Message from the 2004 NCURA President

by Patrick Fitzgerald

I look forward to serving as your President in 2004 with great anticipation, enthusiasm and optimism. I was fortunate to have the opportunity to serve as Vice-President this past year under NCURA President Bob Killoren. Bob presided over NCURA during one of the most successful years in our forty-five year history and we are grateful to him for his exceptional leadership.

NCURA achieved several major milestones in 2003. At the end of the year we had more than 4,500 members, an all-time high. Our Annual Meeting was an overwhelming success by all measures and we had a record attendance of over 1,700 members. What’s most remarkable to me is that these records occurred during an economic downturn and in the midst of significant budget-cutting measures at virtually all of our institutions. This says a great deal about the strength of our programming and the strength of our organization.

This past year was also noteworthy for the introduction of several new professional development programs. We rolled out “Sponsored Programs Administration Part II” (SPA II) as a follow-on to NCURA’s staple program, the “Fundamentals of Sponsored Programs Administration”. Three teams of faculty were deployed for both Fundamentals and SPA II, which enabled us to increase the number of times these two popular training courses were offered in 2003. Responding to our members’ needs for timely and cost effective professional development programs, NCURA introduced the “Online Education” program in 2003. This new program enables research administrators to participate in interactive training courses, both visually (via computer screen) and verbally (by telephone), without leaving their offices. The “Online Education” program enables research administrators to participate in interactive training courses, both visually (via computer screen) and verbally (by telephone), without leaving their offices. The popularity of our new programs and the unparalleled success of our traditional offerings is confirmation that NCURA is providing valuable programming in ways that enable a maximum number of members to participate.

2004 Annual Meeting Program Committee Announced!

See page 11.

See Page 24 for details about FRA V, February 29-March 2, 2004, San Diego, CA!
What Mechanism Should I Use: Purchased Service or Subaward Agreement?
by Michael J. Blackwell

Usually, the distinction between what is a purchased service as compared to a collaborative or subaward relationship is quite clear for research administrators. There are times, however, when the relationship is fuzzy and must be closely evaluated so that the best “mechanism” between the parties is realized. Since statutory requirements for the procurement of purchased services are quite different from those for subawards, it is important to define the relationship accurately and early in the process, particularly at the proposal stage.

Definitions of Purchased Service and Subaward Agreement

Purchased Service – Standard procurement of routine or continuing and repetitive support services, as illustrated in the following two citations:

- US Code, Title 31, Subtitle V, Chapter 63, Section 6303, Using Procurement Contracts:
  (1) The principal purpose of the instrument is to acquire (by purchase, lease, or barter) property or services for the direct benefit or use of the US Government...

- OMB Circular A-133, Section 210:
  (c) Payment for goods and services. Characteristics indicative of a payment for goods and services received by a vendor are when the organization:
  (1) Provides the goods and services within normal business operations;
  (2) Provides similar goods or services to many different purchasers;
  (3) Operates in a competitive environment;
  (4) Provides goods or services that are ancillary to the operation of the Federal program; and,
  (5) Is not subject to compliance requirements of the Federal program.

Examples of purchased services agreements include: Advertising in newspapers or journals, Bookkeeping Services (routine, transaction based), document storage, equipment installation, preventative maintenance, printing or duplicating services, etc. The standard “flow downs” in these agreements are taken from OMB Circular A-110, Appendix A, and if a public university, sometimes from other state statutory requirements, e.g., indemnification, governing law, ownership of IP.

Subaward Agreement – Collaborative relationship with financial assistance to an eligible third party organization to help carry out part of the research or program work scope, as illustrated in the following two citations:

- US Code, Title 31, Subtitle V, Chapter 63, Section 6304, Using Grant Agreements:
  (1) The principal purpose of the relationship is to transfer a thing of value to the State, local government, or other recipient to carry out a public purpose of support or stimulation authorized by a law of the US instead of acquiring (by purchase, lease, or barter) property or services for the direct benefit of the US Government; and,
  (2) Substantial involvement is not expected between the executive agency and the State, local government, or other recipient when carrying out the activity contemplated in the agreement.

- OMB Circular A-133, Section 210:
  (b) Federal award. Characteristics indicative of a Federal award received by a subrecipient are when the organization:
  (1) Determines who is eligible to receive what Federal financial assistance;
  (2) Has its performance measured against whether the objectives of the Federal program are met;
  (3) Has responsibility for programmatic decision-making;
  (4) Has responsibility for adherence to applicable Federal program compliance requirements; and,
  (5) Uses the Federal funds to carry out a program of the organization as compared to providing goods or services for a program of the pass-through entity.

Examples of subaward agreements include: FDP Subaward Agreement to Virginia Tech from U of Washington for collaboration on the human genome project, NIH funded minority investigator award or a non-governmental Clinical Study Agreement from U of Texas Southwestern Medical Center to U of Washington for conducting a study and evaluation of a medical device in patients with chronic liver disease. The standard “flow downs” in these agreements are taken from the sponsor specific prime terms and conditions, for example, NASA Grants Handbook, NIH Grants Policy Statement, NSF GC-1 Conditions, etc.

Guiding Points to Navigating the Fuzziness
At many universities, the guiding principle of choice is where a preponderance of the funding is being spent. If most of the budget is going to be spent on services, then the mechanism used is a services agreement. Occasionally, two agreements are used, one for services and one for collaboration. This is another solution to navigating the fuzziness.

Try to avoid the principal investigator’s circumvent of facilities and administrative charges against the first $25,000 of each subaward. In other words, try to make sure the principal investigator is not calling a service relationship a subaward relationship so that any costs above $25,000 are not subject to indirect cost. Service relationships are normally subject to the institution’s full indirect cost rate.

Focus mainly on the nature of the relationship between the parties to obtain the best fit for appropriate terms and conditions. For example, will the collaborating party contribute to the final technical report? If so, then the relationship is probably collaborative.

It is acceptable to decide, in a specific instance, that the use of one mechanism over another is appropriate, provided you can adequately defend your decision and actions. Be prepared to do so in front of auditors, prime sponsors, the news media, and the general public.

...as research administrators we all strive to do what’s in the best interests of the principal investigator, the project and our employer...
TUITION AND RESEARCH

The Higher Education Act is scheduled for reauthorization by Congress next year, resulting in a great deal of discussion in Washington in recent months of tuition increases at colleges and universities. The College Board reports that tuition increased an average of about 13% in 2003-04, and for the past two decades has outpaced inflation or wage growth in the U.S. Representative Buck McKeon (R-CA), who is the chairman of the House Education and the Workforce subcommittee, has already held hearings and proposed legislation intended to control tuition increases. Rep. McKeon has introduced H.R. 3311, the Affordability in Higher Education Act, which would remove an institution’s eligibility for certain federal student aid programs if its tuition increased above an established threshold.

But is there reason to be concerned about all this attention on tuition in the research community? Unfortunately the answer is yes. In looking superficially at the causes for tuition increases some have argued that part of the reason is that too much money is being spent on research, in the form of new laboratories, or high salaries paid to attract the top scientists, who also do not spend time in classrooms, requiring institutions to hire additional faculty to teach. Also, reports by NSF and others show that universities bear an increasing portion of the total costs of research, bolstering the contention that tuition revenue is being used to subsidize research.

THERE ARE TWO WAYS TO RESPOND TO SUCH CONCERNS.

Data Analyses

The first is to see if any good data-driven analyses have been performed on the relationship between tuition and research. In Issue Brief 97-313, NSF looked at data for a 15-year period during which tuition and fees at over 1300 colleges and universities increased 225%, while median household incomes and the Consumer Price Index increased 82% and 74%, respectively. Looking at so many universities allowed the comparison of tuition increases at institutions with differing levels of research activity – from extensive, to little, to none – and with different governance structures. The result was that increases in tuition charges over the 15-year period were almost identical for all types of institutions, from the most to the least research-intensive universities. NSF concluded that “tuition increases reflect common dynamics affecting all types of higher education institutions, rather than the presence or absence of research in some of them.”

Another study that touches on this issue was published in April 2003, entitled “Who Bears the Growing Cost of Science at Universities,” done by Dr. Ronald Ehrenberg and his colleagues at the Cornell Higher Education Research Institute. This study analyzed 21 years of data on 228 research-intensive universities, and compared, among other things, the relationship between growing internal university expenditures on research and tuition levels. This is a much more technical economic analysis, and it found that institutions whose average internal expenditures for research increased by $10,000 per faculty member per year, undergraduate tuition levels were between $165 and $945 higher than they otherwise would have been. However, the study authors state that they have more confidence in the lower end of that range ($165), and that in any case “the magnitude of these effects are surprisingly small.”

Finally with respect to data analyses, I would remind us all of the NACUBO study of College Costs, which developed a common template for determining and comparing the cost of undergraduate education. One of the most important findings of this study is that cost exceeds price. That is, at almost every participating institution, the cost of providing the programs and services that were part of an undergraduate education exceeded the price charged to students in the form of tuition and fees. Except for two small independent colleges, cost exceeded price by anywhere from a few hundred dollars to as much as $20,000.

