not adversely affect the individual’s privacy rights and welfare;
- that the research cannot practically be conducted without access to or use of the PHI and without the waiver or alteration;
- that the privacy risks relative to the contemplated benefits of the research are reasonable;
- that there exists an adequate plan to protect the individual’s PHI from improper use or disclosure and that patient identifiers will be destroyed at the earliest opportunity (unless retention is supported by health or research justification or required by law); and
• that the researcher provides written assurance that the PHI will not be reused or disclosed unless in connection with authorized oversight of the research, for other research meeting one of the HIPAA research exceptions, or required by law.

If a covered entity does not have an IRB, it may establish a “privacy board” to review requests of a waiver or alteration of individual authorization for use or disclosure of PHI for research purposes. With regard to the privacy board’s composition and voting, the regulations require that the privacy board: (1) include members of varying backgrounds and appropriate professional capacity as necessary to review the effect of the research protocol on the individual’s privacy rights and related interests; (2) include at least one member present at the review who is not affiliated with the covered entity, not affiliated with an entity conducting or sponsoring the research, and not related to any person affiliated with such entities; and (3) ensure that members who may have a conflict of interest abstain from participating in the review.

A waiver of authorization for HIPAA purposes is not also a waiver of informed consent. The documentation of IRB or privacy board approval of a waiver of authorization is based only on an assessment of the privacy risks associated with the research study, not associated with the risks to study participants. IRBs will be required to review the request to waive patient authorization and the request to waive informed consent separately and according to the criteria set forth in the HIPAA regulations and the Common Rule criteria for waiver of informed consent, respectively.

Other Exceptions
The privacy regulations create two exceptions to the general rule that a covered entity must receive either patient authorization or IRB/privacy board approval prior to using or disclosing PHI for research purposes. The regulations permit a researcher to have access to PHI for “reviews preparatory to research,” (e.g., review of information to develop research hypothesis or protocol or to assist in the recruitment of research participants) if the following four criteria are met:

- the PHI must be used solely for preparatory purposes;
- the PHI may not be removed from the covered entity’s premises;
- the PHI for which use or access is sought must be necessary to the research purposes; and
- the researcher must agree to record only de-identified health information.

In addition to the use of PHI for reviews preparatory to research, a covered entity may use or disclose PHI of a deceased person for research purposes without authorization of a legal representative or IRB approval if the covered entity first obtains the following assurances from the researcher:

- representation in writing that the use or disclosure is sought solely for research on the PHI of decedents;
- documentation, at the request of the covered entity, of the death of such individuals; and
- representation in writing that the PHI for which use or disclosure is sought is necessary for the research purposes.

This exception is consistent with the standard under the Common Rule which does not consider deceased persons to be “human subjects.”

Psychotherapy Notes and Vulnerable Special Populations
Special rules apply to the use and disclosure of psychotherapy notes, defined as a mental health professional’s notes documenting the content of a conversation during a counseling session. Therefore, researchers who want to use existing psychotherapy notes for research purposes must obtain patient authorization separate from authorization to use or disclose information created for the research.

Other mental health records, including summaries of an individual’s diagnosis, functional status, treatment plan, and progress, are treated no differently than other PHI and may be used or disclosed without patient authorization for research purposes with IRB/privacy board approval, for reviews preparatory to research, or for research on decedents.

Practical Implications of HIPAA
While HIPAA at best will provide only minimal increase in human subject protection, it will increase the administrative burden on covered entities engaged in research activities, particularly with respect to IRB review of waiver or alteration of patient authorization, documentation, individual accounting of disclosures, and the extension of covered entities’ administrative obligations under HIPAA to research activities (e.g., training, development of authorization forms, process for reporting and investigating complaints, development of policies).

With respect to IRB requirements, IRBs will need to develop detailed standards implementing the criteria for approval of a waiver or alteration of patient authorization, and a procedure for documenting such approvals. For example, IRBs will need to decide what constitutes an adequate written assurance that protected health information will not be reused or disclosed by a researcher. In addition, HIPAA may increase the workload of IRBs, as IRBs will be required to review certain types of research that would otherwise be exempt from IRB review under the federal Common Rule (i.e., research involving the collection or study of existing data or records).

HIPAA also allows individuals to request and receive an accounting of all disclosures made by a covered entity of the individual’s PHI other than disclosures for treatment, payment, and health care operations. A covered entity therefore must track any disclosure for research purposes. A covered entity is not, however, required to give an accounting of its own use of PHI, including internal use of PHI for research purposes. Thus, the organizational structure of a covered entity, including the location of the IRB/privacy board within the organization, and the location of the research will affect whether in a particular case the covered entity must track and provide an accounting of PHI disclosed for research purposes.

For example, a university that operates a faculty practice plan is considered a “hybrid” entity for HIPAA purposes and must designate its healthcare and non-healthcare components. If the IRB is designated part of the healthcare component, the “disclosure” of PHI to the IRB will not be subject to the accounting requirements. The opposite is true if the IRB functions outside of the healthcare component, in which case disclosures of PHI to the IRB is considered a disclosure to a third party. Similarly, if the researcher is an employee of the faculty practice plan -- a healthcare component -- the researcher’s use of PHI held by the faculty practice plan will not be subject to the accounting requirements. Where multiple affiliated covered entities share an IRB, disclosure of PHI to the IRB may be subject to the accounting requirement unless the affiliated covered entities affirmatively designate themselves as a single covered entity for HIPAA compliance purposes. Note that even if the IRB is viewed as a “business associate” of a covered entity, research-related disclosures are subject to the accounting requirements because research is not included in the definitions of treatment, payment or health care operations.

