NCURA DESIGNS NEW UNIVERSITY/INDUSTRY SUMMER CONFERENCE

by Cheryl-Lee Howard and Jim Severson

This year, NCURA is planning a summer conference designed to build and strengthen bridges between the university and industry environments. Most of us are finding that more and more of our daily workload involves some form of university/industry interaction—material transfer agreements, research contracts, non-disclosure agreements, teaming agreements, sub-contracts, licenses. But even as our university researchers are working more actively with their colleagues in the “for-profit” sector, the differences in our two environments are being increasingly highlighted...often through a lack of understanding that breeds frustrations and even roadblocks.

NCURA recently teamed with the Business Higher Education Forum (BHEF), a partnership between the American Council on Education and the National Alliance of Business, to look at these interactions, why we need them, why problems exist, and what we can do to facilitate them. As a result of this project, NCURA (in collaboration with NACUA, AUTM and BHEF) has created this special conference as the next step in the interaction. From August 17 to 20 in Keystone, Colorado, decision makers from Research Administration, Licensing, Legal Counsel, Industry Relations and Economic Development will attend workshops and sessions designed to build awareness and facilitate interaction. There will be opportunities to network across borders with legal, licensing and administrative participants from both industry and higher education.

The 44th Annual NCURA Meeting Update

by Bob Killoren

We know budgets are tightening around the country as we face some critical challenges as a nation, as states, and as institutions of higher education. “Program Committee 44” is building a professional development offering for this coming year’s annual meeting that we hope will truly merit your expenditure of time and money.

The theme for our national gathering is “The Compleat Research Administrator: Building on the Past, Preparing for the Future.” We hoped this title would bring to mind the 17th century book, The Compleat Angler, which in its time and for centuries thereafter was a touchstone for the art of fishing. We’d like the 44th edition of the NCURA annual meeting to be a truly comprehensive presentation of research administration at the beginning of the 21st century, one that will prepare research administrators for a very challenging future.

However, we also used the archaic form “compleat” to remind ourselves that we do indeed have a history. Research administration has been around as a rather specific job for at least 50 years. Interestingly enough, my own research in the Penn State archives uncovered a rather active group of university research administrators 75 years ago, who met regularly to
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Strategic Growth and Assessment in 2002
by F. John Case

We are off to a great start this year at NCURA kicking it off in Florida with one of our most successful professional development programs, Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration. Equally successful, the Financial Research Administration (FRA III) program recently concluded in Tampa with a record number of over 500 participants. Planning is underway for a new summer conference dealing with University/Industry Partnerships, which is described further in this issue. We will continue to address the complex needs of the membership by providing quality programming on both the national and regional levels. NCURA has a history of excellence in professional development programming and this continues in 2002.

The Board of Directors met in January to work on some key issues identified through the strategic planning process. The Board will focus on the following tasks in 2002:

- Developing a strategy for identifying, developing, and cultivating partnerships with other professional organizations (e.g., AUTM)
- Assessing the appropriateness of expanding the scope of NCURA’s mission beyond college and university research administration
- Determining the proper membership categories to reflect a more inclusive organization
- Maintaining a competitive edge to make the most of the membership’s time, talent, and financial resources

Discussion of these and other issues raised additional questions and concerns which were summarized in an electronic survey recently distributed to the membership. Your input is critical to the future of NCURA, and we appreciate all of the responses submitted. The upcoming regional meetings will provide the membership an opportunity to continue discussions on these and other issues over the next several months before the Board convenes in June.

As an organization, we continue to demonstrate financial strength which was apparent by the Board’s approval of the budget for 2002. Discussion of the changes in governance made in 2000 prompted the development of a working group to look at improving the 2003 appointment process for national committees. The Board entertained the idea of developing a national meeting assessment task force to ensure that the annual meetings sustain the professional development needs of the membership during these changing times. The meeting concluded with a charge to review the regional bylaws for consistency with the national bylaws. The review will also include an assessment of the national bylaws for simplicity and ease of application.

Overall, the meeting was a great success, and the Board and I look forward to guiding the organization through this period of self-reflection and strategic growth.

John Case is the NCURA President and serves as the Executive Director, Office of Contracts and Grants for the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Let’s Make Our Subawards Easier and More Efficient – Here’s How
by Robert Killoren

It is often the case that the small things in life can have the greatest impact on us. In research administration, this may be proven no truer than in the case of the subaward agreement form. Such a simple thing, so obvious a solution to so many problems that it is surprising we did not think of it before.

We often put a lot of pressure on our federal partners to streamline their systems, demanding responsiveness and ease. Likewise, we frequently test our own internal systems to make sure things are running smoothly. Yet, when it comes to how we work together – institution to institution – we have made few investigations or improvements.

Chuck Paoletti of the Office of Naval Research at our last annual meeting boldly made this situation evident. He said something to this effect: “You guys are all over us to make the awards process fast and smooth, yet you do nothing when it comes to how you make awards to one another.” How true! How many times have you been bogged down in the legal trappings of a subcontract coming from or going to another university?

A couple years back, the Federal Demonstration Partnership started a Task Force to look into the whole area of subawards. A number of schools had experienced some adverse contractor procurement system review (CPSR) findings dealing with subrecipients under grants. The auditors were demanding that these subrecipient interactions be dealt with as subcontracts, fully adhering to OMB Circular A-110’s procurement provisions. We began to question the wisdom of this. For instance, does it make sense for us, as the prime awardee, to submit a modular budget to the NIH, but demand that an institution collaborating with us on the same project send us a complete detailed budget so that we can do a cost analysis? I don’t think so....

The FDP Task Force developed a “subawards statement” that made it clear that subawards constituted financial assistance and were not subject to the procurement standards of A-110. They were indeed sub-“awards” and not sub-“contracts.” There are still instances in which subcontracts need to be issued – when the other institution is simply performing a service, for example – but most institution-to-institution collaborations are financial assistance, not procurement. This “subawards statement” document was reviewed and approved by both the Office of Naval Research, which has government-wide responsibility for subs (that’s my pun for the year, get it?), and by the Office of Management and Budget. It is available for inspection on the web at: http://fdp3.org/sa.html

Once this task was accomplished, the Task Force began to work on standard language that could be put into a model subawards agreement. Since both federal and university research administrators participated in the Task Force, the resulting model agreement not only included all the appropriate federal conditions, but also provided a solid baseline of clauses to address typical university concerns (those both of the prime awardee and the sub-awardee). The most amazing thing is that it did all this in a relatively few pages. At Penn State, for example, when we implemented the subawards agreement form, we went from a 20- to 30-page subcontract to a 4- to 5-page subaward agreement.

The subaward agreement is designed as a “form.” Face it, most of us are bureaucrats (good bureaucrats, we hope, but bureaucrats nonetheless), and we work well with forms. On the first page, we identify the parties – the prime awardee and the sub-awardee, which we call the “Collaborator.” Pertinent details about the subaward are then listed, including the prime and subaward numbers, the awarding agency, CFDA number, period of performance, subaward amount and title.
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FURTHER ACTION ON BIOTERRORISM AND UNIVERSITY RESEARCH

by Tony DeCrappeo

Last month’s article on this issue generated enough interest that we thought it would be helpful to provide an update on additional steps being taken by Congress and the Administration to protect against potential bioterrorist attacks and the implications for universities. As I described in my previous article, the USA PATRIOT Act was enacted into law on October 26, 2001, and one of its provisions prohibited “restricted persons” from having access to select biological agents. Such persons include non-permanent residents from terrorist-supporting countries, convicted felons, people dishonorably discharged from the United States military, illegal aliens, and illegal drug users. Left uncertain under this law is whether institutions are responsible for conducting background checks on individuals with access to biotoxins, to determine if they fall into the “restricted” category.

At the end of the 2001 legislative session, both the House and Senate passed versions of expanded bioterrorism legislation. Both bills - the Tauzin-Dingell (House) and Frist-Kennedy (Senate) - would tighten the registration and certification requirements for laboratories that contain hazardous pathogens and agents such as anthrax and plague (called “select agents”). One of the main differences between the two bills is that the House bill would not explicitly call for the Department of Justice to perform the background checks on individuals who need to handle or use select agents, as the Senate bill would do. Instead, the House measure would direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a “personnel screening protocol” in consultation with the Department of Justice. Also, HHS could make grants to public and nonprofit private entities to address the cost of new security requirements. Another difference between the two bills is that the House bill would add to the list (of restricted persons who are prohibited from handling or using select agents) people who are suspected of terrorist or criminal activity, or who participate in military or intelligence operations of a non-NATO foreign nation.

The next step is for a House-Senate conference committee to reconcile differences in the bills and send the legislation to the President, which he is expected to sign. This process has been delayed somewhat by the ENRON developments, but is expected to take place soon. Presidents of the major research universities have expressed support through the Association of American Universities for the Senate version of the bills, partly due to its clear call for the Justice Department to perform background checks.

Meanwhile, the lack of clarity of responsibilities under the USA PATRIOT Act has not prevented the Administration from action. The Department of Health and Human Services Inspector General (IG) has begun audits of selected university/medical center laboratory practices to safeguard access to and use of select agents. The audits have four aspects:

1. Compliance with the 1996 Anti-Terrorism Act provisions - registration of facilities with the Centers for Disease Control, proper procedures in place for tracking and reporting of transfers of select agents, and whether the labs are properly equipped to handle and safeguard the materials.

2. Compliance with the USA PATRIOT Act – the main focus will be on restriction on access to select agents by individuals from the seven countries listed in the Act. If directed, the IG could also review other aspects of the Act, such as mechanisms in place to deny access to select agents to individuals that are convicted felons, illegal drug users, those dishonorably discharged from the military and others designated in the Act.