The NACUBO study raises some interesting question in light of the other studies. If (educational) costs exceed (tuition) price, is it reasonable to reverse the question asked by those concerned about tuition increases, and ask if research funding is subsidizing educational costs? Also, if institutions are recovering neither the full costs of education nor research, where is the money coming from? Clearly there is more data and analysis needed to answer those questions.

“Teachearch”

I know, it’s not a word, but maybe it should be. If we’ve heard the statement once we have heard it a hundred times, “teaching and research are inextricably intertwined.” If that is really true, then we should not need to engage in a debate about one core mission subsidizing another, as if the functions are mutually exclusive, competing activities. There have been many editorials on this relationship written over the years, and a recent piece by Dr. James Coleman, Vice Chancellor for Research at the University of Missouri, restates the importance of the interrelatedness of these activities, in the current context. The State of Missouri has faced some of the largest shortfalls in revenues in the past two years and as a result has significantly reduced funding for its State colleges and universities. This has led to large increases in tuition, and the expected voices urging higher education administrators to choose between pursuing research or focusing on teaching, and implying that universities only pursue research for financial gain.

As Dr. Coleman eloquently explains:

“Research and the process of discovery, creation and innovation that underlie it and the intellectual independence and critical thinking skills that are necessary to undertake a close, careful study are the core and cornerstone of higher education. All of the nation’s best colleges and universities, whether they define themselves as “research universities” or “liberal arts colleges,” pride themselves on their focus of developing knowledge of skill in their students through a process that focuses on critical-thinking skills, intellectual independence and close-careful study with faculty who are experts in that field.”

The Presidential associations representing the higher education community have committed themselves to work with Congress, Representative McKeon, and all those concerned about the growing cost of education, to keep college as accessible and affordable as possible. That also means providing greater clarity and understanding of all the costs of higher education, including research and scholarly activity.

Tony De Crappeo serves as the Associate Director for the Council on Governmental Relations (CGR).
In the September/October 2003 (Vol. XXXV, No. 4) publication of the NCURA Newsletter, Tom Wilson in an article on translational research in the clinical setting described the translational research pathway, characterized by a cyclical process starting at the new discoveries from the laboratory bench to the bedside and oftentimes back to the laboratory bench.

This process, when implemented effectively and in a timely manner, will lead to improved patient care. The purpose of this article is to introduce the reader to translation (or evidence-based practice “implementation”) pathways in the Veterans Health Administration (VHA) system which bridge the gap between knowledge and practice and to present a specific example of an initiative demonstrating how evidence-based research was implemented into clinical practice. This example of multi-management of patients with congestive heart failure (CHF) is one of many programs that are currently being carried out at the VHA to improve veterans’ health and quality of life.

The VHA provides healthcare services to more than 25.3 million living veterans, 63% of who are under 65 and 5.6% are female. The VHA creates a unique environment that allows the collection of information on a variety of health care issues while providing health care services to over 6.4 million veterans annually. The VHA system offers the opportunity for building databases on cohorts that are valuable tools for conducting various types of research, including implementation research. A major initiative for the VHA system is to conduct implementation research with the following goal: “to chart a direction for the research program to transform VA into a leading institution in which knowledge of best practices is rapidly applied in the care of patients.”

In general, nearly half of the time American medical patients do not receive the recommended level of preventive, acute or chronic care. Studies have shown that it takes an average of 17 years to receive the recommended level of preventive, acute or chronic care. In the United States, the mission of each group is to create measurable, rapid and sustainable improvements in the quality of care and in the health outcomes of veterans with chronic diseases. The CHF QUERI coordination center is located at the Center for Quality and Utilization Studies in Houston, Texas. This center has been conducting a portfolio of translational research activities to implement the VA health care system’s vision for improvement. These improvements are urgently needed in CHF patients because:

- CHF affects 5 million Americans;
- 550,000 new cases are identified each year; and,
- More than 300,000 VHA patients were diagnosed with CHF in 2001

CHF is also the leading cause of hospitalization in patients 65 years or older and after hospitalization, 40% of the patients are readmitted to the hospital within 3 months. Hospitalization for CHF also very costly and the annual cost for treating CHF exceeds the combined cost for treating all myocardial infarctions and all types of cancer. CHF is a deadly disease; two-thirds of veterans with CHF die within five years of their initial hospitalization. Efforts are underway within the VHA system to not only reduce hospital readmissions but also to improve the quality of life for CHF patients. Translational CHF projects conducted thus far include the Coordinated Care Program (CCP). Through the CCP, a multidisciplinary group of physicians, patients and the VA leadership are involved in identifying and implementing common goals to benefit everyone involved. This coordination is crucial to making the CCP program effective. The main components of the CCP intervention are as follows:

- Readiness for hospital discharge criteria;
- Patient and caregiver education; and,
- Rigorous outpatient follow-up.
We have learned through the translational CHF projects that to bridge the gap between knowledge and practice, the applied intervention (the CCP program) must be customized to the unique organizational characteristics of each clinical site. In addition, visualizing this activity as a clinical activity rather than a research project will lead to a more uniform, consistent integration into routine clinical practice. This integration will change the way research is perceived since research may not currently be seen as affecting routine clinical practice. It is also necessary to apply tools of Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI), which could systematically improve the way questions are asked, the way answers are determined, and how problems are solved. Once the CQI program is in place, continual efforts need to be made to:

- Foster contact with all patients;
- Develop ways to enhance patient empowerment and motivation; and,
- Customize and tailor interventions to account for patient differences.

The momentum for all of these activities must be maintained and implementation program coordinators have to react quickly when the intervention begins to “stall.” Support for implementation should include:

- Additional resources;
- Workforce training;
- Address all levels (system, provider, patient);
- “User friendly” interventions/tools; and,
- Recognition that sustainability is a major problem.

If all effective QUERI interventions are implemented throughout the VHA it could produce potential cost savings of $880 million annually. It is estimated that the VHA can avoid $225 million in readmission costs for CHF patients alone. It is further estimated that 35,000 lives could be saved over a ten-year period for all previously identified chronic diseases.

Each of us involved in research plays an important part in an effort to find the best translational path, by taking an active role in changing the organizational climate and culture and by adopting evidence based research. We must all continue to contribute to the successful dissemination of knowledge and eventually we will close the existing gap between the knowledge generated through research and clinical practice.

For more information on these programs please refer to these websites:

- www.va.gov/resdev
- www.hsrdsresearch.va.gov/research/queri

Barbara Kimmel serves as an Administrative Coordinator and Acting Implementation Research Coordinator for the Chronic Heart Failure QUERI at the Houston Center for Quality of Care and Utilization Studies in Houston, Texas.

The Age of the Audit
(In the spirit and wit of Andy Rooney)

by Richard Miller

When I talk to people who have survived years of technological changes and floods and famine, they label the times. We know about the Stone Age, the Bronze Age, . . . the industrial revolution, the golden age, the technological explosion and the ever popular “me” generation. As Andy Rooney would say . . . I sort of like the me generation because it brings everything up to (or down to) a personal level and has a self-centered focus. Considering the recent events, this past decade will either be the cell phone era or, my preference, the Age of the Audit. I might say some awfully nasty things in the next few paragraphs about “the audit,” and I would like to say some of my best friends are auditors but it wouldn’t be true. In fact there is a bit of an oxymoron when involving the words friendship and auditing in the same sentence.

I used to relish certain labels that conjure a positive image. These labels have been misappropriated by the audit process and compromised. I refer to things like being exceptional or being a poster child. It is pretty much agreed that no one any longer wants to attain exceptional status as a few of our larger and most prestigious research universities have been so labeled. There is a new emerging title, that being the poster child for our industry!

At my institution, we have been blessed by seven audits this year, some being brief one-day, grant specific reviews, a state-level A-133 audit by KPMG and finally a flurry of audits administered by internal audit. If I were paranoid I would be sure that this was a well-coordinated military assault under the command of a sinister force. It is in this spirit that I offer a few strategic hints on the audit process would serve to minimize the pain and suffering. Our first line of defense was to hire an auditor to be on our side. On a serious note, choose the right one, but not one who will be a mole. Have him/her work with your organization to help understand the elements of an audit. The first revelation for us was that there is a scheme or structure to the audit activity. There is an overall plan but also a rigorous detailed process for scoring the activity being reviewed. Auditors often are filling in a matrix. Being knowledgeable about the methodology that is being used takes some of the mystery and angst out of the audit event. However, one should avoid relaxing too much or, in fact, contributing to what might end up being a debilitating consequence.

continued on the next page
It has been shown repeatedly that we all have deficiencies in our programs. The compliance requirements and the research environment are often perceived at odds and a balance must be struck. It’s difficult to justify constraints on a program that benefits from a free-flowing entrepreneurial spirit. Rules do have an adverse effect on creativity. However, stewardship of funds is also essential. We must be accountable, sometimes conforming to the highest standard. Thus the need for a balance. Probably the most important role that the research administrator has is to minimize the pain and suffering of the faculty without a loss in integrity to the project.