Further, the transition provisions of HIPAA grandfather certain consents and authorizations obtained in clinical research projects that do not comply with HIPAA if started prior to the HIPAA compliance date. The grandfather provisions apply only if the research does not include treatment of the individual. Thus, a covered entity that obtained a consent/authorization from the research subject may rely upon that consent/authorization (consistent with any limitations expressed with the consent/authorization) to use or disclose the protected health information it created or received prior to or after the HIPAA compliance date. If a covered entity wishes to use or disclose protected health information but no such consent/authorization exists, it must obtain an authorization or a waiver (if the research project is ongoing and the researchers cannot locate the individual subjects, the IRB may consider such circumstances in its review, and the research will likely be able to continue uninterrupted).

Finally, it is important that applicable covered entities incorporate research considerations into their HIPAA compliance planning process and ensure that privacy policies, notices, authorizations and training programs appropriately incorporate the research function.

Michele Garvin and Jessica Lind are apart of the Health Care Group, Ropes and Gray
Several months ago, in advance of the January 2001 videoteleconference on ERA, NCURA and the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) asked their memberships to respond to a survey on the status of ERA at their institutions. The turnout was tremendous, with nearly 300 respondents from all sizes and types of institutions completing the web-based survey. While several key results of the survey were reported during the ERA videoteleconference, “Where are We Today and What Can We Expect Tomorrow,” much of the data had to be saved for later tabulation and analysis. These results are now available, and we are pleased to be able to share with you soon some of the highlights.

The intent of this survey was to take a time-sensitive snapshot about organizational readiness to engage in ERA, and to understand if there were differences in readiness based on certain factors, including size, type of organization, placement within an organization, or participation in FDP. The eighteen question survey was designed to be completed within a few minutes, and to be answered by one or more individuals at an institution with an interest in ERA. Because the survey was designed to poll individuals affiliated at any level within an organization rather than providing a single official response for each institution, the data provide a valuable insight into respondents’ perception of where ERA is on their campus. Because many individuals from a single institution could respond, however, and because these do not necessarily represent “official” institutional positions, the data should not be interpreted to reflect organizational positions on the topic.

Demographics

A total of 299 individuals responded to the survey. Of these 272 were from colleges or universities, with most of the remainder split between research institutes and hospitals. 186 respondents (62%) were from public institutions and 116 (38%) were from private organizations. 31% of the respondents indicated that they were from an FDP institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Research Award Volume</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$20M</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20-$50M</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50-$100M</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100-$200M</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$200M</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in the chart above, the survey was completed by individuals at all different size organizations. Most of the respondents (64%) indicated that they worked in central offices, while the rest were primarily split between school/college level and departmental level offices. Overall, 42% of the respondents for the survey worked in combined pre-award/post-award offices, with another 49% working in offices that they characterized as pre-award, or pre-award/post-award non-financial.

Existing ERA Activities

To get a sense of where various institutions are on their ERA developments, respondents were asked to answer several questions about their institution’s progress on the following: the ability for faculty/staff to prepare and store a proposal on-line (beyond downloading and/or on-line completion of electronic forms that are subsequently printed); the ability to submit a proposal approval and routing form electronically; and the ability for faculty or staff to receive on-line financial reports or data about their individual sponsored projects.

Access to financial data was clearly a priority – 60% of respondents indicated that they receive financial data or reports on-line, whereas only 24% of respondents can prepare and store a proposal, and only 17% can submit a proposal and approval routing form electronically at this time.

Size of research volume appeared to be correlated to the capacity to receive financial data or reports on-line – 76% of respondents from schools over $200M reported this capability, while those from mid-size institutions hovered around 60% and just over 50% of participants from institutions under $50M reported having this tool. As size increased, so did the likelihood that one could submit a proposal and routing form electronically – only 9% of respondents from institutions under $20M had this capability, while at institutions over $100M in research volume, 23% of respondents said that this was available. If one were interested in receiving financial data or reports on-line, it made no difference whether you belonged to a public or private institution. Respondents from private institutions were, however, slightly more likely to be able to prepare and store proposals on-line or have e-submittable proposal and routing forms.

The data showed that respondents from institutions that are members of the FDP were generally more advanced in terms of electronic capability than the average. For example, 27% of respondents from FDP institutions indicated that they can submit their proposal and approval form electronically, while only 9% of their counterparts from non-FDP institutions reported this capability. Although FDP members were no more likely to have the capacity to prepare and store a proposal on-line, 66% reported they could receive financial data or reports on-line, compared to 56% of their non-FDP peers.

Technical Resources

After capturing data concerning existing electronic tools, the survey asked respondents to share information about their technical resources, including the number of technical professionals supporting their sponsored research offices and an assessment of the office’s hardware and software capability.

Nearly 80% of respondents indicated that their current office technology resources were either adequate for their immediate needs, or were a mixed basket (some cutting edge and some sufficient). Overall, only 4% of respondents felt that their technology resources were primarily or completely insufficient. Interestingly, while technology at the smallest category of institutions was rarely insufficient (1.4%), respondents at institutions between $20M - $50M reported that their technology was primarily or completely insufficient 21% of the time. It appeared that respondents from this category of institution felt that they were either technology poor, or technology rich. This category also reported the highest percentage of having cutting edge technology (28%) of all respondents in the survey.
As might be expected, schools with the lower research volumes were the least likely to have technical professions supporting their offices. 32% of respondents from schools under $20M reported that they had no technical professional assistance, and respondents from schools under $50M were about twice as likely (29%) to use research administrators for this purpose as their counterparts in schools between $50 and $200M. For schools over $200M, 45% of respondents reported that they had 2 technical professional FTE or more, while 40% of institutions between $50-$100M and 43% of institutions between $100-$200M indicated that they had some technical assistance, but typically one FTE or less.

Respondents from private institutions were more likely to be at one end of the spectrum or the other concerning the availability of technical professional FTE. 40% of privates had minimal or no technical assistance (compared to 34% of publics), while 31% of privates had two or more FTE compared to only 24% of their public counterparts.

