2004 Slate is Set - Polls Are Open!

Members are being asked to vote for Vice President/President-elect and two At-large Board Members. Polls are open on the Member's Section of the NCURA Web Site at http://www.ncura.edu/members/.

The N&LDC had a pool of award winning individuals and we thank each one of them for their willingness to step forward and serve NCURA. Following are the candidates:

**Vice President/President-elect:**
- Thomas A. Coggins, University of South Carolina
- Laura L. Wade, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston

**At-large Board Members:**
- John M. Carfora, Boston College
- James J. Casey, Jr., Bradley University
- Judy L. Fredenberg, University of Montana
- Denise A. Wallen, University of New Mexico

Thank you in advance for your participation in these important elections!

The 2004 Nominating and Leadership Development Committee
- Peggy Lowry, Chair
- Norman Hebert, Region I
- Joan Warfield, Region II
- John Childress, Region III
- Deborah Vetter, Region IV
- Jan Fox, Region V
- Dan Nordquist, Region VI
- Josie Jimenez, Region VII
- Robert Killoren, Ex Officio

---

Focus on Departmental Administration (DA), Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions (PUI) and Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU)

Have you ever been in DC on Halloween? People dress up as politicians in various humorous ways. You may want to arrive at this year’s annual meeting and get out on the town on Saturday night and check out the costumes. With the election occurring the following Tuesday, I’m sure you’ll see plenty of interesting outfits.

Last month’s article discussed programming for new members and senior level members. This article will focus on programming for departmental administrators (DA) and for predominately undergraduate institutions (PUI) and historically black colleges and universities (HBCU).

In planning this year’s meeting we noted that DAs represent a significant portion of NCURA members. In an effort to meet the needs of this group programming was developed. The sessions for this track are tailored specifically for DAs. The sessions include an open forum; an update on immigration topics; a federal circular session from the departmental administrator perspective; compliance; export controls; hints, tips and tools; managing personnel; news of the weird, costing urban legends; tech transfer; what departmental administrators need from central administration; how to stay fresh and happy and agreement basics.

continued on page 5
The End of an Era

by Patrick Fitzgerald

The June issue of the NCURA Newsletter included a mention in the “Milestones” column of the impending retirement of Julie Norris, the Director of Sponsored Programs for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and my boss. Although it is purely coincidental that Julie chose to retire during the year of my NCURA presidency, I find the coincidence fitting since she is the reason that I became an NCURA member and NCURA President. With this in mind, I will exercise my Presidential prerogative and use this column to thank Julie for her long and distinguished service to NCURA.

Julie Norris

It would be impossible to overstate the contribution that Julie has made to NCURA and the field of research administration during her illustrious career. She is widely acknowledged as the best in our profession and has worked tirelessly over the years to share her knowledge and experience with NCURA members young and old. Who doesn’t remember attending one of the many terrific workshops that Julie and her esteemed colleague Jane Youngers have put on over the years, which made research administration understandable and interesting to so many of us? Even as she approaches retirement, Julie continues to lead the way as the authority on such complex issues as export controls and the related EARs and ITAR regulations and sharing her wisdom with us at NCURA conferences.

It has been my good fortune to work with Julie for nearly eight years. I’ve learned a great deal about research administration but I’ve also learned other important lessons. Julie taught me that the essence of research administration is providing exceptional service to our institution, to professional organizations like NCURA, and to our fellow colleagues. Julie has contributed her time and talent to NCURA and other higher education organizations countless times over the years and has taken the time to answer thousands of email messages and phone calls from people around the country seeking her advice. Our jobs have become more stressful and more time-consuming in recent years, making it harder to balance our work life and leaving little time for extracurricular activities. I hope NCURA members will find inspiration in the tremendous contribution that Julie has made to our organization and our profession and will be motivated to make a commitment to serve NCURA in some way.

Working for Julie has also shown me the benefits of mentorship. I’ve learned firsthand that having a mentor can be career-enhancing and not having a mentor can impede a career. As my mentor, Julie provided me with encouragement and challenges that have enhanced my career. She encouraged me to learn more about all aspects of research administration and provided me with opportunities to do so. I’ve learned a great deal about leadership by observing Julie in the many leadership roles she has so willingly accepted over the years. I’ve been fortunate to have Julie as my mentor and I encourage other NCURA members to seek out a mentor who will help you to achieve your career goals and realize your potential.

On the eve of her retirement it is safe to say that Julie has won every award there is to win, held most of the significant offices there are to hold, and has been the subject of countless accolades from leaders and colleagues in higher education and the Federal community. Now all that is left to say is THANK YOU JULIE. From all of NCURA, thank you for giving so much of yourself to help make NCURA the exceptional organization it is today and for helping so many of your fellow members to learn more about research administration. I’m fond of telling Julie that she doesn’t have the word “no” in her vocabulary when it comes to NCURA and this is no exaggeration. Julie has been an NCURA member since 1975 and has an unparalleled track record of service. Whether it was leading the organization as our President, developing of new training programs like NCURA Fundamentals and Sponsored Programs Administration-Level II, serving on Program Committees, or preparing one of the hundreds of workshops and concurrent sessions Julie has conducted over the years, she has always been there to work tirelessly and enthusiastically for her NCURA colleagues. We are very grateful to you Julie and we wish you the best in your retirement. And we hope to see you at many more NCURA meetings in the future.

Patrick Fitzgerald is Director of Cost Analysis at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and President of NCURA.

Biosecurity and Dual-Use Research

By Tony DeGrappe

In my last article I mentioned briefly a new Board being created to provide guidance on so called “dual use” research in the life sciences. Discussions between government officials and organizations like COGR and AAAS have provided more details about this Board that are important for our community to be aware of and follow. The Department of Health and Human Services is in the process of creating a National Science Advisory Board for Biosecurity (NSABB) to provide advice, guidance and leadership regarding dual use biological research that has the potential for misuse and that could pose a biologic threat to public health or national security. This Board is being established, in part, as a result of the National Academies’ National Research Council study entitled “Biotechnology Research in an Age of Terrorism: Confronting the Dual Use Dilemma.” NIH has taken the leadership role in organizing the Board, and the NIH Office for Biotechnology Activities will provide the staff support. The NSABB is chartered to have 25 voting members with a broad range of expertise in molecular biology, microbiology, infectious diseases, biosafety, public health, veterinary medicine, plant health, national security, biodefense, law enforcement, scientific publishing, and related fields.

The NSABB is charged specifically with guiding the development of:

• A system of institutional and federal research review that allows for fulfillment of important research objectives while addressing national security concerns;
• Guidelines for the identification and conduct of research that may require special attention and security surveillance;
• Professional codes of conduct for scientists and laboratory workers that can be adopted by professional organizations and institutions engaged in life science research; and
• Materials and resources to educate the research community about effective biosecurity.

