NCURA’s 44th Annual Meeting – Making YOU the “Compleat” Research Administrator

CAN I AFFORD TO GO TO NCURA’S ANNUAL MEETING?

Travel budgets are tightening, time is at a premium, on the job pressures are mounting– new rules and regulations, new forms and procedures, e-grants, RCR… so much to learn, so little time…

Perhaps the better question is:

CAN YOU AFFORD NOT TO GO TO NCURA’S ANNUAL MEETING?

The emphasis this year is on YOU – NCURA wants to give you the knowledge you need

- about today’s environment – the rules and regs, funding opportunities, and compliance issues
- about the job – budgets, proposals, negotiations, awards, cost accounting, subcontracting
- about partnerships – university-to-university, university-to-industry, university-to-government, covering the gamut from proposals to contracts to technology transfer
- about the person – how you can be more effective as a research administrator while coping with the tremendous pressures of the job.

Annual Meeting Program details can be found on the NCURA website at www.ncura.edu.

continued on page 12

Jane A. Youngers to Receive Award for Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration

by Julie T. Norris and Gunta Liders

NCURA’s highest honor will be awarded to Jane A. Youngers, Director of the Office of Grants Management at the University of Texas Health Science Center in San Antonio. The presentation will be made during NCURA’s 44th Annual Meeting at the Monday Luncheon held on November 4, 2002.

continued on page 13

NCURA 2002 Election Slate is set and polls will open in August

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

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

Vice President/President-elect
Milton Cole, Villanova University
Patrick Fitzgerald, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

At-large Board Member
John Carfora, Boston College
Cordell Overby, Michigan State University
Georgette Sakumoto, University of Hawaii
Pamela Whitlock, University of North Carolina at Wilmington

The Nominating & Leadership Development Committee, led by Steve Hansen, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, is made up of one NCURA member from each of its seven regions. Many thanks to Steve and Barbara Cole, Boston University; Carey Conover, Northern Arizona University; Don Boydston, Rush Medical College; Jan Madole, Oklahoma State University; David Mayo, California Institute of Technology; Tom Roberts, Florida Gulf Coast University; and Andrew Rudczynski, University of Pennsylvania.

NCURA ANNOUNCES
NEW VIDEO WORKSHOP,
SCHEDULED TO AIR
IN SEPTEMBER!
SEE PAGE 14
FOR DETAILS
Board Takes Action on Strategic Issues

by F. John Case

W

e are in the final six months of the year, and it seems like

only yesterday I took over the Presidency. The regional
meetings are complete, and I was fortunate enough to

attend each one. I want to thank the regional leadership and

program committees for their hospitality and excellent programming.

It was a pleasure to meet with members across the country and
discuss the strategic issues facing NCURA in the years ahead.

At the June 2002 Board of Directors meeting in Charleston, SC, we

used the feedback provided by the membership to address many
key issues and continued to analyze the mega-issues identified in
the strategic plan. Based on the information received from the
membership at regional meetings coupled with the results of
the April 2002 survey, the Board adopted a resolution to:

1) Develop a By-law change to include any person engaged in
the administration of sponsored programs in an independent
not-for-profit research institute or hospital as Regular members
of NCURA.

2) Develop a Board task force to investigate ways to expand
sponsor inclusions and partnerships with NCURA membership.

The Board is excited about creating a more inclusive population
of research administrators to meet the diverse needs of the research
community. The Board will also address opportunities to expand
partnerships with sponsor organizations to develop a team approach
to research administration. Look for more on these topics in the
coming months.

In their continued discussions regarding partnerships with other
professional organizations, the Board identified four target
organizations: the Society of Research Administrators (SRA), the
Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE),
the Council on Government Relations (COGR), and research
sponsors, specifically federal agencies and non-profit organizations.
In addition to forming a critical partnership this year with
NCURA’s own regional leadership, we have connected with the
National Association of College and University Attorneys (NACUA),
the Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM), the
Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP), and the Business Higher
Education Forum (BHEF). We are pursuing possible ways of
connecting with more medical associations, namely the Association
of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) and Administrators in
Medicine (AIM). As described by one Board member, we need to
expand our sphere of influence through powerful connections with
similar organizations to develop a team approach to professional
development and information dissemination.

Other important accomplishments from the meeting included
finalizing transitional issues facing new Board members as they
take office, including training and briefings on current issues.
We also addressed finalizing a plan for securing sponsorship for
NCURA activities like the annual meeting and special conferences.
Additionally, the Board created a task force to review the format
of the annual meeting.

At this time of year, the Board appoints members to its standing
committees – the individuals identified below were selected to serve
on the 2003/2004 committees. The Board expresses gratitude to
these volunteers for accepting leadership roles in the organization.
While many well-qualified candidates were nominated, we had only
a small number of committee positions to fill, and we thank all
those willing to serve.

NCURA - Joan Warfield, Johns Hopkins University; John Childress,
Vanderbilt University; Dan Nordquist, Washington State University;
Josie Jimenez, New Mexico State University

PDC - Tom Le Blanc, California State University-Chico; Gunta
Liders, University of Rochester; Cordell Overby, Michigan State
University; Dave Richardson, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and
State University

FMC - JoAn Howeth, University of Oklahoma Norman Campus

We are half way through 2002, and the Board has addressed many
important issues for the organization. Volunteers are the lifeblood
of our organization and critical to NCURA’s success. Board activities
require hours of preparation and discussion, and I want to personally
thank each member for their commitment, hard work, and time away
from personal and professional obligations at home.

F. John Case serves as NCURA President and is the Associate Vice
Chancellor for Research at the University of North Carolina at
Chapel Hill.

---

2002 Board Members

President:
F. John Case, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Vice President:
Robert Killoren, Pennsylvania State University

Treasurer:
Bonny Boice, Research Foundation of SUNY

Secretary:
Cindy White, Washington University

Immediate Past President:
Cheryl-Lee Howard, The Johns Hopkins University

Janice Anderson, Princeton University
Paula Burkhart, University of Oregon
Thomas Coggins, University of South Carolina
Brian Farmer, University of Idaho
Patrick Fitzgerald, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Joyce Freedman, University of California, Berkeley
Barbara Gray, College of Charleston
Ed Herran, Indiana University Medical Center
Vivian Holmes, Harvard Medical School
Kathleen Irwin, University of Wisconsin Madison
Kathleen Larmett, NCURA
Peggy Lowry, Oregon State University
Garrett Sanders, University of Albany, SUNY
Allen Soltow, The University of Tulsa
Pamela Webb, Northwestern University
OPENNESS IN RESEARCH AND NATIONAL SECURITY

The National Academies’ Committee on Science and Technology for Countering Terrorism, released its report entitled “Making the Nation Safer: The Role of Science and Technology in Countering Terrorism,” June 25. As stated in the report, traditional research review and funding systems may hamper the evolving post-September 11 research paradigm, and the U.S. may need to consider alternative processes to manage the influx of counterterrorism research opportunities and accommodate the pace of innovation. Preparing the nation for bioterrorism readiness will require focused and sustained efforts to shore up the health infrastructure as well as substantial changes in the way government-supported research is executed, the committee states.

Among the committee’s recommendations, NIH should develop novel funding mechanisms able to support more high-risk, long-range research at a quicker pace. The committee also proposes creation of special research organizations that would engage in bioterrorism-related basic and applied research and product development, handle both classified and unclassified matters and have minimal but effective interactions with federal agencies and universities.

As envisioned, these new organizations would grant researchers creative flexibility within a protected environment -- i.e., without single-year budget limitations -- and would establish special mechanisms to rapidly disperse funding for extramural research activities as the needs and opportunities emerge, with a minimum of red tape.

Turning to universities, the report states that they play a unique role in support of counterterrorism by providing an environment to facilitate creative research, training the nation’s future scholars and professionals and supporting long-term research endeavors; however, the report notes that these institutions are at the center of debates pitting national security against the openness and sharing of the research process. The committee cites a “desperate need” for dialogue between the government and research universities, facilitated by the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) to deliberate how to balance protection of critical national security information and the conventional freedoms under which the research process unfolds -- before major new policies are put in place by the government.

