NCURA 2003 – Inaugural Address

by Robert A. Killoren, Jr.

I am deeply honored to have this opportunity to serve NCURA as its chief elected officer for the coming year. However, when I consider the task that lies ahead I am more than a little daunted. Reading headlines of major budget cuts to state institutions of higher education across the country, of declining revenues from institutional investments, of the uncertainty of federal and state grant support, and even of threats to our national security and of rumors of war... brings home all the more this sense of trepidation and anxiety.

Yet, while all these adversities are very real, the mission of research administrators becomes all the more important... and the need for NCURA to support these men and women and provide them with the knowledge and the tools necessary to help them serve their institutions becomes even more critical. As an organization and as individuals, we need to set aside our fears and take on the job that lies ahead with diligence and vigor. I intend to do this as President, to work closely with my fellow officers, Board and the membership at large.

Robert A. Killoren, Jr.

A Year of Remembrance – Thanks!

by F. John Case

As my presidential term nears the end, I want to express my appreciation for the opportunity to serve a great organization like NCURA. I am grateful for the collegial friendships developed over the past two years, and I am proud of the many accomplishments we’ve made as an organization.

One testament to NCURA’s mission to serve the membership through professional development is the number of record-attended quality programs that culminated with the success of the 44th Annual Meeting. Coming together as professionals to share ideas and expertise provides members with valuable resources for accomplishing our daily jobs.

Without the commitment and hard work of all the many volunteers, it would be impossible to offer such a wide variety of successful programs. Regardless of how large or small your role, the NCURA Board of Directors and the membership at large appreciates the hard work of all our volunteers. Because committee participation and meeting attendance takes time away from the home and office, we also extend our appreciation to those family members and colleagues who contribute to our success as an organization.

I was blessed with a wonderful support structure this year, including the Board of Directors, Standing Committees, and the NCURA staff. We had quite an ambitious agenda this year, and without the dedication of these individuals, we would not have reached our goals.

As an organization, we need leaders to step forward and take the vision into the future. I encourage each of you to experience the challenges and rewards of NCURA leadership. I enjoyed the experience, and I know you will, too.

Thanks for a great a year! I will treasure the memories forever.

John Case is the NCURA Immediate Past President, and serves as the Associate Vice Chancellor for Research, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
Remember the Florida Demonstration Project (FDP) of 1986, the Federal Demonstration Project II of 1988, and the Federal Demonstration Partnership III of 1996? These are all “history” with the launch of FDP IV in October 2002. FDP IV continues the close association of recipient organizations and federal funding agencies with the shared goals of streamlining and stewardship.

Last February there was a solicitation in the Federal Register inviting universities, non-profit research organizations, and hospitals to join FDP for the six-year term of Phase IV. This was the first opportunity since 1996 for additional institutions and organizations to become FDP members. Thirty-five new institutions joined and fifty-seven Phase III institutions elected to continue. The kick off meeting for Phase IV was held at the National Academies of Science in September 2002. Highlights included John M arburger's (Director, Office of Science and Technology Policy) keynote address entitled “Perspective from the Executive Office of the President” and Charles H avekost's (Program Manager, Federal e-Grants Initiative) presentation, entitled “e-Grants: The Future of eRA”. The meeting focused on welcoming new members and identifying those initiatives that the FDP membership will work on as Phase IV begins. The transition to Phase IV is to be complete with the January 2003 meeting at the University of California, Irvine.

Julie Norris of Massachusetts Institute of Technology succeeds Barbara Siegel of Northwestern University as Chair of the FDP Executive Committee. Julie will be joined by M arve Paule, PhD, of Colorado State University, who will represent faculty interests on the Executive Committee. In addition, two new federal representatives and a new OSTP representative, all yet-to-be-named, will round out the members of the Phase IV Executive Committee.

As Chair of the FDP Executive Committee for the past 6+ years, Barbara Siegel’s legacy to the FDP is the structuring of a highly effective volunteer organization that makes important contributions to a broad range of issues at the critical interface of the funding and recipient communities.

PHASE III ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Some of the Phase III accomplishments include:

Impact on Electronic Government (e-Gov) Initiatives
• Developed Core Principles for Electronic Research Administration
• Developed proposed data sets for professional and institutional profiles, funding opportunity announcements, and awards
• Piloted electronic awards
• Piloted electronic signatures on NSF FastLane proposals, leading to the elimination of signed paper cover pages
• Was instrumental in NASA’s revamping of its planned proposal system

Participation in the Presidential Review Directive on the relationship between research universities and the federal government
• Provided tactical services to the National Science and Technology Council
• Submitted extensive comments, particularly on the difference between accounting and accountability and the interrelationship between teaching and research, the importance of standards in data formats, as well as in the terms and conditions of federal awards
• Played a critical role in getting relief from documenting voluntary cost sharing in excess of that committed in the proposal

Engagement in an inter-agency common plan for implementation of Public Law 106-107
• Developed an extensive response to the initial plan
• Worked through FDP agency representatives to continue to provide input to the efforts of the interagency working groups.
• Reached out to State/Local government recipient communities to promote common interests

Improved efficiencies
• Substantially standardized FDP terms and conditions
• Developed a two-page subaward template for use among FDP institutions
• Recommended FAR clauses for commercial entities to flow-down to universities and non-profits

CONTINUITY WITH PHASE III

FDP continues to define itself as a “hands on,” volunteer organization, focused on tasks and demonstrations. As it has from its inception, it is housed in the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable of the National Academies. The same ten Phase III agency participants are members:
• Air Force Office of Scientific Research
• Army Medical Research and Materiel Command
• Army Research Office
• Department of Energy
• Environmental Protection Agency
• National Aeronautics and Space Administration
• National Institutes of Health
• National Science Foundation
• Office of Naval Research
• Department of Agriculture

Additional agencies may join at any time during the course of Phase IV. The Department of Education, for example, has indicated interest in participating. Except for Emerging Research Institutions, defined below, the institutional/organizational membership is fixed for the six years of Phase IV. The organizational structure and operating procedures remain the same as for Phase III, at least for the time being. As always, meetings are open to interested individuals from non-member institutions.

NEW IN PHASE IV

New members bring more geographic and organizational diversity. There are more hospitals and non-profit research organization members, as well as a new affiliate member, the Inter-agency Electronic Grants Committee. There is a new category of membership, namely Emerging Research Institutions (those with less than $10 million in federal research expenditures). Membership in this category will be open throughout Phase IV. In addition to the designated administrative and faculty/program representatives, members can designate a computer technology representative.

Plans for the recruitment of a paid, professional Executive Director are being developed by an interagency working group. The job description of the Executive Director will derive from recommendations developed by an FDP III task force. Funding for this position is in addition to support provided by the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GURI R). The Roundtable, in turn, is funded by a number of federal agencies, including those who are FDP member agencies. There is also now an annual membership fee of $1,500 per institution that will help contribute to the expenses of FDP’s increased size and activity base.

continued on page 20
When I sat down to write this article, I thought I would provide a brief update on a number of issues that will affect research in the coming year, as a sort of Holiday Potpourri. Covering such issues as sensitive but unclassified data, new regulations for research on select biological agents, final revisions to OMB costing circulars, restrictions on foreign students and scientists, etc., etc., I decided that with the approaching holidays, we needed something a bit lighter. Then I remembered a piece we ran across when researching the history of COGR for our 50th anniversary, and decided to share it with all of you. It’s funny, and also as relevant now as the day it was penned. I’ve edited it just a bit for length, and to hide overt references to when it was written.

Tony DeCrappeo

INDIRECT COSTS, PARKINSON’S LAW, AND THE PROCESS OF ILLUMINATION

Howard P. Wile, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn

“There has been so much nonsense spoken and written on the subject of indirect costs that one no longer need apologize for adding a little more nonsense to it. Many people who find the topic over their heads refer to it as overhead. The subject puts accountants on the defensive - even the offensive ones. There are perhaps two people who understand the nature of indirect costs out of every hundred that uses the term, and these two can’t agree with one another about it.

One of the common misconceptions about indirect costs is that they are not costs at all, or at least not as costful as direct costs. In actual fact, most of the indirect costs would be direct costs if the people who kept the books had less common sense. They could count the telephone calls, the postage stamps, and the stationery supplies; they could put a separate electric meter in each laboratory and a time sheet on the wall next to it; they could allocate the sweeping compound and charge an audited rate for each wastebasket emptied; they could make the typists keep time tallies for each letter or report; and by such procedures, they would achieve almost complete direct costing for each activity. This would reduce indirect costs, but it sure as heck would raise the direct costs by a lot more. It would also make the business office the most heavily staffed department in the university.

This, of course, brings us to Parkinson’s Law. I have heard the term “in house research” used by speakers at meeting after meeting. I don’t know much about it, since I am connected with an educational institution, and universities, as you know, are awarded only the outhouse research. This does not entail staffs as large as those of industrial and government agencies. We have primarily faculties and, as has been said before, we are not even in full possession of those. Maybe you have to have a large Parkinsonian staff in order to find yourself with enough spare time to think up a lot of misconceptions about indirect costs. But in a university, we like to keep the staff small and spend our time in better ways than just supervising our assistants. For this reason we don’t count the phone calls and stamps and kilowatt hours and wastebaskets: we throw them into a pot called indirect costs. Yes, Virginia, they are just as actual costs. But to some people who should know better and probably do, there is something occult, unholy, and unethical about a cost as soon as it goes into the indirect pot.

There’s a strange topic that keeps coming up in discussions. It concerns whether or not a grant should carry a lower rate of indirect costs than a contract. The topic is strange because nobody yet has come up with an explanation of the difference between a grant and a contract. I have had so-called grants that were administered more rigidly than contracts. Some contracts have advance payments: some grants are not payable until late in the game. Some contracts convey title to property purchased: some grants vest title in the sponsor. The question of grants involving a lower rate of indirect costs than contracts is strange for another reason. This is that it is advanced by people who know that the determination of indirect costs, under Circular A-2l, is made by a formula that recognizes no difference between a grant and a contract.

The whole point, therefore, belongs to the spirit world. It would, perhaps, be a fitting subject for a debate between a ghost writer and a spokeman. At any rate, it has been haunting us for a long time.

The colleges’ romance with Circular A-21 can hardly be described as love at first sight. Some of our most experienced and tactful colleagues were invited by the government architects of A-21 to sit in as midwives at its birth. The university representatives made a number of constructive suggestions for which they were graciously thanked and whose incorporation into A-2l was uniformly rejected. It can only be concluded that it was called a Circular because of its reasoning. But it became the law of the land. Unfortunately, it was not made the law of the sea, and many of the agencies for whom it was designed discovered that they were completely at sea.

Well, we learned to live with A-21, at least with those agencies that used it. It sort of turned out to be an ugly duckling, and as time went on, we found it less unattractive than we had feared. Then along came General Grant. In the beginning, we resisted his siege, since he was armed with weapons that were only 20% effective. Of course, there were a few schools that accepted 20% grants - in a sense, they were willing to feed the hand that bites them. But the reception was chilly enough so that grants were eventually offered in accordance with A-2l, as advertised. The next step was for some of the military agencies to discontinue contracts and issue nothing but grants. And the final step in the trap is the new proposal to reduce by policy and legislative action the indirect costs on grants. The colleges have been put to rest on the Bed of Procrustes, and I suppose we’ll have to continue looking for good Theseus material.
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Hammer suggests that an organization create a formal structured model of the enterprise that connects the organization’s overarching goals with its controllable activities. However, it is well to understand that having a model, identifying the data elements to measure and collecting data does not create value. Real value is obtained only when a process is developed to use the measurement data to identify the causes of inadequate performance and then to do something about it.

No matter what role your office serves at your institution, there are some things that you can control and others that it is important for everyone to understand you do not control. Even though it may prove useful for you to track and obtain information about these “uncontrollable” problems, you must make sure that judgments of your organizational performance are linked closely only to those areas over which you have some control.

