A summer conference like no other!

by Regina White and Joyce Freedman

In Providence, Rhode Island between July 25 and July 27, 2004, something new is going to take place. A summer conference like no other! We are delighted to present a critically important topic in a whole new way. NCURA, in collaboration with the Council of Governmental Relations (COGR), the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP), and the National Association of College and University Attorneys (NACUA) has joined forces with federal government partners to explore the challenge of compliance together.

The 2004 Summer Conference, “Government and Universities: Partners in Compliance,” has been structured to offer sessions and workshops to all that are interested in this topic. The conference has been designed in three separate tracks, each including workshops and concurrent sessions. The “Basic” track sessions are primers and “101s” for those unfamiliar with the myriad of rules, regulations, and policies.

Stepping Up to the Plate

by Pat Fitzgerald

I look forward to the spring season each year but I can’t recall being more eager for the arrival of spring than I was this year. After enduring an especially harsh New England winter, the change in seasons couldn’t come soon enough for me. Spring also marks the beginning of a new baseball season and as a lifelong Yankee fan I look forward to this season with great anticipation, especially now that “A-Rod” is wearing Yankee pinstripes! This spring also has a special significance for me since it is the year of my NCURA Presidency and I have attended the regional meetings and have had the opportunity to meet many NCURA members. I enjoyed these meetings because it gave me a chance to update the regions on the activities of the Board of Directors and to hear from our members.

IT’S NOT TOO LATE!

2004 NCURA Awards & Nominations

Check out www.ncura.edu for deadlines

Grants.gov – A Partner Agency’s Perspective

by Daniel Hofherr and Kim Deutsch

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has long been recognized as a leader in electronic grants management. Each year over 40,000 proposals, 190,000 reviews, 25,000 progress reports, 14,000 cash requests, and 10,000 post-award notifications and requests are submitted electronically to NSF via NSF’s award winning FastLane system (www.fastlane.nsf.gov).

In total, there are more than 40 different modules in the FastLane system that allows the research community to electronically conduct its business with NSF.

This success of FastLane is due in large part to the input given to NSF by NCURA and its members and NSF is very thankful for this! NSF is always listening to the user community and continues to make improvements to FastLane based on your feedback.

As a recognized leader in electronic grants management, NSF has also been in the forefront as a strong supporter of the Grants.gov initiative. This initiative is one of the 24 Federal cross-agency e-Government initiatives focused on improving access to services via the Internet. The vision for Grants.gov is to provide a simple, unified source to electronically find and apply for grants opportunities — formula, block and discretionary grants originating from over 900 grant programs from 26 Federal grant-making agencies!

As a recognized leader in electronic grants management, NSF has also been in the forefront as a strong supporter of the Grants.gov initiative. This initiative is one of the 24 Federal cross-agency e-Government initiatives focused on improving access to services via the Internet. The vision for Grants.gov is to provide a simple, unified source to electronically find and apply for grants opportunities — formula, block and discretionary grants originating from over 900 grant programs from 26 Federal grant-making agencies!

NSF is one of 11 Grants.gov partner agencies committing resources — both funding and staff — to the success of this initiative. The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) is the managing partner and other partners are the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense (DOD), Education, Housing and Urban Development, Justice (DOJ), Labor, Transportation and Homeland Security. Together, these partner agencies award the majority of Federal grants in both the number of transactions and dollars. Each of these agencies has also designated a senior official as the agency representative to serve on the Grants.gov Executive Board.
Focus on New and Senior Level Members
by Jerry Fife

The 2003 NCURA annual meeting set records for attendance with 1,703 attendees. This represented growth of approximately 10% from the previous year. In an analysis performed by the NCURA staff it was noted that 1,138 (69%) of those attending had been NCURA members 5 years or less and 544 (32%) attended their first annual meeting in 2003. The analysis also revealed that 357 (21%) attendees are considered senior level administrators, holding titles of director or above. With this information in mind, your 2004 annual meeting program committee is devoting efforts to make certain that attention is provided to all of these groups.

Given the growth in annual meeting attendance, more sessions need to be added in 2004. With the sheer size of the conference attendance and the ever-expanding session offerings, just finding sessions can be difficult. This is especially true for first time attendees. First time attendees are trying to process everything from the dinner group offerings to their role in regional meetings. In an effort to better assist all conference attendees, volunteers will be on-hand throughout the 2004 conference to provide directions and offer assistance. Look for members with the “Ask Me” buttons.

In addition to concurrent sessions and discussion groups geared toward newer members, 14 Primers will be offered in areas such as OMB circulars, human subjects, material transfer agreements, consulting agreements, confidentiality agreements, effort reporting, HIPAA, animal care, agreement basics for departmental administrators, biodefense regulations and NIH 101. This year’s conference will also offer sessions and other venues geared toward informing newer members of the many opportunities they have for getting involved in NCURA.

Programs for senior level administrators include responsible conduct in research (RCR); what does the boss expect: view from the vice president for research; dealing with senior administration; hot topics; tissue banks, tissue distribution and clinical data issues; effort reporting; SBIR/STTR conflict of interest management; VA issues; leadership transition; how are we preparing the next generation and campus training and management of ITAR. In addition, the well-received Senior Level Seminars are returning and are being expanded for 2004.

In the coming months I will share programming efforts for department administrators, predominantly undergraduate institutions, federal agency updates, pre-award topics, post-award topics and Information Technology (IT).

MAKE YOUR PLANS NOW TO ATTEND!
October 31 - November 3, 2004, Washington, DC

Jerry Fife is the 2004 NCURA Vice President and serves as the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research Finance, Vanderbilt University.

CAN RESEARCH AND SECURITY CO-EXIST?

In September 2000, Dr. Neal Lane, Assistant to the President for Science and Technology and Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, made the following assertion at a National Academies workshop on scientific communication and national security:

“National security requires scientific excellence; scientific excellence requires openness; and openness is inherently international.”

At that time, universities were struggling with new interpretations and enforcement of export control rules and their application to research related to satellites. Dr. Lane briefly outlined previous attempts in the 1980s to restrict scientific openness and interactions with foreign scientists, and how balance was achieved through the issuance of National Security Defense Directive 189, which protects fundamental research from export controls and states that the only proper way to restrict access to research results was through classification. As stated by Dr. Lane,

“Think about this a minute. At the height of the Cold War, an Administration that was greatly concerned about preventing adversaries from benefiting from our technological advantage issued a directive affirming that free exchange of scientific ideas is a vital component of our economic and physical security. To me, this Directive says that free exchange was deemed to be so important that it justified the risk that our adversary might receive some benefits as well.”

His remarks that day provided a framework for efforts by universities and federal officials to find a way to protect vital interests without blocking the scientific interactions that can improve our security. While some progress was made, as the saying goes, “that was then and this is now.”

After anthrax-laced envelopes addressed to members of Congress were found at postal facilities in the fall of 2001, a provision was added to the USA PATRIOT Act that made it a criminal offense for “restricted” individuals to have possession or access to certain toxins and pathogens, referred to as Select Agents. Restricted persons under the Act included foreign nationals from certain countries. Shortly thereafter, Inspectors General staff from USDA and DHHS made visits to selected campuses to check on select agent security measures, including whether universities were conducting background checks and barring foreign nationals from having access to select agents. The audit reports issued were themselves labeled confidential, so the universities were unable to share the results.
The PATRIOT Act was followed by the Bioterrorism Preparedness Act in June 2002, which required establishment of a rigorous regulatory regime for control of select agents. This included institutional registration, FBI background check for all individuals having access to or responsible for select agents, and security plans to be implemented by the organizations. The regulations were issued in February 2003, and initially were to be fully operational by November 12, 2003. However, completion of the over 10,000 security risk assessments has been delayed, so that institutions are currently operating under provisional approvals.

More recently, NIH announced the establishment of a National Science Advisory Board for Biosecurity (NSABB). As described by NIH, the NSABB will advise all federal departments and agencies that conduct or support life science research. It will recommend specific strategies for oversight of “dual-use” biological research, including the development of guidelines for the case-by-case review and approval by Institutional Biosafety Committees (IBCs). In addition, the board will also review and advise on specific experiments: (1) when a proposal has been denied by the Institutional Biosafety Committee and the institution seeks additional guidance for interpretation and application of the guideline; and (2) when specific experiments that exemplify a significant or particularly complex permutation of an existing category of dual-use research or represent a novel category of dual-use research that requires additional guidance. According to the NIH, "dual-use" research encompasses biological research with legitimate scientific purpose that may be misused to pose a biologic threat to public health and/or national security.

The use of the term dual-use brings us full circle back to export controls. Under the Export Administration Regulations (EAR) administered by the Commerce Department, export licenses may be required for certain dual-use technologies. In the Commerce context, dual-use refers to equipment or technology that has both commercial and potential military use. The Commerce regulations also require an export license for a “deemed export”, which essentially means providing information about or discussing the item or technology with foreign individuals. And as you might expect, select agents are covered under some circumstances by both the EAR and the International Trafficing in Arms Regulations (ITAR), which have their own prohibitions and licensing requirements.

Recently completed visits to a number of universities by Inspectors General staff from the Departments of Defense, Commerce, and State, will reportedly be critical of the agencies oversight with respect to research security and implementation of export controls, particularly deemed exports, and may recommend that contractors and grantees be required to obtain export licenses before allowing foreign nationals to participate in research projects involving sensitive technologies.

The question now for all of us involved in the research enterprise is, are things so different now that the assertions Dr. Lane made about openness and security are no longer valid? Universities already report declining numbers of foreign student applications, particularly in certain disciplines. Exchanges and meetings that include foreign scientists have become increasingly difficult to organize. With respect to select agents, some scientists have shifted their research efforts to non-controlled materials; researchers continuing with their research have had to consolidate laboratories so that adequate security can be maintained; and in extreme cases universities have decided not to allow select agent research on campus. None of these developments bode well for what Dr. Lane hailed as key to our success in research in his remarks:

“It is worth emphasizing that U.S. science is strong, in a large part, because U.S. scientists and engineers have come from everywhere, and they continue to communicate–openly–with the world’s best minds, whatever country they hail from.”

Tony De Crappeo serves as the Associate Director for the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR).
A summer conference like no other! continued

attached to the world of compliance. The “Partnership Dialogue” offers debates, dialogues, and case studies with little or no PowerPoint presentations or “talking heads”. These sessions are for our more seasoned compliance experts and we hope will offer something unique and special. The final track is the “Medical Perspective,” aimed specifically at those administrators who work in medical schools and teaching hospitals. This track will offer “Basic” sessions as well as “Partnership Dialogue” sessions with an emphasis on the compliance challenges facing medical institutions. The workshops, which will be offered on Sunday, follow the same three themes with an additional session for legal and risk management professionals.