**ERA Activities at the Institution**

Finally, respondents were asked about the extent to which they are engaged in exploring ERA in a formal context. Respondents were also asked about their institution’s overall involvement with integrated or cross-cutting systems development vendors (e.g., PeopleSoft, Oracle) and whether their institution had engaged a vendor to develop or implement major new ERA systems specifically.

More than 59% reported that integrated or cross-cutting system development initiatives with a major vendor is occurring in some segment of their organization. 43% of respondents said that their institution is actively exploring ERA in some sort of formal context, with another 11% currently reviewing such an option at this time. 28% had full time ERA Project Managers. Only a quarter of the institutions were engaged with a vendor to develop or implement major new ERA systems specifically.

There was a strong correlation between size of research volume and the likelihood of being involved with actively exploring ERA in a formal context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Research Volume</th>
<th>Actively Exploring ERA in a Formal Context (%)</th>
<th>Designated full-time ERA Manager (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$20M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20M - $50M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50M - $100M</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100M - $200M</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $200M</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Publics were more likely (29%) than privates (19%) to be working with a vendor. Institutions between $50M and $100M were much more likely to engage vendors than any other category - 43% of these institutions indicated that they had engaged a vendor, compared with just under 20% of institutions under $50M and 25% of institutions over $100M.

58% of respondents from FDP institutions said that their organizations were actively involved in exploring ERA in a formal context (compared to the overall average of 43%) and these respondents were much more likely to have a full-time ERA Project Manager (41% compared with the overall average of 28%). FDP institutions were not, however, any more likely to have engaged a vendor to assist with ERA developments than non-FDP institutions.

**ERA Drivers and Barriers**

Finally, respondents were asked whether they had experienced problems working with private agency ERA systems, federal agency ERA systems, and what they saw as the factors that created risk for developing ERA systems at this time. They were also asked to identify their familiarity with Public Law 106-107 and its potential impact on ERA.

Overall, fewer than 30% of respondents reported having had difficulties with the ERA systems of either federal sponsors or private agencies. Respondents from FDP institutions, and from the very largest size institutions were the most likely to report having had difficulties (48% and 43%, respectively).

Size of institution or FDP membership were positively correlated to awareness of Public Law 106-107 and its potential impact on ERA. 53% of FDP respondents and respondents from institutions with research volumes over $200M reported being familiar with P.L. 106-107 and its potential impact, whereas only 35% overall had this knowledge.

The largest concerns with moving forward with ERA related to the uncertainty of technological direction by federal agencies (24%), expense (23%) and because of insufficient institutional buy-in (18%). Interestingly enough, there was remarkably little variance in patterns of concern about developing ERA related to size of institution. Larger institutions were, however, somewhat more likely to be concerned about the uncertainty of technology direction taken by federal agencies than their smaller counterparts. A few respondents from institutions under $20M reported that they felt that ERA might be unnecessary (15%) but this sentiment disappears among all of the larger size institutions.

A complete copy of the survey results is available in the ERA Neighborhood for those who are interested in looking at the data in greater detail.

Nancy Wilkinson is the NCURA Immediate Past President and serves as the Assistant Vice President for Research, and Director, Sponsored Programs at Emory University and Pamela Webb is the Secretary of NCURA and serves as the Director, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at the Chicago Campus of Northwestern University.
Background
Two years ago Harvard was about to cut over to an array of new financial systems. This system conversion would prove to be a tremendous change for the University at all levels. Harvard has ten schools, 15,000 employees and a decentralized culture. The schools are quite independent and are responsible for their own operations and finances. A conversion of this magnitude in our decentralized environment was an enormous undertaking. Our identification of the need for a new system began in 1993. In 1995, the project took shape with the design of some overarching concepts. In 1996, a project team officially formed and a capital budget was approved. Target completion for cut over was July 1998. However, in October 1997, the need for a schedule and scope change was identified, pushing us back one year. Below are what systems were actually converted in July 1999:

Project Scope
Included within the scope of our major systems conversion were the following:

- Chart of accounts (14 digits to 33 digits)
- General ledger
- Web Voucher (modified purchasing system)
- Travel and Employee Reimbursement System
- HURIS (Harvard University Research Information System)
- Budget upload tools (sponsored and non-sponsored)
- Data warehouse

Because our new 33-digit chart was so radically different from the 14-digit chart (and incorporated functionality to facilitate sponsored requirements), it was not possible to keep the old system up while transitioning to the new systems – comparability between old and new was not feasible. As such, we employed a “big bang” approach, cutting over to all new systems university-wide on the same day – July 6, 1999. The legacy systems were maintained for historical data purposes but were retired for transaction purposes.

Looking back now two years later, we can say that the months after conversion were extremely difficult from a “change management perspective.” Many department personnel across the various schools were vastly unprepared for the events on July 6, 1999. As such, many across the university vocalized their concerns through a variety of mechanisms; this was painful to experience for those of us who had worked very hard on the project.

Key Lessons Learned
So here we are in June 2001 – still in business. Let me summarize some of the key “lessons learned” for those of you considering a system conversion or even for those in the midst of one:

1. Set the goals for the project/system conversion early on and obtain consensus with a broad cross-section of the community. Don’t over commit what the system can do and be clear about the potential issues surrounding change management (e.g., if the data is to be entered once and only once at its closest source, that may mean increased responsibility for that closest source). If the goals are broad (e.g., streamline business processes), you may want to supplement them with some critical success factors (e.g., transactions post to the GL within 24 hours of being entered into the system). Broadly publicize these goals and critical success factors through multiple media (local newspapers, intranet sites, town meetings, etc.). We improved on this as the project transpired but some original key messages (later modified) were not forgotten!

2. Be clear and realistic about scope definition – don’t promise to streamline operations and reduce costs without knowing the software’s capability and fit with that of your organization. One way of doing this is to link the people who really do the work with the technical folks to evaluate the software early on. Directors, Deans and Vice Presidents may not be close enough to the day-to-day operations to make decisions that will facilitate processes for the end users.