Performance measures such as the number of proposals processed per person per day fail to adequately capture the variables involved in the work of a sponsored program office or to provide any information on which to base performance improvement. How would you distinguish the proposal prepared by a skilled grantsman, assisted by sophisticated departmental business staff, prepared for a standard grant to a federal agency from the proposal prepared by a less skilled investigator, with minimal departmental support, prepared for a less well known agency which just happens to require the use of a brand new electronic proposal submission method? Do you really expect your staff to treat these as equal? Do you really want to penalize a staff member who spent the extra time to get the second proposal out the door on time and in good form? Only if you have some means of collecting information about the number of problematic proposals and the sources of problems in those proposals will you be able to take some meaningful action to alleviate the problems in the future. The case illustrated above might indicate a need for better training of department business personnel, or perhaps you can devise some on-line tools to help investigators who have minimal access to staff.

Similarly, time to agreement in a contract negotiation doesn’t take into account the complexity of the document, the response time of your negotiation partner or the response time of counsel, both yours and theirs. Does it serve your institution if you conclude more agreements more quickly at the cost of institutional IP rights, or the rights of investigators to publish? Obviously not. But what if you could keep track of the specific issues that were the source of the most intense or lengthy negotiation and then review the final language accepted by all parties? You might make some important discoveries which would lead to shorter negotiations in the future. For example, if you find that after many lengthy negotiations that more agreements more quickly at the cost of institutional IP rights, or the rights of investigators to publish? Obviously not. But what if you could keep track of the specific issues that were the source of the most intense or lengthy negotiation and then review the final language accepted by all parties? You might make some important discoveries which would lead to shorter negotiations in the future. For example, if you find that after many lengthy negotiations that you frequently make the same compromise, you might want to establish the practice of moving to that position earlier in a negotiation.

If your office is responsible for setting up sponsored program accounts in your institutional accounting system you don’t need to do much survey work to know the following. If you ask an investigator how soon they would like to be able to charge expenses to an account the answer will be ASAP. In my office, the goal for account set up is 24 hours from the receipt of a fully executed document to entry into our systems. The only permissible exceptions to this are: 1) central systems problems and 2) those awards placed in suspense due to lack of some compliance requirement, e.g., a conflict of interest problem not yet resolved. It is a clear goal, everyone is aware of it and there isn’t much explanation for why it is important.

If your office is responsible for filing final financial reports with sponsors, and you have the authority to submit such reports (without approval or sign-off from local departments or schools) you can usually control timely submission without assistance from outside your team. You could, for instance, set a realistic goal of no greater than some small percentage of tardy reports and manage to that goal.

continued on page 7
The NCURA 2003 Budget – A Positive Outlook
by Bonny Boice, NCURA Treasurer

The NCURA Board of Directors approved our 2003 fiscal year budget at its November meeting. The 2003 budget indicates a 16.5% increase in projected revenue and a 13.5% increase in projected expenses from the 2002 budget. This substantial jump reflects NCURA’s remarkable financial performance in 2002, and the projections for 2003 are just as positive.

A POSITIVE FINANCIAL OUTLOOK
At a time when other organizations are seeing a downturn in membership, NCURA’s membership continues to grow, currently 4,000 strong. Along with our growth in numbers, we have identified and added several new key programs to serve our larger and more diverse membership. Not surprisingly, an increased enrollment in our new and expanded programs constitute the primary reasons for the growth in revenue and expense. We now offer 10 Fundamentals of Research Administration Workshops, 4 Sponsored Programs Administration Level II (SPA II) workshops, the Financial Research Administration Conference, a summer conference and a full complement of satellite broadcasts. In addition to the on-site professional offerings, we continue to increase the size and scope of our electronic neighborhoods. The major new program for 2003 will be the Leadership Development Institute. If this is not enough, NCURA continues to publish this wonderful newsletter, several monographs and micrographs, and is co-publisher of A Guide To Managing Federal Grants For Colleges and Universities.

THE STEWARDS OF THE NCURA FINANCES
NCURA’s very active Financial Management Committee, chaired by the NCURA Treasurer, is assigned the responsibilities of working with the National Office staff to develop and present the annual budget to the NCURA Board of Directors. In addition to the Treasurer, the current Committee consists of Laura Wade, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston; Julie Bullock, The Jackson Laboratory; Laurice Balian, California Institute of Technology; and JoAn Howeth, University of Oklahoma Norman Campus. The committee also has the responsibility of comparing the budget “to actual” every quarter to ensure continuity with budget projections. The Committee also reviews the annual expenses to develop the annual dues. NCURA’s financial philosophy is that the dues should cover the cost of membership services and all programs should be self-sustaining.

REVENUE BUDGET
Total Revenue for 2003 is projected to be $2,618,350. This is an increase of 16.5% from $2,247,100 in 2002. Membership Services - (consists of the NCURA Newsletter, Research Management Review and Other Publications, Committees, Task Force/Other Projects.) The increase in expenses for membership services is largely due to the costs of supporting NCURA’s electronic neighborhoods and other technology.

Programs - (consists of Annual Meeting, Annual Meeting Workshops, Satellite Broadcasts, Fundamentals, SPA Level II Workshop and Other, which includes the Financial Research Administration and Summer Conferences.) As a direct result of NCURA’s increased membership, meeting attendance is also increasing. Another source of increased revenue is the SPA Level II Workshop. A slight decrease in Satellite Broadcasts revenue is due to a decline in broadcast subscriptions. Nonetheless, NCURA considers the satellite broadcasts to be an important facet of its professional opportunities, and the information about the 2003 series is found elsewhere in this Newsletter.

Other Income - (consists of Interest & Dividends, Unrealized Gain & Loss and Miscellaneous). The budget projects a consistent revenue stream for realized investment income and no gain or loss in investments.

2002 vs. 2003 Budget Revenue Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2002 vs. 2003 Budget Revenue Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Membership Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENSE BUDGET
Membership Services - (consists of the NCURA Newsletter, Research Management Review and Other Publications, Committees, Task Force/Other Projects.) The increase in expenses for membership services is largely due to the costs of supporting NCURA’s electronic neighborhoods and other technology.

Programs - (consists of Annual Meeting, Annual Meeting Workshops, Satellite Broadcasts, Fundamentals of Research Administration Workshops, Sponsored Programs Administration Level II Workshops and Other, the latter including the Financial Research Administration and Summer Conferences.) The increase in the amount budgeted for conferences and workshops is due to the national-scale introduction of “Sponsored Projects Administration: Level II”.
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“Harnessing HIPAA”
by Fred J. Berg and Jeffrey P. Davis

On August 14, 2002, the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) issued the final privacy regulations under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA). Two years after issuing the proposed “Standards for the Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information” (Privacy Rule), DHHS dropped the flag, and the race to compliance by April 14, 2003 began. Given the lead time, and some of the refinements included in the final Privacy Rule, research personnel and scientists may not find the ride too bumpy.

Double-click, do not walk, and include these key HIPAA resources along your way:

- Final Privacy Rule regulations (“just the facts”): http://hhs.gov/ocr/combinedregtext.pdf
- DHHS HIPAA home page: http://hhs.gov/ocr/hipaa/

A studious review of the above documents will yield useful answers for most research staff, and facilitate questions relevant to those involved in human subject research who utilize personal health information in clinical studies and other projects.

Many institutions have commenced plans to develop HIPAA-related policies and procedures, educate research faculty and staff, and prepare materials to assist in compliance. The key features, definitions and procedures for research to comply with HIPAA need to be stressed.

One of the first questions posed is whether all research must be HIPAA compliant. The Privacy Rule defines research generally as “a systematic investigation, including research development, testing, and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.” This broad definition, however, does not prohibit the sharing of protected health information (PHI).

and data if it is properly “de-identified” of all personal information such as name, address, zip code, biometric identifiers, etc. By deleting all eighteen identifiers enumerated in the regulation, and thereby falling within the “safe harbor,” research data that has been de-identified may be shared and used without any authorization by subjects or approval by an IRB or privacy board.

Most research, however, needs some identifiable information in order for analysis and synthesis of results. To accommodate the practical aspects of human subject research, DHHS created a new category in the final Privacy Rule known as a “limited data set” which only requires removal of certain “facial identifiers.” A limited data set may be shared internally and with a third party recipient who signs a “data use” agreement whereby the data will be used only for research, public health and health care operations purposes. Similar to the Privacy Rule’s “business associate” agreement required for disclosures of data for treatment, payment and operations, the recipient of a limited data set must agree to adopt appropriate privacy safeguards and prevent uses of data which would be prohibited by the Privacy Rule. Recipients of limited data sets must also agree not to re-identify the data or to contact the individual.

“Protected Health Information” (PHI), i.e., health data containing personal identifiers must be obtained pursuant to an approved authorization, which may be part of the informed consent document or process, or pursuant to a waiver of authorization. The regulations specify the several components and requirements for a valid authorization including:

- A description of intended uses and disclosures
- The persons or classes of persons who may obtain the data from subjects
- The persons or classes of persons who may receive the data
- The purpose of intended uses and disclosures
- An expiration date or event when data will no longer be shared (such as the end of the research study)
- Procedures for revoking an authorization
- Statements that permission to use personal data may not be a condition of participation
- Signature of the subject and date signed

If a research participant revokes authorization, it should be noted that the Privacy Rule allows continued limited use of the subject’s PHI in order to maintain the integrity of the project. Thus, the PHI may be used to document the participant’s withdrawal. The authorization must be written (or explained) in plain language, and a copy must be provided to the subject. All of the foregoing components and elements may be added to prototype and sample informed consents that researchers use to tailor for their specific projects.

It should be noted that the HIPAA regulations preempt “weaker” state laws, meaning that a stricter state law or other standard or legal requirement (such as a subpoena or court order) will take priority over HIPAA’s protections. For example, some states (such as New York) require separate consents for HIV related disclosures. The stricter state law requirements would take precedence over the federal Privacy Rule requirements under HIPAA.

Just as some researchers may prepare a protocol requesting an IRB to approve research without obtaining informed consent, a waiver (or modification) of the HIPAA authorization may be sought if certain conditions are present and assurances are given. These include a plan to protect the identifiers from improper use and disclosure, a plan to destroy the identifiers, and written assurances that Protected Health Information will not be used or disclosed except if required by law (such as a release pursuant to a subpoena, or for research oversight. In considering a request for waiver, the IRB (or privacy board) must consider whether the proposed use of the data poses a minimal risk to privacy, and that the research cannot be undertaken without a waiver.

continued on the next page
Get Your Programs Here!

continued from page 4

On the other hand, most sponsored programs offices cannot control timely filing of final technical reports by investigators. The office can document the problem, prod and cajole the tardy investigator, but unless the academic leadership has provided the office with a sanction for those investigators who are remiss, this problem ultimately is out of your control.

There is an oft-cited cliché, namely, “be careful what you wish for - you might get it” which might be paraphrased “be careful what you measure - you might be held responsible for it.”

Happy counting!

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

Hammer, Michael “Why Leaders Should Reconsider Their Measurements Systems” Leader to Leader 24, (Spring 2002): 34-38

“Harnessing HIPAA”
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For research that qualifies as a “review preparatory research” such as a chart review, or preliminary analysis of collected data for development of a protocol, no authorization or waiver is required under the Privacy Rule. This may also include a review of data necessary to test or validate the design of a research project.

Clinicians who have created separate research databases from a treatment database cannot use that research database for research after April 14, 2003, unless the patient gave some legal permission or consent to have their treatment data used for research, or the IRB approved the collection of research data from treatment encounters. If you currently have such a database and do not have prior IRB or patient approval, you can only use such data for research in the future if the data is de-identified or a limited data set is applied.

Researchers desiring to utilize PHI from decedent subjects must give an assurance that the use or disclosure is being sought solely for research purposes and that the death will be properly verified.

The final Privacy Rule also permits disclosures of PHI for public health and regulatory purposes. For example, PHI related to reportable contagious diseases may be disclosed to public health authorities. Biomedical researchers engaged in clinical trials and drug testing may disclose PHI to persons who are subject to Food and Drug Administration (FDA) jurisdiction under circumstances such as adverse event reporting, tracking of FDA-regulated products, product recalls, and post-marketing surveillance. Although not highlighted in any of the DHHS releases, disclosures of PHI to ensure research integrity (such as adverse event reporting to the National Institutes of Health) are also permitted under the Privacy Rule.