3. Review of the physical security of labs that house select agents and the buildings the labs are in.

4. Review of the lab or institution’s IT security for research data related to select agents.

The IG plans to visit up to 10 universities by March/April 2002. Early reports from universities already visited are that the audits are as much a learning experience for the IG staff as they are a review of compliance. It is also reported that the primary concern is for adequate inventory and tracking systems for select agents, and for storage and physical security of the materials. IG officials have stated that government lawyers disagree on the extent of background checks required under the PATRIOT Act, so for now they are asking questions and gathering information on the issue. Once the reviews are finished, the universities are being encouraged by the IG to share lessons learned and best practices within the research community.

A good place to keep up to date on this issue is the AAU web site at www.aau.edu. They have established a special section called “Post-September 11 Resources” that provides frequent updates of legislative and executive branch actions.

Tony DeCrappeo serves as the Associate Director for the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR).
January 15, 2002– Clinical Trials Video Conference

by Chris Hansen

January 15, 2002 witnessed yet another highly informative and successful NCURA video conference, this one part of its 2001-2002 broadcast series on compliance issues. Christina Hansen, University of California Irvine, moderated “Compliance Issues for Clinical Trials”, a four-hour interactive broadcast that brought together experts from federal regulatory agencies, major research universities and institutional review boards. Panelists included: Joseph Sherwin, University of Pennsylvania; Michael Carome, Office for Human Research Protections; Cynthia Dunn, Western Institutional Review Board (formerly of the University of Rochester); and David Lepay, Food and Drug Administration. The clinical trial focus was of primary interest to viewers in academic medical centers and research hospitals. However, the broadcast also reviewed the regulatory and ethical bases for general biomedical research issues. The interactive video conference began with discussions on Investigator Obligations, including the FDAs process for obtaining an IND/IDE; performance and oversight responsibilities of PIs throughout the life of a clinical trial; and the ill-defined and troubling topic of incentives and finders fees. Part two of the broadcast focused on IRB Obligations related to education and review, and the fairly new concept of oversight of a study by a Data Safety Monitoring Committee. The last section of the video conference summarized major Institutional Obligations, specifically conflicts of interest; research billing and subject injury; and continuous quality improvement. The panel fielded a series of excellent questions from the studio audience and from individuals at the subscriber sites, which helped make an interesting, fact-filled presentation.

Chris Hansen serves as the Assistant Vice Chancellor, Office of Research Administration for the University of California-Irvine.

March 19, 2002 – Focus on Compliance Education

by Richard Seligman

“From a Culture of Compliance to a Culture of Concern: Building a Compliance Education Program That Works” is the title of NCURA’s live satellite video conference that will be broadcast on March 19. Presented in cooperation with the National Association of College and University Attorneys (NACUA), this is the third program in the 2001-02 satellite broadcast series, which is devoted to examining various aspects of compliance. The focus of the March 19 program is on compliance education and training. Does an effective compliance program need to contain an educational component? Who should be “educated”? How? By whom? What are the best ways to go about doing this? What resources are already available? Moderated by Dick Seligman, Senior Director of Sponsored Research, Caltech, and Bob Killoren, Assistant Vice President for Research, Penn State, the conference features a set of conversations on various aspects of the compliance education topic. Participants include Greg Koski, Director of the Office for Human Research Protections, DHHS; Chris Pascal, Director of the Office of Research Integrity, DHHA; Mark Brenner, Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education, Indiana University—Purdue University, Indianapolis; Kim Moreland, Director of Grant and Contract Administration at the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center; and Mark Righter, a partner in the Pennsylvania law firm of McQuade Blasko Attorneys at Law. The conference promises to provide a lively discussion of critical issues surrounding compliance and training. Campus participants in the video conference will receive a “Compendium of Compliance Education Curriculum Materials” as part of the instructional materials included in this video conference. As always, conference participants are encouraged to call in or fax questions for the panelists.

May 14, 2002 -- The True Cost of Compliance and Why We Must Invest

by John Fini and Michael Amey

If you were to look up the definition of “compliance” in the dictionary (ignore that it falls right after complex and just before complicate- a story for another conference) you would find the following - 1. Acquiescence to a rule, request, demand, etc. 2. A tendency or disposition to yield to others.

We think you will agree this rather passive, if not docile view of compliance does not match the expectations of the public trust or the view that we see every day in our Research Community.

In fact, the headlines of the recent past that relate to Research Compliance would suggest there have been few other topics that have fostered such public concern along with a wide level of intellectual and emotional debate.

We all recognize much of this debate occurred with banner headlines in major newspapers, magazines, and television news programs across the country. The debate over what will constitute reasonable efforts to achieve compliance is far from over, let alone resolved. A number of research institutions have begun, as a means for continuing the process, an insightful refocus towards refining pro-active compliance programs that will meet and satisfy the public’s expectations and those of the regulatory agencies. As such, it is not a moderate surprise that the entire four-part 2001-2002 NCURA Video Conference Series is focused solely on Compliance.

What we plan to bring to you during the May 14, 2002 conference is a cross-cutting multi-institutional and multi-agency discussion surrounding the costs of compliance. We will explore the funded and un-funded costs of compliance and the impact it has on Institutional and Agency budgets.

We will, of course, devote time to the associated costs of non-compliance as this has become a growing concern for many on the local and national scene.

We will address the obvious, the unexpected, and the hidden costs, as well as the benefits that accrue from investing in a comprehensive and integrated compliance program. That will be the easier of our challenges.

What we really want to focus upon is the over-arching investment in compliance programs. We plan to do this, not just in terms of accounting for dollars and time, but in terms of fostering cultural change in institutional and agency program stewardship. We want to weave together the issues of advancement of scientific discoveries, the conduct of science and career development, and then couple those to collaborative regulatory processes that intersect with the Research Community and provide an enhanced view of compliance activities and outcomes.

We expect each of these topics (and many more that will develop) will spark some interesting debate throughout the course of the day. And we fully expect to engage the audience throughout the course of the day as a full partner in these discussions. This will not be a program of ‘talking heads’. This will be a program where both the panel and the audience will be challenged to explore and debate old and new concepts.

continued on next page
We are exceptionally pleased with the wide range of Institutional and Federal Agency representation that is in place for this presentation. We have as Panelists: Gil Tran, Policy Analyst, Office of Federal Financial Management, OMB; Greg Koski, Director, Office for Human Research Protections, DHHS; Betty A. Farbman, Director of Grants and Sponsored Research, St. John’s University; Deborah Galloway, Director, Office for Sponsored Programs, University of Cincinnati; Chris Pascal, Director, Office of Research Integrity, DHHS.

Moderating this session will be Michael Amey, Assistant Dean for Research Administration, School of Medicine at the Johns Hopkins University; and John Fini, Financial Director, Research Management, Massachusetts General Hospital.

We look forward to your participation in this final presentation of the NCURA 2001-2002 video conference series.

Michael Amey serves as the Assistant Dean for Research Administration, School of Medicine at the Johns Hopkins University; and John Fini serves as the Financial Director, Research Management, Massachusetts General Hospital.

VIDEO CONFERENCE REGISTRATION FORM

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 Conferences 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.

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.

For details about the Video Conferences in this Series visit www.ncura.edu!

CONTACT NAME ___________________________ TITLE ___________________________

INSTITUTION ___________________________

ADDRESS ___________________________

CITY ___________ STATE ___________ ZIP ___________

PHONE ___________ FAX ___________

E-MAIL ___________ WEB SITE ___________

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live: $2,800.00</td>
<td>Tape: $950.00</td>
<td>Live: $950.00</td>
<td>Live: $950.00</td>
<td>Live: $950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape: $2,800.00</td>
<td>Tape: $950.00</td>
<td>Tape: $950.00</td>
<td>Tape: $950.00</td>
<td>Tape: $950.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 $50 cancellation fee. Cancellations received after the deadline will not be refunded. You must receive confirmation from NCURA to receive a refund.

NCURA
One Dupont Circle, NW
Suite 220
Washington, DC  20036
Phone: (202) 466-3894
Fax: (202) 223-5573
Email: info@ncura.edu
Website: www.ncura.edu

Cast of the January 15th show on Compliance (l to r): Michael Carome, Cindy Dunn, David Lepay, Christina Hansen and Joe Sherwin.
Contrary to reports in a recent “Chronicle of Higher Education” article that noted a downward trend in membership for several higher ed organizations, membership in NCURA increased once again last year, and we expect the trend to continue. During this fiscal year, NCURA will hold a new summer conference (see the related article in this Newsletter), add a new program (Sponsored Projects Administration: Level II), and increase its number of Fundamentals programs. While these program changes provide an impetus for increased membership, they are also largely responsible for an increase in related revenue and expenses. The NCURA Board of Directors has a strategic plan goal to identify new sources of revenue to help defray membership service costs to members. As an example, NCURA has partnered with commercial sponsors for the past two annual meetings. At the 42nd (2000) Annual Meeting, KPMG, Oracle and Turner Consulting sponsored various activities including the speaker ready room, which provided storage and resources for speakers and panelists prior to their presentations. At the 43rd (2001) Annual Meeting, Oracle, in partnership with Apple, sponsored installation of the computers that were available for use in the Exhibit Hall. In order to continue sponsorship with a structured program, the NCURA National Office engaged a firm to conduct a sponsorship planning study; the final report was submitted to the NCURA Board of Directors in January 2002. During this fiscal year, a newly formed Board Task Force for Sponsorship will implement a structured sponsorship program with a goal of increasing the number of sponsors supporting NCURA. This Task Force will be developing formal policies and guidelines to mitigate any conflict of interest in this attempt to increase revenue.

REVENUE

The following represents highlights of budget FY 2001 and anticipated FY 2002 revenue growth:

- **Membership Services** - (consists of Membership Dues and Other, which encompasses mailing lists, the Newsletter, mono-micrographs, Managing Federal Grants, Journal, NCURA gear, sponsorships and sponsorships-neighborhoods). The steady increase in dues revenue reflects the actual and projected increase in membership. Once again, membership surpassed expectations in FY 2001 with membership of 3600 plus.