There has already been, however, enactment of new legislation and policies that could seriously restrict the fundamental openness of higher education. Flowing through all of these policies and legislation are three primary issues:

1. The tracking of international students who have been issued visas to study at U.S. colleges and universities;
2. A mandate to define “Sensitive Areas of Study” for which the State Department should not grant visas to students or scientists from certain countries; and
3. The need to appropriately secure scientific materials and research results that might be used by terrorists.

In May of this year the Administration announced the creation of a new Interagency Panel on Advancing Science and Security, or IPASS, that will provide a new level of review of specialized visas, including those used by students, postdoctoral students, and researchers. These reviews, by which the meaning of “sensitive areas of study” will be developed, will be triggered when visa applications are received from citizens of countries known to sponsor terrorism who want to pursue study or research in specific topics of concern that are “uniquely available in the United States”.

Dr. Charles Vest, President of MIT, discussed this topic in an address to a recent meeting of College and University Attorneys, stating that:

“The criterion of unique availability in the U.S... the emphasis on weapons of mass destruction... and the use of a substantial multi-agency review panel... seem to me to form the basis of a sensible framework for approaching this complex issue. The details of the protocols are yet to be understood, and many practical questions remain. Above all, it will be essential for the government to maintain substantive dialogue with the academic community. But I am cautiously optimistic that this framework can minimize unnecessary or unworkable incursions against academic openness. We must adhere to the fundamental openness of our system of higher education.”

INTEGRITY IN RESEARCH

The Institute of Medicine (IOM) has just issued a report entitled “Integrity in Scientific Research: Creating an Environment that Promotes Responsible Conduct”.

Many of you will recall the attempt by the Office of Research Integrity to implement by policy, requirements for training in the responsible conduct of research that were subsequently
Select agents are biological agents or chemical toxins that are at high risk of being used for terrorism. Examples include anthrax and botulinum toxins. We don’t know the source of the anthrax used in the terrorist’s letters last fall, but some people were surprised that select agents are used medically and in some research projects at universities.

How do academic institutions keep select agents away from terrorists? Through various federal laws, select agent security is accomplished by the following requirements:

- Agent tracking and acquisition controls—to make sure that only an authorized person with a bona fide purpose can acquire a select agent.
- Personnel screening—to verify the person’s authorization.
- Physical security—to keep unauthorized persons from stealing a select agent.
- Agent inventory—to detect the theft or unauthorized use of a select agent.

This first objective was accomplished by the 1996 Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act, which regulates the transfer of select agents. These rules were promulgated by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) of the U.S. Public Health Services in Part 72 of Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations. They require registration of all select agents acquired or transferred between institutions. Select agents are listed in Appendix A of 42 CFR 72.

The most controversial requirement is for background checks of scientists. On October 26, 2001 the President signed into law the USA Patriot Act, which prohibits restricted persons from shipping, transporting or possessing a select agent. To comply, institutions must secure select agents, control their acquisition and disposition, and screen persons who may have select agent access. USA Patriot Act criteria for restricting persons from access to select agents include criminal record, illicit drug use, residency status, and nationality. Nationals of countries that support terrorism are restricted from possessing select agents.

At the University of North Carolina (UNC), some screening criteria are satisfied via personal certification (e.g., we do not test for illicit drug use), while other criteria are independently verified. We developed a protocol to ensure that background checks are done for new staff prior to gaining access to select agents. Prior to select agent delivery, the Department of Environment, Health & Safety (EHS) reconfirms that background checks have been satisfactorily completed.

At UNC, EHS also keeps careful watch of select agents on campus. As is required with radioactive material, EHS receives all select agents for campus. EHS witnesses unpacking, packing and final destruction of select agents. We track where the agent is used, containment facilities, and laboratory personnel and their training. The University is installing card access for certain research areas and individual laboratories. EHS annually inspects lab security and safety, and performs a physical inventory.

Additional screening, security and inventory requirements will result from the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-188), which became effective with the President’s signature on June 12. Sec. 202(a) of the Act requires universities to inventory select agents. Institutions with select agents must register with U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) or the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)—even if the agent is not transferred.

If you haven’t already done so, prepare for registration by surveying your institution for select agents. You should already be conducting the survey, because the statutory deadline for notification of possession of select agents to DHHS is September 10. Principal investigators may require several weeks to thoroughly review their inventories. In addition, many departments have archival collections of chemicals and microbiological agents, for which no principal investigator is responsible. A thorough, complete inventory is extremely time consuming and labor intensive.

P.L. 107-188 also transfers the responsibility for background checks to the office of the U.S. Attorney General that appears to have discretion as to the screening criteria. The new law provides a DHHS procedure to request waivers for people who do not meet the screening criteria. Other changes include a requirement that DHHS annually review and update the select agent list. Similar to the USA Patriot Act, there are criminal penalties for noncompliance. The new Act also limits access to select agents to those who have a “legitimate need,” although that term is not defined.

Despite these new requirements, research involving select agents is likely to continue. At a minimum, it is prudent to quickly develop and improve vaccines and antidotes for these agents—and government laboratories can’t do it alone. NIH is tripling their funding of bioterrorism research to $1.5 billion. For some of these agents, their high risk is due to a novel biological mechanism that scientists are exploiting to better understand and improve human health. The new law will likely expand the select agent list and change exemptions, making it more likely that a university will possess a select agent.

Under P.L. 107-188, both, DHHS and USDA must write regulations to detail new security requirements. DHHS has 180 days from enactment to promulgate an interim final rule; expect its notice in the Federal Register in December. Be prepared to comment on the rules. My recommendations for the new rulemaking include:

- Physical security standards should be performance-based, rather than prescriptive. DHHS regulations should describe the standards in terms of physical security, access restrictions, personnel monitoring, recordkeeping, and surveillance performance objectives, and allow each institution to choose the most suitable technology to achieve these standards for their location. For example, a card access system can be operated in vastly different ways depending on its security objectives.
- DHHS needs to clarify and resolve select agent exemptions. The exemption for extremely low risk vaccine strains should be broad enough to promote the research and development of select agent vaccines. Because of their low risk, lower toxicity toxins used in biomedical research are now exempt. It is reasonable to expand that exemption to also exempt research other than biomedical research.
- Inventory requirements should also be risk-based. It is reasonable to inventory higher-risk source containers. It is not reasonable or practical to require a detailed inventory of low risk aliquots, attenuated cultures, tissue samples, laboratory animals, minute quantities of toxins, etc. For these low risk items, security requirements alone are sufficient, and obviate the need for additional inventory requirements.

Although these new rules will be costly and burdensome, academia needs to improve laboratory security. In my experience, the typical academic lab is much less secure than commercial labs. Not only are select agents at risk of theft or unauthorized use, but laboratories possess controlled substances, drug precursors, chemicals that can be used as illicit drugs, and radioactive materials, chemicals and other biologicals that could be used for terrorism. At UNC we’ve had good cooperation from researchers because they know the world has changed. Reasonable rules will facilitate this cooperation.

Peter A. Reinhardt serves as the Director, Department of Environment, Health & Safety, University of North Carolina.
In September 1985, National Security Decision Directive (NSDD) 189 was issued which defined fundamental research as “basic and applied research in science and engineering, the results of which ordinarily are published and shared broadly within the scientific community.” Further, the policy stated that “…where the national security requires control, the mechanism for control…at colleges, universities…is classification” and that “no restrictions may be placed upon the conduct or reporting of federally-funded fundamental research that has not received national security classification, except as provided in…statutes.” Effectively, this policy directive removed basic and fundamental research performed at colleges and universities from the need to seek licenses for the export of certain technologies.