We will also present two plenary sessions and breakfast roundtables for special interest discussions. Robert Zimmer, Provost at Brown University and former Vice President of Research at The University of Chicago, will be the keynote speaker to open the conference.

The second plenary “Research Compliance: Expectations and Realities” will be a conversation between Alice P. Gast, Vice President for Research and Associate Provost, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Geoffrey Grant, Deputy Director for Management, Operations and Policy, BFA, National Science Foundation.

The title of the conference “Government & Universities: Partners in Compliance” reflects our intention to have a federal presenter in most, if not all, of the sessions and to begin what we hope to be a long and fruitful relationship working together to reach a mutual understanding of the best approaches to take in the compliance arena.

Pleased mark your calendars and join us and our awesome program committee at this exciting, one-of-a-kind conference!

Joyce Freedman serves as Assistant Vice Chancellor, Research, University of California, Berkeley and Regina White is Associate Vice President, Research Administration, Brown University.

Enjoy your visit to Providence– the “Renaissance City”!

After decades of historic preservation and smart developments, Providence has soared to new heights as a popular travel destination. Millions of visitors per year are discovering Providence. The city’s unique mix of the new and the old in terms of arts and culture, cuisine, architecture, and academia make Providence the perfect place to appreciate an amazing history in the context of a new age Renaissance. No matter what your taste, there is always something new or old to discover in Providence.

During your stay in Providence during the Summer Conference, you may enjoy some of the following events that are taking place:

Owners’ Tour of Belcourt Castle
Dates: 5/1/2004 to 11/1/2004
This unique 90-minute tour will present the rich history and collections of this historic Newport castle, by those who have helped create it. Owners Donald and Harle Tinney saved Belcourt in 1956 and have opened the home to the public for over 44 years. Cost is $25 per person. Call 401-846-0669 or visit the site for more information: http://www.belcourtcastle.com

Doris Duke’s Vast Collections
This unique and priceless collection of art, including pieces from students of Rembrandt, Persian carpets, Newport furniture, and a life-sized Tiffany & Co. silver swan will be exhibited at Rough Point. Vans depart from the Newport Gateway/Visitor’s Center. Tickets are $25 and can be purchased at the Visitor’s Center or online at http://www.newportrestoration.org. Call 401-845-9130.

Masters of the Sky at the Park
Roger Williams Park Zoo presents a live free-flight show, “Masters of the Sky”, featuring majestic and captivating birds of prey. Trained naturalists from the World Bird Sanctuary will give you a close-up look to hawks, falcons, owls, vultures, eagles and more! For more information visit the zoo online at http://www.rogerwilliamparkzoo.org

Newport Summer Comedy Series

22nd Annual East Providence Heritage Festival

Pawtucket Red Sox Vs. Ottawa Lynx
Triple A Affiliate of the Boston Red Sox, the Pawtucket Red Sox play the Ottawa Lynx at McCoy Stadium, Ben Mondor Way, Pawtucket. 401-724-7300. http://www.pawsox.com

Getting around Providence and surrounding destinations is easy!

Enjoy historic Providence the fun way by riding the Rhode Island Public Transit Authority (RIPTA) Trolley! For details, visit wwwRIPTA.com.

Newport, RI
The Providence/Newport Ferry makes it easy to visit nearby Newport! As America’s First Resort, you’re sure to find something appealing! The many available activities include harbour cruises, winery tours, or simply enjoy a walk on beautiful beaches!

Visit www.providenceri.com for more complete information!
Grants.gov continued

As a full-fledged Grants.gov Partner Agency, NSF has contributed staff resources to assist with Grants.gov technical evaluations, steering committees, stakeholder groups and working groups, as well as participated in all of the application pilots. NSF has leveraged its experience with FastLane and provided feedback into the development and implementation of Grants.gov.

NSF is a leading agency in the effort to define a set of research and related data elements and associated forms, along with NIH, DOE and others. This research and related data set will be used across all the research agencies to give applicants a standard application form for the research and related data set. In recognition of its importance, NSF has contributed significant staff time to this effort.

Grants.gov has made significant progress toward providing the grants community with one place to find and apply for grants. The “Find” feature was launched in February 2003, and NSF, along with HHS, DOJ and DOD were the first agencies to begin posting their funding opportunities. All 26 of the Federal grant-making agencies now post opportunities to Grants.gov!

The e-Apply feature of Grants.gov was launched in October 2003, with the SF424 form set. Several agencies that had open funding opportunities using this set of forms quickly announced that they were accepting applications through Grants.gov. Many other agencies including NSF are actively working to ensure that they can accept proposals submitted via Grants.gov. Working closely together with Grants.gov, NSF expects to be able to start receiving applications submitted through Grants.gov by September of this year!

Applicants will notice several differences between the FastLane Proposal Preparation and Submission module and the e-Apply component of Grants.gov. Instead of being a web-based application, Grants.gov offers the applicant a package of forms created in PureEdge. These XML supporting e-forms allow users to complete the applications offline. The completed forms can then be resubmitted online in response to a particular funding opportunity. While anyone can download these forms, only an organization’s Authorized Official Representative, as registered with Grants.gov, can submit the application.

The Grants.gov registration process involves several steps, which must be finished in advance of submitting a proposal through Grants.gov:

- Obtain a DUNS number (many organizations already have one.)
- Register with the Central Contract Registry (CCR),
- Register with the Grants.gov Credential Provider to receive a username and password.
- Register with Grants.gov as an Authorized Official Representative (AOR). The e-Biz Point of Contact as designated in the CCR registration will be notified by email that an organization’s AOR is registering and goes to Grants.gov to grant the AOR access using the DUNS and the MPIN from CCR to login. Grants.gov sends an email notification to the AOR when this step is complete.
- Download the PureEdge Viewer to open the forms.

While all these steps are only required during the initial set-up, the time involved should be taken into account before submitting that first application! All steps and full instructions are given on Grants.gov.

NSF is excited that NSF funding opportunities are already posted on Grants.gov and NSF is looking forward to September 2004, when NSF will be able to begin accepting proposals through Grants.gov. At the same time NSF is working to implement and integrate with other e-gov initiatives such as e-Payroll, e-Travel, Enterprise Human Resources Integration (EHRI), e-authentication and Integrated Acquisition Environment initiatives.

Daniel Hofherr is Chief, External Systems Branch, National Science Foundation; Kim Deutsch is Project Leader, Fastlane, National Science Foundation.
In an earlier newsletter article I spoke about the challenges that accompany the significant growth in NCURA membership and programs in recent years. In the past five years our membership has grown from 3,000 to more than 4,500 and the number of educational programs we offer has increased 157%. NCURA is a professional association made up of volunteers and our rapid growth creates the need for more members to get involved and actively support our organization and its programs. Soon we will be seeking individuals willing to run for Regional and National offices and serve on committees or task forces. In the past year we had several elections for which the “call for volunteers” process did not yield an adequate slate of candidates for office. This is disappointing to me since we have many members who would make exceptional officers or committee members. Increasing the number of volunteers is one of my highest priorities and during my visits to the regions I encouraged members to come forward and volunteer their time and talent. To use a baseball analogy, I asked members to “step up to the plate.”

Over the years I’ve benefited tremendously from my involvement in NCURA. I’ve learned a great deal about research administration, established many contacts and made many new friends. This has inspired me to give something back to the organization by being actively involved in NCURA programs and governance. I believe strongly that membership in an organization entails an obligation to be involved and to make a contribution. Clearly, we are all very busy with our jobs and our personal lives and are faced with many competing demands for our time. But, being an active member of NCURA does not mean that you have to hold an office, serve on a committee or make a significant commitment of your time. There are many ways for you to make a meaningful contribution that doesn’t require a great deal of your time. For example, you may volunteer to be a moderator, presenter or discussion group leader at one of our meetings or conferences. Members who are uncomfortable presenting could contribute to a session by helping to prepare the PowerPoint slides. Or, you can offer suggestions of topics for presentations at annual or regional meetings, video broadcasts or online education programming. Members experienced with web design could contribute to regional websites or the NCURA neighborhoods without leaving your office. Voting in elections or nominating other NCURA members for offices or committees are other ways to be an involved NCURA member. Every member has something to offer and I hope that every member will find a way to become more involved in NCURA.

This year each NCURA member will receive a membership card. The purpose of giving you this card is not to remind you when to pay your dues, rather, it is a symbol to remind you that you are a NCURA member and that all members are an important part of this organization. I will carry my card with me and I hope that you will carry yours. More importantly, I hope you will take pride in the fact that you are a member of NCURA and “step up to the plate” by being an active member, willing to make a meaningful contribution to our exceptional organization.

Pat Fitzgerald is the 2004 NCURA President and serves as the Director of Cost Analysis for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Last fall,

NCURA's Executive Director, Kathleen Larmett, was contacted by the 23,000 member American Society of Association Executives (ASAE), and was asked to submit an article for publication in their magazine Association Management that would describe NCURA's strategic, knowledge-based governance. AM's Executive Editor, Carole Schweitzer, told Larmett that NCURA had been cited as an association that understood and practiced good governance and she believed there were many who would benefit from an article that described how NCURA went about its governance change and the benefits that followed.

The article, titled, When Board and Staff Align was published in the March 2004 edition of Association Management and talks about an association that was already good and how it positioned itself for peak performance. It covers a period from 1998, when NCURA's Board of Directors (then called Executive Committee) learned about the best practices of highly successful associations, through its change in governance in 2000 and where it stands today. Larmett notes at the beginning of the article that NCURA's main strength is it members, “Perhaps the best thing I saw in this member-driven association, and had seen for a number of years, was the willingness of the members to volunteer to help, not only the organization but also each other.” And, later when she describes the process NCURA underwent during its transformation,

• Volunteerism has increased. Members respond to calls for volunteers for both standing committees and NCURA's electronic neighborhood committees.
• The development and launch of NCURA's Leadership Development Institute.
• NCURA now has a Board of Directors.
• Staff partner with members and sit on committees and task forces to lend valuable, professional expertise.
• NCURA continually invests and reinvests in itself. It sponsors free training for its regional leaders, national officers, board members and those who will take leadership positions in the future. It is not afraid to invest in new forms of technology so it can reach out to those in the research community who do not have staff or budget to travel to workshops and conferences in person.
• The number of educational programs sponsored by NCURA has increased by 157%.