- **Programs** - (consists of Annual Meeting, Annual Meeting Workshops, Satellite Video Conferences, the Fundamentals Program, and Other, the latter encompassing ERA, FRA, Summer Conference, and one new program). As a direct result of our larger membership, attendance at meetings is also increasing. Additional workshops and a new program, “Sponsored Projects Administration: Level II”, will be added, along with more Fundamentals offerings.

- **Other Income** - (consists of Interest & Dividends, Unrealized Gain & Loss and Miscellaneous). A slight decrease is projected in 2002 due to the unsteady market conditions.

EXPENSE

The following represents highlights of budget FY 2001 and anticipated FY 2002 expenditures:

- **Membership Services** - (consists of Publications, Committees, Task Force/Other Projects which encompasses the Institutional Profile, Conference Planning, web redesign, neighborhoods, evaluation, regional training). The increase in expenses for membership services is largely due to increased costs that effect publications.

- **Programs** - (consists of Annual Meeting, Annual Meeting Workshops, Satellite Conferences, Fundamental Workshops and Other which encompasses ERA, FRA, Summer Conference and one new Program. The increase in the amount budgeted for conferences and workshops in FY 2002 is due to additional workshops, additional Fundamentals offerings and a new program entitled “Sponsored Projects Administration: Level II”.

- **Administration** - Consists of NCURA Office expense.

- **Strategic Fund** – This fund represents a budgeted amount to be used at the discretion of the NCURA President to cover any new activities developed during the fiscal year. During 2001, the strategic fund was used to support the development of the NCURA neighborhoods.

Bonny Boice is the NCURA Treasurer and serves as the Senior Vice President & Treasurer for the Research Foundation of SUNY.
Administrators and scientists would agree that integrity of research data is a fundamental presumption for quality research. Interpretation of data is what science is all about, and sometimes even the very best and brightest of investigators have disputes about what the data really says. Sharing data and experimental methodologies help assure that scientific work is replicated and validated or further disputed. But when scientific research has enormous economic and financial consequences, opinions about the quality and interpretation of data may reflect more than mere science, shading science with political and/or social agendas. Several controversial and related Congressional forays into the intersection of research data and public policy in recent years are briefly summarized here.

About three years ago, scientists and research administrators were awash in angst over access to federally-funded research data mandated by the so-called Shelby Amendment. The legislative language, proposed by Senator Richard Shelby (Republican-Alabama), authorized public access to all grant-funded research data through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). At the time, only data that was in possession of the federal agency was subject to FOIA, thus the Amendment broadened the reach of FOIA access considerably. When OMB published its final rules on A-110 modifications in October, 1999, FOIA applicability was focused on that data directly cited by the government in rule-making or other legal action having the effect of law. Although the grantee community argued that FOIA was an inappropriate tool, the narrow applicability of access to research data was soothing.

Not unexpectedly, certain public and congressional interests that were frustrated with the outcome for the Shelby Amendment pursued additional legislative redress. The Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001 directed the OMB to issue government-wide guidelines that “provide policy and procedural guidance to Federal agencies for ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility and integrity of information disseminated by federal agencies.” The legislation also directed that agencies establish a mechanism to allow the public to seek and obtain correction to agency information that does not meet certain “quality” standards. Reflecting its likely provenance, this recent legislative mandate was dubbed “Daughter of Shelby.” But, clearly, the “data quality” and information dissemination guidelines are far broader than the access requirements to research data covered under the Shelby Amendment.

OMB’s draft guidelines published in June 2001 described “quality, utility, objectivity and integrity” as related concepts and framed the agency’s obligation to “ensure that reproducibility and transparency have been taken into account” and “the presentation should clearly reflect the quality of the information.” “With reference to scientific and statistical information, OMB directed agencies to have” a focus on assuring accurate, reliable and unbiased data.” Concerned about OMB’s broad definitions of information and information dissemination, the academic community worried about reach-through from the granting agencies to raw research data. There were also concerns that the ambiguity of the guidelines would encourage possible harassment by individuals or groups whose challenge to the integrity of research data might be driven by personal gain or nonscientific agendas. Standards for public accountability, many suggested, should be balanced with protection of privacy, proprietary information and protection from nuisance challenges. A number of commenters asked OMB to recognize that peer-reviewed scientific data has already met standards of quality and utility.

In January, 2002, OMB published final guidelines and charged Federal agencies with developing implementing procedures. While the final rules narrow the potential reach-through to university data, ambiguity about when grantee data that is disseminated by an agency “as fact or agency opinion” would be subject to these guidelines remains. Although OMB recognized the merits of peer review, the reproducibility standard introduced by OMB may affect academic investigators in certain circumstances. Scientific data and outcomes that meet all the standards of quality, objectivity and integrity among academic peers may still be subject to differences of opinion. The normalcy of differences of opinion may be accommodated in agency implementing guidelines, but that is still unclear.

Sharing of grantee data has been a concern to NIH for some time. The Shelby Amendment and the “daughter of Shelby” recently both attracted comment from Dr. Wendy Baldwin, Deputy Director of NIH. Dr. Baldwin had already indicated the NIH is planning to post draft guidelines that will advise grantees of NIH’s expectations relative to sharing of research data. With respect to the OMB “data quality” guidelines, Dr. Baldwin indicated that she dislikes the legislation because it is “a tool to allow questioning of data that is provided by the federal government for its objectivity, utility and integrity so anything that we disseminate can be challenged on these criteria.” In particular, demonstrating utility is highly subjective. The utility of research data for a peer group of scientists may be vastly different from that of a nonscientist or a party more concerned with the economic impact of the data than the scientific credibility.

For NIH, the Office of Communications and Public Liaison is a key player in the development of DHHS’s implementing procedures. Since the regulations cover all information disseminated by the agency and not just research data, scientists are hopeful that NIH’s experience with the research community will influence the impact of the implementing regulations. Organizations such as COGR are working directly with agencies to identify the least intrusive, but fully compliant, strategies for meeting OMB’s requirements. Each agency must prepare and publish for comment a draft report no later than April 1, 2002, providing the agency’s implementing guidelines. The final implementing policies from agencies take effect next October.

Are the guidelines for data quality going to be a serious problem for our institutions and investigators? No one knows. Case law will likely determine whether universities’ concerns were merited. Does this most recent legislation end Congressional and public interest in access to federally-funded research data? Probably not. Stay tuned.

Mary Ellen Sheridan is a Past President of NCURA and serves as the Associate Vice President/Director, University Research Administration for the University of Chicago.
REGION I
New England

How about those Patriots? The New England Region is still celebrating our Super Bowl victory!!!

Bill Corbett’s reign as chair came to an end in December. On behalf of the Region, I would like to thank him for his hard work and dedication. It was a pleasure to work with him over the last two years and look forward to his assistance and sage advice during the next two years.

The Program Committee under the leadership of Bill Corbett and Ben Prince has put together a meeting that is sure to stimulate and inform you with topics of interest to all. The strength of the program is due to their outstanding effort and creativity. Look to the Region I website for current information. The meeting will be held in Newport, Rhode Island from April 29th through May 1st. The Tuesday night event should be great fun. It will be held at the Beechwood (think Great Gatsby). Please remember to make your reservations at the Newport Marriott soon.

RADG continues to offer some excellent programming. Steve Dowdy, Julie Norris and Tom Egan, all from MIT, provided a great presentation on subawards. It was very well attended. We have an opening for our May meeting so if you have a topic you would like to have addressed please contact me.

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

REGION II
Mid-Atlantic

Our Program Chair, Charlie Kaars, has been operating by candlelight in the midst of a Buffalo winter for the record books, and working with Anne Geronimo, Co-Chair and the Program Committee to put the finishing touches on the Region II Spring Meeting program.

Join us in Ithaca, NY, from April 21 through 23 for “Working Better by Working Together”. Sunday workshops will offer OMB Circulars (our presenters make the circulars fun!) and a special workshop on Communication and Working Together.

Concurrent sessions and discussion groups on Monday and Tuesday will focus on working in teams to accomplish shared goals. They will address issues of importance to Central, Departmental, Pre-Award and Post-Award Administrators. We hope that the many institutions in the area around Ithaca will attend, and publicize this opportunity to those on their campuses who may not be NCURA members. Check out the conference website for full program and registration information at www.research.buffalo.edu/events/ncura. Look for an earlybird discount and day registration rates.

We’re also hoping to be able to announce our new Chair-Elect and Secretary at our Spring meeting, so please plan to join us as spring begins in one of the loveliest parts of New York State.

Betty Farbman serves as the Region II Chair and is the Director, Office of Grants and Sponsored Research for St. John’s University.

REGION III
Southeast

According to Tim Conlon, Chair-Elect, plans are in the final stages for the Region III Spring meeting in San Antonio. The theme, “Coming Together in 2002,” reflects our joint venture with Region V in San Antonio, TX - May 5th through May 8th. The meeting will be held at the St. Anthony Hotel in San Antonio. Reservations can be made at any time by calling the hotel at (210) 227-4392. The hotel is located across from historic Travis Park at 300 East Travis Street, in the heart of downtown San Antonio. Situated in the city’s commercial and retail center, the hotel is only a few blocks from the Convention Center, Paseo del Rio Riverwalk, Rivercenter Mall and the Alamo. Remember the Alamo! (Sorry, couldn’t pass that one up…)

On Sunday, May 5, we will offer two all day and four half-day workshops. The meeting proper runs from Monday morning through Wednesday noon. A guest speaker will kick-off the meeting Monday. Thirty-two, action packed, information filled, concurrent sessions will follow. As usual, we will have our share of social events. There will be a Newcomers’ Session on Sunday evening, followed by a reception for all attendees. (To be admitted to the reception you must wear clothing bearing the logo/name of your institution.) Tuesday night’s event is a Texas BBQ. The program and registration forms will be available soon. Please check the Region III web site http://www.orga.cofc.edu/ncura3/ for updates. For further details please contact Tim Conlon at tjc@virginia.edu.

While the Program Committee has been finalizing the program for the Spring meeting, the other Region III committees have also taken their charges seriously and are working diligently.