I suggest some of the following procedures when an audit is announced. First, scream, throw a tantrum and yell “The sky is falling, the sky is falling.” Do this when you are alone in the car and on a very lonely street. Then get a grip and:

1) Identify a coordinator/contact person for the audit;
2) If you have an experienced person, hold a brief training session for others;
3) Get out front and communicate that an audit is planned;
4) Respond to internal concerns;
5) Educate people on the scope of the audit and synthesize what may occur;
6) If you have an experienced person, conduct a brief pre-audit (retaining no working papers);
7) Closely coordinate the auditors’ activities;
8) Have an experienced person accompany the audit team for all interviews;
9) Cooperate with the auditors but avoid the urge to volunteer information or areas to review; and,
10) When the audit concludes, provide management’s response to findings only.

Findings should be related to specific policies and procedures. Normally comments about management practices or recommendations for improvements should be accepted by management but do not require a management response. They should not be characterized as findings.

The audit could be characterized as and should be of benefit to an organization. The information and feedback can be useful. It is so ironic that those organizations that have had the greatest “success” instituting broad policies and faculty buy-ins have had to be labeled exceptional or the poster child to gain internal administration support!

Rich Miller serves as the Director, Federal Compliance for Texas Engineering Experiment Station, Texas A&M University System.

**CHANGING OF THE GUARD**

Just as Electronic Research Administration (ERA) seemed to be moving along, several individuals have decided to seek other opportunities. While it is not clear if any of these departures will have a negative impact on the progress of ERA, one has to wonder why so many have decided to leave now rather than basking in the glory of watching key projects mature and reach production.

At the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Mark Foreman, administrator for the Office of E-Government and Information Technology, Norm Lorentz, OMB’s chief technology officer, and Angela Styles, Office of Federal Procurement Policy have all resigned and OMB Director Mitchell Daniels reportedly will leave in June. One has to wonder where OMB’s institutional memory will come from over the ensuing months.

Fortunately for ERA, Karen Evans has been appointed to replace Foreman. Evans, formally the chief information officer at the Department of Energy and co-chair of the federal Chief Information Officer’s Council has worked closely with Foreman and is fully supportive of the 24 e-government initiatives outlined in the President’s management agenda. The transition should be easy, Evans presented at a recent FDP meeting and seems to understand our issues well. In fact, it was Evans that dropped the bombshell on the agencies at that meeting when she announced that the agencies would have to submit migration plans to retire their agency-specific ERA solutions once grants.gov provided the functionality that their legacy systems provided.

At NIH, Dr. J.J. McGowan left as head of the NIH Commons project at the end of December. McGowan’s insight and influence over the various units within NIH has been instrumental in keeping the Commons project focused and moving forward. As of the writing of this article, no replacement for Dr. McGowan has been announced.

Along with McGowan, Dr. George Stone, a long-time friend of NCURA and the FDP, one of our strongest advocates of ERA, and iEdison czar at NIH has announced his resignation. Also, Paul Markovitz who worked closely with the Interagency Electronic Grants Committee (IAEGC) and the Federal Commons (which has morphed into grants.gov) has recently announced his departure and will take up residence at the NSF. Regina White has left the policy office to return to academia and David Wright will be moving to the IT department leaving our Commons Working Group (CWG) advocate vacant for the time being. Also, other contractors, which were key players in the NIH Commons development, are leaving the project.

Rich Miller serves as the Director, Federal Compliance for Texas Engineering Experiment Station, Texas A&M University System.
At the last Commons Working Group (CWG) meeting, NIH reported that the eRA management team has been reassessing business practices. For some functions (e.g., user support), there were multiple contractors performing the same work. For others (e.g., development), there is a single contractor with no competitive incentives. These contracts are now being consolidated into four basic categories:

**Integration:** Awarded to IBM Business Consulting Services

**Operations:** Awarded to RN Solutions

**User Support:** Request for quotes out; announcement will be made very soon

**Design and Development:** Original request for quotes has been cancelled. A new request has gone out and awards should take place shortly. NIH is looking for 3-4 vendors that will be “pre-approved” to bid on task orders.

According to Jim Cain, Director of the Division of Extramural Information Systems, NIH is maintaining an extensive risk list with mitigation strategies to provide system stability throughout the transition period. However, despite best efforts, the transition period may still bring adverse effects to users. NIH hopes the project will be in a “steady” state again by January.

Cain expects the number of major functional releases will be reduced to 1–2 per year. To resolve production issues in a timely manner, maintenance work will be separated from major functional releases. Maintenance activities will be bundled, tested, and released as needed throughout the year.

**PULLING THE PLUG**

**NIH X-Train**

Deployment of a new version has been postponed several times and may not happen until mid-2004. The current version of X-Train is experiencing system quality issues and the NIH eRA team is evaluating whether to shut it down. There are 18 institutions with access to the current system of which 7 are regular users. Although there are political ramifications for shutting down the system, NIH says it is hard to justify the expense with only 300 uses in the last year and a half.

**E-Authentication Initiative**

A recent memo from Drew Ladner, E-Authentication Executive Steering Committee Chair & Treasury CIO to the Chief Information Officers states:

“Recently, stakeholders of the E-Authentication Initiative have raised concerns regarding progress of the effort. Specifically, use of a centralized E-Authentication gateway was questioned by the GAO (in their report entitled, “Planned E-Authentication Gateway Faces Formidable Development Challenges”) and by Congressman Tom Davis (in his letter to the GSA responding to GAO’s report)…. Due to these findings, development efforts on the E-Authentication Gateway ceased on October 10, 2003.”


“An Architecture Team has been established to develop alternative architectures for federated identity authentication services that will scale government-wide. The team will also present interface specifications for all components in the federated authentication architecture. These specifications are targeted for release June 2004.”

The E-Authentication initiative was a cornerstone of all the 24 e-government initiatives and it is not clear how this project may delay and affect other projects such as grants.gov.

Is it one step forward, two steps back? Or is it two steps forward, one step back? I’m not sure. But given recent events, I worry that many projects are feeling the effects of political pressure from senior administration officials, experiencing project scope creep, suffering from a lack of adequate resources, and suffering from a lack of sufficient by-in from all the agencies to keep the forward momentum we’ve experienced over the past several months.

Steve Doedey serves as the Assistant Director, Office of Sponsored Programs for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Most audits of sponsored research programs involve a problem(s) with salary. This is very expensive for the institution because if the salary payment is disallowed, the fringe benefits and facilitative and administrative costs are also lost. Depending on the magnitude of the problem, there can be many other far-reaching ramifications as well. We will not elaborate on those here, but will simply discuss what NIH sees as the top ten audit issues concerning salary along with some possible preventative measures. These possible solutions are not all-inclusive and other reasonable approaches should also be considered.

**PROBLEM 1:** The certifying official does not have first-hand knowledge of the effort performed.

**SOLUTION 1:** The institution should have written procedures outlining who can sign effort reports. Faculty and professional staff are encouraged to sign their own effort reports. Principal investigators can also sign for staff on their projects. Business managers are discouraged from signing for faculty or scientific staff.

**PROBLEM 2:** Effort reports are not certified and returned in a timely manner.

**SOLUTION 2:** Since all salary charged to federal projects must be supported by effort certification, salary not certified or not certified in a timely manner should be removed from the federal project and charged to unrestricted funds. This action does not usually need to be taken more than once before the department of the offending faculty member emphasizes to the faculty member the importance of following effort certification requirements.

**PROBLEM 3:** Salary cap is not treated correctly with respect to effort and charging to NIH grants/contracts.

**SOLUTION 3:** Guidelines for adjusting effort reports for reporting the cost sharing required by the NIH salary cap must be clearly communicated. Offering training sessions and providing examples is usually necessary. Central monitoring for adherence to these guidelines may also be warranted.

**PROBLEM 4:** The budgeted effort is certified rather than the actual effort.

**SOLUTION 4:** Effort certification instructions provided by the institution should clearly state that the certifier is reporting on his/her actual activities during the reporting period. A reference to “actual effort” can also be made in the certification statement on the effort report.

**PROBLEM 5:** The corrections for significant changes in budgeted vs. actual effort are not made or are not made in a timely manner.

**SOLUTION 5:** This problem is related to problem 4. It must be clearly stated to certifiers that changes in effort must be documented on the effort report and reported in a timely manner.

**PROBLEM 6:** Costs are transferred from one project to another to avoid a cost overrun.

**SOLUTION 6:** Institutional policies and procedures should clearly prohibit this. Establishing accounts specifically designated for cost overruns will discourage this practice, allow for monitoring, and ensure that these costs are properly recorded in the facilities and administrative proposal.

**PROBLEM 7:** Prior approval was not obtained for changes in key personnel who are absent for 3 months or more, withdraw from the project completely, or reducing their time by 25% or more.

**SOLUTION 7:** Communication of clearly stated requirements to both faculty and administrative staff is critical for this problem. Central monitoring is usually not timely if possible at all.

**PROBLEM 8:** There is an overlap of scientific and or budgetary support.

**SOLUTION 8:** The “Other Support” must be accurate and complete. Institutional policies and procedures must clearly prohibit overlap.

**PROBLEM 9:** Overlap of commitment.

**SOLUTION 9:** Same as solution 8.

**PROBLEM 10:** The institutional base salary is defined incorrectly, especially when the clinical practice plan is involved.