3. Establish Project governance in the project-planning phase. The project needs an Executive Sponsor (President or Provost?) and an oversight committee comprised of a cross section of the institution (school department and central personnel – include faculty members on this oversight group!). Publicize oversight group members in the communications about the project so that end users know who is representing them and who to contact with questions or concerns. Harvard’s Executive Sponsor was our Provost. Our original oversight group was comprised of senior university staff, which was not enough of a cross-section, as we learned.

4. Project organization and management is critical. Originally, we had technical teams separated from functional teams, so the right hand and left hand were not coordinated. After we missed our first “go live” target, we partnered with a new consulting firm who presented the concept of a “diamond team” for each system module:

- Business Owner
- Functional Lead
- Management Module
- Consultant
- Technical Lead

This integrated team structure proved difficult to implement but successful overall. Another key component of project organization for us was the role of “local implementation support managers or “LISMS”. These were individuals, assigned to a school, charged with briefing the local units/departments with the project details: milestones, problems, key decisions. The idea here was to provide consistent messages and a single point of contact for the schools. The LISMS worked with the Project Teams to invite their local units to design checkpoints and conference room models – these are prototype reviews of the new systems’ workflow and contemplated end state business processes.
5. Project staffing will make or break the project. Use the best functional staff to lead the project modules – they know the business and have credibility with the community. Backfill them in their core functional roles – they can’t work on the project and fulfill their core line roles at the same time. Use consultants to force the tough decisions on scope and business process and tie their payments to project deliverables. Again, we learned this one the hard way and used four different consulting firms before we understood that time and materials billing are a disincentive to completing the project!

6. Plan for a substantial stabilization period post “go live” as you are going to need it... we underestimated this stabilization effort as it lasted about a year. You may want to inform your constituents (sponsors, external auditors, Inspector General, etc.) of current state and action plan to stabilize so they are not surprised when reporting delays or other pitfalls occur. Set expectations for end users about what “stabilization” means – it does not mean everything desired will magically appear! Within stabilization, establish a process for system enhancements. Some criteria to consider when deciding on enhancements include:

- Who will benefit from the enhancement?
- Is there compliance risk associated with not making the enhancement?
- Will the enhancement force a software customization? (if so, you may want to reconsider...)
- Is the enhancement needed because the business owners are driving the systems or the systems are driving the business owners?

Also within stabilization are change management implications. The new systems may bring altered roles and responsibilities for end users and central personnel. Ideally, we would understand the implications of change management before cutover, but one can’t always predict exactly how everything is going to work. Recognize this, talk about it and work it through so everyone understands what his/her roles and responsibilities are in the “new world”. Along these lines, plan for employee turnover – not everyone will be willing or able to work in the new environment.

7. There is an obvious need for training but there are not simple solutions to when and how to deliver it. Our training coordinator for our new systems surveyed end users early on; she learned that users preferred a lecture style of training delivery to that of an on-line, self-teach approach. Of course, just-in-time (JIT) training delivery is preferable, but with seven major new systems and thousands of end users requiring training, the JIT approach was not viable. We’ve added a new training support function group within university central administration to support ongoing refresher courses and full courses for new personnel.

8. Consider options with software, make versus buy, early on. One of the reasons compelling us to tackle this project was that we had home grown systems that were difficult to maintain and not well interfaced. In the early 1990’s we said, “our business is higher education and research, not systems development – what are we doing?” So, we decided to purchase and implement an “off-the-shelf solution.” Along the way, we have realized the implications of buying an off-the-shelf solution:

- off-the-shelf does not necessarily fit neatly with our business processes, environment and culture
- commercial software packages are generally geared to the for-profit business sector and can highlight many of our differences with this model
- once you commit to an off-the-shelf solution, you are committed to that vendor for life - their release schedules and their upgrades become your life. If you customize the off-the-shelf product, you will not be supported by the vendor. This is a marriage from which divorce is not an option!
- There is an ongoing cost to customizing off the shelf packages – we pay for every enhancement we make as there is a tremendous amount of effort in upgrading those customizations to the next iteration (also known as “release”) of the vendor’s software

Post-Implementation

The year after we went live, we further reflected upon and refined some of our lessons learned:

- The costs/benefits associated with data acquisition should be carefully evaluated; of course we want more data, but at what cost? Who will gather it, ensure its integrity and enter it into the system?
- Central administration’s requirements should be balanced against end user practicality. Although some of the original lofty principles of the project sounded great, once in operation many end users were thinking, “be careful of what you ask for – you might get it!”
- A “phased” approach should be carefully evaluated against that of a “big bang” implementation. We converted seven major systems for thousands of users in one day. In retrospect, a phased model may have been more desirable – although it would have presented other challenges as referenced earlier.
- The importance of end-user involvement can not be overstated. There will be resistance to staffing the project this way as if the end users are on the project, who will do their jobs? Hire temps and back fill by creating a project funding model that will allow for this – if end users are not involved up front, the likelihood of the systems driving the business instead of the reverse increases exponentially.

Summary

Despite years of planning and implementation, several consulting partners and project plans/models and millions of dollars, we survived this. With hundreds of people putting in 200% effort, we closed our books, vendors were paid, FSRs were filed, and proposals were submitted - all on time. As we approach the conversion of the Human Resources/Payroll/Benefits system, Fixed Assets, and yet another iteration of Grants Management, we are trying to keep the lessons learned from Phase One in the front of our minds – a formidable challenge when faced with the day to day mechanics of getting a new system up!

Elizabeth Mora serves as the Director, Sponsored Research for Harvard University.
COMPLIANCE ISSUES IMPACTING FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

By Jerry G. Fife

On May 15, 2001 NCURA presented Compliance Issues Impacting Financial Research Administration, the last of this year’s series of video conferences. Faculty for this videoconference included Elizabeth Mora, Director of Sponsored Research Operations at Harvard University; Frank Zuraf, Vice President, Internal Audit at the Research Foundation of SUNY and Barbara Walsh, Manager, PricewaterhouseCoopers. Jerry Fife, Director, Contract and Grant Accounting at Vanderbilt University moderated the videoconference.