However, after the transfer of all satellites for export control purposes from the jurisdiction of the Commerce Department to that of the State Department, there were concerns raised by the higher education community. Colleges and universities and the government clearly recognized the difficulty of protecting both national security and fundamental research. As a result of months of discussion between the State Department, Office of Science and Technology Policy, the Department of Defense, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, revisions to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) were published in the Federal Register on March 29, 2002 (see Federal Register, Vol 67, pages 15099-15101) that provided exemptions for U.S. institutions of higher learning.

In general, the regulations reaffirmed the exclusion for fundamental research and the applicability of NSDD 189. The regulations apply, however, only to university-based space research, and are designed to provide additional clarification to the current regulations and to remove obstacles that were identified with respect to the conduct of university-based fundamental research.

Specifically, the regulations establish an exemption for accredited institutions of higher learning in the U.S. from having to obtain licenses for the transfer of defense articles fabricated only for fundamental research purposes covered by two sections of ITAR’s munitions list [sections 15(a) and (e)] outside the U.S. and the provision of defense services and related unclassified technical data for the assembly of such articles into a satellite. However, there are restrictions imposed on this: transfer may only be made to accredited institutions of higher education or government funded research institutions in certain countries (NATO or major non-NATO allies, members of the European Union). Further, all the information, including the design, is in the public domain and the satellite may be launched into space only from countries and by nationals of countries identified in the regulations.

These regulations certainly help in some instances, but many universities feel that additional clarification is needed. The reaffirmation of the fundamental research exemption (the applicability of NSDD 189) appears in the supplemental information but not in the regulation itself. More importantly, some faculty have expressed concerns about foreign collaborators. Even if the receiving entity is a qualified foreign collaborator, the regulations do not permit that qualified foreign collaborator to involve foreign nationals from a non-qualified entity. Additionally, there is concern about the language in the regulations that projects must be “under the aegis of a U.S. accredited institution of higher learning” which raises a question whether the U.S. institutions must always be the “lead” in the collaboration. There is also concern that the wording appears to narrow the definition of “public domain” by the use of the words “will be published” rather than the broader language “ordinarily are published.” A far greater problem has surfaced with regard to university/industry collaborations and the fact that the regulations do not make explicit the fact that higher learning institutions conducting fundamental research qualify for the exclusion even though an industrial collaborator who is the prime award recipient does not qualify.

In summary, it is clear that much effort was devoted to the development of these amendments, which provide clarification and some broader exemptions for institutions of higher education. Especially helpful is the reaffirmation of NSDD 189 and the fundamental research exclusion. However, some difficulties remain that limit the applicability of the regulations. Certainly, institutions cannot assume that the March 29 issuance solved all the ITAR problems for universities. The best advice is to carefully read the amendments and take advantage of what they offer without assuming they provide greater flexibility than they really do.

Julie Norris is a Past President of NCURA and serves as the Director, Office of Sponsored Programs for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

---

**Capital View continued from page 3**

withdrawn, at least in part due to the overly prescriptive nature of the proposed policy. The IOM report is an attempt to address the need to develop means for assessing and tracking the state of integrity in the research environment, and reached the following conclusions:

- No established measures for assessing integrity in the research environment exist.
- Promulgation of and adherence to policies and procedures are necessary, but they are not sufficient means to ensure the responsible conduct of research.
- There is a lack of evidence to definitively support any one way to approach the problem of promoting and evaluating research integrity.
- Education in the responsible conduct of research is critical, but if not done appropriately and in a creative way, then education is likely to be of only modest help and may be ineffective.
- Institutional self-assessment is one promising approach to assessing and continually improving integrity in research.

The IOM, I believe, identifies the proper framework for institutions to create and foster an environment for scientific integrity. It is based on institutions developing and implementing a comprehensive program designed to promote integrity in research, using multiple approaches adapted to the specific environments within each institution. This includes educational programs, periodic self-assessment and external peer review to provide input for continuous improvement, and possible integration into existing education accreditation processes. Nevertheless, successful implementation of such a research integrity program will require a significant commitment of resources by institutions, at a time when resources are remaining flat or contracting.

There are additional issues and challenges we face as research institutions, some like the protection of human research participants that have been with us for a while, and others related to bioterrorism thrust to the forefront like never before. It will take a great deal of ingenuity and collaborative spirit to adjust to the new climate for the scientific enterprise, but fortunately those qualities have always been a hallmark of the university community.

Tony De Crapeo serves as the Associate Director for the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR).
NCURA Financials

A comparison of 2001 vs 2000 actuals
by Laurice Balian

For the year ended December 31, 2001, NCURA continued to experience growth with various programs and initiatives. A steady increase in the total number of members was attributed to a higher than expected dues revenue. As was the trend in 2000, this year was marked again by a strong performance from workshops and conferences. These programs have rapidly become core contributors to the organization, as the demand for such specialized information and training continues to be an area of emphasis for research administrators and their staff. However, these positive trends were affected by the tragic events of 911, and the continued decline in the market as reflected in the organization’s financial results, reported for the year ended December 31, 2001.

Revenues

The most significant growth was realized in the area of the Fundamentals workshops followed by a continued growth in Special conferences. Additionally, the increased total number of members also attributed to a modest rise in Membership dues.

Fundamentals workshops – The revenue for the Fundamentals workshops increased by $93,288 or 39%. Demand for these workshops continued to be strong. In an attempt to meet this demand an additional team was put in place in 2001.

Special conferences - Revenue for special conferences steadily rose approximately 5% in 2001. There were fewer number of institutions registered to the Satellite series in 2001 than anticipated. The 54% surge experienced in 2000 was due to the addition of the FRA Conference to NCURA’s offerings.

Membership dues – NCURA membership revenue has been on a positive incline primarily due to the increase in the number of members associated with the organization. Enrollment marks a total of over 3,600 members.

Expenses

As with the growth in revenues associated with the Fundamentals workshop, there was a corresponding increase in costs. The Annual meeting revenue was impacted by the events of 911 and subsequent travel and safety concerns; thus, registration was down. In addition, a substantial number of cancellations were received. In response to the extraordinary situation, NCURA honored all cancellation requests, even after the cancellation deadline. Albeit meeting attendance was down, many of the costs to host the annual meeting were fixed and thus represented a substantial cost for NCURA in 2001.

New and exciting programming initiatives will be included in the forecast for next year. One such initiative will be “Sponsored Programs Administration -Level II.” As the natural next step to the existing Fundamentals workshop, this course will take Fundamentals participants to the next level of grants administration.
E-Grants Initiative Strives to Simplify the Grant Application Process
By Charles Havekost

Despite the growing integration of computing services into daily business processes in many industries and organizations, many Federal grants processes remain agency-specific and paper-based. This is particularly true of the processes for grant application, which puts a heavy burden on applicant organizations and Federal agencies alike. The Federal government awards over $350B in grants annually, with grants awarded through over 600 programs managed by 26 Federal agencies. Administration of these grants often varies from program to program, and the need to standardize and streamline grants management processes is reaching a critical mass. The President’s Management Agenda (which can be found at http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2002/mgmt.pdf) says, “Agencies will allow applicants for Federal grants to apply for and ultimately manage grant funds online through a common web site, simplifying grants management and eliminating redundancies....”

The E-Grants initiative is intended to transform the Federal grants environment through a combination of process simplification, standardization of data, and creation of an electronic storefront. E-Grants will put a single, simpler face on the currently complex tasks of finding Federal grant opportunities and applying for Federal grants, eliminating redundant, paper-based processes currently required of grant applicants. In addition, E-Grants will associate a single identifier with grant applicant organizations, allowing information about the organization to be collected once and have it included with every application submitted by that organization.

While all Federal grant-making agencies participate in E-Grants, 11 agencies are specifically designated as partners in the initiative: the Departments of Health and Human Services (managing partner), Defense, Education, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, Transportation, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor; and the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the National Science Foundation.

The E-Grants team is working to build the consensus needed to define data standards and implement common systems. Outreach to academic institutions, States, non-profits, and other organizations is an integral part of this consensus building. Specific objectives and milestones for the E-Grants initiative and other electronic government initiatives can be found in the “E-Government Strategies” document (http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/infareg/egovstrategy.pdf). Participation will be solicited as pilots are planned and rolled out in an effort to produce E-Grants solutions and systems that meet the needs of academic institutions and other organizations.