To ensure orderly transition and implementation, DHHS reiterated in its commentary and guidance that the incorporation of the HIPAA Privacy Rule elements into human subject research is an extension of the dimensional risks that are already assessed by investigators and IRB’s. Thus, the HIPAA privacy requirements are intended to build upon the assessments of risks and benefits required under the Common Rule, which is predominant at almost all U.S. biomedical institutions and teaching hospitals.

Finally, it should be noted that the Privacy Rule allows the use of data obtained from research subjects who are entered into studies before the April 14, 2003 effective date. This assumes, naturally, that a valid and approved informed consent was used when the study was initiated. However, it is not necessary to re-consent these research participants specifically to obtain a HIPAA authorization, unless an informed consent is modified on or after April 14, 2003, or an IRB requires that participants be re-consented.

Investigators and research personnel should be on the lookout for further guidance that may be forthcoming from federal agencies such as NIH and FDA. Investigators should pay close attention to practice and specialty literature for analysis and discussion of HIPAA issues related to their research interests. Any institutions are considering a phase-in period to assure orderly adoption by April 14, 2003. Timely planning will ensure compliance by the 2003 effective date.

The foregoing is not provided as legal advice, and researchers and their support staff should necessarily consult with their respective institutional legal and other advisors.

Fred Berg is the Associate University Counsel, Weill Medical College, Cornell University and Jeffrey Davies is the Associate Vice President and Privacy Official, Columbia University Health Sciences Center.

The NCURA 2003 Budget – A Positive Outlook
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Administration - (consists of National Office Staff Expenses & Other). The increase in General administration is due to staff growth. The FTE for NCURA has grown to 9.5 FTE’s, with a projected increase in staffing to support the new programs and expanded membership.

Strategic Fund - (a special account used at the discretion of the President).

Total Expense - Total expense is projected at $2,535,933, with a projection of Net Income of $82,417. Total projected expense for 2003 is an increase of 13.5% from the $2,234,288 projected for 2002.

2002 vs 2003 Budget Expense Comparison

Bonny Boice is the Treasurer of NCURA and serves as the Senior Vice President & Treasurer for the Research Foundation of SUNY.
This issue of the NCURA Newsletter highlights college and university efforts aimed at improving local compliance and oversight of sponsored programs. The following pair of articles describing the Cardinal Curriculum at Stanford and the Institutional Oversight Model at the University of Minnesota are but two examples of the response of the grantee community to improve compliance operations. Other examples of this ongoing effort will be provided in subsequent issues of this Newsletter. Eds.

Organizing for Research Compliance: An Approach from the University of Minnesota
by Winifred A. Schumi

A. INTRODUCTION

The University of Minnesota (UMN) started on the path of reorganized sponsored project management practices in the early 1990s, and was encouraged to emphasize these efforts even more upon being designated as an ‘exceptional organization’ by the NIH in August, 1995. This directive from the NIH also helped to focus efforts in research compliance in the following five areas:

• More clearly defined policies and procedures
• More clearly defined roles and responsibilities
• Better system-wide training and education
• Improved oversight and enforcement functions
• Improved electronic systems and information.

B. INSTITUTIONAL OVERSIGHT MODEL

To direct the work and create a foundation for improved grants management, an institutional oversight model was created, which consists of three levels:

UMN Institutional Oversight Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENFORCEMENT</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functions</td>
<td>Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>Internal Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovers</td>
<td>Audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigates</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedies</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>Electronic Systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles &amp; Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The operations level consists of all the departmental, collegiate and central administrative offices that are required to run the organization, and that have impact on and influence the grants management structure. The focus for this level is on policies, procedures and work processes. The oversight level provides monitoring, investigating, educating and setting internal controls. The focus for this level is on functions and tools. These two levels collaborate to ensure that compliance is built into the daily activities of grants management.

At the top of the oversight model is enforcement, necessary to ensure that corrective action or discipline procedures are in place should the need arise. The goal, of course, is to have proper operations and successful oversight, thereby minimizing the need to proceed to this level of the model.

C. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

In order to achieve a strong compliance structure, an important place to start is with a review of policies and procedures as they relate to grants management. These can be specific research policies, such as intellectual property, effort certification, or conflict of interest. There is also the need to review related financial policies that apply across the institution and might have specific impact on grants management.

One example is the institution’s cost transfer policy. At UMN, prior to the grants management project, guidelines existed for how to handle cost transfers on grants. The NIH considers this a critical area, and asked for more than guidelines. So a policy was developed that would address not only cost transfers within sponsored projects, but also applied to non-sponsored accounts. This policy was developed to promote consistency, regardless of the source of funds.

Another important need was for the UMN to develop a code of conduct policy, with a focus on ethics and integrity. This policy was critical for re-emphasizing the important behavioral aspects needed within a more compliant grants management environment.

D. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Once policies and procedures are in place to facilitate operations and oversight, there are a number of major components of the research compliance program that need to be developed. One of these components is a clear definition of roles and responsibilities. An effective compliance program identifies the roles and responsibilities of individuals involved in the sponsored project management process. The UMN Roles and Responsibilities Committee prepared a matrix of responsibilities, listing all functions in the process, and identifying which office or position was responsible for each function. In addition, a set of general principles was developed, to guide the process of specifying individual roles and responsibilities.

The Roles and Responsibilities Committee included major involvement from key faculty members. The committee, chaired by the UMN Internal Auditor, reviewed the matrix in light of the general principles they had established. The result was a comprehensive roles and responsibilities document that can be used as a reference for all involved in the grants process. This document is considered to be a dynamic one, which must be continually reviewed and revised to make sure it reflects the current climate of activities in grants management.

continued on next page
E. EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Another major component of the research compliance program is education and training. As a result of the NIH exceptional status, a UMN Regents Policy was adopted that required all faculty to have completed Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) training before being allowed to spend money on their sponsored accounts. This requirement was phased in because of the need to educate about 3000 faculty. The initial phase-in is now complete, with an ongoing program to allow new faculty to meet the requirement. Information about the status of faculty education requirement is available in a PeopleSoft database. Sponsored project administrators have access to web reports that help them determine whether or not a faculty member has met the requirements. If the education requirement has not been completed, the central sponsored projects office will not establish an account on the University's financial system.

A UMN Faculty Education Advisory (FEA) Committee provided vital input into the process of developing the RCR Program. This committee helped define the educational needs for the faculty, and developed the curriculum for the program. Members of this faculty committee offered valuable insights into how to effectively communicate this information to their peers.

The RCR Program is divided into two parts. Part 1 focuses on ethics, with topics such as history and values relating to research scholarship, social responsibility and reporting misconduct, authorship, plagiarism and peer reviews, and research data management. These sessions are three hours in length, interactive, and conducted by faculty members. Part 2 focuses on the areas of conflict of interest, intellectual property, and fiscal management. Both an administrator for the specific area and a knowledgeable faculty member conduct these sessions.

There are currently two methods of delivering this training, the three-hour classroom sessions described above, and a 1.5 hour case study discussion, which combines mandatory individual reading of web-based materials with a group discussion of case studies. The FEA Committee continues to discuss the most effective way to deliver this information, based on feedback received from faculty attending the sessions. An effort is also made to provide incentives for the faculty who are involved in creating and providing this education program.

Another important element of this faculty education program is designed to engage all University faculty, not just researchers, and to promote an overall culture of compliance on campus. A series of All-University forums was developed, with national and university experts invited to discuss issues such as Authorship and Publications (2000-2001) and Setting the Research Agenda (2001-2002). Members of these forums have been tailored to specific disciplines, since the needs and concerns can vary across a campus as diverse as the UMN.

F. OFFICE OF OVERSIGHT ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

Another major component of the research compliance program at the UMN was the establishment of a new office dedicated to the oversight of institutional research compliance. The Office of Oversight Analysis and Reporting (OAR) has identified its mission as the following: to promote compliance awareness in sponsored projects management within the University through assistance, education and communication. In support of this mission, the office has put in place a number of procedures to facilitate effective compliance monitoring and assistance, such as:

- Random and targeted sampling of transactions on sponsored accounts
- Monitoring of web financial oversight reports to identify unusual spending patterns
- Responding to issues and questions raised by UMN staff regarding transactions on sponsored accounts
- Continuous review of federal and state regulations and university policies
- Working closely with Department of Internal Audits

Two specific programs that have proven very successful are the Risk Summary Assessment Reports and the Certified Approver Program. Both programs were piloted and are now managed through the OAR office.

Risk Assessment Reports

A tool was developed for performing this assessment and identifying categories of risk, such as allowable costs, financial accounting and electronic research administration. A unit (department, center, or small college) is analyzed at a specific point in time, using information and data that are available electronically. OAR staff prepare a report that summarizes the results of that analysis. A meeting is held with the unit head and key administrator to discuss the assessment and to identify the potential areas of risk. The Unit head is required to write a response describing how they plan to address these areas of risk.

The objective of this process is to help administrators understand ways they can identify these compliance areas themselves, and to reinforce their awareness of financial grants management compliance issues. These reports and interactions have been very successful. There have been only a few cases where the unit did not respond as requested. For these cases a follow-up procedure was used to obtain the response.

continued on page 10

Capital View continued from page 3

The National Science Foundation came out recently with a study showing that colleges and universities performed 44% of all the basic research accomplished last year in the United States in the natural sciences. They go on to say that the colleges paid 28% of the cost of this research out of their own funds.

In another place in the same study, the NSF reports on the number of scientists and engineers engaged in research and development. A simple comparison of the figures shows that the cost of research and development per professional researcher averaged $49,000 in government laboratories, $40,000 in nonprofit institutions other than universities and colleges, $37,000 in industry, and $23,000 in colleges. Apparently we’re doing more of the basic research, doing it at a lower cost, and paying 28% of the costs out of our own funds. And on top of that, we are the same source of the people who are doing research elsewhere. As a reward, we’ve been elected to have our pockets picked.

It is therefore a fairly safe assumption that if the Government decreases the dollar amount it is willing to pay for the research it sponsors, this can serve only to force down the total amount of research performed. That will reduce our capacity for providing thesis research and consequently the number of masters and doctors we can send to industrial and government laboratories. I suppose we will end up by training business administrators instead of scientists and engineers. Then at least we may get some people around who understand indirect costs. This is an example of the process of illumination.

Maybe we ought to make a deal with Uncle Sam. Instead of using our students’ tuition payments to cover the costs of the research we do for the Government, let us educate the students to become large earners and steady taxpayers so that Uncle Sam can afford to pay all of the costs of the research he buys from us.”

That’s about as well written a piece on indirect costs - now called facilities and administrative costs - as I have ever read. The only sad thing about it, as you might have suspected, is it was written a while ago - 1963; to be specific. It proves again the old adage - the more things change, the more things stay the same.

Tony D’Crappeo is the Associate Director, Council on Governmental Relations (COGR).
Organizing for Research Compliance: An Approach from the University of Minnesota continued from page 9

The information received through this entire process is shared with the UMN Internal Audit department for use in subsequent official audits of the unit. The continuing goals for this program are to do an assessment of its effectiveness, and to establish performance measurement trends, based on the information gathered to date.

Certified Approver (CA) Program

The Certified Approver (CA) Program at the UMN is for department administrators who are appointed and given authority as approvers of financial transactions on sponsored projects. They deal on a regular basis with financial planning, transaction review and record keeping for sponsored projects. UMN colleges and departments have a variety of sizes and organizational structures, and therefore have differing needs for both the number and functions of the CAs they appoint. For example, some colleges are centrally organized, so the CA is part of the Dean’s office. Other large research-intensive units have multiple department-level CAs due to the volume of transactions they must review and approve. Important considerations of the program are the reporting relationships of CAs, and maintaining a process for resolving conflicts. For this part of their jobs, CAs report to an associate dean for research at the collegiate level. And each college must have in place a plan that describes a process for resolution of disagreements if problems should occur between a principal investigator and a CA.