The session was organized in a panel format with the faculty interacting with each other throughout the session. Questions were accepted from videoconference participants and the studio audience throughout the videoconference.

Elements of financial compliance was the first topic discussed, led by Beth Mora and Frank Zuraf. This portion of the conference included discussion on allowability, allocability, consistency, cost sharing, effort reporting, program income, cost transfers, the life cycle of an award and the Cost Accounting Standards.

Jerry Fife led a discussion on the importance of developing a Roles and Responsibilities document that defines “who does what” in meeting the various aspects of compliance in research administration. The development of this document has been deemed critical by NIH and has been an area of focus by NIH during their recent Proactive Site Visits.

Frank Zuraf and Barbara Walsh described the elements of special compliance programs required by the Justice Department and agency Inspector Generals that are mandated subsequent to civil fraud cases. These programs, termed Integrity Agreements, contain specific requirements. It is interesting to note that institutions implementing voluntary compliance programs often use many of the elements contained in Integrity Agreements.

Frank and Barbara also shared their insights on financial compliance monitoring. This included discussion on audits, transaction reviews, sampling techniques, exception reports, A-133 audits and the role of Internal Audit in compliance monitoring.

Barbara Walsh concluded the videoconference by answering the question, “How do we organize for compliance?” This discussion included different organizational models that universities are using as they implement their comprehensive compliance programs.

If you did not have an opportunity to view this videoconference you can obtain a copy by contacting NCURA at 202-466-3894. This videotape will provide an excellent training and discussion tool for your university.

Jerry G. Fife is the Director, Contract & Grant Accounting for Vanderbilt University.

NCURA’s famous Workshop Program will begin on Sunday, November 11, 2001. Either take a refresher course or learn something new in the sponsored programs administration arena. Workshop topics will include, but are not limited to, the areas of social science IRB concerns, how to strengthen your writing skills, and how we subcontract to our sister institutions, just to name a few.

NCURA’s 43rd Annual Meeting will begin on Sunday, November 11, 2001. Either take a refresher course or learn something new in the sponsored programs administration arena. Workshop topics will include, but are not limited to, the areas of social science IRB concerns, how to strengthen your writing skills, and how we subcontract to our sister institutions, just to name a few.

The traditional NCURA banquet will be on Sunday. The reception prior to the banquet will provide attendees the opportunity to connect with colleagues and meet with old friends. The banquet festivities will conclude with an appearance from Miami Herald humor columnist, Dave Barry.

Interested in George Stephanopoulos’ insights regarding the direction the current administration may take as it relates to research? We are very fortunate to have Mr. Stephanopoulos as our keynote speaker Monday morning to kick off NCURA’s 43rd Annual Meeting.

And last, but by no means least, the “Soul Source and the No-Cost Extensions” are returning on Tuesday evening, party night. We are fortunate to have such a talented group of colleagues to help us unwind on the last night of our conference. Relax, dance, join the festivities, and support “The NCURA Band.”

As a final note (and one that is a money saver), the Hilton Washington and Towers is reducing its rates on 60% of NCURA’s room block. This offer is on a first come first serve basis. Take advantage of the cost savings and when making your reservation be sure to identify yourself as an NCURA member.

Denise Clark serves as the Director, Office of Sponsored Programs at Cornell University and Alice Tangredi-Hannon serves as the Director, Office of Research Administration at Thomas Jefferson University.

See you in November!
Calendar year 2000 was truly an outstanding year for NCURA, both programmatically and financially. Revenues grew in almost all areas, as did expenses. The surge in revenue resulting from the growth in membership and increased volume of programming was utilized to offset escalating costs. In fact, this year was grounded in the strong performance of conferences, workshops, and publications; these programs are fast becoming the financial linchpins as investments follow the recent national downward trend. Additionally, the annual meeting, long a big source of revenue, is beginning to net less revenue due to rising costs involved in holding it.

**Revenue**
In almost all areas of revenue we experienced a significant increase from 1999. The most significant growth was in the areas of Member Dues, Special Conferences, and Fundamentals Workshops.

- NCURA saw a significant increase in funds from membership primarily due to the increase in the number of members and ended the year with a record-breaking 3,517 total members.
- The revenue for special conferences rose 54% based on the variety of special conferences that we were able to offer this last year. It was a year in which NCURA partnered a satellite videoconference with the Office of Research Integrity, offered a four-session video conference series, and inaugurated the first conference specifically geared for the financial side of research administration.
- The last area where a significant increase was seen is Fundamentals. For the year 2000, the demand for our Fundamentals workshops continued to be strong; there were five Fundamental workshops plus two on-site campus workshops. The addition of the two on-site campus workshops and one additional workshop increased the revenue by $82,737.

With the increase in membership there have been across-the-board increases in attendance at our annual meeting, workshops, conferences, and meetings. This increased participation in NCURA activities resulted in an increase in funds generated from NCURA publications. Three new publications were introduced in 2000: The Role of the Research Administrator, Facilities and Administrative Costs in Higher Education, and The Basics of Cost Accounting Standards.

**Expense**
As expected, with all this growth in revenue, we experienced a corresponding increase in program expenses. The expenses of the annual meeting and special conferences/workshops are driven by attendance. With the increased attendance at meetings, together with a concomitant increase in new and recurring workshops, there was an increase in food and beverage costs, the number one expense at meetings. This expenditure was followed closely by the usual workshop audio visual costs, which also continue to rise each year. The satellite videoconference series also represented a new and substantial cost for NCURA in 2000.

Overall, the year was a time of dynamic growth for NCURA.
We are pleased to report that the substantial investment NCURA made in the introduction of new and expanded workshops and conferences in 2000 was successful both programmatically and financially. With the close of 2000 a financially strong stage has been set to support the activities and initiatives that we have set for 2001.

