From the New Editors

As our editorial reign commences, we are humbled by the work of our predecessors. Under the leadership of the past editors and the National Office staff the newsletter has become a very effective means of information dissemination. While living up to this established standard will be challenging, we are both excited to have the opportunity to guide the content of the newsletter for the next three years.

While we harbor no grand plans to muddle with past success, we will, however, take this opportunity to increase the number of contributing editors with the intention of expanding the breadth of the newsletter and addressing the ever increasing diversification of the NCURA membership. We have added a Compliance Corner to be led by Richard Miller (Texas A&M University) and a University/Industry Partnership Corner to be led by Connie Armentrout (Monsanto Corporation). The Financial Corner has been tweaked with its focus shifting from NCURA's finances to issues related to the financial administration of sponsored projects. For this, we welcome Marilyn Surbey (Emory University) as our contributing editor. We are excited about the addition of these Corners and we feel quite fortunate that we have a

continued on page 7

New Select Agent Rules Will Be Costly for Research Universities

by Peter A. Reinhardt

With 2003 comes still another federal law to regulate select agents—microbes and toxins that are at risk of being used for terrorism. Following last June's passage of the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act, the U.S. Departments of Agriculture (USDA) and Health and Human Services (HHS) published interim final rules on December 13, 2002.

For HHS, the new Part 73 replaces and greatly expands the select agent sections of Part 72 of Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The USDA rules regulate plant pathogens and high consequence livestock pathogens and toxins. Some agents are regulated by both USDA and HHS. These are called "overlap" agents, but institutions need to comply only with one set of rules.

continued on page 12

University/Industry 2003: Enhancing the Partnership in a Global Economy

August 17-19, 2003 • San Francisco, CA

By John Carfora, Boston College, US University Chair; Susan Batts, Dow Chemical, Industry Chair; Stephen Jerema, Dublin Institute of Technology, International University Chair

The 2003 University/Industry Conference is taking the strong start we made in 2002 and moving it to the next level... and we'll look forward to you joining us! Conference attendees will have an opportunity to enjoy an outstanding program in beautiful San Francisco.

Since many of our faculty are already working with or aspire to work with colleagues and companies outside the USA, adding the international component to the conference is a natural progression as we strive to expand the knowledge base of research collaborations.

The conference starts on Sunday with an expanded set of workshops, including a "special team" from the Center for Corporate Citizenship that will be offering a highly regarded workshop on strategies for enhancing communications between industry and universities. Other workshops will cover ITAR and export regulation, conflict-of-interest, and industry/university contract negotiations. Our distinguished faculty will include professionals from the university and industry communities.

Monday and Tuesday will be two full days of interactive sessions and networking opportunities, beginning with understanding cultural differences that surface in creating a university/industry partnership. Understanding the differences in missions and metrics is key and will be addressed to set the stage. We will then break into groups to explore the issues of background intellectual property, import/export regulations and the US government reaction, intellectual property control and differences in flexibility.

Monday continues with an examination of the many different types of partnership vehicles that exist and how they are working and how they might work better. It is followed by another working group session to explore in detail the partnership vehicles identified.

continued on page 3
Honoring Our Federal Partners

by Bob Killoren, NCURA President

The Government-University Partnership is critical to the advancement of research and education in our country. Those of us who work in universities day in and day out at the point of this interface know how important our federal partners are to research. This relationship involves not only a specific grant, or even a particular university, but also affects all universities and federal agencies. For instance, the expanded authorities we enjoy as institutions under OMB Circular A-110 evolved because of the receptivity, concern, expertise and foresight of a number of federal employees who were willing to listen to and work with the university research administrators to improve and streamline processes. This relationship is continuing into other areas such as eRA. It is through this interaction occurring again and again that good things happen - both great and small.

NCURA wants to recognize our federal partners who work so hard at fostering and maintaining this Government-University relationship. Thus, at the January 2003 meeting, the NCURA Board of Directors established the annual Joseph F. Carrabino Award that will be awarded to a federal employee who has made a significant contribution to research administration, either through a singular innovation or by a lifetime of service.

The naming of this award was a great personal satisfaction for me. Joe Carrabino was a grants officer at the National Science Foundation during my formative years in research administration. Back when I was still learning the ropes, he arranged an administrative internship at NSF for me - an invaluable experience that has helped shape my career. He was a mentor and a friend to me and many, many other university research administrators.

Joe not only affected the lives of many individual research administrators, but he was also a motivating force at the NSF for many years, working on improving the Government-University Partnership. Often his work was done quietly behind the scenes - he did not care who got the credit as long as good things happened. Many of the standards we enjoy today are the result of Joe’s efforts.

Joe Carrabino’s career and contributions embody the ideal of this Award.

My friend and colleague passed away in December of 1989, just shortly after retiring from the NSF. His loss is still felt by many of us. I am so pleased that what he accomplished in his lifetime, while working at the National Science Foundation, will live on in this award - recognizing anew the contributions of those, who like him, so positively impact research administration and the Government-University Partnership.

The Nomination and Leadership Development Committee of NCURA will be establishing procedures for nominations and awardee selection. You will be hearing more about this later in future newsletters.

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

NCURA Leadership Development Institute - Selection of Inaugural Class Announced

by Garrett Sanders and Kathleen Larmett

When NCURA developed its first Strategic Plan in September 1998, one strategy in the five-year plan was to develop more leadership programs. Following Board approval at its November 2001 meeting, the NCURA Leadership Development Institute moved from strategy to reality.

A Board Working Group, chaired by Garry Sanders, Ordway Research Institute; Joyce Freedman, University of California at Berkeley; Cynthia White, Washington University in St. Louis; and NCURA Executive Director, Kathleen Larmett, took the recommendations begun by the 2000 Nominating and Leadership Development Committee and enhanced by the 2001 committee, and brought them to life.

A special reception was held at the 2002 Annual Meeting to announce the Institute and, after the meeting, a call for applications was sent to the full membership. Applicants were required to submit a letter of support from their institution and an essay describing how the LDI would enhance their individual and professional development, as well as contribute positively to the future goals of NCURA and their home institution. Other areas considered were other professional and community service, as well as service to NCURA.

A Selection Committee composed of the Board Working Group and three of NCURA’s 2002 Distinguished Service Award recipients, Christina Hansen, University of California-Irvine, Andrew Rudzynski, The University of Pennsylvania and Steven Smartt of Vanderbilt, along with past president, Cheryl-Lee Howard, of The Johns Hopkins University, met on January 31st and selected the LDI Class of 2003. The committee is pleased to announce their selection:

Diane Barrett, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Jennifer Barron, The Johns Hopkins University; Joe Bezerra, California State University, Fresno; Dawn Boatman, University of North Florida; Wayne Brown, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey; Dwight Davis, Baylor College of Medicine; Stacey Donnelly, Whitehead Institute for Biomedical Research; Kenneth Felthouse, Arizona State University; Thomas LeBlanc, California State University, Chico; Susan Leitzel, The Pennsylvania State University; Drew Memmott, Columbia University; Vickie Monta, Harvard Medical School; Melody Page, The University of Texas, M.D. Anderson Cancer Center; Jerry Pogatshnik, Southern Illinois at Edwardsville, M aggie Pyle, University of South Alabama; Lillie Ryans-Culclager, Stanford University; and Deborah Smith, University of Tennessee Health Science Center.

All participants will be assigned a mentor, and will be given on-going class assignments by faculty, Annette Petrick and Gordon Banks before attending a two-day workshop on June 20-21, 2003, at the Hilton Key West Resort and Marina in Key West, Florida. Class assignments will continue until they gather again, for a half-day workshop at this year’s Annual Meeting. While travel costs must be covered by the participant’s institution, additional expenses including lodging, meals, books, and instructors fees are covered by NCURA. Both NCURA and the participant institutions see the expense of participation as a very worthwhile investment in their future.

As one supervisor stated, “He has great potential for leadership both on campus and through NCURA. It will benefit us all if he has this opportunity to gain additional background and experience in leadership.”

The inaugural class will be introduced at this year’s Annual Meeting, November 2-5, 2003, and will host this year’s LDI Information Reception, just prior to the Tuesday evening “annual gathering.” If you would like information on NCURA’s Leadership Development Institute, be sure to attend this reception, or contact Kathleen Larmett at larmett@ncura.edu or 202-466-3894.

Garry Sanders is on the NCURA Board of Directors and serves as the Director, Office for Sponsored Research, Ordway Research Institute, Inc and Kathleen Larmett is the Executive Director of NCURA.
“Let the Planning Begin”
by Patrick Fitzgerald

Believe it or not, we are just (nine) months away from NCURA’s Annual Meeting for 2003. Rest assured, the planning process is well underway and another outstanding meeting is in the works. Actually, planning for the NCURA annual meeting never really ends and the close of the 2002 Annual Meeting marked the beginning of the planning cycle for Annual Meeting 2003. As the curtain was being drawn on the 2002 Annual Meeting, the NCURA staff was hard at work compiling data from the 600 on-line meeting evaluations. Next, the program committee was formed and summaries of the meeting and workshop evaluations were sent to each member for review. On January 24th, Kathy Larmett and Tara Bishop facilitated a very productive planning meeting that produced an outline of the 2003 program. I’m pleased to report that the committee is making great progress and I am confident that this year’s annual meeting will be the best ever!