Early in the development of this program, management made a decision not to specifically require an education curriculum for department administrators who wished to become CAs. A number of courses, developed with the assistance of central sponsored projects office staff, were already operational and taught by our Human Resources (HR) Training Services Division. Instead, a prescribed set of knowledge was identified, which covered important policies and procedures of the new oversight model, along with a two-part exam that would test the knowledge base of departmental administrators who wanted to become eligible to be appointed as CAs. Part 1 is a multiple-choice exam that tests their knowledge of UMN and sponsoring agency policies and procedures. Part 2 is a case study exam that measures their ability to apply their knowledge to specific situations that they might encounter in their daily work as a CA. Upon successful completion of these exams, an individual becomes eligible to be appointed by the department head and dean to be a CA.

In addition to passing the two-part exam, CAs must meet continuing education requirements and demonstrate satisfactory performance in order to keep their appointments or eligibility to be appointed. The continuing education program is developed in conjunction with a CA Advisory Committee, elected by their peers. The OAR office manages the CA Program and monitors the performance of individual CAs, as part of their oversight function.

G. ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS

In order to promote and oversee compliance activity, UMN put in place a number of electronic systems. Many specific financial reports for principal investigators (PIs) and department administrators were developed and placed on the web. Central offices, such as OAR, can also use these reports, but the primary audiences for the reports are the departments and PIs. It was very important that information on grants activity be provided centrally, and made available to the widest possible audience, to discourage use of separate financial shadow systems at the local level.

An electronic routing and approval system was also developed, so that the majority of financial transactions on sponsored accounts could be approved through this mechanism. Financial Forms Nirvana (FFN) flags potential violations of OMB A-21 (i.e., costs that should not be charged to a sponsored account without a specific reason) and shows current balances prior to the approval of transactions. In addition, FFN transactions are posted to accounts quickly, making specific financial reports more accurate and timely.

Finally, an Electronic Grants Management System (EGM S) was developed. This is a web-based proposal form preparation system, allowing PIs or their administrators to prepare grant budgets online, using both the UMN financial system categories of cost, and the various sponsor categories. EGM S automatically supplies the appropriate UMN fringe benefit and F&A rates, and prompts for appropriate justifications where required. The information is available and used by the central sponsored project administration staff to manage grants and contracts. This system has continued to evolve over time and now integrates many of the UMN’s other research compliance databases related to grants management, such as conflict of interest, research subjects protection programs, and responsible conduct of research education program.

H. WHAT MADE THIS PROGRAM SUCCESSFUL?

There are three key successes to the research compliance program at UMN. The first is directly related to the vision statement for grants management: Faculty must have a small administrative burden, even though they are responsible for the proper financial and scientific oversight of their grants. Their focus should be on creation and dissemination of new knowledge. At the same time, administrators must have the knowledge to assist faculty in grant preparation, submission and financial oversight of awards.

The second key success is the fact that there is strong support from the highest levels of management. Upper management at UMN realized that they needed to make investments in new and enhanced systems, and continue to do so. Equally important, they made a commitment to incorporate ethical, compliant and good business practices into all levels of sponsored projects management.

The third key success was how the research compliance program was developed. It was a team effort, involving faculty, staff and administration. Senior faculty representatives led the grants initiative, and thereby helped engage other faculty in key areas of implementation, in particular defining the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved in the grants process and developing the education program. It continues to be a model for partnership between faculty and administration, highlighting communication and consultation between the two groups.

Organizing for compliance is an ongoing task. It is important for institutions to determine where their vulnerabilities are, and target their efforts. The UMN is committed to the goal of having a compliant grants management program. To accomplish this goal, there is ongoing development of electronic processes, enhancement and improvement of the education programs, continuous review and updating of the roles and responsibilities document, and efforts to keep all policies and procedures current.

Winifred A. Schumi is the Assistant Vice President for Research, University of Minnesota.
With the launch of the new “Cardinal Curriculum” training and certification courses this fall, Stanford University became one of the first universities to require staff who work in sponsored research administration to be certified. The role of the research administrator is one of stewardship and, we at Stanford, want to provide avenues for individuals to verify and build competencies. You wouldn’t drive a car without first getting a license. The Cardinal Curriculum is based on the same idea.

The Cardinal Curriculum is a series of courses created for staff members who support the sponsored research enterprise at Stanford University. The courses help individuals build competencies in areas related to sponsored research, and guide the professional development of those who choose to continue in the research administration field. In addition, the Cardinal Curriculum is available to anyone who wants to increase and confirm his or her knowledge of research administration. The Cardinal Curriculum will ultimately increase efficiency and effectiveness of staff, improve compliance with Stanford and Sponsor requirements, and move the University towards better serving the mission of Stanford and its faculty.

The Cardinal Curriculum courses are grouped into Levels I, II, and III. A certification program for Level I has been established, and Level II and III certification programs are in development. Individuals may achieve certification by demonstrating competency on a pre-assessment test. Training will not be required in those instances.

All individuals supporting research administration are expected to achieve Level I certification. Level I includes two courses, Cost Policy and The Regulatory Environment, the equivalent of 9 hours of classroom training.

Both courses are available on the web and can be accessed as an entire course or as individual modules. They also serve as an always-available desktop reference tool. Level I certification is encouraged for all, and required for administrative staff who support sponsored research activity. This includes staff members who:

- Originate transactions on sponsored accounts
- Approve transactions on sponsored accounts
- Assist with proposal preparation
- Monitor or review expenditures on sponsored accounts

The goal of certification is to ensure a baseline level of competency in those supporting sponsored research at Stanford. Today’s environment necessitates continuing development of skills and knowledge. In addition, change in external regulations and in Stanford policies, procedures, and practices have created risks/liabilities that require the delivery of consistent information to Stanford employees with specific responsibilities. The Cardinal Curriculum provides an avenue to help us achieve this goal. Certification is required for all research administration staff, no matter how long they’ve worked at Stanford. Although experienced staff can sail through much of the material, even seasoned administrators have reported they’ve learned something new by taking the quizzes required for certification.

The Cardinal Curriculum works in the Stanford culture because major stakeholders agree compliance is a number one priority for the University and training is recognized as a tool to achieve that goal. In 1991, training in Cost Policy was mandated for all employees requiring signature authority. In 1999, the University President established a mandatory seminar for principal investigators. A principal investigator must complete this seminar before an award can be accepted at Stanford.

Stanford University Introduces
The Cardinal Curriculum: An Approach To The Training and Certification of Research Administration Staff

by Patti McCabe

Geoff Grant presents the Cardinal Curriculum Certificate to Marilou Hemenway, a Stanford staff member of 18 years.

Stanford. Both the course and the seminar are available 24/7 on the web, or in a classroom setting.

In 1998, the Office of Research Administration was created by pulling together all functions related to sponsored research into one organization. In addition, a Training and Development Office was created which is dedicated to the mission of furthering compliance through training. Although Stanford had individual courses to address isolated training needs, the University did not have a curriculum to address all competencies required for research administration. The University had discussed mandatory training of staff for many years. Obstacles that stood in the way were:

- Who needs to be trained? It is often hard to identify a research administrator by position title, or difficult to subjectively measure an individual’s impact to sponsored programs administration.
- What delivery method? Classroom, web?
- Sanctions? Should there be sanctions for those who can’t/won’t demonstrate competency?
- Incentives? Should we provide financial incentives?
- Follow-up training? Since research administration is always changing, how much training is enough?

The Cardinal Curriculum began with a vision that evolved as it was operationalized. Subject matter experts were gathered to identify the gaps between existing training courses and an optimal training program. Through this process, a focused training program gradually developed. The Associate Vice President and the Training Director then met with major stakeholders to gain input and buy-in. The design concept was developed with the help of two consultants, one representing the delivery method and one to address content. It was decided web delivery would be appropriate for courses taken by the largest number of research administrators. The courses required for Level I certification utilized web delivery because of the following benefits:

- Provides 24/7 access to instruction
- Serves as a desktop resource
- Facilitates searches (subject and key word)
- Accommodates new and continuing research administrators

continued on page 20
Those of you who attended the business meeting were introduced to our newly elected officers – Charlie Kaars of SUNY Buffalo, is now the Chair Elect, and Kerry Peluso of the University of Pennsylvania, is Treasurer. You also heard our plans for the Spring Meeting in NYC from April 13 - May 21, 2003. Our location at the Millennium UN Plaza Hotel is a short walk from Grand Central Station. The rooms are beautiful, as is the rooftop swimming pool and gym. You will have easy access to the Big Apple’s cultural (and shopping) resources. Make sure to mark your calendar now! Rooms can be booked now by calling 212-758-1234. Tell them you’re with NCURA Region II, and you will receive the conference rate.

The Communications Committee has been working on a Regional web site located at http://www.osp.cornell.edu/NCURA_RRegion_II/ or via NCURA’s national site at http://www.ncura.edu/. Click on “Regions”. The site is a work in progress, and we are adding to it frequently, thanks to our webmaster, Tammy Custer at Cornell. Right now, there is a list of officers, an “About the Region” section, the revised Regional By-laws, upcoming (and past) meetings, and job postings. Suggestions are welcome. Please send them to Region II Secretary, Cheryl Williams at cwilliam@orpa.rochester.edu.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank all of you for your support and volunteer efforts during the last two years. While you may not be interested in the politics of the association, the changes that were made to the bylaws have created more opportunities for volunteers to share their skills and get involved in the organization, as well as providing additional support to the leadership. This has already enhanced opportunities for the membership. Your current Regional leaders, Janet Simons, Chair, Charlie Kaars, Chair Elect, Cheryl Williams, Secretary and Kerry Peluso, Treasurer, will be looking to all of you for ideas and will welcome your involvement. We believe that there is a resurgence of energy in the Region, and hope that new members will “raise their hands” and contact the regional leadership to get involved and share your ideas. The National Board of Directors, including our regionally elected representative, Denise Clark, are always interested in receiving your input as well.

The Steering Committee has guided us ably through the chances of the past two years. The Program Committees for the regional meetings, headed by Denise Clark, Charlie Kaars and Anne Geronimo have put together programs that have kept the membership in touch with cutting edge developments in research administration. These meetings are the core of the region’s activities, and their success was a direct result of the tremendous efforts of the teams put together by the Program Co-Chairs.

Warmest thanks to all. See you in NYC in April!!

Betty Farbman is the Immediate Past Chair of Region II and serves as the Director, Office of Grants and Sponsored Research for St. John’s University. Ann Holmes is the Immediate Past Treasurer of Region II and serves as the Assistant Comptroller Contract & Grant Accounting for the University of Maryland College Park.

**REGION III**

Southeast

Many thanks to the NCURA staff and volunteers who worked to make the 44th annual meeting a success by providing numerous learning and networking opportunities. It was announced at the Region III Business Meeting that there are now over 800 members in the region, with over 300 in attendance at the annual meeting - 110 of those being new members.

The Program Committee is shaping up for the spring meeting in Sandestin, FL, May 4-7, 2003. The program will include four Sunday workshops, computer training sessions, an afternoon of “ask the experts,” short takes, concurrent sessions, discussion groups and a beach party.

Please submit names of presenters that you would like to hear from to the Program Committee via the Region III website (http://www.orga.cofc.edu/ncura3). Also, let Sue Kehn (skkehn@ualr.edu) and the Program Committee know if you are willing to serve as a moderator or other volunteer during the regional meeting.

Look for some action from the Nominations and Elections Committee as they search for nominations for Chair-Elect. You can send nominations to the committee via the NCURA website.

As of January 1, Dawn Boatman began her term as the Region III Secretary-Treasurer. Thanks to Stephen Williams, outgoing Secretary-Treasurer, for his hard work over the past two years. On a related note, farewell to John Case who will be leaving Region III for Region IV upon accepting a position at the Cleveland Clinic. Region III will miss you John, but fortunately we can still harass you during the annual meetings!

If you have regional news that you would like to see published here or on the Region III website, please send it to tricia.callahan@ku.edu.

We hope to see you in May!!

Tricia Callahan serves as the Proposal Development Coordinator, Office of Sponsored Programs for Western Kentucky University.