Bonny Boice is the NCURA Treasurer and serves as the Senior Vice President & Treasurer for the Research Foundation of SUNY. Bonny also serves as the Chair of NCURA’s Financial Management Committee and would like to acknowledge their assistance.
Harbor-UCLA Research and Education Institute

Career Opportunity

Job Title: Senior Grants and Contracts Officer III
Job Number: 94 (Be sure to refer to job number when applying)
Wage: Depending On Experience

Job Requirements:
B.A./B.S. preferred. Will accept some college with five or more years recent and relevant experience in grants and contracts research administration, preferably in a biomedical, non-profit organization or university setting. Strong verbal and written English communication skills are essential. Must be proficient in Microsoft Word/Excel and able to use calculator.

Description of Duties:
• Assist principal investigators in preparing budgets for research grant and proposals and provides guidance in completing applications
• Review grant and contract proposals for accuracy, completeness and compliance with agency and institutional policies
• Draft and negotiate agreements with other agencies
• Monitor use of grant and contracts funds for appropriateness and timely spending
• Initiate funding for projects by inputting data into the computer
• Monitor and coordinate submission of required reports to agencies
• Coordinate computer operations and standardize the existing data input
• Monitor all post-award aspects with the appropriation of funds for all projects funded
• Perform other duties as required by the Director of Grants and Contracts

To apply, submit your resume to the Human Resources Department:
Mail: Harbor-UCLA Research and Education Institute
      Human Resources Department, Building N-12
      1124 West Carson Street. Torrance, CA 90502-2064
FAX: 310-222-3640
Web site: www.rei.edu/hr

This position requires a successful criminal conviction search for employment.
If you do not have a resume, you may apply in person in the Human Resources Office. Office Hours: Monday - Friday 8:00 am to 4:00 pm

FOR REI EMPLOYEES:
You must normally complete your six-month introductory period and your current performance evaluation must be “satisfactory” or better to apply for a transfer.

94AH senior grants contracts officer
Grant and Contract Specialist #LE-12454

Exciting opportunity for excellent communicator w/great interpersonal skills to advise scientific investigators & their administrators on issues relating to their grants & contracts awarded by external sponsors particularly the NIH; act as primary liaison w/sponsoring agency; assist in the development & review of administrative information & budgets included in applications for grants & contracts, negotiate grant awards, monitor spending levels, review restricted expenditure requests, assist w/problems & questions, prepare financial & admin reports.

Req's BA/BS in Accounting, Public Admin or related field, proficiency w/budgets & numbers incl. Spreadsheet programs (Excel) & 10 key, ability to make independent judgments, 3 yrs grant & contract experience preferred, particularly with NIH grants.

Salary DOE + exc benefits.

Full info @ www.fhcrc.org.

Include job# w/ resume & email/fax/or mail to:
FHCRC/H R, 1300 Valley Street, Seattle, WA 98109,
E-mail jobresponses@fhcrc.org,
Fax (206) 667-4051,
TTY: 206-667-6861.

An Equal Opportunity Employer Committed to Work Force Diversity.

Certified Research Administrator

CERTIFICATION: THE TIME IS NOW

* KNOWLEDGE  * SATISFACTION

* CAREER ADVANCEMENT  * RECOGNITION

Review sessions: October 19, Vancouver (before SRA)
November 10, Washington, DC (before NCURA)

For further information: Clifford Shisler, Ph.D., CRA RACC@nku.edu 859-572-5137

Visit our Booth or Website: http://infoserv.rttonet.psu.edu/spa/cra.htm
**Research Compliance**

**DIRECTOR-RESEARCH COMPLIANCE AND RESEARCH SEISMIC SAFETY.** University of California, Berkeley is seeking applicants with expertise in research compliance to ensure that campus regulatory compliance programs affecting researchers are developed in a coordinated fashion, yet not restrictive to research activities. Responsibilities include, but not limited to: ensure that campus research compliance activities are consistent with federal, state and university regulations; initiate strategic risk assessment to identify high risk areas within campus research activities, policies and procedures; develop and implement training/education programs for effective research; serve as liaison to government regulatory agencies; supervise and monitor the staffs of various research compliance units.

The ideal candidate must possess technical competence in a broad range of research compliance issues; ability to evaluate, prioritize risks, and to develop efficient programs to control identified risks; develop and implement efficient and effective compliance programs that function across departments and research activities; and knowledge and experience in campus and system wide personnel policies.

A detailed job description can be found at www.chance.berkeley.edu/research/.

Submit a resume and cover letter to: University of California, Berkeley, Employment Services, Job Vacancy Listing # 07-825-30, 207 University Hall #3540, Berkeley, Ca. 94720-3540 or applyucb@uclink4.berkeley.edu.

The University of California is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer.

---

**NDSU Research and Technology Park Executive Director**

The Board of Directors of the NDSU Research and Technology Park, Inc. invites inquiries, nominations, and applications for the position of Executive Director of the NDSU Research and Technology Park, Inc. Established in 1999, the NDSU Research and Technology Park consists of a 40 acre site with the first phase of the project composed of a 72,000 square foot research and administration facility for NDSU. Construction of a business incubator and a second research building are also planned for completion in 2002.

The responsibilities of the Executive Director include

1) design and planning;
2) marketing and development; and
3) research park management.

A complete position description and qualifications are available at http://WWW.NDSU.NODAK.EDU/ndsu/vprcatt/RTPdirector.shtml.