Charles Havekost serves as the E-Grants Program Manager, United States Department of Health and Human Services.

FRA IV Chair Named

Gunta J. Liders, Director, Office of Research and Project Administration, University of Rochester has been named program chair for the FRA IV Conference. She has served as a member of two FRA program committees and is soon to conclude a three-year appointment as co-editor of the NCURA Newsletter. Liders offered,

“I am very excited and honored to serve as your Chair for FRA IV. This meeting has gained a reputation of being a dynamic and informative forum for financial issues confronting the research administration professional. I promise you that this year’s conference will build on the FRA “tradition of excellence” and the program will offer something for the newcomer to the seasoned veteran. Hope to see you in New Orleans!”

The Financial Research Administration (FRA) Conference brings together research administrators to learn and discuss the latest cross-cutting issues for pre-award, post-award, and departments. This year’s conference, in Tampa, FL had record attendance with over 525 participants. As of press time FRA IV is slated to be held in late February, 2003 in New Orleans.

MARK YOUR CALENDAR NOW FOR
FRA IV
February, 2003 in New Orleans
application form will be announced in an upcoming email.

Anne Geronimo of the University of Maryland and Sue Leitzell of Penn State University have been solidifying the membership on the program committee for the spring 2003 regional meeting which will be in NYC in April of 2003. Contact Ann Geronimo at ageronimo@gradschool.umd.edu if you have suggestions for sessions.

Remember, you can bring any issues of concern to the attention of the Board of Directors of NCURA National by contacting any one of them. They are listed at the NCURA website. Jan Anderson of Princeton University and Garry Sanders of SUNY Albany are National Board members who hail from Region II, and they would be happy to hear your concerns.

Enjoy the rest of the summer, and keep your eyes peeled for email blasts to come.

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

REGION III
Southeast

Congratulations to the Region III and Region V Program Committees for their successful joint venture “Coming Together in 2002” in San Antonio, TX. Special thanks to Pamela Napier of Western Kentucky University for coordinating technical assistance for all the workshops, joint and concurrent sessions.

Entertaining and insightful, Dr. Fred Droege, Founder and President of Droege and Associates, started us off with a lesson in communication. Kudos to the Program Committees for providing sessions for everyone, whether new to research administration or a seasoned veteran; working in pre-award or post-award; coming from a large or small, central or departmental office. New sessions included a look into the federal appropriations process (Fathoming the Federal Government presented by John Hardin, V.P. for Research & Sponsored Programs at the University of North Carolina) and troubleshooting in Acrobat (Changing the Grrr to Grin presented by Rosemary Ruff, Associate Director in the Office of Review and Compliance at Auburn University). We hope to see more on these themes during upcoming national and regional meetings.

If you missed the 2002 regional meeting, plan to join us for the 44th Annual National meeting, November 3-6, in Washington, D.C. Or join us next spring at the Sandestin Golf and Beach Resort in Sandestin, FL. We encourage you to contact Sue Keehn, Chair Elect, or other members of the Program Committee if you have innovative ideas for sessions, workshops and roundtables for the spring meeting. Program ideas can be submitted through the Region III website at http://www.orga.cofc.edu/ncura3/ncura3.html.

For those of you who don’t know me, I am the Proposal Development Coordinator in the Office of Sponsored Programs at Western Kentucky University. (I was formerly in Sponsored Programs at the University of Louisville). I’ve enjoyed being an NCURA member for four years and welcome the opportunity to write the regional news in place of Rosemary Ruff who is now serving on the Program Committee. (Rosemary formerly served on the ERA Committee and as the Hospitality Chair).

I hope to see you this November in D.C.!

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

REGION IV
Mid-America

The results of the Region IV elections were announced at this spring’s annual meeting in Madison, Wisconsin. Newly elected to the Region IV Board of Directors were:

Chair-Elect:
Joanne Altieri, University of Kansas

Chair-Elect Runner-Up:
Pamela Krauser, University of Notre Dame

Members-at-Large:
Dola Haessig, University of Missouri-Columbia
David Lynch, Mayo Clinic

Secretary:
William Sharp, University of Kansas

Deborah Galloway, University of Cincinnati, takes the helm as Chair, while Jim Maus, Washington University, becomes Immediate Past Chair. Continuing their service on the Board are Byron Helms, University of Illinois at Chicago, Treasurer, Mary Laura Farnham, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Member-at-Large, and E. Edward Herran, Indiana University Medical Center, Board Member from Region IV.

While the summer heat tries to slow all of us down, Region II is pushing forward with plans for electing a new national Board of Directors member, a Treasurer, and a Chair–Elect, all to take office in January of 2003. Watch for the email blast for these upcoming elections.

The Steering Committee will also be issuing a call for nominations for a travel award. The criteria will be very broad, and the announcement, as well as a link to the application form will be announced in an upcoming email.

Anne Geronimo of the University of Maryland and Sue Leitzell of Penn State University have been solidifying the membership on the program committee for the spring 2003 regional meeting which will be in NYC in April of 2003. Contact Ann Geronimo at ageronimo@gradschool.umd.edu if you have suggestions for sessions.

Remember, you can bring any issues of concern to the attention of the Board of Directors of NCURA National by contacting any one of them. They are listed at the NCURA website. Jan Anderson of Princeton University and Garry Sanders of SUNY Albany are National Board members who hail from Region II, and they would be happy to hear your concerns.

Enjoy the rest of the summer, and keep your eyes peeled for email blasts to come.

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

REGION III
Southeast

Congratulations to the Region III and Region V Program Committees for their successful joint venture “Coming Together in 2002” in San Antonio, TX. Special thanks to Pamela Napier of Western Kentucky University for coordinating technical assistance for all the workshops, joint and concurrent sessions.

Entertaining and insightful, Dr. Fred Droege, Founder and President of Droege and Associates, started us off with a lesson in communication. Kudos to the Program Committees for providing sessions for everyone, whether new to research administration or a seasoned veteran; working in pre-award or post-award; coming from a large or small, central or departmental office. New sessions included a look into the federal appropriations process (Fathoming the Federal Government presented by John Hardin, V.P. for Research & Sponsored Programs at the University of North Carolina) and troubleshooting in Acrobat (Changing the Grrr to Grin presented by Rosemary Ruff, Associate Director in the Office of Review and Compliance at Auburn University). We hope to see more on these themes during upcoming national and regional meetings.

If you missed the 2002 regional meeting, plan to join us for the 44th Annual National meeting, November 3-6, in Washington, D.C. Or join us next spring at the Sandestin Golf and Beach Resort in Sandestin, FL. We encourage you to contact Sue Keehn, Chair Elect, or other members of the Program Committee if you have innovative ideas for sessions, workshops and roundtables for the spring meeting. Program ideas can be submitted through the Region III website at http://www.orga.cofc.edu/ncura3/ncura3.html.

For those of you who don’t know me, I am the Proposal Development Coordinator in the Office of Sponsored Programs at Western Kentucky University. (I was formerly in Sponsored Programs at the University of Louisville). I’ve enjoyed being an NCURA member for four years and welcome the opportunity to write the regional news in place of Rosemary Ruff who is now serving on the Program Committee. (Rosemary formerly served on the ERA Committee and as the Hospitality Chair).

I hope to see you this November in D.C.!

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

REGION IV
Mid-America

The results of the Region IV elections were announced at this spring’s annual meeting in Madison, Wisconsin. Newly elected to the Region IV Board of Directors were:

Chair-Elect:
Joanne Altieri, University of Kansas

Chair-Elect Runner-Up:
Pamela Krauser, University of Notre Dame

Members-at-Large:
Dola Haessig, University of Missouri-Columbia
David Lynch, Mayo Clinic

Secretary:
William Sharp, University of Kansas

Deborah Galloway, University of Cincinnati, takes the helm as Chair, while Jim Maus, Washington University, becomes Immediate Past Chair. Continuing their service on the Board are Byron Helms, University of Illinois at Chicago, Treasurer, Mary Laura Farnham, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Member-at-Large, and E. Edward Herran, Indiana University Medical Center, Board Member from Region IV.