A web site for more information can be found at http://www.biosecurityboard.gov. The site includes a set of FAQs which provide the initial definition of terms like “dual-use” research and preliminary operational details.

As mentioned above, NIH officials discussed the organization and activities of the Board in more detail with representatives from the scientific and research administration societies and provided some additional details. NIH reportedly took the initiative on this issue due to the very real possibility that certain types of research might be virtually shut down, if the decision were left to the security establishment. When NIH explained the model of the Recombinant DNA Advisory Committee and its operating regulations, it seemed to calm the fears and offer a reasonable approach to other involved government representatives.
Nominations to the Board are being taken, so NIH cannot predict with any certainty what guidelines will emerge. It is expected, however, that responsibility for implementation of new rules will be with Institutional Biosafety Committees (IBC). The IBC would be renamed Institutional Biosafety and Biosecurity Committee (IBBC), with much more diversity in its membership, similar to the NSABB, and with a greatly expanded education and training responsibility. While local decision-making will be maintained, researchers and institutions will be able to appeal to the NSABB for specific guidance if there is uncertainty or disagreement. NIH expects the NSABB to develop very narrow definitions for research that should be considered dual-use, so that it is the exception to the norm.

NIH is hoping to have a first meeting of the fully constituted NSABB by late fall or early winter 2004. The earliest date on which to expect draft guidelines ready for public comment would be late spring or early summer 2005, with final guidelines by the end of 2005.

While the operational aspects of the NSABB and implementation of its rules or guidance are uncertain, there are some things we can at least anticipate based on recent experiences with the expansion of IRB responsibilities and Select Agent regulations. Much like IRB operations up to the mid to late 90’s, IBCs are relatively small panels made up of volunteers and staffed by individuals as part of their “other duties as assigned”, and no significant financial resources are committed specifically for IBC operations. That will all change. The membership on IBCs will grow, to include or at least have ready access to much of the expertise described above for the NSABB, including areas such as biodefense, national security and law enforcement. In addition an education role, carried out by the IBC or other institutional compliance office, is a certainty.

The potential similarity to what has happened with research on select agents is of more concern. While more systematic data is being collected, it is already clear that the number of both institutions and individual scientists conducting select agent research has shrunk. It is telling that about 1,800 applications for FBI background checks required to work with select agents were eventually canceled, primarily because someone decided they did not want to work with the agents. In a recent New York Times interview, Nobel Laureate Robert Richardson at Cornell stated:

“The potential similarity to what has happened with research on select agents is of more concern. While more systematic data is being collected, it is already clear that the number of both institutions and individual scientists conducting select agent research has shrunk. It is telling that about 1,800 applications for FBI background checks required to work with select agents were eventually canceled, primarily because someone decided they did not want to work with the agents. In a recent New York Times interview, Nobel Laureate Robert Richardson at Cornell stated:

“Let me give you an interesting example from Cornell. The Patriot Act, which was passed after 9/11, has a section in it to control who can work on select agents. At Cornell, we had something like 76 faculty members who had projects on lethal pathogens and something like 38 working specifically on select agents. There were stringent regulations for control of the pathogens - certain categories of foreign nationals who were not allowed to handle them, be in a room with them or even be aware of research results.

So what is the situation now? We went from 38 people who could work on select agents to 2. We've got a lot less people working on interventions to vaccinate the public against smallpox, West Nile virus, anthrax and any of 30 other scourges.”

It is clear from discussions with government science and policy officials that this is exactly what they do not want to happen, either with select agents or with potential dual-use research under NSABB. We will need to work closely with our federal colleagues to minimize the constriction of research in the very areas that have the potential to enhance our security.

Tony De Crappeo serves as the Associate Director for the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR).
I am pleased to have been offered the opportunity to chair NCURA’s FRA VI Conference this coming year. Our theme for the conference is “Responsible Stewardship in a Complex Environment”, reflecting the increasingly complicated, and sometimes convoluted, environment in which we all live. We hope the program will offer each attendee a chance to reflect on how each piece of the puzzle fits together to enable us to work as a team to ensure we ARE responsible stewards at our organizations.

The committee is in place and beginning to work to bring you an outstanding opportunity for professional development, through both formal sessions and informal opportunities to discuss issues among ourselves. There will truly be something for everyone, from departmental administrator to those of us negotiating F&A. Tracks for this year have been identified as: Compliance, Costing, Departmental Administration, Hospital/Non-profit, Transactional, Primers and Communications. The committee is planning seven workshops as well as concurrent sessions, the ever-popular discussion groups and senior level seminars. Please mark your calendars now for February 20-22, 2005 in sunny Orlando, Florida and watch for the program and registration information.

Pam Whitlock is the Chair of FRA VI and serves as the Director, Office of Sponsored Programs for the University of North Carolina at Wilmington.

How does each piece of the puzzle fit together to enable us to work as a team? Find out at FRA VI!
cases coming across their desks. Although guidance documents are available, institutions typically develop their own management techniques in the context of the specifics of a case, the discipline involved, and local campus policies and culture. As an extremely timely topic for research administrators, NCURA is pleased to offer a video workshop entitled, “Conflict of Interest Management,” which targets key conflict of interest issues and provides examples of workable management options.

Christina Hansen, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research at the University of California-Irvine, hosts this final program in the 2004 Video Workshop series, along with panel members Julie Gottlieb, Assistant Dean for Policy Coordination at The Johns Hopkins University; Kathy Irwin, Senior University Legal Counsel at the University of Wisconsin-Madison; and David Richardson, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs at Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University. This workshop will present an overview and management details of conflicts of interest arising from faculty involvement in start-up companies, non-clinical research and human subjects research. Discussion also targets the challenges at primarily undergraduate institutions. Institutional conflict of interest requirements will not be discussed in this workshop. Questions will be taken from the studio audience and broadcast sites.

Kathleen Larmett, NCURA’s Executive Director (center) joins the cast of NCURA’s Project Management Workshop (from l to r) Patrick Fitzgerald, Director of Cost Analysis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Laura Yaeger, Managing Director, Huron Consulting Group; Penny Cook, Executive Director, Grants & Contract Administration, School of Medicine, Yale University; and Deena Giancotti, Manager, PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP. The show, which aired live on June 15, 2004 is now available on VHS and DVD.

Similarly, programming was developed to meet the needs of those members representing PUIs and HBCUs. The sessions tailored for this group include an open forum; developing an IP policy; dealing with senior administration; coping with human subject issues; proposal development training; encouraging faculty externally sponsored scholarly activity; ERA; building a research foundation; assessing the small institution office of sponsored programs; managing small offices; emerging issues; team work and cross training; guiding faculty on managing their funds; sponsored program databases and HBCU/Minority Institution issues.