This year marks NCURA 45th anniversary and to commemorate this important milestone an outstanding program committee has been assembled. The committee is currently hard at work planning an exemplary program with something for all NCURA members. While the Co-Chairs for this year’s meeting are Region I members, Barbara Cole from Boston University and Vivian Holmes from Harvard Medical School, other members on the program committee are representative of each of NCURA’s regions. Workshop coordinators for Annual Meeting 2003 are “veteran” planners Denise Clark from Cornell University and Tommy Coggins from the University of South Carolina.

At this year’s meeting we will be “exploring our Neighborhoods.” The 2003 program will be organized around tracks representing each of our six NCURA Neighborhoods: Pre-Award, Financial Research Administration (FRA), Privacy, Executive Research Administration (eRA), Compliance, Primarily Undergraduate Institutions (PUI), and Departmental Administration. We will also have a track devoted to professional development and personal improvement. And of course there ample attention will be paid to networking opportunities, entertainment, and a celebration 45 years of building the NCURA community and promoting excellence in research administration. The meeting dates are November 2-5, 2003. Please mark these dates on your calendars and plan to join us for a memorable event in NCURA history—Annual Meeting 2003.

Program Committee for Annual Meeting 2003

NCURA Vice President:
Patrick Fitzgerald, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Conference Co Chairs:
Barbara Cole, Boston University
Vivian Holmes, Harvard Medical School

Workshop Coordinators:
Denise Clark, Cornell University
Thomas Coggins, University of South Carolina

Concurrent Session Coordinators:
Judy Fredenberg, University of Montana
Michelle D. Christy, Princeton University
Thomas Roberts, Florida Gulf Coast University
Shereyll M. Ills Englander, University of California, Santa Barbara
Deborah Galloway, University of Cincinnati
Sara Streich, Rush-Presbyterian-St. Luke’s Medical Center
Ken Forstmeier, Pennsylvania State University
Brian Farmer, University of Idaho
Megan Columbus, National Institutes of Health
Laura Yaeger, Huron Consulting Group
Bregeta Jefferson, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Bobby McQuiston, University of Texas at Austin

Pat Fitzgerald is the Vice President, President-elect of NCURA and serves as the Director of Cost Analysis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

University/Industry 2003 continued

Since the working groups will each be looking at different facets of a topic, important perspectives and results from all groups will be shared with conference attendees.

Tuesday will begin with a well-conceived plenary session utilizing a Case Study examination of an international project, complete with intra-company and intra-university conflicts. This approach will help bring into focus conflict of interest issues that bedevil us all.

Tuesday continues with concurrent sessions addressing a number of themes. For example: Do universities and industry wish to collaborate or compete? Why Startups fail and succeed and what constitutes success/failure? How many succeed and how many fail? Fiscal issues will also be addressed, and how an office of sponsored projects and industry identify opportunities will be evaluated. And that’s all before lunch!

The afternoon sessions will include: transfer of technology rights vs. technology transfer; conflict of interest relating to university business interest vs. university research interest; US and European IP: divided by a common language; partnerships in the biotech and pharmaceutical industries; organizing, managing, commercializing international projects; and best practices in tech transfer. We also look forward to a strong closing/wrap-up session to help us put all of this information into context and perspective.

In addition to a number of engaging, interactive sessions, the NCURA program committee is very excited to have as partners the Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM), Institute for Industrial Research, Inc. (IRI), and the National Association of College and University Attorneys (NACUA). We have all worked together to bring to you this exciting program.

We’ll have an opportunity to get together each evening when the sessions end and before you go out to enjoy beautiful San Francisco. With a great location, a strong program and representation from the many facets of the university/industry partnership, we look forward to bringing you this important conference.

Please feel free to contact us if you have questions and suggestions, or would like to get involved. See you in San Francisco!

Program Committee

U.S. University Chair
John Carfora, Boston College

Industry Chair
Susan Butts, The Dow Chemical Company

International Chair
Steve Jerrams, Dublin Institute of Technology

Program Committee:
James Casey, Bradley University
Kathleen Irwin, University of Wisconsin - Madison
Ravi Kiron, Pfizer Global R & D
Tanna Pugh, Pennsylvania State University
Tyler Thompson, The Dow Chemical Company

John Michael Carfora, US University Chair serves as the Director, Office for Sponsored Programs for Boston College; Susan Butts, Industry Chair, serves as the Director of External Technology for Dow Chemical Company; and Stephen Jerrams, International University Chair, serves as the Head of Research for the Dublin Institute of Technology.
SCIENTIFIC OPENNESS AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Throughout our history, the United States has benefited greatly from an influx of foreign-born scientists whose talents have driven many of our advances in scientific research and technological development. Through most of the 20th Century, scientists from Western Europe helped lay the foundation for our global leadership in modern science. More recently, immigrants from other parts of the world - most notably China, India, and Southeast Asia - have joined our research institutions and many are now leaders of universities and technology-based industries. Many others have returned to take leadership positions in their home countries, and now are among the best ambassadors that our country has abroad. In addition, according to the National Academies, about half of the graduate students currently enrolled in the physical sciences and engineering at U.S. universities come from other nations. These foreign students are essential for much of the federally funded research carried out at academic laboratories.

Recent efforts by our government to constrain the flow of international visitors in the name of national security are having serious unintended consequences for American science, engineering, and medicine. The National Academies has collected information that shows that ongoing research collaborations have been hampered; that outstanding young scientists, engineers, and health researchers have been prevented from or delayed in entering this country; that important international conferences have been canceled or negatively impacted; and that such conferences will be moved out of the United States in the future if the situation is not corrected.

On another front, the concern regarding how to protect potentially "sensitive" research information and publications has intensified. I described in my September 2002 Capital View article that the White House Office of Homeland Security has 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. In the absence of any further clarification, universities continue to receive research awards containing a range of contract and grant clauses that, in one way or another, attempt to control the sharing and release of research results, and the involvement of foreign scientists.

At a January 2003 National Academies conference on this issue, some progress was made in bringing together policy makers from the government and research community to address these issues. It was reassuring to hear the President's Science Advisor and others in the Administration reaffirm the general principles in National Security Directive-189, that federally funded basic and applied research conducted at universities should be unrestricted, and that the only method to protect research results considered critical to national security was classification. Nevertheless, it was clear from the discussions that some mechanism was needed to review research results with the potential for harm as well as good, and to their credit the federal officials challenged the research community to help devise such a mechanism. To paraphrase a statement by the OSTP Assistant Director for Homeland and National Security, Congress and/or the federal government will act alone if necessary, and the result will likely be onerous and largely ineffective.

The National Academies has since formed a joint effort with the Center for Strategic International Studies to develop criteria for evaluating and defining sensitive research information. In addition, the major scientific journals have announced new editorial policies on identifying, and deciding whether to publish, potentially sensitive research articles.

For research administrators who have to deal with restrictive contract clauses, there has been some recent success. The Army Research Laboratory has recently agreed to revert to using contract clauses that provide for the ability to confer and consult on publications, rather than demanding approval authority for all publications. We can take this as a hopeful sign, but another less comforting indicator, disclosed by the Information Security Oversight Office, is that since February 2000, there has been a 44% increase in the number of documents classified by the government.

Also, we clearly have some educating to do with some federal officials and those advising them, based on recent statements. The Executive Director of the President’s Homeland Security Advisory Council has stated “we’d like to know if someone from a certain country changed graduate programs from English literature to nuclear physics.” That statement shows a lack of understanding of the responsibility of the university community to engage with federal officials to alleviate such concerns where possible, and help devise policies on international collaborations and access to research results that are consistent with the twin goals of maintaining the health of science and technology in the United States and protecting our nation’s security.

Tony DeCrappeo is the Associate Director, Council on Governmental Relations (COGR).
Cost Sharing Update from NSF: A Little History

by Joanna Rom

In the July/August 1999 issue of the NCURA Newsletter, NSF shared information about major cost-sharing policy changes made by the National Science Board (NSB) earlier that year. Key changes included making NSF-required cost sharing an eligibility, rather than a review criterion that had to be explicitly stated in solicitations. Under this change, cost sharing could only apply when there is a “tangible benefit” to the awardee. Another key change was a set of tighter ground rules for award budget negotiations, including explicit institutional involvement in the documentation of the impact of budget reductions.

WHAT’S NEW?