While the summer heat tries to slow all of us down, Region II is pushing forward with plans for electing a new national Board of Directors member, a Treasurer, and a Chair –Elect, all to take office in January of 2003. Watch for the email blast for these upcoming elections.

The Steering Committee will also be issuing a call for nominations for a travel award. The criteria will be very broad, and the announcement, as well as a link to the application form will be announced in an upcoming email.

Anne Geronimo of the University of Maryland and Sue Leitzell of Penn State University have been solidifying the membership on the program committee for the spring 2003 regional meeting which will be in NYC in April of 2003. Contact Ann Geronimo at ageronimo@gradschool.umd.edu if you have suggestions for sessions.

Remember, you can bring any issues of concern to the attention of the Board of Directors of NCURA National by contacting any one of them. They are listed at the NCURA website. Jan Anderson of Princeton University and Garry Sanders of SUNY Albany are National Board members who hail from Region II, and they would be happy to hear your concerns.

Enjoy the rest of the summer, and keep your eyes peeled for email blasts to come.

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

REGION III
Southeast

Congratulations to the Region III and Region V Program Committees for their successful joint venture “Coming Together in 2002” in San Antonio, TX. Special thanks to Pamela Napier of Western Kentucky University for coordinating technical assistance for all the workshops, joint and concurrent sessions.

Entertaining and insightful, Dr. Fred Droege, Founder and President of Droege and Associates, started us off with a lesson in communication. Kudos to the Program Committees for providing sessions for everyone, whether new to research administration or a seasoned veteran; working in pre-award or post-award; coming from a large or small, central or departmental office. New sessions included a look into the federal appropriations process (Fathoming the Federal Government presented by John Hardin, V.P. for Research & Sponsored Programs at the University of North Carolina) and troubleshooting in Acrobat (Changing the Grrr to Grin presented by Rosemary Ruff, Associate Director in the Office of Review and Compliance at Auburn University). We hope to see more on these themes during upcoming national and regional meetings.

If you missed the 2002 regional meeting, plan to join us for the 44th Annual National meeting, November 3-6, in Washington, D.C. Or join us next spring at the Sandestin Golf and Beach Resort in Sandestin, FL. We encourage you to contact Sue Keehn, Chair Elect, or other members of the Program Committee if you have innovative ideas for sessions, workshops and roundtables for the spring meeting. Program ideas can be submitted through the Region III website at http://www.orga.cofc.edu/ncura3/ncura3.html.

For those of you who don’t know me, I am the Proposal Development Coordinator in the Office of Sponsored Programs at Western Kentucky University. (I was formerly in Sponsored Programs at the University of Louisville). I’ve enjoyed being an NCURA member for four years and welcome the opportunity to write the regional news in place of Rosemary Ruff who is now serving on the Program Committee. (Rosemary formerly served on the ERA Committee and as the Hospitality Chair).

I hope to see you this November in D.C.!

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

REGION IV
Mid-America

The results of the Region IV elections were announced at this spring’s annual meeting in Madison, Wisconsin. Newly elected to the Region IV Board of Directors were:

Chair-Elect:
Joanne Altieri, University of Kansas

Chair-Elect Runner-Up:
Pamela Krauser, University of Notre Dame

Members-at-Large:
Dola Haessig, University of Missouri-Columbia
David Lynch, Mayo Clinic

Secretary:
William Sharp, University of Kansas

Deborah Galloway, University of Cincinnati, takes the helm as Chair, while Jim Maus, Washington University, becomes Immediate Past Chair. Continuing their service on the Board are Byron Helms, University of Illinois at Chicago, Treasurer, Mary Laura Farnham, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Member-at-Large, and E. Edward Herran, Indiana University Medical Center, Board Member from Region IV.
Our Spring Joint Meeting with Region III is behind us and I want to thank all presenters/speakers and moderators for their efforts in making this a very successful meeting. It took a tremendous amount of effort from both regions to pull this meeting together. One of the highlights of the meeting was Tuesday evening Bar-B-Q on the rooftop of the St. Anthony Hotel with entertainment provided by a local band called “PART OF THE PROBLEMS”.

Results of the recent Region V election are in and the new officers are:

Chair-Elect is Judy Cook of Baylor College of Medicine at Houston. Judy will assume her new duties at the end of the regional meeting and will chair the program committee for the Spring 2003 Regional meeting in Las Vegas, April 28th thru May 1, 2003. Our new Treasurer is Michael Mathiesen of Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas.

Michael will assume his new position on July 1, 2002. Our at-large members are Scott Davis of University of Oklahoma, Health Sciences Center at Oklahoma City, Jan Fox of Texas Christian University and LeAnn Forsberg, University of North Texas Health Science Center at Fort Worth.

Congratulations to everyone and thanks for contributing your time and effort to our organization.

JoAnn Howeth serves as the Chair of Region V and is the Associate Director Office of Sponsored Programs for the University of Oklahoma Norman Campus.
I first heard about *Bowling Alone, The Collapse and Revival of American Community* listening to National Public Radio when Robert D. Putnam, the author of this fascinating book, was interviewed on “Fresh Air.” Terry Gross of NPR and Putnam were discussing the way society has changed, the way that people do not tend to gather in groups as they once did. They discussed the fast-vanishing extended family in the U.S., the way that civic clubs are decreasing in size, and aging membership of organizations as no new members apply. Of course as I heard this I was at lunch, driving with one hand and eating a greasy burger with the other, so I had time to think, “That sounds very much like my life.” When I was a kid I went to a church with full congregations, my parents had packs of people over to visit, I saw my extended family regularly, and civic clubs were a big deal in my little town. Now, none of that is true. Then I went back to work, rumbles of indigestion on my digestive horizon.

Two years later my sister, who is also in the soft money racket, mails me this book, saying, “I think you will be interested in what Putnam has to say.” Was I ever! And I think that anyone in research administration can benefit from the big picture that Putnam paints. Why? Our business is based on personal interaction, self-interest, community interest, building partnerships and alliances. And many of us approach our work as if we still worked in the world of our youth, a world that is vanishing before our unseeing eyes.

Putnam describes civic interconnectivity, the relationships that make society work, as “social capital.” Terms like reciprocal interaction, self-interest, community interest, building partnerships and alliances. And many of us approach our work as if we still worked in the world of our youth, a world that is vanishing before our unseeing eyes.

Why is this happening? The author suggests the pressures of time and money, mobility and urban sprawl, and to a great degree technology and mass media, all come together to reinforce the generational change that has become apparent since the end of World War II.

The effect? From several sources, Putnam illustrates the difference in social capital in regions of the U.S. indicating the impact on educating and raising children (It actually might Take a Village), safe neighborhoods, economic prosperity, health, and democratic process. This discussion is particularly interesting as he discusses possible root causes for the differences in community from North to South and East to West.

So why is this information important? As social structures change, the sense of social obligation changes. As the nature of membership in a group or organization changes, the degree of allegiance and loyalty changes. As the economy is globalized, ties to locality, institution and region decrease. And all of these changes will affect how sponsors look at their support of institutions and research topics. On one hand, traditional support for a particular institution might disappear, while support for a research problem or even an individual researcher might continue to increase. As private and industry sponsors become decreasingly place-bound, their likelihood to support traditional recipients will decrease. As technology has reduced our consideration of place and time, so the changes in our social structure will decrease those sources of support that we felt were once almost entitlements.

This book is important to our understanding of the world in which we work and the changing nature of our sponsors’ view of that world. It is a bit dense, but can be read in pieces. The graphs, maps and charts are particularly useful, presenting vividly the data indicating how our society is similar as well as how it differs. Scanning, flipping, cruising through this book is almost as good as reading every word, but if you do read it all, you will be left with a powerful new view. The effect is not unlike the popular book Megatrends of 20 years ago. You will read it and say to yourself, “Yeah, I knew that,” but then you will realize that you have never internalized that which you “knew.”