**REGION I**

New England

The Program Committee has been hard at work, planning for a great spring meeting with lots of interesting sessions. A boat cruise/lobster bake and entertainment is planned for Monday evening. The dates for the meeting are May 18th-May 21st. The meeting will take place at the recently renovated Sheraton Harborside. Portsmouth is located just an hour north of Boston and south of Portland, Maine. Please check the Region I website in February for a tentative program schedule. If you haven’t had the opportunity to visit Portsmouth, it’s a terrific place. Plan on arriving early to visit the Outlet Malls (my personal favorite) in Kittery, Maine or stroll down to Market Square, the center of historic Portsmouth.

Congratulations to Stacy Riseman, the new secretary for Region I. We look forward to working with Stacy in the upcoming year.

On behalf of the Region, I would like to thank Tom Richardson for serving as Secretary during the past two years. Tom contributed valuable time and effort to ensuring the success of the RADD meetings. We wish you all the best, Tom.

Wishing all of you a wonderful new year!!!

Louise Griffin serves as the Chair of Region I and is the Managing Director, Research Foundation, University of Massachusetts Lowell.

**REGION II**

Mid-Atlantic

It was great to see over 300 Region II members at the NCURA Annual Meeting in November. Our Regional Travel Award winner, Beth Ann Bates of William Paterson University was “enthralled by Robert Ballard’s keynote address.” In describing her experience, she mentioned the excellence of all the presenters, the networking opportunities, and even claims to have attended two sessions on Wednesday morning! That can only mean that Bob Killoren, NCURA President and Region II member, put together a “completely” fabulous program.
REGION IV
Mid-America

Region IV Spring Conference, Cincinnati, Ohio, April 26-29, 2003

Plans for the Region IV Spring Conference are nearing completion and it promises to be a great conference this year! The theme this year is “E-Gov, E-Grants, E-Gads!” and the conference will highlight the challenges and deadlines that electronic research administration is imposing on all of us, as well as the entire gamut of research administration topics we know and love so well. Everyone in your office will find something of interest or something they need to be interested in!

Money woes have many of our institutions scrambling for solutions, but the information and professional development opportunities offered at the regional conferences are always a good investment for your research administration offices. In times like these, many of our institutions are relying more and more on sponsored project dollars to support activities that were formerly supported with state or other institutional funds. In order to keep those sponsored program dollars rolling in you have to stay one step ahead of the game!

We have a terrific location in Cincinnati, Ohio, at the Westin Hotel in the heart of the downtown area near great restaurants, museums, art galleries, theatres, riverboats and gambling casinos. There’s a German village within a short bus ride on the “TANK” – a super way to get around the city. So come a day early and enjoy the attractions, because we will keep you busy during conference days and nights!

We will start off the conference on Saturday, April 26th, with two Workshops you will want to be sure not to miss. Diane Barrett, University of Wisconsin-Madison, will lead a workshop for newcomers on the fundamentals of research administration. Kim Moreland, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, and Steve Hansen, Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville, will combine their talents to present a workshop for the senior research administrator. On Sunday morning we will continue with four more workshops from seasoned professionals in our field covering pre- and post-award topics, professional development issues, fundamentals of NIH, and probably a workshop dealing with clinical trials.

There will be a total not less than twenty four concurrent sessions from Sunday afternoon through noon on Tuesday on the hottest topics affecting all of us. Dr. Randy Seeley will be the Plenary Speaker and will discuss his research in the area of neuroendocrine regulation of food intake and body weight – right before lunch on Monday! And if you are looking for a great way to interact with your colleagues in the evening, on Monday night we have a wonderful dinner trip to the Cincinnati History Museum, in Cincy’s beautiful art deco style railroad terminal building.

So plan ahead - get those travel requests in early - and plan on an exciting and information-filled conference with your colleagues from Region IV. Be there or miss out on a great conference!

Joanne K. Altieri, is the Chair-elect Region IV and serves as the Director, Contract Negotiations and Research Compliance University of Kansas and University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc.

REGION V
Southwestern

This Spring we will be starting the process to identify new officers and executive committee members for NCURA Region V. A formal announcement will be released soon calling for nominations. This year we will elect a Vice-chair/Chair Elect, Secretary, Region V Member on the National Board of Directors and three (3) Regional Executive Committee members. We need your help – please begin thinking about potential candidates for the above positions.

Research administration – It shouldn’t be a gamble!
Do you and the PI cut cards to see if those copy costs are allowable?
Do you want to put the FAR clauses on a roulette wheel and let it decide which one is appropriate?
Do you think ITAR & HIPAA are a new comedy team on the Vegas strip?
Do you just hope the odds are in your favor?
Take the "gamble" out of Research Administration. Mark your calendar now for the Region V Spring 2003 meeting! We’re going to Las Vegas! We’ll learn new skills, meet new people and get the latest news from our Federal friends.

Our meeting will be located on the Las Vegas strip at the Imperial Palace Hotel and Casino (conference room rate is $62.00/night). It’s not too early to make your hotel reservations by calling the hotel directly at (800) 800-2981 and mention you are with the National Council of University Research Administrators. This year’s meeting will be a bit off the regular schedule since the hotel does not provide for Saturday check-ins. So we’ll start gathering on Sunday, April 27, and will hold the workshops on Monday, April 28. The meeting wraps up at noon on Thursday, May 1. More details to come!

Judy Cook is the Vice Chair of Region V and serves as a Research Administrator for Baylor College of Medicine. Matt Berry serves as a Proposal Development Specialist for the University of Oklahoma Norman Campus.

REGION VI
Western

I wanted to use this last Regional Corner article to say thanks. Thanks for allowing me the pleasure of serving as your regional chair this past year.

Thanks to the members of our Regional Advisory Committee for their service. Those members are: Terry M anns, California State University, Sacramento; Dan Nordquist, Washington State University; Cece M noonchirhi, California Institute of Technology; Geri Walker, Western Washington University; Gary Chaffins, University of Oregon; David M ayo, California Institute of Technology; Linda Patton, University of San Diego; and Dick Seligman, California Institute of Technology.

Thanks to Paula Burkhart, University of Oregon, for serving as the region’s representative to the National Board of Directors. She “did us proud”.

Thanks to Cece M noonchirhi for serving as our Secretary-Treasurer this past year. Cece is the first secretary-treasurer to go through our new regional officer structure!

Thanks to the members of our region’s Nominating Committee, especially since this committee served for 2 years. The committee was lead by Vincent Oragwam, California State University, Bakersfield, and members were Gary Chaffins, University of Oregon; and Geri Walker, Western Washington University.

Thanks to the Regional Travel Award Committee. This committee was lead by Ray Rizmov, California State University, Dominguez Hills, and members were Carol Brodie, University of the Pacific; Marg Herndon, Desert Research Institute; and Patricia Yano, University of Washington.

Thanks to all of you who helped make this year’s regional meeting such a great event. The Program Committee was lead by Judy Fredenburg of Region VI; members of Region VI who served on the Program Committee were Paula Burkhart; Terry M anns; Cece M noonchirhi; Dan Nordquist; and Georgette Sakamoto, University of Hawaii.

While I look forward to serving as the region’s representative to the National Board of Directors, I know that Terry M anns and his program committee will put together an outstanding program for the regional meeting to be held April 6-9, 2003, in Denver, Colorado. Terry has already lined up Regina White, Director of OPERA at NIH. I’m sure this will be an event “not to miss”.

continued on page 17
NCURA 44th Annual Meeting Breaks Another Attendance Record: Bob Ballard “Steals the Show”

1569 research administrators registered for NCURA 44th Annual Meeting, “The Compleat Research Administrator: Building on the Past, Preparing for the Future” November 6-8, in Washington, DC. Add to that number, guests, exhibitors and guest speakers, and 1569 rose to almost 1,700. With an almost 40% return rate on evaluations, it is clear that keynote speaker, Dr. Robert Ballard was one of the best speakers NCURA has ever sponsored at its Annual Meeting. Countless members responded to the question, “What did you like best about the meeting?” with numerous items but always included Bob Ballard with statements like, “The Plenary Session was OUTSTANDING! Getting the opportunity to hear a researcher speak about his research was wonderful. It felt as if we really make a difference for the researcher. I walked out of there glowing!” and “I thought it was wonderful that you were able to get Dr. Ballard as the keynote speaker. Sometimes in the Research Administration world, we forget the end result...RESEARCH findings. Thanks for the pleasant reminder that the hard work is not all in vain!” Others commented on the collegiality of the group, “The best part of the meeting is always networking with colleagues from other institutions. We have a wealth of experience in NCURA and I always return home with new ideas and approaches gleaned from these experts” and, “What I liked best was the friendship displayed by everyone I met. I was treated as though I was a member for years and had attended every meeting, even though I have only been a member for a couple of months and this was my first meeting. This is a direct reflection on the organization and the values they place upon communication and friendship between one another.”

Still others, were extremely pleased by the wide variety in topics this year, “The remarkable variety of sessions/discussions/updates available. Something for everyone (truly) this time.” And, “The high level of professionalism, organization, relevant topics that I have come to expect from NCURA were there again. We also have a lot of fun! Needed, are the party, a humorous speaker at the banquet, some light-hearted sessions - all of which I found this year.” “Given the number of attendees, the meeting was extremely well organized and I was able to participate in all the sessions that I had originally planned. I found it to be a very enriching professional experience.”

Members had the opportunity to attend over 100 concurrent sessions in addition to having some lighthearted moments during Sunday night’s banquet, Monday night’s after-hours session “Cost to Cost with Dick Clark” and Tuesday nights gathering where, NCURA’s own band, the Soul Source and No-cost Extensions debuted another original research administrator’s song and, were available to autograph their first CD.

If you were unable to attend this year’s meeting, you may now go to NCURA’s web site to view the handouts and presentations. Browse the next few pages for a look at who was there!
The inaugural Distinguished Service Awards were presented to (l to r) Andy Rudczynski, Kim Moreland, Steve Smartt, Christina Hansen and Marianne Rinaldo Woods.

NCURA Past Presidents (standing l to r) Steve Erickson, Cheryl-Lee Howard, Kim Moreland, Jane Youngers, Steve Smartt, Dick Seligman (seated l to r) Tony Merritt, Mary Ellen Sheridan, Julie Norris and Mary Husemoller.

Bob Killoren, 44th Annual Meeting Program Chair and his Honorary Co-Chair, Catherine Taylor-Core.

2002 Catherine Core Travel Award Winners (l to r) Sylvia Rodriguez, Frances Bloech, Jeanette Culbreath and Toni Allen join Catherine (front) during the awards luncheon.

2002 Board of Directors (standing l to r) Pat Fitzgerald, Ed Herran, Kathleen Larmett, Cheryl-Lee Howard, Garry Sanders, John Case, Kathleen Irwin, Barbara Gray, Peggy Lowry, Tommy Coggins (seated l to r) Paula Burkhart, Pamela Webb, Jan Anderson, Bonny Boice, Cindy White and Bob Killoren.

A very gracious Dr. Ballard met with our members.

Bob Killoren and John Case thank the outgoing Fundamentals Faculty for their dedicated service to this important program. (l to r) Mildred Ofori, Jo Barnes, Bob Killoren, Steve Erickson, Dick Seligman, Christina Hansen and John Case.

NCURA members have the opportunity to share their knowledge and brainstorm solutions.
NCURA 44th Annual Meeting Breaks Another Attendance Record: Bob Ballard “Steals the Show” continued

44th Annual Meeting Program Committee (standing l to r) Steve Erickson, Kim Moreland, Connie Armentrout, Dave Richardson, Denise Clark, Marianne Rinaldo Woods (Vice Chair), Tommy Coggins (seated l to r) Bob Killoren (Chair), Pam Whitlock, Marti Dunne and Alice Tangredi-Hannon.

Soul Source Rocks On! (standing l to r) Mike McCallister, Chuck Underwood, Jennifer Morgan, Tim Conlon, Tara Bishop, Stephen Williams; Milton Cole, Bruce Swain, (kneeling l to r) Steve Smartt, Scot Gudger, Garry Sanders

Exposition 2002 brought us all together to explore technology solutions.

Collegiality, a hallmark of NCURA, shines through during the sessions.

Garry Sanders meets perspective candidates for the Leadership Development Institute.