Since that time, NSF has implemented those changes and the NCURA community has felt the impact. In many cases, the experiences with the 1999 changes have been positive. Having explicit requirements in solicitations where cost sharing is required does take away a lot of the guesswork and campus in-fighting over how much cost-sharing is sufficient when a solicitation is vague. Requiring documentation on the impact of reductions from requested funding amounts has proved useful, at least to an extent. And NSF’s “transparent” policies received endorsement in the National Science and Technology Council’s (NSTC) Committee on Science’s report, “Implementing the NSTC Presidential Review Directive-4: Renewing the Federal Government-University Research Partnership for the 21st Century,” (link: Taking Steps to Strengthen Our Research Partnership with American Universities) and implementation via Executive Order 13185 of December 28, 2000 [http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=2001_register&docid=fr03ja01-85.pdf]

While these publications were issued during the previous Administration, the current OSTP Director, Dr. John Marburger, endorsed the concepts expressed in the report at the Federal Demonstration Partnership Phase IV kick off meeting in September 2002 and the Committee on Science will be continuing with this effort.

Nevertheless, despite strong support for the general principles determined by the NSB, lessons learned since implementation have revealed that this is an opportunity for improving and refining NSF’s actual practices. In particular, there were continued disputes on the nuances of cost sharing “negotiations,” pressure on limited resources at grantee institutions and questions about how best to define “tangible benefit.” In addition, audits by the Office of the Inspector General had resulted in findings that highlighted grantee cost sharing tracking and documentation as a management challenge for NSF.

These various issues were discussed with the National Science Board's Committee on Audit and Oversight at several meetings in 2002. It was clear that there were concerns about the opportunity costs that diverting funds to meet cost sharing requirements represented. It was also clear that “voluntary” cost sharing was still popping up on Line M, confusing reviewers and distorting the playing field. And further, it was evident that budget negotiations were still generating the perception of pressure on institutions to cost share, even when no formal requirement existed. As a result, at their November 2002 meeting, the NSB approved some modifications to the 1999 policy in an attempt to tighten up the implementation of the policy even more. Under the revised policy, budgets reduced by 10% or more must be accompanied by an explicit reduction in scope – the option of agreement of doing the same with less is “off the table.” The Board also requested from NSF an additional study of key cost sharing issues, including the application of the “tangible benefit” standard and cost sharing solicitation requirements that reduced negotiated indirect cost rates. NSF staff will be working on this review and reporting back to the NSB later this year. The policy and its impact and effectiveness will be periodically re-assessed by NSF and the Board in the next few years.


The changes reflect the tighter budget negotiation documentation requirement, the plans to mask Line M from reviewer scrutiny and the commitment to a more rigorous implementation of the tangible benefit standard.

In addition to the content of the Important Notice and FAQs, it goes without saying that audit findings mean that special attention still needs to be given to accurate and auditable documentation of cost sharing commitments. If it’s in “line M” it’s on the audit radar screen. This is nothing new, the requirements haven’t changed, but for those of you who attended the NCURA Annual Meeting sessions [and for those of you who didn’t see http://www.ncura.edu/conferences/44/presentations/CostSharing.ppt] note that this is serious audit territory.

THERE’S STILL WORK TO DO—HOW YOU CAN HELP

As noted above, there are still outstanding issues under review. And, with the changes, effective this April, there will still be a learning curve, particularly for Program Officers and Principal Investigators. It’s important that we get your feedback, both to assess the impacts of the changes and remedy situations with non-compliance. If you run into a non-compliance cost-sharing negotiation situation with a particular NSF program, please forward a message to costsharing@nsf.gov with the details. Run, don’t walk-- it is critical to do this-- we cannot address a situation we don’t know about. (And we do so discreetly).

If you have questions or suggestions about the policy and procedures, please contact policy@nsf.gov.

THE BOTTOM LINE

We are trying to make progress in clarifying cost sharing requirements, adding more discipline to policy implementation, and reducing its negative impact on our academic partners. We know we can do more, and we want to, but we need your help. Like all complex policies, it requires that we experiment and learn more about its impact and effectiveness. Above all we want this policy to be fair and to be clear. We want the result to be effective and efficient research support. That’s the real bottom line.

Joanna Rom serves as the Deputy Director - Planning, Coordination and Analysis, Office of Budget, Finance and Award Management, National Science Foundation.
A s universities take on the role of the prime contractor or primary recipient they often assume the task of awarding contracts to one or more subrecipients. They assume the responsibility that the awarding agency or sponsor normally has when it provides grants and contracts to the prime.

Historically, many universities have complained about the contractual terms and the perceived constraints imposed upon them by the awarding agency. Today some universities are declining contracts with federal agencies because of the unacceptable constraints and terms that might violate state regulations or interfere with academic freedoms. However, when the shoe is placed on the other foot, universities often create incredibly bureaucratic regulations and controls on their subrecipients.

Issues arise between universities mostly because the subrecipient university is not organized in the same manner as the prime, is new to preparing a subcontract or is not as well staffed as the prime. These issues may result in delays in the processing of subcontracts or may result in extensive negotiations concerning the terms and conditions contained in the subcontract. These issues cause conflict and arise more frequently when subcontracts are let between a research-intensive university with multiple subcontracts and a less research-intensive university with limited subcontracts. Many of these conflicts can be quickly resolved if university administrators would simply ask themselves one question: how would my university react if the contract being created for the subrecipient was handed to me for signature?

It should not surprise us if a less experienced subrecipient has neglected to consider IRB or IACUC review for their portion of the project. Conflict of interest policies also continue to elude many universities, particularly institutional conflict of interest. These issues are easily neglected by a less experienced subrecipient. We should not expect to encounter the same level of experience at every university. We should exercise patience and in the “NCURA way” offer advice and samples of subcontracts for adoption by the other university.

A fundamental safeguard to ensure that critical compliance issues are not overlooked at universities involves the use of the “internal approval routing form.” This form requires university officials to approve the technical, budgetary, and compliance elements of a proposal being submitted to a funding agency. These routing forms are attached to proposals, either electronically or using paper. The routing form can be used as a tool for thought to encourage the principal investigator/project manager and others signing the -form to consider item-by-item whether or not compliance issues are being met. Suggesting that subrecipients utilize an appropriate routing form may be the first step in eliminating problems that seem to arise during contract negotiations.

Monitoring subrecipients is critical to the financial and data integrity of the research enterprise. Financial monitoring is required on federal awards when awarding a subcontract. This requirement can be time consuming and burdensome on the awarding institution. Often less experienced universities have trouble in submitting to the awarding institution the necessary documentation to support the requested payment of funds, primarily because they have not been told what the awarding institution considers appropriate documentation. When the awarding institution refuses to pay the subcontractor, feelings of animosity can arise between the institutions. This can be avoided by inserting simple language into the subcontract that explains what is considered appropriate documentation acceptable to the awarding institution.

Another area of concern arises in the monitoring of subrecipient audit findings. It is not clear, how universities, especially institutions not well funded, are to monitor the financial audit findings of subrecipients without incurring incredible costs to the institution. A-133 audits are required by the Federal government for subrecipients who have expenditures of federal funds in excess of $300,000. (This may change soon to a $500,000 threshold). Rather than actually requiring a copy of an annual audit of the subrecipient, it has been found more efficient and effective to only require a certification from the subrecipient that an appropriate audit has been performed and no material findings exist. This limits paper accumulation and filing. If, however, findings do exist, a more comprehensive review and assurances from the subrecipient are indicated and should be carried out by the awarding university.

Technical supervision of subrecipients should also be considered and should have a detectable presence. This does not mean that the Principal Investigator from the awarding university has to visit the subrecipient’s campus. Adequate instructions and a well-crafted statement-of-work can suffice but this needs to be in the formal contractual paperwork issued by the leading institution to ensure that the subrecipient has accepted and is fully aware of the technical terms and conditions.

Yet as much as we may want to avoid visiting a subrecipient, there may be situations that dictate close on-site monitoring. As a rule of thumb, it is considered wise for research administrators to make a physical visit to subrecipients who have large subcontracts or where the project has high visibility or is, for example, of substantial interest to Congress. These trips should be carried out as a review and not look like an audit.

In summary, craft a contract that you would be willing to sign and encourage the use of an internal routing form for the subrecipient review of the contract, including a list of compliance areas to be considered. Closely monitor subcontracts that are high dollar or high visibility projects and use the certification method to satisfy the A-133 audit requirements.

Some additional comments on this subject are available in Techniques for Monitoring Federal Subawards from Thompson Publishing Group or a Guide to Managing Federal Grants for Colleges and Universities, Julie T. Norris and Jane A. Youngers, published by NACUBO and NCURA.

Richard E. Miller serves as the Director, Federal Compliance, Texas Engineering Experiment Station, Texas A&M Univ System.
The Critical Roles of Central and Department Administrators in Compliance.

On February 4, 2003, NCURA presented an on-line discussion as a prequel to the FRA IV conference in New Orleans. The speakers for the session were Ann Holmes and Dan Ramia from the University of Maryland. The discussions centered on what universities were doing to ensure they were complying with Federal regulations. The hot topics of discussion were documenting cost sharing, managing cost transfers, and training programs available for university research administrators.

