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FRA IV Upcoming In
The “Big Easy”: How Can You NOT Attend?
by Gunta Liders

Hopefully, we will all still be enjoying the crisp days of fall when this goes to print and the cold footprint of winter (at least for those of us in Rochester, NY) will still be some months (OK, weeks) in the future. While winter is still not upon us, the program committee for the fourth edition of NCURA's Financial Research Administration conference (FRA IV) has been hard at work planning for the February 16-18, 2003 meeting. I am pleased to report the program is shaping into a dynamite meeting for post-award, costing, departmental, and pre-award research administration staff.

As previously noted, the FRA conference has become an integral professional offering and networking opportunity for those of us involved in post-award, departmental, pre-award and compliance functions in our universities, agencies and organizations. We are VERY pleased that the National Conference on College Cost Accounting (NACCA) is joining NCURA to offer FRA IV as THE annual meeting for NACCA members in 2003. This effort not only fosters the goals of both organizations, but will bring to life cross-communication among costing professionals, department administrators and pre and post personnel. We anticipate that the discussions, illustrations and conversations will be an invaluable experience for all and that this “conversation” can develop and continue for years to come.

continued on page 12

THE RESULTS ARE IN!
Patrick Fitzgerald Wins NCURA Vice Presidential Election;
Sakumoto and Whitlock Also Elected! See page 13 for details!

Workshop 2002
by Stephen Erickson and Alice Tangredi-Hannon

Each year, on the Sunday before and the Thursday after the Annual Meeting, NCURA presents its Workshop series and full day workshops. Workshop 2002 will be offering attendees a tremendous variety of informative and valuable sessions. We have brought back a number of old favorites and have added several new offerings. In addition, members will be pleased to find half-day workshops scheduled with complementary topics in the morning and afternoon time slots.

continued on page 12

On Sunday, November 3, members will be able to select from one full day workshop on Contracting and Subcontracting Under the FAR, as well as twenty half-day workshops. The Sunday morning offerings include: A Primer in Intellectual Property for the Research Administrator; Pre-Award Fundamentals; Cost-Sharing on Sponsored Projects: Is It Better to Give Than to Receive?; Now You Are the Sponsor: The Basics of Proposing, Awarding, and Administering Subawards; Website Design; Pre-Award Primer: What Goes Into a Proposal to a Non-Federal Source; Contracting with Industry: A Practical Solution; Sponsored Programs at Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions: The Fear Factor; and Writing Policies and Procedures that Work.

continued on page 12

SPA II “OPENS” IN PASADENA
For some time now, a persistent question has been raised by many who have completed NCURA's time-honored, award-winning training program, Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration: so, what's next? Now there's an answer: Sponsored Project Administration Level Two: Critical Issues in Research Administration, a training program for those who have completed the “Fundamentals” workshop. This new workshop had its debut on July 15-17 at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena. This was the “out of town trial” of the workshop before its official opening in Boston in October.

SPA II, as the program has come to be known, is a two and a half day professional development program offering participants an opportunity for in-depth instruction in four seminal aspects of research administration: proposal creation and submission, contract review, post award financial administration, and research compliance. Each of these topics is explored through a combination of lecture, discussion, and case study analysis.

Faculty members for SPA II were selected from among NCURA's most experienced workshop faculty and include Elizabeth Mora, Director of Sponsored Research at Harvard University; Julie Norris, Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs, M.I.T.; and Dick Seligman, Senior Director of the Office of Sponsored Research at Caltech. From the point of view of the faculty, SPA II is a very rewarding experience that
NCURA Moves Forward with Strategic Plan and Professional Development Opportunities

by F. John Case

In pursuit of NCURA’s envisioned future, the Board of Directors has approved broadening the category of Regular Membership to include any person engaged in the administration of sponsored programs in independent not-for-profit research institutes or hospitals (see the article by Bonny Boice located on page 9 of this newsletter). Diversifying our membership to attract participation from all segments of the research enterprise is critical to the Board’s commitment to become more inclusive by defining the membership more broadly and creating opportunities for all members to pursue national leadership roles (e.g., Executive Committee and Board of Directors).

The Board also finalized the process for revising the By-laws to coincide with the governance change made three years ago to commence the Board’s operating year on January 1. This change extends the time required for submitting revisions to the Secretary and creates a more realistic time frame for the Board to conduct its yearly activities. The language eliminates the August 1 deadline and allows for submissions 30 days prior to the Annual Meeting.

NCURA’s commitment to professional development continues with the introduction of Sponsored Project Administration: Level II, designed for members who have completed the Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration. The first two sessions of the year presented by the team of Dick Seligman (CalTech), Julie Norris (MIT) and Beth Mora (Harvard) delivered an in-depth program on topics including university research compliance, financial oversight, contract negotiations, as well as an open forum for attendee group interaction. Sessions for 2003 are currently being organized. Please visit the NCURA website for more information. I want to personally thank Dick, Julie, Beth and Kathleen Larmett (NCURA) for all their hard work in designing the program. The Board and the Professional Development Committee (see article by Dick Keogh below) continue to examine new curriculum for our members and the research administration community.

It’s hard to believe the Annual Meeting is just around the corner. Program Chair and Vice President Bob Killoren and his program committee worked hard to put together an excellent professional development opportunity. With 147 different sessions offered, research administrators will have ample opportunity to learn new skills and enhance their knowledge throughout the event. We look forward to hearing from Bob Ballard about his scientific discoveries and other thoughts on university research. Lastly, the banquet and Tuesday night party will provide occasions for relaxation and networking with colleagues. I hope to see you in D.C. in November.

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

NCURA’s Professional Development Committee Announces Three New/Updated Publications

by R.N. Keogh

Communities, Committees, Committees! We deal with enough of them in our home institutions and perhaps the last thing you want to know about is what is going on with another NCURA committee. Yet, the various committees of NCURA are where most of the national policies of the organization are developed and where specific programs get implemented. NCURA’s Professional Development Committee, or PDC as it is more commonly known (yes, we love alphabet soup as much as our federal colleagues), plays an especially important role. The Committee has been busy over the past year reviewing how well the organization is serving the professional development needs of the membership, recommending individuals for key appointments, and developing new publications. In fact, there are 3 very important publication announcements to be made at this time — but more on that later.

What Is It and Who’s On It?

First, let me review the role played by the PDC in NCURA’s governance structure. As one of 3 standing committees reporting to the Board of Directors, the PDC is responsible for professional and program development, evaluation of these programs, and publications oversight, including the development of policies relating to the development and dissemination of publications. The composition of the PDC is incorporated within NCURA’s Administrative Policies, which require the PDC to consist of a minimum of five members to include:

• at least one member with national program committee meeting experience (the current Committee has two such individuals)
• one former Fundamentals Faculty member (ably served currently by Steve Smartt, who will be replaced by Christina Hansen next January 1)
• NCURA’s Evaluations Coordinator (M yrta Stager, who currently serves in this role, has been reappointed Evaluations Coordinator and will continue in this capacity for another term)
• A member with publications experience (Jim Casey is Editor of the Research Management Review (RMR) and will continue to serve on the Committee as of January 1; I currently serve as Co-Editor of the NCURA Newsletter and will continue as Chair of the PDC until December 31, 2003)

The current committee consists of more than the minimum number of 5 individuals. All serve as Board of Director appointments. They include, in addition to those named above, Brenda Sanders Dede, Celia Gravely, Pam Krauser, Kris Rhodes, and Deborah Vetter. Since the Committee reports to the Officers and Board of Directors through the NCURA Vice President, Bob Killoren also is a member of the Committee. Marc Schiffman superbly provides NCURA staff support for the PDC. Although the PDC conducts a great deal of its business electronically via the PDC listserve and through conference calls, the Committee typically meets face to face twice a year, once in November at the Annual Meeting in Washington and once just before the spring meeting of the NCURA Board of Directors.

continued on page 16
Never before has that adage rung as true as it does today—
for good or for ill. And because it is so true, we are
seeing an almost unprecedented struggle among all interested
parties to determine the extent to which certain scientific
information should be controlled, and who will control it.
I touched on this briefly in my last Newsletter article, and
in an article in this issue, Sue Polmar provides a university
perspective on the importance of preserving openness in
research while working in concert with the federal
government to protect information with national security
implications. My intent here is to highlight the developing
multitude of federal, scientific society, association, and
individual assessments of how best to manage scientific
information in a radically changed environment.

As might be expected, the Department of Defense was
the first agency to express concerns for protecting certain
research results. A memorandum entitled “Mandatory
Procedures for Research and Technology Protection”
circulated internally within the Department of Defense
in March, 2002. That document was obtained by the
Chronicle of Higher Education and elicited serious concerns
from the university community because it suggested
restrictions on publication, travel and other exchange
of information by DoD grantees. Subsequently, a group
within DoD appointed by the Deputy Director for Defense
Research and Engineering began revising the document.
Reportedly the purpose of any new regulations will be
to guard against disclosure of “sensitive” defense-related
research while working in concert with the federal
government to protect information with national security
implications. My intent here is to highlight the developing
multitude of federal, scientific society, association, and
individual assessments of how best to manage scientific
information in a radically changed environment.

I highlighted the word “sensitive” above, because finding
common ground on what this word means remains the
overarching challenge to policy makers. To emphasize this
point, in June 2002, the Center for Strategic International
Studies (CSIS) issued a report entitled “Science and Security
Studies (CSIS) issued a report entitled “Science and Security
in the 21st Century”, developed by a Commission chaired
by a former Under Secretary of Defense. It focused on
Department of Energy security issues, and found that a
“serious rift has developed between the scientists and the
security professionals, and security will be seriously
undermined if these two communities drift farther apart.”
Also, “sensitive unclassified information is causing acute
problems at DoE,” the Commission found, because it has
“no usable definition,” there is “no common understanding
of how to control it,” and “no agreement on what
significance it has for U.S. national security.” The CSIS
report recommends that security procedures should vary in
intensity according to the level of sensitivity of information,
avtivities, and materials. According to the CSIS, this
intuitively obvious prescription is often violated in DOE
and elsewhere in government. “In many laboratories, islands
of ultra-sensitivity coexist on site within larger seas of little-
to-no sensitivity.”