Screening of applications will begin August 6, 2001 and will continue until position is filled. Applicants should send a current resume, a cover letter specifically addressing qualifications and responsibilities, and the names, titles, addresses, and telephone numbers of at least three references to:

Joseph A. Chapman, President,
North Dakota State University,
PO Box 5167, Fargo, ND 58105-5167.
ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Virginia Commonwealth University is seeking an experienced individual for the position of Associate Vice President for Research Administration. The AVPRA reports directly to the Vice President for Research and will have oversight for pre-award services. Research enhancement is a primary focus for VCU and this individual will play a key role in helping to reach that institutional objective. The AVPRA will facilitate interactions between faculty members and the research services that serve their research competitiveness needs. This individual will:

• assume a strong role in further developing an effective and centralized grants and contracts system that is transitioning to electronic grants management
• provide the University community with guidance in dealing with research policy, regulations, or grants management
• interact closely with the Associate Vice President for Research Development, the Director of Technology Transfer and the Director for Research Information Systems
• work closely with the Vice President for Research in planning strategic and multidisciplinary research initiatives
• develop policies and procedures governing sponsored programs and research activities

VCU is ranked in the top 100 universities in federal funding for research with a research base of over $120M, includes the Medical College of Virginia Hospitals, is interlinked with the Virginia Biotech Research Park and is located in Richmond, Virginia’s capital city.

Candidates should possess a terminal degree with at least five years experience in sponsored programs in a research university. Strong leadership and communications skills, exceptional knowledge of federal regulations, national university sponsored programs and practices relating to intellectual property are essential. Salary is commensurate with background and experience. Proposed hire date expected Fall of 2001. Applications and nominations, including vitae and the names of three references should be submitted to:

Dr. Roy Pickens, Chair – Search Committee
Virginia Commonwealth University
Office of Research
1101 E. Marshall Street, Sanger Hall 1-018
POB 980568
Richmond, Virginia 23298-0568

Virginia Commonwealth University is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer. Women, minorities and persons with disabilities are encouraged to apply.
DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH SERVICES

The CSUS Foundation is seeking a dynamic research administrator who is ready to assist the university to achieve even higher levels of extramural funding. This new post award position is an essential component for future growth & will be responsible for the post-award administration of grants & contracts for faculty, center & institute research & projects.

REQUIRED: BA degree in Business Admin. or rel. field or equiv. exp; work exp. & background in administering grants, contracts, programs, & projects; knowledge of funding agency & policies, procedures, & regs regarding grants & contracts; Demonstrated comprehensive sponsored research administration exp, w/ understanding of university research environment; thorough knowledge & exp. w/ OMB circulars A133, A110, A21, FAR & major federal funding agency guidelines; understanding of acctg principles & fiscal records development, maintenance, & reporting; knowledge of principles of budget development & maintenance; exp. supervising, training, & evaluation of employees.

The salary is competitive & commensurate w/ quals. F/T, exempt, benefited, position. Incl. PERS retirement & 24 days/yr vacation. Search will continue until an acceptable candidate is found. Review of applications will begin after 9/4/01.

Applicants should submit a cover letter, complete resume & the names, addresses and phone numbers of at least three current references to:

CSUS Foundation, HR Dept.,
Rm 300 (CSD525), Bookstore Bldg.,
6000 J St., Sac, CA 95819-6063.
Internet:  www.foundation.csus.edu.
AA/EOE

CSD 01525
Grant Administrator® 2000

Grant Accounting and Management Software to Help You Accomplish MORE in LESS TIME

- Unsurpassed user-friendly interface
- Wide variety of both simple and detailed reports
- Flexibility to track internal and/or external funds and programs

Single-User, Multi-User, and Site License packages
Custom packages to integrate data from other systems also available

Please call or visit our website at www.Dyna-Quest.com for full details and a free demo program.

Dyna-Quest Technologies, Inc.

phone: 978-443-3073
fax: 978-443-8634
email: info@Dyna-Quest.com
web: www.Dyna-Quest.com

SENIOR GRANT AND CONTRACT ADMINISTRATOR

The Office of Research and Project Administration seeks a Senior Grant and Contract Administrator who will be responsible for review and submission of research proposals; negotiation and acceptance of grants and contracts. Individual will assist faculty and research staff with project funding activities with federal agencies, corporate and foundation sponsors.

Position requires a Bachelor's degree with five years' relevant experience in higher education, government agency or similar environment. Candidate should be skilled in formal and informal negotiation procedures and have strong computer ability. Knowledge of compliance issues (animal care, human subjects, biosafety) helpful.

Princeton provides an exceptional benefits package. Interested candidates should apply online at: http://www.princeton.edu/hr/emp or send resume and salary requirements to:
Human Resources, One New South/1584-NCU, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544-5264.
NO FAXES, PLEASE.
An equal opportunity employer.
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR

Busy, growing quasi-public agency in the PA and NJ area is seeking a Contract Administrator to assist the Manager in overseeing contract and grants acquisition and grants management programs. Specific duties include preparing RFPs, negotiating and administering contracts, projecting costs, compiling data and reports, and preparing grant proposals.

The successful candidate will have a Bachelor's degree in business or equivalent experience, along with comprehensive knowledge of contract and grant administration.

Strong written and oral communication skills and computer proficiency are also necessary.

We offer a competitive salary and benefits program. Interested and qualified candidates must submit their resume for confidential consideration, on or before August 31, 2001, to:

MS: 01-1546, P.O. Box 2069, Philadelphia, PA 19103.

We are an Equal Opportunity Employer.

DEPARTMENT MANAGER/DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS

Department of Physics

The Department Manager/Director of Operations will lead and manage all technical, administrative and support areas in the department. He/she will have direct responsibility for financial affairs, personnel management of technical and support staff, personnel development, facilities management, computing and departmental automation and short and long term planning. He/she will plan and review department equipment, service and technical needs as well as develop, recommend and implement cost effective solutions.

Candidate must have direct operations management experience in a research environment, strong computing skills, and the ability to communicate effectively and professionally at all level within the University community.

5+ years of experience managing operations similar in scope and complexity is required. Must be able to effectively manage space allocation and maintenance, building construction or renovation, and equipment acquisition or inventory control.