With the Presidential election occurring during our annual meeting you are encouraged to register and make your hotel reservation early.

See you in Washington in October!

Jerry Fife is the 2004 NCURA Vice President and serves as the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research Finance, Vanderbilt University.
Introduction
In the early 1990’s, the University of Minnesota (UMN) became aware of some serious problems related to grants management and research compliance. Some examples were possible unreported program income, possible illegal non-salary cost transfers, possible conflicts of interest, no official Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval for the sale of a drug developed using federal grant funds, and poor management controls. As a result, the university administration self-reported these infractions to the federal government and started on the path of reorganized sponsored project management practices. We were strongly encouraged to emphasize these efforts when the National Institutes of Health (NIH) described the university as having “…a pervasive environment of non-compliance”. Subsequently they designated the university as an ‘exceptional organization’ in August 1995 and required us to pay a penalty of $32 million to the NIH. This directive from the NIH resulted in a list of 55 “Corrective Actions” that were required to be implemented before removing this designation. This document helped to focus our efforts in research compliance in a number of areas, such as:

- more clearly defined policies and procedures;
- more clearly defined roles and responsibilities;
- better system-wide training and education;
- improved oversight and enforcement functions; and,
- improved electronic systems and information.

Laying the Groundwork
The first step toward achieving a strong compliance structure was to review research policies and procedures. The UMN Board of Regents approved the Code of Conduct Policy, which has a focus on ethics and integrity. Specific academic administrative and financial procedures were also developed. These policies and procedures were critical to re-emphasize the important behavioral aspects that must exist within a more compliant research environment, and to facilitate operations and oversight.

The next step was to clearly define the roles and responsibilities of individuals involved in the various research processes. The UMN Roles and Responsibilities Committee, chaired by the Internal Auditor and including major involvement from key faculty members, developed a set of general principles to guide the process of specifying individual roles and responsibilities. The committee used these guidelines to prepare a matrix of responsibilities, which identified all functions and the responsible office or position. The result was a comprehensive roles and responsibilities document that can be used as a reference for everyone who is involved in the grants process.

This analysis also resulted in the creation of several specific research compliance activities – the Office of Oversight, Analysis and Reporting (OAR), the Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) training program, and additional electronic systems for preparing and managing sponsored projects.

Office of Oversight, Analysis and Reporting
The mission of OAR office is to promote compliance awareness in sponsored projects management within the University through assistance, education and communication. In support of this mission, the office has put in place a number of procedures to facilitate effective compliance monitoring and assistance, such as:

- random and targeted sampling of transactions on sponsored accounts;
- monitoring of web financial oversight reports to identify unusual spending patterns;
- responding to issues and questions raised by UMN staff regarding transactions on sponsored accounts;
- continuous review of federal and state regulations and university policies; and,
- working closely with Department of Internal Audits.
Two specific programs that are managed by the OAR office, Risk Summary Assessments and the Certified Approver (CA) Program, have proven very successful.

The Risk Summary Assessment is a process to help administrators be aware of and understand financial grants management compliance issues. The OAR office has identified categories of risk, such as allowable costs, financial accounting, and electronic research administration. These categories are used to analyze data from a unit (department, center, or small college) at a specific point in time, and to prepare a report. OAR staff meet with the unit head and key administrator to discuss the assessment and to identify potential areas of risk. The unit head is required to write a response describing how they plan to correct the items identified in the assessment. Additional steps, such as sharing results with Internal Audits or using established procedures to take corrective action, are used as needed.

The CA Program was developed for department administrators who are responsible for financial planning, transaction review, and record keeping for sponsored projects. To become eligible to be appointed as a CA, individuals are required to pass a two-part exam, which tests their knowledge of UMN and sponsoring agency policies and procedures, as well as their ability to apply this knowledge to specific situations. CAs are appointed by the department head or dean of a specific college and report to an associate dean for research at the collegiate level. Each college must have in place a plan that describes a process for resolution of disagreements if problems occur between a principal investigator and a CA. Each CA is also monitored and supported by the OAR office. CA appointments are ongoing, provided continuing education requirements are met, satisfactory performance is demonstrated, and the organizational need continues to exist.

Responsible Conduct of Research
Another major component of the UMN research compliance program is education and training. A UMN Regents Policy was adopted that required all faculty to have completed Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) training before being allowed to spend money on their sponsored accounts. Attendance is tracked using a Peoplesoft database and Sponsored Projects Administration staff use web reports to help them determine whether faculty members have completed the training. If the education requirement has not been completed, the central sponsored projects office will not establish an account on the university's financial system.

A UMN Faculty Education Advisory (FEA) Committee provided vital input into the process of developing the RCR Program. This committee helped define the educational needs for the faculty, and developed the curriculum for the program. Members of this faculty committee offered valuable insights into how to effectively communicate this information to their peers. The RCR Program is divided into two parts. Part 1 focuses on ethics, with topics such as history and values relating to research scholarship, social responsibility and reporting misconduct, authorship, plagiarism and peer reviews, and research data management. These sessions are three hours in length, interactive, and conducted by faculty members. Part 2 focuses on the areas of conflict of interest, intellectual property, and fiscal management. A faculty member and an administrator with expertise in the specific area conduct these sessions.

Electronic Systems
In order to promote and oversee research compliance activity, UMN developed a number of electronic systems. The goals were to provide up-to-date and accurate information on grants activity in a central location that was available to the widest possible audience, and to discourage the use of separate shadow systems at the local level. Many specific financial reports for principal investigators (PI) and department administrators are now available on the Financial Reports web site.

An electronic routing and approval system, Financial FormsNirvana (FFN), was also developed. This system is used as the primary mechanism for approving financial transactions on sponsored accounts. FFN includes a feature that flags potential violations of OMB A-21 (i.e., costs that should not be charged to a sponsored account without a specific reason) and shows current balances prior to the approval of transactions. In addition, FFN transactions are posted to accounts quickly, making specific financial reports more accurate and timely.

The Electronic Grants Management System (EGM S), a web-based proposal form preparation system, allows Principal Investigators (PIs) or their administrators to prepare grant budgets online, using both the UMN financial system categories of cost, and the various sponsor categories. The central sponsored project administration staff uses this information to manage grants and contracts and to upload data to the financial system, once an award is made. Other research compliance databases related to grants management, such as conflict of interest (REPA), research subjects protection programs (IRB and IACUC), and responsible conduct of research program (RCR) are included in our electronic systems.

In order to make it easier for our faculty to know about and meet all their compliance requirements, we are developing the concept of eResearch Central (eRC). eRC will serve as an “index” or “entry point” into other systems. It will provide a launching point for faculty to initiate documents. It will also provide statuses for the documents that are already in process, such as award notices and IRB submissions. The goal of integrating our electronic grants management and compliance systems into one front end is to provide the tools for our researchers that will save time, reduce frustration, and ensure compliance standards are being met.