Then in late August we learned that The White House Office
of Homeland Security had asked the Office of Management
and Budget to develop new policy guidance on so-called
“sensitive but unclassified” (SBU) information. The scope of
SBU information (also termed Sensitive Homeland Security
Information) has not been described. Nor has the meaning
of “sensitive” been defined, prompting concerns that it
could function as a catch-all for whatever information an
increasingly secretive executive branch does not want to
release. OMB officials have tried to assuage such concerns,
stating that most agencies already have procedures for
handling what amounts to “sensitive but unclassified
information” – such as privacy data, law enforcement
information, and the other assorted types of unclassified
information that are exempt from the Freedom of
Information Act – but these procedures vary from agency
to agency. OMB’s stated goal is consistent treatment among
the different agency practices.

But that is a daunting task. The complexity of existing
government controls on unclassified information is not well
understood. In fact, it is questionable whether all of the
overlapping directives can be reconciled without a new
statutory framework. There are at least a dozen distinct
systems of unclassified information control, including various
provisions implementing the International Traffic in Arms
Regulation, the Export Administration Act, Unclassified
National Security Information, Withholding of Unclassified
Technical Data from Public Disclosure, Limited Official Use
Information, and the Computer Security Act of 1987-
Sensitive Information.

At a recent meeting on this subject with representatives from
the research community, OSTP and OMB officials stated
that there were two different issues involved in this debate
in terms of protecting and safeguarding “sensitive
information. The first involved the protection of
government-owned information, while the second involved
the use and safeguarding of information and data generated
by non-governmental entities, such as campus-based
researchers. OMB emphasized that campus-based
research “belongs to the grantees” and was not subject
to the proposed guidelines. The unanswered question,
however, is what happens if campus-based research
results reported to the funding agency are later
determined to be “sensitive” information?

continued on page 7
Note from the Editors

Homeland security has been a primary concern of all of us for more than a year now. Congress and the Administration have since moved to shore up national security on several fronts, and many of these efforts have both immediate and perpetuating effects on the support, conduct, and administration of research in America’s colleges, universities, research institutes, and hospitals. This issue of the NCURA Newsletter focuses on the real and evolving impact of these efforts from a variety of perspectives.

Steve Smartt and Midge Gardner discuss how creation of a Department of Homeland Security may affect support for university-based research and what “strings” may or may not become attached to this support. From her Senior Corner, Sue Polmar discusses negotiating the “tightrope” that stretches between the need to protect information having national security implications and the equally vital need to preserve openness within university-based research. Tony DeCrappeo’s always insightful Capital View column, focuses on the evolving struggle of how to best manage scientific information in a research environment that has changed radically over the past several months.

We trust you will find the recurring homeland security theme of this trio of articles both thought provoking and informative.

R. Keogh and G. Liders, Editors

HOMELAND SECURITY:
Its Impact on the Research Mission and Core Values of The American University
by Suzanne K. Polmar

At NCURA’s Conference on University Industry Research Collaboration, held recently in Keystone, Colorado, there was general agreement that the preservation of a free and open intellectual community is a fundamental value of academic institutions. Over and over again, university representatives at the meeting pointed out the problems for institutions when industrial sponsors request “confidentiality” terms which would prevent sharing information among scientific colleagues, or propose contract clauses which could unduly delay reporting or publication of the results of research. As research administrators, we are careful to avoid restrictions imposed by commercial sponsors; we cite our own policies and federal regulations as the basis for our negotiating positions. But even as we proclaim these core values to our industry colleagues, these values are challenged by new federal laws and regulations.

The Patriot Act, the Homeland Security Act, requirements for more stringent review of those applying for foreign student visas, and a new system for tracking movements of foreign students within the educational system, all have been put in place with the laudable goal of protecting American citizens from events such as those of September 11, 2001 and the anthrax attacks which followed. Faced with the destructive outcome of these events, it is hard to argue with the desire for greater security.

The ability of faculty researchers to discuss their work with colleagues and to publish their results is a cornerstone of the academic enterprise and forms the basis of how knowledge is created.1

continued on page 6
Creating a Department of Homeland Security: A Spectator’s Guide
by Steven Smartt and Midge Gardner

One of the more visible federal responses to terrorism has been the proposal for a new cabinet-level Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The new department is more of a reorganization than it is a creation, pulling together existing federal agencies dealing with immigration, border and transportation security, emergency preparedness and response, and information and infrastructure protection.

To paraphrase a politician from an earlier time, when the going gets tough, the tough reorganize.

President Bush in June of this year presented to the public and to Congress his vision for the new department. To quote from the Bush proposal with respect to R&D for homeland security, “it would consolidate and prioritize the disparate homeland security-related research and development programs currently scattered throughout the executive branch.”

Not surprising, the proposed realignment triggered much discussion and debate in political as well as academic circles. For example, some critics felt that DHS as proposed by the President needed a more significant role in R&D. In both the House and Senate, the President’s plan was amended to include an under secretary for science and technology (S&T). The House passed its version of a plan in July, with Senate and conference committee action expected in September.

With things evolving quickly and dynamically, this article will not attempt to be a news digest; rather, we wish to offer a framework for research administrators to monitor and size up the eventual outcome and evolution of the new department, its structure, programs, people and policies. As research administrators, most of us will naturally be interested in the following elements of the new DHS:

The role of R&D in DHS. Although the President’s June proposal did not mention a major division for science and technology, the following month in a White House companion document entitled “National Strategy for Homeland Security” included a chapter on S&T. As mentioned above, congressional proposals in both the House and Senate include an undersecretary for science and technology (S&T) and some of the more influential advisory and lobbying groups have urged that S&T be prominent in the new department. This is a feature we can count on being in the DHS structure, although it is not yet clear the extent to which DHS will itself initiate R&D as opposed to monitoring R&D in other agencies.

Transfer of existing programs from other departments and agencies. This is where it gets sticky. Some university associations have advocated that on-going research programs not be removed from other federal agencies; rather, they urge that DHS monitor existing civilian research activities and look for promising or have clear relevance to solutions for near-term security concerns. In this environment, fine distinctions are being made between words like “oversight” and “coordination,” and between a policy role and a management role. In the natural law of bureaucratic behavior, program and budget managers in existing agencies will be reluctant to relinquish their turf and control. Watch for the tug of war that may affect NIH (bioterrorism research), CDC (vaccine research), DOE (selected computer science programs in at least one national laboratory), USDA (animal pathogen lab), and DOD (biological defense and biological counter-terrorism).

Restrictions on information, data, research results, and “sensitive information.” The bills pending in congress state that “to the greatest extent possible research conducted by the Department shall be unclassified.” We can expect, then, that controls on data and information will be determined not by statute, but through policy guidance by the executive branch (e.g., OSTP) and through the operating regulations to be issued by the new DHS. A new terminology is already taking shape, with references to “sensitive information” and “sensitive topics” of research or study. (Might this give rise to a new meaning in the compliance arena to the phrase “sensitivity training”?)

In late August, officials from OSTP and OMB met with representatives of research universities to discuss whether certain types of federally-funded research on campuses would be subject to these new controls on disclosure. Early indications are that university-based research will not be restricted, but it is not clear if collaborative projects between a campus and a federal agency would be more tightly controlled.

For additional background on this issue, see Tony DeCrapo’s excellent Capitol View column, “Climate Change,” in the July/August 2002 NCURA News Letter.

How much money will there be for university-based research? The authorizing legislation focuses primarily on the creation of the new department and its roles, responsibilities, and programs. Most of the R&D budget will be a function of the existing programs that are transferred into DHS and the funding already in place for those programs. The statute will hang a dollar sign on only newly authorized programs. Subsequent appropriations action this fall will spell out the details of funding for DHS in fiscal year 2003. One proposed new feature, a Homeland Security Institute modeled after DARPA in DOD, may have up to $200 million to work on anti-terrorism technologies.

Early news accounts cited $2 billion as the amount DHS will spend annually on S&T. Once the dust settles on the final blueprint for DHS and the appropriations have been approved, we can expect numerous reports and analyses on the funding available for university-based research.

How will funding decisions be made? The House and Senate bills call for merit-based competition for DHS extramural research. Currently funded researchers who are supported by existing programs that are transferred to DHS will not be happy campers if they find they now have to re-compete under different criteria. Watch for DHS mechanisms for fast-track decisions on research proposals that are uniquely promising or have clear relevance to solutions for near-term problems on the DHS agenda. Some forward-thinking (opportunistic?) universities have already offered to serve as a coordinating point for a Homeland Security Institute.

Other special conditions for grants management and compliance obligations. We’ve already experienced an initial wave of oversight and compliance issues with the new controls on select agents, facility security, and background checks on individuals with access to certain materials. In fact, there will need to be some clarification on the question of whether the background checks will be performed by the Justice Department or DHS. We should anticipate that some grants or contracts from DHS will include terms and conditions for management controls, such as restrictions on personnel and release of information.

One overriding observation is the renewed public appreciation for science, engineering, and technology and the contributions made by research to national security. The academic community is poised and eager to play a deservedly key role in homeland security. CAREFUL attention will be needed, however, to balance the traditional openness of academic research against the needs to limit access to potentially strategic information.

Steven Smartt, a past NCURA president, is Director of Sponsored Research at Vanderbilt University. Midge Gardner is an NCURA member from Washington, D.C.
The conflict between science and security is certainly not new. We have long known that science and technology can be used for both good and evil. In the words of Eugene Skolnikoff of M.I.T., “all technologies have dual uses; they can be used or adapted for civil purposes or for military purposes, for peaceful goals or for destructive goals...”