**SOLUTION 10:** The institutional base salary must be defined in writing according to federal guidelines and the effort certification system should account for all salary defined as institutional base salary.

You have probably caught on by now. Avoiding these audit issues is possible. It requires the key ingredients of WRITTEN POLICIES AND PROCEDURES, EDUCATION AND COMMUNICATION, AND MONITORING.

Marilyn Surbey serves as the Associate Vice President for Finance and Research for Emory University.
NCURA Leadership

2003 Board of Directors
Back (l to r) Cindy White, Washington University; Tielia Fisher Reigbley, University of Colorado Health Sciences Center; Vivian Holmes, Harvard Medical School; Kathleen Larmett, NCURA; Pat Fitzgerald, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Laura Wade, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston; Pamela Webb, Stanford University; Garry Sanders, Ordway Research Institute, Inc; Ed Herran, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center; Tommy Coggins, University of South Carolina; Marti Dunne, New York University; Kathleen Irwin, University of Wisconsin – Madison; Dick Seligman, California Institute of Technology; Front (l to r) Pat Hawk, Oregon Health & Science University; Pam Whitlock, University of North Carolina at Wilmington; Georgette Sakumoto, University of Hawaii; Bob Killoren, Pennsylvania State University; Bonny Boice, Research Foundation of SUNY; John Case, Cleveland Clinic Foundation; Denise Clark, Cornell University. Not pictured Al Soltow, The University of Tulsa

2003 NCURA Executive Committee
John Case, Cleveland Clinic Foundation; Kathleen Larmett, NCURA; Pat Fitzgerald, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Cindy White, Washington University; Bob Killoren, Pennsylvania State University; Bonny Boice, Research Foundation of SUNY

NCURA Past Presidents
Standing (l to r) Steve Smartt, Vanderbilt University; Dennis Barnes, e-Numerate Solutions Inc.; Kim Moreland, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center; Steve Hansen, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville; Steve Erickson, Boston College; John Case, Cleveland Clinic Foundation; Seated (l to r) Jane Youngers, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio; Julie Norris, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Cheryl Lee Howard, Johns Hopkins University; Richard Seligman, California Institute of Technology; Mary Ellen Sheridan, University of Chicago

2003 President Bob Killoren recognizes and thanks the leaders who began the strategic planning and governance growth process. From left to right, Cheryl Lee Howard, Johns Hopkins University; Steve Hansen, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville; Bob Killoren, Pennsylvania State University; Kim Moreland, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center. Recipients not pictured, Mary Husemoller, Emeritus, University of Nevada Reno and Kathleen Larmett, NCURA

45th Annual Meeting Program Committee:
Standing (l to r): Ken Forstmaier, Pennsylvania State University; Tom Roberts, Florida Gulf Coast University; Sherylle Mills Engleander, University of California-Santa Barbara; Bobby McQuiston, University of Texas at Austin; Denise Clark, Cornell University; Tommy Coggins, University of South Carolina; Sara Streich, Rush-Presbyterian-St. Luke's Medical Center; Judy Fredenberg, University of Montana; Seated (l to r) Michelle Christy, Princeton University; Co-chair Vivian Holmes, Harvard Medical School; Pat Fitzgerald, 2003 Vice President, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Co-chair Barbara Cole, Boston University; Debi Galloway, University of Cincinnati. Not pictured: Megan Columbus, NIH; Brian Farmer, University of Idaho; Bregenta Jefferson, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center; Laura Yaeger, Huron Consulting Group
Awards

2003 President, Bob Killoren (left) and 2004 President Pat Fitzgerald (center), join our 2004 honorees. (l to r) Ada Sue Selwitz, University of Kentucky, Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Awardee; Alice Tangredi-Hannon, University of Pennsylvania, Distinguished Service Awardee and Jean Feldman, National Science Foundation, the inaugural recipient of the Joseph F. Carrabino Award.

Honoree Ada Sue Selwitz, pictured here with Bob Killoren, shared her enthusiasm for our profession during her acceptance remarks.

Honoree Alice Tangredi-Hannon, surrounded by friends and colleagues, receives her award from Bonny Boice, NCURA Treasurer.

Honoree Ada Sue Selwitz, pictured here with Bob Killoren, shared her enthusiasm for our profession during her acceptance remarks.

Inaugural honoree Jean Feldman accepts award from Bob Killoren, and shares this special moment with her parents, Leonard and Virginia Wysinski, and two of her children Matthew and Jessica.

Sessions

NCURA members sharing knowledge and fostering community at the 45th Annual Meeting.

NCURA members take a lot home from the Annual Meeting… information, knowledge, understanding and a strong network of friends and colleagues to share with throughout the year.

Exhibits

Over 1,700 NCURA members attended the 45th Annual Meeting… NCURA’s biggest homecoming ever!
Events

Pat Fitzgerald with Jimmy Tingle, our Banquet Entertainment who kept us all laughing through our dessert!

Tim Russert, (center) from NBC’s Meet the Press, joins Kathleen Larmett, NCURA’s Executive Director, and Pat Fitzgerald, NCURA’s 2004 President before his outstanding keynote address.

Pat Fitzgerald thanks the Sponsors of the 45th Anniversary meeting:
- **GOLD PARTNER** – Huron Consulting Group;
- **SILVER PARTNERS** – SAP and Accenture;
- **BRONZE PARTNERS** – MAXIMUS and American Appraisal Associates;
- **SELECT PARTNERS** – BearingPoint, TSIG Consulting; PriceWaterhouseCoopers and Strategistics, Inc.

“Hello NCURA!”
Bob Killoren welcomes us all home.

Leadership Development Institute

From left to right: Debbie Smith, University of Tennessee Health Science Center; Susan Robb, Virginia Commonwealth University; Maggie Pyle, University of South Alabama; Melody Page, University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center; Drew Memmott, Columbia University; Tom LeBlanc, California State University - Chico; Stacey Donnelly, Whitehead Institute for Biomedical Research; Wayne Brown, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Newark Campus; Joe Bezerra, California State University - Fresno; Diane Barrett, University of Wisconsin - Madison

2004 Annual Meeting Program Committee Announced

**Co-chairs:**
Jamie Caldwell, Loyola University
Jane Youngers, University of Texas Health Sciences Center at San Antonio

Michele Codd, Vanderbilt University
Christopher Crowell, Middle Tennessee State University
Tony DeCrappeo, COGR
Joe Ellis, NIH
Marjorie Forster, University of Maryland Baltimore
Jilda Diehl Garton, Georgia Tech
Katherine Ho, UC San Francisco
Ann Holmes, University of Maryland at College Park
Josie Jimenez, New Mexico State
Phillip Myers, Western Kentucky University
Jim Roth, Huron
Lillie Ryans-Culclager, Stanford
Mike Smith, MAXIMUS
Dorothy Spurlock, University of Toledo
Alice Tangered Hannon, University of Pennsylvania
Michelle Vazin, Vanderbilt University
Deborah Vetter, University of Nebraska Medical Center

NCURA 2004 Vice President and 46th Annual Meeting Chair Jerry Fife, Vanderbilt University
REGION II
Mid-Atlantic

The New Year brought with it some changes in Regional officers. I have begun my term as Chair of Region II. The membership selected Bob DeMartino (Seton Hall University) as Chair-elect and Carol Berdar (Research Foundation of SUNY Central Office) as Secretary. Kerry Peluso (University of Pennsylvania) will complete her two-year term as Treasurer at the end of this year. Congratulations to Bob and Carol on their election and many thanks to Janet Simons and Cheryl Williams for the great jobs they did as Chair and Secretary.

Contact information for all of the officers, as well as members of the Steering Committee and other Regional committees may be found on our website at http://www.osp.cornell.edu/NCURA_Region_II.

We will return to Baltimore’s Inner Harbor for our spring meeting on April 25, 26, and 27. Mary Beth Curtin (who succeeded to the Program Committee Chair when Sue Robb was recruited out of our region) and the Program Committee have put together an innovative and informative program around the theme, “On the Waterfront: Riding the waves of Research Administration.” The keynote address, “What price a Martian, Human Limits to Exploring the Red Planet”, will be by Dr. James Pawelczyk. In addition to the ever-popular workshops and concurrent sessions, this year’s meeting will also feature “Short Takes”, forty minute, tightly focused sessions. The full program may be viewed at http://www.osp.cornell.edu/NCURA_Region_II/Meeting2004/WebSiteProgram At A Glance2004-A.pdf.

The venue for the meeting is the Hyatt Regency Baltimore. The Hyatt is centrally located in the Inner Harbor with a skywalk to the Harborsplace shops and is within 1-3 blocks of the National Aquarium, the Maryland Science Center, and Camden Yards. And speaking of Camden Yards, those not attending a workshop on Sunday, will want to join the group attending the Orioles-Blue Jays afternoon game. Monday night we will be aboard ship for a dinner cruise on the harbor. Registration information is found – you guessed it – on our website at http://www.osp.cornell.edu/NCURA_Region_II/Meetings.html. This is a wonderful program in one of the best locations in the country. Don’t miss it!