Jane Youngers, recipient of the 2002 Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award, accepts congratulations from 2002 NCURA President John Case.

Steve Dowdy, Ann Holmes, George Stone, Jean Feldman, Pat Fitzgerald, Nancy Wray, Denise Clark, Tammy Custer, Pamela Webb and Dick Seligman treated us to a humorous look at communication during the Monday Evening After Dark Sessions.
Like all large and complex organizations, NCURA has a well-defined structure of governance. Basically, an elected Board of Directors sets policy and direction for NCURA, while three standing committees are charged with the task of implementing those policies. The Nominating and Leadership Development Committee (N & LDC) is one of those three standing committees reporting to the Board (Professional Development and Finance being the other two committees). It performs the functions of identifying and recognizing future leaders for the organization. Specifically, the N & LDC is responsible for 1) soliciting and slating candidates for NCURA’s elected offices, 2) developing future leaders for NCURA, and 3) managing the recognition and awards programs.

The Committee is regionally balanced. Each region nominates two individuals to serve on the N & LDC and the Board selects one individual from each region to serve a two-year term. The Chair is nominated by the President and confirmed by the Board. The current members are: Barbara Cole (Boston University), Joan Warfield (Johns Hopkins University), John Childress (Vanderbilt University), Don Boydston (Rush Medical College), Jan Madole (Oklahoma State University), Dan Nordquist (Washington State University), and Josie Jimenez (New Mexico State University), Steve Hansen (Southern Illinois University - Edwardsville) serves as the NLD chair and John Case (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill) acts as the liaison to the Board.

All of that is well and good, you say, but what functions does this committee really perform?

A critical function of the N & LDC is nominating individuals for NCURA’s elected offices. The Committee is charged with slating two candidates for each elected office. This year, in addition to Vice President/President-Elect, the N & LDC will be seeking candidates for Secretary, and for two at-large Board members.

The N & LDC also coordinates the Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award, which is given annually to an individual who has made a significant contribution to the profession of research administration. Nominations are due April 1. This award is considered NCURA’s highest and most prestigious honor. The N & LDC carefully reviews the nominations and recommends a recipient to the Board at the June meeting.

The N & LDC is equally responsible for the selection of the Distinguished Service Awards. Up to five awards may be given to individuals who have made significant contributions to NCURA. The nomination process requires a letter of support, a copy of the individual’s vita, and the completion of an NCURA activities checklist. Nominations are due May 1 and the recipients are selected at the June N & LDC meeting.

The Committee also chooses recipients of the Catherine Core Travel Awards, a program that supports travel to the NCURA annual meeting for up to four individuals from underrepresented groups who would not otherwise be able to attend this conference. June 1 is the deadline for nominations. In selecting recipients, the N & LDC considers whether or not the institution will sustain that individual’s participation in NCURA, the level of the institution’s commitment to underrepresented groups, and the commitment of the individual to research administration.

Lastly, the N & LDC assisted the Board with the newly created Leadership Development Institute. The LDI is designed to help develop leaders for the profession of research administration. Specifically the Leadership Development Institute will provide two days of intense leadership training to prepare participants for leadership roles in NCURA and at their institutions. Applications for the LDI were due January 10th for training that will be conducted in late Spring or early Summer.

Okay, you say, so why should I care? The N & LDC is responsible for helping to insure that every member has an opportunity to participate in the governance of NCURA. To meet this challenge, the Committee needs the active involvement of all our members. We need you to volunteer to run for office or to nominate worthy colleagues for recognition awards. Please begin now to think of NCURA members who would be outstanding recipients for the awards offered this coming year and who would make good candidates for the elected offices. Contact your representative on the N & LDC or the national office with your ideas and suggestions. Your involvement is what makes NCURA a viable organization.

Steve Hansen is the Chair of the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee, and serves as the Dean, Graduate Studies & Research, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville.

Regional Corner

I also know that David M. Ayo, as the 2003 chair-elect, will find a great hotel in the San Francisco area for the 2004 spring meeting. Stay tuned for details on both events in the coming months.

Lastly, I wanted to say thanks to all of you who volunteered throughout the year to help make NCURA the great organization it is. You’re the best! Don’t be bashful about offering to help for the first time or for the “umpteenth” time. Your hard work is always appreciated.

Patricia Hawk is the Immediate Past Chair of Region VI and serves as the Assistant Director, Sponsored Projects Administration, Oregon Health and Science University.

REGION VII

Rocky Mountain

As usual, the national annual meeting in November was professionally stimulating and well-attended. Such meetings provide invaluable collegial opportunities for professional development and Region VII welcomed several new members. So for your new members – and those that have been around the block – I encourage you to take advantage of the networks you’ve developed. Now that you’re tuned in, don’t touch that dial. Stay involved.

A perfect way to remain engaged is to look ahead to spring. Plans for the Region VI-VII Joint Spring Meeting are underway and full slate of workshops and sessions is under construction. Preliminary indications point to a very productive meeting so mark your calendars: We’ll meet in Denver, Colorado, April 6-9.

As this is my last Regional Corner as chair, I do want to take a moment to express my gratitude to you all for making my tenure challenging, rewarding, and, most of all, fun. In addition to the personal and professional benefits I’ve experienced, I’ve thoroughly enjoyed the ride. So it is with great pleasure that I pass the proverbial gavel to Denise Wallen of the University of New Mexico.

Judy Fredenberg is the Immediate Past Chair of Region VII and serves as the Executive Assistant to the Vice President of Research and Director of Federal Relations, University of Montana.
NCURA 2003 – Inaugural Address
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of Directors, standing committees, and with the NCURA staff, regional leadership, and NCURA members across the country in moving our organization and profession into the future to meet the challenges and create success.

All those who attended the annual meeting and heard the keynote address by Dr. Robert Ballard could not help but be reinvigorated in their dedication as research administrators to providing service to those who do the teaching, research, and outreach at our institutions. He gave us a renewed vision of the importance of the work of scientists, humanists, artists, and educators at our institutions and the critical role we play as research administrators in facilitating their work.

Much of what is needed to restore our sense of national security and our economic well being will come in small bits and pieces, like those of some gigantic jigsaw puzzle, from all the various research, education, and outreach projects conducted by our faculty that will be fitted together in the future into national and global solutions to help fix our most pressing problems. As research administrators we play an important role in facilitating this process, helping in our own small way to make all of it possible.

When we use techniques learned from an NCURA workshop to aid a new faculty member in assembling a convincing and compelling proposal, when we use strategies we heard about in an NCURA videoconference to successfully negotiate a difficult contract, when we navigate through the hazardous waters of ITAR because we understand these regulations by our reading of the NCURA newsletter, when we help protect human research participants and institutional integrity with tools we gained at a national or regional NCURA meeting, when we help our institutions be trustful financial stewards of federal funds with knowledge we learned at an FRA conference, when we help our institutions be trustful financial stewards of federal funds with knowledge we learned at an FRA conference, we realize how important our jobs are and how important NCURA is to helping us do that job right.

Over the coming months I will be sharing details with you about initiatives NCURA will be undertaking in the coming year. But let me now introduce one major effort we will embark on.

Research isn’t a local business anymore – it’s international. Our institutions are increasingly called upon to compete and to partner on an international basis for significant research programs. To lead this effort effectively as research administrators we need to understand international contracting and funding mechanisms and to have available a global network of research administrators to facilitate effective collaborations.

I am also hearing more and more from U.S. industry and international corporations that they feel compelled to go outside the U.S. to get research done. We need to understand this dynamic and see how we can work better with industry, and how we can partner with institutions on an international basis, to better help solve industry’s problems.

On the other hand, I also hear from international research administrators who fear that they are missing opportunities because they do not know how to adequately protect their intellectual property and how to successfully transfer technology in such a way that their institutions, regions, and countries benefit, too. They want to learn from NCURA how to accomplish this because they know just how well NCURA does professional development.

NCURA must step up to help our members and our profession meet the challenge of administering research in a global economy.

To this end the following steps seem appropriate:

- With the concurrence of the NCURA Board of Directors, we will establish a Presidential Commission to study what role NCURA can play internationally.
- We will begin a dialogue with international research administration organizations, institutions, and individuals to discuss mutual interests.
- The Summer Conference for 2003, to be held in August in San Francisco, will continue our examination of industry-university interactions, but expand that to the global arena and include a track on international collaborations. Tri-chairs are being appointed to lead the conference: John Carfora from NCURA, Dr. Susan B. Butts, from Dow Chemical, and representative of the international research administration community [at press time we have identified an interested person, and we are awaiting confirmation].
- We will establish a Conference and International Activities page on the NCURA website, open to the public to share information about developments in this new area and for members and non-members to make suggestions.

Over the months to come, I will keep you informed about this important initiative and share with you some others.

Thanks for having the trust in me to have me serve as NCURA’s president; I shall do all within my power to deserve that trust.

Bob Killoren is the NCURA President, and serves as the Assistant Vice President for Research, Pennsylvania State University.
FRA IV – Seize the Opportunity to Attend continued

research administration professional. NCURA is addressing the continuing needs of the research administration community by offering quality basic overview workshops at FRA IV. Managers and Directors with new staff, or staff assuming new responsibilities, will want to consider these workshops for training and development needs.

Those new to central post award positions will benefit from the “Post Award – Managing the Daily Hurdles of Accounting for Sponsored Projects” workshop, as it will provide an overview of all the critical functions of central post award administration. New staff in all areas, whether pre-, post-, costing or departmental, will find “A is All About A-21 and A-110” to be an essential tutorial that provides a fundamental understanding of our costing and administrative processes. Similarly, attendees can build a post award foundation by attending “Determining the F&A Cost Rate – The Basics”.

For those attendees and compliance managers that want to achieve a greater understanding (and appreciation) of implementing a successful research compliance program within your institution, you will not want to miss “Research Compliance and K.I.S.S.” – successful financial administration simply can not be achieved without compliance. And finally, if you are interested in gaining a better understanding of effort reporting and cost sharing, and bring home tools to reduce the compliance risk and burdens associated with these functions, attend “Effort Reporting and Cost Sharing – Increase Your Knowledge and Explore Ways to Reduce the Burden”. Registration for the pre-conference workshops is limited, so don’t let these wonderful workshop opportunities pass you by!

Mix in some spice for the plenary session, as it will examine the thought-provoking topic of accountability and financial stewardship on campus. Panelists are: Al Horvath, Vice President for Business and Finance, California Institute of Technology; Joseph Kull, Deputy Controller, Office of Federal Financial Management, OMB; Andy Ruczynski, Associate Vice President for Finance and Executive Director, Research Services, University of Pennsylvania. The session will be moderated by none other than Paul Begala, Co-host of CNN’s Crossfire.

We are also pleased to offer at this year’s FRA conference, two new concurrent session tracks and a new series of primer sessions. A brief description of each track follows:

Compliance: The sessions in the compliance track will provide a focus on adherence to rules and regulations, whether aided by formulation of policies or educational programs, or instilling or monitoring processes (electronic or otherwise) that promote compliance. These sessions will also provide insightful views on how compliance is viewed by federal agencies or internal audit personnel. The compliance track is intended for all levels of research administration professionals, especially those that have oversight or stewardship responsibilities.

Costing: The costing track sessions will provide a focus for the costing professional or the research administrator that simply wants to know more about the principles and best practices that underlie the calculation of F&A or fringe benefit rates. The costing track includes a wide assortment of sessions, ranging from asset management to effort reporting. We are pleased to offer this new track encompassing a wide breadth of costing topics and issues for NACCA and NCURA members.

Departmental Administration: This track will provide valuable resources and tools to enable university department administrators to manage their roles and responsibilities in sponsored programs in a more efficient and knowledgeable manner. Sessions will provide both practical information, “just enough” information on implementing university and federal systems in order to manage post award processes, regulatory changes that may impact financial management and knowledge-enhancing sessions on particular challenging financial issues. The central post award professional will benefit from this track, as will other university staff who are involved in everyday financial transactions.

