The Industry/University Congress
From NCURA's President...
by Bob Killoren

I am pleased to announce that NCURA has joined forces with the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR, established under the National Academies) and the Industrial Research Institute (IRI) to help lead a national effort in improving industry/university (I/U) research collaborations. This effort will begin with an “Industry/University Congress” to be held in San Francisco on August 19-20 in conjunction with our NCURA international conference entitled “University/Industry Collaborations: Enhancing the Partnership in a Global Economy.” It is planned to conclude with a “National Summit” of government, industry, and university leaders at the National Academy of Sciences in Washington, D.C., to be held in the fall or winter of 2004.

Last April GUIRR adopted a new project called “Re-Engineering Intellectual Property Agreements in Industry/University Collaborations.” GUIRR entered into this project in response to concerns brought to the GUIRR Council by NCURA and the IRI. NCURA and IRI raised concerns that the partnership between industry and universities was weakening over difficulties associated with the negotiation of intellectual property (IP) rights in research contracts. Anyone involved in working with industry knows what this is about. It centers around the fact that more and more negotiations between industry and universities are

Expanded 2003 Offerings @ 1983 Prices!
By Denise Clark and Tommy Coggins

In honor of NCURA’s 45th Anniversary, workshop prices are rolling back 20 years and we are expanding our offerings in response to your professional development needs.

What to Look for In Workshops
From the newest and hottest topics to the tried and true favorites, this year’s Annual Meeting workshops promise to offer something for everyone. Your coordinators have been busy reviewing last year's feedback, looking at areas of increased focus, and evaluating the needs of our membership to put together a slate of workshops that we think will satisfy all levels of interest and experience.

Something for Everyone
Whether you are new to research administration or a seasoned veteran, this year’s workshops are designed to provide a variety of professional development opportunities. Is your job focus pre-award? Post-award? Electronic? Clinical trials? Human subjects? Departmental? Have you seen a rise in sub-award activity? Financial compliance? Material transfer agreements? Corporate sponsorship? Federal awards? In addition to the traditional

Securing the Homeland:
McQueary to Deliver Keynote Address at 45th Annual Meeting
by Patrick Fitzgerald

On November 25, 2002, President Bush signed a bill creating the new Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and on January 24, 2003, the new Department came into existence. I am pleased to announce that Dr. Charles E. McQueary, Under Secretary for... continued on page 20

2003 Slate is Set
Polls to Open in August

Members will be asked to vote for Vice President/President-elect; Secretary, Treasurer-elect and two At-large Board members. The Nominating and Leadership Development Committee had a pool of award-winning individuals and they thank each of them for their willingness to step forward and serve NCURA.

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

Vice President/President-elect
Jamie Caldwell, Loyola University of Chicago
Jerry Fife, Vanderbilt University

Secretary
Christina Hansen, University of California - Irvine

Treasurer-elect
Peggy Lowry, Oregon State University

At-large Board of Directors Member (2)
Barbara Gray, College of Charleston
Dorothy Spurlock, The University of Toledo
Sarah Streich, Rush-Presbyterian-St. Luke’s Medical Center
Cynthia White, Washington University

See you at the Polls in August!
Advancing Guerrilla Retreat
By Tim Atkinson

Staff development requires time and energy that none of us seem to have anymore. It is hard to take time out of any busy week to have a retreat, and nobody wants to come to work on Saturday for something work related, even if you do get to wear jeans. That is why at University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences we implemented “Guerrilla Retreat.” A Guerrilla Retreat is a spontaneous discussion of a high interest topic, generally at regularly scheduled staff meetings. The spontaneous nature of the discussion brings an element of surprise making the approach an effective tool for boosting moral. The main guerilla tactic is the “email ambush.”

In an “email ambush” a staff member who has volunteered or I will take the lead by picking and researching a topic of organizational interest. Topics might include leadership, team building, communication, and organizational psychology. The topic is announced via email to everyone in the ORSP staff for discussion at our next regularly scheduled meeting. Remember: the topic has to be short and everybody has to present their view within the amount of time allotted for your regular staff meeting. If you can’t get around to everyone during the meeting, just stop the meeting and say, “We’ll pick this up at the next meeting.” If you don’t regularly have staff meetings this is a fine way to institute the meetings. Next time, it’s someone else’s turn to pick a topic and run the meeting. If this catches on, I am sure Scott Adams will find a way to worm it into a Dilbert cartoon in the near future.

Speaking of Dilbert cartoons, they are a good source of Guerrilla Retreat material because some of the strips are quick commentary on organizational culture and it makes people think about how some of the things we do really are stupid. It may also cause some of us pointy haired bosses to change the way we do things. Here’s a suggestion: for the next Guerrilla Retreat, cut out a Dilbert cartoon that says to you, “That’s exactly the way it is in my office,” copy it and send it out to everyone in the office. The email message to them should say, “For discussion at our next meeting.” It will get a laugh and it will also get people to think about the work context in general and how to improve it. Also, you can cover the material within 30 minutes to an hour and you get to meet with your co-workers for a change. And I do mean a change. Instead of boring edicts about remembering to clean up after yourself in the break room, you can laugh at yourself as the boss (which adds a lot of soul to the office, believe me) and you can laugh at each other.

Last time we did Guerrilla Retreat, the whole office took the online Myers-Briggs Jung personality type indicator. A collective groan comes from those of you who have beat this one to death, but that’s okay. We did it “guerilla style” and everyone had a lot of fun. And better yet, it only took an hour. The Myers-Briggs Guerrilla Retreat went really well. I get the sense that most people had no idea their office mates could be so multifaceted and I think it actually cut down on the number of people coming into my office to complain about a co-worker. You see retreating “guerilla style” is a way to bring out dimensions of the office you never knew would come out.

This brings up an interesting point. If you are going to use a professional psychological test for Guerrilla Retreat, be sure to raise everybody's comfort level by making, “I don’t want to see your answers” statements. Ensure everyone that the answers are private and all we want to share is the basic type or the letters that make up a type. My type was an INFJ. Someone commented that the “I” stands for ego. I retorted that maybe so, but you have to use all the letters together to come up with the personality type. Everybody laughed when I said, “I’m an INFJ and that makes me just like Sean Connery and Ross Perot. I am all for advancing the Guerrilla Retreat. It’s leadership by humor.

Tim Atkinson serves as the Director, Research and Sponsored Programs, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences.

Utilizing NCURA Videos as a Training Tool
By Vicki Spadaccio

I was quite impressed with the basic research administration knowledge presented in the Video Workshop “A-110 for Departmental Administrators” presented by Pat Hawk (Oregon Health and Sciences University) and Richard Seligman (California Institute of Technology) on January 27, 2003. I decided to utilize sections of this video as a training tool for our Departmental Administrative staff in the College of Education at Penn State.

I began with the Cost-Sharing section of the video which ran about 40 minutes and featured the video during our monthly Research Administration Finance Team Meeting. I prepared hand-outs containing the Cost-Share section of the A-110 slide presentation including the Cost-Share case studies and a copy of Penn State’s Cost-Share Policy.

I presented the video, with popcorn of course, and stopped the video right after the case-study questions were introduced and detailed. This allowed our staff the opportunity to discuss each case study as a group and relate the case studies and appropriate answers to actual examples in our College. After showing the video, we shared questions and answers and briefly discussed how the A-110 requirements on cost-sharing were incorporated in Penn State’s Cost-Share Policy. Immediately after the meeting, I was approached by two departmental staff assistants who were interested in viewing the entire video at home! Success!

In March, I was asked to present a session at the Society of Research Administrator’s Allegheny Chapter Meeting and I suggested a Cost-Share workshop (Why reinvent the wheel?). I received permission from NCURA to use the video as an educational tool with the understanding that SRA would give attribution to NCURA.

I co-presented the Cost-Sharing session with Debra Moon (Carnegie Mellon) and Carrie Nelson (Bearing Point). After the video, Debra and Carrie provided advice and shared their experiences from the accounting/auditing side of cost-sharing. Carrie provided a slide which showed the potential impact of cost-sharing by reducing the indirect cost rate. I shared my experiences and suggestions for the development of proposal budgets.

Over 50 people attended our session including Dr. Christine Boesz, Inspector General with the National Science Foundation. Dr. Boesz added some valuable comments from the NSF perspective and informed us later that she really enjoyed the presentation and appreciated our efforts to train research administrators on the importance and impact of cost-sharing.

Both presentations were a success and required less preparation time on my part. I plan to utilize the NCURA Video Workshops as a training tool again in the future. Thank you NCURA!

Effort is getting a lot of attention these days. The recent settlement agreement between the federal government and a major research university, resulting in a $5.5 million payment from the university to the government, has gotten everyone’s attention. The problem, at least to date, is that from published reports it is not easy to discern enough about the issues involved in that situation for either funding agencies like NIH or university associations like COGR to provide meaningful guidance. But we will work on that. I want to focus on another aspect of the case that has so far received little attention, and do it with a sports analogy.

It is probably a safe bet that science, no matter how dramatically it affects our lives, will ever seriously compete with sports for the attention of the average American. Sports phrases and terminology are infused so seamlessly into our culture that they form a common reference point for understanding in many areas. So let’s break down a common phrase from the sports world – I’ll use professional basketball, but it applies in all sports and see how that might help us understand effort by university faculty.

“He/she gives 110%.”

What does that mean? No one can really give more than 100%, right? Well, if you listen to the people making these claims – coaches, for instance – they will go on to explain. They will say that “he or she gets to the gym early for conditioning drills, lifts more weights, stays after practice shooting free throws, takes 100 extra jump shots, etc. She or he does this to make themselves a better player, which will make the team better, so they all might perform better.” More often than not, the very best players “give 110%.” The players do not have to do that. They are pros, they get a salary guaranteed in their contract, and they make more money from those contracts (at least that is true for the men) than you and I can imagine. Plus, they might play for corporate sponsors in summer leagues, or conduct sponsor-paid clinics for fans or junior players, for companies like Nike, Gatorade, or Jockey, to name a few. And how does society view this? Except for some degree of envy over the huge amounts of money involved (I’m guilty), it’s all good. Their performance has exceeded expectations, and everyone is happy.

Now let’s consider university researchers. They receive a salary from the university that pays them for teaching, research, service, and some administrative activities. They are also allowed to engage in non-institutional professional activities, and are in fact encouraged to do so. As they become more skilled in their field, they receive more grants, mentor more graduate students, serve on more departmental, college, or university-wide panels, serve on national panels and study groups, and engage in professional and clinical activities that may or may not be affiliated with the university. They are giving “110%.” These are the scientists making the breakthroughs we need to solve problems faced now and in the future. And this is, or at least should be if we follow the basketball analogy, a good thing that society is happy with and appreciates.

But what do we make them do? Because much of the university scientist’s compensation may be provided through federal support, they must account for their “effort,” which of course in total cannot exceed 100%. As required in OMB Circular A-21, the university must have an acceptable method of apportioning salaries to the activities for which the researcher is being compensated by the university, and the Circular provides examples of three acceptable payroll distribution methods. What these methods share is a requirement that someone, usually the principal investigator, must verify and assert that the charges are accurate and reflect the effort expended by himself/herself and others.