Mike McCallister serves as the Director, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs for the University of Arkansas at Little Rock.

Opinions expressed in Editorial Columns and in Letters To The Editors are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the NCURA Newsletter Editors or NCURA.

Share the online benefits of NCURA membership! For two weeks the Neighborhoods will be open to guests and friends, and research administrators not affiliated with NCURA. Walk them through the Compliance Town Hall, make a stop in the Pre-Award Library, peruse the ERA Careers, or check out the FRA Events page! All six Neighborhoods will be open and available this fall!

In addition, a special Interactive Learning Series (ILS) session has been scheduled for October 1. We will feature a session from the upcoming 44th Annual Meeting. Stay tuned to the NCURA website for details, as this event will be included in the Neighborhood Open House!

For more information, please contact Joshua Lessin at lessin@ncura.edu or call 202-466-3894.

NCURA Neighborhoods

FIVE THINGS YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT ESTABLISHING A COMPLIANCE OFFICE

1. Work closely with highest institutional officials (such as the President and Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and Deans) to establish compliance as an institution-wide priority.

2. Establish a “Compliance Committee” with representatives from the faculty, senior college/university officers, and Directors of campus compliance areas such as: the Committee for the Protection for Human Subjects (IRB); Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC); Environmental Health and Safety (EHS); Audit and Advisory Services (AAS); Office for Sponsored Programs (OSP); Insurance and Risk Management (IRM); etc.

3. Identify campus-wide stakeholders (faculty PIs, post-docs, graduate students, etc.) and work closely with them to identify compliance-related areas and compliance-related needs.

4. Establish important and realistic “benchmarks” toward development of a manageable and campus-wide compliance program.

5. Work closely with stakeholders to achieve shared goals and thereby help stakeholders become shareholders.

For more information on compliance management and issues, visit the Compliance Neighborhood at http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/compliance.asp.

John Carfora, is the Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at Boston College.
NCURA’s 44th Annual Meeting

Professional development will be provided in 147 different learning sessions in a variety of venues including:
- plenary sessions
- concurrent sessions
- primers
- 101 series
- real-life-experience discussion groups
- special forums, and
- workshops.

Over the course of the meeting there will be plenty of opportunities for networking with new and old friends and having some fun. Of special note is Monday evening’s Mentor’s Marketplace, which will provide an opportunity for you to talk directly with some of the leading research administrators in the country about your special problems.

YOU are the focus of this year’s NCURA national meeting. We want to help you become the “compleat” research administrator.

Annual Meeting Featured Speakers

We have already announced that Dr. Robert Ballard, whose most recent undersea exploration has uncovered PT-109, the ship that sank during World War II under the command of lieutenant and future president John F. Kennedy, will provide the keynote address on Monday morning, but we now are ready to announce Sunday night’s entertainment:

Humorist Loretta LaRoche presenting “The Joy of Stress.”

Loretta LaRoche has helped people all over the country deal with everyday stress for over thirty years. With irreverent humor and an innate sense of the absurd, Loretta helps people see how needlessly complex and stressful our lives can become.

Loretta’s wit, wisdom and humor derive from a common-sense view of life that leaves audiences inspired, motivated, and roaring with laughter. Often irreverent — always hilarious — Loretta helps people discover how thoughts, feelings, and behaviors can affect work performance, relationships, success and self-worth. Loretta shows how humor can benefit the health of an organization and its employees, and improve productivity in the workplace.

Loretta LaRoche is an adjunct faculty member at The Mind/Body Medical Institute of Boston, affiliated with Beth Israel and Harvard Medical School.

What a great way to start your NCURA professional development experience – humor you cannot only enjoy, but can learn from, too. You’ll really love the Sunday night banquet and entertainment at NCURA’s 44th annual meeting!

Visit the NCURA website at www.ncura.edu for Annual Meeting Program details

MILESTONES

Jenny Bradley, Director of Academic Grants & Foundation Relations of Roanoke College in Salem, Virginia, and a member of NCURA since 1990, has accepted the position of Grant Development Officer for the Clinical Research Department of the Carilion Health System in Roanoke. Jenny anticipates beginning her new assignment in August. Best Wishes, Jenny!

After 19 years at Princeton in the Office of Research and Project Administration, Glenn Davis has joined the Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia as the Director of Research Services and Project Development. Glenn’s new position was effective as of July 1. Glenn, we wish you the best in your new role.

Robert DeMartino has also relocated to a new institution. Effective July 22nd, Bob assumed the role of Director, Office of Grants and Research Services at Seton Hall. Bob was formerly the Director of Sponsored Research at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey – Camden Campus. We are sure that Bob will excel in his new position.

Susanne E. Churchill, Associate Dean for Research at Harvard Medical School, has been elected to the Board of Directors for the National Space Biomedical Research Institute (NSBRI). The NSBRI, a NASA-funded consortium of 12 research institutions, seeks solutions to health concerns facing astronauts on long missions. Harvard is a consortium member. Congratulations, Susanne!

Best Wishes!
The award is given for excellence in contributions to the field of research administration, and Jane’s efforts and dedication over the last two decades testify to this. Jane has been a member of NCURA for 27 years, and quickly demonstrated her leadership strengths to the organization. Jane has been both a regional and national officer in the organization, including serving as NCURA’s president in 1989.

The award also recognizes noteworthy service to NCURA. Jane’s contributions to NCURA are simply enormous, and the few highlights mentioned here are only illustrative of her achievements for our professional organization. Jane was program chair for four of NCURA’s special conferences – on compliance in 1993, on “Changing Times” in 1997 and for two video conferences (“Straight Talk” in 1999 and “F&A” in 2000). All of these conferences were highly successful and all served as models for other special topics conferences.

Jane also served as a faculty member on the Fundamentals of Sponsored Projects Administration for a three-year term commencing in 1990. She has served both as Chair and as a contributing member of several national NCURA committees, has been a member of the planning committee for numerous national meetings (including the FRA conferences), and has acted as a moderator, panelist and/or discussion leader at more than a dozen national meetings. She has been an annual meeting workshop leader since 1983, and has not missed a year since 1990 – truly a testimony both to her knowledge of research administration and the high respect afforded by her peers. Jane co-authored the NACUBO/NCURA book on Managing Federal Grants: A Guide for Colleges and Universities, and is currently the editor of AIS’ Managing Federal Grants Newsletter for research administrators. She also is the current Chair of the NCURA Neighborhood Community Advisory Committee.

As well documented by this abbreviated list of her accomplishments and contributions, Jane’s experience and understanding of the issues facing the research administration community is comprehensive. Even more, her experience in pre-award, post-award, costing and technology transfer issues is unique. As stated by Francisco G. Cigarroa, MD, President of the University of Texas Health Science Center in San Antonio, Jane’s “understanding of the issues facing research universities at the state and national levels is well know on our campus, and she is sought out by faculty and staff for advice and counsel on all matters related to research administration”.

Jane’s work on behalf of our profession has also been demonstrated by her activities in COGR, where Jane has served on numerous committees and is currently a member of its Board of Directors. Jane has also served on the faculty of NACUBO’s facilities and administrative cost workshops and for the Cornell/EACUBO Administrative Management Institute. She also remains very active in the Federal Demonstration Partnership.

The preceding catalogues some of Jane’s past and on-going contributions to the profession of research administration, but does not address perhaps her greatest contributions: a commitment to excellence, to integrity, and to mentorship. Kate Phillips, President of COGR, states “when the award is announced, there will be a tremendous wave of applause from the audience, coming from the innumerable young professionals in this association. So many in the audience, including myself, have benefited more than once from Jane’s teaching, her advice and counsel, her kindness and good humor. She is a generous person, who will devote her energies not only to ‘the cause’ but also to each individual person, in whom she sees a future colleague.”