Dan directed the participants to his departmental website http://www.agnr.umd.edu/fiscaloffice/forms to view a “cost sharing worksheet” which his departmental administrators use to calculate cost sharing commitments. Dan stated that the work sheet assists in ensuring that principal investigators include all of the costs associated with commitments of a researcher’s time, namely fringe benefits and the related facilities and administrative costs. Some of the participants in the session mentioned that they require separate cost sharing accounts for each commitment.

Cost transfers and procurement card transactions were another area of concern addressed in the sessions. The participants discussed methods for reviewing these transfers and controlling the use of procurement cards on sponsored awards. Cornell mentioned they recently put a new cost transfer policy in place and are cautiously waiting feedback from the university community.

Training departmental administrators was the major topic of the discussion. University of Maryland discussed its training programs and all the participants agreed that training was critical to compliance. It was recommended that universities that do not have training programs look to those that do for ideas and materials.

Ann Holmes serves as the Assistant Comptroller for the University of Maryland, College Park.

The NCURA community is great about sharing training ideas and presentations. I hope that you look to your NCURA colleagues to assist you with initiating training for your institutional administrators.

From the New Editors (continued from the cover)
very talented base of existing contributing editors from which to draw. Our goal is to simply provide the readership with a newsletter that can offer something for everyone. As the membership grows so too does the diversity of the readership. We aim to promote the publication of articles that the members will find informative and occasionally entertaining. While hot topics will always be front page news, we may occasionally dedicate a newsletter to a specific topic area. We encourage members to share ideas concerning the newsletter or to forward topics that you wish for us to cover. The newsletter owes its existence to the membership, and we owe the membership the best and most informative articles that we can deliver. We are honored to have the opportunity to serve the membership in this capacity and look forward to the challenge of maintaining the quality of the newsletter.

You may contact us by email at editors@ncura.edu.

Marianne Rinaldo Woods is the Assistant Vice President for Research and Director, Office of Research, University of Texas at Arlington.

Dave Richardson is the Director of Sponsored Programs, Virginia Tech.
I never thought I would do it but after some twenty-two years in the academic setting, I jumped the fence. Going to the “dark side” (or as I like to put it, the side with the money) has been an exciting experience. Before making the move, I thought that I had an idea of the work that took place behind the scenes before industry would or could fund an academic research program (or license in an invention or set of technologies) but was mistaken. For some companies, there is a tremendous amount of work that goes into making the decision to fund the project then in monitoring that funding. I hope to share some of my newly acquired insight with you in the next few paragraphs.

After conducting industry negotiations with both small and large companies, it is easy to recognize the differences. Small companies are in a better position to move quickly, providing rapid response to drafts, questions, and suggestions. Many times you are negotiating directly with the person that can make the final decisions. With large companies, the company may require a bit of time to review any drafts, questions, and/or suggestions but will expect quick turnaround from the university.

For many companies much thought goes into their quarterly “spend”, and for most companies budgets have become tighter in the last few years due to tough economic conditions. The overall budget available to fund research programs, options and/or licenses to external technologies, and payment of any associated patent expenses may be reviewed as frequently as weekly. Rarely are these budgets increased as the year goes along but many can suffer from major reductions either due to budget cuts or the completion of a particular technology or research program that requires a significant expenditure of that year’s budget. In other words, since many units may pull from the same source of funding, at any given time the budget could be cut by more than half.

Large companies have more units (or individual sectors) than the university does (or at least as many!). Their structures can become more confusing than that of the university. Much time and effort goes into communication and coordination between the groups but the fact remains that there is great competition within the company if there is only one pot of funds to use for these types of expenditures. In most cases, the amount of a research program isn’t entered into the budget as a “fixed cost” until the agreement is fully executed. If contract negotiations are stalled or, for whatever reason, are stretched out over a long period of time, there is a good (actually more than “good”) chance that the money that has yet to be earmarked as a “fixed cost” may be taken for another project. Although I feel that these agreements should be negotiated carefully based on the individual program’s merits, it is a good idea to keep these negotiations in the forefront of your activities. As industry funding becomes more important in the university’s overall research funding growth and the economy forces more belt-tightening for both large and small companies, the good will and lasting relationship established by timely negotiation becomes very important for both parties. Bottom line, your industrial funding is not a “done deal” until the day that it is fully executed by both parties.

Companies’ fiscal years are very real. Anything unspent by year-end goes into the profit line or to help offset some other expenditure. Any new additions to the profit line at year-end are important. If your counterpart says that the money is only available until that company’s year-end, it is not just an intimidation tactic to move negotiations along. Almost always, your counterpart knows that if the agreement is not fully executed in time to be processed for payment by year-end, the money will not automatically be available in the next year. When your counterpart tells you that the final execution of the research agreement remains subject to the funds still being available, chances are the money could disappear at any time.

Another real situation is the continuing reorganization that companies both large and small must go through to remain competitive. At any time during negotiations, an entire research unit may be disbanded for whatever reason. If that happens to your company champion your research program stands a good chance of no longer being a priority for the company. Again, timing can be everything or result in nothing.

In closing, I offer that you should review the research program on its merits to facilitate successful negotiations. Was the research program initiated by the university or the industry partner? Does your research require industry confidential information or technology to complete a program that was initiated by the university? Consider these different scenarios during your review and redrafting efforts. Make sure that you capture everything that should be addressed as quickly as you can. Work steadily toward your goal of an agreement that works for both sides of the negotiations. Don’t let up until the agreement is fully executed. I know from experience that your industry counterpart does not like to make the phone call saying that the funding for the program has been redirected in mid-stream. It is a hard call to make and to receive.

Connie Armentrout serves as the Technology Licensing Manager for Monsanto Company.
At the January 2003 Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) meeting held in Irvine, California, the FDP entered into Phase IV with a change in leadership in both the Executive Committee and a number of the Standing committees. Brad Stanford (Office of Naval Research) and I have agreed to co-chair the FDP’s eRA (Electronic Research Administration) standing committee. Brad has assumed the agency representative co-chair role from outgoing co-chair Jerry Stuck (National Science Foundation). I am excited about this new opportunity and hope that I will be as effective as the outgoing university representative co-chair, Denise Clark (Cornell University).

The FDP eRA committee is involved in many aspects of eRA and has recently undertaken some exciting new activities. Presented here is the summary of the three main areas of the FDP’s eRA.

External Relations: Members of the committee routinely meet with various federal representatives on a variety of topics and activities. Barbara Siegel (Northwestern University) has spearheaded interactions with the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to clarify the burdens and costs associated with the implementation of a variety of eRA systems. Also, we have encouraged OMB to examine the data collection mechanism in their review. For example, an agency must get OMB clearance to issue a new form or to add an additional piece of data to an existing form. However, some agencies do not provide OMB with an opportunity to review their systems when converting from a paper to a web-based system. In addition, the act of adding a simple check-box to an existing form has drastic consequences in the electronic world. Every university system will have to be modified to accommodate a new piece of data that seems inconsequential in print form.

Denise Clark will be working with the Inter-State and Non-Profit Advisory Group (INAG). INAG hopes to work collectively, much in the same manner as the FDP, with the State Governments, Local Governments and of Non-Profit agencies that receive federal assistance awards. The State and Local governments receive the majority of federal assistance awards in terms of dollars, but the university community represents the largest number of transactions. By finding the commonality between large State block grants and smaller university research grants, our hope is that the FDP and the INAG will work together to present a more simplified, unified approach to electronic grant processes. We want to ensure that any new system is not designed to only accommodate the largest dollar volume but also works for universities that represent the largest number of individual transactions.

Brad Stanford (ONR) and Ken Fortmeier (Penn State) will continue to lead our relationships with the Inter-Agency Electronic Grants Committee (IAEGC) and with the Federal government’s E-Grants initiatives. Brad is the co-chair of the IAEGC committee and, therefore, brings good continuity to the FDP’s relationship with the IAEGC, E-Grants and the Research and Related (R&R) subcommittee of the IAEGC. I will be working closely with Brad and Ken as we strengthen our relationships with these very important working groups.

On-going Activities/Special Projects: The committee often responds to various Federal Register notices and also reviews and comments on agency developed eRA systems.

Currently, the Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) 194 transaction set (TS) is available for public comment. The eRA committee will provide comments regarding suggested changes to the EDI 194 TS and will also offer some additional changes for consideration.

In the past, I have written about the FDP’s “bad doggie” letters. Needless to say, many agencies were not happy to receive these letters. We are evaluating the best approach to provide feedback on agency systems without giving the impression that we endorse any system that is outside of the PL 106-107 framework or that does not seem to align with the activities of the Federal E-Grants projects.

Ellen Beck (UCLA) and Tammy Custer (Cornell University) are heading a special project to create a matrix of all agency-developed systems and to identify the functionality provided in those systems. This work will be integrated with the OMB outreach activity.