Have you ever tried this yourself? It’s not so easy, especially if you do not do it on a daily basis. I cannot imagine how a PI - with, say, 3 or 4 grants, serving on an IRB, a tenure committee, supervising three graduate students, traveling to and presenting at scientific meetings, and writing journal articles – is supposed to sit down once a month and try to very precisely apportion her/his effort. And what effort are we talking about? This has always been a sticking point with effort reporting, often mistakenly referred to as “time and effort” reporting, which erroneously links time to effort. A-21 tries to recognize this dilemma, by stating, “...it is recognized that, in an academic setting, teaching, research, service, and administration are often inextricably intermingled. A precise assessment of factors that contribute to costs is not always feasible, nor is it expected. Reliance, therefore, is placed on estimates in which a degree of tolerance is appropriate.”

Nevertheless, the little information available from the Qui Tam lawsuit and the Justice Department and the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General indicates that at least some within the government have much greater expectations with respect to the precision, inclusiveness, and timeliness of university effort reporting systems and current and pending support documentation. This is troubling, and we will have to work closely with NIH and other interested federal officials to develop a better understanding of how university systems currently work, engage with our faculty to help them allocate effort (not time) appropriately, and develop guidance that might help institutions establish compliant systems.

Obviously the pro basketball analogy is significantly different from federally-funded research in that no public money is involved. But, to use another sports term, we need to keep our eye on the ball. We cannot become so intent on accounting for precise levels of effort in all scientific and professional endeavors that researchers, in frustration, curtail their activities in order to be able to more precisely account for them.

Tony De Crappeo is the Associate Director, Council on Governmental Relations (COGR).
Since the NIH Commons version 2.2 was deployed last December 2002, over 430 research institutions have registered institutional profiles in the NIH Commons system and 3,300 registered users accounts have been established for investigators and administrative personnel. Fifty-two percent of the registered users are Principal Investigators.

electronic Streamlined Non-competing Application Process (eSNAP)
The sixteen grantee institutions that comprise the Commons Working Group (CWG) met on April 30, 2003 and reported at that meeting the following information:

- 84 type 5 progress reports had been submitted through eSNAP;
- Since April 30 the number of progress reports submitted through eSNAP has increased to over 200;
- Twenty grantee institutions have participated in this eSNAP “production pilot;”
- An updated version of the eRA Commons (Version 2.2.3.0) is expected to be released to the pilot group in July with some significant enhancements based upon input from the institutions and Principal Investigators participating in the pilot; and,
- The eSNAP module is expected to be fully deployed and available to all grantee institutions in December 2003.

Financial Status Reports (FSR)
The electronic FSR module was fully deployed in March 2003 and is currently available to all grantee institutions. Over 3,900 FSRs have been submitted electronically, 50 percent of the total volume of Financial Status Reports submitted since the deployment. The CWG institutions at the April 30 meeting reported that the FSR module was working well and did not need any major enhancements.

Internet Assisted Review (IAR)
NIH began an IAR pilot in December 2002. Sixteen NIH Scientific Review Administrators have participated in this pilot to expedite the review of competing grant applications. The IAR module provides a standard process for the submission of critiques and initial priority scores prior to the study section meeting. Use of IAR results in easier, more efficient administration of scientific reviews resulting in summary statements being released more quickly. IAR is scheduled to be deployed in production the first weekend in August 2003.

Outreach Program
NIH staff has offered a number of presentations on the NIH eRA project across the country over the past year. There will be two NIH Commons Demos at the NCURA Annual Meeting on Monday afternoon November 3 and Tuesday afternoon November 4.

NIH, also, recently initiated a Virtual eRA School on the Web at http://era.nih.gov/virtualschool. An FSR tutorial is currently available at this site. Later this year the NIH eRA communications Outreach Branch plans to offer other tutorials on iEdison, Internet Assisted Review, and possibly eSNAP.

Tom Wilson serves as the Director, Grants & Contracts, University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center and is the NCURA Representative on the NIH Working Group.

More and more universities are receiving research funding from industry. The contracts that are negotiated for this funding are often very different from the Federal contracts that have been a staple around the university research administration offices for many years. What sorts of things should you expect to see in an industry-generated research agreement? What flexibility is required to make industry/university research more palatable for both sides?

There are at least two types of research programs that industry may choose to fund. One would be research that is of great interest to the industry partner where any output from the program will provide value-added for the sponsor. Another scenario would be when industry sponsors research for a particular faculty member because that faculty member has been a supporter of their particular cause. It is not often that industry funds a research program that provides them no benefit at all. Following are a few of the clauses that you could expect to see in an industrial research contract. Each of these may differ in content considerably depending on how the research program fits into the industrial sponsor’s commercial development program. Having a good understanding of what the research program entails will help you better understand how to approach the negotiations for these clauses.

Nearly all industry research contracts will contain a confidentiality clause. The clause will be written either as a one-way clause whereby only the confidential information from one party is covered under the agreement. If the circumstance is such that both parties intend to provide information that they deem confidential, the clause will be written to cover the confidential information of both parties. Work closely with your industry counterpart and your researcher to understand what information is needed from

continued on next page
both parties to know how to approach this clause. Look to your publication clause to deal with your “publish or perish” needs making sure that the two clauses complement each other.

The publication clause will be one that will change dramatically from contract to contract based on the research program and how it fits into the industry’s own program. There are times when your tenured faculty may be willing to conduct a research program where no publications can or will be developed (either due to lack of data or because of contract restrictions) to be able to access the information that would be provided by industry that they could not otherwise get their hands on. Taken in context and with everyone’s understanding regarding any restrictions or special review and approval processes from the outset, this can work within the university. In the cases where publication creates no problems for either party, industry will need to have the right to review publications before they are submitted so that any intellectual property that has been disclosed in the publication can be properly protected. These reviews give the university the ability to rely on your industry partner to help identify inventions that might not be so obvious. This review and protection period is important to both parties especially given the university’s inability to make the filing of a patent application a priority for a faculty member. You might consider this as you are negotiating the period of time allowed for preparation and filing of any patents.

With the current climate of acquisitions and mergers, most industry partners will need the ability to assign a research contract should their business that the contract pertains to be acquired or merges with another entity. It is important to make sure that both parties’ interests are covered in this type of clause, however, most contracting folks within the university will know through the local media whenever these acquisitions or mergers are taking place well in advance so that the research administrators can get in contact with their sponsor to discuss the project going forward.

Last but not least will be the options/licenses clauses that you will find in an industrial contract. If the industry partner cannot benefit from the research that it has funded, it rarely makes sense for them to provide the money to the university for the project. To recognize benefit, the industrial partner will need the right to review the inventions and take appropriate licenses to them. Be reasonable about the length of time to review disclosures of inventions that arise from the research program. Many times faculty report inventions that are at a very early stage and are yet to be proven. You may be in a position to consider the payment of related patent preparation and filing costs as fair compensation for lengthening an option period for these early stage inventions. If the invention centers around the industry’s confidential information, you might consider a longer period of time for the option. If this industry partner can not see it’s way clear to use the new invention at the stage that it is in, probably no other industry will either. Some industries have a much longer invention-to-shelf time based on the type of product they sell. Consider all of these options when negotiating these clauses. Your research sponsor is a built-in licensee if all works well. You should always consider whether you are pricing your technology (and “pricing” would include but not be limited to, license fees, patent costs, future compensation either as annual fees and/or royalties) so high that it would be less expensive for industry to go in-house and find another way to solve their problem.

As stated earlier, good negotiations and contracts come about when both parties are familiar with the project, their expected outcomes, and the needs of the other side.

Connie Armentrout serves as a Technology Licensing Manager for Monsanto Company.

HIPAA: COMMONLY ASKED QUESTIONS FOR RESEARCH

For many, April 14, 2003 was just another spring day. But for some lucky few, it was “HIPAA Day.” On this long-awaited day the final privacy regulations as promulgated by the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) went into effect. While we are not aware of any earth-shattering events occurring on this day or since, many research administrators, researchers, research staff members, IRB’s and research sponsors are still grappling with the challenges of being HIPAA compliant.

The HIPAA regulations set forth the standards that aim to protect the privacy of electronically transmitted health information. These standards include data security, electronic transactions and code sets. The April 14th compliance date was for the “Privacy Rule” which sets the minimum standards for protecting electronically transmitted health information. It is also within these privacy regulations that research involving individually identifiable health information is governed and that the research community has become most familiar with HIPAA.

In order to assist researchers and administrators with these complex research issues, we have prepared the following commonly asked questions and responses:

Is HIPAA authorization the same as informed consent? No. HIPAA authorization is a written authorization for the use or disclosure of protected health information (i.e., research study data) for research purposes. Researchers must still obtain informed consent from the study participant and document this process with the informed consent document. HIPAA authorization is supplemental to the informed consent document and not a replacement. As such, the HIPAA authorization can be obtained in a separate document that is signed and dated or it can be a section within the informed consent document.

What are the required elements of a HIPAA authorization? HIPAA authorization should include:

- Specific and meaningful description of information used or disclosed;
- Name of person(s) authorized to use or disclose;
- Name of person(s) to whom the covered entity may disclose;
- Description of the purpose for use/disclosure;
- Signature of subject and date;
- Expiration date for disclosure/use (research may be “none”);
- Right to revoke authorization (must be in writing);
- Conditions of the authorization; and
- Potential for information disclosed with authorization to be re-disclosed by recipient and without “Privacy Rule” protection.

continued on next page
What is a waiver of authorization?
A waiver of authorization allows the use or disclosure of Private Health Information (PHI) without written authorization. A waiver of authorization may be granted by IRB or Privacy Board when:

- the use/disclosure of PHI involves “minimal risk” to subject’s privacy;
- an adequate plan to protect identifiers from improper use/disclosure exists;
- an adequate plan to destroy identifiers at as soon as possible or at the end of the study exists;
- adequate written assurances that PHI will not be reused/redisclosed (except as required by law) are made;
- the research could not “practically” be conducted without waiver; and
- research could not “practically” be conducted without PHI.

What is the required documentation of a waiver of authorization?
Upon granting a waiver of authorization the IRB or Privacy Board must document:

- Name of IRB/Privacy Board;
- Date of waiver approval;
- Signature of IRB/Privacy Board Chair or designee;
- Statement that IRB/Privacy Board determined that waiver criteria were met;
- Brief description of PHI necessary for the research project; and
- Statement that waiver was reviewed and approved under “normal or expedited review procedures and all applicable procedures were followed”.

Please note that while the process is similar to the process of waiving informed consent documentation; the two are distinct and separate processes.