“Universities and government have continually struggled to walk a fine line between protecting the nation’s security while also retaining the ability to conduct the free open exchanges necessary to make rapid and creative scientific progress”.³

In 1985, in the era of the “Cold War”, a compromise was reached between university investigators and the government - information which could not be disseminated for reasons of national security was to be classified, and all other basic and applied research would not be restricted. This policy is articulated in National Security Decision Directive 189, which states: “No restriction may be placed upon the conduct or reporting of federally funded fundamental research that has not received national security classification, except as provided in applicable U.S. Statutes” (emphasis added).

In addition, the exemption of fundamental research from ITAR and export regulations has been widely viewed as a safe harbor protecting the freedom of university scientists and their students to publish or present the results of their research to scientific colleagues worldwide.

New efforts to control even unclassified research projects should raise considerable concern on campus. For example, a clause entitled “Release of Information” (FAR 52.004-44001), has been inserted into contracts from the Army to universities. This clause requires Army “review and approval prior to any public release of any information” in the contract. Versions of this clause make reference to “non-releasable, unclassified information”. Yet, “non-releasable unclassified information” is not an information category recognized in official U.S. Government policy. Similarly, the expression “sensitive but unclassified” information is another officially unrecognized term that has recently appeared in DOD documents.

In addition, some of our colleagues have reported receiving contract clause 52.004-4400, “Foreign Nationals Performing Under Contract”, that requires prior approval for foreign nationals to work on unclassified public domain contracts. While no criteria for approval or rejection of foreign nationals as participants is identified in the clause, the section of the Code of Federal Regulations cited as the basis for the clause is concerned only with proper visa status. Thus, our usual personnel practices should be sufficient and additional individual approvals should not be required.

Senator Tom Daschle, in remembering the events of September 11, said: “We learned that the mightiest nation on earth is not invulnerable; that a major new effort is needed to better secure our homeland; and that great care must be taken to preserve the fundamental liberties that define America, even as we work to combat terrorism.” In a democracy, it is difficult to develop policies that balance security and access to information. Terrorists’ actions cannot be predicted and need to be thwarted. On the other hand, scientific and technological progress requires information exchange, and economic growth depends, in part, upon commerce in technologically sophisticated goods, which flow from advanced R & D in core fields of science and technology.

Universities, including their faculty and researchers, are not locked in the proverbial Ivory Tower. They witnessed the events of September 11 and shared in the shock and dismay in our country; they do want to use their knowledge and skills to help in the effort to protect our nation and, indeed, all people throughout the world. But there must be a balance between the mission of American universities and national security.

It may be that those of us in research administration are experiencing the challenges to the basic tenets of the open American university before others in our institutions. We undoubtedly will face, if we have not already been faced with, situations in which we are expected to negotiate award terms for a project that is clearly in the national interest, yet whose terms conflict with the core values of our institutions. Dr. Charles Kruger, Vice Provost for Research at Stanford University, has suggested that compromises may have to be made.¹¹ That may be so, but I submit, decisions impacting core values should be made only after real discourse, free of the immediacy of negotiating a funding agreement. We must work to engage the faculty and senior administration at our institutions in this important discourse now.
Integrity in Scientific Research
Creating an Environment that Promotes Responsible Conduct

A Report of the Committee on Assessing Integrity in Research Environments

A Review by Carol Blum and Andy Rudczynski

THE STUDY

In response to a request from the Department of Health and Human Services’ Office of Research Integrity (ORI), a special committee of the Institute of Medicine and National Research Council produced a report that focuses on institution’s responsibilities to educate its members and create an environment that ensures integrity in research. As requested by ORI, the Committee attempts to define the concepts and identify the elements that promote integrity in research.

The goals of the Committee were to define desired outcomes and to set forth initiatives that would enhance research integrity in the research environment. Apart from the recommendations for future actions made by the Committee, the report makes several cogent observations that will have significant implications for the research community and will be critical in research institutions’ implementation of the principles espoused in the report:

The overarching conclusion of the Committee, based on interviews, reports, presentations and review of relevant literature is that there are no rote solutions for the successful promotion of integrity in research.

Importantly, the Committee also observes: “The provision of instruction in the responsible conduct of research need not be driven by federal mandate”. The need for instruction should be derived from a fundamental premise of science: “...that the responsible conduct of research is not distinct from research.” Moreover, while federal mandates should set a floor of expectations for behavior, for educational programs and for institutional promotion of research integrity, it is up to the research institutions to develop an appropriate ethos for research and scholarly activity.

“Research integrity should be developed within the context of... an overall research education program.” Based on this observation, the committee encourages a broad based approach to education in the responsible conduct of research, involving all levels of the institution. In that regard the committee urges: “...Instruction in the responsible conduct of research is best done by faculty actively engaged in research related to that of the trainees.”

The Committee makes it clear that it believes federal regulations or policies alone will not serve to promote integrity in the research environment. Regulations that set standards in specific areas of research activities – e.g., human research participant protections, animal welfare regulations, bio-safety standards – provide a useful framework, but a mere regulatory approach to research integrity has “important limitations.” Beyond increasing the administrative and scientific cost without a commensurate benefit, the Committee believes that regulations would fail to “foster a deep understanding of the ethical issues involved and variety of sophisticated approaches available to address those issues.”

The Committee’s report presents recommendations that encourage research institutions to create programs that build an ethical climate and culture – an environment that promotes integrity - and to conduct rigorous, continuous assessment of the programs’ effectiveness. The federal government is only one of a number of external environments or factors that have an impact on the conduct of research and, ultimately, the integrity of that work.

Other factors include the competitive funding for scientific work, the competitive nature of job and training opportunities, and journal and scientific policies and practices. All of these factors have either a direct or indirect impact on the institutions and their ability to create an environment that fosters integrity in research.

The Committee attempts to define the concepts and identify the elements that contribute to integrity, the types of data that can be drawn to measure these elements, the methodology that can be used for assessing the data, and appropriate measures or benchmarks to be used to determine a measure of success. In the absence of studies focused specifically on research integrity, the Committee draws on a broad range of complimentary theoretical works in preparing its recommendations. It points to research in areas like organizational behavior and ethical decision-making that offer a general framework to identify elements and approaches that create effective learning environments.

Recommendation 1:
Observing the scant empirical data and established measures available to “definitively support any one way to approach the problem of promoting and evaluating research integrity,” the Committee’s first Recommendation urges ORI and other funding agencies to establish grant programs “to identify, measure, and assess those factors that influence integrity in research.” As the Committee notes, ORI has begun to fund these types of studies and encourages expansion of these efforts by other agencies as well.

continued on page 8

Capital View continued from page 3

OMB officials have stated that the pending guidance on sensitive but unclassified information would be published for public comment prior to adoption, probably in a few months. This will obviously be proposed guidance that will require thoughtful review and comment from the research community.

Never to be left out of a controversial topic, Congress will weigh in on this issue soon.

Representative Sherwood Boehlert (R-NY), Co-Chair of the House Subcommittee on Human Intelligence, Analysis, and Counterintelligence, plans hearings in Washington this fall that focus on security at research universities. The hearings will let researchers air their concerns about legislation such as the USA Patriot Act, the Bioterrorism Preparedness Act and other security measures. Rep. Boehlert has stated that he understood concerns. He said the openness of America’s university system was not under attack, but that the “casualness” of research labs was being scrutinized. Boehlert said he does not support shuttering down borders or stifling research, but added that terrorism has made it necessary for people from all walks of life to rethink “how we go about our daily lives.”

Add to the list planned fall symposia sponsored by the National Academies and the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and it becomes clear how important this issue is for the research community. We do not want to end up having to follow the advice of Dogbert, the oily business consultant in the Dilbert comic strip who advises, “Be careful that what you write does not offend anybody or cause problems. The safest approach is to remove all useful information."

Tony De Crappeo serves as the Associate Director for the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR).
Integrity in Scientific Research
continued from page 7

Recommendation 2:
In its second Recommendation, the Committee places the responsibility for ensuring the integrity of the research environment squarely on the research institution. It calls for universities and other research institutions to create a “comprehensive program to promote integrity in research, using multiple approaches adapted to the specific environments within each institution.” Outlining steps similar to those used by many universities to achieve the institution’s core missions and promote similar climate and learning goals, the Committee identifies some key elements of an institutional program for developing and maintaining an ethical culture and climate: supportive leadership; appropriate policies and procedures; effective educational programs; and thorough and continuous evaluation and assessment.

Recommendation 3:
Defining education as the key component of a program to promote integrity, the Committee’s third Recommendation charges institutions to implement effective educational programs “built around the development of abilities that give rise to the responsible conduct of research.” The Committee believes that this training should be provided by faculty actively engaged in research.

Recommendation 4 and 5:
Recommendations 4 and 5 focus on institutional self-assessment and external peer review. The Committee calls for a robust system of self-assessment ultimately linked to evaluation criteria in the higher education accreditation processes. But the Committee goes beyond an institutional-level program assessment calling for the integration of the goals of promoting integrity into all aspects of evaluation conducted on campuses - evaluations of deans, departments and individual faculty members. To ensure the credibility of the process, both internally and externally, the Committee emphasizes the need for external peer review. The Committee looks to the accreditation process as an opportunity to systematically conduct assessments and external reviews.

Recommendation 6:
The final Recommendation urges ORI to create an informational database of activities to establish a resource for universities building their own programs and a demonstration for the public that universities are working to ensure research integrity.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study directly addresses education of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows in the responsible conduct of research. It does this not because there is a sense that problems of research integrity lie in these populations, but rather that educating future scientists and researchers will have the greatest long term benefit for the academic enterprise.