The development of these aspects of our research compliance program was a team effort, involving faculty, staff and administration. Senior faculty representatives led the grants initiative, and thereby helped engage other faculty in key areas of implementation, in particular defining the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved in the grants process, developing the education program.

Expansion to Institution-Wide Program
The UMN had demonstrated its commitment to the ongoing task of maintaining a compliant grants management program—developing electronic processes, enhancing and improving the education programs, reviewing and updating the roles and responsibilities document, and maintaining the currency of all policies and procedures. Then in September 2002, it took the next logical step and established an institution-wide compliance framework. The scope of the university’s compliance program now extends to all federal, state and local laws, rules, regulations, and university policies—essentially all “legal” compliance risks. A variety of factors contributed to the decision to adopt an institutional compliance program, including:

- federal expectations as illustrated in eleven Office of Inspector General Guidelines and in the United States Sentencing Guidelines for Organizations;
- an accelerating regulatory burden, both locally and nationally;
- rising standards of public accountability generally;
- lessons learned from our institutional history and our corrective action plans; and,
- the movement toward such programs in many other regulated industries.

7
Growing a Culture of Compliance at the University of Minnesota

The Office of Institutional Compliance provides independent oversight over operational compliance units, and promotes and facilitates compliance best practices. In setting up this position, the university balanced the need for integration across compliance “silos” with the need for independence of the compliance function. Accordingly, while the Director works closely with managers and other interested parties in the various compliance areas, the Director remains independent, reporting to the university’s President, and through a committee of university senior officers to the university’s Board of Regents Audit Committee.

The University of Minnesota’s Compliance Model

The university’s compliance program is founded upon well-established compliance governing principles. It is designed to be proactive, transparent, consultative, integrated, and risk (as opposed to “rule”) based. The program is built upon the model established in the United States Sentencing Guidelines for Organizations, as formed by industry and other models, and tailored to academia. These indicate the following nine elements for an effective compliance program:

1. Risk assessment;
2. Identification of responsible parties and roles;
3. Standards and procedures;
4. Program oversight;
5. Awareness, education, and training;
6. Lines of communication;
7. Monitoring and auditing;
8. Enforcement; and,

The Director of Institutional Compliance is responsible for promoting these nine elements across compliance units. In doing this he helps operational managers apply these nine elements as well as integrate area-specific compliance practices with an institution-wide program.

Implementing an Institutional Program:
The “nuts and bolts”

When we designed the implementation of the institutional compliance program we wanted to balance the need to respond to current issues with the need to pursue more fundamental programmatic and infrastructure developments. The result was two parallel tracks for implementation: (1) efforts to address current concerns, and (2) long-term compliance infrastructure/program development.

The first track focused on current compliance practices, improving communication, addressing emergent/current issues, making recommendations, and acting as a resource to evaluate and respond to various compliance initiatives. We formed “operating” compliance committees for “research,” “fiscal,” and “safety and security” compliance issues. These are populated largely by the operational managers within each category. Each committee identified current compliance issues/risks that cross operational governance lines, and, based upon these issues, identified specific actions the university should take to respond. The operational compliance committees also serve as a vehicle to brainstorm, share best practices, identify new issues, and otherwise facilitate communication across compliance areas.

In addition to operational compliance committees, the Institutional Compliance Office has pursued a variety of compliance initiatives as part of the “current impact” track. These have included a code of conduct video and promotion; compliance training materials for university managers, department heads, and other university leaders; topical compliance “alerts” to promote awareness of particular compliance issues; policy development and consultation; a university-wide training inventory; monitoring national and local compliance issues; responding to compliance questions and emerging issues; and, conducting investigations where appropriate.

The second track for an institutional compliance program focuses on long-term programmatic and infrastructure developments. As a starting place, we examined our operations and identified our primary compliance areas. For each risk area, we identified key responsible parties/contacts, and established a contact list and in some cases a workgroup. These networks serve a variety of important purposes. They form a consolidated resource to identify responsibilities for specific compliance issues. We also have created a network of interested parties identified by compliance risk area across our decentralized structure. This serves as a resource to share ideas, ask questions, identify compliance barriers, and communicate emergent issues as the compliance office or others identify them.

Through area-specific workshops, workgroups also engaged in a systematic inventory and assessment of their compliance risks. This resulted in an institution-wide compliance risk assessment, as well as an awareness and education program for the participants. This risk assessment forms a “risk-based” method to align compliance resources with compliance risk. Accordingly, starting with the “highest” identified risks, workgroups will proceed to evaluate and document or create the model elements for an effective program to ensure we have appropriately managed these risks, and flow down to less significant risks after addressing priorities. We have developed a detailed manual to guide workgroups through this process.

For the next stages, we are working to “institutionalize” responsibilities and reporting for the compliance program. This includes the establishment of a senior management compliance oversight committee, designated compliance partners in compliance risk areas, and creating a more formal compliance reporting structure.

Lessons Learned

For universities seeking to establish an institution-wide program, we offer the following suggestions:

• Involve all stakeholders in the process from the outset;
• Ensure you have buy-in from senior management, for example, meet with the “bosses” of those you want to serve on your compliance committees get support for the time commitment you need, then recruit members carefully;
• Find a way to “add value” for every initiative, committee, or workgroup you establish; try to give something back after each meeting;
• Engage the subject matter experts and responsible parties—they might not always be your management or directors, but will have the best sense of the compliance environment;
• Look for small successes along the way and share the credit;
• Create accountability for initiatives through written work plans, assignments from senior management, or other formal structures—do not rely solely upon volunteerism or your program will fizzle; and,
• Network with compliance peers in industry and other universities.

Winifred A. Schumacher is Assistant Vice President for Research and Thomas Schumacher is Director, Institutional Compliance, University of Minnesota.
What costs are permitted in the category of “Training-Related Expenses” on Kirschstein-NRSA institutional training grants (T32)? The NIH Grants Policy Statement (NIH GPS) offers some guidance. First, and foremost, the applicable cost principles apply. The NIH GPS offers further direction by identifying such costs as “staff salaries, consultant costs, equipment, research supplies, staff travel, and other expenses directly related to the training program.” Program announcements sometimes list other categories of costs such as computers and books. However, it is important to note that program announcements do not override cost principles. A faculty group at a university wanted more specific guidance and submitted the following questions to the NIH policy office. Both the questions and answers are printed below.

**Question 1.** Does A-21 apply to T32 grants in the same way it applies to research grants? If no, what parts are not applicable?

**NIH:** Yes. T32 program requirements concerning allowability of certain costs also apply.

**Question 2.** Can the salary and benefits for a small portion of the time an administrative assistant (AA) spends administering the training activities be charged to the grant?