Since the publication of NCURA's story, numerous inquiries have come in from associations across the country with questions on everything from “May we have samples of your volunteer job descriptions?” to “May we have a virtual tour of your Leadership Development Institute.”

Congratulations to you and all of your NCURA member colleagues for contributing to the continuing success of this organization and to the Board of Directors and staff who's alignment is still strong as the partnership holds firm.

NCURA's Governance Acknowledged by Association of Associations

“We scrutinized everything, including infrastructure in an open and honest way and created lists of strengths and weaknesses. …and the one thing that kept rising to the top in the strengths category was the people who made up NCURA – both staff and members.”

Major changes at NCURA since the change in governance in 2000 that are discussed in the article are:

• NCURA's membership has grown from 3,000 to 4,500 as of 12/31/03.
• Committees are based on competency, rather than constituency. Committee membership is now determined by expertise rather than geography or “whom you know.”
• Collaborations with other associations has increased and now includes AUTM, COGR, NACUA, SRA, FDP, and NAS's GIRR.
With so many demands placed on sponsored research administrators, it should not be surprising to note that records retention is a topic that does not always receive the attention it deserves. There is so much more filling our days: effort reporting, cost-sharing, proposal submission, financial reporting, etc. With limited time and resources, we instinctively want to focus our efforts on “big” activities that keep our institutions in compliance and directly facilitate the work of faculty and research staff. My purpose in writing this article is to show you that establishing a sponsored research records retention policy and schedule can translate into a big win for you and your institution and should not be considered a low priority task.

Because A-110 and the FAR each sets forth a three-year retention period for business records associated with grants, contracts or cooperative agreements, some of you may have interpreted this to mean that if a federal sponsor were to initiate an audit or some other action following the end of the three-year retention period, your institution would not be required to turn over the requested information. If the materials are in your institution’s possession and you know this, you are required to make them available. Without a retention schedule and destruction of records in accordance with the schedule, you may be exposing your institution to greater risk. I think it’s fair to say that we all work from the assumption that our institutions are doing the right thing. Yet, that notwithstanding, as sponsored research administrators, it is our role to keep risk to a minimum. Sometimes a little housecleaning can go a long way toward reducing risk.

Most universities have delegated oversight responsibility for records management and retention to the University Archives or the General Counsel’s office. I encourage you to work with the appropriate office within your institution when formulating your sponsored research record retention policy. Staff can provide you with guidance, templates and the latest federal and state requirements, both of which should be considered when formulating your policy. For example, in my home state, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, contractual documents must be retained a minimum of six years. Consequently, my institution’s grant and contract retention schedule is longer than both A-110 and the FAR require.

There are many parts to a grant or contract file, which may be housed in different offices and departments. Thus, when developing your policy, you should determine who has what and where the master record of information will be maintained. You should also identify the format in which the different parts of the file may reside, e.g., hard copy, electronic, video, photo, email, etc. Ideally, in your schedule you should be able to tie together the entire file regardless of format or location.

Consideration of a records policy and schedule for sponsored research offices should not be limited to individual grant and contract files. There are ancillary policy, committee, and related files that should also be reviewed. One should develop a means of documenting different policies and how they have changed or were interpreted over time. While there are no sponsor-imposed requirements for the retention of these types of records, it makes good business sense to provide a historical overview and policy context for sponsored research actions. With the move toward posting policies and procedures on the world wide web, you should make sure your policy and schedule allow for capturing different iterations of the sponsored research administration web site.

Developing a records retention policy and schedule can be a liberating experience. It forces us to focus on what is essential. Who knows, you just might have fun eliminating unnecessary records from files, and you could discover unexpected ways to streamline business processes.

Mary Mitchell is Director of Awards Management, Office for Sponsored Research, Harvard University.
Guidance for awarding and charging the facilities and administrative rate can be found in OMB Circular A-21 Section G.7. It states “Federal agencies shall use the negotiated rates for F&A costs in effect at the time of the initial award throughout the life of the sponsored agreement. ‘Life’ for the purpose of this subsection means each competitive segment of the project. If negotiated rate agreements do not extend through the life of the sponsored agreement at the time of the initial award, then the negotiated rate for the last year of the sponsored agreement shall be extended through the end of the life of the sponsored agreement.” The preamble to the May 8, 1996 revision to A-21 clarified that this applies to both the funding and reimbursement of F&A costs throughout the competitive segment.

**CASE STUDY 1:**

The University has a predetermined rate of 50%, effective July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2006. After June 30, 2006, the 50% rate is provisional. A competitive award is received for the five-year period May 1, 2004 through April 30, 2009. The 50% rate would be used for the funding and reimbursement for the full five-year period. The negotiated rate may go up or it may go down when the rate is negotiated for the period starting July 1, 2007. However, this fluctuation does not affect either the funding or the charging of F&A costs on this award.

In some instances a rate negotiation may result in different predetermined or fixed rates for each year of the Facilities and Administrative Rate Agreement. Consequently, the negotiated rates would be applied separately to each year of the competitive segment. The negotiated rate for the last year would be extended through the end of the competitive segment.

**CASE STUDY 2:**

The University has negotiated predetermined rates for the period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2006. The rate for FY 2003 is 50%; FY 2004 is 49%; FY 2005 is 48% and FY 2006 is 47%. The University receives a competitive award for May 1, 2004 through April 30, 2009. For FY 2004, the 49% rate would be used for funding and reimbursement of F&A costs. The 48% rate would be used for FY 2005, and 47% rate would be used for the remainder of the competitive segment.

There is a special situation that applies when the initial award is received during the period when only a provisional rate is in effect. This situation occurs when the period covered by a predetermined or fixed rate ends before a new predetermined or fixed rate is negotiated. If an initial award under a competitive segment is received during this “gap” period, the provisional rate would be used for funding purposes, but the predetermined rate(s) eventually negotiated for the period covered by the competitive segment would be used for F&A reimbursement.

**CASE STUDY 3:**

A predetermined rate of 50% ends on June 30, 2002. After June 30, 2002, the 50% rate is provisional. A predetermined rate of 48%, effective July 1, 2003, is negotiated on November 1, 2003. A five-year competitive award is received on July 22, 2003, for an award start date of August 1, 2003. The funding of F&A costs will be based on the provisional rate of 50% (usually for the entire competitive period). However, when the predetermined rate is negotiated in November, the negotiated rate of 48% must be charged back to August 1, 2003.

The NIH Grants Policy Statement states on page 83 that F&A costs awarded may be subject to upward or downward adjustment, depending on the type of rate negotiated, and grantees may rebudget between direct and F&A costs in either direction without NIH prior approval, provided there is no change in the scope of the approved project. This provision applies to all types of NIH grantees (hospitals, nonprofit research institutes, universities, etc.), some of which are not subject to A-21. This section has limited applicability to universities. One situation is the funding of a “gap” period as discussed above. Another is when the direct charges of a grant moved from F&A base costs to non-F&A based costs or vice versa. For example, when costs originally budgeted for salaries and fringe are actually spent on equipment, which reduces the amount of F&A costs applicable to the grant. A portion of the unused F&A costs could be rebudgeted to direct costs.

Marilyn Surbey is Associate Vice President for Finance and Research, Emory University.
A colleague and I were recently discussing his experience with a dysfunctional team and I commented that it sounded as if the team had too many Eeyores. My friend was unfamiliar with the Winnie the Pooh characters and didn’t understand my reference. His childhood reading had been filled with Babar, a benevolent despot with armies of loving subjects at his command. The world of Christopher Robin and his friends in the 100 Acre Woods is, of course, quite different.

A.A. Milne, the author of the Pooh books (no they aren’t the creation of Disney Studios) is said to have claimed that he didn’t actually write the books for children. Indeed there is much to be learned about how adult humans behave from these fictional characters, based on stuffed animals, forest animals and a small boy.

In his article “The Trouble with Teamwork” Patrick M. Lencioni discusses the way that personal styles and behavior can lead to dysfunctional teams. Lencioni’s hierarchy of team dysfunctions starts with absence of trust, and progresses through fear of conflict, lack of commitment and avoidance of accountability to inattention to results. While he offers advice to those who have to manage and lead teams of senior professionals, he suggests that sometimes a team may not be the best way to achieve a goal.

There are times, however, when a project requires expertise in a variety of fields and a team is the best way to tap that diverse pool of knowledge. How to assemble that group so that it is a productive team, able to make good decisions, is of course the challenge. We tend to pay close attention to the functional expertise of the prospective team members; I suggest it is equally important to consider the intrinsic behavioral characteristics of each team member.

For those of us familiar with them, the characters in Winnie the Pooh provide some useful analogies to the way people think and act. Using those analogies, as you consider individuals, might help you to put together a productive team. Below is my guide to selecting a team based on the inhabitants of the 100 Acre Woods and The House at Pooh Corner for those of you who have not had the pleasure of making their acquaintance.

Pooh is a lovable bear. He is sometimes creative; he makes up songs and poems; and he makes some quite startling associations. Pooh is a lovable bear. He is sometimes creative; he makes up songs and poems; and he makes some quite startling associations.

Tigger, for example, thinks Tiggers can climb trees as well as bears, and he does quite well going up. It is coming down from the tree that presents the problem. Tiggers can also be a problem for a team when they volunteer for more than they can accomplish, forcing others to pick up their work and finish it.

Pooh is a simple childlike faith and curiosity. Poohs don’t like acronyms, and they don’t like long and complicated explanations; they will ask for interpretations in simple language. On the downside, however, they act in the present and rarely consider the impact of their actions in the future. A perfect example of this lack of forethought is the episode in which Winnie the Pooh eats too much while visiting rabbit and then cannot get out of rabbit’s front door because he has grown too fat. Eeyore (a donkey if you haven’t guessed) is quite the opposite of Pooh. Eeyore might well be described as a curmudgeon, a complaining and skeptical, old soul. He always finds something wrong with the way you propose to do something and he always sees the worst possible outcome of any proposed plan. I find Eeyores in small numbers are valuable members of the team because they make us think about the “worst case scenarios” and contingency planning. Of course if you have too many Eeyores you might abandon good projects for not very good reasons.

Tiggers are risk takers; they think they can do anything. They have enormous energy, which is often stimulating to the team. Unfortunately, without proper supervision they start projects without any consideration of whether they could actually finish.

Eeyore’s tail in the forest and used it a doorknocker without recognizing what it was. Owls will do extensive analyses of a situation but they do tend to miss the obvious, as when Owl found Eeyore’s tail in the forest and used it a doorknocker without recognizing what it was. Owls are a very real challenge to the leader of a team. You must be prepared to ask direct questions and move the team toward a decision or your owl will just keep accumulating more data and doing more analysis.