The draft November 2000 PHS Policy on Instruction in the Responsible Conduct of Research suggests that faculty and staff who play key roles in proposing, performing, reporting or reviewing research, or who receive research training should complete a program of training in the responsible conduct of research. The Committee’s report does not provide education recommendations for faculty or staff but rather leaves the target audience for training to the institution.

The role of professional and scholarly societies is acknowledged but is not developed fully in the Committee’s discussion. Professional societies have an important role in guiding members at all stages in their careers on communal norms. Professional societies, through their education programs and publications also provide key tools for establishing discipline-specific standards of behavior. Scientific and professional journals likewise provide standards and benchmarks of professional behavioral expectations that can be more real and immediate than education programs. As journals and societies further evolve their expectations there will be a real world assessment and known consequences of irresponsible behavior.

IMPLICATIONS FOR INSTITUTIONS

As institutions and their faculty consider the IOM report, several suggestions for future action come easily to mind.

First among these is, involve faculty from all scholarly and scientific disciplines in establishing institutional program and policies for instruction in the responsible conduct of research. These groups should seriously consider the breadth of the target audiences. The faculty should serve as role models in the responsible conduct of research. Education in research integrity will become most effective when taught values are seen as being operative within the institution’s research and scholarly programs.

Second, institutions should take care to tailor instructional programs to address discipline specific cultural norms. For example, authorship practices differ widely even among science disciplines, let alone across the humanities and the sciences.

Third, design flexible instructional activities based on principles of providing “students” with the “tools” to make ethical decisions in new situations based on prior experience and employ adult learning techniques that facilitate engagement of learners in the educational experience.

Fourth, use faculty as “instructors” and integrate the training/learning in ethical decision-making into the core research education curriculum. Training the faculty will be critical to the program’s success if the training in ethical decision-making is to move beyond a seminar or sequence of seminars for students. Having engaged faculty will amplify the opportunities for more informal learning, e.g., in labs, “practicums”, colloquia, etc. (implementing the “spaced review and practice” approach).

Fifth, assess individual faculty on integrity issues. The criteria used by individual departments in the annually or promotion assessments of their colleagues brings into sharp focus how the standards used by the university (e.g., dean) and the department in determining continuing employment are set. The development of criteria and, perhaps more importantly, measures to be used to assess those criteria will require careful and thoughtful collaboration between the faculty and academic leadership. Given the reported ambivalence of some faculty to receiving orientation in the responsible conduct of research this may prove to be a difficult challenge and will require a fair amount of discussion among faculty to achieve a consensus view. Some campuses with faculties represented by unions will need to build these issues into negotiations.

Ultimately, all of these activities including rethinking the core research education curriculum will take a focused and extended period of time - time that some faculty will be unable or unwilling to commit. If the stakes are high enough - the incentives significant enough - to bring the faculty to the table, the institution must be prepared to provide sufficient support services and resources to assist the faculty.

Carol Blum is the Associate Director of the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR) and Andrew Rudczynski serves as the Associate Vice President for Finance and Executive Director, Research Services for the University of Pennsylvania.
NIH Transitions to Providing Electronic Progress Report
Due Date Information
by Megan Columbus and Marjorie Hahn

Historically the National Institutes of Health (NIH) has mailed pre-printed PHS 2590 and PHS 416-9 face pages to its grantees several months before the application due date. As we work towards electronic research administration, we are transitioning from hard copy to an electronic format for providing non-competing due dates for progress reports. NIH has already mailed face pages for awards with start dates through November 2002. Beginning with December 2002 start dates and beyond; e.g., those progress reports due on/after October 1, 2002, grantees will need to access a public website, http://era.nih.gov/userreports/pr_due.cfm, to determine which progress reports are due. Users search the website using an IPF (Institutional Profile File) number, a unique number that NIH uses for tracking and reporting on grant awards to grantee organizations. (Users who do not know their IPF number may link to a query system that allows them to retrieve that information.) The system currently lists: institution name; grant number; Principal Investigator name; progress report due date; and whether the project is in the last year of their project period. The report includes records for all NIH Institutes/Centers as well as the Agency for Health Care Research and Quality and is sorted in due date order. New records will be added on/around the 30th of each month so users are encouraged to check the report monthly.

Eventually NIH-Commons registered users will have access to information on application status in a secure web-based environment and will be able to link to pre-populated face pages in PDF format. The NIH Commons deployment schedule will be published in the NIH GUIDE. Grantees will continue to mail progress reports directly to the NIH awarding Institute/Center. A list of Institute/Center mailing addresses for progress reports is found at: <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/type5_mailing_addresses.htm>.

Questions concerning the progress report website should be addressed to the eRA Helpdesk: e-mail: Commons@od.nih.gov. Questions concerning submission of progress reports should be directed to the specific NIH Institute/Center. We will continue to update the NCURA membership on additional transitions involving the transmittal and reporting of grant-related information through periodic notices through usual channels, including the NCURA newsletter.

Megan Columbus is the Assistant to the Director, Office of Policy for Extramural Research Administration, National Institutes of Health and Marcia Hahn is the Assistant Grants Policy Officer, Office of Policy for Extramural Research Administration, National Institutes of Health.

Proposed Membership Category By-Law Revision
by Bonny Boice

Last fall I had the pleasure of chairing a Board working group on Membership Categories. Recognizing the value of involving all individuals who participate in research administration to furthering NCURA’s mission and supporting its core values, the group recommended that we change our by-laws to include research administrators from not-for-profit entities as Regular Members. The April 2002 member survey showed support for such a membership change. The Board adopted a resolution to revise the membership category by-law 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. The Board working group is excited about creating a more inclusive population of research administrators to meet the diverse needs of the research community, and we support formal adoption by the NCURA membership of a by-law revision that will allow us to welcome our fellow research administrators to NCURA. Their inclusion will increase our body of knowledge and expertise and help our organization achieve global recognition as the preeminent source of professional development, knowledge and leadership for research administration.

Bonny Boice is the Treasurer of NCURA and serves as the Senior Vice President and Treasurer, Research Foundation of SUNY.

University/Industry Conference Was a Rocky Mountain High!
by Cheryl-Lee Howard

In late August, 321 individuals from diverse backgrounds came together in Keystone, Colorado to accomplish a tremendous task. They met to determine where the difficulties lay when industry and universities work together and what could be done about it. This new offering in NCURA’s conference curriculum was developed in partnership with the Business Higher Education Forum (BHEF), the Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM) and the National Association of College and University Attorneys (NACUA).

The program was designed to provide bites of solid information followed by plenty of opportunity for discussing the problems and situations presented, while also networking with representatives from several key-playing groups. To view the slides from most of the sessions and read a summary of ideas that came from topical breakout sessions, go to http://www.ncura.edu/meetings/univconf/presentations/. A major thank you goes to our speakers, facilitators and leaders who made even the largest audience feel like they were chatting intimately with a few of their closest colleagues. The program was exceptionally strong not only because of them, but also because of the members of our program committee, who had the foresight to bring them together.

At the closing plenary, attendees were given the opportunity to discuss where they had gone, what they had learned and where they wanted to go from here. The general consensus was that we need more on university/industry matters and that we definitely need to get our industrial counterparts to attend in much greater numbers. So watch for more to come on this topic in our future programming.

*Program committee members included: Ira Blumberg, Intel; Cheryl-Lee Howard, Johns Hopkins University (co-chair); Kathleen Irwin, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Ravi Kiron, Pfizer Global; Steve Kohler, CB Richard Ellis; James Severson, Cornell University Research Foundation (co-chair); Todd Sherer, Oregon Health Sciences University; and Mary Ellen Sheridan, University of Chicago.

Cheryl-Lee Howard is the Assistant Provost University Research Projects Administration for The Johns Hopkins University, and serves as the Immediate Past President of NCURA and was Co-chair of the University/Industry Conference.
It's hard to believe, but November is just around the corner and with it, this year's National Meeting in Washington on November 3-6. Volunteers are needed to man the Region II hospitality suite in the evenings, especially Tuesday night during the period between the meeting sessions and the annual party. While at the meeting, plan to attend the annual regional business meeting on Tuesday from 3:45 to 5:00 p.m. Come see all your friends from around the Region and meet the new Region II National Board member, the new Chair-elect, and the new Treasurer.

Speaking of new, the newly formed Communications Committee has been appointed for the next two years. The members are Carol Berdar, Compliance Specialist, Research Foundation of SUNY; Tammy Custer, Electronics Systems Specialist, Office of Sponsored Programs, Cornell University; Catherine (Liz) Kirby, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, American University; Alfredo Medina, Jr., Director for Sponsored Programs, Siena College; and Cheryl Williams, Senior Research Administrator, Office of Research and Project Administration, University of Rochester. This committee will be responsible for providing articles about the region for the NCURA Newsletter, developing and maintaining a Region II website, and disseminating information to the regional membership regarding region activities, as needed. The committee will be meeting via conference calls and at the national meeting prior to the business meeting.

Don't forget, our 2003 Spring Meeting will be held in New York City in April. The program committee welcomes your suggestions for sessions. Contact Anne Geromino at ageromino@gradschool.umd.edu.

Cheryl Williams serves as Secretary of Region II and is a Senior Research Administrator, Office of Research and Project Administration, University of Rochester.

Volunteers Needed! If you plan to attend the 44th Annual NCURA Meeting, please consider helping out our region. Volunteers are needed to assist in the Region III Hospitality Suite. Here you can relax, meet others from the region, while lending a helping hand. If interested, contact the new Hospitality Committee Chair, Bruxanne El-Kammash, at bruxanne@coastal.edu. You can also help by volunteering to have your room located within earshot of the Hospitality Suite. This guarantees you a room on the 7th floor with a lovely view.

NCURA has posted the Final Program for the 44th Annual Meeting on its website. Note that the Regional Business Meetings will be held on Tuesday, November 5 from 3:45 - 5:00 p.m. Plan to join us and hear updates from your committee chairs and NCURA representatives. Also get updates on the Spring 2003 Regional Meeting in Sandestin, FL and hear from the Site Selection Committee on the 2005 Regional Meeting.