Hot Topics: We are equally pleased to offer this new track at FRA IV. Hot topics are simply that - sessions focusing on current and vital issues or implementing regulations that should be of interest to all meeting participants - especially senior and mid-level managers. Sessions will enhance the sponsored programs administrator’s understanding of ongoing initiatives and how these will effect management at home institutions, and will broaden attendee perspectives on financial management issues and trends impacting post award administration.

Primer: The primer sessions introduce the basics of a topic on a very primary level to an audience that has little or no background on the topic. The primers are a must for people who are new to the field of research administration or who are interested in learning more about a different field within research administration for the first time.

And if the concurrent sessions are not enough, there are at least two discussion groups slated to run concurrently with sessions. These smaller-sized sessions give attendees the opportunity to learn new information and share face-to-face best practices, as well as to ask advice on issues that may be vexing them at home institutions.

Finally, if the program content alone is not enough to convince you to attend this conference, New Orleans in February (just before Mardi Gras) is an exciting and vibrant place to be. The flavor and excitement of New Orleans is unlike any other city in the United States. In addition, on Saturday evening, pre-Mardi Gras festivities begin with the parade of the provocative Krewe de Vieux in the French Quarter. Or if you are more of the reserved (and pet loving) nature, on Sunday afternoon there is another parade in the quarter for the Krewe of Barkus - a parade made up entirely of dogs. How can you go wrong there?

Seize the opportunity and join us in New Orleans. I can guarantee that you will not be disappointed!

Gunta Liders is Program Chair for the FRA IV Conference and serves as Director, Office of Research and Project Administration, University of Rochester.
FDP IV: Close Encounters of the Fourth Kind continued from page 2

MAJOR THRUSTS AT INCEPTION OF PHASE IV

The initial major thrusts of Phase IV will be:

Faculty efforts
- Faculty perspectives on any and all issues addressed by FDP, especially electronic research administration and streamlining of administrative requirements
- Research outcome measurements that agencies can use in defending research budgets
- Other initiatives to be identified by the Faculty Committee, such as peer review, technical reporting, etc.

Public Law 106-107 Implementations
- Pre-award (proposal submission, terms and conditions, profiles, program announcement)
- Post-award (payment systems, financial reporting, technical reporting, etc.)
- Audit/oversight
- Electronic initiatives

IRAB—Initiative to Reduce Administrative Burden
- Payroll Certification
- Allocation of space costs
- Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) issues
- Non-Value-Added requirements in A-21

Electronic Research Administration
- Continued participation of institutional FDP representatives in the IAEGC
- Selectively encouraging/discouraging agency initiatives; especially disapproving of those happening outside of the Federal E-Gov umbrella
- Provide testing and feedback for E-Gov

Other initiatives being discussed for possible inclusion as Phase IV initiatives include:
- Design a pilot basic assistance grant project
- Eliminate institutional signature on non-competing applications
- Eliminate financial status reports
- Extend and standardize expanded authorities for all grant mechanisms
- Limit exceptions to FDP terms and conditions
- Simplify F&A rate calculations
- Cover the rising cost of compliance within the F&A rate calculation
- Streamline time and effort reporting
- Streamline the peer review process, time requirement, and the “pink sheet” comments
- Standardize and simplify financial reporting and payments (at least pooled payment systems)
- Streamline subawards to non-FDP institutions
- Achieve more uniformity in FAR clauses incorporated into research contracts
- Achieve greater interaction with the audit and oversight community

The new FDP website http://thefdp.org (no www) will provide continuous information on the activities and accomplishments of the Federal Demonstration Partnership. We invite all NCURA members to visit this website and to keep informed or participate in FDP initiatives. With the combined support of FDP and non-FDP members, Phase IV will make a true difference with respect to streamlining, simplification of administrative processes and promoting research.

Sarah Wasserman is the Associate Director, Grants & Contracts Administration, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Stanford University Introduces The Cardinal Curriculum: An Approach To The Training and Certification of Research Administration Staff continued from page 11

- Permits immediate update and wide dissemination of information
- Automates registration and certification
- Permits learner tracking
- Utilizes digital technology
- Leverages use of University infrastructure

The courses take advantage of a unique feature of web delivery; namely, the ability to have a multimedia presentation which is flexible to accommodate different learning styles. The learner can access:
- Simulated classroom training that uses voice-over with synchronized slides.
- Just audio, that allows a learner to simply listen to the audio portion without reading along. This would appeal to an auditory learner.
- Full text including links to supplementary information is available to someone who would prefer to read along with the voice over or simply read to himself or herself. This accommodates the visual learning style.
- Interactive instructional activities for each module to confirm learning and develop ability to apply concepts learned to the job.

A search engine is built into the site so the curriculum also can serve as a comprehensive reference tool. Users can search for specific topics or “shop” for information on the site by browsing through an alphabetical list of keywords.

To date more than 200 staff have registered for the training program, and 85 have already earned certificates since launching of the Curriculum in mid-October. As noted recently by Geoff Grant, Associate Vice President in the Office of Research Administration at Stanford University, the Cardinal Curriculum, “supports our goal of making it easy for people to do the right thing.”

Patti McCabe is the Director, Training & Development, Office of Research Administration, Stanford University.
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A-110 for Departmental Administrators
January 27, 2003

What is OMB Circular A-110 and why should departmental administrators know or care? This circular provides the basis for the administrative requirements associated with federal grants and cooperative agreements awarded to colleges, universities, and other non-profit organizations. A-110 is the fundamental building block on which nearly all federal grant regulations and policies are built. So, what difference does it make to departmental administrators? As the individuals on the front line in administering federal grants and cooperative agreements, departmental administrators need to “know the territory” if they are going to be effective in this aspect of their job. This includes understanding the basic rules for managing federal grants and recognizing the relationship between the government-wide requirements and the agency-specific variations on those requirements.

This workshop presents a thorough review of A-110, with special emphasis given to those aspects of the circular that have the most relevance for departmental administrators at grantee institutions. The program features lively discussion and active participation. Short case studies will be used to illustrate key issues.

Faculty: Richard P. Seligman, Senior Director, Sponsored Research, California Institute of Technology and Patricia A. Hawk, Assistant Director, Sponsored Projects Administration, Oregon Health & Science University

Subawards and Subcontracts: A Workshop Primer on Managing Collaborative Projects
March 4, 2003

Putting together a multi-institution project takes the cooperation of everyone from principal investigators to department administrators, from sponsored programs officials to procurement specialists, from research coordinators to accountants, as well as the cooperation of all their counterparts at collaborating institutions. It also involves the full spectrum of research administration activities from proposal writing to contract negotiations, from budget building to expenditure reporting, from sole source procurements to invoice analysis. Join the workshop faculty as they explore subawards vs. subcontracts, FAR flowdowns, A-110 requirements, and the latest in subaward agreement forms and contract clauses.

Faculty: Robert A. Killoren, Jr., Assistant Vice President for Research, Pennsylvania State University; David J. Mayo, Associate Director of Sponsored Research, California Institute of Technology; Julie T. Norris, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Exploring the Lifecycle of Costs: Budget to Audit
June 24, 2003

Does budgeting on research proposals matter anymore? How do costs on the budget relate to expenditures? What do auditors expect to find in the history or documentation that supports award expenditures? This presentation will examine the life cycle of costs on a sponsored research project, from the budgeting process through expenditures and ultimately the audit examination. The faculty are experienced explorers in all aspects of a Life Cycle approach to understanding the budget and financial management of sponsored research agreements. Pre-award and Post-award administrators should find this presentation an opportunity to more clearly understand the implications and results of costing methods.

Faculty: Jane A. Youngers, Director of Grants Management, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio; Mary Ellen Sheridan, Associate Vice President for Research and Director, University Research Administration, University of Chicago; Jerry G. Fife, Director, Office of Contract and Grant Accounting, Vanderbilt University

A Primer on Intellectual Property for the Research Administrator
September 16, 2003

A thorough understanding of intellectual property, both the law and its practical application, is critical to the daily work of the research administrator. This workshop will introduce patent and copyright law, as well as other key concepts necessary for the understanding and negotiating of intellectual property. The faculty will outline current federal regulation and policy with respect to intellectual property, such as the Bayh-Dole Act and rights in technical data. Finally, the workshop will introduce issues when negotiating intellectual property rights in industry sponsored research agreements. This session is designed for the newcomer that wishes to gain a basic understanding of intellectual property. The faculty will provide the tools that are needed to build a strong foundation in this area. In depth reference materials, including a user friendly glossary of patent and copyright terms will be provided to workshop participants.

Faculty: Ann M. Hammersla, Senior Counsel for Intellectual Property, Office of Intellectual Property Counsel, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Kathleen S. Irwin, Senior University Legal Counsel, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Gunta J. Liders, Director, Office of Research & Project Administration, University of Rochester

Who Should Subscribe?

Any institution which has training needs, whether they be immediate training through participation in the live broadcast or future needs through the use of a taped broadcast, will benefit from this series.
2002 Catherine Core Minority Travel Award

NCURA was once again fortunate to receive a large pool of impressive applicants for the Catherine Core Minority Travel Award. The award is available to minority applicants who, because of financial constraints, could not otherwise attend NCURA's Annual Meeting. The award recipients receive up to $1,000 toward expenses associated with attending the Annual Meeting.

The purpose of the award is not only to assist in the financial aspects of attending the meeting, it also offers a wide variety of services and opportunities for the awardees to interact with their peers and colleagues from other educational institutions around the country. Here's what this year's recipients had to say, "I am very grateful for having been given the opportunity to attend NCURA's 44th Annual Meeting. It was amazing to me the wealth of information and knowledge that was shared openly. I was very happy to have something tangible to bring back to the office." (Frances Bloech) Jeanette Culbreath said, "My experience at NCURA's 44th Annual Meeting was beyond what I had anticipated. There was a lot of interaction, which made the sessions come to life. I learned a lot of tips on how I can perform better at my university. NCURA helped me to see what was missing from my experience the personal development. I now see my job in a different perspective."

Letters of recommendation from the institutional official stated repeatedly the benefits of attending the National NCURA Meeting. In addition to the awardees personal and professional growth, the institution acknowledged it would also reap the benefits of networking opportunities, agency contacts and the overall knowledge of the NCURA membership.

The 2002 Catherine Core Travel Award recipients were: Toni Allen, Illinois Institute of Technology; Frances Bloech, Marist College; Jeanette Culbreath, Yale University; and Sylvia Rodriguez, University of Texas at El Paso. The NCURA Nominating and Leadership Development Committee eagerly anticipate the participation and leadership that our winners will bring to future NCURA activities.

The deadline for applications for the 2003 Catherine Core Minority Travel Award is June 2, 2003. The application form is available on the NCURA web site at www.ncura.edu. The criteria for selection are as follows:

The applicant should:

- Be engaged in the administration of sponsored programs
- Represent one of the following minority classifications: African American, Hispanic, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander
- Never have attended an NCURA national meeting
- Agree to stay at the host hotel for the duration of the meeting and be responsible for making own room and travel reservations
- Include with the application a letter of support from an official at their institution which clearly delineates the benefits to the applicant and institution
- Agree to submit a report on his/her annual meeting experiences within thirty (30) days of the meeting.

We look forward to many outstanding applications in 2003!

REGISTRATION NCURA 2003 Video Workshop Series

The cost of the full series (all four workshops) is $2,800.00 per campus. To purchase a “ticket” to an individual session the cost is $950.00 per campus. All Video Workshops will be aired from 11:30 am – 3:30 pm, Eastern Time. NCURA will transmit a test signal one hour (10:30 – 11:30 am, Eastern Time) prior to air time!

Live: Those institutions that choose the live presentation will receive the handout information, satellite coordinates to receive the show live on their campus, a toll-free telephone number to call in their questions on the day of the broadcast, and a license to tape the shows for future on-campus training.

Tape: Those who select the tape option will receive handout information when they receive their copy of the tape. A check or credit card information must accompany registration form. For credit card payments, please complete the information below. Registrations received without payment 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.