Task Forces and Working Groups: Often, the eRA committee establishes task forces and working groups. Task forces must be approved by the FDP membership and Executive Committee while working groups conduct initial fact gathering and research to determine if a formal task force is warranted on a particular subject.

As an affiliate organization, NCURA is working with the FDP to begin an outreach activity to foundations and other non-profit agencies. This task force will explore the potential role that the research community may take with respect to establishing and promoting best practices among eRA systems developments. The task force plans to undertake the design and construction of a data collection and management system and to establish a national repository of eRA-related systems being used by private organizations. The task force will also identify mechanisms that may be used to promote information sharing and potential links between non-profit grant-making organizations, the federal government, and the research community. John Cafora (Boston College) is the NCURA representative and Jay Walton (Johns Hopkins University) is the FDP co-lead on this project.

Richard Keogh (Rhode Island College) and Richard Valenzuela (UCLA) are co-leading a new working group formed during the January FDP meeting. This working group is reviewing the return on investment (ROI) that eRA is (or maybe is not) bringing to our faculty and administrative staff. This group is still defining their goals and mission. Some of their ideas include creating metrics to measure how effective eRA is, determining the costs associated (both short-term and long-term) with engaging in eRA activities and systems, and finding ways to measure these outcomes. From the faculty point of view, the benefit may be a reduction in time from receipt of proposal at the agency to issuance of the award to the institution. If use of eRA systems can reduce the time it takes for agencies to issue awards, we can better argue that our streamlining and automation efforts work. Other areas may include metrics reducing the amount of time from receipt of award to establishment of an account in a university’s financial system or perhaps, the number of FTEs it requires to perform similar activities. For example, if an eRA system needs five FTEs to complete work that others complete with two FTEs, this may be a good indicator that the larger system(s) needs adjustment.

Finally, Ken Forstmeier (Penn State) and Darin Stewart (Oregon Health and Science University) are heading a new task force. This group will explore the world of Institutional Review Boards (IRBs), and will work to identify best practices, transform those practices into data requirements, establish a data dictionary from requirements, and work within the IAEGC to develop data standards from data dictionaries. While this task force is not limited to any specific area of IRB activity, adverse event reporting will be a top priority. Recently, the NIH has started a similar initiative, and the FDP will work closely with the NIH as the Institutes begin to explore and define their own IRB data collection requirements. Additional areas that may be explored include committee data, agendas, minutes, consent forms, protocol related data, multi-campus projects and reporting among others.

In summary, the FDP eRA committee is tackling some major challenges and undertaking a lot of work. I urge you to volunteer to assist in these activities. Even if your college or university is not a member of the FDP, I am sure the leaders of these groups would value your input. For FDP only succeeds from the strengths and talents of our volunteers.

Stephen Dowdy is the Assistant Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
REGION I
New England

Greetings from snowy and cold New England!!!

The Region will soon begin the process of identifying new officers. An announcement will be released shortly calling for nominations. This year we will elect a Chair and a Treasurer. We will also be looking for candidates to run for the National Board of Directors. Please help us in identifying potential candidates for the above positions.

Need an escape from the winter blues?? Think Portsmouth in May! The Program Committee is putting the finishing touches for the spring meeting in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, May 18-21, 2003 at the Sheraton Harborside. The program will include two workshops, concurrent sessions and small discussion groups. And for after hours, a boat cruise/lobster bake and entertainment is planned for Monday evening. Portsmouth is located just an hour north of Boston and south of Portland, Maine. Please check the Region I website in the next few weeks for the program schedule. If you are interested in volunteering at the regional meeting, please contact Sally Tremaine at sally.tremaine@yale.edu

We are looking for topic ideas for the RADG meetings. If you have a topic that you are seeking guidance on or you are interested in leading a discussion, we welcome your participation. Ideas can be sent to louise.griffin@uml.edu.

If you have any regional news that you would like to see published in this column or on the website, please send it to srisman@wpi.edu. We look forward to seeing you in May!!!

Louise Griffin is the Chair of Region I and serves as the Managing Director, External Funding and Technology Transfer, University of Massachusetts Lowell.

REGION II
Mid-Atlantic

Region II is looking forward to its regional meeting in New York City, April 13-15, 2003! This year’s theme is “Research Administration: A Global Enterprise,” recognizing the far-reaching effects of international events on our world of grants and contracts. The meeting hotel is right near the United Nations, and attendees will have special opportunities to tour the UN and other local attractions. We will welcome keynote speaker Ruth Macklin of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, who will speak about human subjects research and conducting research in foreign countries, including some of her experiences on the Scientific and Ethical Review Committee at the World Health Organization and as chair of the Ethical Review Committee of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS. Other sessions include topics as varied as subawards, e-grants, and research as an economic tool. Thanks to Anne Geronimo of the University of Maryland, College Park for her work as Program Chair for this meeting.

For more meeting information, visit Region II’s website, accessible via the “Regions” section of the N CURA home page, or directly at http://www.osp.cornell.edu/N CURA_RegII/Metings.html.

There is still time for early bird meeting registration (before May 24).

M. ake your hotel reservation before May 24, and let them know that you’re with N CURA Region II to receive the conference rate.

One of Region II’s initiatives for 2003 is the official establishment of a regional Nominating and Membership Development Committee. This committee will be overseen by Charlie Kaars, Region II Chair-Elect, and Eileen Callahan of Scranton University has agreed to take the lead on membership activities. This committee will open up a number of volunteer opportunities for members looking for a chance to get involved with N CURA! Cheryl Williams, Region II Secretary, chairs the Communications Committee, and with the able assistance of Tammy Custer at Cornell, has made improvements to the Region II website. Suggestions are welcome — send them to Cheryl at ccwilliam@orpa.rocch.edu. Kerry Peluso has begun her term as Treasurer. Many thanks to outgoing officers Betty Farberman and Ann Holmes for their very hard work over the past couple of years, and for their continued support.

This year promises to be another great year for Region II. We look forward to seeing you in New York City in April!

Janet Simons is the Chair of Region II and serves as the Grants and Contracts Manager, University of Maryland Baltimore.

REGION III
Southeast

Spring Meeting: Mark your calendars for the N CURA Region III spring meeting—“Excellence in Research Administration” at the Sandestin Golf and Beach Resort in Destin, Florida, May 4-7. Preliminary program and registration information can be found on the N CURA Region III website (http://www.orga.cofc.edu/ncura3). The Program Committee has been hard at work creating an outstanding program that guarantees something for everyone. Make your room reservations now! The room rate is $125 per night and is good for three days prior to and after the meeting should you decide to enjoy a little extra time at Sandestin.

First-time attendees can apply for a travel award of $500 by completing a Travel Nomination Form and mailing it to the M. embership Committee Chair, Bonnie S. Smith, Director of Sponsored Programs, Elon University, 2550 Campus Box, Elon, NC 27244.

If you are interested in volunteering in the Hospitality Suite, contact Bruxanne El-Kammash, Hospitality Committee Chair at bruxanne@coastal.edu.

Chair-Elect. The nominations are in! Look for ballots to come out of the National office and cast your vote!

Website. If you have ever served on a Region III committee or as a Region III officer, please send the particulars to ncura3@orga.cofc.edu so that the web site database can be updated with the information about you. Include: the position you held, the year(s) involved, your title, institution address, phone and fax numbers, e-mail address, and URL. Also, if you are currently serving as a Region III officer or on a committee and have changed positions, institutions, buildings, etc., send your new contact information.

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

REGION IV
Mid-America

Spring Meeting: E-Gov, E-Grants, E-Gads!


Location: The Westin Cincinnati.

Room rate: $120 single and double.

Registration and hotel deadline: April 11, 2003.

Workshops on Saturday feature a Senior Forum hosted by Kim M. oreland and Steve Hansen examining “The Janus Face of Research Administration” as well as a Primer on the “Fundamentals of Pre-Award for the New Grant Administrator” led by Diane Barrett. Regional Workshops on Sunday will cover such topics as “OMB Circular Overview,” “NIH Commons Practicum: A Guide to Using and Deploying the Commons at Your Institution,” “NIH Fundamentals,” and “Trends and Practices Shaping the Workplace.” Concurrent sessions and roundtables will be offered in a wide variety of topics. For a complete program description and online registration information, visit the Region IV Web site at http://www.ncura.uc.edu/.
Office Nominations
Region IV has issued a Call for Nominations for positions on the Region IV Board of Directors and for a seat on the national Board of Directors. Nominations are being solicited for:
• Chair-elect
• Treasurer
• Elected Member to the Board (two positions)
• Region IV elected member to the national NCURA Board of Directors.
The deadline for nominations was March 14, 2003. See the Region IV Web site at http://www.ncura.uc.edu/ for complete information.