Finally, if you are new to NCURA, plan to attend an “Orientation for the Newer Member” on Saturday evening or Sunday afternoon. Here you can meet other “newer” members and find out what NCURA is all about.

See you in November!

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

The last Region IV Committee Chair is in place: Diane Barrett, Director of Federal Sponsored Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Madison will head the Awards Committee. The Awards Committee oversees Region IV's award/recognition programs: The Distinguished Service Award, Kevin Reed Outstanding Professional Award, and the Meritorious Contribution Award. In addition, the Awards Committee will begin implementation of the proposed Regional Travel Award.

As always, Region IV committees need you to volunteer. Just get in touch with a committee chair. If you have an interest or expertise in a particular area, speak up. Coming up, volunteers will be needed for Region IV New Member activities and the
Region IV Hospitality Suite at the National meeting in November. Contact Heather Mills Offhaus (734-763-4272;mailto:hmills@umich.edu) to volunteer for these National meeting activities.

The Program Committee will need volunteers for the Spring meeting. Contact Joanne Altieri (785-864-7462;mailto:jaltieri@ku.edu or Pamela A. Krauser (574-631-5537;mailto:pkrauser@nd.edu) to get involved in the Spring meeting. For more committee information, please see the Region IV web: http://www.ncura.uc.edu/.

Dola Haeuss is the Coordinator, Research Community Project, College of Arts & Science, for the University of Missouri-Columbia.

**REGION V**

Southwestern

What an honor for Region V to have two National NCURA awards presented to two of our members. Marianne Rinaldo Woods will be presented the Distinguished Service Award and Jane Youngers will be presented the Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award. Congratulations to the both of you. We will be hosting a reception in the hospitality suite (room 3174) Sunday at 6:00 to honor our two award winners.

The nominating committee members for 2003 have been selected. Matt Berry, University of Oklahoma, Norman Campus, will serve as chair. Members include Jan Fox, Texas Christian University; Scott Davis, University of Oklahoma, Health Sciences Centers and LeAnn Forsberg, University of Texas, Health Sciences Center at Fort Worth. They will be seeking a slate of nominees for the following officers: Vice-Chair (Chair-Elect), Secretary and three Regional Executive Committee members. If you are interested in serving as an officer or would like to nominate another member, please contact one of the committee members.

Speaking of officers, Alyson McCarty Balandran has resigned as secretary. After receiving approval from the Executive Committee, Lisa Thompson from the University of Tulsa will serve the remaining term as secretary. David Wright has resigned as our Regional Web Master and his replacement is Rich Bredahl, University of Texas at Austin. A special thank you to Lisa and Rich for accepting these positions.

A committee was formed to review how and when the newly elected officers begin their terms. Debbie Newton, University of Tulsa will serve as chair. Members include Al Solto, University of Tulsa, Judy Cook, Baylor College of Medicine at Houston and JoAnn Howeth, University of Oklahoma, Norman Campus. A report on the findings will be presented at this year’s National meeting. If you have any suggestions please visit with one of the committee members.

Be sure to mark your calendar for our spring meeting in Las Vegas, April 28th thru May 1st, 2003. More information will be available on our regional web site soon. The site for our 2004 meeting is set for Galveston, Texas.

Take care and see you all in D.C.

JoAnn Howeth is the Chair of Region V and serves as the Associate Director, Office of Sponsored Programs for the University of Oklahoma, Norman Campus.

**REGION VI**

Western

It’s fall again, and elections for both Region VI and National offices should be completed by the time you read this column. I’d like to thank all of you for “doing your civic duty” and voting. Thanks also go to our Regional Nominating Committee for all of their hard work.

The National meeting is right around the corner, and I’m looking forward to seeing both new and old members. Don’t forget that our regional business meeting will take place on Tuesday, November 5, from 3:45-5:00pm. Be sure to check NCURA’s website before coming to DC— we plan to have information posted about the hospitality suite (location, hours open) prior to the meeting.

Also, don’t forget to “just say yes” to helping out. Not only will Terry Manns be looking for help with the program for next year’s regional meeting, he’ll also be looking for regional committee chairs when he assumes leadership in January 2003.

Speaking of the regional meeting, please mark your calendars now for these dates— April 6-9, 2003—the Region VI-VII spring meeting. The site is the Hyatt Regency Denver, and Region VII has secured an excellent rate of $112/night. This rate will be good 3 days pre-and post-meeting, and I know we can count on Terry to put together an excellent program.

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

REGION VII

Rocky Mountain

It’s a pleasure to report briefly on the many behind-the-scenes activities that have been underway. As you know, we are in the midst of our regional election that will result in a new chair, member-at-large, and board member who will begin working on our behalf come January. These individuals will be elected prior to our November business meeting, at which we’ll have a chance to meet and greet them.

Dianne Horrocks from Idaho State University has worked diligently to update and revise our regional by-laws. These are posted on our regional web site at http://www.unm.edu/ncuravii/ for our review. In the next few weeks, we will be voting electronically on their adoption.

Nominations for our regional travel awards have been received and the successful recipients will be announced later this month. These new colleagues will be recognized at the national annual meeting in November. Again, I urge you to take advantage of the ample networking opportunities there to extend your welcome and congratulations.

And plans continue for our regional meeting next spring, April 6-9, at the Hyatt Regency Denver. With a room rate at $112 per night and a dynamite program being developed in conjunction with Region VII, preliminary indications suggest this will be a meeting well worth your consideration. Watch for logistical and programmatic updates via our regional listserv.

In closing, I hope you are gearing up to attend the National Annual meeting to be held in Washington, DC, next month. As usual, an outstanding program is planned; also worth mentioning is that Region VI and VII will again be jointly hosting a hospitality suite. So, just as most of our campuses celebrate Homecoming in the fall, this annual meeting is an opportunity for us to renew acquaintances and meet new colleagues. It’s a time for professional rejuvenation and regeneration, and I look forward to seeing you there!

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.
From the Cover

SPG II continued

provides a tremendous opportunity for interaction and stimulating discussion with workshop participants on a variety of subjects pertaining to research administration.

Reactions of participants in the first SPA II program were extremely positive. A few select comments:

"Definitely met my needs! Great workshop with excellent presenters."

"Exceeded my expectation."

"I was pleased and surprised by how much I learned. Some of the information was new to me. As a grants manager, it shouldn’t have been."

"The past 2 ½ days has been a great learning experience."

"Far more than I expected. Not only did I learn what the critical issues are and why, but also learned a new way of thinking about grants administration."

At press time, SPA II just wrapped up in Boston where the workshop was presented on October 2 – 4. Additional sessions are being planned for 2003. In a field that is noted for continuous and ever more rapid change, NCURA continues to lead the way by offering the very best in continuing professional development to the research administration community. Program agenda and registration is available at www.ncura.edu.

FRA IV continued

OK, some specifics for you to contemplate.
The meeting will offer:

• Five pre-conference workshops on February 16th, including in-depth learning opportunities in the basics of F&A rate preparation, government circulars, cost sharing and effort reporting, and vital overviews for post-award, pre-award and departmental personnel;

• Five conference tracks. We are bringing back the ever-popular Compliance, Transactional, and Departmental tracks, and adding a Costing and Hot Topics track that will be of interest to all specializations as well as all levels of experience. Just a sampling of session topics includes: federal agency perspectives on compliance, critical roles of central and departmental personnel in compliance, best practices from recent system implementations, a federal panel on costing, asset management, tools for department administrators, the increased cost of compliance and a Washington Update;

• Several primer sessions offering basic introductory tutorials on select topics. Our past FRA meeting attendees have requested more “basics” and we have tried to respond to this need. Primer topics will include financial reporting, effort reporting, financial tracking and monitoring, budget development, the ever-important Circulars and even development of the Federal Budget!

• Discussion sessions that will bring participants together to focus and kibitz on topics of interest, and offer face-to-face small discussion groups with federal representatives, research administration and costing experts.

If this is not enough to entice you to think about attending FRA IV, the meeting will be held in New Orleans, a city known for “letting the good times roll”. The host hotel, Sheraton New Orleans, is right on the edge of the famous French Quarter. Lots to do ... AFTER the meeting sessions, of course.

In keeping with the meeting’s location – a city with a reputation of seizing the joy of the moment – the meeting theme will be “Carpe Diem: Seizing the Opportunities”. (For those pocket protector types out there, carpe diem is not a fancy name for per diem, and it is not a type of fish either! Look it up.) What opportunities, you may ask? Well, come to the meeting and take advantage of the professional opportunities that await you!

And finally, this meeting is truly blessed with a talented and very well respected program committee. Its members include prior (and future) recipients of the NCURA Outstanding Achievement Award in Research Administration, past NCURA national program chairs, the Director of NACCA, seasoned departmental and central research administration personnel, with lots of federal agency experience and insight, and external consulting expertise. How can this program NOT be worthy of Mardi Gras-like celebration? The committee members are:

Fred Cantrell, University of Florida
Michele Codd, Vanderbilt University
Diane Dean, National Institutes of Health
Tony DeCrappeo, Council on Governmental Relations
Joanne DeStefano, Cornell University
Jerry Fife, Vanderbilt University
Ann Holmes, University of Maryland
Jack Kamrer, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Brenda Kavanaugh, University of Rochester
Dick Keogh, Rhode Island College
Mary Jo Lyke, University of Rochester
Julie Norris, MIT
Gary Talesnik, KPMG Consulting
Jane Youngers, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio

Gunta Liders, is program chair for the FRA IV conference, and serves as Director, Office of Research and Project Administration, University of Rochester.
Patrick Fitzgerald, Director of Cost Analysis for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has been elected Vice President/President-elect of the National Council of University Research Administrators. Currently serving on the Board of Directors, Fitzgerald has served NCURA in a number of ways. He chaired the FRA II Conference in 2001, is a faculty member on the popular Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration Workshop, Chairs the Financial Research Administration (FRA) Neighborhood and has served on the Financial Management Committee in addition to presenting and teaching at numerous NCURA Workshops and Sessions.