CONTACT NAME ____________________________________________
TITLE ______________________________________________________
INSTITUTION ________________________________________________
ADDRESS ____________________________________________________
CITY __________ STATE __________ ZIP __________
PHONE __________ FAX __________
E-MAIL ______________________________________________________
WEB SITE ____________________________________________________

☐ Full subscription
2003 Series
(1/27/03; 3/4/03;
6/24/03; 9/16/03)
☐ A-110 for
Departmental
Administrators
(January 27, 2003)
☐ Subawards and Subcontracts:
A Workshop Primer on
Managing Collaborative Projects
(March 4, 2003)
☐ Exploring the
Lifecycles of Costs:
Budget to Audit
(June 24, 2003)
☐ A Primer on Intellectual
Property for the
Research Administrator
(September 16, 2003)
☐ 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 _________________________________

CANCELLATIONS: Notification of cancellation must be received in writing no later than 14 business days prior to each telecast and are subject to a $75 cancellation fee. Cancellations received after the deadline will not be refunded. You must receive confirmation from NCURA to receive a refund.
DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF GRANTS, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, AND ADMINISTRATION

Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science is a private, non-profit entity founded in 1966. The University, located in Los Angeles, California, provides services for a community of 1.5 million and is affiliated with King-Drew Medical Center, UCLA, and Los Angeles Unified and Compton School Districts. We are currently seeking an experienced administrator to provide a leadership role in the Office of Grants, Research Development, and Administration. The Director is responsible for developing and directing the overall administration of management systems and practices for university grants and contracts. This includes identification of potential sponsors, budget preparation, overseeing proposal preparation and grant submission, reporting, and accountability to funding agencies. The incumbent will also oversee sponsored agreements with various private and public agencies including federal, state, and local governments, foundations and research organizations; clinical business development agreements; and entrepreneurial organizations including pharmaceutical companies and other health related businesses. A graduate degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., or M.P.A.) and five years experience in higher education working with grants and contracts is required. The incumbent must also have a thorough understanding of OMB circulars A-Z1, A110, and A133 NIH policies and procedures. A highly developed orientation toward customer service is essential for success in this position. Qualified candidates should submit a resume, cover letter, and three professional references to: Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science, Human Resources Department, 1731 East 120th Street, Los Angeles, California 90059.

Charles R. Drew University is an Equal Opportunity Employer.
Announcing a modern, easy-to-use alternative to COS and Spin
ResearchResearch.com

- Daily news on policy from Howard Hughes to the NSF
- A reliable database of every funding opportunity open to America’s researchers
- Unique profiles of every research grantmaker
- And administration so simple that you can set up customized email alerts for your entire faculty in half a day or less

All these add up to a service that can make your university more successful.

For a free trial for your entire institution, email us at USA@ResearchResearch.com
For more information visit www.ResearchResearch.com/USA
New York Institute of Technology seeks a dedicated professional to lead its Office of Sponsored Programs and Research.

New York Institute of Technology – a private, independent, senior comprehensive college offering undergraduate and graduate degrees – educates approximately 11,000 students through eight academic schools: Allied Health and Life Sciences; Architecture and Design; Arts, Sciences, and Communication; Education and Professional Services; Engineering and Technology; Extended Education; Management; and the New York College of Osteopathic Medicine. Ranked highly for its academic reputation and campus diversity in national publications, NYIT has three traditional campuses: two on Long Island and one at Columbus Circle in Manhattan, as well as an online campus and a growing number of sites throughout the world. NYIT’s special mission has three elements: career-oriented education infused with technology, access to opportunity for all qualified students, and applications-oriented research.

The Director of Sponsored Programs and Research, based at the Old Westbury campus on Long Island and reporting to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, is responsible for researching and disseminating information about funding opportunities from foundations, corporations, and government agencies; maintaining a library/database on funding sources; providing assistance in planning and development of proposals, including budgeting; serving as the administrative liaison for the campus institutional review board process; handling all postaward activities such as preparation of final budgets, overseeing recoveries of indirect costs, review of appointment forms, and preparation and/or review of progress reports; relationship-building with program officers; and preparation of annual reports.

The successful candidate will have at least four years relevant experience. An advanced degree is preferred but highly qualified candidates with a bachelor’s degree will also be considered. Knowledge of computer applications is essential. The successful candidate must also have exceptional written and oral communication skills, be self-motivated, and be able to work with minimum supervision in a deadline-oriented environment.

Applicants please send letter of intent, curriculum vitae, and a list of at least three references to: Office of Academic Affairs, New York Institute of Technology, Northern Boulevard, Old Westbury, NY 11568-8000. Review of applications will begin immediately and will continue until the position is filled.

NYIT is an AA/EEO institution.

Grant Administrator® 5.0

Now for Both Pre- and Post-Award Offices. Many New Reports to Keep Your PIs and Award Recipients Happy. Award Management and Accounting Has Never Been Easier!

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

Licenses for Single-Workstations and Networks available, as well as Site Licenses Custom packages to integrate data from other systems also available

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

phone: 978-443-3073
fax: 978-443-8634
email: info@Dyna-Quest.com
web: www.Dyna-Quest.com
### NCURA 2003 Calendar of Education and Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 20 - 22, 2003</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Unfunded Program Administration, San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 20 - 22, 2003</td>
<td>Sponsored Programs Administration Workshop: Level II, San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27, 2003</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Unfunded Program Administration, Orlando, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3 - 5, 2003</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Unfunded Program Administration, Orlando, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 4, 2003</td>
<td>The Critical Roles of Central and Departmental Administrators - A Prequel to FRA IV Interactive Learning Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 16 - 18, 2003</td>
<td>Financial Research Administration (FRA) IV, New Orleans, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 27, 2003</td>
<td>Department of Education: E-Grants Update Interactive Learning Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 4, 2003</td>
<td>NCURA 2003 Video Workshop Series Part II of a IV Part Series: Sub-awards Broadcast live from Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 10 - 12, 2003</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Unfunded Program Administration, Charleston, SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 10 - 12, 2003</td>
<td>Sponsored Programs Administration Workshop: Level II, Charleston, SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 18, 2003</td>
<td>NIH Commons Update Interactive Learning Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6 - 9, 2003</td>
<td>Region VI and VII Spring Meeting, Denver, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13 - 15, 2003</td>
<td>Region II Spring Meeting, New York City, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 26 - 29, 2003</td>
<td>Region IV Spring Meeting, Cincinnati, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 27 - May 1, 2003</td>
<td>Region V Spring Meeting, Las Vegas, NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4 - 7, 2003</td>
<td>Region III Spring Meeting, Sandestin, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 13, 2003</td>
<td>Washington Update Interactive Learning Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18 - 21, 2003</td>
<td>Region I Spring Meeting, Portsmouth, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 24, 2003</td>
<td>NCURA 2003 Video Workshop Series Part III of a IV Part Series: Cradle to Grave Broadcast live from Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2, 2003</td>
<td>Workshop 2003, Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2-5, 2003</td>
<td>45th Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEWSLETTER DEADLINES:**
- **February/March 2003 Issue**
  - Submission of Articles: February 7, 2003
  - Submission of Display Ads: February 14, 2003

---

### MILESTONES

**NAN WELLS**, Director of the Office of Government Affairs, Princeton University has announced her retirement at the end of 2003. Best Wishes, Nan!

**LINDA PATTON**, previously Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at the University of San Diego assumed in September 2002 the position of Director, Office of Grants and Contracts at California State University – Fullerton. Linda, we wish you all the best.

**GARRY SANDERS** has also relocated to a new institution. Effective December 2002, Garry undertook the Directorship of the Office for Sponsored Research at the O’ordway Research Institute, one of a group of research medical centers and institutes in the Albany, New York region. Prior to this role, Gary was the Assistant Vice President for Research at the University of Albany, SUNY. We are sure that Gary will excel in his new position.

**STEVE SMART**, formerly Director, Division of Sponsored Research at Vanderbilt University, and former NCURA President, has been promoted to Assistant Provost for Graduate Education and Research. In his new role, Steve will coordinate the day-to-day functions and services within the Graduate School and will continue to assist, as needed, with research policy issues. Congratulations, Steve!

---

**ANN HAMMERSLA**, previously Director, Division of Research Administration at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). Her expertise on intellectual property issues has been a great asset for NCURA, and we are confident that MIT will benefit from her continued guidance.

**CAROL WELT**, previously Associate Dean for Research Administration, New York University has relocated to the University of Connecticut. Here, Carol will serve as Executive Director and Assistant Vice Provost for Research. Best Wishes, Carol in your new role.

On January 1st, **JIM SEVERSON**, former President of the Cornell Research Foundation, became Vice Provost, Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer at the University of Washington.

---

**Best Wishes to all of you!**
As our term as co-editors of the NCURA Newsletter ends with this issue, we are left with feelings of satisfaction and gratitude. The past three years have passed incredibly quickly (despite one of us spending the entire first year of the co-editorship under the mistaken impression that he had signed on for only a two-year term). Our term of office has proved most enjoyable and, more importantly, we are pleased that some of our innovations have been greeted with general approval by the membership.

One of these was establishment of Newsletter "Corners", which mirrored and, we hope, reinforced continued development of NCURA's Neighborhoods. But we are keenly aware that most of the credit for these periodic columns belongs to the knowledgeable corps of contributing editors who created this consistently insightful series of articles. All readers of this publication are indebted to Steve Dowdy of MIT for the eRA Corner, Sue Polmar of Yale for the Senior Administrators' Corner, Richard Sohn of Columbia for the Biomedical Corner, Ann Hammersla of MIT for the Intellectual Property Corner and Bonny Boice of the Research Foundation of SUNY and NCURA Treasurer, for the Financial Corner.

And, of course, a very special thank you to Tony DeCrappeo of COGR for his consistently eloquent and thought provoking Capital View column. Tony's noteworthy contributions appeared in every issue of the Newsletter over the past three years, and we are especially grateful for his loyalty and dedication.

We were fortunate not only to be blessed with quality of authorship from our contributing editors, but from many of you who agreed to write one (or several) articles on a particular area of expertise or newsworthy event. We also wish to express our appreciation for assisting us to make the Newsletter a publication that we could be proud of.

The talent and skills needed to organize and format the articles into an attractive newsletter that also contains photographs, charts, advertisements, and even short NCURA news-related articles is quite an accomplishment in and of itself. For all of this we are indebted, once again, to the talented National Office Staff, most especially Kathleen Larmett, Executive Director, and Tara Bishop, Associate Executive Director of NCURA, who has functioned as Production Supervisor of the Newsletter for the past several years. Kudos to all at One Dupont Circle.

Many members have become increasingly dependent on the electronic version of the Newsletter, released a few days in advance of the mailing of the hard copy. The electronic version requires special formatting and creation of accompanying copy. Tara and other members of the NCURA staff play an important role here as well, but much of the credit for the “E-Version” goes to Jill Tincher of the University of Miami, who has functioned as NCURA's E-News Editor for most of the past three years. Thanks so much, Jill!

The time has come to pass on ownership of the "red pencil", both in its traditional and electronic form, to the new co-editors of the Newsletter – Marianne Rinaldo Woods of the University of Texas at Arlington and David Richardson of Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Best wishes to Marianne and Dave. We stand ready to cheer you on, where desired, to lend more tangible support. The Newsletter has become NCURA's most widely read publication and we know you will elevate it to an even higher standard.

Finally, to each other we say farewell as Newsletter co-editors, but not as friends, as co-collaborators and contributors to future NCURA committees, workshops and presentations and, most of all, as colleagues who share a mutual love and respect for our profession and for the many good people we have had the privilege of meeting through our association with NCURA.

Gunta J. Liders is the Director, Office of Research and Project Administration for the University of Rochester and Richard N. Keogh is the Director, Office of Research and Grants Administration for Rhode Island College.

Thank you Gunta and Dick

It is with great excitement and trepidation that we accept the role of co-editors of the NCURA Newsletter. We consider ourselves very fortunate to follow in the wake of the outstanding editorial leadership provided by Dick and Gunta over the last three years. Under their leadership, the newsletter has expanded its capacity to inform the NCURA membership by broadening its scope. We plan to honor all of their hard work by ensuring the newsletter maintains its focus and remains an effective means of communication. As we begin our duties, we are comforted that we have a talented National Office Staff to assist us in our efforts. We look forward to serving as your co-editors.

Marianne Rinaldo Woods
and Dave Richardson