**Example:** The Neurosciences training grant has six slots. Most of the training faculty are members of the Neuroscience Graduate Program. The University matches this support by funding admission of three additional Neuroscience students each year. Thus the training grant results in an additional 9 students per year for this program of around 90 total students. The Neuroscience Program employs a part-time administrative assistant (paid by the Graduate School) who is responsible for coordinating all recruiting, admission, registration, class scheduling, grade reporting, examinations, record keeping, and documentation of progress towards degree. Currently, this administrative assistant also now furnishes such services to the Training Grant supported students, including those activities that are strictly Training Grant related. Since 9 of the 90 students are a direct result of the T32 funding, is it allowable to charge 10% of the salary and benefits of the administrative assistant to the Trainee Related Expenses of the T32?

**NIH:** First as noted above the cost incurred on a training grant is subject to OMB Circular A-21. Specifically in order to direct charge administrative and clerical salaries the requirements of F.6.b.2 must be met. F.6.b.2. states that “…a project that requires an extensive amount of administrative or clerical support, which is significantly greater than the routine level of such services provided by academic departments.” Due to the extensive amount of administrative support (consistent with this requirement in OMB Circular A-21) needed for the conduct of a training program there is an inherent assumption that training programs should in most cases be able to document that sufficient administrative support is required to meet the standard of A-21. In addition, it is recognized that the NIH training grant provides support for only a portion of the trainees participating in the overall training program that is described in the NIH application and supported in NIH’s grant award.

The Trainee Related Expenses category is a very limited amount of money with many potential allowable uses. With the above premises in mind, this category can be used for staff salaries, in particular administrative support. What is also recognized, however, is that there may be constraints on what a grantee institution can reasonably charge to the grant because of the limited funding available in this budget category. So while an administrator may devote a significant commitment of time in support of the training program, it may be determined that only a fraction of the actual cost can be recovered as a charge to the grant.

We have asked for input from several HHS officials expert in the requirements of OMB Circular A-21. They take exception to the example of “Since 9 of the 90 students are a direct result of the T32 funding, is it allowable to charge 10% of the salary and benefits of the administrative assistant to the Trainee Related Expenses of the T32.” They find this process is not consistent with the requirements for documentation of payroll distribution. They recommend that effort be documented by the institutions activity reports consistent with the requirements of A-21.

Ultimately, it remains the challenge and responsibility of the grantee to determine what is the most reasonable use of these limited funds.

**Question 3.** Please clarify the policy regarding the purchase of books. Are the categories listed below an allowable charge to the training grant? Can these books become the personal property of the student and be taken with the student when he/she leaves the University?

- Textbooks required for coursework
- Specialty volumes that will enhance training
- Laboratory and technical manuals
- Professional journal subscriptions covering the period of the appointment

**NIH:** This is where A21 allowability and consistent treatment needs to be a factor. If such books are available through the library, then these would not be allowable. For a, b & c, I would say these would not be appropriate unless all students in the training program were reimbursed for this cost regardless of their source of support. If any such books are purchased with training grant funds, when appropriate I’d suggest that these not be allowed to become personal property rather than they be provided to all trainees in a departmental or program resource room.

Individual journal subscriptions are not allowed.

continued on next page
Allowable Costs on NIH Institutional Training Grants continued

Question 4. Under what circumstances can a student purchase a computer? Can the computer become the personal property of the student and be taken with the student when he/she leaves the institution?

NIH: When the nature of the science & training program requires it (special purpose equipment). For instance, epidemiology studies that require a lot of statistical data gathering and analysis, or field work. However if the primary use would be for routine daily activity (e.g., e-mail), then I’d say this is not an allowable direct cost since it would fall in the category of general purpose equipment. The grantee can determine disposition of equipment in accordance with administrative regulations (45 CFR Pt 74.30 -.34). Keep in mind, however, that some computers (e.g., laptops) might not actually meet the equipment threshold. In those cases, the regulations governing supplies (74.35) would apply.

Question 5. Are the meals, lodging, and airfare for invited speakers an allowable cost to the training grant? If the training grant pays for the speaker, can others be invited?

NIH: Yes, but only if covered as part of the cost of a consultant. It would be very rare for the training grant to cover the full cost of such a speaker—because this would be benefiting all students in a training program, not just the NRSA-supported. With this in mind, only a proportion of any such cost should be actually charged to the grant. And again, the reminder that this would be an allowable cost for the limited Trainee Related Expenses budget line item.

Marilyn Surbey is Associate Vice President for Finance and Research, Emory University.

Noteworthy!

Milestones

After 11 years of service at the University of Georgia, Cindy Case has accepted a new position and now serves as the Associate Director, Research and Graduate Studies at Kent State University in Ohio.

Gunta J. Liders is now the Associate Vice President for Research Administration for the University of Rochester.

Michael A. Mathisen formerly of University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas now serves as Controller at Baylor Research Institute.

Denise Clark has accepted a position at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute as the Director of Research Administration and Finance.

Twila Fisher Reighley has moved to Iowa and is serving as the Assistant Vice President for Research and Director, Sponsored Programs for the University of Iowa.

Sharon L. Kiser has retired from her position as Director of Sponsored Programs at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

Jill Frazier Tinker now serves as the Senior Director, Research Administration for University of Miami’s School of Medicine.

Kelly C. Downing has moved to the University of Pittsburgh and serves as the Clinical Grants & Contract Officer in the Office of Research.

Edwin "Bud" May has moved to Regis University and serves as the Director of Academic Grants.

Leadership Development Institute

The Leadership Development Institute (LDI) Class of 2004 gathered on June 24th at the Belmont Conference Center in Elkridge, Maryland for a two-day retreat. Although classmates since the beginning of the year, this was their first opportunity to meet face-to-face. LDI Facilitator, Gale Wood of Comet Consulting and Coaching, had the group work through several exercises and within 90 minutes, they sat down to dinner knowing each other and knowing they were in for a very special and meaningful two days.

Since February 2004, the class has met within the cyberspace walls of NCURA’s Leadership Development Institute’s classroom, over telephone conference calls and in a specially designed LDI chat room. When not chatting with each other or their NCURA advisor about various assignments, they are required to complete course material – approximately 3 hours per month.

“We did a mock meeting session where leaders (I was one) were coached as to the goals of the meeting and the members were coached about what kind of problems and objections to raise or support to offer. That was extremely illuminating, as I was forced to balance such a range of views and orientations and try to move the meeting forward. I wish I could practice like that more often. How many times have we had a meeting sunk by someone being unable to synthesize the range of issues into meaningful actions?”

Joseph M. Nicholas
University of Redlands
When students entered the classroom in February, the course syllabus was already posted and they were given their first assignment. After posting their homework, they began the Kouzes & Posner Leadership Challenge.