Upon learning of his election, Fitzgerald stated:

“It is a great honor to be elected NCURA Vice President/President Elect and I’m excited to have this opportunity to serve. I’m also very grateful to all NCURA members who took the time to vote. A record number of votes were cast in this election and I believe this symbolizes the desire of NCURA members to be involved in this organization. In the coming months I will be calling on many of you to become more involved in NCURA committees and programs. I look forward to working for you, and with you, these next two years.”

Two Board Slots Filled

Georgette Sakumoto, Administrative Officer, University of Hawaii will serve on the Board of Directors, being elected by the membership to an At-large position. Sakumoto was the Recipient of Region VI’s Travel Award in 1991 to the National Meeting and has been involved in NCURA on many levels since then. Sakumoto has served on the former Finance and Budget Committee and the Membership Committee. She was a member of the Minority Participation Task Force, and has been very active in Region VI.

Sakumoto credits NCURA for being her “lifeline to keeping up with the ever-changing role of the Research Administrator”. She stated, “The strength of this organization is in its membership and the wealth of knowledge that our senior peers have to offer. Data collected by the Minority Participation Task Force in 1999 indicated that we just need to “ask” and many new and minority members are willing to contribute to this great organization. The new governance structure of NCURA provides us the opportunity to “get involved”. One of my goals as an at-large director is to increase and encourage new and minority members participation in NCURA.”

Pamela Whitlock, Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs for the University of North Carolina at Wilmington, was also elected to an At-large seat on the Board of Directors. Whitlock is committed to Professional Development as is demonstrated with her years of service as a workshop faculty, moderator, presenter, and evaluator at regional, national, and special conferences. Whitlock has also served as a Regional Officer and as a member of NCURA’s Professional Development Committee. Whitlock feels strongly that “We must continue to investigate alternate modes of service delivery, innovative recruitment techniques, and expanded membership value, as well as collaborative activities with other professional organizations. I would serve as an advocate for the smaller, predominantly undergraduate institutions within our organization to play an active role in the continued growth of NCURA as the premier professional development organization.”


This award is given to up to five recipients who have made sustained and distinctive contributions to the organization. The letters of support and nomination for these award winners were outstanding and articulate the expertise and incredible generosity they bring to NCURA.

Awardees will be recognized with a plaque, presented at the Annual Meeting. Look for information on the 2003 Distinguished Service Award in the spring of 2003.

FIVE RECEIVE NCURA’S FIRST AWARD FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

Christina Hansen, University of California-Irvine; Andrew Rudczynski, University of Pennsylvania; Kim Moreland, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center; Marianne Rinaldo Woods, University of Texas at Arlington and Steven Smartt, Vanderbilt University are the first recipients of the NCURA Distinguished Service Award.
Remember the movie “Groundhog Day” where actor Bill Murray continues to re-live the same day over and over? Well, it looks like the snowstorm that caused Bill Murray to repeat his nightmare has hit eRA. Like the actor in the movie who remembers each day’s events, I remember all too well the events that have led us to E-Grants. And just when progress was being made, it looks like we may be reliving the events of the past.

Currently, there are two main projects associated with E-Grants. These are referred to as “Find” (as in find funding opportunities) and “Apply” (as in apply for a grant.)

For the “Find” function, a grants portal pilot has been developed to integrate the Catalog for Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) and FedBizOpps (http://www.fedbizopps.gov). But don’t go clicking on this web site too soon. The site is still a pilot and only NIH has thus far put any funding opportunities on-line. Even more disappointing, this web site is not intended to carry the full program announcement; but rather, simply a storefront to see all opportunities with relevant links to the individual agency’s full program announcement. The site has extremely limited search capabilities and will only include a short synopsis.

The Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) has developed a set of data items to capture the business rules associated with a program announcement. These include data items such as: eligibility of faculty and institution, funding mechanisms, eligible activities, F&A limitations, cost sharing requirements, budget limitations, etc. Unfortunately, these essential data items are not being considered for the FedBizOpps grants portal pilot at this time. On August 12, 2002, OMB issued a notice entitled, “Standard Data Elements for Electronically Posting Synopses of Federal Agencies’ Financial Assistance Program Announcements at FedBizOpps.” While FedBizOpps as currently envisioned may be of value to commercial contractors and State and Local governments, it will be disappointing, this web site is not intended to carry the full program announcement; but rather, simply a storefront to see all opportunities with relevant links to the individual agency’s full program announcement. The site has extremely limited search capabilities and will only include a short synopsis.

The painfully apparent consequence is that we are going back to “square one” where individual federal agencies can justify anything they want.

We continue to hear conflicting statements from agencies about what is allowable as “non-core” data. Some say if the data is on an OMB approved form then the agency can collect it as “non-core” data. Others say only data required by statute or legislation that is not in the “core” data can be collected. Whatever the case may be, one thing is clear. If it is not in TS 194 and the agency can justify the data, it will be collected.

Which brings us to the next standards-related problem: the lack of standards for use in a business-to-business model for non-core data items. As reported at the IAEGC meeting in August 2002, the rationale for creation of E-Grants (encompassed in the E-Grants Business Case) proposes establishment of an E-Grants Trusted Broker, a single application module that conforms to standards and benefits both parties, that collects a core data set augmented by agency-specific data elements (no mention on how this agency-specific data will be collected), and that provides a centralized location for grant business rules. According to the IAEGC web site, these rules “will assist in the identification of commonality, will add transparency to the grant application process, and will adapt easily to the P.L. 106-107 needs for simplification and streamlining.” Further, it is reported, “the trusted broker concept facilitates system-to-systems interfaces.” This may be true in theory, but how can a functioning business-to-business model be created without first establishing standards for the transaction of non-core data elements? It cannot, and establishment of such standards is likely to require a substantial investment of time and effort.

And finally we come back to one of my main themes, authentication and security. As reported by the Government Computer News (GCN) (http://gcn.com), Charles Havekost, E-Grants Program Manager at the Health and Human Services Department, believes technology might be more of a problem than the business process redesign efforts. As reported, he called authentication “a real hurdle—how much authentication is the right amount for a process.” On this front, I totally agree with Mr. Havekost. Finding the right authentication model for the associated transaction is not going to be easy. This major obstacle, in itself, may delay the process and jeopardize the October 2003 target date for implementation.

All other data elements would be “non-core”. These may include common cross-agency, agency-specific, program-specific, and solicitation-specific data elements. E-Grants management, supported by OMB, has requested agencies to look at the core data elements and to identify those that are agency-specific. The process of identifying agency specific data elements involves comparing agency-specific forms with the core, identifying and consolidating agency specific application packages, and filling out tables in common formats for agency-specific-data to be implemented in the E-Grants storefront.

See why I’m living in a Groundhog Day movie? We did this seven years ago! The agencies came forward with all their forms and we created the 194 Transaction Set. It was published in the Federal Register for comment and we read the Federal Register to see what new rules affected us as grantees. However, several federal agencies have taken the position that the rules do not apply to them, and that the creation of the TS 194 and its subsequent publishing in the Federal Register did not mean that an agency had to use it. The painfully apparent consequence is that we are going back to “square one” where individual federal agencies can justify anything they want.

We continue to hear conflicting statements from agencies about what is allowable as “non-core” data. Some say if the data is on an OMB approved form then the agency can collect it as “non-core” data. Others say only data required by statute or legislation that is not in the “core” data can be collected. Whatever the case may be, one thing is clear. If it is not in TS 194 and the agency can justify the data, it will be collected.

Which brings us to the next standards-related problem: the lack of standards for use in a business-to-business model for non-core data items. As reported at the IAEGC meeting in August 2002, the rationale for creation of E-Grants (encompassed in the E-Grants Business Case) proposes establishment of an E-Grants Trusted Broker, a single application module that conforms to standards and benefits both parties, that collects a core data set augmented by agency-specific data elements (no mention on how this agency-specific data will be collected), and that provides a centralized location for grant business rules. According to the IAEGC web site, these rules “will assist in the identification of commonality, will add transparency to the grant application process, and will adapt easily to the P.L. 106-107 needs for simplification and streamlining.” Further, it is reported, “the trusted broker concept facilitates system-to-systems interfaces.” This may be true in theory, but how can a functioning business-to-business model be created without first establishing standards for the transaction of non-core data elements? It cannot, and establishment of such standards is likely to require a substantial investment of time and effort.

And finally we come back to one of my main themes, authentication and security. As reported by the Government Computer News (GCN) (http://gcn.com), Charles Havekost, E-Grants Program Manager at the Health and Human Services Department, believes technology might be more of a problem than the business process redesign efforts. As reported, he called authentication “a real hurdle—how much authentication is the right amount for a process.” On this front, I totally agree with Mr. Havekost. Finding the right authentication model for the associated transaction is not going to be easy. This major obstacle, in itself, may delay the process and jeopardize the October 2003 target date for implementation.

continued on the next page
Douglas Baptist: We are aware that additional guidance, training and discussion with our Contracting Officers is needed. We held a teleconference in which they told us how we could help them and I advised them of the feedback we’ve received on their performance. There’s a learning curve for everyone involved, and we recognize that coping with the myriad of changes in our business environment is a huge challenge.

Edward Roberts, University of Cincinnati: What does DOE expect as far as electronic signatures? Is signed by and the date good enough? Or, do you want scanned signatures?

Douglas Baptist: DOE expects an authorized person to submit the proposal, the blank entitled “Signature” must contain the typed name of the person authorized to sign that particular document. We do not want you to scan a manually executed document and submit it.