Charlie Kaars is the Chair of Region II and serves as the Assistant Vice President for Sponsored Programs Administration for the State University of New York at Buffalo.
The Crowne Plaza is located in the heart of downtown Indianapolis, within a short walk of shopping, restaurants, and entertainment. Longer walks or short cab rides will take you to museums, the zoo, and more great food, entertainment, and shopping.

We hope to see you all there!

Bill Sharp is a Compliance Specialist for the University of Kansas.

REGION V
Southwestern

Mark Your Calendars!
The region V Spring Meeting will be in Galveston, Texas from April 24 – 29. Program information coming soon! We’ll look forward to seeing you there!

REGION VI
Western

Happy New Year! I hope that your holidays were both pleasant and restful.

The ballots for our region’s new officers - Chair-elect, Secretary/Treasurer-elect, and member of the Region’s Advisory Committee - are being tabulated and the results should be announced shortly. Our thanks to the Nominating Committee - Vincent Oragwam, Gary Chaffins, and Geri Walker – for all the effort they put in to get us an excellent slate of nominees. Our thanks also to all our colleagues who volunteered to stand for office. The strength of NCURA is indeed the willingness of colleagues to shoulder responsibility by volunteering to serve is so many different capacities.

Now that the holidays are over and we’re all busy with the new term, it’s time to send in your registration for our joint Region VI-VII spring meeting. We’ll be meeting in San Francisco, April 18-21 at the Argent Hotel. The room rate is $153 (plus taxes) for single or double occupancy. The registration form will be posted shortly. In the meantime you can make your hotel reservations by calling toll free 877-222-6699. Thanks to our new Chair, David Mayo, for securing this excellent site.

Denise Wallen and the program committee are preparing a truly exciting program that will have sessions of interest to all of us in research administration not matter what our job is. The program and all registration information will be posted shortly.

On January 1, David Mayo took over as Chair of Region VI for 2004. It has been my pleasure to serve our region for the past several years as Secretary-Treasurer, Chair-elect, and this past year as Chair. My sincere thanks to all our colleagues for all their hard work within the region and, most of all, for their dedication to the profession of Research Administration!

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

REGION VII
Rocky Mountain

It is my pleasure to report on the results of our regional election.

Terrie Ekin, Arizona State University has been elected as our new Secretary/Treasurer, replacing Timothy Edwards, University of Montana. Our new member-at-large is Brian Christian, University of New Mexico, replacing Ron Splittgerber, Colorado State University. On behalf of the entire region I would like to extend our sincere thanks to both Tim and Ron for their service and enthusiasm. It was a personal pleasure having the opportunity to work with you.

We enjoyed a successful regional turn-out to the National Meeting. As always, it provided a great opportunity for professional development and networking. Our regional travel award went to Glenn Felton, Health Sciences Center, University of New Mexico.

Since the National meeting, the Program Planning Committee has been busy making plans for the 2004 Joint Region VI and VII Meeting which will be held in San Francisco in April 18-21, 2004. A preliminary program can be found at the regional website at http://www.unm.edu/~ncuravii/

This promises to be a great meeting in a wonderful location with a very exciting program. I hope you can join us in San Francisco.

Denise Wallen serves as the Chair of Region VII and is the Special Assistant to the Vice Provost for Research at the University of New Mexico
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
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; Stephen Dowdy, Assistant Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

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

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 COGR’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

---

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
☐ Live: $2,800.00 (3/9/04; 6/15/04; 9/14/04)
☐ Tape: $2,800.00

Cost Sharing Management
 aired 1/21/04

Research Records Management
(3/9/04)

Project Management
(6/15/04)

Conflict of Interest Management
(9/14/04)

☐ Live: $950.00
☐ Tape: $950.00

Total Amount Due: $__________________

Please circle one: Visa MasterCard American Express

Card # __________________________ Exp. __________________________

Card Holder’s Signature ________________________________

A check or credit card information must accompany registration form. For credit card payments, please complete the information below. Registrations received without payment will not be processed. Please make check payable in U.S. currency to NCURA and send payment and registration to NCURA, One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 220, Washington, DC 20036.
2004 Committees

2004 BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President:
Patrick W. Fitzgerald, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Vice President/President-elect:
Jerry Fife, Vanderbilt University

Treasurer:
Laura Wade, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston

Secretary:
Christina Hansen, University of California-Irvine

Immediate Past President:
Robert A. Killoren, Jr., Pennsylvania State University

Executive Director:
Kathleen M. Larmett, NCURA
Don A. Boydston, Rush University Medical Center
Susan Butts, Dow Chemical Company
Denise Clark, Cornell University
Thomas A. Coggins, University of South Carolina
Barbara Cole, Boston University
Barbara Gray, College of Charleston
Patricia Hawk, Oregon Health & Science University
Vivian Holmes, Harvard Medical School
Twila Fisher Reighley, University of Colorado Health Sciences Center
Georgette Sakamoto, University of Hawaii
Cynthia White, Washington University
Pamela Whitlock, University of North Carolina at Wilmington
Stephen Williams, Wake Forest University
Marianne Rinaldo Woods, University of Texas at Arlington

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Chair:
Laura Wade, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston
John Bain, Harvard University
JoAn Howeth, University of Oklahoma Norman Campus
Marilyn Surbey, Emory University

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS
Immediate Past Treasurer:
Bonny Boice, Research Foundation of SUNY

Treasurer-elect:
F. Edward Herran, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center

NOMINATING AND LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Chair:
Peggy Lowry, Oregon State University
John Childress, Vanderbilt University
Jan Fox, Texas Christian University
Norman Hebert, Brown University
Josie Jimenez, New Mexico State University
Dan Nordquist, Washington State University
Joan Warfield, The Johns Hopkins University
Deborah Vetter, University of Nebraska Medical Center

EX OFFICIO MEMBER
Immediate Past President:
Robert A. Killoren Jr., Pennsylvania State University

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Chair:
Garry Sanders, Ordway Research Institute, Inc.
Vincent "Bo" Bogdanski, University of Utah
Thomas Le Blanc, California State University-Chico
Gunta Liders, University of Rochester
Kim Moreland, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Cordell Overby, Michigan State University
Ellen Rogers, University of Notre Name
Myrta Stager, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston
Jill Frazier Tincher, University of Miami

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS:
Newsletter Co-editors:
David Richardson, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Marianne Rinaldo Woods, University of Texas at Arlington

Research Management Review (RMR) Editor:
James Casey, Jr., Bradley University

Vice President:
Jerry Fife, Vanderbilt University
Message from the 2004 NCURA President

We should all take pride in the accomplishments of the past year but we must remain mindful of the fact that our success is attributable to the commitment of our members. We are blessed to have an extraordinary Executive Director and an exceptional staff in our Washington, D.C. office. My experience of the past year has given me an appreciation for the excellence of our staff.

NCURA is an organization of volunteers and our success is the result of the dedication of members who are committed to serving other members and who strive to make NCURA a truly exceptional organization. However, with our growth in membership, increased attendance at our meetings, and the expansion of our portfolio of professional development programs, it becomes increasingly difficult to sustain the excellence that has become the trademark of NCURA programs. We have many reasons to be optimistic about NCURA's future, but we also will face significant challenges in maintaining our high standards of quality in the months and years ahead. In 2004 my attention will be focused on serving our members, improving our professional development programs and ensuring that we use our resources effectively as we respond to the demands of a rapidly growing organization.

My top priority for 2004 will be to increase member involvement in NCURA programs and activities. Our greatest resource is our members and our future success is contingent on greater member participation in our organization. The growth in membership and programs means that more members than ever will have to contribute their time and talents in service to NCURA. Every member has something unique to offer and even the newest member can infuse our organization with the innovative ideas, energy and enthusiasm necessary to keep NCURA vital. I'm convinced that many members are ready and willing to serve and that the minimal response rate we typically receive from our “Call for Volunteers” is not indicative of member apathy or a lack of desire to be involved. We must be more proactive and less passive in soliciting member involvement and fostering an attitude of service to the organization.

NCURA's leaders need to be more aggressive in identifying volunteers and convincing them to participate in programs and governance, both at the Regional and National level. NCURA's members need to be more assertive in making their interest known and actively seek ways to become involved. I feel fortunate to have the opportunity to serve NCURA as President, but I've also derived a great sense of accomplishment and satisfaction from being involved in many NCURA programs and activities over the years. I got involved because I was encouraged to do so and I have stayed involved because I believe very strongly that being an NCURA member entails an obligation of service to the organization. In the coming year I will encourage all members to come forward and make a commitment to NCURA by sharing your time and talent in some way.

Another priority for the coming year is to assess the effectiveness of all of our professional development programs. Our track record for offering innovative programming is exceptional, and we have been extremely successful in utilizing technology to deliver our programs in new ways. We must make sure that we provide programming options for all members in ways that facilitate the learning experience. Each of our programs must be constantly reevaluated and refreshed to ensure that both the content and the teaching methods remain up-to-date and effective. The breadth of our professional development programming must provide appeal and value to all NCURA members. We must offer programs suited to the newest research administrator and the most experienced, the central administrator and the departmental administrator, those engaged in pre-award activities and post-award activities, and administrators in universities, medical centers, hospitals and not-for-profit research institutions. In the coming year we will establish a process to perform a periodic, comprehensive evaluation of each of our programs to ensure that we are meeting the needs of our members. We have to make sure that our past successes do not lead to complacency in the future.