Nominations for Chair-Elect, Secretary/Treasurer and NCURA (National) Board Member closed on February 1. We will be voting electronically. Please watch for the announcement that the polls are open for us to vote at http://www.orga.cofc.edu/ncura3/. It only takes a minute to cast your vote. If you have questions please contact Nominations and Elections Committee Chair Deborah Walz at the University of Central Arkansas at deborahw@mail.uca.edu.

Membership Committee Chair Bonnie Smith is coordinating the Region III Travel Award of $500 to the Regional Meeting. You can email Bonnie your nominations at bsmith3@elon.edu. The awardee must be an NCURA member attending his or her first regional meeting.

Site Selection Committee Chair Mary Watson and her fellow members have chosen three very attractive 2004 spring meeting sites for us to consider. Vote for your favorite site when you vote for the regional officers at http://www.orga.cofc.edu/ncura3/. The sites to consider are Wild Dunes Resort at Isle of Palms, South Carolina; Park Vista Resort Hotel in Gatlinburg, Tennessee in the Smokey Mountains; and the El Conquistador Hotel in Puerto Rico. Treat yourself to a little “for fun” web surfing and check these places out!

Chair Carl Frantz and his Professional Development Committee are developing an innovative senior leadership professional development program. Please contribute your ideas to Carl at cd1406@louisiana.edu

David Battey’s Electronic Research Administration Committee is working hard to facilitate your nominations and voting for officers and meeting sites on the Region III Web Site. Please refer to our web site often at http://www.orga.cofc.edu/ncura3/. There’s a ton of interesting and useful information here.
Can Hospitality Chair Greg Thompson and his Committee put together another great hospitality room at the meeting in San Antonio? We’re betting he can make it even more memorable than the one in DC. The room, on the tenth floor of the St. Anthony Hotel, has a large roof top area with a terrific view with socializing just through the French doors. After you see it you’ll believe that it is one of our most unique hospitality suites.

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

REGION IV
Mid-America

The Region IV 2002 Program Committee is finalizing plans for the spring meeting scheduled for April 27–30, 2002 in Madison, WI. Online registration will be on the Region’s Website (http://www.ncura.uc.edu) the first week of March.

Focusing on the theme, “Research in Ethics,” the committee has arranged for workshops on clinical trial management, compliance for the new and advanced administrator, fundamentals for the newcomer, as well as a general professional development topic. Concurrent sessions have been organized around four tracks of sponsored administration: biomedical, compliance, professional development, and pre and post award activities. As a special incentive for this meeting, Region IV will distribute binders containing all presentation handouts. The committee wants participants to have access to information important to them, even if scheduling prevents them from attending some sessions.

Nominations. Both the Awards Committee and the Nominations Committee are asking for NCURA members to nominate candidates. Consider nominating yourself—we need you! See Call for Nominations at http: www.ncura.uc.edu or contact Glenda Luecke (Washington University), Awards Committee Chair and Kathy Taggart (Creighton University), Chair of the Nominations Committee.

Recognizing Excellence. Since 1986, Region IV has practiced the tradition of recognizing exceptional performance through awards. Based on the recommendation of the 2001 Awards Committee, Region IV has honored two members with the Kevin Reed Outstanding Professional Award: William (Bill) Sharp (University of Kansas) and Mark A. Sweet (University of Wisconsin-Madison). To qualify for the Kevin Reed Award, recipients must have no more than five years experience in the research administration field, have served on national or regional NCURA committees, and have participated in an annual meeting at the national or regional levels. Clearly, our awardees meet these criteria and exemplify outstanding new professionals.

William Sharp. As a member of Region IV’s Communications Committee and this year’s editor of the Region IV News, Bill has demonstrated skills in production, layout, design, and editing. Dola Haessig (University of Columbia-Missouri), co-chair of the Communications Committee, writes “Bill offered to do the kind of work that doesn’t garner much recognition, yet requires a fairly large block of time compressed against deadlines.” At the national level, Bill serves on NCURA’s Select Committee on Communication and Member Services. Appointed as the top choice of the selection committee from an incredibly strong pool of candidates, Bill received the “strongest possible endorsement” by the Board of Directors, writes Pamela Webb (Northwestern University).

Mark Sweet. Mark’s expertise with technology has benefited his campus, NCURA, and the federal government. He has been active in the Federal Demonstration Partnership as well as NIH initiatives. Mark’s nomination for this award included support from George Stone of the Extramural Inventions and Technology Resources Branch of NIH’s Office of Policy for Extramural Research Administration. Stone writes that he is impressed with the level of detail of Mark’s understanding of “the business practices involved in NIH grant management...” Mark now co-chairs a User’s Interface Specification Subgroup for NIH.

Region IV welcomes members, new members, and non-members to it’s Regional Meetings. Mark your calendar for April 27-30, 2002.

Deborah Vetter serves as the Director, Sponsored Programs Administration for the University of Nebraska Medical Center.

REGION V
Southwestern

Region III and Region V members will be Coming Together May 5 – 8, 2002, in San Antonio. The conference site, the St. Anthony, is a Wyndham Historic Hotel in the heart of downtown, two blocks from the famed Riverwalk and just a few blocks from the Alamo.

Tim Conlon of Region III and Joan Howeth of Region V have created an exciting program for us. There will be two full-day workshops, one on the Basics of Research Administration and the other with the intriguing title of Thirty Systems for Sponsored Program Administrators. The half-day workshops are:
1) Intellectual Property & the Research Contract—Should Marriage or Divorce Be Considered?; 2) Professional Development;

Our friends from NSF and NIH will give us the latest updates.

To be admitted to the Sunday evening reception attendees should wear a shirt representing their school (or wear NCURA gear). Tuesday morning, our opening plenary speaker will be Frederick Droge, Founder and President of Droge and Associates. John Case, the President of NCURA, will be our guest speaker at the Tuesday luncheon. We have planned a Bar-B-Q for Tuesday evening under the stars of Texas with great western entertainment and a dance band. Ronald Blank, President of the University of North Texas Health Science Center in Fort Worth, will be our closing plenary speaker. Make your plans now to come and join us. See y’all in San Antonio!

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

REGION VI
Western

2002 is already a very busy year for our region! The Nominating and Travel Awards Committees have been established. The Nominating Committee from last year has agreed to continue their wonderful work from last year. The Committee is chaired by Vincent Orgawam (California State University Bakersfield); members of the committee are Barry Dorman (California State University, Los Angeles), Gary Chaffins (University of Oregon), and Geri Walker (Western Washington University). The Travel Awards Committee will be chaired by Ray Riznyk (Central Washington University); committee members are Marg Herndon (Desert Research Institute), Denis Meerdink (University of the Pacific), and Patricia Yano (University of Washington). In addition, David Mayo (California Institute of Technology) will join the Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) as an appointed member. The preliminary program is set for the Region VI/VII Joint Spring Meeting. The program is very impressive, starting with 6 workshops (one of which is a half-day NSF workshop). For concurrent sessions, the program shows presentations by NSF, NIH, ONR, and EPA.

continued on page 17
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Citizens Scholarship Foundation of America
Families of Freedom Scholarship Fund
1505 Riverview Road
P.O. Box 297
St. Peter, MN  56082

Dear Friends:

In November, the National Council of University Research Administrators held its 43rd Annual Meeting at the Hilton Washington and Towers. During this meeting our members, who traveled to Washington, D.C., from colleges, universities and teaching hospitals across the country, raised $3,000.00 for the Families of Freedom Scholarship Fund — an amount generously matched by the Hilton.

On behalf of our members, Board of Directors and the Hilton Washington and Towers, please accept the enclosed check in the amount of $6,000.00.

With sincere appreciation for your continuing efforts,

Kathleen M. Larmett
Executive Director

cc: NCURA Members
Board of Directors
William Edwards,
Hilton Washington and Towers

February 12, 2002

Ms. Kathleen M. Larmett
Executive Director
National Council of University Research Administrators
One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 220
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Ms. Larmett:

Thank you so much for your gift of $6,000.00 for the Families of Freedom Scholarship Fund. Your gift will help fund postsecondary education for the children and spouses of those killed or permanently disabled as a result of the September 11 Attack on America and the follow-up rescue efforts.

We are grateful to former President Bill Clinton and former Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole who are serving as co-chairs for the fund campaign for the Families of Freedom Scholarship Fund™. This Fund was created by Citizens’ Scholarship Foundation of America (CSFA) in partnership with Lumina Foundation for Education. Lumina and USA Funds have provided challenge grants that will match the initial $1.5 million in gifts from individual donors—which means that your gift will double in value!

Our goal is to secure a total of $100 million for educational support for the victims’ families through gifts from corporations, foundations, individuals, and from special fundraising events throughout America. With the help of generous and caring people like you, we are moving closer to this goal every day.

Again, thank you for your generosity. While the terrorist acts have left us with sadness in all our hearts, we are truly grateful and very proud of the people and the organizations that have come forward to help with both their time and their money.

With appreciation and best wishes.

Sincerely,

William C. Nelson, President
Citizens’ Scholarship Foundation of America

P.S. CSFA is the nation’s largest private sector scholarship and educational support organization and has been named one of the most efficient charities in the U.S. by Smart Money Magazine, the Wall Street Journal’s magazine of personal finance. For more information about CSFA, please visit our website at www.csfa.org.

NCURA members begin an evening of community at the 43rd Annual Meeting by singing “America the Beautiful” with the Soul Source.
Sustaining Core Principles of eRA Systems or Trying to Teach Old Dogs New Tricks
by Stephen Dowdy

It appears that [the system] does not comply with the requirements of Public Law 106-107.

It [the system] fails to provide a mechanism for institutional approval of proposal submissions, the registration process security and authentication controls are insufficient, and it imparts additional and substantial burdens upon the submitting institutions.

It [the system] is an effective consumer-to-business model. However, the FDP believes that this approach is inappropriately applied in the context of research grants because this relationship is essentially a business-to-business relationship: institutions make proposals, awards are made to institutions, and institutions are held responsible for performance.