Individual must possess the highest level of customer service skills. Bachelor’s degree or equivalent related experience in physics, engineering or similar discipline is preferred. Direct experience in administering or managing sponsored projects for research or education in science desirable. Project management ability in a technical, scientific or construction environment a plus.

Princeton provides an exceptional benefits package. Interested candidates should apply online at: http://www.princeton.edu/hr/emp or send resume and salary requirements to: Human Resources, One New South/NCU-1664, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544-5264. NO FAXES, PLEASE. An equal opportunity employer.
NCURA 2001-2002 Calendar of Education and Events

August 22-24, 2001
Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration
Portland, OR

September 6, 2001
Live Video Satellite Broadcast
focusing on Compliance
Part I of the 2001-2002 Subscription Series
What Department Administrators Need to Know about Compliance Issues

September 18, 2001
Interactive Learning Series (ILS)
Financial Research Administration Neighborhood

September 24-26, 2001
Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration
New Orleans, LA

November 11, 2001
Workshop 2001

November 12-14, 2001
43 Annual Meeting
Washington, DC

January 15, 2002
Live Video Satellite Broadcast
focusing on Compliance
Part II of the 2001-2002 Subscription Series
Compliance Issue for Clinical Trials

February 4-6, 2002
Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration
Orlando, FL

February 17-19, 2002
Financial Research Administration III
Tampa, FL

March 19, 2002
Live Video Satellite Broadcast
focusing on Compliance
Part III of the 2001-2002 Subscription Series
From a Culture of Compliance to a Culture of Concern: Building a Compliance Education Program that Works

April 14-17, 2002
Region VI & VII Joint Spring Meeting
Kailua-Kona, HI

April 20-23, 2002
Region II Spring Meeting
Ithaca, NY

April 27-30, 2002
Region IV Spring Meeting
Madison, Wisconsin

April 28-May 1, 2002
Region I Spring Meeting
Newport, RI

May 4-8, 2002
Region III & V Joint Spring Meeting
San Antonio, TX

May 14, 2002
Live Video Satellite Broadcast
focusing on Compliance
Part IV of the 2001-2002 Subscription Series
The True Cost of Compliance and Why We Must Invest

NEWSLETTER DEADLINES
September/October 2001 Issue
Submission of Articles: September 7, 2001
Space Reservation for Ads: September 7, 2001
Submission of Display Ads: September 14, 2001

NCURA’s 2001-2002 Live Satellite Broadcast Subscription Series
Those who select the tape option will receive handout information when they receive their copy of the tape.

CONTACT NAME ________________________________________ TITLE ________________________

INSTITUTION ____________________________

ADDRESS ____________________________________________

CITY ____________________________ STATE ________ ZIP ________

PHONE ____________________________ FAX ____________________________

E-MAIL __________________________________ WEB SITE ____________________________

A check, purchase order or credit card information must accompany registration form. For credit card payments, please complete the information below. Registrations received without payment or purchase order will not be processed. Please make check payable in U.S. currency to NCURA and send payment and registration to NCURA, One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 220, Washington, DC 20036.

☐ Full subscription 2001-2002 Series (9/6/01; 1/15/02; 3/19/02; 5/14/02)
☐ What Dept. Administrators Need to Know About Compliance Issues (Sept. 6, 2001)
☐ Compliance Issues for Clinical Trials (Jan. 15, 2002)
☐ Building a Compliance Education Program that Works (March 19, 2002)
☐ The True Cost of Compliance and Why We Must Invest (May 14, 2002)

☐ Live: $2,800.00
☐ Tape: $2,800.00
☐ Live: $950.00
☐ Tape: $950.00
☐ Live: $950.00
☐ Tape: $950.00
☐ Live: $950.00
☐ Tape: $950.00

Total Amount Due: $__________________ Please circle one: Visa  MasterCard  American Express
Card #: ____________________________ Exp. ____________________________

Card Holder's Signature ____________________________

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.

Co-Editors:
Richard N. Keogh
Rhode Island College
Phone: (401) 456-8228
Fax: (401) 456-8209
E-mail: rkeogh@ric.edu
Gunta J. Liders
University of Rochester
Phone: (716) 275-5373
Fax: (716) 275-9492
E-mail: gliders@orpa.rochester.edu

Managing Editor:
Kathleen Larmett
E-mail: larmett@ncura.edu

Associate Editor for Regional Activities:
Tara E. Bishop
E-mail: bishop@ncura.edu

Production
Tara E. Bishop
E-mail: bishop@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 $400. 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
The Professional Development Committee recently appointed Marianne Rinaldo-Woods, Assistant Vice President and Director of Grant and Contract Services, University of Texas at Arlington, to replace Steve Smartt (Vanderbilt University) as a faculty member of the Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration Team. Rinaldo-Woods joins Christina Hansen (University of California, Irvine) and Pat Fitzgerald (MIT) on the “Traveling” team. This team presents the Fundamentals workshop at various locations across the nation throughout the year. Rinaldo-Woods is very active in NCURA, and has recently been appointed as the Chair of the Institutional Profile Task Force approved by the Board of Directors earlier this year.

Prior to UT Arlington, Rinaldo-Woods held similar positions at the University of Texas at Dallas and California State University, Long Beach. She has been on the NCURA Board of Directors and held other various national research administration committee positions (e.g., Federal Demonstration Partnership, Steering Committee and the Texas Technology Transfer Association, President).

Also appointed to the Team was Jerry Fife, Director – Grant & Contract Accounting, Vanderbilt University, to replace Don Allen (University of Washington) as a faculty member of the Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration Team. Fife joins Dick Seligman (Cal Tech) and Kim Moreland (Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center) on the “On-Campus” Team. This team travels to university campuses upon request to deliver NCURA’s popular Fundamentals workshop.

Prior to Vanderbilt, Fife managed research administration offices at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Mississippi State University. Along with NCURA, he is active in the Council on Governmental Relations and the Society of Research Administrators. He received a BS from Purdue University with an emphasis in finance.