I believe NCURA can benefit from partnerships with other organizations and in the coming year I will work to build alliances with other professional associations, Federal agencies, sponsors and commercial firms. It is critical that NCURA stay focused on its mission as a professional development organization, but we should also seek opportunities to benefit the field of research administration through collaborations with organizations with which we have mutual interests. One example of a collaborative effort is the conference being planned for the summer of 2004 with Compliance as the theme. By bringing together professional associations such as COGR, FDP and NACUA and federal agencies, NCURA can facilitate a dialogue between research performers and research sponsors that can lead to a better understanding of federal regulations and the expectations and realities associated with regulatory compliance.

NCURA is working to build partnerships with many of the commercial firms that support the research enterprise on our campuses. We have much to offer these firms and NCURA members can benefit greatly from commercial sponsorship of our meetings and events. The 2003 Annual Meeting was the most successful meeting for sponsorship in our history and we should build on this success and develop long-term partner relationships with commercial firms who provide important products and services to our institutions.

A key factor in the success of any organization is good communication. Through articles such as this, and through communications directed to the Regional Officers, I will provide periodic updates to the members to let you know about the activities of the Officers and Board of Directors. But effective communication is a two-way process and while it is important that you know what your Board and Officers are doing, it is equally important that we learn about the activities of NCURA's Regional organizations and what is on the minds of our members. In the coming year I will establish regular communications with the Regional Officers and in turn I hope to receive periodic up-dates from each Region. I also encourage NCURA members to take the time to contact me, the Officers and/or the Board of Directors with your comments (positive and negative) and suggestions. The beginning of a new year is a time to reflect on the past and look ahead to the future. NCURA is finishing a very successful year and I'm grateful for the opportunity to serve in 2004 as President of this exceptional organization. I hope that 2004 is the year that many of you will be inspired to become more involved in NCURA and work with me to make this great organization even better. Please accept my best wishes for a very happy and very successful new year.

Pat Fitzgerald is the 2004 NCURA President and serves as the Director of Cost Analysis for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
2004 Catherine Core Minority Travel Award

Here’s what this year’s recipients had to say, “Coming to this conference allowed me an opportunity to be part of a professional community who not only share a similar job, but also have mutual respect. It is reassuring that professional award programs like this exist and are available to small or young institutions like where I work.” (Roxanne Alvarez) Miriam De La Paz said, “It was wonderful to share, and receive advice and solutions from others who have been there. I not only received a wealth of information to share with my coworkers, but I also had the opportunity to network with other research administrators. There was truly a feeling of camaraderie amongst all the attendees which made the NCURA Annual Meeting stand out from other conferences.” Elaine Nicholson said, “I would like to thank NCURA for such a memorable experience and I encourage the organization to continue offering this award. This conference provides exposure to the full scope of what sponsored research entails. It offers a perspective that will help any newcomer to discover the wide range of possibilities that are available in this field.”

Letters of recommendation from the institutional official stated repeatedly the benefits of attending the National NCURA Meeting. In addition to the awardees personal and professional growth, the institution acknowledged it would also reap the benefits of networking opportunities, agency contacts and the overall knowledge of the NCURA membership.

The 2003 Catherine Core Travel Award recipients were: Roxanne Alvarez, Nova Southeastern University; Miriam De La Paz, University of Florida Shands Cancer Center; Karen J. Mosley, Morehouse School of Medicine; and Elaine Nicholson, Seton Hall University. The NCURA Nominating and Leadership Development Committee eagerly anticipate the participation and leadership that our winners will bring to future NCURA activities. The deadline for applications for the 2004 Catherine Core Minority Travel Award is June 1, 2004. The application form is available on the NCURA web site at www.ncura.edu. The criteria for selection are as follows:

The applicant should:
• Be engaged in the administration of sponsored programs
• Represent one of the following minority classifications: African American, Hispanic, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander
• Never have attended an NCURA national meeting
• Agree to stay at the host hotel for the duration of the meeting and be responsible for making own room and travel reservations
• Include with the application a letter of support from an official at their institution which clearly delineates the benefits to the applicant and institution
• Agree to submit a report on his/her annual meeting experiences within thirty (30) days of the meeting.

We look forward to many outstanding applications in 2004!

Thanks for a great year!

support of NCURA. We need to cherish them and keep reminding them how much we appreciate all they do.

Finally, I give recognition to the current Board of Directors and to the officers and Boards of the past. NCURA is where we are because of the foresight of those that have led NCURA in the past. Our attention to our strategic plan and our concern about not only where we are now but also where we want to be in the future has ensured NCURA’s health and continued growth. We need to continue to anticipate the needs of our membership and the demands that will be placed on research administrators in years to come.

My work as your president is done, but let me assure you that I will continue to work to keep NCURA in the forefront of our profession. A number of initiatives are underway and I know that Pat Fitzgerald, our incoming president, and the new NCURA Board will continue them – initiatives that are looking at NCURA’s international dimension, at new models for delivering professional development to our members, and most especially looking at what NCURA will be like on our 50th anniversary.Thanks to all of you for your tremendous support during the past year. I feel it has been NCURA’s best year ever! And I certainly hope and expect Pat to feel the same way this time next year. Adios.

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

What Mechanism Should I Use: Purchased Service or Subaward Agreement?

Continued from page 2

What about the use of Consultants in sponsored programs? Do they contribute to the fuzziness? Yes indeed, so be careful, use of Consultants should be guided as the use of contractual services that are typically of short duration, and that specifically contribute to a portion of the project but do not contribute to the final technical report, and thus differs from that of a subaward relationship. Consultants are not employees of the pass through entity; rather they act as independent agents, and are thus not subject to Federal withholding claims. The IRS uses common-law principles to determine employment status, referred to as “20 Common Law Factor” test. See Rev. Rul. 87-41, 1987-1 C. B. 296. Right of control is the overarching consideration.

Summary

Naturally, there will be situations where it’s not readily apparent what mechanism to utilize. There may be occasions where selection of more than one mechanism is appropriate. Of course, as research administrators we all strive to do what’s in the best interests of the principal investigator, the project and our employer, all the while keeping it legal and defendable in the eyes of independent auditors, the prime sponsor’s terms and conditions, the news media and general public. Fuzziness can be a good thing sometimes; it can afford research administrators the luxury of being flexible in their ways.

Michael Blackwell serves as a Subcontract Administrator for the University of Washington.
NCURA Members Answer Call to Neighborhood Watch

The NCURA Neighborhoods recently completed its third Call for Volunteers for the six online communities and the Neighborhood Program Committee. We are pleased to announce that a number of members volunteered to participate in 2004, and the new committees were able to meet during the 45th Annual Meeting to review their goals and objectives for the coming year.

One feature the Neighborhoods will continue in 2004 is the monthly electronic interview, On Campus. The January issue, a Departmental Administration edition, features Wayne Brown, Business Manager at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. The February issue, sponsored by the eRA Neighborhood, will profile Chris Lambert of the National Institutes of Health.

The 2004 Neighborhood Committees are listed below. Complete Neighborhood rosters with e-mail addresses of all committee members are available in each of the Neighborhood Town Halls. Neighborhood Chairs are noted with an asterisk.

**NEIGHBORHOOD PROGRAM COMMITTEE**
- Tom Drinane, Dartmouth College
- Scot Gudger, Oregon Health & Science University*
- Tom Le Blanc, California State University - Chico
- Jerry Pogatshnik, Southern Illinois University - Edwardsville
- Maggie Pyle, University of South Alabama
- Debbie Smith, University of Tennessee - Health Science Center
- Alice Tangredi-Hannon, University of Pennsylvania

**COMPLIANCE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITTEE**
- Diane Ament, Iowa State University
- Steve Erickson, Boston College
- Carol Pech, The Johns Hopkins University
- Kathleen Taggart, Creighton University
- Alice Tangredi-Hannon, University of Pennsylvania*

**ELECTRONIC RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITTEE**
- Dave Battey, College of Charleston
- MJ Carver, University of North Carolina - Wilmington
- Tammy Custer, Cornell University
- Tom Drinane, Dartmouth College*
- Diane Stout, University of Arkansas

**FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITTEE**
- Albertha Barrett, Georgia State University
- Kathryn Page, Dartmouth College
- Melody Page, UT MD Anderson Cancer Center
- Kerry Peluso, University of Pennsylvania*
- Arsenio Roldan, Stanford University
- Denise Rouleau, Worcester Polytechnic Institute

**DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITTEE**
- Meghan Carter, The Johns Hopkins University
- Susan Cassidy, Brigham and Women’s Hospital
- Sue Downey, University of Mississippi Medical Center
- M. Wayne Finley, University of South Florida
- Peggy Grause, University of Cincinnati Medical Center
- Scot Gudger, Oregon Health & Sciences University*
- Denise White, Thomas Jefferson University

**PRE-AWARD NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITTEE**
- Holly Benze, The Johns Hopkins University
- Michelle Joy Clark, Georgia Institute of Technology
- Maggie Pyle, University of South Alabama*
- Debbie Smith, University of Tennessee Health Science Center*
- Jaynee Tolle, University of Cincinnati
- Peggy Vroman-Gracy, University of Texas at Arlington

**PREDOMINANTLY UNDERGRADUATE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITTEE**
- Nicole Banks, New York Institute of Technology
- Julie Cole, Georgia Southern University
- Tom Le Blanc, California State University - Chico*
- Maureen McMahon, Canisius College
- Jerry Pogatshnik, Southern Illinois University - Edwardsville*
- Jackie White, San Francisco State University

For more information on the Neighborhoods, please contact Scot Gudger, Chair, Neighborhood Program Committee, at gudgers@ohsu.EDU, or Joshua Lessin, NCURA Project Manager, at lessin@ncura.edu.