...the registration process is open; that is, in a matter of minutes, anyone can register, impersonate a faculty member of any institution, and submit proposals. No institutional approvals are required during the registration process.

Obviously, these comments are direct, to the point and address some very real concerns.

As system after system was evaluated, the same issues continued to surface. The FDP decided to draft a set of core principles that would accompany each bad doggie letter. These core principles reflect the functional specifications recommended for inclusion in all eRA systems that involve or represent research institutions in a substantial, formal or legally binding way. While general in nature, these core principles are primarily directed to organizations that sponsor research.

Many NCURA members are now being asked by various agencies to pilot and test new systems. You are encouraged to use the following core principles, which summarize those issues that are important to the research community, and encourage sponsors that are designing, developing or deploying eRA systems to carefully consider these principles. As the overarching standard, all agency eRA system development initiatives should meet the system requirements for seamless implementation within the Federal Commons.

Principle 1: The interests of the funding entities, recipient organizations, and general public are best served when initiatives that involve electronic interactions between a federal funding entity and recipient organization are undertaken within the context of the implementation of PL 106-107. Electronic systems that maximize convenience to a single department, agency, or program without contributing to a government-wide solution should not be initiated. Any such programs already in existence should have a plan for converting to one of the government-wide solutions. Whenever possible, funds that would have been expended for a non-standard solution should be redirected toward a government-wide solution.

Principle 2: Consultation with recipients early in system development increases both utility and satisfaction. Consultation can and should include beta testing with volunteer partners from the recipient community.

continued on page 12
Sustaining Core Principles of eRA Systems
or Trying to Teach Old Dogs New Tricks
continued from page 11

Principle 3: Interoperable systems for the electronic exchange of data in support of grants administration processes are possible only when government-wide data standards, such as the ANSI X-12 transaction sets, are used. Funding entities should refrain from requiring data that is not included in the government-wide data standards. Data definitions should be standard across funding entities, such that any given data element means the same thing for all funding entities. Where non-standard data is required by statute, funding entities should devise a mechanism for collecting this data that doesn’t compromise the use of data standards (e.g., if a sponsoring agency requires data that is not part of the standard, then the funding agency should enter this information into internal funding entity systems, as necessary). Funding entities should take into account the time and expense incurred by recipient organizations when there are changes to the data standards.

Principle 4: The promise of electronic commerce in grants administration depends on each funding entity and recipient organization implementing one of the approved data exchange mechanisms. Funding entities should provide recipients the option to use any one of the approved data exchange mechanisms, and use the Federal Commons for transactions that use an exchange mechanism other than that supported by the entity. For their part, recipient organizations must be able to consistently use one of the approved data exchange mechanisms. Business-to-business transactions are appropriate for funding entities and recipients administering a sufficiently large number of grants to merit the investment in electronic grants administration systems. Consumer-to-business transactions are appropriate for funding entities or recipients with smaller volumes of grants. Electronic submissions are in lieu of (not in addition to) paper.

Principle 5: Funding entities must respect recipient organizations’ need to know what is being proposed by individuals and groups from within their organizations. These entities also must respect the role organizations play in providing quality control over proposal submissions and in monitoring deliverables. Electronic systems should incorporate institutional approval of proposals, and should provide access to technical report submissions. The electronic identity of the authorized institutional officials has to be established and used. Any statutorily mandated, proposal-specific assurances, representations, or certifications can be provided only when the organization is involved in the submission process.

Principle 6: Data should be collected once, at its inception, without redundant data entry. Data ought to be entered only once and updated as needed, by the designated person(s) at the responsible organization authorized to provide it. The submitting organization is the entity responsible for assigning responsibility and authority to its employees within the context of the roles agreed to by the parties. Once entered, data may be updated only in accordance with established standards (e.g., proposal data may not be updated after a submission deadline, except for administrative corrections and with the consent of the affected agency).

Principle 7: Electronic data must be secure from unauthorized access during transmission, storage, and subsequent use by the funding entity. Security has to be provided to protect the technical narrative of proposals, demographic information, proprietary information, and other information protected under law.

Principle 8: The utility of systems to be used by recipients is greatly enhanced when the systems are pre-loaded with as much funding agency legacy data as possible.

Principle 9: Data integrity is essential. Data transmission has to be confirmed as accurate and complete. The source and content of the transmission has to be non-refutable. Where funding entity actions are based on graphical information, such as a technical proposal narrative or report that includes images or other graphics, the funding entity must assure that it does not allow images to be degraded in a way that could result in decisions adverse to the recipient.

Principle 10: System performance must be adequate for the processes and applications supported. System capacity must be sufficient to handle peak loads, and system response time must be acceptable.

Principle 11: Funding entities are responsible for providing training materials and support of recipient organization personnel. There also should be a help desk, or equivalent means, for providing ready assistance to users.

Applying these core principles to all eRA systems will do much to increase the efficiency of interactions between recipients and funding agencies, as well as reducing overall costs. And, who knows? Successful application of the principles someday may merit creation of a congratulatory, tail wagging, “good doggie” letter that can be applied to all of us - grantor and grantee alike.

Stephen Dowdy serves as the Assistant Director, Office of Sponsored Programs for Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Let’s Make Our Subawards Easier and More Efficient – Here’s How continued from page 2

What follows is the heart of the subaward, the terms and conditions. I wouldn’t say we worked towards the lowest common denominator in terms of selecting the contract language, but we certainly worked to get verbiage that nearly all institutions should be able to “live” with.

The following are highlights of the terms and conditions:

- The statement of work and budget are referenced by the date of the “proposal” submitted by the Collaborator. Thus, we don’t have to attach copies of the proposal and budgets to the agreement. NSF, for instance, is using this method in their emailed award statements and it works well.
- The billing information and final fiscal reporting are addressed, following a model that is standard among most universities.
- Technical reporting is covered in an attachment to the form.
- Contact people for fiscal, technical, and administrative issues are also all identified in an attachment, making it easy to keep track of names and phone numbers.
- The terms and conditions end by pulling in any special terms and conditions and certifications/assurances that appear in two separate appendices.
- The final element of the agreement is the signature boxes for each institution.

In terms of what clauses we bring into the agreement, we have tried to stick with the minimum required. We have to have a certification regarding lobbying and debarment, for instance. We’ve also added one on A-133 compliance. For the rest, we’ve stuck with either FDP terms and conditions (if it is an FDP-to-FDP-school arrangement) or with A-110 and the agency policies (like GC-1 for NSF grants).

There are over 30 institutions currently participating in the FDP subaward agreement form pilot project. We haven’t collected data yet, but I can tell you from what I’ve heard so far – this is one of the best improvements we’ve seen in years in research administration. At Penn State we’ve found it increases efficiency in processing, increasing the speed of processing, from request for sub to issuing the sub, dramatically. MIT is doing some neat things with e-mails. They send the subaward agreement form to the collaborator and instruct them to print it and sign it if it is okay. This cuts out a number of days of mailing legal documents around.

The most dramatic impact, however, will simply be the standardization of the subawards process, institution to institution. If you get a subaward agreement, you know it is acceptable and can be executed immediately. You also know you have an agreement that has been put together by federal as well as university research administrators. At the end of the pilot we even hope to get ONR’s and OMB’s approval of the subaward agreement, giving it a “Good Housekeeping seal of approval,” so to speak. That might get even some of the stingiest University general counsels to loosen up and go with the “national standard.”

The subaward agreement form is available in two basic flavors: FDP and non-FDP. Because the heart of the subaward agreement concept is A-110, any A-110 institution should feel comfortable using it with another A-110 institution. At Penn State, we’ve even modified it a little for use with non-federal prime awards, like when we make subawards under a foundation project. The subaward agreement IS a legal contract, so it works well with any situation with the proper changes to special terms and conditions.

The forms are all available on the FDP website. Go to: http://fdp3.org and click on “Committees,” then click on “Subaward Demonstration Project,” where you’ll find all the forms you need. Once you try it, you’ll never want to go back to subcontracts again!

Robert Killoren is the NCURA Vice President and serves as the Assistant Vice President for Research for Pennsylvania State University.

Berenice Saxon, formerly of the University of Pennsylvania and a member of NCURA since 1982, has accepted a new position at Thomas Jefferson University as Associate Director of Research Training.

Good Luck!
The 44th Annual NCURA Meeting Update
continued from the cover

The workshop series and the meeting’s concurrent sessions will incorporate these four crosscutting perspectives in a number of ways.

The meeting will offer sessions directed to new and experienced research administrators and to folks in central or departmental offices and in all different sizes of institutions. Attendees can also choose different kinds of concurrent sessions. We will offer a series of forums for special interest groups, an expanded series of primers, and a number of small discussion groups in our “real life” series.

This year’s annual meeting will also host a special eRA track for those who are significantly engaged in electronic research administration. Topics will include such areas as eRA standards, security, digital identity, portal technology, and document imaging. In addition, since eRA is such a part of a research administrator’s everyday life, we are asking moderators for all sessions to weave eRA into their sessions whenever possible. We really hope that those who have attended NCURA’s eRA conferences in the past will be encouraged to come this year to the annual meeting.

A new twist to this year’s program will be some special offerings on Monday evening to bridge that gap between dinner and hospitality. We’ll have a very interesting experimental session on communications, a Mentor’s Marketplace where you might find some answers to nagging questions, and more. Stay tuned as this concept takes shape.

Of course, there will be plenty of occasions for networking with friends new and old at the Sunday Banquet, the Tuesday night party, and special events for newcomers and old timers!

Make your plans to attend Number 44.