Award Nominations
Nominations will be accepted through March 31, 2003 for the following regional awards:
• Distinguished Service Award
• Kevin Reed Outstanding Professional Award
• Meritorious Contribution Award
Eligibility criteria and nomination forms can be downloaded from the Region IV Web site at http://www.ncura.uc.edu/.

Reaching Out to Newer Members
In an effort to make attendance at an NCURA meeting more inviting and professionally enriching experience, the membership Committee is launching a pilot “Buddy Program” at the Region IV Spring Meeting in which more “veteran” member volunteers will be paired with interested new members to help introduce the newer members to the wealth of professional development opportunities that an NCURA meeting offers. As the membership committee Chair Heather Offhaus puts it, “The point of the program is to use existing members as resources for new folks who may want to know what they are getting into!” To read more about the pilot program, see the Region IV newsletter at http://www.ncura.uc.edu/. If you are interested in participating in the program, either as a “veteran” or as a newcomer, please email Heather Offhaus (hmill@umich.edu).

REGION V
Southwestern
From the Region 5 Program Committee:
As you probably know, we have cancelled the location of our Spring 2003 meeting in Las Vegas. Dallas has been selected as our new site for this meeting and the meeting dates have changed to May 18-21. Information about the Renaissance Dallas North Hotel was sent to you via email. If you did not receive that email, please let us know. Also, go ahead and make your reservations now!!!

Due to the location and meeting date change, some of our speakers and presenters have conflicts and are now unable to attend. The program committee is working diligently on confirming dates with presenters and locating new presenters to fill in these vacant slots on the program. Please bear with us as we try to put all our pieces back together!

We'll have a great opportunity to network and learn from our knowledgeable constituents. We have topics that are geared to pre-award, post-award, ERA and much more. An NSF update, ITAR, EAR, and HIPAA issues are just a few of our sessions. And if this will be your first meeting - we've got a session just for you. Two half-day workshops will be offered on Sunday, May 18, and our keynote speaker on Monday morning will be quite interesting for us all.

Thanks for your patience. We'll get all the finalized information out to you as soon as possible. Watch the Region V website and your email for further announcements. See you in Dallas!

Judy Cook is the Chair-elect of Region V and serves as a Research Administrator, Baylor College of Medicine.

REGION VI
Western
The Region VI-VII spring meeting is rapidly approaching. April 6-9 are the dates; the Hyatt Regency Denver is the place. Six workshops and more than 120 sessions are planned for the meeting. Our colleagues from Region VII are doing a spectacular job in handling the local arrangements so you can be sure that this will be one of the best meetings ever.

Dr. Margaret M. urnane, Professor of Physics, University of Colorado, Boulder will be our keynote speaker. Dr. urnane is considered one of the elite woman physicists in the United States. She received worldwide recognition for winning the Maria Goeppert-Mayer Award, given each year to the top woman physicist under the age of 40, and in 2000 was named a John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Fellow.

Dr. Jack Burns, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research for the University of Colorado system will welcome us and will speak on the importance of research administrators to the university research enterprise. Bob Killoren, NCURA’s President, will be our Monday luncheon speaker.

Our dinner speakers for Tuesday evening are two seasoned research administrators who will, after our meal, offer us a second desert. “When All Else Fails, Try Humor: An Alternative to Hitting Your Head Against the Wall.” Dorothy Yates, University of Colorado, Denver and M. erriet H efferich, Innovation Consulting, Inc., Anchorage will help us understand the different types of humor and how each can be an effective tool for dealing with the many pressures we all face both on and off the job.

We will have our “Ask the Experts” panel and, of course, there will be the irrepressible Judy Freedenberg with her wonderful solo performance, “Naked at Noon.” An interesting set of sessions are ones we are calling “Region VI-VII Neighborhoods: Real, Live and In Person!” There will be three of these - on Pre-Award, Post-Award, and Compliance issues. So bring you sweater and join one of M. r. Rogers’ cousins for a lively and informative discussion of ideas, problems, and - most of all - suggested solutions.

Here’s a sampling of other planned sessions:
“Presenting Papers and Preparing Articles: Another Side of Research Administration”; “10 Things I Hate About You: Resolving Conflicts Between the Department and the Sponsored Research Office”; “Building Your Own Grants IT System”; “M atrial Transfer Agreements”;
“Research, Research Administration, and Research Administrators: A Dean’s View and A Faculty Member’s View”; “Research Administration Automation: An E-Form Management System”; “Patent and Licensing Accounting”; “ERA/Information Technology”;
“How to Get the Job Done in a Very Small Office”; and many more.

The program is posted on the Region VI web site http://www.ogrd.wsu.edu/6ncura/.

Terry Manns is Chair of Region VI and serves as the Director, Research and Sponsored Projects, for the California State University, Sacramento.

REGION VII
Rocky Mountain
We are gearing up for the Spring Regional Meeting with Region VI and are looking forward to a great meeting. The meeting will be held in downtown Denver, Colorado. The downtown business and entertainment district is near the State Capitol and within walking distance to historic Larimer Square, the Denver Center for the Performing Arts, Denver Pavilions, Coors Field and the Sixteenth Street Mall.

Workshops will be held on Sunday, April 6 and sessions will be Monday through Wednesday April 7-9, 2003. Details of can be found at the Region VII website at http://www.unm.edu/~ncuravii/.

The Region VII 2002 Travel Award Winners were Nancy Colter, University of New Mexico, and Andrew Ferencak, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University.

We look forward to seeing you in Denver!!

Denise Wallen is Chair of Region VII and the Special Assistant to the Vice Provost for Research, University of New Mexico.
New Select Agent Rules Will Be Costly for Research Universities (continued)

Examples of HHS-only Select Agents and Toxins
- Ebola viruses
- Herpes B virus
- Variola major virus (Smallpox virus) and Variola minor virus (AstraZeneca)
- Conotoxins
- Ricin
- Saxitoxin
- Tetrodotoxin

Examples of HHS-USDA Overlap Select Agents and Toxins
- Bacillus anthracis
- Botulinum neurotoxin producing species of Clostridium
- Francisella tularensis
- Botulinum neurotoxins

Will this impact your university? Maybe not. The most welcome part of the new rule is its exclusions. For example, few schools will have toxins above the exclusion quantity. The regulated biological agents are within the domain of specialized research, typically not done at most colleges and universities. HHS and USDA provide exemption procedures for clinical research using investigational products.

For affected research universities, there is lots of work to do in a hurry. The rules are being phased in from February 7th to November 11th, when they are fully effective. As of February 7th, institutions with select agents were required to:
- Designate a Responsible Official for campus
- Develop and implement a safety plan
- Conduct regular inspections
- Develop and implement an OSHA-compliant emergency response plan for select agents
- Conduct training related to safety and emergency response
- Notify HHS or USDA of any theft, loss or release

February 7th is also the deadline for keeping detailed records of select agent inventories, individuals who are approved to use the agent, as well as those who enter the area where the agent is used or stored. Both USDA and HHS have the authority to conduct inspections and impose civil and criminal penalties for noncompliance. If select agents are on your campus, there is a lot at stake.

A security plan isn’t due until June 12th, and its implementation is not required until September 12th. The rule’s preamble says that security requirements and costs aren’t different than those in the current NIH/CDC guidelines. However, no one is sure what will constitute a satisfactory security plan. Most universities expect to spend a lot of money beefing up laboratory and research building security. It is easy to spend $5,000 to add card access to just a few laboratory doors. At many institutions, budget plans for new laboratory security systems run into hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Many people are concerned about the requirement for background checks—called security risk assessments—for individuals who have access to select agents and toxins. By March 12th, universities must apply to the U.S. Attorney General for a security risk assessment for their Responsible Official. Applications for security risk assessments are due on April 12th for all investigators and other individuals who have access. Criteria for obtaining a security risk assessment include those in the 2001 USA Patriot Act: criminal record, illicit drug use, residency status, and nationality. Nationals of countries that support terrorism are restricted from possessing select agents. As a new procedure for the U.S. Attorney General, we hope these assessments will be timely and not unduly burdensome for researchers.

I also worry about rule implementation and HHS/USDA inspections. Due to the paucity of agency guidance, we may disagree on secure area boundaries, or what constitutes access or possession. As careful as people are in keeping records, it is inevitable that a vial will be misplaced or misrecorded. If you haven’t already done so, thoroughly survey your institution for select agents. Urge your microbiologists, investigators and science departments to completely review their inventories and archival collections of chemicals and microbiological agents. Carefully excavate those laboratory freezers that have not been defrosted in years. This takes time and a lot of effort, but finding an unreported agent now will be a lot less painful than dealing with it in the future.

Even if your institution does not have a select agent today, it may tomorrow. Bioterrorism funding increased from $275 million to $1,748 million between 2002 and 2003. In his 2003 State of the Union address, President Bush said he would ask Congress to provide $6 billion to develop and make available vaccines and treatments against biological agents such as anthrax, botulinum toxin, Ebola, and the plague. This will mean plenty of work for research universities.