Prior to their two-day retreat each student went on-line and took the Myers Briggs Trait Indicator (MBTI). The MBTI, administered by Gale, who is MBTI certified, was used throughout the retreat and the group learned that knowing how to manage yourself is an important tool in leadership and in management. Gale and the class also explored how the MBTI works with problem solving, group dynamics, teamwork, change management and feedback through a number of exercises over the course of the two days. Adding to the mix, several “senior” NCURA-types were on hand to assist. Past President, John Case of The Cleveland Clinic Foundation; NCURA Executive Director, Kathleen Larmett; Chair of NCURA’s N&LDC, Peggy Lowry of Oregon State University; and NCURA Board Chair of the 2004 LDI, Cindy White of Washington University in St. Louis came armed with their own MBTI analysis and were each assigned to work with one of four student groups.

In addition, Larmett moderated two panels where Case, Lowry and White responded to questions about their own leadership paths and how to become more involved in the numerous opportunities NCURA offers. Case noted, “After attending the recent LDI retreat, it is evident NCURA continues to provide quality professional development for research administrators. This leadership program surpassed my expectations and the quality of the students is remarkable.”

On the last day of the leadership retreat, the class was given the assignment of taking on the leadership role in a project at their institution. Their supervisor will be advised of this project and will be asked for feedback at its completion.

The class of 2004 will continue to meet virtually until their last half-day workshop during the Annual Meeting. After their workshop, they will meet with both regional and national leaders, will be presented with certificates of achievement at the Monday Plenary Session and will have the opportunity to meet with their colleagues from the Class of 2003.

Members of both classes will be available to answer questions during the Annual Meeting not only at the LDI exhibit booth but also at the LDI reception on Tuesday evening. When asked about her LDI experience, Lisa Gentry Laatsch of the University of Arizona, replied, “I truly believe that I learned more from our LDI retreat than I have at any other conference or retreat that I have previously attended. …I will continuously use the information I gleaned from the LDI retreat in both my professional and volunteer careers.” Louise Rosenbaum of Dartmouth said, “LDI takes my experience with research administration to a new level. I feel like I’ve taken enormous leaps in understanding NCURA and the value of participating in the organization. As well, I’ve been able to apply some of the lessons in communications quickly, to interactions with colleagues, friends, and the research community. I feel energized and educated about advancing new projects.”

Members of the 2004 Class and their NCURA Advisors are: Robert Andersen, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Norm Hbert, Brown University, Advisor; Tricia Callahan, Western Kentucky University; Tom Wilson, University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, Advisor; Jennifer Crocket, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Pam Whitlock, University of North Carolina at Wilmington, Advisor; Mary Beth Curtin, State University of New York at Binghamton; Judy Fredenburg, University of Montana, Advisor; Nancy Daneau, California Institute of Technology; Deborah Vetter, University of Nebraska Medical Center, Advisor; Kallie Firestone, Vanderbilt University; Barbara Cole, Boston University, Advisor; Tamara Hill, University of Cincinnati; Cheryl-Lee Howard, The Johns Hopkins University, Advisor; Lorraine Horgan, The Dublin Institute of Technology; John Carfora, Boston College, Advisor; Elizabeth Kennedy, The Dublin Institute of Technology; Garrett Sanders, The Ordway Research Institute, Advisor; Lisa Gentry Laatsch, University of Arizona; Scott Gudger, Oregon Health & Science University, Advisor; Joseph McNicholas, University of Redlands; David Richardson, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Advisor; Anne Pancucci, Rhode Island College; Sally Tremaine, Yale University, Advisor; Louise Rosenbaum, Dartmouth College; Carole Zuech, University of Washington, Advisor; Jaynee Tolle, University of Cincinnati; Allen Soltow, University of Tulsa, Advisor.

“My expectations and motivations were exceeded and the sincerity with which current NCURA leaders invested themselves and shared experiences was integral to establishing a sense of trust and camaraderie amongst the group as a whole....overall, exceeded my expectations and motivated me to want very much to give more to my institution and to the NCURA community of research administrators.”

Nancy Daneau, California Institute of Technology
I hope everyone is enjoying their summer so far. The Region has wrapped up its 2004 Spring meeting, which I might add was a huge success. Congratulations and thanks to all those who worked hard and dedicated their time to make the meeting such a huge success. Great job!

Plans for the 2005 Spring meeting are already under way. We will be returning to Mystic, Connecticut for the 2005 Spring meeting, the dates are scheduled for May 15 – May 18. We are currently in negotiation with the Mystic Hilton which will be the host hotel for the meeting. So please mark your calendars. More details will be provided later Fall.

Another important event to mark on your calendar is the upcoming NCURA Annual Meeting. The dates of the meeting are October 31 – November 3, 2004. An electronic copy of the preliminary program has been sent out and looks very exciting. This will be an exciting time in Washington with the Presidential election as well. So start making your plans to attend now. Also, on Tuesday night at this year’s meeting, the Region will be participating in an event titled “Main Street USA”. We will be creating a Regional Booth that will be representative of the spirit and character of Region I. If you would like to volunteer to participate in this event, please let me know.

The dates for the upcoming RADG meetings have been set. The dates are October 19 and December 15, 2004 and February 10, April 5 and June 14, 2005. All meetings are scheduled to be held at the John Hancock Conference Center. We are looking forward to another year of informative and interesting sessions. I hope to see you all there.

Finally, please keep your eyes open for nomination information regarding the position of Region I Secretary. Norm Hebert, Chair of the Region I Nominating Committee will be sending out a call for nominations very shortly. The election will be held in early Fall with the incoming Secretary taking office on January 1, 2005. This is an opportunity to become involved in the organization and serve in a regional leadership position. The job description can be found on the Region I website.

Enjoy the rest of your summer, and we’ll see you in October.

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

Region II
Mid-Atlantic

I’m very happy to report that the spring meeting in Baltimore was very successful. More than 170 took in the offerings put together by the ‘04 Program Committee led by Mary Beth Curtin. The Inner Harbor dinner cruise was enjoyed by almost 100 attendees who crowded the dance floor shortly after the boat left the dock.

Planning for the 2005 spring meeting is already underway. The dates are April 17-19 and the venue will be the Crowne Plaza Philadelphia Center City Hotel (http://cphphladelphia-centercity.felcor.com). It’s not too late to send your suggestions for tracks, topics, or sessions to Jennifer Baron (jlb@jhu.edu) who is chairing the ‘05 Program Committee.

If you are at one of our Philadelphia members and are interested in helping with local arrangements for the ‘05 meeting, please contact me (kaars@research.buffalo.edu). The Local Arrangements Committee plans our Monday night event, provides liaison with the host hotel, and supports the meeting A/V needs. If you can help in one or more of these areas, we need you.