Mary McGonagle, Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Is the system still mandatory as of October 1?

Douglas Baptist: Yes, for all competitive financial assistance.

Alexandra Garrison, New York University: So for the record as long as a PI has been authorized by the SRO they can register for IIPS and submit a proposal?

Douglas Baptist: Yes.
What Does It Do?

One of the most important functions of the Committee involves responding to data related to professional development that has been gathered from the membership through a variety of channels (including evaluation forms filled out by those attending the annual meeting workshops and sessions, special conferences such as those dealing with electronic and financial aspects of research administration, and the increasingly popular fundamentals workshops). The NCURA Evaluations Coordinator plays a critical role in sifting and sorting through the data to help the PDC develop recommendations for new programs and sessions that might fill a vacuum or emerging need. In this context, the PDC will be working more closely than ever with the program committee planning the annual meeting for November, 2003 in creating sessions and workshops that are even more responsive to members needs.

This data also is important fodder for the editors and authors of NCURA’s electronic and hard-copy publications. A topic currently under discussion within the PDC involves creating a virtual electronic library, where members not only can access current issues of the NCURA Electronic Bulletin, Newsletter, and RMR, but also can access past NCURA articles, PowerPoint presentations, and a wide variety of federal resources through sophisticated search engine technology. The virtual library might also permit members to customize transmittal of information that might have special relevance.

Three New/Updated Micrographs:
The PDC also is instrumental in initiating development of NCURA’s series of highly popular micrographs and monographs, and that finally brings me to announce three important new publications currently under development. All should be available for purchase sometime in the latter half of 2003.

The first of these actually constitutes an updating of NCURA’s monograph on compliance. All members of the PDC are both delighted and gratified that the co-authors of the previous version of this publication, Julie Norris of M.I.T. and Jane Youngers of the University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio, graciously have accepted responsibility for creating an updated version that will include the wealth of new compliance information and policies that have swept upon us since the earlier version was published several years ago.

Research administrators who deal with intellectual property policy and practices will especially welcome the micrograph being developed by Ann Hammersla of M.I.T. and Kathy Irwin of the University of Wisconsin, Madison. The publication will serve as a primer on intellectual property, especially assisting researchers, research administrators and faculty who frequently are called upon to help coordinate interactions between researchers, intellectual property specialists and research sponsors.

NCURA remains equally concerned about the needs of research administrators toiling in the “vineyards” of the less research intensive institutions, including most Historically Black Colleges and Universities, other minority institutions, and predominately undergraduate institutions generally. Steve Hansen of Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville and Mildred Ofosu of Morgan State University are working on a micrograph that will serve as a guidebook for individuals creating or managing sponsored programs offices within such institutions. The micrograph will outline and review the functions that need to be performed in offices that solely perform pre-award functions, or are charged with both pre-and postaward oversight. It also will address integration with associated compliance functions, such as human subjects, animal welfare, and biohazards, which frequently fall within the jurisdiction of “smaller” offices.

Co-authors of the intellectual property and “small” institutions micrographs will be supported by small advisory review committees, each led by a member of the PDC. Celia Gravely will lead the group supporting development of the intellectual property micrograph and Brenda Sanders Dede will provide leadership for the advisory group supporting the co-authors of the “small” institutions publication.

The PDC exists solely to support the professional development needs of the NCURA membership. Consequently, suggestions for the creation of workshops, meeting sessions, special programs or additional publications are always welcome and can be directed to any of the NCURA offices, the National Office Staff, or any member of this extremely important and active standing committee.

Dick Keogh is the Chair of the Professional Development Committee, is the Co-Editor of the Newsletter, and serves as the Director, Office of Grants and Research Administration for Rhode Island College.

It has been the practice of this Newsletter to periodically update the membership on the nature and activities of NCURA’s various committees and task forces. This issue provides an updated review of one of the organization’s three standing committees.
Got a nagging question on intellectual property you just can’t seem to get answered?

Have an idea about how to organize your office that you’d like to try out on someone?

Or do you just need some advice on how to handle a problem with a faculty member?

Come to the Mentors Marketplace on Monday evening, November 4, 2002 from 8:30 - 9:30 pm.

The Mentors Marketplace, located in the Exhibition Hall, will be stocked with cold drinks and staffed by some of the nation’s best research administrators to talk with you about contract negotiations, research administration home pages, information management, F&A costs, and a host of other research administration topics.

For further information on NCURA’s 44th Annual Meeting, check out http://www.ncura.edu or call the NCURA Office at (202) 466-3894.

WE LOOK FORWARD TO SEEING YOU IN WASHINGTON!
ORDER YOUR COPY TODAY!

The Soul Source and No-cost Extensions' first CD will be ready for delivery at NCURA's 44th Annual Meeting. Order your copy by October 25 and it'll be in your Registration Packet when you arrive at the Meeting! If you can't make the meeting this year, we'll ship it right to your door. Songs include:

1. Welcome and introduction.................John Case
2. Taking Care of Business ................Steve Smartt
3. Vehicle ........................................Spanky McCallister
4. Something to Talk About..............Tara Bishop
5. Respect ...............................Jane McGlade and the Soul Sisters
6. China Grove ..............................Jerry Fife
8. My Girl ....................................Stephen Williams
9. Wild Nights..............Tara Bishop & Spanky McCallister
10. Gloria ..............................Steve Smartt
11. Bang on the Drum..............Spanky McCallister
13. Ain’t Too Proud to Beg ..................Stephen Williams
14. Saw Her Standing There ...............Jerry Fife
15. Mony Mony ..........................Spanky McCallister
16. I Got Your F&A Right Here ..............Steve Smartt
17. Will it Go Round in Circles .........Milton Cole
18. Feelin’ All Right ..................Spanky McCallister
19. Land of 1000 Dances ..............Spanky McCallister
20. Shout ......................................Steve Smartt

YES! PLEASE RESERVE A COPY OF "OUT OF COMPLIANCE" FOR ME!

CONTACT NAME ____________________________ TITLE _______________________

INSTITUTION ________________________________

DELIVERY ADDRESS ________________________________

CITY __________________________ STATE ____________ ZIP ___________

PHONE __________________________ FAX __________________________

E-MAIL __________________________ WEB SITE __________________________

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

SOUL SOURCE AND THE NO-COST EXTENSIONS "OUT OF COMPLIANCE" CD

☐ I will be attending NCURA's Annual Meeting, please deliver the CD(s) to me via my Registration Packet..................$10.00 EACH X ________ COPIES

☐ Please deliver the CD(s) to the above address. Please allow 2 weeks for delivery.................................$12.00 EACH X ________ COPIES

Total Amount Due: $__________________ Please circle one: Visa MasterCard American Express

Card # __________________________________________ Exp. __________________________

Card Holder’s Signature __________________________________________
Thomas Jefferson University
Office of Research Administration
Associate Director, Pre-award Services
and Senior Grants Manager

Thomas Jefferson University is offering two exciting opportunities in its Office of Research Administration. The Associate Director, Pre-award Services will manage and direct the proposal submission and award negotiation process for all sponsored programs. This individual will negotiate federal, industrial clinical trials, craft subaward agreements, and provide leadership to the Pre-award staff. A minimum of eight years experience and a Bachelor's degree are required or appropriate combination of advanced degree and experience. A thorough understanding of OMB Circulars A-21, A-110, and A-133, NIH policies and procedures, the Bayh-Dole Act and the issues surrounding intellectual property are required. Supervisory experience is a must and the ability to communicate effectively is essential.

The Senior Grants Manager will provide assistance to the community in grant preparation and will be responsible for reviewing proposals, negotiating grant awards, and crafting subaward agreements. A Bachelor's degree with a minimum of five years experience in grants administration both federal and non-federal are required. The candidate must have a thorough understanding of OMB Circulars A-21, A-110, and A-133, NIH policies and procedures. A customer service attitude is essential as are excellent communication skills both verbal and written.

Please mail or fax your resume to: Office of Employee and Placement, Attn: PS-220, Thomas Jefferson University, 201 South 11th Street - Martin Building, Philadelphia, PA 19107. Fax: 215-503-4329. EOE. E-mail: patricia.starr@mail.tju.edu. Or apply online at http://employment.tju.edu.
DIRECTOR OF CLINICAL TRIALS AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS OFFICER
WINSHIP CANCER INSTITUTE - EMORY UNIVERSITY

Quick Leonard Kieffer International is actively engaged in the search for a Director of Clinical Trials at the Winship Cancer Institute – Emory University. Quick responses are appreciated. The research conducted at the WCI facilities includes basic, translational and clinical research projects. Research programs include Cancer Prevention, Oncology Clinical Research, Molecular Therapy, Immunology and Cancer Genetics. Membership of the WCI is made up of 300 Emory faculty members from a cross-section of disciplines.

FUNCTION: Collaborates with Administration in determining the strategic and tactical plan for the Clinical and Translational Research Unit (CTRU) and with setting institutional policies. Designs and implements systems to meet strategic objectives. Controls outcomes by monitoring, evaluating and adjusting activities of CTRU staff and allocation of other resources.

SCOPE: Impacts the conduct, approval, regulation, and financial aspects of all clinical, translational and population-based research done at the WCI.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY: Develops and manages yearly budget and is accountable for revenue streams resulting from the contracts with Industry Sponsors. This position reports to the Medical Director of the CTRU.

Interested and qualified candidates call Debra Spangler at Quick Leonard Kieffer Int’l. 312.876.9800 – dspangler@qlksearch.com - quick responses are appreciated.
GRANTS COORDINATOR

University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey (UMDNJ) – School of Health Related Professions (SHRP)
Newark, New Jersey

THE POSITION: Reports to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Research.