Finally, many other issues have been raised about the new rules, so it is important to monitor USDA and HHS guidance, and possible changes. CDC and APHIS deserves kudos for the excellent information and comments posted on their web sites. See http://www.cdc.gov/od/sap/ for more information on the HHS rules. USDA’s useful site is at http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ncie/bta.html.

Peter A. Reinhardt is the Director, Department of Environment, Health & Safety, University of North Carolina.
January & February 2003: NCURA Members Planning, Teaching and Learning...What a Great Way to Start the Year!

2003 NCURA Board

Planning for the Future: NCURA’s Board of Directors works with the Strategic Plan and tackles the “Mega Issues” which address strategic questions that keep NCURA ahead of the curve.

NCURA Video Workshop Series

With an outstanding faculty and production team, NCURA brings A-110 home to you via satellite broadcast.

Our studio audience is ready to go!

Dick Seligman, California Institute of Technology and Pat Hawk, Oregon Health & Science University bring important information on A-110 for the Departmental Administrator to all who are participating in the Workshop. In addition, many institutions tape the proceedings so countless individuals will benefit from this invaluable “nuts and bolts” workshop.

A few of the many talented, behind the scenes professionals that NCURA partners with to bring you this Video Workshop Series.
Planning for the Year Ahead!

University/Industry 2003: Enhancing the Partnership in a Global Economy

The conference may be August 17-19, 2003 in San Francisco, CA, but the planning began early this year as our committee made up of University, Industry, and International partners lay the groundwork for a compelling and important conference.

Members of the University/Industry Program take a breather after an exciting day of planning for University/Industry 2003. (l to r) John Carfora, US University Chair, Boston College; Susan Butts, Industry Chair, Dow Chemical Company; Tyler Thompson, Dow Chemical Company; Tanna Pugh, Pennsylvania State University; Jim Casey, Bradley University and Stephen Jerrams, International Chair, Dublin Institute of Technology. (Not pictured Ravi Kiron, Pfizer, Inc. and Kathy Irwin, University of Wisconsin - Madison)

Annual Meeting Program Committee

Pat Fitzgerald, MIT and NCURA Vice President, and Debi Galloway, University of Cincinnati; work to ensure the balance of topics in this time slot.

Co-chair, Barbara Cole, leads the planning team on a recap of the day’s work.

Representing the 3 facets of the partnership, Stephen Jerrams, Susan Butts and John Carfora share the Chairperson responsibilities for this offering.

The 45th Annual Meeting Program Committee are excited about the program they are creating for you! (front row, l to r) Marc Schiffman, NCURA; Vivian Holmes, Annual Meeting Co-chair, Harvard Medical School; Pat Fitzgerald, NCURA Vice President, MIT; Barbara Cole, Annual Meeting Co-chair, Boston University; Tara Bishop, NCURA; (second row, l to r) Laura Yaeger, Huron Consulting Group; Sara Streich, Rush Presbyterian St. Luke’s Medical Center; Sherylle Mills Englelander, University of California-Santa Barbara; Kathleen Larmett, NCURA; Megan Columbus, NIH; Judy Fredenberg, University of Montana; Debi Galloway, University of Cincinnati; Denise Clark, Cornell University; Bregeta D. Jefferson, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center; Michelle D. Christy, Princeton University; (back row, l to r) Tommy Coogins, University of South Carolina; Ken Forstmeier, Pennsylvania State University; Brian Farmer, University of Idaho; and Bobby McQuiston, University of Texas at Austin. (Not pictured, Tom Roberts, Florida Gulf Coast University)

(l to r) Barbara Cole, Co-Chair, Boston University; Megan Columbus, NIH and Laura Yaeger, Huron Consulting Group and the entire program committee work to choose the “best of the best” for the Annual Meeting Program.

Ken Forstmeier, Pennsylvania State University, leads the eRA session planning discussion.
NCURA Members Come Together in New Orleans, Orlando and San Francisco.

An important exchange on Financial Stewardship kicks off the Financial Research Administrator’s Conference (FRA IV) in New Orleans. (l to r) Jerry Fife, Vanderbilt University; Mike Smith, MAXIMUS; Paul Begala, CNN’s Crossfire; Kathleen Larmett, NCURA Executive Director; Al Horvath, California Institute of Technology; Gunta Liders, Conference Chair, University of Rochester; Bob Killoren, NCURA President, Pennsylvania State University.

Attendees, Faculty, Sponsors and Exhibitors share a wealth of information with each other and brainstorm solutions.

Orlando, FL. Another sold out Fundamentals event with a faculty that bring their expertise along with their wonderful teaching style. (faculty l to r) Pamela Webb, Stanford University; Marianne Rinaldo Woods, University of Texas at Arlington; and Pat Fitzgerald, NCURA Vice President, MIT.

Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration & Sponsored Project's Administration Level II

One of our three faculty teams, (l to r) Steve Smartt, Vanderbilt University; Cheryl-Lee Howard, The Johns Hopkins University, and John Case, The Cleveland Clinic.

Sponsored Projects Administration Critical Issues, addresses the needs of Research Administrators who are ready for the next level. One of our three faculty teams, (l to r) Steve Smartt, Vanderbilt University; Cheryl-Lee Howard, The Johns Hopkins University, and John Case, The Cleveland Clinic.

Sponsored Projects Administration Level II

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

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

REGISTRATION NCURA 2003 Video Workshop Series

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

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

Tape: Those who select the tape option will receive handout information when they receive their copy of the tape.

Who Should Subscribe?
Any institution which has training needs, whether they be immediate training through participation in the live broadcast or future needs through the use of a taped broadcast, will benefit from this series.
**Director of Research and Sponsored Programs**

**Denton, Dallas, & Houston**

**TEXAS WOMAN’S UNIVERSITY**

**Position:** Director to manage the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs in Denton, with satellite office in Houston. Director reports to the Provost.

**Duties:** Identifying funding sources, assisting faculty with proposal preparation, insuring compliance with local, state, and federal research policies and procedures, monitoring awards, reporting on proposals and grants, and supervising staff.

**Education/ Experience:** Doctorate strongly preferred, master’s degree is required. A minimum of five years of progressively responsible experience in all aspects related to preparation of grant proposals and follow-up of awards, preferably in college or university settings.

**Applications:** Submit letter of application, vita, and listing of 5 current references including telephone numbers and e-mail addresses to Dr. Judith Bean, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, Texas Woman’s University, P.O. Box 425468, Denton, TX 76204. FAX to (940) 898-3306; electronic submissions may be sent to jbean@twu.edu.

Texas Woman’s University is a Doctoral/Research Intensive institution with campuses in Denton, Dallas, and Houston; the primary office for Research and Sponsored Programs is in Denton. TWU is an equal opportunity employer.
For the thirteenth year in a row, Children’s Hospital Boston has been rated the best hospital specializing in pediatric care in the nation, according to a survey by U.S. News & World Report. Children’s Hospital Boston is a 325-bed comprehensive center for pediatric health care. Whether from across the street or across the globe, your skills and professionalism will be valued as a member of our team. Currently we have two openings reporting directly to the VP of Research.

WE HAVE WORK TO DO.

DIRECTOR, RESEARCH FUNDING

In this role you will be managing and developing the Research Funding department comprised of Research Finance and Sponsored Programs (pre-award and post-award). Overseeing proposals, awards, contracts and other various funding arrangements, you will analyze research and training activities including expenses, overhead, losses, trends, projections, rate negotiations etc. to department heads, senior management and/or board members. You will also ensure that all systems, policies, procedures and personnel comply with federal and nonfederal funding agreements, and that all research community needs are recognized, represented and reflected in our financial system.

To qualify, you must have a degree in business administration, accounting or finance and 8 years’ experience. Excellent communication, negotiation and analytical skills for planning, designing and improving programs are essential, as is the ability to effectively manage people.

DIRECTOR, RESEARCH MANAGEMENT

In this newly created role you will be responsible for ongoing project management supporting the research community and providing integration among the research administration departments. Responsibilities will include working in conjunction with other Directors and the research community. The Director will support multiple disciplines including ISD, compliance, report generation, communication, HR and HIPAA requirements. This position requires a strong project manager with excellent communication skills, proven leadership qualities as well as a strong customer service orientation.

To qualify, you must have a Bachelor’s degree, Masters preferred, 5-10 years’ current experience in research with project management.

For more information please visit our website at: www.childrenshospital.org.
or apply on line to gayle.farnham@TCH.harvard.org.

Children’s Hospital Boston is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer.