THE 2002 ANNUAL MEETING
PROGRAM COMMITTEE

Chair: Bob Killoren, Assistant Vice President for Research, Pennsylvania State University
Co-Chair: Marianne Rinaldo Woods, Assistant Vice President for Research, The University of Texas at Arlington
Honorary Co-Chair: Catherine Taylor-Core, NCURA emeritus, retired from Howard University

Connie Armentrout, Monsanto Company
Denise Clark, Cornell University
Tommy Coggins, University of South Carolina
Marti Dunne, New York University
Steve Erickson, Boston College
Judy Fredenberg, University of Montana
Chris Hansen, University of California - Irvine
Bob Hardy, Council on Governmental Relations
Kathleen Larmett, NCURA
Lambert McCollough, Office of Naval Research
Kim Moreland, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Dave Richardson, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Alice Tantredi-Hannon, Thomas Jefferson University
Pam Whitlock, University of North Carolina at Wilmington

Robert Killoren is the NCURA Vice President and serves as the Assistant Vice President for Research for Pennsylvania State University.

discuss such topics as: “agreements with commercial concerns”; “institutional policy… on patents and patent rights”; “proper cost accounting”; and “the research work of the Graduate School.” What we know and what we do today is built on a solid foundation of knowledge that has been laid by those who came before us. Research administration over that history has evolved from an area of specialty to a true profession.

And as in every profession, to be fully effective, today’s research administrator must be knowledgeable about a broad spectrum of topics and possess a deep understanding of some core elements. Program Committee 44 has been hard at work for the past two months preparing an outline of professional development programs in four major domains of research administration:

- **The Environment** - What are the primary policies that govern research and how do we live with them? What new regulations are being developed or implemented and how will they affect research administration? What is compliance and accountability all about? What’s the current “market” like among our various sponsors? Is funding heading up, leveling off, or going the way of the economy?

- **The Job** - Let’s get down to basics… what does a research administrator need to know to do the day-to-day job? What are the core elements? Sessions will explore all facets of research administration from pre-award activities, to negotiations, to accounting, to costing issues, to closeout and beyond.

- **Products and Partners** - The research administrator’s job doesn’t begin with the submission of proposals and it doesn’t end when the grant is over! To address the area beyond one end of the spectrum we’ve assembled sessions to explore building partnerships between institutions and between universities and industry. Beyond the other end, we’ll offer sessions on patenting and licensing and other technology transfer activities.

- **The Person** - Finally we want to explore the “research administrator.” Sessions will explore professional and personal growth of research administrators, building good interpersonal relationships with our various customers and partners, and developing our full potential as service providers and professionals.
Neighborhoods Announce Upcoming ILS Sessions; Build New Communities continued from the cover

If your question wasn’t answered in January or if new compliance concerns have been raised, then this session is for you!

The ILS continues on April 2 when Garry Sanders, Assistant Vice President for Research, Office of Sponsored Programs at the University of Albany, discusses and answers questions on International Project Administration. Due to the scope of this discussion, this session will be co-sponsored by the Pre-Award and FRA Neighborhoods. A description of the session can be found online at the ILS website http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/ils.asp.

The Neighborhoods are developing a Washington Update ILS session for April 9. Tony DeCrappeo, Associate Director, Council on Government Relations (COGR) has been invited to discuss new policies and activities pertaining to research funding agencies. Information on this session will be available on the ILS website (shown above).

If you aren’t able to participate in an ILS session, transcripts will be available in the ILS Archive. Once online, members may request ILS transcripts via e-mail (lessin@ncura.edu). Sessions will be archived within one week of the program.

Stay tuned! Even more ILS sessions are being developed for summer 2002!

More NCURA Neighborhoods!

Exploratory committees (http://www.ncura.edu/members/Neighborhoods/) have been formed to lay the groundwork for the next three NCURA Neighborhoods: Compliance, Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions (PUI), and Departmental Administration.

Committee members are busy collecting information, materials, and online resources for the Neighborhoods’ Library, Events, Town Hall, and Careers sections. Please consider submitting your favorite websites, materials and any job opportunities for the Neighborhoods. Your comments and suggestions will greatly enhance their quality and utility.

The Neighborhood committees are working to launch the new communities in April 2002. The Neighborhood website is updated daily and will be the first place to advertise the latest information on the new Neighborhoods.

For more information on the Neighborhoods or the ILS, please contact Joshua Lessin at 202-466-3894. E-mail: lessin@ncura.edu.

NCURA DESIGNS NEW UNIVERSITY/INDUSTRY SUMMER CONFERENCE continued from the cover

The program planning committee is representative of the agenda:

Co-chairs:
Jim Severson, Cornell University and Cheryl Howard, Johns Hopkins University
Ira Blumberg, Intel
David Byer, Apple
Midge Gardner, Vanderbilt University
Kathy Irwin, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Ravi Kiron, Pfizer Global R&D
Steve Kohler, CB Richard Ellis/Pittsburgh and formerly Director of the [Pennsylvania] Governor's Action Team
Shaye Mandle, The Illinois Coalition
Todd Sherer, Oregon Health Sciences University
Mary Ellen Sheridan, University of Chicago
Tara Bishop, NCURA

While the committee’s work is only just beginning, you can sample the flavor of the conference by reading the BHEF publication, “Working Together, Creating Knowledge” available at no charge on line at www.acenet.edu/bookstore. Then mark your calendars for August 17-20 and watch for more information so you won’t miss this opportunity to make a real difference in the University-Industry collaboration initiative.

Cheryl-Lee Howard and Jim Severson are the Co-Chairs of the University/Industry Conference. Cheryl-Lee is a Past President of NCURA and serves as the Assistant Provost University Research Projects Administration for the Johns Hopkins University and Jim serves as the President, Cornell Research Foundation for Cornell University.
NCURA was undoubtedly pleased that its first two Financial Research Administration (FRA) conferences were successful. Now with FRA III “under our belts”, it is clearly evident that a conference highlighting financial issues effecting sponsored awards will remain a critical component of NCURA’s educational programming. Despite several professional organizations bemoaning that conference attendance remains low, FRA III can boast a number of 541 registrants – slightly higher than the FRAII conference held last year. What was the draw to this conference?

Yes, FRA III targeted financial issues. But the conference also provided practical advice and the opportunity to share best practices for those involved in sponsored programs administration from a central organization-wide role, a departmental perspective and those involved in compliance and oversight. Indeed, conference demographics show that at least 1/3 of those responding to the evaluation were departmental administrators. This is a clear indication of the need for professional training for this group of individuals, who are key to the success of research administration in many institutions. The conference also stressed the need for these three groups to work together, and in partnership with our federal sponsors, if we are to advance financial administration and compliance to even higher levels.

The conference theme “From Theory to Practice” certainly held to its name. The 22 concurrent sessions and 9 discussion groups were chock-full of information. At least in the sessions that I attended, attendees were not shy about sharing their own experiences and observations. This type of participation only enhanced the information gained from the excellent presenters and discussion leaders. Despite my 20 years in research administration (I started working in this profession when I was 10), I walked away with information that I can immediately apply to the procedures and policies of my university. My personal thanks to all the presenters, moderators and discussion leaders that helped to make the conference so beneficial, including those new to NCURA, our long-time federal friends, and representatives from accounting firms.

Special note should be given to the faculty of the four workshops held on Sunday that dealt with issues ranging from costing to F&A to compliance. While many of us enjoyed the warm weather and excellent walking paths of Tampa, the faculty of these workshops were hard at work. Written evaluations were impressive (i.e., “best workshop I ever attended”), thus their efforts were acknowledged and appreciated.

The very interesting plenary session on Monday morning was lead by Gary Thompson, Associate Dean for Research Compliance, Harvard University; Regina White, Director of the Office of Policy for Extramural Research Administration at NIH; and Lee Limbird, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research at Vanderbilt University Medical Center. This session explored the subtle differences and similarities of compliance viewed from both a federal and university perspective, in addition to giving the (primarily) administrative audience insight in to how faculty often view compliance. Developing a culture of compliance and responsible conduct of research is critical to all, but it was evident that there is no one best way to achieve this goal.

Special note should also be given to Tony DeCrappeo, Associate Director of the Council on Governmental Relations and contributing editor to this Newsletter (see Tony’s article on page 3), who lead the general session on Tuesday morning. Tony provided the attendees with valuable information on current federal policy and regulatory developments that impact general and financial research administration. All this despite the fact that Tony’s voice was hoarse from “yelling for beads” at the spectacular Sant’Yago Knight’s Parade in Ybor City on Saturday night.

Finally, all meeting attendees should acknowledge the hard work of Jerry Fife, the program chair of FRA III, the program committee and the remarkable NCURA staff. Feedback on the conference is critical as NCURA looks ahead to next year’s offering and can be provided via the on line survey at http://www.ncura.edu/meetings/fraiii/fraiii-evluations.htm. We look forward to the FRA IV conference next February (somewhere warm!) and the continued dialogue on financial issues impacting our profession.

Gunta Liders was an attendee at FRAIII, is the Co-editor of the NCURA Newsletter, and serves as the Director, Office of Research and Project Administration for the University of Rochester.
This is in addition to presentations by NCURA members on compliance, technology transfer, sessions on RCR, compliance, training programs, FAR, deal-breakers on contracts, financial topics, the FDP, communications, leadership, dealing with the media, and a presentation from the Director of the organization responsible for the Keck Telescopes (the largest optical and infrared telescopes in the world). You'll even find a session on poi (check out the program if you want to know what that is).

As a reminder, this meeting will be held from April 14-17, 2002, at the Ohana Keauhou Beach Resort in Kailua-Kona, Hawaii. The program, hotel information and meeting registration information can be found on the regional website (http://www.ogrds.wsu.edu/r6cura). Remember, the hotel has established March 14, 2002, as the cut-off date for reservations. If you haven't already made them, do it now!

I look forward to seeing you in Hawaii--Aloha! "

Pat Hawk is the Chair of Region VI and serves as a Sponsored Projects Administrator, Office of Research Services Administration for University of Oregon.

REGION VII
Rocky Mountain

Aloha! For those anticipating the combined Region VI and Region VII Spring Meeting in Hawaii, look no farther than the web site http://www.unm.edu/~ncuravii. The hard-working program committee is making final touches on a comprehensive schedule designed to enhance your skills.