Planning for the 2006 spring meeting will begin toward the end of the summer (late August in the northern reaches of Region II) with the appointment of a Site Selection Committee. The ‘03-‘05 meetings will have been held in urban centers. It may be time for a meeting in a more bucolic setting. If you would like to help select the site for the ‘06 Region II meeting, or if you would like to contribute suggestions of sites worthy of consideration, please contact me asap (kaars@research.buffalo.edu).

We also need help planning what will be one of the highlights of the Annual Meeting in November on Tuesday night when the Exhibitor’s Hall will become “Main Street USA” complete with hot dog and popcorn carts, Iowa style bingo, strolling clowns and a pie eating contest. Each Region has been asked to set up a booth to capture the spirit and character of its region. Tammy Custer has agreed to lead the group developing the Region II booth. Want to help? If so, contact Tammy (tjb3@cornell.edu)

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, later this summer we will hold elections for Chair Elect, Treasurer and member of the NCURA Board of Directors. If you are interested in running for one of these offices, or if you would like to nominate a colleague, please contact Bob De Martin (demartro@shu.edu). The responsibilities of these offices can be found in the Region II by-laws (http://www.ncura.edu/data/committees/docs/RevisedBYLAWS.pdf). Charlie Kaars is Chair of Region II and serves as the Assistant Vice President for Sponsored Programs Administration, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Region III
Southeast

Region III started off our summer with a wonderful week at Wild Dunes Resort on the Isle of Palms, South Carolina with a record attendance of over 200 attendees. Many thanks go to Patrick Green from Vanderbilt University and the Program Committee for arranging an informative and fun and sun-drenched conference. Special thanks to Barbara Gray from the College of Charleston for making the local arrangements.

These Region III individuals received the following accolades:

**Senior Professional Service Award** - Phillip E. Meyers, Western Kentucky University

**Senior Professional Service Award** - Pamela B. Whitlock, University of North Carolina at Wilmington

**Travel Award** - Debra Benoit, Nichols State University

**New officers were elected:**

- **Chair** - Patrick Green, Vanderbilt University
- **Chair-Elect** - David Richardson, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
- **Secretary-Treasurer** - Marc Aurel (Mo)
Greetings Region IV'ers,

It's time to fire up your Palm Pilot, open up your day planner, or put a string around your finger- whatever it takes to remind yourself about Region IV's 2005 Spring Meeting:

**REGION IV**

**Mid-America**

**Dates:** May 1-4, 2005  
**City:** Chicago, Illinois  
**Hotel:** Chicago City Centre Holiday Inn

The newly-remodeled hotel should provide a wonderful setting for the meeting, located in downtown Chicago two blocks from Michigan Avenue's "Magnificent Mile" of stores, restaurants, and recreation. Three blocks away is the Navy Pier on Lake Michigan, one of Chicago's most popular family tourist attractions. Also nearby is the John Hancock Observatory, the Sears Tower, the Theater District, and the Chicago Contemporary Museum of Art. Region IV Chair-Elect Heather Mills Offhaus and the Program Committee are working hard to put together a bang-up program. This will be a joint meeting with the Society of Midwest Administrators Midwest Section, so there should be an abundance of workshops, concurrent sessions, and roundtable discussions covering topics of interest to everyone. Look for more details in the coming months in the Region IV Newsletter and on the Region IV website at http://graduate.siu.edu/ncura4/.

Speaking of the Region IV website, have you visited it lately? Jerry Pogatshnik and his web team are doing a great job of keeping up with everything Region IV: M ember news and events, meeting minutes, a calendar of events, meeting information, the Region IV newsletter archive, and the Region IV listserv archive. Currently the site includes a feature on Loyola University's Kristin Wojtulewicz, named as the N CURA Region IV Kevin Reed Outstanding Professional Award for 2004. The site also has a photo slide show of the Region IV Spring Meeting in Indianapolis (including the award presentation to Kristin). Relive memories of April or see what you missed at http://graduate.siu.edu/ncura4/. And be sure to check out the other useful resources the Region IV website has to offer.

Bill Sharp is a Compliance Manager/ Contracts Officer at the University of Kansas.

**REGION V**

**Southwestern**

Many thanks to those of you within Region V that made our regional meeting in Galveston, Texas such a success! Comments provided through the evaluation process, follow up e-mails and face-to-face contacts have been absolutely wonderful. We especially enjoyed seeing new faces filled with enthusiasm and a willingness to participate. For those who presented at the meeting, evaluations will be forwarded to you shortly.

For those members unable to attend the regional meeting, I am pleased to announce the outcome of our recent elections:

**V ice Chair/Chair Elect:** Govind Narasimhan, UT Medical Branch at Galveston  
**Treasurer:** Scott Erwin, Texas State University  
**Regional Executive Committee Members-at-Large:** Alicia Brossette, Southern Methodist University  
Gary Carter, Baylor University

In addition, Myrta Stager, UT Medical Branch at Galveston, has graciously agreed to serve as the Region V member of the National Board of Directors, a position made vacant when Marianne Rinaldo Woods accepted another position outside of our region. M arianne, a recipient of the Region IV Distinguished Service Award, will be greatly missed as a mentor, educator and a friend. However, we will still benefit from her knowledge through her participation in N CURA at a national level.

Looking forward to the national meeting in November, we will be forming a new committee to coordinate our region's participation in N CURA's new "party" activity, "Mainstreet USA." The charge of this committee will be to choose a theme and create a booth (and activity) that best represents our region. For all those fun and creative folks out there, this should hardly be a challenge. Please contact me at debbie-newton@utulsa.edu if you are interested in participating. More information will be made available on our website shortly. Until then, don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Looking even further ahead to our next spring meeting, we will be in Tulsa, OK. Due to a recent change in hotel ownership, we will be staying at the Crowne Plaza (formerly the Adams Mark). The dates for the meeting are April 10-13, 2005, so mark your calendars! If you are interested in presenting or volunteering to assist, please contact Govind Narasimhan at gonorasi@utmb.edu.

As the new Chair of our region, I'd like to thank Judy Cook for her service as our Chair for the past year. If you have any questions, suggestions or comments concerning our region, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Debbie Newton is the Chair of Region V and serves as the Associate Director, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs for The University of Tulsa.