Owls represent another personality type commonly found on teams at academic institutions. Like real owls they tend to be loners, uncomfortable in the team environment. They will devote considerable time to studying the problem, and amass much knowledge, both useful and not so useful, which they are pleased to share. They see knowledge as a means to achieve personal gain and prestige. Background and research, statistics, charts and tables - that’s the role owls love. Owls will do extensive analyses of a situation but they do tend to miss the obvious, as when Owl found Eeyore’s tail in the forest and used it a doorknocker without recognizing what it was. Owls are a very real challenge to the leader of a team. You must be prepared to ask direct questions and move the team toward a decision or your owl will just keep accumulating more data and doing more analysis.

Pooh is a lovable bear. He is sometimes creative; he makes up songs and poems; and he makes some quite startling associations. Pooh has a simple childlike faith and curiosity. Poohs don’t like acronyms, and they don’t like long and complicated explanations; they will ask for interpretations in simple language. On the downside, however, they act in the present and rarely consider the impact of their actions in the future.

Eeyore (a donkey if you haven’t guessed) is quite the opposite of Pooh. Eeyore might well be described as a curmudgeon, a complaining and skeptical, old soul. He always finds something wrong with the way you propose to do something and he always sees the worst possible outcome of any proposed plan. I find Eeyores in small numbers are valuable members of the team because they make us think about the “worst case scenarios” and contingency planning. Of course if you have too many Eeyores you might abandon good projects for not very good reasons.

Eeyore (a donkey if you haven’t guessed) is quite the opposite of Pooh. Eeyore might well be described as a curmudgeon, a complaining and skeptical, old soul. He always finds something wrong with the way you propose to do something and he always sees the worst possible outcome of any proposed plan. I find Eeyores in small numbers are valuable members of the team because they make us think about the “worst case scenarios” and contingency planning. Of course if you have too many Eeyores you might abandon good projects for not very good reasons.

There are times, however, when a project requires expertise in a variety of fields and a team is the best way to tap that diverse pool of knowledge. How to assemble that group so that it is a productive team, able to make good decisions, is of course the challenge. We tend to pay close attention to the functional expertise of the prospective team members; I suggest it is equally important to consider the intrinsic behavioral characteristics of each team member.

For those of us familiar with them, the characters in Winnie the Pooh provide some useful analogies to the way people think and act. Using those analogies, as you consider individuals, might help you to put together a productive team. Below is my guide to selecting a team based on the inhabitants of the 100 Acre Woods and The House at Pooh Corner for those of you who have not had the pleasure of making their acquaintance.

Pooh is a lovable bear. He is sometimes creative; he makes up songs and poems; and he makes some quite startling associations. Pooh has a simple childlike faith and curiosity. Poohs don’t like acronyms, and they don’t like long and complicated explanations; they will ask for interpretations in simple language. On the downside, however, they act in the present and rarely consider the impact of their actions in the future.

A perfect example of this lack of forethought is the episode in which Winnie the Pooh eats too much while visiting rabbit and then cannot get out of rabbit’s front door because he has grown too fat.

There are many other characters in the books which might inform your planning but I’m sure by now you get the concept. It is important to consider not only expertise but also behavioral characteristics when assembling a team so that it will, in fact, be able to complete its task. As you put together a team you need to balance Poohs with Eeyores, add an Owl for research, Tiggers for energy and courage and a Piglet or two for introspection.

Suzanne Polmar serves as the Director, Grant and Contract Administration, Yale University.

Bibliography:
In late February, over 700 participants traveled to the beautiful climate of San Diego to learn how to better maximize our assets at this year's Financial Research Administrator's Conference. Participants were given the opportunity to learn everything from how to improve their subrecipient monitoring policies to how to work with difficult people.

This year's communication theme was threaded throughout the conference. The conference kicked off with a keynote address given by Chip Eichelberger. With over 18 years of experience, including 6 years with world famous author and motivator Anthony Robbins, Chip got everyone thinking about the methods we use to communicate and how we can improve how we are communicating at work and in our personal lives. After this energized start to the conference, attendees were able to choose from an expansive list of informative sessions offered in seven tracks—Costing, Primer, Hospital/Non-Profit, Transactional, Communication, Compliance, Departmental. In addition, there were numerous discussion groups in which to participate. For those who came early, San Diego offered a long list of attractions, entertainment, and fine dining in addition to great opportunities offered by NCURA's Sunday workshops.

A choice of seven workshops were offered (one in each track).

This conference has continued to grow each year providing those involved in financial research administration with a fantastic opportunity to learn more about the issues they face, as well as a chance to talk to others about how they handle the multitude of challenges faced in this field. As with all NCURA conferences, one of the most valuable benefits of attendance was networking with colleagues. While communication was the theme for this conference, overall, it is the true theme of NCURA. The opportunity to share information and knowledge with others is invaluable. NCURA provides individuals with several arenas in which to efficiently interact with those most informed about our profession. The annual FRA conference provides a great opportunity for financial research administrators to expand their knowledge and skills.

FRA VI will be held February 20-22, 2005 in Disney’s Contemporary Resort, Orlando, Florida.

Kerry Peluso served as the Chair of the FRA V Program Committee and is Director of Post Award Financial Administration at the University of Pennsylvania.

Keynote Speaker Chip Eichelberger, NCURA Executive Director Kathleen Larmett, President Pat Fitzgerald and Conference Chair Kerry Peluso have the “YES!” spirit.
Greetings from Region I!

It’s springtime in New England. That means sunny weather, golf and hopefully winning Red Sox baseball. As I write this article, we are preparing to attend our annual spring meeting, which is being held in Sturbridge, MA on May 2 – May 5. Congratulations to Lee Picard and Stacy Riseman, along with their program committee, for putting together a great program.

Once again we will be honoring the recipient of the Region I Merit Award. The recipient of this year’s award is Charlie Tardivo of BearingPoint. Charlie has been a mainstay in NCURA activities at both the regional and national level for several years. Charlie continuously offers his expertise, whether participating in regional meetings, presenting at RADG meetings or taking the stage at national meetings. He has also served as Chair of Region I and has served on several regional committees. Congratulations to Charlie for a well deserved honor.

I’d like to also recognize the recipients of the 2004 Bernard McLane Travel Award. Congratulations to Mark Chisholm, Grant and Contract Specialist, Northeastern University and Kris Monahan, Grants Development Coordinator, Bridgewater State College. The travel award will allow both recipients to attend the spring meeting.

Finally, please note that the location of the June 9th RADG has been changed from the John Hancock Conference Center to the Marriott Copley Place. More details to follow.

Ben Prince is Chair of Region I and Administrator for the Meyers Primary Institute, University of Massachusetts Medical School.

We realize that not all who are interested in participating in Region II are NCURA members every year. The membership is driven to a certain extent by our institutional finances. To try to reach the broadest group of people in our region who are involved with NCURA whenever their institutions can afford to pay their membership dues, over the summer we will develop a list of sponsored program offices in our region and maintain liaison with those offices, in addition to being in touch with current members.

Charlie Kaars is Chair of Region II and serves as the Assistant Vice President for Sponsored Programs Administration, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Our meeting in Baltimore April 25-27 was interesting, informative, very well attended, enjoyable and, at times, exciting. In short, it was another very successful Region II Spring Meeting. Special thanks go to all who worked so hard to produce this event. The Program Committee was under the leadership of Sue Robb (before she deserted us for Region III) and Mary Beth Curtin, who were joined by Jennifer Barron (who graciously stepped into the Program Co-Chair position) Robin Cyr, Jeanne Galvin-Clarke, Diane Shaw, Cheryl Williams and Ailing Zhang. Thanks also to Kurt Flick and Diane Shaw (again) for attending to our AV needs. And to Kerry Peluso, our Treasurer, who attended to the myriad of registration and hotel arrangement details.

All of our Region’s activities are dependent on volunteers. We know that you want to volunteer so that you can make our future activities and events successful. In order to make the membership better informed of volunteer opportunities, early in the summer we will add to the Region II web site a list of all of our standing and ad hoc committees with the names and terms of service of their members. If you see that a committee slot will become vacant and you are interested in filling it, contact me (kaars@research.buffalo.edu). If you have an idea for an activity or service that would be helpful to our membership, let me know. If you would like to be involved in our 2005 Spring Meeting in Philadelphia or have suggestions for the program, contact Jennifer Barron (jlb@jhu.edu). At this year’s Annual Meeting, the Tuesday Night Party will include Regional Booths to represent our regional character and spirit (a fuller description is posted on the Region II website: http://www.osp.cornell.edu/NCURA_RegII/). We’re looking for volunteers to get involved in this fun activity. Interested? Let me know.

As I write this, members of Region III will be in Wild Dunes (Charleston, SC) attending our Annual Meeting. This year’s theme is “Trained, Tested, and Ready”, reflecting on our needs and opportunities to stay trained and provide training for staff and faculty at our institutions. The meeting will be attended by over 160 research administrators from throughout the Region and NCURA National Executive Director, Kathleen Larmett and Members, don’t forget to volunteer for opportunities on various committees that will be assigned in the next few weeks. And the Mainstreet, U.S.A. competition is coming in November, so be ready to take on our friends from other regions. More about this in the coming months.

Patrick Green is the Chair of Region III and serves as the Associate Director, Division of Sponsored Research for Vanderbilt University.

Region IV continues to grow national leaders. For example, a member of the faculty for the recent Online Education Program: How to Avoid the Pitfalls of Post-Award Administration (April 1, 2004) is Winifred Schumi, University of Minnesota. Kathleen Irwin, University of Wisconsin-Madison, is a member of the faculty for the Conflict of Interest Management Video Workshop coming September 14, 2004, and Steve Hansen, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, serves on the Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration team. F. Edward Herran, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, recently moved from Region IV, is Treasurer-Elect of the national Board.
of Directors. For a list of Region IV members serving at the national level (too long to include in this newsletter!), visit the Region IV website at http://146.163.5.85/ncura4/.

Member participation at the regional level is vital as well. Volunteer opportunities abound at the regional spring meeting and at the November national meeting. Be on the lookout for sign-up sheets and calls for volunteers from committee chairs seeking your help. Volunteering is a great way to meet fellow Region IV members and is a good first step toward regional, as well as national, service opportunities. Feel free to contact a Region IV board member or committee chair directly to ask, “How can I help?”

Bill Sharp serves as a Compliance Specialist for the University of Kansas, Center for Research.