DUTIES: This individual will be responsible mainly for administering key functions in the pre-award area and working closely with SHRP researchers in the submission of federal and foundation grant applications. The successful candidate will assist faculty with: identifying appropriate funding sources, preparing budgets and budget justifications, proofing and editing text, preparing grant form pages (e.g., Face Page, Biosketch, Resources, Checklist), as well as compiling, formatting and tracking of applications through the internal approval process. Other duties will include serving as a resource person to SHRP’s Committee on Research, and as liaison to the University’s Office of Grants and Contracts, the Newark campus Institutional Review Board, and the Office of the VP for Research. The Grants Coordinator will be responsible for accurately tracking and reporting on grants by maintaining appropriate databases.

EDUCATION/EXPERIENCE: Bachelor’s degree (preferably in the Health Sciences) with 5 or more years of experience in pre-award grant administration. Master’s degree a plus.

SALARY: The position offers a competitive salary and excellent fringe benefits.

TO APPLY: Please send resume and cover letter to UMDNJ – School of Health Related Professions, Attention: Cherlyn Scantlebury, 65 Bergen Street, Room 163, P.O. Box 1709, Newark, NJ 07101-1709. Fax: 973-972-7403 or E-mail to scantlca@umdnj.edu.

UMDNJ is an AA/EEO employer.

Adventures in Research

Now part of ResearchResearch.com, the leading European publisher of research policy and funding information.

In addition to enhancements on the ScienceWise.com website, we are developing new institution-wide services - and you can see them first at the NCURA 44th Annual Meeting.

These new services will make the time-consuming task of finding funding opportunities much easier, not only for you, but for everyone in your organization with an interest in research.

Unique and valuable
As well as a comprehensive database of funding opportunities and the ability to set up customized email alerts, the new services include a wide range of other unique features and online tools designed to help you find and share material with your colleagues.

Authoritative and easy to use
We can now offer you an alternative to COS and Info-Ed that is up-to-date, comprehensive and easy to use - even by Principal Investigators. The user-friendly interface makes the services accessible to all - without the need for time-consuming training sessions.

See it for yourself
In addition to having a booth at the NCURA 44th Annual Meeting, we have organized on-site demonstrations of the services, and would like to invite you and your colleagues to these sessions.

The demonstrations will give you a clear overview of the new services, so you can see how beneficial they would be to your organization. We will show you all the features of the service and how they can be used by different kinds of people in their work. The demonstrations will also include an explanation of the service options and pricing.

Book your demonstration place TODAY
The demonstration places are limited and we are already receiving a lot of interest from NCURA members. To reserve your place now, simply email NCURADemo@ScienceWise.com and we will give you the dates and times of the demonstrations to choose from.

Alternatively, visit our booth during the conference to discuss your requirements and whether there are any demonstration vacancies.

If you are not attending the NCURA Annual Meeting, but would like more information on our new services, then please email us at Info@ScienceWise.com

An important announcement from ScienceWise

See our new institution-wide services at the NCURA Annual meeting

We look forward to hearing from you soon - and helping to make your job easier
UNIVERSITY of UTAH
Director, Office of Sponsored Projects

Position Summary: Responsible for pre- and post-administration of all projects funded by external sources, which exceeds 2200 proposals each year resulting in approximately 1300 awards with a value of $260 million. Must ensure awards are properly channeled so significant indirect cost dollars and intellectual property are not lost. Must stay current with project activity and maintain communication with university departments and federal agencies. Assists in formulating new policies or changes in existing ones that impact sponsored project activities. Responsibility encompasses the day-to-day operation of the office; has authority to make hire/fire/salary decisions for staff, take disciplinary actions, and determine the allocation of office funds. Reports directly to the vice president for research.

Qualifications: A bachelor's degree in accounting, business administration or related field and eight years of increasingly responsible experience in an office for research, sponsored projects or equivalency is required. A master's degree and experience at the director's level in an office of sponsored research are preferred. Knowledge of sponsored research policies and initiatives is preferred. Must have demonstrated human relations and communication skills. A commitment to provide excellent customer service is required. Must be computer literate and committed to the concept of a paperless office by utilizing electronic submission of proposals, applications and other documents.

Contact: Human Resources www.med.utah.edu/hr Job #WH 11253.


Grant Administrator® 5.0

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

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

Licenses for Single-Workstations and Networks available, as well as Site Licenses Custom packages to integrate data from other systems also available. Please call or visit our website at www.Dyna-Quest.com for full details, customer testimonials, and a free demo program.

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

Dyna-Quest Technologies, Inc.
### NCURA 2002/2003 Calendar of Education and Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 3, 2002</td>
<td>Workshop 2002 Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 3-6, 2002</td>
<td>44th Annual M meeting Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 20 - 22, 2003</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 20 - 22, 2003</td>
<td>Sponsored Programs Administration Workshop: Level II San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3 - 5, 2003</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration Orlando, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3 - 5, 2003</td>
<td>Sponsored Projects Administration: Level II Orlando, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 16 - 18, 2003</td>
<td>Financial Research Administration (FRA) IV New Orleans, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 4, 2003</td>
<td>NCURA 2003 Video Workshop Series Part II of a IV Part Series Sub-awards Broadcast live from Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 10 - 12, 2003</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration Charleston, SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 10 - 12, 2003</td>
<td>Sponsored Programs Administration Workshop: Level II Charleston, SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 24, 2003</td>
<td>NCURA 2003 Video Workshop Series Part III of a IV Part Series Awards: Cradle to Grave Broadcast live from Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEWSLETTER DEADLINES:**

- **December 2002/January 2003 Issue**
  - Submission of Articles: December 6, 2002
  - Space Reservation for Ads: December 6, 2002
  - Submission of Display Ads: December 13, 2002

---

**MILESTONES**

**JOHN KAVANAUGH,** Director of the Office of Grants and Contracts at Dartmouth College has announced his retirement effective November 1, 2002. John has served as Director at Dartmouth for 23 years, has been a member of NCURA since 1975, and is both a former Chair of Region I and a recipient of that region’s award for meritorious service.

**NANCY WRAY,** Senior Associate Director at Dartmouth, has been appointed as Director effective November 1. In addition to Nancy’s promotion, the office will be changing its name to the Office of Sponsored Programs on this date. We wish both of you the best.

**PAMELA WEBB,** Director, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, Chicago Campus, Northwestern University has accepted the position of Senior Director for Sponsored Research and Director, Office of Research Administration at Stanford University. This position is effective on November 14. Pamela will undoubtedly excel in her new position.

**JOAN MORETTI** is serving as the Director of Finance for the Center for Integration of Medicine and Innovative Technology (CIMIT) within the Partners HealthCare System. The founding members include Massachusetts General (MGH) and Brigham and Women’s Hospitals, M IT, and the Charles Stark Draper Laboratory. CIMIT’s mission is “to improve patient care by bringing together scientists, engineers and clinicians to catalyze development of innovative technology, emphasizing minimally invasive diagnosis and therapy”. JoAnn has been serving in this capacity since January 1, 2002.

**MILDRED OFOSU** has taken the position of Assistant Vice President for Sponsored Programs and Research at Morgan State University. Mildred previously served as the Assistant Provost for Research and Director of Sponsored Programs at Delaware State University.

**PAT HAWK,** previously Sponsored Projects Administrator at the Office of Research Services Administration at the University of Oregon has been named Assistant Director, Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, at Oregon Health Sciences University. Congratulations, Pat!

**RAYMOND RIZNYK** has moved from Central Washington University to California State University, Dominguez Hills, where he has accepted a position of Director of Research and Sponsored Projects. In his new position, Ray is chiefly responsible for assisting faculty and staff in proposal development and submission.

**JOYCE FREEDMAN,** formerly Director of the Sponsored Projects Office for the University of California at Berkeley, will be assuming a new role as Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research Administration and Compliance for the Berkeley Campus. In addition to her current responsibilities for sponsored projects, and for coordinating the activities of the Conflict of Interest Committee and the visiting scholar and postdoc program, Joyce will now also serve as the primary point person attending to research compliance issues for the Berkeley campus. Congratulations on your promotion!

---

**Best Wishes to all of you!**
NCURA’s very own band, the Soul Source and the No-cost Extensions has just cut its very first CD. Out of Compliance is being released under the “NCURA label” and will go on sale at the 44th Annual Meeting.

The Soul Source first appeared on NCURA’s Annual Meeting stage in 1990 and proved, once again, what we have all known for a very long time – Research Administrators are talented! Having stayed together for 12 years (how many other rock bands can say that?) also proves that NCURA members have stamina and great taste in bands.

Bandleader, Steve Smartt (Vanderbilt University) is excited about the group’s first release, “The NCURA party is always a memorable event and the chemistry between the band and the people on the dance floor is what makes it work. The live recording from last November gave us plenty of good material to capture that party groove onto a CD. We pretty much filled this disk to capacity with 19 tunes, which is almost twice the industry standard. Everybody in the band gets a chance to shine. Anyone who’s enjoyed an NCURA party will be able to relive some of that excitement by popping this disk into their CD player. Some NCURA friends have asked if the band can play at their regional meeting. That’s not possible, of course, but now this CD allows them to take a little bit of Soul Source home with them or to NCURA regional events.”

**Songs in Out of Compliance include:*** Takin Care of Business; China Grove; Feelin’ All Right; Shout; Get Down Tonight; Shout; and last year’s hit song, I’ve Got your F&A Right Here.

**Band members to listen for are:*** Tara Bishop, NCURA; Milton Cole, Villanova University; Timothy Conlon, University of Virginia; Jerry Fife, Vanderbilt University; Scot Gudger, Oregon Health & Sciences University; Spanky McCallister, University of Arkansas at Little Rock; Garry Sanders, University at Albany, SUNY; Steve Smartt, Vanderbilt University; and Stephen Williams, Wake Forest University.

Stop by the NCURA Store at this year’s Annual Meeting for a copy or go on-line to the NCURA Bookstore at www.ncura.edu.