Don Hess, former Vice President for Administration at the University of Rochester recalls that Jane’s “unusually deep, personal commitment to the development of personnel in the field of sponsored programs administration pertains not only to the institution where she may reside, but it transcends throughout the professional organizations of which she is a member.”

This award is honoring Jane for all of her remarkable achievements, and is most fitting to be awarded at an NCURA Annual Meeting dedicated to the “complet research administrator”. Jane is representative of the true “complet” professional and friend. We will all applaud you, Jane.

Julie Norris is a Past President of NCURA and serves as the Director, Office of Sponsored Programs for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Gunta Liders is the Co-Editor of the NCURA Newsletter and serves as the Director, Office of Research and Project Administration for the University of Rochester.

Youngers continued from the cover

The award is given for excellence in contributions to the field of research administration, and Jane’s efforts and dedication over the last two decades testify to this. Jane has been a member of NCURA for 27 years, and quickly demonstrated her leadership strengths to the organization. Jane has been both a regional and national board of directors member from Region VII. These two-year positions begin in January 2003; your nominations (and self-nominations) are encouraged. For more information about these offices, do not hesitate to contact the individuals completing their terms: Judy Fredenberg, chair, 406-243-6670; Winnie Ennenga, member-at-large, 520-523-8319; and, Brian Farmer, regional representative, 208-885-5264.

I encourage you to keep an eye out for NCURA’s call for volunteers, and respond enthusiastically. While NCURA provides stellar professional development opportunities, becoming actively involved gives you far more bang for your buck because of the personal and professional growth you’ll experience through such volunteerism.

I wish you all a wonderful summer and look forward to seeing many of you in November at the annual meeting in Washington, DC. Judy Fredenberg serves as the Chair of Region VII and is the Executive Assistant to the Vice President, Research and Director of Federal Relations, for the University of Montana.

Regional Corner continued from page 9

REGION VII
Rocky Mountain

Now that we’re all "back in the saddle" following our spectacular spring meeting in Hawaii, it’s a perfect time to announce that the 2003 Region VI/VII Joint Spring meeting will be held in downtown Denver, Colorado, April 6-9, at the Hyatt Regency Denver. The program committee, lead by Region VI, will be working diligently to put together a strong program between now and then so mark your calendars and plan to attend!

The nomination/election process is well underway – thanks to Debra Murphy of Arizona State University – for our new chair, member-at-large, national board of directors member from Region VII. These two-year positions begin in January 2003; your nominations
As NCURA begins another year of live satellite broadcasts we’ve drawn from our success of the small workshop format and incorporated it into a broadcast opportunity. NCURA will hold its first live satellite video workshop on September 24, 2002 from 11:30 am - 3:30 pm Eastern time.

What Departmental Administrators Need to Know About Post-award and Cost Analysis with John Case, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research, Office of Sponsored Research, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and Elizabeth Mora, Director, Sponsored Research, Harvard University.

The broadcast will focus on understanding the symbiotic relationship between departments and post-award offices. This “back to basics” program will be taught in a workshop setting with participants both in studio and on campus. This workshop, first taught at NCURA’s FRA II conference, received outstanding evaluations from those who attended:

“Excellent overview of a wide range of topics, each of which could take a full day’s workshop.”

“Both John Case and Beth Mora are excellent speakers and certainly have extensive expertise to draw from.”

“One of the best sessions I’ve been to in a while!”

ABOUT THE VIDEO WORKSHOP

Typically, the university pre-award office “determines the fate” for the post-award and cost analysis personnel. In order to work seamlessly (and avoid problems and pitfalls), experience suggests that we could all benefit from understanding the critical components of each other’s functions and operations.

This workshop will begin with “account set up” and go all the way through “account close out” and include what departmental administrators and pre-award administrators should know about the mechanics of the facilities and administrative (F&A) rate, cost sharing, effort reporting, the Cost Accounting Standards, financial reporting, cash management, cost transfers and post auditing.

This workshop is recommended for academic department administrators who work on proposal development and pre-award issues in their departments as well as pre-award central office administrators.

Faculty: F. John Case, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research, Office of Sponsored Research, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Elizabeth Mora, Director, Sponsored Research, Harvard University

What Departmental Administrators Need to Know About Post-award and Cost Analysis

- **Live:** $700.00
- **Tape:** $700.00

Total Amount Due: $__________________

Please circle one: Visa MasterCard American Express

Card # __________________ Exp. __________

Card Holder’s Signature_____________________

Cancellation Policy: Notification of cancellation must be received in writing no later than 14 business days prior to the broadcast 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.
ScienceWise services, including the FEDIX database of federally-funded programs, are being improved. The new range of services and better interface will allow you to access a wider range of funding opportunities more easily than ever before.

At present there are holding pages on the website and all services are suspended whilst these important enhancements are put in place. Bringing the revisions to the site will take a few more weeks - but the results will be well worth waiting for.

By September, the work will be complete and the combination of free and paid-for services will resume via your existing username and password. Customers who have paid for services will have their subscriptions honored - and extended to cover the break in service.

Help us to make your job easier. We are very interested in hearing your views on the current ScienceWise service and your suggestions for new features that will help you in your work. We have posted a survey on www.ScienceWise.com and encourage you to spare a few minutes to complete it. Your views will play an important role in shaping the site and services.

Keep in touch. To be kept updated on developments up to the relaunch of the site, write to us at SWUpdate@TheScientificWorld.com

Thank you. Finally, we know that many of you have been registered to ScienceWise and FEDIX for many years. We are grateful for your continuing support and encouragement. We apologize about the break in service, but look forward to providing you with a comprehensive and reliable funding opportunities service for many more years to come.

See you at NCURA’s 44th annual meeting
Director, Grants & Contracts Administration

The Public Health Institute (PHI) is a not-for-profit research institute currently administering $75 million in sponsored programs. The Director is responsible for managing the office of Grants and Contracts Administration and providing organizational leadership and training in the area of sponsored program administration at the Public Health Institute as well as supervising a staff of six positions and coordinating grant and contract administration in PHI’s satellite and program offices.

The Director is responsible for all aspects of post-award administration, including budget preparation and submission of continuation proposals, contract negotiation, account setup, financial monitoring, fiscal reporting, and compliance monitoring.

The Director plays a key leadership role in setting organizational policies and procedures in all areas of grant and contract administration. As such, the Director maintains a thorough knowledge of OMB Circulars A-122, A-110, A-133, and the applicable policies and procedures of the state of California and private foundations. The Director must demonstrate knowledge and basic understanding of accounting principles and fiscal reporting, and of the computer software used in grant and contract financial and management information systems.

The Director is a member of the organization’s Senior Management Team and reports directly to the Vice President/Chief Operating Officer. If interested, please submit resume, cover letter and salary requirement to:

PUBLIC HEALTH INSTITUTE
2001 ADDISON STREET, 2nd FLOOR
DEPARTMENT ON-68
BERKELEY, CA  94704
We are proud to be an EEO/AA Employer
(No Phone Calls, Please)

For other opportunities within the Public Health Institute, please call our job hotline at (510) 644-3700, ext. 55, or visit our Web page at: http://www.phi.org.

MANAGER, GRANT & FUND ACCOUNTING

Research is growing at CSMC, and we are looking for a highly organized team leader with a strong background in sponsored project accounting.

You will be responsible for all financial transactions related to the administration of research agreements, including oversight of the chart of accounts, invoicing, letter of credit draw, A/R reconciliation, journal entries, reporting, audits, and financial statements. Requires extensive knowledge of federal regulations (OMB A-110, OASC-3, A-133) and billing practices. Masters degree or equivalent, plus 5 years experience in administration of federally funded accounts required. Excellent analytical, communication, organizational, computer and supervisory skills are essential. Prior experience with financial system conversion (e.g. Oracle, PeopleSoft) and/or experience with clinical trial billing a plus. Salary and benefits competitive.

Please reference Job # EW-NCURA.
Email cover letter and resume to:
lazzaroj@cshs.org
Cedars-Sinai Health System
8723 Alden Dr. SSB-110
Los Angeles, CA  90048.