REGION V
Southwestern

A big round of applause and congratulations are due our Spring 2004 Region V program committee: Debbie Newton (Univ. of Tulsa), Matt Berry (Univ. of OK), Gail Davis (Lamar Univ.), Lisa Faulkner (OK State Univ.), Linda Golden (Univ. of Tulsa), Brett Henry (TEES), Joan Howeth (Univ. of OK), Beth King (UTMB-Galveston), Govind Narasimhan (UTMB-Galveston), and Melody Page (UTMB-Galveston). What a tremendous job! Great meeting! Thanks to each of you for all of your hard work and dedication to making this meeting such a great success.

If you were not able to attend this year’s regional meeting, then please mark your calendar now for the Spring 2005 Region V meeting. It will be held in Tulsa, OK. Meeting dates are April 10 – 13, 2005. Please consider volunteering to moderate a session, to present a session, to be on a committee, or to help in any of the numerous ways that are needed to prepare the spring meeting. You’ll have the chance to meet new people, learn new things, and see just what is involved in meeting preparations. But most of all, you’ll have a great time. Please contact Debbie Jennings (debbie-jennings@utulsedu) or me (jcook@bcm.tmc.edu) if you’d like to volunteer.

At the conclusion of the Spring 2004 Region V meeting, I handed over the duties of Chair to Debbie Jennings, so this will be my last Regional Corner update. It has been a great pleasure to serve as Chair-elect and Chair for Region V. I’m somewhat sad that my term is ending, but there’s a bit of relief too. Now I’ll have time to volunteer to help out with the Spring 2005 meeting!

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

REGION VI
Western

Dear Region VI Members:

As I wrote this month’s article, I was in the midst of preparing for our spring meeting in San Francisco. I don’t think I was ever that busy, between the logistics of working with the hotel and my day job. And, for some reason, the PIs kept sending over their proposals (didn’t they realize that I was busy?).

We had almost 300 people registered - more than I can ever remember at a regional meeting. And, while I think geography is playing a significant role in the number being so high (there are several large campuses within driving distance), I’m sure a large part of the draw was the strong program (thank you, program committee).

I was amazed by the number of people who contacted me offering to help out in any way that they could. This is most definitely a "volunteer" organization. I will report on the how the meeting went in the next Regional Corner.

On another note, I would like you all to start thinking about regional elections, which will be coming up late this summer. We have had excellent leadership over the years, and this has been made possible because people have volunteered to serve. I won’t deny that serving in any of the elected positions is a lot of work, but its most definitely rewarding.

And, by working with the organization in one of these more intensive roles, you get the chance to work with some exceptional people, and you learn what an incredible organization NCURA truly is. The positions that will be open beginning January 1, 2005 are: Chair-Elect, Secretary/Treasurer-Elect, Member of the Board of Directors, and Regional Advisory Committee. An official call for nominations will be going out later this spring.

Last of all, beginning January 2005, Dan Nordquist’s 2-year position on the Nominating & Leadership Development Committee will expire, and the Board of Directors has asked me to send them the names of two candidates to consider - only one of which will be selected by the Board to sit on this committee. Among their many responsibilities, the NLD comes up with the slate of candidates for national elections; they select the annual recipient of the Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award, and the recipients of the Catherine Core Minority Travel Awards.

They also make recommendations for new programs to the Board (the Leadership Development Institute started as a recommendation from the NLD). If you are interested in serving on this committee, please feel free to contact me.

David Mayo is the Chair of Region VI and serves as the Associate Director of Sponsored Research, California Institute of Technology.

REGION VII
Rocky Mountain

Over 300 participants attended the Region VI/VII Spring Meeting in San Francisco, CA, April 18-21. This was an outstanding meeting, with record breaking attendance, not only because of the great site, but because of the strong program, knowledgeable speakers, and ongoing opportunities for networking between Region VI and VII. The meeting was a great success.

Looking ahead to this summer, keep an eye out for the call for nominations to elect new individuals to the positions of Chair, and Board Member from Region VII. Serving in a regional leadership position is a wonderful opportunity to learn more about NCURA, while having opportunities to meet colleagues nationwide.

We also anticipate a call for our regional travel award. This award provides assistance to an individual who has never before attended a national meeting to do so this coming November.

For more information about these or other regional issues, please feel free to contact me at 505-277-2256 or via email a wallen@unm.edu.

I look forward to seeing you in the fall!

Denise A. Wallen is Chair of Region VII and serves as Special Assistant to the Vice Provost for Research, University of New Mexico.
Welcome to the Neighborhoods! This spring issue of Neighborhood Watch features important federal updates on Grants.gov, the NIH Commons, and grants sponsored by the U.S. Army. The Compliance Neighborhood has a special feature on upcoming conferences sponsored by the Office of Research Integrity and the Office of Human Research Protection, and the eRA Neighborhood has special announcement from NASA regarding their Solicitation and Proposal Integrated Review and Evaluation System.

As noted in the inaugural issue of Neighborhood Watch (February/March 2004), this column is designed to cover all-things Neighborhood. So, in addition to the essential federal notices and events, you will also read about how the Neighborhood Committees are working to provide NCURA members with best and most relevant resources possible.

The FRA and Compliance Neighborhoods have designed quick electronic surveys to help determine which resources and materials are of the greatest interest and need for the members, and the PUI Neighborhood has launched a successful new online discussion forum. The FRA Neighborhood has been busy updating their online Library and the eRA Neighborhood has offered a glimpse into their community with an updated introduction and welcome.

All six Neighborhoods have either recently released or are preparing to publish a new issue of On Campus, the monthly electronic interview featuring one member of NCURA. In May, NCURA members were given a special double issue of On Campus. The FRA Neighborhood released one issue (details are available in the FRA update on page 15), and the Neighborhoods released a second issue featuring two recipients of the 2003 Catherine Core Award. Miriam De La Paz, Grants Assistant at the University of Florida, and Elaine Nicholson, Assistant Director, Office of Grants and Research Services at Seton Hall University are featured in this issue. The deadline for the 2004 Catherine Core Award is June 1, 2004.

Discover the Neighborhoods first-hand! Visit us at http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/.

The PUI Neighborhood Committee would like to encourage all research administrators at predominantly undergraduate institutions to join the Neighborhood. We have moved the ‘Join’ link to the PUI Neighborhood homepage to make it easier for you to find us. As of May 14, we have 60 members on the PUI listserv. Our goal is to double the size of the PUI Neighborhood before the NCURA National Meeting in November. Visit the PUI Neighborhood at http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/pui.asp.

As mentioned in the previous newsletter, the PUI Neighborhood began a series of ‘Neighborhood Meetings’ over the PUI listserv. On the first day of each month, we will explore ideas and issues of concern for research administrators at our institutions. The first ‘Neighborhood Meeting’ debuted on April 1. The topic of discussion for April was F&A Issues for PUIs. Members from Capital University (OH), Central Washington University, Lewis-Clark State College (ID), New College of Florida, and Canisius College all joined in the online discussion. We encourage all PUI members to join us for these discussions.

The PUI Neighborhood is sponsoring the June issue of On Campus. Visit the PUI Town Hall at http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/puitownhall.asp to read previous issues, and feel free to contact me at jpogats@siue.edu if you know of a member who you think should be considered as a feature for an upcoming issue of On Campus.

Jerry Pogatsnik serves as Associate Dean of the Graduate School at Southern Illinois University – Edwardsville and is Co-Chair of the Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions Neighborhood.
The goal of the Pre-Award Neighborhood (PAN) is to provide NCURA members with current information and a forum for discussion of pre-award issues.

The NIH has recently revised its salary limitations, as well as the pre- and post-doctoral stipend levels. Information on both can be found on the PAN website at http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/pan.asp. You will need your user ID and password to log in.

For those institutions participating in the NIH Commons and who may be having trouble with faculty reluctant to submit progress reports electronically (despite the 2-week deadline extension!!?), just remind them of the other advantages available through Commons. Once they learn that they can access early information about feedback on submitted grants, they will be knocking on YOUR door!! Institutions who are not already participating in Commons but who are interested may want to contact commons@od.nih.gov.

The Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) recently (January) released a publication that may be useful for pre-award members who have responsibility for negotiating clinical trial agreements. The booklet, “Clinical Trial Contracts: A Discussion of Four Selected Provisions,” is available from the AAMC through its Customer Services and Fulfillment Order, 2450 N Street, Washington, DC 20037 (202) 828-0416; fax (202) 828-1123; www.aamc.org/publications.

Institutions who are applying for Army grants may want to remind their investigators that the Army is VERY strict about the 5:01 p.m. (Eastern) deadline. The PI must release the grant for institutional approval in time for the institutional official to access it, review it, and submit it prior to that deadline. The site automatically locks applicants out after the deadline. They even have a link to enable you to synchronize your clock to theirs to be sure there are no questions about the time! The url for Army (and other DOD) grants is https://cdmrp.org/index.cfm; the institutional official must provide institutional data (including uploading current F&A agreements) prior to submission.

The PAN committee would like to ask the NCURA membership to let us know of tools or information that you would like to see on the PAN web site; it’s there to serve you!

Debbie Smith is the Director of Research Administration at the University of Tennessee Health Science Center and is Co-Chair of the Pre-Award Neighborhood.

The FRA Neighborhood is busy at work reviewing their Library in an effort to build upon the information included there. Part of this review will include consideration of new topics to be added. Subrecipient Monitoring and ERA Financial Tools are a couple of topics which are planned to be added in the near future. Suggestions from all NCURA members for new topics or other improvements to the site are very welcome and can be forwarded to the committee’s Chair, Kerry Peluso at pelusok@pobox.upenn.edu or to any member of the FRA Committee at http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/fratownhall.asp.

At the recent FRA V meeting in San Diego, a neighborhood meeting was held for this committee. The library review was discussed as well as other future plans for the neighborhood. In the coming weeks, a survey is planned to be distributed to find out what NCURA members want to see in this Neighborhood, as well as what resources they are looking for. Visit the FRA Neighborhood at http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/fra.asp for more information.

An interviewee for the May 2004 issue of On Campus interview was selected. John Bain, Associate Director for Cost Analysis and Compliance at Harvard University was highlighted in the issue. The committee came up with a list of questions that are sure to provide an interesting article with insight into the life of one of our colleagues. Please visit the NCURA Neighborhoods to view this and prior interviews.

As a final note, all NCURA members are invited to join the FRA listserv if they are not already included. This is a great resource for interacting with your fellow research administrators on the financial administration issues we all face. To join this listserv, please go to http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/fratownhall.asp.