What is Protected Health Information (PHI)?
The following variables are considered PHI:

- Name
- Address
- Employer
- Relative’s Names
- Dates
  - DOB
  - Admission
  - Discharge
  - Death
- Age ≥ 90
- Telephone Number
- Fax Number
- Email or IP Address
- SSN
- Medical Record Number
- Account Numbers
- Certificate/License Numbers
- Vehicle identifiers
- Voice/fingerprints
- Photos
- Any other unique identifying number, characteristic or code

What is de-identified health information?
De-identified health information is information that does not identify an individual or that has no reasonable basis to believe that an individual could be identified. Removing the PHI from the data transmissions/extractions serves de-identify the data.

What is a limited data set?
A limited data set allows for the use or disclosure of a limited amount of identifiers when used for:

- Research,
- Public Health, or
- Health Care Operations

When conducting research that involves a limited data set both parties are required to sign a Data Use Agreement that includes specific regulatory terms.

What is the role of the IRB as it relates to HIPAA?
For most research institutions, the IRB is serving as Privacy Board as it relates to research issues. As such, the IRB has the responsibility of reviewing and approving HIPAA authorizations and reviewing and approving HIPAA waivers of authorization. Human subject protections and subject confidentiality still remain the primary focus of the IRB.

For data collected prior to April 14, 2003, does it require authorization for use?
No. Researchers do not have to reconsent or gain authorization from subjects for data collected prior to April 14, 2003. Researchers only need written authorization or waiver of authorizations for data collected on or after April 14, 2003.

Who may review medical records for potential subjects and who may contact potential subjects?
A researcher who is a member of a covered entity may review medical records without HIPAA authorization under review preparatory to research to identify potential subjects. Additionally the researcher may contact potential subjects. However, the researcher CANNOT release information (such as names or phone numbers) to sponsors.

A researcher who is NOT a member of a covered entity may review medical records without HIPAA authorization under review preparatory to research to identify potential subjects. However, this researcher CANNOT contact potential subjects without IRB/Privacy Board approval of waiver of authorization, nor can he/she release information (such as names or phone numbers) to sponsors.

Are research sponsors or researchers considered a business associate?
A business associate is an organization who performs activities on behalf of the covered entity (i.e., claims processing or billing agency). Generally, a research sponsor or researcher is NOT a business associate. If a researcher is hired to create a “limited data set”, he/she may be treated as a business associate. As such, you should consult with your Chief Privacy Officer. When a project involves a business associate, both parties are required to sign a Business Associate Agreement or have such language in another agreement that includes specific regulatory terms.

While these questions and responses do not address all issues that the research community will face in the coming months, it highlights the issues that researchers and research institutions will face in conducting research under the newly implemented HIPAA regulations. For additional guidance, please refer to DHHS’ website: http://www.dhhs.gov/ocr/hipaa/.

Angela Charboneau serves as the Director, Research Facilitation and Compliance for the University of Texas Medical Branch Galveston.

Click on the NCURA Neighborhoods at www.ncura.edu to check out the transcript from the Interactive Learning Series on HIPAA.
All over Yale’s campus, administrators with critical messages try to get the faculty’s attention - conflict of interest, sexual harassment, blood borne pathogens, proper conduct of investigations involving human subjects or animals, financial management of grants and contracts – the topic list of required training runs into the hundreds. Moreover, that list doesn’t include all the management, leadership, and other training that would also benefit each faculty member as s/he moves through his or her career.

Every administrator, part of whose job it is to make sure that faculty are in compliance with laws and regulations, knows in his or her heart that their area or topic is the most critical piece of information, rising above all other topics. It isn’t unusual for me to hear, “Oh Laura, forget about sexual harassment training, my radiation safety course is much more important.”

Whether legally required or designed to enhance management skills, faculty simply don’t willingly participate. At Yale, we have a 2% faculty participation rate in management, career, personal development and other non-required classes as compared with an almost 55% participation rate among our management and clerical staff. In required training, Yale does much better, but not without an extremely high “effort” to “attendance” ratio (“effort of the training unit” to “attendance by faculty” ratio).

Barriers to Faculty Participation in Training
So why is it so hard to train faculty? After 20 years at Yale, as a student, consultant, summer faculty, alumni, and now employee and facilitator of faculty organizational development interventions, I believe the following factors contribute to the faculty’s reluctance to participate in training programs:

Professional Identity
Joseph Raelin, in his book “The Clash of Cultures: Managers Managing Professionals,” articulates the tension created by professional identities. Many administrators identify with their university or college. “I am a Yale administrator.” They might have a sense of professional identity as well. “I am an organizational development practitioner.” But both identities (organizational and professional) are held in equal stature and are often not in conflict with one another.

For other professionals, such as faculty and physicians, the primary identity is the professional one. When I ask a member of the astronomy faculty to define herself, the first answer is “I am an astronomer,” not “I am a Yale faculty member.” The tie to the University and its organizational needs is often very low on the identity list. This hierarchy of identity produces a different set of priorities and focus of attention than one in which professional and organizational identity is more closely aligned.

Sense of Knowing
Most faculty are at the “top of their game” in their field. They have spent years learning, researching, and writing in their field. They are the experts. This level of achievement works against them in a learning situation outside their field. To learn, at some psychological level (conscious or unconscious), one must accept the idea that one does not know. This stance of not knowing is counter to the expert stance that most faculty justifiably hold during their usual activities.

Time
Yada, yada, yada. There’s not much to say about this barrier that almost all of us don’t already experience every day. Given the pressure to do research, get research dollars, teach, serve on university committees, participate in their professional associations, mentor graduate students and have a life, it is no wonder that faculty, like all of us, choose their priorities. When I was pregnant with my first son, the midwife leading our childbirth class did a bit of math for all of us expectant and naïve parents in the room. She asked us how much time we thought we would have for our current activities, such as sleeping, once the baby was born. We all optimistically raised our hands and said 2 hours, 5 hours, 3 hours. Then she did the math for us. How long does it take to change a diaper? 15 minutes x 11 diapers/day. How long does it take to nurse? 40 minutes x 8 times/day. How long does it take to dress or bathe the baby? 20 minutes x 2 times/day. How long does it take to get the baby back to sleep? 20 minutes x 5 times/day.

You get the picture. By the time we did the math, we realized that we’d be lucky to get a shower every other day and more than 3 hours of sleep.

All of our lives these days have the same math, just different elements in the equation. The professor’s equation has as its required outcome success in a specialized field --not in their organization, in their field. If training does not directly relate to this outcome then the training element will be dropped from the equation.

Peer Pressure
“I am a professor, therefore I will act like a professor. And what is it that my faculty peers are doing?” When a professor looks around at his/her peers, running off to a training class with a joyous face is not one of the primary activities s/he sees. What s/he does see is fellow faculty members trying their best to keep the administrative requirements to a minimum.

Noise in the Field
When someone is attending the symphony, usually the discrete sounds of the instruments sum to a meaningful whole. Occasionally the composer will pull one sound out to make a musical point. Faculty life can be like a symphony without a conductor. Each instrument represents a different “noise” or pull on the faculty member’s attention. Administrative training is just one small voice in the back of the symphony. It is extremely difficult to increase the training sound so that it will be heard above the other instruments and it is highly unlikely that training will be given a solo unless there is a crisis that demands training.

So what can be done to increase the faculty’s attention to and availability for training and learning about administrative matters?

1) Accept reality. It is impossible for any one method to overcome the barriers listed above since they are a part of the structure of academic life.

continued on page 20
Go West, Young Research Administrator

by Bill Sharp

One of the earliest uses [of the word “wilderness”] was in the eighth-century epic Beowulf, where wildēor appeared in reference to savage and fantastic beasts inhabiting a dismal region of forests, crags, and cliffs.

Roderick Nash
Wilderness and the American Mind

Like westward pioneers endeavoring to transform fearsome “wilderness” into righteous civilization, NCURA has started to bring some order to the often savage but always fantastic world of research administration by establishing its own set of beneficent communities. The NCURA Neighborhoods have arrived!

A significant member benefit, the web-based NCURA Neighborhoods provide an array of resources, opportunities for discussion, and news all centered on a particular topic area. The Electronic Research Administration (eRA), Financial Research Administration (FRA), and Pre-Award Neighborhoods were established toward the end of 2001, with the Compliance, Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions (PUI), and Departmental Administration Neighborhoods joining them in 2002. Now entering their third year of existence overall, the Neighborhoods are already among the most frequently visited pages on the NCURA Web site.

A Quick Tour of the Neighborhoods

Like any “real” neighborhood, each NCURA Neighborhood has its own character (even charm?), but they do share some common features:

Library. Each community library contains articles, links, and other resources pertaining to that Neighborhood’s theme. The libraries are nicely organized into topics and subtopics. Browse through them and you are likely to find a goldmine of useful information.

FRA Neighborhood chair Kerry Peluso points out that in her Neighborhood, for instance, “there are many topics covered with lots of links to sample policies and best practices. Whether you want to learn about the basics of post award administration, view other institution’s cost sharing policies, or read about some ‘hot topics’ in research administration, this is a great place to look. Why reinvent the wheel? Need a nicely written explanation defining ‘F&A’? There are several already written and available from links in the FRA Neighborhood’s library section. Newly added areas include Financial Accounting Systems and Newsletter Articles.” In short, the Neighborhood libraries are a great resource.

Interactive Learning Series. Making its debut in August 2001, the Interactive Learning Series (ILS) is a program of moderated online “chats” featuring notable guests ready, willing, and able to respond to questions and comments on a timely topic. Over twenty ILS sessions have been held to date, with an average of thirty-three NCURA members participating in each. Recent sessions have addressed:

• The Critical Roles of Central and Departmental Administrators, co-sponsored by the Departmental Administrators Neighborhood and the FRA Neighborhood;
• A HIPAA Q&A sponsored by the Compliance Neighborhood;
• An e-Grants Update sponsored by the eRA Neighborhood and co-lead at the U.S. Department of Education; and,
• A Washington Update sponsored by all of the Neighborhoods and co-lead by two associate directors from the Council on Government Relations (COGR).

• These hour-long ILS sessions enable NCURA members to pose questions to key national figures as well as to colleagues “in the know” on a particular subject. Questions may even be submitted in advance. For those who are unable to participate in the chats “live,” transcripts are available for download within a week at http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/ilsarchive.asp.

On Campus. On Campus is a series of “e-interviews” designed to provide a personal perspective on the day-to-day activities and concerns of research administrators at various levels and from varied institutions. Administrators from the University of North Florida, State University of New York at Buffalo, Vanderbilt University, Oregon Health and Science University, and Morgan State University submitted to this intimate “Q&A” in 2002-2003. Each Neighborhood will sponsor about two On Campus sessions during the next year. Get to know some of your colleagues from across the country in a new way by perusing the On Campus archives accessible from the “Town Hall” menu of each Neighborhood.

Listservs. Each Neighborhood has its own email list, or “listserv,” allowing list members to post questions and engage in threaded discussions regarding current topics of interest with other members of the list. A listserv is a great way to find somebody else out there who has encountered an issue facing you right now. It allows you to compare notes easily and quickly. Since the lists are centered on a topic area, your posts will only go out to others who have signed up for that list. In other words, no need to worry about bothering the entire online world of research administrators with your elaborate HIPAA question! Join any of the Neighborhood listservs by sending an email to Joshua Lessin at lessin@ncura.edu. A confirmation with user guidelines will be sent to you. Then you can manage your Neighborhood listserv preferences along with all your other NCURA communications from your member page at http://www.ncura.edu/members.