With the recent announcement of many discount tickets to Hawaii, and a great bargain at the host hotel, be sure and make your reservations soon. If you want to relax before or after the meeting, hotel room pricing is available 5 days before and following the meeting. Vital statistics:

Dates of Meeting: April 14-17, 2002
Place: Ohana Keauhou Beach Resort, Kailua-Kona, Hawaii (Big Island)
Room cost: $109 + tax single or double occupancy
Hotel Reservations: 877-532-8468
Hotel Reservation Cut-off Date: March 14, 2002

The hotel is located oceanside on the sunny Kona Coast of The Big Island of Hawaii. The Big Island has something for everyone—volcanoes, snow-capped mountains, and of course, lots of sun and sand. The Ohana Keauhou Beach Resort is located on 10 acres of lush tropical gardens and tide pools, and is one of the Big Island's historical sites. King David Kalakaua ("The Merrie Monarch") built his summer home on this property, and a replica still stands. The Resort adjoins the Kahalu'u Beach Park, perhaps the best snorkeling beach in Hawaii, and is one mile from the Kona Country Club golf course. Imagine sitting on the verandah, and watching green sea turtles in the daylight, and spectacular sunsets in the evening.

The program is quite comprehensive, starting with Sunday workshops, which are an additional fee. Workshop topics are technology transfer, financial compliance, making meetings matter, knowledge for newcomers, and human subjects and institutional review boards. Staff from the National Science Foundation will also be presenting "NSF in Sunny Hawaii"; this should be an excellent workshop.

Following the workshops, enjoy the opening luau Sunday night and then get ready for the rest of the program. Here are some of those highlights:

- Speakers from both the Keck Observatory and the Volcanoes National Park
- Concurrent session offerings include:
  - Representatives from NSF, NIH, ONR and OMB
  - Sessions on RCR, compliance, training programs, FAR
  - Deal-breakers on contracts
  - Financial topics
  - The FDP
  - Communications
  - Leadership
  - Many others

The meeting's program goes through Wednesday afternoon with a registration fee of $250, which includes the luau, continental breakfasts and lunches Monday-Wednesday, and dinner Tuesday. Workshops will be $60 for the first workshop and $40 for the second workshop with a limit of 2 workshops. Questions should be directed to: Judy Fredenberg, Chair, Region VII, fred@selway.umt.edu, 406-243-6670 or Pat Hawk, Chair, Region VI, phawk@orsa.uoregon.edu, 541-346-2504

As a newly elected ‘Member at Large’ for Region VII, one challenge is to learn more about the workings of the NCURA area organization. I wanted to learn more about the officers and the friends I made at the last Spring Meeting in Santa Fe. In addition to learning that there are three types of members per our By-Laws (Members, Associate Members and Emeritus Members) I also discovered our current officers and their terms of office as well as hard-working committees:

Chair: Judy L. Fredenberg (2001 - 2002), University of Montana, Missoula, Montana, (406) 243-6330
Immediate Past Chair: Brian Farmer, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, (208) 885-6796
Secretary/Treasurer: Timothy C. Edwards (2002 - 2004), The University of Montana, (406) 243-4700

Members-at-Large:
Winnie Emnenga (through 2002), Northern Arizona University, (520) 523-1075
Ron Splittgerber (2002 - 2004), Colorado State University, (970) 491-1555

Representatives to NCURA National Board:
Brian Farmer, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, (208) 885-6796

Nominating and Leadership Development Committee:
Carey Conover, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona, (520) 523-1075

Neighborhood Community Advisory Committee
Denise Wallen, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, (505) 277-2256

Though I’ve worked with many of these folks at NCURA National meetings, I was amazed to discover that each also contributes their valuable time and talents to Region VII programs and educational resources. I look forward to the challenge of serving as a ‘Member at Large’ and working with each of you in the future.

Ron Splittgerber serves as the Region VII Board Member At-Large and Director, Research Services, Colorado State University.
APPLICATION DEADLINE EXTENDED

DIRECTOR – RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MILWAUKEE

Looking for a challenge and a change in your life - for a career opportunity that will allow you to move up in your field? Looking for a new work environment in which to exercise your outstanding management and leadership skills – a place where you can make a difference? If your answer is yes, we are looking for you!

The Graduate School Office of Research Services and Administration is looking for a Director whose leadership and management skills have been well developed and finely tuned through years of experience and professional development in research administration. We’re looking for a leader who can be a partner and collaborator in moving the University to the next level of research achievement. Research growth is our goal and you have an opportunity to play a major role in that growth!

Don’t wait – look to the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee – a great University on the move. UWM is making waves in the community with the Milwaukee Idea – a University/community partnership that is bringing positive change to institutions, organizations, neighborhoods, and people in the Milwaukee Metropolitan area and well beyond (www.uwm.edu/MilwaukeeIdea/). Located on the northern edge of the city of Milwaukee, just blocks from Lake Michigan, UWM is minutes from downtown in an excellent and historic residential neighborhood. With a total student population over 23,000, a graduate student body numbering over 4,000, and over 3,300 faculty and staff, the diversity of the academic, research and cultural life of the University community offers something for everyone. It is a great place to put your career aspirations to work for a dynamic University on the move.

The city of Milwaukee has all the urban amenities of a big city - excellent restaurants, great theater, noteworthy museums including the internationally recognized Calatrava addition to the Milwaukee Art Museum, numerous art galleries, outstanding musical offerings, and an array of professional sports and recreational opportunities. Yet, its neighborhoods retain a small town feel. Wisconsin K-12 schools consistently rank among the best in the nation.

Want to know more about this job, the Graduate School, the University, the city of Milwaukee, the State of Wisconsin? Check out the job announcement on our website at www.uwm.edu/Dept/Grad_Sch/Jobs/. Then take a look at the UWM Human Resources website www.uwm.edu/Dept/HR/employporportun/ which has many links to information about the city and the state, as well as about benefits and other amenities of civilized life! You will see why so many people like living and working in Wisconsin, and more importantly, working at UWM!

For more information about this position and how to apply, call 414-229-5547, or email gshrb@uwm.edu and we will send it to you.

UWM is an AA/EO employer
Spelman College invites applications for the position of Grants and Contracts Development Officer. This position works primarily with Spelman College faculty and administrators in the humanities, education, and the arts to identify and secure funding in support of research, research training, curriculum development, outreach and other programmatic initiatives. The Grants and Contracts Development Officer will:

- Implement a system to identify and alert faculty regarding funding opportunities.
- Establish and maintain relationships with program officers at private foundations, corporations and government agencies.
- Assist faculty in developing competitive grant applications.
- Assist in organizing training to help faculty increase their grantsmanship skills, including activities such as workshops and other training mechanisms.
- Facilitate agreements with other institutions and organizations in support of collaborative initiatives.
- Serve as a liaison between faculty and funding source to negotiate grant award, resolve potential conflicts, coordinate site visits, and oversee other activities related to the procurement and administration of the grant award.

Master's Degree in the humanities, education, communication or related field is required. Must have a minimum of 3 yrs. of exp. in sponsored program and research administration and a proven track record of securing funding. Must be well-versed in higher education administration and federal regulations governing grants administration. Candidate should be self-motivated and able to work in a courteous and professional manner with a diverse faculty population and senior administrative leadership. Excellent written and verbal communication skills a must, with proven proficiency in the prevailing word processing, spreadsheet presentation, and database management programs—including internet-based search engines. Moderate travel.

Please submit letter of application, resume, writing sample and salary requirements by March 31, 2002 to:

Ms. Joyce L. Thompkins, Recruiter  
Office of Human Resources  
Spelman College  
350 Spelman Lane, S.W. Box 1133  
Atlanta, GA 30314  
Fax: (404) 223-7661

EEO/AA/TITLE IX INSTITUTION
As part of a reorganization and growth of its research activities, Vanderbilt University Medical Center (VUMC) in Nashville, Tennessee has created the position of Executive Director, Grants and Research Contracts. The position reports through the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research (Basic Science emphasis) to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Research. It will also have a dotted line relationship to the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research (Clinical Science emphasis). Reporting to the Executive Director will be an Associate Director for Research Contracts, a Director or Associate Director for Federal Grants, and an Associate Director for Non Federal Grants and Training activities. The position requires administrative experience in an academic setting; at least 7 years background and experience in grant and contract administration; and, experience in database management and information technology. Candidates should possess a Bachelor Degree; in addition an MBA and/or Ph.D. is desirable. The position offers a competitive salary and excellent fringe benefits package.

Applicants should send their resumes in confidence to Paul Stark at Alexander, Wollman & Stark, 1601 Market Street, Suite 550, Philadelphia, PA 19103. Fax: 267-256-0725 or e-mail pkstark@aol.com.

Vanderbilt is an equal employment opportunity/affirmative action employer.

---

The end of cancer will come. It will be a reality, here in a state that has the second highest level of cancer in the U.S. And that end will be here at Moffitt Cancer Center, where we are expanding our research capacity while we grow to serve over 1,200 patients daily.

H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center and Research Institute is an NCI Comprehensive Cancer Center that includes a hospital facility with 162 licensed beds, a large (150,000+ visits annually) outpatient operation, and a research enterprise with more than 100 scientists and $29 million in grant funding. We are growing rapidly and want you to join us as we begin to submit, receive and administer grants directly.

**DIRECTOR OF POST-AWARD ADMINISTRATION**

The successful candidate will be responsible for directing all aspects of post-award administration of Cancer Center sponsored activities and serve as lead in the planning/implementation of receiving grants directly.

Qualifications include 10-15 years experience in grant administration, primarily post-award; MBA or related degree; thorough knowledge of sponsor policy and relevant OMB circulars; and excellent communication and organizational skills.

**GRANTS COORDINATOR, PRE-AWARD**

The successful candidate will be responsible for administering key functions in the pre-award area, including assisting faculty and staff with locating appropriate funding sources; preparing grant applications; developing policy and procedures; accurately tracking and reporting on grants; administering internal grant programs; and reviewing proposals prior to submission.