Kerry Peluso serves as Director of Post Award Financial Administration at the University of Pennsylvania and is Chair of the FRA Neighborhood. Kerry recently served as Chair of the FRA V Program Committee.

Continued on next page
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION Neighborhood

The Departmental Administration Neighborhood is working collaboratively with the Department Research Administration Task Force to identify how NCURA can better meet the needs of departmental administrators. Several Departmental Administrators attended a focus session held at the Financial Research Administration Conference in San Diego, resulting in many great ideas for future conferences and for the neighborhood. Look for continued evolvement of initiatives to strengthen NCURA offerings.

The Departmental Administration Neighborhood is located at http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/da.asp. Please stop by, take a look around, and let us know if you have any thoughts. The Neighborhood Committee is online at http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/datownhall.asp.

Scot Gudger serves as Department Administrator for Molecular and Medical Genetics at Oregon Health & Science University and is Chair of the Departmental Administrator Neighborhood and Chair of the Neighborhood Program Committee.

COMPLIANCE Neighborhood

It is the goal of NCURA’s Compliance Neighborhood Committee to provide the membership current and relevant information and tools to assist in maintaining an environment of compliance at our institutions. Since compliance offices and activities are defined and handled in a variety of ways from institution to institution, the committee has developed a short survey to better define and recognize the needs of the membership. This survey is now online in the Compliance Neighborhood at http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/compliance.asp. It will only take a few minutes to complete the survey and the information you provide will contribute to making our Neighborhood informative and useful. The survey will be available online from May 1 - June 15, 2004.

If you have not read the most recent issue of On Campus featuring Tim Fournier, Associate Vice President for Research Integrity at Northwestern University, it is now available in the Compliance Town Hall, located at http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/compliancetownhall.asp. As an experienced compliance officer, Tim’s insights on the role of a compliance office and the challenges facing universities when defining and creating such an office are very useful.

Lastly, often we are bombarded through a variety of venues of upcoming meetings and publications of interest. It will be a goal of the Compliance Neighborhood to provide in each edition of the NCURA Newsletter, a consolidated listing of such opportunities.

NCURA – June 10
Online Education Program
“Compliance Never Ends...Effective Grant & Contract Closeouts” http://www.ncura.edu/meetings/oep

Office of Research Integrity - June 28-29
“The RCR Summit: A National Dialogue on Future Directions of RCR”
East Lansing, MI

NCURA - July 25-27
“Government & Universities: Partners in Compliance”
Providence, RI
http://www.ncura.edu/conferences/summer04

In addition, the following compliance publications are also available through NCURA and the Atlantic Information Services.

Report on Research Compliance
NCURA and Atlantic Information Services (AIS) have launched a new publication, Report on Research Compliance. This publication includes weekly e-news and instant e-alerts when especially compelling news events take place. For more information visit http://www.reportonresearchcompliance.com/.
Regulation and Compliance
A Revised Edition of the 1996 NCURA Best-Seller, Regulation and Compliance covers more than 75 federal rules, contains a consistent, easy-to-use format, and was completely updated in August 2003. To order your own copy, visit http://www.ncura.edu/docs/regandcomp.pdf.

Be a part of the Compliance Neighborhood listerv. You can register in the Compliance Town Hall, located at http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/compliancetownhall.asp.

Alice Tangredi-Hannon is the Director of Research Compliance in the Office of Research Integrity and Compliance at the University of Pennsylvania. Alice is the Chair of the Compliance Neighborhood.

**eRA (electronic Research Administration) Neighborhood**

Approximately 80 users from 30 research institutions gathered in New Orleans, LA in March for the annual Coeus Users Group Meeting. The attendees represented institutions that have used Coeus for years, some that are just installing Coeus now, and some that are considering installation. The two-day get-together was an opportunity for users to learn about new enhancements to the Coeus application, including an entire new module to handle Institutional Review Board processing and a conceptual overview of improved handling of large program project proposals, as well as presentations of modifications user institutions have made to the base application.

Coeus is a project administration application developed by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). It provides management of proposals and awards with modules for proposal development (including budgeting), electronic proposal submission, and awards management, including a report-tracking module. Users at the conference, in addition to focusing on the application and its development, discussed a mechanism for forming a consortium for planning future application functions as well as accomplishing the work to make those plans a reality.


**SUZAN MOODY OF NASA PROVIDED THE FOLLOWING ANNOUNCEMENT.**

Rita Svarcas recently left her position as lead of the NASA Office of Procurement, Sponsored Research Business Activity to work as part of the transition team for NASA’s planned Shared Services Center. Tom Sauret is the new lead, and he may be reached at Thomas.E.Sauret@nasa.gov. Phone: (202) 358-1068.

NASA is beginning the transition from its existing SYS-EYFUS peer-review system to the new NSPIRES program. NSPIRES stands for "NASA Solicitation and Proposal Integrated Review and Evaluation System". The NSPIRES application will provide NASA with a web-based system to help manage their research application and selection process in support of NASA’s research mission. The NSPIRES application should not only provide NASA and its support services contractor with greater flexibility and efficiency, but also offer improved recipient services as well, particularly in the areas of proposal preparation, tracking, and post-award management. NSPIRES will also serve as NASA’s interface with the government-wide Grants.Gov initiative. Deployment of NSPIRES is scheduled for September 2004.

Tammy J. Caster serves as Grant & Contract Office, Electronic Systems Specialist at Cornell University. Tom Drinane serves as Information Systems Analyst at Dartmouth College and is Chair of the eRA Neighborhood.
Tim Fournier is Associate Vice President for Research Integrity at Northwestern University. Tim has been involved in many NCURA conferences and workshops. Most recently, Tim was a panelist at FRA V in San Diego, CA. Tim has been a member of NCURA since 2001.

What types of training/education have you found to be most effective in fostering an awareness of research compliance issues and in developing a culture of compliance?

In higher education institutions across the country, our researchers and research administrators face myriad external and internal expectations for appropriately managing sponsored projects. It’s our job to help the research community understand what those expectations are. But I think the challenge for those of us in compliance roles has been to take the next step to help the research community understand the reasons for those expectations.

Researchers are focused on asking questions that explain causal relationships, that reveal and define base characteristics, that contribute to a greater understanding — “why” questions. On the other hand, research administrators are typically focused on understanding the procedures that must be followed to appropriately support research activity — “what” and “how” questions. I think that many of us in compliance roles have historically answered compliance questions by focusing on procedures and mechanical structures that primarily answer the “what” and “how” questions.

I have found that the most effective methods for educating the research community have answered the “why” of regulatory and policy expectations in addition to the “what” and “how” questions. The goal is to open a dialogue with investigators and administrators that identifies policy and regulatory requirements, explains the intended objectives of those requirements and effectively demonstrates appropriate techniques for meeting those requirements.

What kind of mechanism do you think Research Compliance Officers should use to share their resources, talents, educational programs, etc? Since this is a growing group, should we have an annual compliance summit, a separate organization, or should we always insist on a separate compliance track?

As we all know from working in an academic setting, there is no one best way to share our experiences, tools and information. Each of us receives and processes information in different ways. So my short answer is all-of-the-above.

What kind of mechanism do you think Research Compliance Officers should use to share their resources, talents, educational programs, etc? Since this is a growing group, should we have an annual compliance summit, a separate organization, or should we always insist on a separate compliance track?

As we all know from working in an academic setting, there is no one best way to share our experiences, tools and information. Each of us receives and processes information in different ways. So my short answer is all-of-the-above.

What measures would you use to determine the success of a compliance office?

Performance measures for compliance activities have always struck me as particularly challenging. In some ways, the value of the compliance function is in the penalties avoided as a result of compliance activities. Even more fundamentally, the value comes from the change in the culture, staff and faculty awareness and sense of personal responsibility that results from effective compliance activities. I think many of us struggle with measuring compliance success because the core value is essentially determined by psychological and behavioral factors.

That being said, I think some of the things that must be evaluated to consider success include the number of staff reached with compliance education and training, participation in voluntary compliance activities, the volume of inquiries and contacts made to the compliance office, the volume of activities in which the compliance office is invited to participate by other institutional offices. At both the University of Pennsylvania and now at Northwestern, I consider that one of the functions of my office is to be a compliance help desk — a place that faculty and staff can contact with policy and procedure questions as well as to report incidents. I think that once the compliance office is considered to be a natural point of contact, a resource within the university, the office has achieved success.

The growth in what I’ve come to know as the research compliance industry during the last five years has been astounding. Even beyond the research area, our universities and research organizations have recognized the value of establishing visible and effective compliance functions. With those functions has come an increasing sense of responsibility and accountability within the research community that is important to share.

I believe that NCURA is already able to provide a framework for sharing research compliance knowledge within existing frameworks — and I think there will always be a need for a compliance track within NCURA meetings. I would like to see the development of an annual compliance summit that brings together compliance professionals with responsibilities beyond just research. Together with representatives from many other institutions, I participate in an informal forum with a mission of serving as an information network, an early warning system and a learning opportunity about all the compliance issues facing universities. I think one goal for those of us with research compliance responsibilities should be to interface with our peers with other compliance responsibilities and in a variety of industries.

What measures would you use to determine the success of a compliance office?
What are some of the resources you use in your office?

Both now and in the past, I have been very fortunate and honored to have worked with some great people. And the most valuable resource has been those people, some who have been part of the compliance office and many who have been from the other offices in the institution. The greatest benefit to me has been the support and knowledge of those individuals who have known the organization more deeply and for a longer time than I have.

I think that what I’ve brought to the table has been the experience of having seen and worked with a variety of issues, recognizing familiar patterns, being able to pose questions that help identify particular concerns, identifying other relevant considerations and coordinating the activities of staff from a number of offices. While tools such as technology, handbooks and regulations are extremely valuable, I think the real gain comes from identifying and utilizing the skills of the people who can identify the right sources within the institution to answer questions, who understand the real practices and culture within the organization.

How is the staff in your office trained?

Quite well ;-) On this my 20th day in this position, my assistant and I are the only members of Northwestern’s Office of Research Integrity. We will soon be opening searches for two new members of our staff. We will be looking for individuals with experience in some combination of a number of valuable areas including research administration, education and training, data and information analysis, accounting and finance, audit and regulatory compliance. Future training will of course depend on the skills of the individuals that we recruit. But I think the research professional organizations’ regional and national meetings as well as ad hoc gatherings of research personnel from Northwestern and other institutions will be a great way to keep up-to-date. In addition, I will rely on the interests of the personnel we recruit to develop an individual educational plan that might include some combination of professional certifications, continuing education and possibly an internal “internship” program that allows Research Integrity staff to learn about the operational responsibilities of departmental and central research administrators.