Events. Each Neighborhood maintains a calendar of events of ILS sessions, national meetings, workshops—any event related to that Neighborhood’s topic area. Click “Events” on the main menu bar of any Neighborhood page to view them.

Careers. Hedge your bets by keeping an eye on job opening announcements in your field. Click on the “Career” button on the main menu bar of any Neighborhood page to check them out.

And More. Some of the best features of the Neighborhoods just can’t be categorized. Visit the main Neighborhood page regularly at http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods to find out what’s new in the Neighborhoods. An article of general interest can usually be found there, as well as some useful links, such as convenient URL listings of institutional sponsored research offices, federal funding agencies, and nonprofit research administration organizations. The status of FY2003 federal appropriation bills is also currently posted.
A Community Effort
Do you remember that television Western where a homesteader’s barn burns down but then all of the other settlers from miles around join in to help rebuild it? (Don’t bother trying to remember which Western that was, because it was most of them.) Well no one’s barn has burned down in this case, but the same sense of community has truly raised these Neighborhoods out of nothing. NCURA’s Joshua Lessin, who was hired in May 2001, to serve as project manager for the Neighborhoods project, remarked that the volunteer support at all levels has been the one characteristic that has most impressed him about the Neighborhoods. People have stepped forward to serve as speakers at ILS sessions, have committed their time and efforts to serve on Neighborhood committees, and have scoured their file drawers, bookmarks, and notebooks to come up with a very useful collection of resources for the Neighborhood libraries—a collection that continues to grow every week. NCURA has indeed established a “settlement” to be proud of!

What’s on the Horizon?
Now that the Neighborhoods have been established, Neighborhood committees are focusing on strategic planning to ensure that they continue to grow with their “residents” needs in mind. For example, Scot Gudger, chair of the Departmental Administration Neighborhood, notes that departmental administrators require a broad background of knowledge in many areas—not just in research administration. His Neighborhood plans to use its listserv and upcoming ILS sessions this fall as settings for focus group discussions that will help identify members’ professional needs that can be helped by the Neighborhood. He also hopes that the Neighborhood will be able to provide more opportunities for departmental administrators to interact and network with one another.

NCURA believes that after two years spent largely just getting established, the Neighborhoods have now really hit their stride as they enter the third year. We have scheduled a fall open house, which will allow the Neighborhoods an opportunity to shine for members and non-member visitors. For non-member visitors this open house will no doubt make the case for the benefits of NCURA membership.

In conclusion, for the Neighborhoods to continue their trend of “smart growth,” the continued active participation of NCURA members is crucial. Think “community” when the next call for volunteers is issued. In the meantime, if you have not already done so, be sure to visit the Neighborhood. And stay a spell.

Bill Sharp serves as a Compliance Officer for the University of Kansas.

See page 10 for information about NCURA’s Online Education Programs!

Neighborhoods to Sponsor Fall Open House, Call for Volunteers
For the second consecutive year, the NCURA Neighborhoods will sponsor a “Back to School” Open House and invite members and guests to visit the online communities, participate in Interactive Learning Series (ILS) sessions, review the monthly issues of On Campus, and of course, peruse the many online resources and materials.

When you log on, be sure to check out what’s new in the Neighborhoods!
On Campus is an electronic interview designed to give a more personal account of day-to-day activities, issues, and obstacles in research administration. The July issue (Department Administration Neighborhood) featured Scot Gudger, Department Administrator for Molecular and Medical Genetics at Oregon Health & Science University. The August issue (ERA Neighborhood) is scheduled to feature Ellen Beck, ERA Coordinator at the University of California - Los Angeles. On Campus is published the first Monday of each month. Read On Campus at http://www.ncura.edu/members/Neighborhoods/.

Visit the ILS page for a schedule of upcoming programs and the pdf transcripts of all previous sessions. The ILS page also has links to Frequently Asked Questions, User Guidelines, the Appropriate Use Policy, and details on how and when to participate in the online discussions. View the ILS website at http://www.ncura.edu/members/Neighborhoods/ils.asp. The Neighborhood Open House is scheduled for September 1 - October 15, 2003. During this time the Neighborhood’s front door will be open so and you will not be required to provide your userid and password to enter the communities.

We look forward to your visit!

In addition to the “Back to School” Open House, the Neighborhoods are also sponsoring a Call for Volunteers for 2004. All six online communities will be seeking members to lead the online community initiative. Committee members will help determine which materials should be posted in the Neighborhoods and assist in the planning of ILS sessions and the monthly issues of On Campus (as scheduled). Neighborhood Committees work best when made up of a wide variety of backgrounds, so whether you’re new to NCURA or you’re an experienced member of the association, the Neighborhoods could be a great match for your knowledge, skills, and interest! The Call for Volunteers is scheduled for September 1 - October 15, 2003. Each Neighborhood Committee typically has five or six members. The 2004 Neighborhood Committees will have an opportunity for a “Meet and Greet” during the 45th Annual Meeting in Washington, DC. Consider nominating a colleague or answering the Call for yourself! For more information on the Neighborhoods, please contact Joshua Lessin at lessin@ncura.edu. Phone: 202.466.3894.
On June 12, 2003, NCURA debuted its first Online Education Program (OEP) entitled “Tools for the Department Administrator: Essential Administrative and Fiscal Management Tactics” and forever changed the way NCURA members can share, teach, and learn.

The OEP is a live, interactive web/audio conference that combines the audio and PowerPoint slides of the Video Workshop Series with the desktop accessibility of the Interactive Learning Series (ILS). All that is required to participate in OEP is an Internet connection and a phone line. Over 400 members and guests participated in the inaugural program. Three institutions (Baylor College of Medicine, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, and Georgetown University) took advantage of the multi-user discount, saving their institutions hundreds of dollars.

The OEP has specific learned outcomes (similar to the Annual Meeting Workshops) associated with each program. The OEP format invites the same interaction with participants as a face-to-face seminar. This user-friendly medium allows for questions to be submitted electronically (like the ILS) and via telephone (like the Video Workshop Series). Online polling, led by the speakers and moderator, provides attendees with topical questions and immediate results for discussion. In addition, Continuing Education Units (CEUs) are available to those who attend the OEP. To receive CEUs one only needs to verify participation by sending an Excel spreadsheet with a list of all participants to ceurequest@ncura.edu.

“NIH Commons and the ERA Environment” will be the topic for the third OEP. This program will take place on September 11, 2003 and will feature David Wright, eRA Policy Analyst, and Paul Markovitz, Computer Specialist at the National Institutes of Health. Program information and registration details will soon be available on the NCURA website.

For more information on the Online Education Programs, please contact Joshua Lessin at lessin@ncura.edu

Phone: 202.466.3894
Join us along with these OUTSTANDING speakers

Daniel D. Adams, Protein Sciences Corporation
Jack Anthony, Tularik
Connie M. Armentrout, Monsanto Company
Karin Bartels, Degussa Corporation
Janet Bercovitz, Duke University
Scott Blackwood, U of North Carolina Chapel Hill
Carol Blum, Council on Governmental Relations
Susan Butts, The Dow Chemical Company
James J. Casey, Bradley University
Robert Coraor, Air Products and Chemicals, Inc.
John M. Carfora, Boston College
Beth Donley, Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation
John Donovan, Innovation Dublin
James Duley, Hewlett-Packard Labs
David Dworaczyk, Quintiles
Maryann Feldman, University of Toronto
Jilda Diehl Garton, Georgia Institute of Technology
Kay Gilles, Agilent Technologies
Bradley Googins, Center for Corporate Citizenship
Robert Gruetzmacher, DuPont
Ann Hammersla, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Patricia Harsche-Weeks, Fox Chase Cancer Center
Thomas R. Henneberry, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Lucy Cathcart Hicks, U of Alabama at Birmingham
Cheryl-Lee Howard, Johns Hopkins University
Owen Hughes, Pfizer Global R&D
Catherine Innes, University of Washington
Kathleen Irwin, University of Wisconsin - Madison
Chris Jansen, Chris Jansen Associates
Steve Jerrems, Dublin Institute of Technology
Richard A. Johnson, Arnold & Porter, Washington, DC
Patrick Jones, University of Arizona
Regis Kelly, University of California, San Francisco
Ravi Kiron, Strategic Alliances, Pfizer Global R&D
Bob Killoreen, Pennsylvania State University
Ed Krause, Ford Motor Company
Beatrice Leigh, GlaxoSmithKline Pharmaceuticals R&D
Martin Lyes, Enterprise Ireland
David Mayo, The California Institute of Technology
Joe McCracken, Genentech/Roche
Gary E. Miller, Pennsylvania State University
Arlene Morris, Clearview Projects
Julie T. Norris, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Marvin Parnes, University of Michigan
Tom Picone, Pharmacia Corporation
Michael R. Poterala, Michigan State University
Frederic Quan, Corning Incorporated
David H. Quick, Rolls-Royce Corporation
Pete Records, Battelle Memorial Institute
Bryan Renk, Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation
George Rountree, Caterpillar, Inc.
Cheryl Schaffer, Center for Corporate Citizenship
John A. Schneider, Purdue Research Foundation
James A. Severson, University of Washington
Juliana Shei, General Electric Corporation
Sarah E. Starr, The Ohio State U Research Foundation
Harry Steudel, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Tyler B. Thompson, The Dow Chemical Company
Jim Urquhart, Dublin Institute of Technology
Francis Via, Fairfield Resources International, Inc.
James Walsh, Dublin Institute of Technology
Lou Witkin, Hewlett-Packard Company

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

SESSIONS INCLUDE:

- Enhancing Communications and Understanding Between Industry and University
- Export Controls and University Research: Know the Bright Lines but Read the Fine Print!
- A Delicate Balance: The Deal and Financial Conflicts of Interests
- Industry-University Contracting: Confluence or Conflict?
- Understanding and Working through Culture Conflicts-Dealing with Different Metrics and Expectations
- Successful Partnering: Many Forms, A Single Theme
- The Good, The Bad, The Ugly Consortium: How It Really Will Benefit the General Public
- Improving the Process of Creating Research Partnerships: What Six Sigma and Other Tools Tell Us
- Collaborate or Compete: What Do the Partners Want?
- International Roundtable: Framing Current and Future Issues
- University and Industry: Partnering in the Post-award Environment
- Shaping the Opportunities of Today into Tomorrow’s Research
- Studies of the University/Industry Interface: Insights on Problems and Best Practices
- Real Technology Transfer: Transfer of Knowledge vs. Transfer of Rights
- USA & European IP: Divided by a Common Language
- Partnerships in the Biotech Industry
- International Research Partnerships: Headaches or Eye-openers?
- Best Practices in Technology Transfer

Make your hotel reservations today! Hotel Cut off is July 25, 2003. Make sure to tell the Argent you are with NCURA.