Cedars-Sinai welcomes and encourages diversity in the workplace. AA/EOE.
www.cedars-sinai.edu
HARVARD PILGRIM HEALTH CARE  
Director of Research Administration

The Director of Research Administration is an executive-level position responsible for the overall administration of the research program of Harvard Pilgrim Health Care (HPHC), a managed care organization with research expenditures of approximately $14 million per year. S/he will direct all functions of the Office of Research Administration, including review of all proposals to insure scientific integrity, appropriateness and adherence to funding agency regulations. S/he will also implement and monitor financial systems; manage the Human Studies Committee; direct development of HPHC policies and procedures regarding sponsored programs; interact with faculty and administration regarding all aspects of research; review funding announcements to seek opportunities for research collaboration with other organizations; supervise grants management staff; and act as liaison with sponsoring organizations (Harvard Medical School and Harvard Vanguard Medical Associates).

Candidate should have Master’s Degree (Doctorate helpful); minimum of seven years experience directing an office of research administration in a university, teaching hospital, or research institution; thorough knowledge of accounting and financial management; familiarity with NIH and other federal funding agency policies; excellent interpersonal and written communication skills; and ability to identify problems and develop and implement solutions in a large, multi-level organization.

Send letter of application, resume, and references to:

Ann Plasso  
Dept. of Ambulatory Care and Prevention  
133 Brookline Ave.  
Boston, MA 02215  
Fax: 617-859-8112  
Ann_plasso@harvardpilgrim.org

Review of candidates will begin immediately. Open until filled.

Research Administration—a Profession, not just a job

It takes experience, knowledge and education to become a Certified Research Administrator (CRA)

Let us help you become certified

CRA Review sessions

Orlando, FL – October 25 (prior to SRA)  
Washington, DC – November 2 (prior to NCURA)

(Next CRA Exams, October 26, 2002 and March 8, 2003)

Visit our website for full details www.cra-cert.org  
or call 859-441-4452
DIRECTOR OF SPONSORED PROGRAMS

The University of the Virgin Islands seeks an energetic, experienced individual to provide leadership in Pre- and Post-Award administration of grants and contracts. The University administers between $10-15 million in grants and contracts annually.

Qualifications: At least a bachelor’s degree; Master’s or PhD degree preferred • minimum five years experience in grant and contract administration • demonstrated knowledge of pre- and post-award processes and federal regulations governing grant and contract administration, with extensive knowledge of key OMB Circulars • experience in developing and implementing policies and procedures to ensure compliance in grant and contracting administration • supervisory experience in a university environment; experience with BANNER or equivalent financial management system, as well as general database management • excellent oral, written, negotiating and interpersonal skills with the ability to relate to a wide diversity of people • self-starter, service- and results-oriented; demonstrated ability to handle multiple tasks and meet deadlines • consensus builder and team player.

Start Date: Immediate • Closing Date: until filled • Competitive salary/benefits.

Application: Submit a cover letter, resume, names and telephone numbers of three current references to the Provost, University of the Virgin Islands, 2 Johns Brewers Bay, St. Thomas, VI 00802-9990. Initial materials may be sent by email to gmoolen@uvi.edu

For more information about UVI and the position, visit our website at www.uvi.edu

Grant Administrator® 5.0

New Release! Now for Both Pre- and Post-Award Offices. Your PIs and Award Recipients Will Marvel at the Fantastic New Reports. Award Management and Accounting Has Never Been Easier!

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

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

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

phone: 978-443-3073
fax: 978-443-8634
email: info@Dyna-Quest.com
web: www.Dyna-Quest.com
In the final NCURA video conference for the year, Kathleen Larmett hosted an excellent panel discussion on the costs of compliance. John Fini and Mike Amey set the tone for an open discussion of the individual presentations. John described the scope of institutional compliance and non-compliance cost issues and framed the complex choices on resource allocation faced by institutions. Mike described eight areas of expanding compliance costs, ranging from human subjects to conflicts of interest, and suggested that the solutions were either better management of the costs or finding new sources for payment.

James Moran, from the University of Pennsylvania, spoke about their new efforts for supporting clinical research and the expanding institutional liabilities from clinical trials. Regina White, representing NIH, described the new NIH Grants Compliance Oversight site visits, the Human Subjects Protection Enhancement grant program and expected additional indirect cost recovery on Career Development and NRSA awards.

Gilbert Tran, speaking for the Office of Management and Budget, said that no changes were anticipated in the applicable cost principles, but agreed that we all needed more data on the costs of compliance. Representing small institutions, Steve Hansen noted that institutions with very few studies often cannot afford the fixed costs of the required compliance programs and may need to limit what research they perform or find new ways to collaborate on compliance with other institutions.

The federal Office of Research Integrity (ORI) perspective was articulated by Chris Pascal, noting that quality comes from good compliance. ORI seeks to support best practices and collaboration through conference and training grants. Greg Koski, speaking for the federal Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) began with noting that protection of human subjects is more important than compliance, and that the assurance process is a way of getting to excellence beyond compliance. OHRP prefers that grantees focus on prevention and noted that the agency has begun a Quality Improvement Program to assist in that effort.

Two potential ideas for future improvements that arose from participant comments during the video conference were 1) an FDP study of compliance costs, and 2) a Belmont type report on the national principles for research compliance to facilitate creation of national versus current institutional curricula.

Michael Amey served as a faculty member on the broadcast and is the Assistant Dean, Research Administration for the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine.
NCURA Conducts Second Regional Volunteers Workshop

On June 1-2, 2002, fourteen representatives of NCURA's seven regional organizations traveled to Washington, D.C. to attend NCURA's second Regional Volunteers Workshop. Developed in response to a recommendation from an NCURA Board of Directors working group in 2001, led by Kathleen Harris of Texas Tech University, the workshop provided training for members likely to be involved with developing regional conferences or managing regional finances.

During the mid-1990s, NCURA National Office Staff offered meeting planning workshops for regional members during the first day of the National Annual Meeting. This approach proved very difficult, especially for national office staff who were simultaneously attempting to launch the Annual Meeting and, after several years, the meeting planning workshops were discontinued. Nevertheless, the need for such workshops remained and the NCURA board voted to finance a one and a half-day workshop in June, 2002 for one representative from each region. The regions could, at their discretion and cost, send up to two additional members to the workshop.

The first day of the workshop focused on planning and running a conference; the second day dealt with more broad-based financial issues and the responsibilities of regional chairs and treasurers. National office staff responsible for organizing and speaking at the workshop included: Kathleen Larmett, NCURA Executive Director; Tara Bishop, NCURA Associate Executive Director; Marc Schiffman, NCURA Meetings Manager; and Chia Kao, NCURA Manager of Financial Services. Other speakers included: Jim De Kornfeld, Regional Director, HelmsBriscoe; and Jeff Tennenbaum, Esq., Venable, Baetjer, Howard & Civiletti, LLP.

NCURA members attending the workshop included:

Region I
Bruce Elliott - Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center

Region II
Ann Geronimo - University of Maryland, College Park
Sue Leitzel - Pennsylvania State University
Janet Simons - University of Maryland Baltimore

Region III
Dawn Boatman - University of North Florida
Sue Keehn - University of Arkansas at Little Rock

Region IV
Joanne Altieri - University of Kansas
Pamela Krauser - University of Notre Dame

Region V
Judy Cook - Baylor College of Medicine
JoAn Howeth - University of Oklahoma Norman Campus
Michael Mathisen - University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas

Region VI
Terry Manns - California State University, Sacramento
Geri Walker - Western Washington University

Region VII
Tim Edwards - University of Montana

Regional Workshop Class of 2002!

Front Row (l to r) Janet Simons, Terry Manns, Dawn Boatman, Bruce Elliott, Geri Walker, Michael Mathisen, Pamela Krauser, Sue Leitzel.

Back Row (l to r) Tim Edwards, Joanne Altieri, Judy Cook, JoAn Howeth, Ann Geronimo and Sue Keehn.