What experience do you believe would be most helpful for staff in this office?

One thing I’ve learned in research compliance is that sometimes it’s the skill or experience that you least expect that offers the greatest value in a particular situation. For example, at one distant, long ago point in my life, I had planned to be a research chemist. I changed from that potential career path a long time ago, but I find that the little bit of knowledge that I retain from those days is enormously helpful in understanding and communicating with our research faculty today.

I think the most valuable skills are — even though it may sound trite — the ability to observe and to listen. I think that in research compliance and integrity, there are often many confusing bits of information and partial understanding of actual practices. I’ve found that if you can hear and understand what people are telling you, you’ve done 90% of the work needed to find the real operational and compliance challenges.

Since compliance offices are relatively new entities at many institutions, what can they do to enhance their credibility and not just be seen as another bureaucratic “add-on”?

I think building credibility is one of our greatest challenges. And it takes time for us to overcome the perspective that the compliance office is a necessary evil. It’s my guess that at many of our institutions, management implemented compliance functions because they’ve either experienced a triggering event or are frightened of having a triggering event. That’s not a great way to begin if one’s goal is to be seen as a partner rather than an obligation. As compliance professionals, we’ve got to go out of our way to present the value proposition to the research community.

That frequently means communicating differently with different parts of the community. For a department with relatively inexperienced administrators, we might focus on the availability of resources in the compliance office to answer questions. For deans and chairs, we might explain the ways in which a compliance function can help protect faculty and the institution from erroneous or malicious allegations. We’ve got to identify the issues that are important to our faculty and administrators and work with them to build solutions. Too often we forget that it’s the faculty and administrators in the department that have to directly respond to regulatory and policy expectations. If we ignore them, how can we not expect them to ignore us?

We have seen that institutions define the roles of their compliance offices in many ways, but are there certain core areas that compliance offices should cover that should not be left to other offices?

In my opinion, the compliance office supplements the operational functions of the institution. Each institution defines the responsibilities of the compliance function in relation to its unique organizational structure, culture and personnel. I believe the fundamental vision for the Office of Research Integrity at Northwestern University is to serve and support the research community by helping faculty and staff better understand applicable laws, regulations and policies; to support Northwestern’s commitment to research and intellectual growth and to foster a culture that focuses on ethics and integrity. The core functions to achieve that vision include coordinating and delivering education, working with the research community to identify compliance risks through interviews and data analysis, and lending expertise and resources to our operational units to minimize and manage compliance risks.

Do you see the core responsibility of a compliance office as a locus of reporting and other compliance functions, or should it be an assessment and education function?

In short, both. Fundamentally, I believe that the path to implementing a culture of integrity results from identifying risk areas and educating the university community about regulatory and policy expectations. However, adopting a university-wide compliance office that helps coordinate the activities of research compliance, billing compliance, athletics compliance, privacy and the many other compliance issues our institutions face can help the institution identify broader challenges and concerns that can lead to compliance risks. To fully understand an institution’s compliance challenges, I think the compliance office must do both.

continued on the next page
What do you see as the greatest challenges facing research institutions regarding the implementation of compliance programs?

The greatest challenge is in identifying the potential impact of the cultural on the compliance program activities. For example, at many institutions a code of conduct is defined as a single document that describes certain issues and institutional expectations for behavior. At other institutions, the code of conduct is documented in a set of policies, procedures, guidelines, job descriptions and communications that clearly establish the set of behaviors that comprise the institution’s values. A compliance program at a decentralized institution with a relatively high ratio of administrative staff might rely heavily on departmental administrators to communicate fiscal policies and procedures. A more centralized university will communicate directly with the faculty. A formal organization may readily adopt and implement audit and monitoring procedures and have a well-defined disciplinary process that ensures consistency. A less formal institution that relies more on relationships and word-of-mouth communication may face a real challenge in implementing these types of monitoring and response mechanisms. As the compliance industry grows, there will be greater pressure to standardize compliance program tools and activities across institutions. We’ve seen much of that already in recent years in the offerings of a variety of vendors. I think that a variety of approaches can be effective, but the most effective program will be the one that understands and adapts to the university’s dominant culture.

Do you see a distinction between compliance assessments and audits? If so, what are they and would they be performed by two different departments? If not, is the Audit Department performing the "assessments" along with the audit function?

I do see a difference between audits and compliance assessments. The university’s auditors are audit professionals who adhere to accepted audit principles. They may share many characteristics and responsibilities with the professionals who conduct compliance assessments. I think the primary difference, though, is more a matter of quantification. The auditors utilize statistical sampling techniques to quantify the existence of a particular trait in a population. I think the purpose of a compliance assessment is to obtain a broader understanding about a particular population.

An audit might tell you that 75% of your effort reports were completed after the established deadline. A compliance assessment might indicate that existing tools and procedures guarantee that the majority of the effort reports will be late or that the education provided to a particular group of faculty about the importance of effort reporting had little impact on the timeliness of their effort reports. The audit might indicate how extensive an issue is, the compliance assessment might indicate potential causes.

Of course, there is significant overlap between these two functions. I think it can be economical and efficient to use the same staff to conduct both types of reviews. But I think it can blur the distinction between the functions for the research community, and I think it’s difficult for staff to understand when one hat comes off and the other goes on. There is a fine line that needs to be carefully defined by the compliance staff and the audit staff before the work is done.

How has the culture changed at Northwestern since the very public settlement regarding effort reporting was announced?

In many ways, I think it’s still too early for me to know. But Northwestern has an advantage over many other institutions now in that our faculty and staff are actually talking about effort reporting. We’re well into a real dialog about expectations for effort reporting and how to complete the process in a way that’s accurate and timely without being overly burdensome. How many of our institutions can say that they’re having a deep discussion among administrators, faculty, management and the compliance office about an important compliance issue? The public settlement helped foment a discussion about Northwestern’s core values and expectations and triggered a deep look inward that pointed out some of the challenges we face but also the tremendous strengths that we enjoy.
Question: When do you start planning for the closeout process?

a. At the time the proposal is designed.
b. At the time the award is accepted.
c. At the time modifications, extensions or supplements are approved.
d. Just prior to the expiration of an award.
e. At the time of expiration of an award.
f. All of the above.

If you answered f, you are right! By starting at the proposal stage, special and problematic closeout issues can be identified. At the award stage and with each modification, justifications and negotiations can occur to address problematic closeout issues. And, effective planning and communication of closeout procedures should occur from the beginning of the proposal through the completion of all closeout requirements.

Who should understand the closeout procedures? The persons in the pre-award office should understand the closeout requirements of the sponsor and the effect those requirements will have on the areas working to meet those requirements. Pre-award staff must understand the flexibility as well as the restrictions that the post-award or financial staff have in order to meet final invoicing and financial reporting requirements.

The pre- or post-award/financial area responsible for negotiating subagreements certainly must understand the closeout requirements. While drafting the subagreement and during negotiations, the prime awardee must ensure that it can receive all the required reports and deliverables in time to complete its reports to the sponsor. The post-award/financial staff also will be monitoring the closeouts and notifying applicable principal investigators (PI) and departmental administrators about upcoming award expirations including their role and responsibilities.

The PI and his/her departmental administrator should also understand the closeout procedures, especially if there are any specific deliverables due to the sponsor other than a technical report. These other deliverables may require significant involvement of the PI in order to complete.

How do you know what the closeout requirements are? For contracts, all of the closeout requirements should be included in the contract. Examples of issues that should be addressed in the contract are the types of reports or deliverables that will be due, timeline for when reports and deliverables are due, terms for final payments, whether the award is on a fixed-fee basis or cost-reimbursable basis, early termination processes, cost sharing and/or program income applicability, etc. For grants where terms and conditions are usually referenced, research administrators need to understand all of the referenced policies, guidelines and forms of that awarding sponsor. For federal awards, there must be an understanding of subparts C and D of OMB Circular A-110, OMB Circular A-21, and for subrecipients monitoring requirements of OMB Circular A-133.

Who is responsible for closeout requirements? The PI will always be responsible for any technical reports and related deliverables. Any type of financial report or invoice will generally be the responsibility of the post-award or financial area. However, many institutions require approval by the PI of these financial documents prior to submitting to the sponsor. There may also be equipment reports or invention statements required. Equipment reports will generally be prepared by your asset management area and reviewed by the post-award/financial staff. Invention statements will generally be prepared by the PIs but may also require review by the institution’s technology management office. In any event, the sponsored programs office must also understand their own university’s policies and procedures relating to the closeout process in order to ensure those requirements are met in addition to the sponsor’s requirements.

If effective closeout is so important, why is the process often neglected? In the grand scheme of everything that needs to be done during the post award phase, closeout of an award usually falls to the bottom of the list. A few of those other issues that get in the way are: negotiating awards, establishing accounts, negotiating subcontracts, reviewing expenditures for allowability, allocability and reasonableness, reviewing rebudgeting and expense transfers for allowability, allocability and reasonableness, requesting no-cost extensions, monitoring subrecipients, monitoring time and effort reporting, invoicing, recognizing revenue, managing accounts receivable, preparing interim financial reports, etc. The purpose of this article is to re-emphasize the importance of the closeout process and make everyone aware that this process is also a compliance process monitored by sponsors.

Now that you have effectively closed an award, are you done? No, there are still record retention policies of your sponsor and your institution with which you must comply. So at the beginning of this article, the question was asked, “When do you start planning the close-out process?” and now you may be asking “When does it end?”

Laura Wade is the 2004 NCURA Treasurer and serves as the Director of Finance, Contracts and Grants, The University of Texas Medical Branch.
Regulators are focusing more attention than ever on the diverse group of federal rules that fall under the umbrella of "research compliance." This collection of rapidly changing government requirements —

- Can torpedo the reputation of even the most prestigious U.S. universities,
- Ranges widely from internal business issues (e.g., effort reporting) to grave matters of international security (e.g., select agents missing from your lab and export controls),
- Can have a very sudden impact on your funding and financial well-being,
- Is the focus of complex rules and penalties from a dozen federal agencies,
- Is under constant review on Capitol Hill, where political volleyballs like the Patriot Act now have a direct impact on colleges, universities and teaching hospitals.