The Argent Hotel
50 Third Street
San Francisco, California 94103
Phone: 415-974-6400
Reservations: 877-222-6699
Room Rate: $153 Single/Double
Cut Off Date For Reservations: Friday, July 25, 2003

See you in San Francisco!

For the Full Program, or to register online with a credit card, please go to http://www.ncura.edu/conferences/ui03
Results of Directory Survey

By Cynthia S. White

During the month of May, 831 NCURA members actively participated in a survey about the on-line NCURA Membership Directory. Though the Board had led the organization to an on-line directory to both contain costs and provide up-to-the minute accuracy, NCURA leaders have clearly heard expressed concerns and calls for the return of the hard copy format. Survey questions focused on awareness of the directory and its features and usage of the directory. In addition, members were polled about their interest in paying for a hard copy of the Membership Directory through either dues (every member receiving a copy in the mail) or purchase (the option to order a bound directory or purchase one at an NCURA meeting).

The results of this survey were quite interesting. More importantly, the results sent clear messages to the Board---always hoped for but never guaranteed.

• Out of the 831 responses, 67% were aware that NCURA does have an on-line Membership Directory and “Quick Membership Search” feature--41% use it.
• Only 7% of those surveyed have ever printed out a Membership Directory. (A PDF version resides on the website to ensure an attractive printed product.)
• Eighty-five percent of those responding do not support paying higher membership dues to supply each member with a hard copy of the Directory.
• Eighty-one percent believe that members who desire a hard copy of the Directory should be requested to purchase it. Only 16% said they would purchase one.
• Finally, though 16% said, “Yes, I would like to purchase a hard copy,” 18% responded that they would be willing to pay $20 plus postage and handling (The price quote won 14 people over on the spot, so it must be more than fair).

With this impressive number of responses, leadership and staff can truly say that the pulse of the membership has been taken. On behalf of the Officers and Board, I would like to say thank you to everyone who weighed in on this question and submit a parting request to all 831 respondents and you, the gentle reader:

VOTE IN THE UPCOMING NCURA ELECTION!

Your voice and opinion are needed to choose leadership for the future. Participation is powerful, so come back and do it again!

Cynthia White is the Secretary of NCURA and serves as the Director, Research Office, Washington University.

NCURA Members Care

By Kathleen Larmett

Last month, I was asked to give a luncheon address on the topic of strategic planning at the headquarters of a large trade association based here in Washington, D.C. My audience was made up of 50 president-elects of the organization’s state affiliates. During my presentation, I spoke about the responsiveness of NCURA members and mentioned that during a poll about our membership directory, over 300 members voted within two hours of the poll’s release. This remark was met with looks of surprise, awe, wonderment, and, in some cases, disbelief. At first, I didn’t understand these reactions and then, the light bulb turned on --- one of those “Aha!” moments. “Hard to believe?” I asked my audience. “Not at NCURA. Our members are very engaged and active in their association. They want to know what’s happening, they want a voice in major decisions and, they are not afraid to step up and volunteer when help is needed.”

With over 200,000 associations and professional societies in this country, we often look to those that are most successful to obtain our best practices. What we often fail to do is look at those that are not so successful --- to make sure we have not picked up any of their bad habits. Having the good fortune to know association CEOs from across the country, I can tell you that association problems come in all shapes and sizes. I have heard Executive Directors talk about everything from dysfunctional Boards to apathetic members. Many organizations lack leadership and many have no strategic plan (or have one and never look at it). So they wind up changing course each year and never arrive at a successful destination. This is not NCURA.

Thank you, NCURA members, for taking the time to respond to our membership directory poll and, be assured, that when the next issue arises we’ll be back to ask you for your opinion. Your continuing support and interest is what helps make your professional society the one that works for you!

Kathleen Larmett is the Executive Director of NCURA.

Regional Leadership Training Workshop—June 6-7, 2003

By Kathleen Larmett

Financial Research Administration V

It is a great honor to serve as your chair for next year’s upcoming FRA conference. The concept of a conference dedicated to Financial Research Administration has been a wonderful success. Each year, this conference has benefitted us all by providing up to date information, as well as, providing us with an opportunity to expand and further develop our skills and knowledge. Whether you work in a department or in a central office, are experienced in financial research administration or are new to it, next year’s conference will continue to provide many opportunities to expand your knowledge base. We will be taking a fresh look at topics addressed at past conferences, as well as, expanding our agenda to include other issues currently facing financial research administrators. I look forward to sharing another rewarding experience with all of you next year. Hope to see you there!

FRAV Chair Kerry Peluso is the Director, Post Award Financial Administration, University of Pennsylvania.

Front Row (l to r) Charlie Kaars, SUNY-Buffalo; Judy Cook, Baylor College of Medicine; Melody Page, University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center; Debbie Neuton, University of Tulsa; Middle Row (l to r) Chiia Kao, NCURA; Stacy Riseman, Worcester Polytechnic Institute; Cindy Lopez, California State University, Monterey Bay; Debra Barnes Murphy, Arizona State University; Back Row (l to r) Sara Streich, Rush-Presbyterian-St. Luke’s Medical Center; David Mayo, California Institute of Technology; Kerry Peluso, University of Pennsylvania; Patrick Green, University of Miami; Joanna Leman, NCURA; Robert Bridges, Harvard Medical School (not pictured Mary Beth Catren, SUNY-Binghamton)
The growth trend that NCURA has experienced over the past few years continued for the year ended December 31, 2002. The tragic events of 911 negatively impacted the 2001 revenues, however, 2002 has resumed the positive trends of the previous years. Conferences and workshops continue to be very well attended and expanded offerings such as more on-line interactive sessions are planned for the upcoming year. NCURA continues to strive to provide updated and informative training information that is applicable to the sponsored research community. The popularity of the conferences and workshops is a key indicator that we are accomplishing this goal.

President of NCURA, Robert A. Killoren, Jr., spoke recently at the regional spring meetings. During his speech he reminded us of the difference in NCURA’s strategic financial goal set a few years ago and the latest revised goal. The previous strategic goal stated in part that “NCURA will have sufficient non-dues revenue”, while the current strategic goal states “NCURA will maintain its financial strength and integrity”. Based on the previous financial statements and the current year, NCURA has met the goal the board set and the organization is on its way to “maintaining its financial strength and integrity” as shown in the financial statement for the year ended December 31, 2002.

A recent quote by Kathleen Larmett, NCURA Executive Director, reinforces the strength of NCURA. She states, “In the first four years of NCURA’s Strategic plan, our educational programs increased by 157% and our membership increased in size by 1,000. The financial health of NCURA is a reflection of a healthy, active and robust organization.”

REVENUES
For 2002, NCURA showed growth in all areas of operating revenues. The largest increases were the Annual Meeting, Membership Dues and Regional Conferences. The 2002 annual meeting revenue was expected to show a significant increase over 2001, as attendance in 2001 had been impacted by post-911 travel concerns. Yet, the 2002 annual meeting exceeded our expectations having an increase in revenue of $140,453 or 26% while membership dues increased by $79,386 or 17%. Regional Conferences showed the largest increased revenue growth of 45%. Demand for the workshops, special conferences and regional conferences continue to be strong. With these strong content offerings, NCURA has expanded its membership to approximately 4,500 members, an increase of 28% since 2000.

EXPENDITURES
In addition to the positive revenue growth, NCURA was able to maintain the 2002 expenditures relative to the 2001 level. In total there was a 3% increase in total program services expenditures from the previous year. Regional conferences expenditures showed the largest growth of 31%, however, the increases are in line with the increase in revenues. Everyone involved in the annual meetings, conferences and workshops should be commended for keeping expenditures to a minimum especially given the significant increases in membership participation. These fiscally responsible actions on behalf of NCURA and its staff contribute significantly in accomplishing the Board of Director’s strategic financial plan.

Julie Bullock is a Member of the Financial Management Committee and serves as a Manager, Accounting Operations for The Jackson Laboratory.

NCURA FINANCIALS: 2002 versus 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Category</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member Dues</td>
<td>$554,801</td>
<td>$475,415</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
<td>$678,381</td>
<td>$537,928</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting Workshops</td>
<td>$93,670</td>
<td>$82,055</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Conferences</td>
<td>$649,286</td>
<td>$632,958</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Conferences</td>
<td>$311,250</td>
<td>$214,462</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Workshops</td>
<td>$356,909</td>
<td>$335,645</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>$78,189</td>
<td>$70,240</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Dividends</td>
<td>$33,203</td>
<td>$61,369</td>
<td>-46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized loss/gain Investments</td>
<td>$(46,069)</td>
<td>$(37,744)</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>$16,914</td>
<td>$10,812</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,726,534</td>
<td>$2,383,140</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Category</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member Services</td>
<td>$506,277</td>
<td>$512,274</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
<td>$607,008</td>
<td>$611,833</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting Workshops</td>
<td>$59,224</td>
<td>$55,014</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Conferences</td>
<td>$497,791</td>
<td>$480,630</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Conferences</td>
<td>$365,225</td>
<td>$278,280</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Workshops</td>
<td>$213,517</td>
<td>$228,504</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>$47,526</td>
<td>$56,701</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,296,568</td>
<td>$2,223,256</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Difference            | $429,966 | $159,884 | 169%           |
Employee Self-Evaluation  By Beth H. Israel

No money? Are raises and evaluations due? More and more of our institutions require that we provide all professional staff with written evaluations at least once per year. I know mine does. As difficult an exercise as this is for managers in good times, how much more difficult does it become when little or no funds are available for increases? And how contentious can it become? How do we tell our staff members that they are doing wonderful jobs and yet give them 1% (or less) increases?

One way to handle this distasteful situation is to empower your employees to write their own evaluations. “No,” you say, “they will all write glowing evaluations that I will need to counter.” Not in my experience. I have asked my professional staff to write their own evaluations for the past 2 or 3 years now.

I have found that, almost to a fault, these individuals write thoughtful, realistic evaluations and are often harder on themselves than I would be. From a manager’s standpoint it is most interesting to see how an individual rates him/herself – how they present their achievements of the past year and their goals for the coming year. These self-evaluations are oftentimes most thought provoking for the manager. The evaluation then presents an opportunity for you to have a discussion of the individual’s performance – starting from their opinion, are the way to go. Good times or bad.

Try it. And let me know if it works for you.

Beth Israel is the Executive Director, Office of Projects and Grants, Columbia University.
On June 24th, research administrators across the country tuned in for the latest NCURA Satellite Video training program on the “The Lifecycle of Sponsored Costs: Budget to Audit”. The workshop featured Jerry Fife, Vanderbilt University, Mary Ellen Sheridan, University of Chicago, and Jane Youngers, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio as faculty. The premise of the program is that successful financial sponsored project management is a seamless enterprise. It begins with planning the budget during proposal submission, and continues through managing the day-to-day expenditures throughout the project period, closeout, reporting and audit. The faculty repeatedly stressed communication as the keystone among all the stakeholders: the PI, the pre- and post-award administrators, local research administrative staff, and those in central offices, and involving special resources when necessary, such as human resources, legal, and information systems folks. A-21 and A-110 were often cited as reference documents reminding us of the value of familiarity with these circulars to guide managing costs throughout the lifecycle of a sponsored project.