Children’s Hospital Boston

The first place for children
CHILDREN’S HOSPITAL RESEARCH CENTER

A world-recognized leader in the study and exploration of children’s healthcare issues since our founding in 1982, The Children’s Hospital Research Center is comprised of numerous and often interlocking boards, offices, and projects. We are proud to conduct more than 200 clinical trials each year to investigate new drugs, devices and techniques. When you bring your career to our dynamic organization, you join a highly professional team from a multiplicity of disciplines, including cardiology, orthopedics, dermatology and infectious diseases. We also deal with such areas of healthcare as neuroscience of autism and other specialized studies. Ours is a unique environment that includes an extremely active emergency department with a Level I trauma center, the Children’s Motion Analysis Laboratory, and links to all children’s health initiatives within the community through the Center for Child Protection and the Center for Healthier Communities. Currently, we are recruiting for the following positions in our Research Dept.:

**Director/Research**

In conjunction with CHHC, the medical staff and community leadership, you will develop, implement and monitor our strategic research objectives; direct/prioritize administrative support; plan/control operating budgets; and make recommendations within applicable laws and regulations. Requires 5 years’ research experience at Director-level or above — investigational drug/device trials background strongly preferred; advanced degree; distinguished record in management/leadership and research development; proven ability to grow a research program showing increased dollar value/volume of federal grants, successfully recruit Ph.D./M.D./administrative personnel for a nonuniversity setting and secure state/county/private grants; high level of communication, negotiation, business development and strategic planning skills.

Please apply online at [WWW.CHSD.ORG](http://www.CHSD.ORG) or call Cher DeMore at 800.869.5627, x7841.

EOE M/F/D/V

**IRB Coordinator/Research Specialist**

The IRB Coordinator provides assistance to the Institutional Review Board Chairs, principal investigators, and IRB applicants; prepares/processes IRB submissions; maintains the database system and research files; and organizes workflow. Requires 4 years’ IRB, research office, hospital, healthcare, university, or legal experience; strong organizational, follow-through, interpersonal, and written/verbal communication skills; a high degree of attention to detail; PC proficiency (Word, spreadsheets and Internet); and a B.S. or equivalent.

**Team Leader, Clinical Research**

The TL of Clinical Research oversees clinical, administrative and financial personnel; hire/train staff; enforce research compliance; perform program development; and represent the program to the professional community and to the public. Requires 2 years’ clinical trials administration experience; 1 year of HR management experience; 1 year of pediatric experience; working knowledge of clinical trials budgets; good public speaking, leadership, and problem-solving skills; computer proficiency; excellent written/verbal communication abilities, and an advanced degree in Nursing, Pharmacy, Healthcare Administration or a related healthcare field.
SPELMAN COLLEGE

SPELMAN College, nationally ranked as one of the leading liberal arts institutions for the education of African American women, invites applications for the position of Post-Award Grants Administrator. This position serves as a single-point of dedicated support to assist faculty in the administration of the more than 75 active grant accounts at the College, with a specific emphasis on biomedical and behavioral research. The Administrator will have job responsibilities in four core areas:

- **Database Development:** Implement a system to track awards and alert faculty and other units when reports and other required documentation are due.

- **Compliance, Reporting and Stewardship:** Establish and maintain relationships with grants management officials at government agencies, private foundations, and corporations. Includes assisting to orchestrate site visits, serving as a liaison between faculty and funding source to negotiate modifications to the grant agreement.

- **Training:** Design and launch a training program to educate faculty about how to properly administer their grants within the confines of the grant agreement and the College’s internal policies and procedures.

- **Seed-Grant Administration:** Manage the process for awarding and distributing funds through an internal grant program.

Bachelor’s degree in business administration, accounting or related field is required. Must have a minimum of 3 yrs. of experience in sponsored program and research administration and a working knowledge of rules and regulations governing the administration of federal funds. Excellent written and verbal communication skills a must, with proven proficiency in the prevailing word processing, spreadsheet, presentation, and database management programs. Must be self-motivated and able to work in a courteous and professional manner with a diverse faculty and administrative staff population. Moderate travel.

Please submit letter of application, resume, writing sample and salary requirements to:

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

EEO/AA/TITLE IX INSTITUTION
President (CEO)
Texas A&M Research Foundation

TEXAS A&M RESEARCH FOUNDATION, College Station, Texas, invites applications and nominations for an experienced, entrepreneurial leader to serve as the President and CEO upon the retirement of its current President. Chartered in 1944, the Research Foundation is a non-profit 501(c)3 organization providing support to The Texas A&M University System members for administration of sponsored programs and related activities. Currently, the Research Foundation employs 140+ employees, administers in excess of $130 million in sponsored programs and submits approximately 1,300 proposals annually.

The President, who serves at the pleasure of the Board of Trustees, is responsible for the overall operation and management of the Research Foundation. The President directly supervises the organization’s four vice presidents who assist the President in supervising managers of Human Resources, in-house Legal Council, Management Information Services, Preaward, Contracts and Grants, Purchasing and Property, Project Accounting, and branch offices at Prairie View A&M University and at the Ocean Drilling Program, College Station facility. The President works with the officers and staff to develop and implement the Foundation’s vision, strategic plan, goals and objectives, as approved by the Board of Trustees. In addition, the development and implementation of all policies and procedures is overseen by the President. An important part of the responsibilities of the President is working directly with the officers and administration of the various members of The Texas A&M University System.

Bachelor’s degree required. Candidates should possess at least 5 years senior level administrative experience, such as a vice president or CEO. Prefer 7 years experience in senior level administration. An MBA or MPA is preferred.

Applicants should send a letter of application, resume, a list of five professional references, and a written statement indicating how their qualifications and accomplishments meet the needs expressed in the position description. Specify “Presidential Search” and send application materials to Adam Davidson, Manager, Human Resources, Texas A&M Research Foundation, 3578 TAMU, College Station, Texas 77843-3578 or Faxed to (979) 862-3250 or e-mailed to adavidson@rf-mail.tamu.edu. Applications should be received no later than May 1, 2003. For further information about this announcement and the Research Foundation, please see World Wide Web address: http://rf-web.tamu.edu/

The Texas A&M Research Foundation is an Equal Opportunity Employer Committed to Diversity

---

GRANTSlam—THE LEADING GRANT-APPLICATION SOFTWARE SINCE 1994

GRANTSlam provides:

- Powerful support for multiple budgets
- Efficient use of professional and organizational profile databases to autofill NIH forms
- Automatic and complete budget calculations
- Instant generation of 2590 forms from 398 data
- Expert technical support

Now, more than ever, GRANTSlam is an investment in your future!

Cayuse has been selected to develop, in partnership with NIH, electronic submission of NIH proposals.

Under our current SBIR award, we are enhancing GrantSlam to enable applicant organizations (like your institution) to send proposals in an electronic data-stream directly to NIH.

Learn more about Cayuse and GrantSlam by phoning (503) 297-2108 or visiting:

www.cayuse.com

Ask about special pricing for NCURA members!
Research Administrators Certification Council
Serving the Profession for over a Decade

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

Let us help you become certified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRA Review sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROVIDENCE, RI-April 11, 2003 (Fri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMPHIS, TN-April 26, 2003 (Sat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUI, HAWAII-May 17, 2003 (Sat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITTSBURGH, PA-Oct 17, 2003 (Fri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON, DC-Nov 1, 2003 (Sat)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEXT CRA EXAMS, OCTOBER 18, 2003 AND MARCH 6, 2004

Visit our website for full details:  www.cra-cert.org
or call 859-441-4452
The National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA), founded in 1959, is an organization of individuals with professional interest in problems and policies relating to the administration of research, education and training activities at colleges and universities.
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Assistant Director  
Office of Research Administration  
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Responsibilities: Serves as the Institutional Official for 1/5th of the School of Medicine Departments, involving approximately 600 proposals and $100M in annual awards. Primarily a pre-award and post-award sponsor liaison office (amendments/prior approval/closeout), this position has signature authority for all grants and sub-contracts (in/out) and negotiates/drafts all contracts for the assigned departments. Contract responsibility includes about $10M of commercial agreements, 2/3rds of which are clinical trials. Also serves as the editor of the Sponsored Projects Handbook for the School of Medicine. Duties include participation in the training/guidance of departmental staff and faculty in grantsmanship, research compliance and sponsored programs administration. Reports to the Associate Dean, Research Administration.

Requirements: Masters degree or higher, and at least six years of directly related bio-medical sponsored projects administration experience, preferably involving NIH award mechanisms, non-profit foundations and commercial funding. Experience with bio-medical research and clinical trials contract negotiation preferred. Experience should demonstrate past performance effectiveness and increasing responsibility. Must be self-confident, articulate and oriented to assisting the faculty to succeed.

Classification: Senior Staff Grade 44 (starting salary would normally be in the range of $59K – 70K, depending upon experience). Johns Hopkins University is an equal opportunity employer.

Johns Hopkins University offers a comprehensive salary program and excellent benefits in a smoke and drug free workplace. For consideration you may apply on line at http://jobs.jhu.edu, or send resume with salary requirements, including SOURCE CODE # M CBA9768 on cover letter via e-mail to jhu@alexus.com, fax to 1-(877) 262-0646, or mail to JHU Resume Processing Center, P. O. Box 3687, Scranton, PA 18505.

EOE/AA/D/V.