We Offer: • Relocation Assistance • Health/Dental/Life Insurance • Competitive Salaries • Free Cancer Screening • On-Site Child Care • Work-Life Balance • And More!

To find out more, visit our Career Opportunities pages at www.MoffittCancerCenter.org

If you are interested, please send letter of application, resume of experience and three references to:

H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center & Research Institute
12902 Magnolia Drive, Tampa, Florida 33612
Attention: Georgie Herrera
Phone: (813) 975-7899
Fax: (813) 975-7827
E-mail: herrerg@moffitt.usf.edu

Moffitt Cancer Center is an equal opportunity, affirmative action employer, and a drug free workplace.
Manager: Research Accounting & Administration

KEY RESPONSIBILITIES: Sponsored project accounting and administration reporting to the Controller of the Institute. Provide Institute community with expert guidance / information about grant and contract proposals, accounts status, and government regs. Support the Director of Institute Technology Initiatives through prep of monthly reports. Assist principal investigators in prep/review of proposal budgets. Set up new approved grant and contract accts, monitor current accts & prep journal entries. Respond to internal, external & Fed auditor inquiries for annual compliance audits. Provide administrative liaison/support for research customers, researchers and the Institute. Negotiate contracts and review language with customers and sub-contractors for approval by the Institute. Complete other duties as assigned by the Controller.

EXPERIENCE/COMPETENCIES/EDUCATION: 3 yrs pre and post-award grant & contract admin in a Higher Ed environment including: in-depth understanding of OMB Circulars A-21, A-110, A-133, handling intellectual prop issues related to grant proposals and contracts, prep of financial reports for grants contracts / necessary accounting entries, interacting with internal, independent and Fed auditors, coordinating sponsored projects computer database. Add'l requirements: Bachelors degree in accounting or related field, excellent written and verbal communication skills. Knowledge of Excel, Word, Access or similar programs. Proven ability to easily work and interact with associates at all levels of the Institute.

INTERESTED CANDIDATES: Please email resume (WORD doc.) Re. S/A # 02-001-004 resumes@kulpercompany.com
For further information contact: KULPER & COMPANY,LLC-Executive Search 973-285.3850

This is an equal employment opportunity offering

DIRECTOR OF REGULATORY COMPLIANCE FOR RESEARCH AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER - DENVER, COLORADO

THE POSITION: The Director of Regulatory Compliance for Research is a newly created position and is a senior member of the Vice Chancellor for Research staff at the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center (UCHSC).

DUTIES: This position shall be responsible for establishing/coordinating, monitoring and enforcing all regulatory compliance requirements that relate to research. The work will require extensive collaboration with the Deans offices of the Schools, faculty, and affiliates of the Campus.

EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE REQUIRED: Bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university in basic or environmental sciences, public or business administration, public health or related field. Masters or terminal degree preferred. Extensive leadership experience with a minimum of 5 years in federal regulatory compliance. Experience on an academic research campus is preferred. Experience in a consultant role, government agency, or corporate clinical trials/pharmaceutical environment will be considered.

For further information on duties and qualifications for this position visit our web site at http://www.uchsc.edu

SALARY: Negotiable - Depending upon qualifications

TO APPLY: Screening of applicants will begin March 31st and will remain open until filled. The University of Colorado Health Sciences Center is committed to equal opportunity and affirmative action. Interested parties should forward a resume and cover letter (maximum 3 page letter) addressing their background and experience in relation to this position electronically to mary.jackson@uchsc.edu or mail to:

UCHSC Director of Regulatory Compliance for Research Affairs Search Committee
University of Colorado Health Sciences Center
Fitzsimons Campus - Mail Stop F539
P.O. Box 6508
Aurora, CO 80045-0508
The children's hospital of Philadelphia seeks candidates for a new Director of Research Services and Project Development. An experienced and innovative leader in pre-award, sponsored program administration, the candidate will report to the VP for Research Administration and will be part of the senior management team of the Joseph Stokes, Jr. Research Institute, which is responsible for CHOP's sponsored activity. This individual will be responsible for facilitating research, including collaborative and interdisciplinary research; functioning as a resource in research administration; representing the Hospital to funding agencies, foundations and professional associations; and enhancing CHOP's profile in the grants community.

Position will play a critical role in ensuring the guidance, development, planning, and review of submissions for approximately $130 million of annual proposals for research, public service, and training projects and the negotiation and acceptance of the resulting awards.

The Director will establish a new Office of Research Services and Project Development at CHOP with the following key responsibilities:

- identify and respond to federal and state grant and contract opportunities;
- assess current and emerging regulations, legislation and appropriations; identify funding agency priorities; and ensure a continuing flow of information essential to the support of a research and scholarly agenda consistent with Hospital priorities;
- in collaboration with the faculty and staff, provide support for the development of proposals;
- manage pre- and post-award activities, including ensuring compliance in proposal submission with funding agency, regulatory agencies and Hospital policies and procedures; negotiating award terms and conditions; establishing subcontracts with collaborating institutions;
- recommend policies regarding the conduct of research and the enhancement of grant activity at the Hospital;
- assist in the development and implementation of a Hospital-wide sponsored research training program;
- review of operational practices and procedures to implement a broad-based ERA program.

The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia has enjoyed enormous growth in sponsored research in the last decade with expenditures in FY 2001 of $65 million. With aggressive recruitment and construction plans, CHOP is positioned for continued expansion.

Qualifications: Advanced degree and significant senior professional experience in a university or academic medical center. A candidate with an exceptionally strong background and a Bachelor's degree may be considered. Ideal candidates will have: a breadth of relevant education, knowledge and experience, combined with an interpersonal style that engenders confidence and facilitates communication and collaboration; demonstrated knowledge of federal regulations pertaining to research administration and understanding the current regulatory environment governing the conduct of academic research; and senior level administrative experience in an academic setting that includes close collaboration with researchers.

 Competitive salary commensurate with experience. Direct inquiries, nominations, and applications with cover letter in confidence to: Denise Outlaw (HR Mgr.), Search: Director of Research Services and Project Development, The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, 3535 Market Street - 9th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19105. (E-mail: outlaw@email.chop.edu - electronic submission of credentials encouraged.) The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia is an Equal Opportunity/ Affirmative Action Employer. Visit our Web site at http://careers.chop.edu or call (800) 649-8254 for more information.
The Manager, Cost Reimbursement and Analysis is responsible for the development and negotiation of the federal Facilities and Administrative Cost Rate with the Department of Health and Human Services; for the development, submission, and amendment as required of the Disclosure Statement (DS-2); for management of the institutional labor distribution/effort reporting system; and for development of training programs relative to cost-compliance issues.

Minimum requirements for the position include a Bachelor’s degree in Accounting, Finance, or related area; a CPA is desirable; five years experience in auditing, cost accounting, and/or other financial analysis, preferably in an academic institution; understanding of federal accounting principles (A-21 and A-133); comprehensive understanding of research administration processes and responsibilities, including agency requirements, effort reporting, cost sharing, space surveys; skilled in performing detailed financial and data analysis, conducting studies, and preparing complex management reports; experience in accessing and using large financial database files; experience in the preparation of a Facilities and Administrative Cost Rate proposal and DS-2 at an academic institution highly desirable.

The Office of Grants and Contracts is sited organizationally within the Office of the Vice President for Research at the Medical College of Georgia. Sponsored program activity at MCG has grown by over 88% over the past three fiscal years, and increasing research and the infrastructure that supports it has been given highest priority by senior leadership.

Interested and qualified candidates should submit a cover letter and resume on or before April 30, 2002 to:
Medical College of Georgia
Human Resources Division
Augusta, GA 30912-8100
Email: resume@mail.mcg.edu

Medical College of Georgia is an affirmative action, equal opportunity and equal access employer.

NCURA 2002 Calendar of Education and Events

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

April 2, 2002
Pre-Award & FRA Neighborhood
Interactive Learning Series
International Project Administration

April 3 - 5, 2002
Fundamentals of Sponsored Programs Administration
Tucson, AZ

April 9, 2002
NCURA Neighborhoods
Interactive Learning Series Washington Update

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

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

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

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

May 5-8, 2002
Region III & V Joint Spring Meeting
San Antonio, TX

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

NEWSLETTER DEADLINES: April/May 2002 Issue
Submission of Articles: April 5, 2002
Space Reservation for Ads: April 5, 2002
Submission of Display Ads: April 12, 2002
NCURA is offering a new award this year. The Distinguished Service Award is to recognize members of NCURA who have made sustained and distinctive contributions to the organization. The Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration award, in contrast, recognizes an individual's significant contribution to the profession of research administration.

Up to five Distinguished Service Awards may be given in a year. The deadline for nominations is May 1. The Nominating and Leadership Development Committee (NLDC) selects the recipients. Awardees will be recognized with a plaque, presented at the Annual Meeting.

Award guidelines are:

**Eligibility**
- Must be a current or past member of NCURA
- Must have made a significant contribution to NCURA
- A letter of nomination describing the nominee's contribution to NCURA
- One letter of support from an individual familiar with the nominee's contribution to NCURA
- The completion of the Distinguished Service checklist (see next column)
- A copy of the nominee's c.v.
- Nominations must be sent to the NCURA National Office, postmarked no later than May 1.

Questions about the new award program may be directed to members of the NLDC or to Steve Hansen (shansen@siue.edu).

**Distinguished Service Award Checklist**

Please use the following guide to list the nominee's service to NCURA. Provide exact titles and dates of the activities.

1. NCURA presentations (distinguish between moderating and presenting. State if the presentation was a workshop, open forum, roundtable, etc.).
   - National
   - Regional
2. NCURA publications
   - RMR
   - Newsletters (Regional and National)
   - Websites
   - Monographs/pamphlets
3. NCURA committees
   - National
   - Regional
4. NCURA Offices
   - National
   - Regional
5. Other (e.g. editing, reviewing, evaluating, coordinating, meeting/conference support, etc.)

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