Timely subjects included:
- Why budget development is still important, even for modular grant applications;
- Using the award document (Notice of Grant Award, for example) as a tool for setting up the project correctly, the first time;
- Noting special conditions such as cost sharing or prior approvals right from the beginning of the award;
- Implementing an efficient and effective close-out process;
- Always be prepared for an audit

A live audience of NCURA members from several institutions in the DC vicinity provided a “classroom” quality for the workshop. Questions from the audience and from around the country fostered an interactive dialogue with the faculty on topics such as subrecipient monitoring, tracking cost sharing, and treatment of network connections from home offices. As faculty, we had fun preparing and presenting the program. We hope it reinforced for administrators the seamless thread of successful project management (or the consequences of oversights) from the initial stages of proposal development through closeout and report, and the dreaded audit.

Mary Ellen Sheridan serves as the Associate Vice President for Research and Director, University Research Administration, University of Chicago and is a Past President of NCURA.
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Region II enjoyed a productive meeting and wonderful spring weather in New York City in
Thanks to Anne Geronimo and the program
committee for recruiting a top-notch line-up of presenters, including our
keynote speaker, Dr. Ruth Macklin
of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, who spoke about ethical
issues in multinational research.
Special thanks to NYC residents Betty Farbman and Marti Dunne who provided
invaluable assistance and resources as we
made arrangements for the meeting and
events.
We are already making plans for our 2004
spring meeting at the Hyatt Regency
Baltimore on the Inner Harbor, Baltimore,
Maryland, April 24 - 27, 2004.  Sue Leitzell
is our Program Chair, assisted by co-chair
Mary Beth Curtin.
If you have never before attended the
NCURA Annual Meeting in Washington
DC -- think about attending this year, and
look for information (coming to you soon
by email) about the Region II travel award,
which provides some travel funds for a
“newcomer” to the annual meeting.
Region II is seeking candidates for the
position of regional Chair to serve as
Chair-Elect during calendar year 2004
and as Chair during 2005.  We are also
seeking candidates for the position of
regional Secretary to serve during calendar years 2004 and 2005.  Please contact
Charles Kaars (Kaars@research.buffalo.edu)
if you wish to suggest a candidate.
Self-nominations are welcome!

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

REGION III
Southeast

The 2003 spring meeting at Sandestin Golf
and Beach Resort was a tremendous success and a great time was had by all. Look for
a summary on the regional website at
http://www.orga.cofc.edu/ncura3.  It takes a
lot of helping hands to make a meeting
come off smoothly. Members on the
Program Committee were: Tim Atkinson,
University of Arkansas for Medical Science;
Ava Chambliss-Richardson, Mercer; Sharon
Kaufman, University of Arkansas at Little
Rock; Mike McCallister, University of
Arkansas at Little Rock; Pamela Napier,
Western Kentucky University; Myra
Norman, Middle Tennessee State University;
Tom Roberts, Florida Gulf Coast University;
Rosemary Ruff, Auburn; and Mo Valentine,
Arkansas Children’s Hospital.
Special thanks to Nick Perez, Georgia Tech,
and his team for coordinating all of A/V
Tech setups for all of the sessions: Michelle
Clark, Georgia Tech; Rosemary Ruff,
Auburn University; Pamela Napier, Western
Kentucky University; Mo Valentine,
Arkansas Children’s Hospital; and Juanita
Winegar, Auburn University.

Election results were announced at the
Business Meeting. Pat Green from the
University of Miami won the race for Chair-
Elect.  Pat has wasted no time in planning
for next year’s spring meeting. The theme is
“Trained, Tested, and Ready.” The meeting
will be at Wild Dunes Resort in South
Carolina May 9 – 12, 2004. Pat will bring
us up to date at the National NCURA
meeting in November.

New Regional Committee Chairs for
2003-2004 are:

Membership Committee
Regina Allen, Western Kentucky University

Professional Development Committee
Priscilla Pope, University of South Florida

Nominating and Elections Committee
(Chair-Scott Blackwood, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Michelle Vazin, Vanderbilt University

Hospitality Committee
Bruxanne El-Kamish, Coastal Carolina University

Do you sing? Juggle? Tell jokes? Looking
for a chance in the spotlight?? Here’s your
opportunity!!

Pat Fitzgerald, NCURA President-elect, has
announced a new activity at the National
meeting in November, the “NCURA
Coffeehouse.” Although all the details
aren’t in so far, there will be a “friendly
talent competition” with regions vying for
modest prizes. So if you are interested in
representing Region III or would you like to
nominate someone who is, let Sue Keehn
(sjkeehn@ualr.edu) know.

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

REGION IV
Mid-America

Results of the Region IV elections were
announced at the spring meeting in
Cincinnati, Ohio. Newly elected to the
Region IV Board of Directors were:
Chair-Elect:
Pamela Krauser, University of Notre Dame

Welcome Summer!!!
The Spring Meeting was a wonderful
success!!  Congratulations to Sally Tremaine
and the program committee on a job well
done!

It’s hard to believe that plans are underway
for the 2004 Spring Meeting. Sturbridge,
Massachusetts has been tentatively selected
as the location. The dates of the meeting
will be May 16th – May 19th. More
information will be provided as it becomes
available. At this time, we are beginning to
assemble the program committee. If you
would like to volunteer, please contact me.

Congratulations to two of Region I’s finest
for their leadership role in pulling together
this year’s program for the national meeting.
Vivian Holmes and Barbara Cole, under the
leadership of Pat Fitzgerald (another of the
Region’s finest) are to be commended for
their effort and dedication in undertaking
this challenging assignment. The
preliminary program is simply marvelous
and offers loads of educational and
networking opportunities sprinkled with fun
events in the evening hours.

The RADG season has ended for the
summer months. At the final meeting,
Steve Dowdy, Beth Mora and Julie Norris
provided us with a very informative update
on the FDP Phase IV activities. RADG
will resume in the fall.

Speaking of the fall, we will be sending
out a call for nominations for the positions of
Chair, Treasurer and the National Office
Board of Directors. Barbara Cole is the
chair of the nominating committee. If
you have an interest in serving in any of
these positions, please contact Barbara
Cole or me.

Wishing you all a safe and happy summer!!!
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

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

**Southwestern**

Our Spring 2003 meeting finally happened, and it was a great success! After false starts, location changes, and scheduling conflicts, it all came together. Thanks to everyone that attended, and to all that had a part in our success. Debbie Newton is currently working to put the program together for the Spring 2004 meeting together. The 2004 meeting will be held at the San Luis Resort on Galveston Island. Dates are April 24-29, 2004. If you’d like to help with the meeting, please contact Debbie Newton.

Congratulations to the winners of the Region V 2003 elections!

**Vice Chair/Chair Elect** – Debbie Newton, University of Tulsa

**Secretary** – Melody Page, University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center

**National Board Member** – Marianne Rinaldo Woods, University of Texas Arlington

**At-Large Executive Committee Members** – Linda Golden – University of Tulsa

Bob Effinger – Prairie View A&M University

Carolyn Ivey – University of Texas at Dallas

Tena Smith – University of Oklahoma

Congratulations to Mary Katherine Spijkerman! Mary Katherine was the recipient of the Region V 2003 Distinguished Service Award. Her years of hard work and dedication to research administration and NCURA were recognized at an award reception held during the Spring 2003 meeting. What an honor to bestow this award to Mary Katherine. Thank you for all that you’ve done over the years from all of us in Region V.

We also want to give our best wishes to two of our members who will be retiring from our profession in August. Jean Vorhaben will be retiring from her position as Director of the Office of Sponsored Research at Rice University. Wayne Kuenstler will be retiring from his position as Director of the Office of Sponsored Projects at the University of Texas at Austin. We’ll certainly miss both of their knowledge of research administration and their willingness to help out when called upon. Hope you enjoy your retirement, but we’ll miss you.

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

**REGION VI**

**Western**

It’s summer ... but have things slowed down in your office? I suspect not! What with the fiscal crisis that faces many of the states and the budget crunch that we are all experiencing this is probably not a restful time for many of us.

While we are busy closing the books for the last year and planning for the next year, let’s take a few minutes to stop and think about NCURA ... how it assists us in our job, how it provides us with a strong network of colleagues we can call on for assistance, and how it offers us the opportunity to volunteer and to offer our expertise to others.

It is this last point ... the opportunity to volunteer ... that forms the main point of this column.

Next year’s spring joint meeting for regions VI-VII will be in San Francisco. David Mayo, our Region VI Chair-elect, will be in charge of logistics. I’m sure that he would welcome volunteers for the myriad of tasks that will need to be done to make that meeting the great success that I’m sure it will be. Region VII will be in charge of the program. Denise Wallen and her committee are already hard at work developing the program but I am sure that they would welcome suggestions for sessions and workshops and would especially welcome volunteers to make presentations.

Within the next few weeks Vincent Oragwam and the members of his nominating committee will be contacting all region VI members for candidates to stand for a regional office. This year we will be voting for the positions of Chair-elect, Secretary/Treasurer-elect and a member of the Regional Advisory Committee. Why not consider running for one of these offices? Our region could make use of your many talents.

The election results will be announced during the regional business meeting in November. This year’s meeting will be a luncheon and will be held on Monday, November 3rd from noon-1:30pm. Mark this on your calendar! There is one other event that you can volunteer for ... the preliminary program for this year’s annual meeting has a new event listed for Monday night called the “NCURA Coffee House.” One feature of the Coffee House will be a friendly regional talent competition where NCURA members will vie for the title of “NCURA Idol.” In addition to the adoration and respect (?) of peers, you will receive a custom designed, limited edition T-Shirt. Let me hear from you if you would like to volunteer yourself (or maybe someone else) for this friendly competition. Let’s win this one for Region VI! This is our chance to put our Region VI on Top!

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

continued on page 20
The Industry/University Congress

From NCURA’s President…continued

getting bogged down on IP issues, to the point that some projects never get off the ground. Is this what industry wants? Is this what universities want? Is this good for the country? Most would agree that the answer to these questions is definitely NO.

Last fall this issue got national attention in a Congressional hearing. One industry scientist expressed concern for the “future health of the U.S. R&D enterprise.” His words reverberated through academic halls and industrial corridors calling to our attention that I/U negotiations and collaborations are in trouble. The scientist, R. Stanley Williams, HP Fellow, Hewlett-Packard Laboratories, testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Science, Technology and Space on September 17, 2002. Williams stated that “U.S.-based corporations have become so disheartened and disgusted with the situation (i.e., negotiating intellectual property rights with U.S. universities) they are now working with foreign universities, especially the elite institutions in France, Russia and China, which are more than willing to offer extremely favorable intellectual property terms.”