Visit the NCURA Neighborhoods at http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/.
Anyone who attended the annual meeting of NCURA in November will know that times have changed for the research enterprise since 9/11. At the meeting there were a myriad of sessions warning us about the current climate in Washington for contracting with a university. The NCURA sessions had such wonderful titles, such as “ITARS, Export Controls and Other Things That Go Bump in the Night!” and “Problems and Issues When Contracting with DOD,” “What Am I Signing Anyway?” and so on.

Those of us on the front lines of negotiating research agreements at research intensive institutions have always had to be mindful of accepting clauses in agreements that restrict “academic freedom” or that allow the research sponsor to approve who can and can not work on our projects. But those clauses were rare and usually provided to us with contracts that could be considered “defense-like.” Not so anymore, enter 9/11 and homeland security, and the entire game changed. The frontline contracting officers and program directors at the agencies are trying to assure themselves that the projects they are funding will not get into the wrong hands and lead to the next wave of terrorism. I think that is a noble desire but they have the wrong audience.

Top officials at the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) and the heads of the federal agencies are in denial that business vis-à-vis university/government contracting has migrated into a battle of “troublesome clauses.” So to prove the point, a taskforce of 20 AAU COGR institutions have been recording, since August 2003, the problematic clauses that appear in their agreements (either directly from the federal government or through an industry prime), the results of which have been stunning. At my institution alone, we have logged ten separate agreements with publication restrictions, release of information which have been stunning. The frontline contracting officers and program directors at the agencies are trying to assure themselves that the projects they are funding will not get into the wrong hands and lead to the next wave of terrorism. I think that is a noble desire but they have the wrong audience.

Those of you who have read this far and are saying to yourselves “so what’s the problem?” probably don’t have a problem and can accept classified research or export controlled work. But most of the rest of the university community cannot, and for us, the university’s mission is to freely disseminate the results of all research, and to education and train all citizens of the world. Therefore, it is incumbent upon us to be aware that by accepting clauses restricting freedom to publish, allowing for the agency’s approvals of foreign nationals, or agreeing to a “non-disclosure of unrestricted information” we have just given away our fundamental research exemption and turned an unclassified agreement into an export-controlled agreement, requiring licenses from the government to allow our PIs to talk out loud about their work.

Here are a few of the so dubbed “troublesome” clauses:

- Cyber Security R&D Act of 2002 (P.L. 107—305)
- Release of Information, July 2002 (ARL 52.005-4401)
- Foreign Nationals Performing Under Contract (ARL 52-004-4400)
- Rights in Data – Special Works (52.227-17)

So what do you do when you see these and other such clauses? Obviously, the first line of attack is to try to negotiate them out or just reduce them to harmless. If you can’t, then remind the contracting officers about NSDD-189. Issued in September of 1985, the National Security Defense Directive 189 (NSDD-189) entitled “National Policy on the Transfer of Scientific, Technical and Engineering Information” defines fundamental research, as “basic and applied research in science and engineering, the results of which ordinarily are published and shared broadly.” The Directive declares, “… fundamental research remains unrestricted.” In 2001, Dr. Condoleezza Rice reaffirmed NSDD-189 as the policy of the Bush Administration. In a letter written to Dr. Harold Brown, Center for Strategic & International, Dr. Rice states, “The key to maintaining U.S. technological preeminence is to encourage open and collaborative basic research.” She goes on to say that “…the policy on the transfer of scientific, technical, and engineering information set forth in NSDD-189 shall remain in effect, and we will ensure that this policy is followed.”

If you still have been unable to convince the contracting officer to remove the troublesome clauses then…it’s okay to walk away.

Joyce Freedman serves as the Assistant Vice Chancellor, Research for University of California-Berkeley.

Congratulations to Bobby McQuiston who has been promoted to Director, Office of Sponsored Programs at the University of Texas at Austin.

Louise Griffin as been promoted from Managing Director, External Funding and Technology Transfer to Vice Chancellor, Administration and Finance for the University of Massachusetts Lowell. Congratulations Louise!

Pat Green, formerly the Senior Director, Medical Research Administration for the University of Miami has moved to Vanderbilt University and serves as the Associate Director, Division of Sponsored Research.

Congratulations!
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**CAREER OPPORTUNITY**

**Director, Clinical Trials Unit**

Job #189 (Be sure to refer to job number when applying)

The Research and Education Institute at Harbor-UCLA Research and Education Institute (REI) invites applications for the position of Director, Clinical Trials Unit. REI is an independent, 501 c (3) institution having primary affiliations with the David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA and the Harbor-UCLA Medical Center.

The Director reports to the Vice President of Research Administration and Research Services and the Medical Director of the Clinical Trials Unit and is responsible for all administrative and technical duties associated with clinical research; protocol development, budgetary planning, along with other job functions to promote the smooth operation of clinical research studies; strong familiarity as a study coordinator with additional roles that are instructional, supervisory and managerial; academic and scientific; visible by the industry and government; and plays a key role in future planning and business enhancement of all industry studies, which involve therapeutic drugs, biologics or devices.

The qualified applicant must have current CA RN license, Clinical Research Coordinator certification, Bachelor's degree in nursing, and ten (10) year's or more of progressive experience and responsibility in clinical research. A Master's in business administrative and member in professional research organizations preferred. Also strong knowledge of phases of clinical research, Federal Regulations for the conduct of research, Good Clinical Practices, the International Conference of Harmonization guidelines, and data and safety monitoring issues. Experience and familiarity with study sponsor requirements and the ability to interact effectively with sponsors to facilitate industry studies. Experience with sponsor, FDA and other regulatory audits preferred. Strong project management skills, including experience with developing and meeting study timelines and deliverables and with subject recruitment and enrollment activities. Must have working knowledge of home health care and outside lab pricing.

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

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

- **By FAX:** 310-222-3640
- **On-Line** www.rei.edu and click on Career Opportunities
- **By Mail:** Human Resources Department, Building N-12
  Harbor-UCLA Research and Education Institute
  1124 West Carson Street. Torrance, CA 90502-2064
- **In Person:** Apply at the above address Monday–Friday between 8 am to 1 pm

This position requires a successful criminal conviction search for employment.
System Analyst – Biomedical Research
Office of Sponsored Programs (Pre-Award)
You will be the primary OSP resource for implementation and support of research administrative systems (COEUS). And play a central role in integrating the functioning of new systems into ongoing research administrative operations. This includes definition of requirements, refining business procedures, testing software, end-user training and systems support. Act as liaison to ISD and research departments to identify and resolve issues related to systems and communicate any problems to appropriate personnel. Prepare customer reports from the COEUS database for Research Administration and develop mailing/distribution systems to assist them in communicating with their members.

Requires a Bachelor's degree in Computer Science (or related field) and 3-4 years' experience. Must have analytical skills to collect information from various sources, perform analysis and summarize information to solve problems. Knowledge of sponsored-program administration, in either a hospital or university setting, is highly desirable. Reference job code 5016BR.

Fund Accountant III
Research Finance (Post-Award)
Serve as the primary resource for everyday financial system support functions and reconciliation issues related to BA3. Communicate problems and issues to appropriate personnel. Prepare reports concerning awarded funds. Maintain and reconcile the financial aspects of the BA3 database for the Research Administrator community.

Other responsibilities include:
- Reconcile all feeders from Peoplesoft Materials Management and Financials systems; performing reconciliations for monthly and year-end closings.
- Serve on committees including the Peoplesoft general ledger, FCOC, BA3 user group and other design/development/testing and implementation teams.
- Play a key role in implementation of the BA3 system including development, enhancement, and quality assurance testing and problem resolution.
- Special projects, particularly research/resolution of system problems, creative use of existing functions to meet business needs, development of reports for principal investigators/research administrators.
- Establish user access to grants management software; develop new security roles; update software business rules, using SQL Enterprise Manager to update DTS scripts.

Requires a Bachelor's degree in Accounting (or related field) and 5-6 years' pertinent experience. Analytical skills, oral and written communication, and ability to work in cross-functional teams are all important to this position. Requires familiarity with grants management concepts and skill in using Microsoft Excel, Access, PowerPoint, and Crystal reports. Familiarity with DTS scripts and post-award grants management software (especially BA3) a definite plus. Reference job code 5024BR.