To help research administrators manage these complicated issues and do their jobs more effectively, NCURA and AIS are offering Report on Research Compliance, a unique three-part service that includes:

1. Weekly e-mail newsletters that report on recent events in Washington, and instant e-alerts when especially compelling events take place in the field;
2. Monthly printed newsletters (and free e-mail versions of the monthly) with practical news you can use on your campus with the best information there is to help institutions avoid the negative publicity, financial setbacks, and management problems that compliance requirements can create; and
3. Access to a password-protected web site, with links to federal agencies and documents such as laws and regulations, agency opinions and guidance, policies, a library of past printed issues in PDF format, archives of individual articles arranged by subject, recent e-mail issues, sample policies and procedures, and many more resources and tools.

With offices located in downtown Washington, D.C., Report on Research Compliance will track down the news you need from Capitol Hill and HHS’s Office of Inspector General, OMB, NSF, FDA, NASA, NIH, Office of Human Research Protections, Office of Naval Research, Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare, HHS Office of Research Integrity, the Departments of Justice, Commerce, State… and wherever else compliance news breaks in Washington that you need to know about.

In addition to being among the first to read breaking compliance news, as a Charter Subscriber to Report on Research Compliance you’ll be armed with a quick analysis of what it means for you … and follow-up stories and web-based content on options you should consider for your compliance programs. This new multi-media service is designed to deliver the intelligence you need, how and when you need it.

For NCURA members, a one-year subscription to Report on Research Compliance is available for a special charter subscription rate of $282. That’s a $50 savings off the regular price.

To order or obtain more information, call 800-521-4323 or visit www.reportonresearchcompliance.com.

Video Tapes available for January 21, 2004 and March 9, 2004

Video Conferences!

See next page for details.

March 2004 Video Workshop for Research Records Management from l to r, Mary H. Mitchell, Harvard University; Susan McKinney, University of Minnesota; Kathleen Larmet, NCURA; Stephen Dowdy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Anne Geronimo, University of Maryland.
Cost Sharing Management
aired January 21, 2004

When an institution makes a commitment to share in the costs of a sponsored project it assumes an obligation to the sponsor and accepts certain responsibilities for tracking and reporting cost sharing expenditures. This program will discuss the various aspects of cost sharing, from proposal to award and through the project closeout. The session will also discuss the expectations of the project sponsor regarding the documentation and reporting of cost sharing commitments and will describe the cost sharing policy of the National Science Foundation (NSF). The presenters will describe several institutional systems for tracking cost sharing expenditures.

Team Leader: Ann M. Holmes, Director of Administration, Center for Advanced Study of Language, University of Maryland College Park
Faculty: Jean I. Feldman, Head, Policy Office Office of Budget, Finance & Award Management, National Science Foundation; Jerry G. Fife, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research Finance, Vanderbilt University; Michele G. Goetz, Director, Sponsored Research Administration, San Diego State University Foundation

Research Records Management
aired March 9, 2004

Does your institution have a clearly delineated policy regarding ownership or retention of research records? What should your policy include and why? This broadcast reviews the basics and then tackled the tough issues facing many institutions. How do we deal with new forms of records or even research materials (electronic data sets and cell lines, for example)? How are records stored and who pays the cost? How can we work with faculty to bring about an understanding of the importance of maintaining records? And, finally, what happens to the records when your faculty member moves to another institution?

Team Leader: Mary H. Mitchell, Director of Awards Management, Office for Sponsored Research, Harvard University
Faculty: Stephen Dowdy, Assistant Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Anne Geronimo, Associate Director, Office of Research Administration and Advancement, University of Maryland; Susan McKinney, CRM, Director of Records and Information Management, Office of the General Counsel, University of Minnesota

Project Management
June 15, 2004

Project management includes many levels. How do you step up to organize a major multidisciplinary project, program project or center grant and, if you're in a department, how do you assist a faculty member to do so? Whether you're in a school, department business office or a sponsored project office, do you know what is needed to manage a project? What needs to be organized in addition to: budgets and project expenditures; issuance of subawards with specific budgets and deliverables; tracking of performance expectations; foreign sites with varying scientific disciplines and a culture different from ours; monitoring research subjects issues including IRB authorization agreements and HIPAA; publications and invention reporting.

Team Leader: Patrick W. Fitzgerald, Director of Cost Analysis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Faculty: Penny Cook, Executive Director, Grants & Contract Administration, School of Medicine, Yale University; Laura Yaeger, Managing Director, Huron Consulting Group; Deena Giancotti, Manager, PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP

Conflict of Interest Management
September 14, 2004

Getting disclosures of financial interests from researchers is the first step in addressing real or perceived conflicts of interest. Managing the conflict is more difficult since there is no one model that fits the variety of financial relationships, research areas, sponsor types, and student involvement that may be encountered. This Video Workshop expands on COGIR's "Recognizing and Managing Personal Financial Conflicts of Interest" by offering the audience tested methods of conflict of interest management with guidance on how to evaluate the effectiveness of each.

Team Leader: Christina K. Hansen, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Office of Research Administration, University of California-Irvine
Faculty: Kathleen Irwin, Senior University Legal Counsel, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Julie Gottlieb, Assistant Dean, Policy Coordination, Johns Hopkins University; David Richardson, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

---

2004 NCURA VIDEO WORKSHOP SERIES REGISTRATION FORM

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

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

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

CONTACT NAME ____________________________ TITLE ____________________________

INSTITUTION ____________________________________________________________

ADDRESS ____________________________________________________________________________________________

CITY ____________________________ STATE ____________________________ ZIP ____________

PHONE ____________________________ FAX ____________________________ E-MAIL ____________________________________________

WEB SITE ____________________________

☐ Full subscription $2,800.00
☐ Tape: $950.00

Cost Sharing Management (aired 1/21/04)

☐ Tape: $950.00
Research Records Management (aired 3/9/04)

☐ Tape: $950.00
Project Management (6/15/04)

☐ Live: $950.00
☐ Tape: $950.00
Conflict of Interest Management (9/14/04)

☐ Live: $950.00
☐ Tape: $950.00

Please circle one: Visa MasterCard American Express Exp. ____________

Total Amount Due: $__________________

Card # ____________________________ Card Holder’s Signature ____________________________
What constitutes closeout of a sponsored program? Just because the end date has been reached, it doesn’t mean the work is over. Many tasks remain to be done that are often not visible to our university community. Closeout of a sponsored program can mean different things, depending on your point of view. Departmental administrators may be concerned with liquidating PO’s and changing salary sources. Accounting will worry about drawdowns, grants about final reports and the PI about when her next funding will arrive.

In this session, we will focus on the closeout process and the various roles and responsibilities of different units. Processes and procedures for orderly closeout and compliance assurance will be discussed.

**LEARNING OUTCOME**
In this session you will learn:
- what tasks are involved in closing an account;
- the several groups of people involved;
- fiscal reporting; and
- one school’s process for ensuring an orderly closeout with tips you can take back to your institution and use.

**TAKE HOME**
In just ninety minutes you can interact in one the most highly successful sessions offered at the NCURA 45th Annual Meeting. Travel budget low? Simply log on and view the presentation on your computer, listen to the speakers over the phone! Submit questions over e-mail!

**PRESENTERS**
- Laura Wade, Executive Director, Research Services, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston
- Pamela Whitlock, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, University of North Carolina at Wilmington

**HOW DOES THE WEB CONFERENCE MEDIUM WORK?**
It’s easy and incredibly convenient! You just need a phone for the audio and an Internet connection to view the slides and other information on the Web. No downloads or special hardware are required. A dial-up connection will work fine.
Case Western Reserve University’s School of Medicine, ranked by U.S. News and World Report as one of the leading medical schools in the country, invites nominations and applications for the new position of Associate Dean for Research Administration. The Medical School was awarded over $200M in sponsored research funding in fiscal year 2003. The Associate Dean will report to the Vice Dean for Finance and Administration and will be responsible for research administration services for the Case School of Medicine and its affiliated hospitals. The position will also provide research administration support for the Case Research Institute, a joint research enterprise between the Case School of Medicine and University Hospitals of Cleveland, building on the historic partnership of these two institutions. The Associate Dean will work in close collaboration with central university research administration staff and key faculty and administrative leaders throughout the university and affiliated hospitals.

The overall role of the Associate Dean will be to facilitate research, provide quality, state-of-the-art support to the faculty, and to assure compliance and accountability in all of the School’s activities.

Responsibilities will be organized in three major areas:

- Sponsored projects administration including clinical research services,
- compliance, and
- management of core facilities, including the Animal Resource Center.

Sponsored projects administration: will include assisting with proposal and contract preparation, review, and negotiation; establishment of grant and contract accounts; management of post-award activity; and monitoring of accounts. Clinical research services: will include support for clinical research development, identification of additional opportunities for clinical trials, assistance with proposal and protocol development, management, and monitoring.

Compliance: will include responsibility for the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) as well as training and education for committee members, investigators, and research staff.

Management of core facilities: will involve developing strategies for establishment, management, and ongoing evaluation of institutional cores. Information technology support, in collaboration with the central University, to maintain websites and support electronic submission and review is also within the purview of this position.

Qualifications: An advanced degree is required. Extensive experience in research administration in a research university or academic medical center highly desirable.

Application Procedure: Please send application, cover letter, resume, and references or nominations to: Judith A. Auerbach, President, Auerbach Associates, 65 Franklin Street, Suite 400, Boston, MA 02110, Fax: (617) 451-5199, Email: Sara@auerbach-assc.com, Please visit www.cwru.edu.

In employment as in education, Case is committed to affirmative action and equal opportunity.

Visit our website at www.wellesley.edu/HR/
Assistant Director, Office of Research Administration
Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine

Responsibilities: Serves as the Institutional Official for 1/6th of the School of Medicine Departments, involving approximately 500 proposals and $100M in annual awards. Primarily a pre-award and post-award sponsor liaison office (amendments/prior approval/closeout), this position has signature authority for all grants and sub-contracts (in/out) and negotiates/drafts all contracts for the assigned departments. Contract responsibility includes about $10M of commercial agreements, 2/3rds of which are clinical trials. Duties include participation in the training/guidance of departmental staff and faculty in grantsmanship, research compliance and sponsored programs administration. Reports to the Associate Dean, Research Administration.

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

Classification: Senior Staff Grade 44 (starting salary would normally be in the range of $65K – 75K, depending upon experience). Johns Hopkins is an equal opportunity employer.

If you have the necessary experience and expertise and would like to be considered for the position please send your resume to: Michael B. Amey, Associate Dean, Research Administration; Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine; 733 N. Broadway, Suite 117; Baltimore, MD 21205-2196, or mamey@jhmi.edu
The National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA), founded in 1959, is an organization of individuals with professional interest in problems and policies relating to the administration of research, education and training activities at colleges and universities.
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