What happened that brought the relationship between U.S. companies and U.S. universities to this point? Here again Williams effectively reflects the situation: “Largely as a result of the lack of federal funding for research, American Universities have become extremely aggressive in their attempts to raise funding from large corporations. Severe disagreements have arisen because of conflicting interpretations of the Bayh-Dole Act.”

While many of us on the university side of the equation would disagree on why things seemed to have soured in many of our relationships with industry, most of us would agree that something’s not right. And while we encourage greater collaborations between industry and our colleagues in foreign universities around the world, it is definitely not a good thing if industry and our colleagues in foreign universities around the world, it is definitely not a good thing if industry and our colleagues in foreign universities around the world.

The Industry/University Congress

Williams’ testimony acted as a wake-up call for many of us. We began to discuss ways that Industry and Universities could come to the table and discuss these issues. So, NCURA talked with GUIRR and IRI and together we decided to sponsor a national forum on Industry/university collaborations and call it “The Industry-University Congress” (I/U Congress).

The purpose of the I/U Congress is to explore the current situation on IP rights as it affects negotiations on industry-funded research contracts and the regulations; to examine economic forces affecting IP rights; to create an understanding of cultural differences that are creating problems and controversy and keeping productive I/U relationships from happening; and to explore new ways of doing business that will meet the needs of industry, universities, and government.

The idea of discussing these matters in a “Congress” was appealing to NCURA. The word “congress” best describes what we want this national forum to be... a “coming together” of “delegates” from “constituent organizations” to “discuss problems and arrive at solutions.”

Issues

There are four current issues that seem to be behind much of today’s growing difficulties. First, there is the issue of cultural differences that exist not only between universities and industry but also between the different sectors of industry. As an example manufacturing’s needs are different than those of the electronics and IT sectors, and the pharmaceuticals industry operates differently than manufacturing, electronics or IT.

Second, the type of university and culture within the institution varies across the country. Some universities stick to basic research and dissemination through publications, while other universities may need to respond more to a regional need for economic development assistance and work to create new companies and new jobs through university-initiated technologies.

The third major issue deals with the impact of federal regulations on our relationships with industry. Primary among these, of course, is the Bayh-Dole Act. This legislation has lost support among many in industry who feel that universities are using it as a hammer in negotiations and straining some interpretations of the Act’s meaning. I know that Bayh-Dole is an important consideration in my institution’s negotiations, as well it should be. Whenever we have federal projects that overlap with industry, the potential for problems with Bayh-Dole exist and, in the minds of most university negotiators, can restrict what we are able to work out with companies.

We also face challenges from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and must deal with their regulations that deal with IP agreements and the use of facilities built with tax-exempt bonds. A more recent, but growing concern, is the interjection of export control regulations into the industry-university mix. In spite of these challenges, however, I think universities are anxious to dialogue with industry and to try to reach an understanding of how we can better relate to one another in the context of federal rules. This is one of the main reasons we are including federal delegates to the Congress, so that we might not only gain from university and industry insights but from government insights as well.

The fourth issue that universities constantly struggle with in our negotiations with industry is the complexity of research relationships and funding webs. On many large research programs it is extremely difficult to build walls between projects and to determine who funded what. Often, even though we have separate funding for projects, the research in the faculty lab is often mixed together and sometimes becomes indistinguishable, despite our pleas for separate lab notebooks and all that. This “funding web” makes it hard to sort out IP rights, particularly in advance, when one doesn’t know what kind of inter-relationships might be in play that could lead to a discovery and invention. Trying to deal with such issues as exclusive licenses and background rights in this context is difficult. Industry and universities need to talk through these problems so that we can better understand each other.

Of course, dealing with all the above concerns in a global economy makes matters even more complex, as any US university knows that has tried to work with a company or a university under the auspices of the European Union. US export laws, foreign patent filings, and international law all contribute to that complexity. Yet, universities need to be able to work with international and foreign corporations, and to arrange collaborations with researchers abroad in foreign institutions.
Principle-Based Negotiations

How do all these matters affect our negotiations with industry? These issues are without a doubt controversial. Based on my experience I can tell you that when industry and universities get together discussions between the two can be downright contentious. To dive right into debates on the four areas I have discussed or others might lead to a kind of bi-partisan bickering that could rival our U.S. Congress. This is why the I/U Congress will begin with the development of principles that should govern industry/university collaborations. On these, I think we can find consensus. Thus, the I/U Congress will address questions geared toward the establishment of these principles. Included in these discussions will be questions such as: Why is it important for industry and universities to work together? How does this collaboration benefit industry, universities, and the nation? What do companies need from a relationship with universities? What do universities need from a relationship with industry? What should the ideal industry/university relationship look like? What would it produce? Who would benefit? What would other non-deliverable outcomes be? If we can agree on the principles, perhaps working on the details would flow more smoothly. If we are unable to accomplish this task and, despite our best efforts, we do not arrive at any better ways of doing business together, the exercise of coming together will, by itself, have been rewarding and productive.

Action Plan

The Congress will begin its work during the August meeting. From there, we plan to break up into working groups that will continue our efforts throughout the year culminating in the summer of 2004. An array of strategies for translating the agreed upon principles into IP agreements will be presented to a National Summit of leaders from industry, universities, and government. The National Summit members will then work cooperatively to develop and endorse solutions for IP agreements that will foster the creation and commercialization of new knowledge and new technologies while appropriately protecting the interests of all parties. As a result of the National Summit we hope to develop a report that will contain the strategies and, hopefully, some very practical recommendations on agreement language for an array of ways industry and universities interact. The buy-in from both the I/U Congress and the National Summit to the principles and solutions we have developed together should provide a powerful impetus toward arriving at a national consensus on how industry and universities should work together.

If you want to learn more about some of the thoughts of industry and university people in this area, I recommend you visit NCURA's Research Management Review (RMR) site at http://www.ncura.edu/rmr/ and check out the monthly feature articles and the latest completed issue. Editor Jim Casey has put together a series of great articles in the current and previous issues of the RMR journal providing us with the perspective of the industry/university connection from the point of view of a university attorney, a university technology manager, and an industry program officer.

Also, if this topic has piqued your interest, you can follow up by attending NCURA’s University/Industry Collaborations: Enhancing the Partnership in a Global Economy Summer Conference to be held in San Francisco, August 17 - 19, 2003. To find out more information about the conference look on the NCURA website www.ncura.edu.

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

Expanded 2003 Offerings @ 1983 Prices! continued

For the intermediate to advanced members, the format for certain workshops has been spiced up by embedding case studies and mock negotiations into the presentations. Faculty will be developing topical scenarios for discussion and interactive dialogue.

Back by Popular Demand

Always a must will be sessions on the FAR, cost sharing, intellectual property, clinical trials and sub awards. In addition, we are pleased to announce that we are bringing back the full day workshops on the fundamentals of pre-award and post-award research administration.

Senior Level Seminars

In an effort to challenge our members with the highest levels of experience, we are introducing an exciting new concept called the “Senior Level Seminar Series.” Geared toward the upper-level experienced research administrator, sessions will focus on interactive problem solving in an atmosphere quite different from the traditional workshop format. Forget the workbooks and the PowerPoint lecture. Instead, participants will enjoy a more spontaneous learning environment by sharing professional concerns and discussing/proposing solutions to situations they currently face. Class size will be limited, and registrants for this series will be expected to have subject matter experience and expertise.

On the Federal Agency Front

Once again, we will offer full day workshops on Thursday with NIH and NSF. We will be returning to the NIH for an up close and personal visit to the Bethesda facilities. A new twist has been added to our NSF day this year. NSF staff will be visiting us at the Hilton as we try a different format especially designed for this year’s attendees. Both promise to be well worth the extra day’s stay at the conclusion of the Annual Meeting.

Don’t Miss Out – Sign-up Now

With expanded full day Fundamentals for the Newcomer, case studies and mock negotiations for the intermediate level, and the new “Senior Level Seminar Series” for the advanced research administrator, NCURA’s Pre-Conference offerings truly have something for everyone; at every level and at a fee we have not seen in 20 years! Join us for Workshops and the Senior Level Seminar Series at the 45th Annual Meeting!

Denise Clark and Tommy Coggins are the Workshop Coordinators for the 45th Annual Meeting. Denise serves as the Director, Office of Sponsored Programs for Cornell University and Tommy as the Director, Office of Research Compliance for University of South Carolina.
REGION VII

Rocky Mountain

Following a successful “between snow-storms” Spring Meeting in Denver, the Program Committee led by Region VII will be working on the Spring 2004 meeting in San Francisco. If you are willing to help plan this event, please contact Denise Wallen by phone (505) 277-2256, or e-mail wallen@umn.edu.

Time to start planning for NCURA’s 45th Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C. on November 2-5, 2003. The preliminary program is available on the NCURA website (http://www.ncura.edu) and promises to be another landmark event. Region VII members will be hosting a Regional Business Meeting during the week. All members of the region are invited, and new members are especially encouraged to attend to meet their elected representatives and learn more about their own geographic neighbors. The Region VII Business Meeting will be a luncheon and is scheduled for Monday, November 3 from noon to 1:30 p.m. Location will be announced in the published program.

Please look for NCURA’s call for volunteers, and respond enthusiastically. While NCURA provides stellar professional development opportunities, becoming actively involved gives you far more bang for your buck because of the personal and professional growth you’ll experience through such volunteerism. Visit the Region VII Website at http://www.umn.edu/~ncuravii/ for information coming soon about election schedules and the possibility for a travel award to the Annual Meeting.

Each of you have a wonderful summer! All of the Region VII officers look forward to seeing many of you in November at the annual meeting in Washington, DC.

Ron Splittgerber is a Region VII ‘Member-at-Large’ and serves as Director of Research Services for Colorado State University.

Why Professors Won’t Learn (about administrative stuff)

continued from page 7

2) Whenever possible, take the mountain to Mohammad. Fifteen to thirty minutes on a faculty meeting agenda is the best place to conduct short pieces of training. One-on-one is even better.

3) Be sure that you’ve distilled your message down to a meaningful nutshell. Remember that faculty are smart and they’re good at deductive reasoning which means that you can tell them the bare bones and they’ll get the rest. Provide some reference materials, a phone number or a website for any further questions.

5) Always tie your topic to their bottom line. How does this information further their research, their writing, their teaching, their gaining of tenure? If it doesn’t help any of those endeavors but is legally required, you need to figure out a way of getting the training done using the least amount of their time. Consider web-based training modules for topics that are not required to have in-class instruction. If class instruction is required, make sure you schedule multiple sessions in locales which are convenient.

6) If it’s not relevant to them and it’s not legally required then ask yourself what you’re doing teaching it.

7) Get a moment with the Chairs and Deans. Go see them one-on-one. Ask for only 10 minutes of their time. Teach them in those ten minutes. Ask them if you can have time on the faculty meeting agenda (see point 2).

8) Ask faculty to teach each other. Do you have a well respected faculty member who might be willing to teach one or two auditorium style sessions?

9) Act like you understand their world; avoid stridency. Walk away, loop back, and pick up the thread later.

10) Take it easy. We’ll get there.