Research Computing Systems Analyst
Information Services – Research Computing
Serve as the lead ISD analyst on the project team to implement the COEUS system at Children's Hospital Boston. Work with functional and technical team members to complete the analysis of business processes and workflows and define/document the best fit of COEUS into our environment (including alternative approaches and possible enhancements). You will meet with clients and management to negotiate and document requirements, review prototypes and system specifications, develop QA test plans, set up/monitoring testing and ensure an orderly transition to production.

Other responsibilities include configuring the application to accommodate the desired workflow; developing plans for data conversion and creating necessary data transformation and load modules; creating systems development life cycle (SDLC) documents and supporting live applications.

Requires a Bachelor’s degree in Computer Science or a closely related field and 3-4 years’ experience. The research computing analyst must have skills to collect information from diverse sources, apply professional principles in performing various analysis, and summarize the information and data in order to solve problems OR design relatively complex systems and programs that cross department/divisional lines. Reference job code 4776BR.

Project Manager Research Internet Project
Contractor, One-Year Position
You will have extensive web-development experience to create a research web site at Children's Hospital. You and your team will be responsible for the design, development and implementation of the site under the direction of the Office of Research Affairs, ISD and Public Affairs. You will hire and lead a team of three, including a project assistant, programmer and designer. Determine the needs of the communities represented on the site such as basic science researchers, the Clinical Research Program, Glaser Center, Institutional Review Board, Intellectual Property, Children's Hospital Trust, Public Affairs, Marketing, Human Resources, CHB administration and others.

Responsibilities include:
- Develop scope of content, hierarchy and structure for site.
- Determine, divisions, departments, labs, etc. to be represented.
- Meet with various audiences to determine needs on site and motivate researchers to participate.
- Develop detailed budget.
- Work with IDS to implement web content and design into final product.
- Hire/supervise project staff; assure assigned tasks are completed on time.
- Report on progress and budget to Director of Research Management.

Requires strong project management skills, ability to work independently, meet deadlines and to motivate a research staff. Knowledge of the basic science and clinical research community is essential. A background of working in a web-based environment with programmers and familiarity with IS environment is important. Experience managing an interdisciplinary team with diverse skills is desirable.

Compensation for this position is highly competitive and attractive for senior-level Project Managers/Web Developers. Reference job code 51068R.

Please send resume and cover letter to: researchrecruitment@childrens.harvard.edu.

Children's Hospital Boston

We are an equal opportunity employer.
**NCURA 2004 Calendar of Education and Events**

**February 2-4, 2004**
**Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration**
Orlando, FL

**February 2-4, 2004**
**Sponsored Project Administration Level II**
Orlando, FL

**February 29 - March 2, 2004**
**Financial Research Administration (FRA) V**
San Diego, CA

**March 9, 2004**
**2004 Video Workshop Series**
Research Records Management

**March 15 - 17, 2004**
**Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration**
New Orleans, LA

**March 15 - 17, 2004**
**Sponsored Project Administration: Level II**
New Orleans, LA

**April 18 - 21, 2004**
**Region VI/VII Spring Meeting**
San Francisco, CA

**April 24 - 27, 2004**
**Region IV Spring Meeting**
Indianapolis, IN

**April 24 - 27, 2004**
**Region II Spring Meeting**
Baltimore, MD

**April 24 - 27, 2004**
**Region V Spring Meeting**
Galveston, TX

**May 3 - 6, 2004**
**Region I**
Spring Meeting
Sturbridge, MA

**May 9 - 12, 2004**
**Region III Spring Meeting**
Isle of Palms, SC

**June 15, 2004**
**2004 Video Workshop Series**
Project Management

**July 25 - 27, 2004**
**NCURA Summer Conference: Government and University: Partners in Compliance**
Providence, Rhode Island

**September 14, 2004**
**2004 Video Workshop Series**
Conflict of Interest Management

**October 31 - November 3, 2004**
**46th Annual Meeting**
Washington, DC
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- Submission of Ads: February 6, 2004
- Space Reservation for Ads: February 6, 2004
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**ADVERTISMENT**

**KUMC Medical Center**

### Associate Vice Chancellor for Research Administration,
University of Kansas Medical Center (KUMC)

and

### Director, Division of Sponsored Programs Administration,
University of Kansas Medical Center Research Institute (KUMC RI)

This executive-level position combines demonstrated administrative skills with detailed knowledge of sponsored programs administration. The incumbent leads and directs the division, as well as ensuring effective pre- and post-award administrative operations that support the University’s strategic research mission. Foci include proposal development, preparation and submission; effective data and fund management; compliance; reporting; education; and excellent service to faculty. The position reports to the Vice Chancellor for Research Administration. Salary is $115,000-130,000 annually, commensurate with experience, qualifications, demonstrated capabilities and accomplishments. Competitive benefits package.

**Required qualifications:**
- Doctorate degree in a related field; track record of successful and extensive sponsored programs administration experience in university environment; knowledge of federal and private funding sources; legal compliance; leadership & management skills as a university administrator; highly developed conceptual, problem-solving and communication skills; demonstrated understanding of computerized systems (including PeopleSoft and InfoED) and web-based methods for receiving, processing, submitting and reporting proposals and awards; ability to generate accurate budget/financial analyses; demonstrated diversity.

**Preferred qualifications:**
- Eligibility for a faculty appointment in any of the schools of KUMC; successful experience negotiating and managing contractual research relationships with industry, government and other funding sources; significant related experience at academic health center; mastery of PeopleSoft and InfoED.

The University of Kansas is a major comprehensive research and teaching university that serves as a center for learning, scholarship and creative endeavor. The main campus is located in Lawrence. KUMC is located in Kansas City. It includes the School of Medicine (which also has a campus in Wichita), the School of Nursing, the School of Allied Health, and the Office of Graduate Studies, which together enroll approximately 2,500 students. The schools are actively engaged in research, teaching and service functions. The University of Kansas Hospital is located on the KUMC campus and is governed by a public authority board. KUMC also serves as a statewide resource for health education and health services to the public. Area Health Education Centers, distance education, and provision of health care services and consultation are just a few of the benefits to the citizens of Kansas. KUMC is located in a residential setting that is centrally situated in metropolitan Kansas City. The area encompasses 7 counties over rolling terrain in Kansas and Missouri, with a population of nearly 1.6 million. Kansas City offers a wide variety of educational, cultural, recreational and entertainment opportunities in a blend of urban, suburban and rural environments. Additional information is available at [http://www.kumc.edu](http://www.kumc.edu).

Submit cover letter referring to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Research Administration position announcement and clearly indicate how you meet the qualifications and learned of the position. Include your resume/CV, as well as names and phone numbers of 3 professional references. Submit via (1) fax to 913-588-5042 attn Stacey Snakenberg; (2) e-mail to ssnakenberg@kumc.edu (3) mail to Stacey Snakenberg, Human Resources Generalist, University of Kansas Medical Center, Mail-Stop 2033, 3901 Rainbow Blvd, Kansas City KS 66160. Recruitment began 12/01/03 and will continue until the position is filled. KUMC is an EO/AA institution.
A n exciting keynote speaker, outstanding sessions and speakers, invaluable networking opportunities, and fantastic day adventures of beautiful San Diego and the surrounding area are all on the horizon for you! Details can be found at http://www.ncura.edu/conferences/frav/

NCURA welcomes our Silver Partners MAXIMUS and PricewaterhouseCoopers and our Bronze Partner Huron Consulting Group! Thank you for your support of the Financial Research Administration Community and FRA V.

We have a wonderful keynote address to kick off the conference:

**Financial Administration for Research * Get Switched On !**

So much to plan for, create, implement and assess in the realm of the financial administration for research ... and the one thread that ties the success of these and all of the components of our profession together is effective communication.

Chip Eichelberger, with 18 years of experience and 6 years with world famous author and motivator Anthony Robbins, brings his blend of practical content, motivation and humor to this interactive presentation. The renewed tenacity, high morale and contagious energy that his audiences from organizations such as Prudential, American Dental Association, GlaxoSmithKline, and PriceWaterhouseCoopers bring home to their colleagues and families is transforming!

Check out the newly updated FRA V Program for the latest on session descriptions and outstanding speakers. Thank you to those speakers who have shared their bios with us! Take a moment to get to know your colleagues who will be working through the challenges in the financial administration for research next month by clicking “Speakers” on the FRA V homepage http://www.ncura.edu/conferences/frav/

NCURA has partnered with “The Meeting Manager” to take you to Tijuana, Southern California Wine Country, Sea World, Old Town, La Jolla and the San Diego Zoo! There are full and half-day trips, so you can attend a morning workshop, have a San Diego adventure and be back to join us for the opening reception Sunday evening. Check them out by clicking on “Day Trips” on the FRA V homepage at http://www.ncura.edu/conferences/frav/

WE LOOK FORWARD TO SEEING YOU IN SAN DIEGO FOR FRA V!

If you have any questions please don’t hesitate to contact the NCURA office at (202) 466-3894.