Laura Freebairn-Smith is Director, Organizational Development and Learning Center, Yale University.

1. There is a lengthy debate on the use of the word “training.” Some people feel that “training” is for dogs, not people. It is a matter of semantics, and the best semantics create a positive world, so use whatever terminology works for your audience. At Yale, we use “learning” as in “organizational development and learning center.”


From the Cover

Securing the Homeland: McQueary to Deliver Keynote Address at 45th Annual Meeting continued

Science and Technology, Department of Homeland Security, will deliver the keynote address at our 2003 Annual Meeting.

The creation of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is the most significant transformation of the U.S. government since 1947, when President Truman merged the various branches of the U.S. Armed Forces into the Department of Defense. The DHS represents a similar consolidation. In the aftermath of the September 11th terrorist attacks President Bush decided that 22 disparate domestic agencies needed to be coordinated into one department to protect the nation against threats to the homeland.

Dr. McQueary was chosen by the President to be head of the DHS Science and Technology (S&T) directorate, one of four major directorates within DHS.

Dr. McQueary was appointed to the important role of Under Secretary after a distinguished career in the private sector, most recently as President of General Dynamics Advanced Technology Systems. Previously, Dr. McQueary served as President for AT&T, Lucent Technologies, and as a Director for AT&T Bell Laboratories.

The Department of Homeland Security will have a major impact on our lives, both professionally and personally. Dr. McQueary will oversee the establishment of a National Laboratory for Homeland Security and the creation of a sub-agency to award extramural grants for basic and applied research. More than $800 million in funding for FY 2004 will go to the S&T directorate. The new DHS Homeland Security Advanced Research Projects Agency (HSARPA) will receive an estimated $350 million of this funding. Dr. McQueary will discuss the DHS research mission and the grantsmaking activities of the S&T directorate.

All of us are concerned with the government’s efforts to protect our borders and secure our country and the role of DHS will be critical to the success of this mission. Please join us at the Annual Meeting to hear Dr. McQueary speak about this new, and vitally important, cabinet department.

The preliminary program for Annual Meeting 2003 is available at the NCURA homepage: www.ncura.edu. Please check out this exceptional program.

Patrick Fitzgerald is the Vice President of NCURA and serves as the Director of Cost Analysis for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
The Wistar Institute, an NCI-designated basic science cancer center located on the University of Pennsylvania campus, invites applications for a Director of Grant and Research Support Services. This newly created position will provide grant and research support to Wistar’s scientific staff, currently comprised of 27 principal investigators. The incumbent will report directly to the Associate Director for Academic Affairs and oversee pre- and post-award grant activities, including coordination of multi-disciplinary grants. He/she also will supervise editorial services, graphics, web development, and audio/visual services.

The successful applicant must have detailed knowledge of the National Institutes of Health granting process including regulations, application formatting and deadlines. In addition, a Bachelor’s degree, in Communications, Management, English or related field, with several years of supervisory experience and excellent managerial capabilities in grants management, is required. Excellent computer skills and ability to meet multiple deadlines in a fast-paced setting are mandatory. The ideal candidate will possess strong organizational and problem solving skills along with superior interpersonal and communication skills, both oral and written.

The Wistar Institute offers a comprehensive salary and benefit program.

For consideration, please submit your resume to:
Human Resources Department
The Wistar Institute
3601 Spruce Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104
Recruit@wistar.upenn.edu
EOE/AA/M/F/D/V/

For more information about the Institute, please visit our website at: www.wistar.upenn.edu
The Research and Education Institute at Harbor-UCLA Research and Education Institute (REI) invites applications for the position of Director, Grants and Contracts Office. REI is an independent, 501 © (3) institution having primary affiliations with the David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA and the Harbor-UCLA Medical Center. The Director of Grants and Contracts is a senior member of the administrative staff of REI with annual research, education and service funding of approximately $60 million.

The Director reports to the Vice President of Research Administration and Research Services and is responsible for all pre-award and non-financial post-award activities for all non-industry programs. Major responsibilities include: providing assistance to faculty in the development and submission of proposals; review and negotiation of awards; monitoring compliance with applicable state, federal, institute, and sponsoring agencies’ policies and regulations; and providing training to faculty and staff. The Director will have supervisory responsibilities over four grants and contracts officers and three administrative assistants.

The qualified applicant must have a Bachelors degree, ten (10) years experience in sponsored research administration at a major university or non-profit institution with increasing levels of responsibility, a thorough knowledge of governmental regulations and compliance requirements, strong managerial, supervisory, and interpersonal skills, and a demonstrated ability to work enthusiastically with creative professionals and complex programs. The successful applicant will be expected to create an environment that encourages faculty to pursue external funding for their research, scholarly and creative activity.

Compensation and benefits are highly competitive. A summary of employee benefits can be viewed at http://www.rei.edu Career Opportunities and Benefit Information.

Applicants must submit a letter of interest, and a resume including salary history and requirements to:

Elvia Ruano, Employment Coordinator
Human Resources Department
Harbor-UCLA Research and Education Institute
1124 W Carson Street, Bldg N-12
Torrance, CA 90502
FAX: (310) 222-3640
Web Site: www.rei.edu

Job Number 87  Be sure to refer to job number when applying
Research Accounting Analyst

Mayo Clinic has an exciting opportunity for an experienced Research Accounting Analyst. The Analyst works with research investigators and administrators to analyze expenditures, revenue and cash on awards, monitors award spending and performs financial analysis, budgeting and forecasting, while also monitoring compliance with terms and conditions of awards.

The Analyst will have a Bachelor’s degree in business, business administration, accounting, or a closely-related field and a minimum of six years of relevant experience in research post-award grant management or accounting, including two to three years of supervisory experience. Knowledge of Federal Circulars is required (OMB A-110, A-122, A-133). A graduate degree or certifications such as MBA, CPA, Master’s degree in health care, finance or accounting is preferred. Certifications such as SRA (Society of Research Administrators International) Departmental Administrators Certification DA-101, DA-201and DA-301 are preferred.

*Mayo Clinic offers an excellent salary and benefits package. Please submit resume referencing job posting #03-1887, JNCURAN.*

**Mayo Clinic:**
Laura Samuel, Human Resources
200 1st Street SW, Rochester, MN 55905
Fax: 507-266-3167 e-mail: careers@mayo.edu

Rutgers University is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer

---

**Director**

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs

Reporting directly to the Associate Vice President for Research, and collaborating as required with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and with deans and directors, the Director will supervise the daily operations of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) which in FY 2002 had a staff of 16 and processed 2,021 applications for funding that resulted in 1,801 awards with a value of $242.4 million.

The Director will:

- Manage the negotiation of all non-corporate grant and contract terms and conditions.
- Ensure University compliance with all applicable state and federal regulations, audits, and OMB Circulars.
- Assist in the formulation of new University policies, procedures and computer programs, or in changes in existing ones, that impact on sponsored program activities.
- Organize relevant training for office employees as well as for other University personnel, including unit business managers and faculty members.

Qualified applicants will have a bachelor’s or advanced degree, preferably in management, finance or an economics related field; extensive management experience in university administration, preferably in a sponsored programs or government procurement office; a working knowledge of pertinent computer management, electronic and technical support systems; and display exceptional communication and analytical skills as well as human resource management skills and ability.

To apply, send letter of application, résumé, and references to:

Agnes Jahoda-Sánchez
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
3 Rutgers Plaza, room 347a, New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Rutgers University is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer
Executive Director

The IUP Research Institute is affiliated with Indiana University of Pennsylvania. The Executive Director will guide the creation of the Research Institute and will manage all areas of the Institute to create and maintain services that promote the development and administration of sponsored research programs and related activities.

Graduate degree and/or equivalent combination of education and experience in senior university management, start-up organizations, corporate or nonprofit management, contract and grant administration, research regulatory and compliance strategies, computerized information systems and an understanding of the academic enterprise are highly desired.

Full description at www.iup.edu/graduate/institute, or call 724-357-3241. Starting salary $60,000-$80,000. Submit a resume, letter of application, and 3 references to: Alicia Linzey, Vice Provost/Dean of Graduate Studies, 210 S. 10th St., Indiana, PA 15705. Review will begin August 4 and continue until the position is filled. The RI is an Equal Opportunity/ Affirmative Action employer.
They complain about the heat, the cold and the rain, but they sing your praises.

New Yorkers. They make this city thrive – and no one takes care of them like the hospitals of Continuum. When you join us, you will see the impact of the work you do all around you. So come to one of our five outstanding facilities – Beth Israel Medical Center, St. Luke’s Hospital, Roosevelt Hospital, Long Island College Hospital, or New York Eye & Ear Infirmary – and do what you do best in the best health system in the best city in the world…

Manager, Government Grants

We are currently seeking a professional to identify applicable grant opportunities for Continuum Health Partners with special emphasis on governmental sources of funding. The successful candidate will prepare written grant proposals and all supporting documentation while working collaboratively with key internal departments to ensure all institutional grant policies are followed. The selected candidate will also maintain a database of grant sources, report on status of grant applications and awards, and monitor expenditures of grant funds. Candidates must have a minimum of ten years of experience in grant development or a similar business setting. Exceptional writing skills, familiarity with public health and/or community health issues and a Master’s degree are required. The ability to work under pressure to meet deadlines is essential.

To apply, please send your resume to: Human Resources Department, 555 West 57th Street, 19th Floor, New York, NY 10019. Fax: (212) 523-5776. E-mail: jmckay@chpnet.org

Continuum Health Partners is committed to diversity and equal opportunity.
Grant Administrator® 5.0

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

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

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

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

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

Details about NCURA’s 45th Annual Meeting and Registration Form are available online at www.ncura.edu.

Register today!
JO ANN TREAT, President of Texas A&M Research Foundation, is retiring after 37 years of service in research administration on August 31, 2003.

JOHN CHILDRESS, formerly Associate Director, Division of Sponsored Research at Vanderbilt University, as of July 1, has been promoted to Director. John has been at Vanderbilt for 16 years. Congratulations on your promotion!

BRUCE W. ELLIOTT JR., formerly at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center has relocated to Chicago. Bruce is now the Director, Chicago Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, Northwestern University.

ALICE TANGREDI-HANNON, formerly Director, Office of Research Administration at Thomas Jefferson University has moved across town to accept a new position as Director of Research Compliance, University of Pennsylvania. Best wishes in your new role!

MILESTONES

Michael Anthony, formerly Director of Financial Research Administration at Cornell University has assumed a new position as Manager of Extramural Funds, at UC-San Francisco. Best of luck!

Maria Karatzas returned from living several years abroad in Greece and is now back at MIT as Senior Contract Administrator. Welcome Home!

Barbara Siegel, former Executive Director, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, Northwestern University and Chairperson of FDP, has assumed a new position as Assistant Director for Compliance and Research Administration, and Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, at the Whitehead Institute for Biomedical Research.

Mary Spijkerman, former Director of Office of Grant and Contract Management at the University of North Texas Health Science Center at Fort Worth (UNTHSC) has assumed a new position at UNTHSC, Director of IRB Services.
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