**REGION VI**

**Western**

The joint Region VI/VII Spring Meeting was a great success - 300 attendees found their way to San Francisco. Amazing! We've paid all of our bills for the meeting and I think it's safe to say that we came out ahead. We're still finalizing our "receivables," and I should have final numbers by the time you read this. I'd like to take this opportunity to thank all of those who worked hard to make the meeting so successful. In particular, I'd like to give special thanks to: Cindy Lopez (CSUM B) for managing the registration, and all that that entails; Dan Nordquist and M one Sutton (WSU) for invaluable assistance with the electronic registration site; Georgette Sakumoto (UoH) for organizing the volunteers (and for volunteering so much of her own time); Steve Shapiro (UoO) for coordinating the data projectors loaned to us by the IT folks; Denise Wallen (UM M) for heading up the committee that gave us such a strong program; and, of course, the staff of the
The recent solicitation for the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Director’s Pioneer Awards, which invited some 250 researchers from around the country to apply, marked the first NIH grant application process to mandate use of Grants.gov. Invitations were sent to applicants in May, with a deadline of June 21, 2004. Beginning on June 17, e-mail discussion groups began to buzz with reports of submission problems. An informal survey of some applicants from major research institutions revealed that, by the deadline, all had managed to submit their applications, but not without many calls to several help desks and sharing among themselves various tricks and tips to get the process to work.

Apparently in response to administrative mandates to embrace totally electronic grant application submission, the process to apply for the Pioneer Awards involved the use of the Standard Form 424, rather than the NIH standard PHS 398. This led to some confusion, including establishing the identification of principal investigators vs. institutions on the form, which led to the need to submit multiple corrected versions of the application. There was no clear avenue to submit test applications, although upon request NIH provided instructions on how to do so.

By Friday, June 18, institutional officials attempting to submit applications were encountering multiple errors, including an inability to open completed forms. Some applicants were told that Grants.gov was experiencing “server problems” and that they should continue to try to submit.

At the end of the day, all applications submitted by the e-mail list participants, who reported on their experiences, were successfully submitted. While there were some Help Desk gaffs (e.g., asking for passwords), in all cases the Help personnel were reported to be easy to deal with and, well, helpful. Federal officials who were contacted were responsive, worked through the weekend, and served as valuable information conduits to applicants. There were valuable lessons learned all round, including the need for applicant institutions to prepare themselves for last minute problem solving and creativity as we progress through this latest chapter in the evolution of electronic research administration. It is also evident that institutions need to look at their own systems to ensure that they will be able to respond to shifting requirements as we continue to develop electronic grant proposal submission.

Tom Drinane serves as Information Systems Analyst in the Office of Sponsored Programs at Dartmouth College and is Chair of the eRA Neighborhood Committee.

The FRA Neighborhood is still busy at work reviewing the Library in an effort to build upon the information included there. Part of this review includes consideration of new topics to be added. Subrecipient Monitoring is a new topic that was added recently. If your university has a good policy or information source available on the web for this topic, we would love to add it. Please forward it to pelusok@pobox.upenn.edu. Suggestions from all NCURA members for new topics or other improvements to the site are very welcome and can be forwarded as well.

On May 10, 2004, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) published a notice in the Federal Register announcing the final revisions to the cost principles in Circulars A-21, A-87 and A-122. These cost principles are effective June 9, 2004 and can be viewed at http://www.whitehouse.gov/FR_0410350.pdf.

If you haven’t had the opportunity to look at the May issue of On Campus, you can reach it via the FRA Neighborhood homepage. John Bain, Associate Director for Cost Analysis and Compliance at Harvard University was interviewed and discussed a variety of topics including effective communication methods, departmental administrators impact on the F&A rate and some of the largest issues facing research administration today.
FRA VI Announced

The dates for the FRA VI conference have been announced! The conference will be held February 20-22, 2005 at the beautiful Contemporary Resort in Disney World in Orlando, FL. Please keep those dates reserved for what looks to be another great opportunity for financial research administrators to expand their knowledge, skills and network of colleagues. Pam Whitlock, Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington is Chair of the 2005 Program Committee. Stay tuned to the NCURA website for more information on this excellent conference!

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

Kerry Peluso is the Director of Post Award Financial Administration at the University of Pennsylvania and is Chair of the FRA Neighborhood Committee.

An Excerpt from On Campus with John Bain

May 2004

What are the key components of the calculation that you feel deserve the most attention?

John Bain: Actually, the calculations are rather mechanical, assisted by software applications and good technical support staff. While all components must be calculated correctly, what matters most after that is what happens at the negotiating table. There you must employ strategic thinking, reasoning and communication spontaneously, as not much can be scripted ahead of time. The success of your negotiation is heavily influenced by the business relationship you have with your cognizant agency staff. Thus I urge all to develop and maintain good working relationships with your region's DCA/DCAA and have periodic, positive communications with them.

COMPLIANCE Neighborhood

In order to learn how to better serve its fellow members, NCURA's Compliance Neighborhood Committee developed an online survey that members were encouraged to complete in June. The Committee will use the results from the survey to identify the needs of members and will work to find ways to make the Compliance Neighborhood more useful. If you did not have a chance to complete the survey, please contact one of the Committee members with your thoughts and suggestions for improving the Neighborhood (e.g., what kind of resources would be helpful to you, what topics you would like to see addressed either online or in the newsletter?). The Committee encourages members to participate in the Neighborhood, so please stop by and register for the listserv at http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/compliancetownhall.asp.

Federal Update

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) has launched a new website at www.hhs.gov/ohrp. In addition, the Office has established a new toll-free number, 866-447-4777.

HHS has issued new guidance on financial interests and relationships in research involving human subjects. The guidance offers recommendations for managing potential financial conflicts of interest including establishment of conflict of interest committees, using an independent organization to administer an institution's financial interest, and assessing the kind of information provided to subjects regarding funding and financial interests. An announcement of the new guidance and a link to the complete text may be found online at http://www.hhs.gov/news/press/2004pres/20040512.html.

New Publications

Staying with HHS, the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) has released a revised version of Introduction to the Responsible Conduct of Research. The booklet provides an overview of compliance issues such as human subjects research, conflicts of interest, research misconduct, and use of animals in research. Copies may be purchased from the Government Printing Office at http://bookstore.gpo.gov. The booklet also will be posted on the ORI website later this year.

NCURA and Atlantic Information Services (AIS) have launched a new publication, Report on Research Compliance. This publication includes weekly e-news and instant e-alerts when especially compelling news events take place. For more information visit http://www.reportonresearchcompliance.com/

Upcoming Compliance Events

September 14, 2004
IACUC 101 Workshop
Irvine, CA

September 19-23, 2004
Association of College and University Auditors (ACUA) Annual Conference
Arlington, VA
http://www.acua.org/annual/conf_info.cfm

September 23, 2004
NCURA
Online Education Program (OEP)
Effort Reporting: In Principle and In Practice
http://www.ncura.edu/meetings/oep/

November 10-12, 2004
University Research, Technology Transfer, and Intellectual Property
Pentagon City, VA
NACUA
http://www.nacua.org/meetings/cleworkshops.asp

November 12-14, 2004
2004 ORI Research Conference on Research Integrity
Paradise Point Resort, San Diego, CA
http://ethicsconference.ucsd.edu/

Carol Pech serves as Special Assistant to the Associate Dean for Research at The Johns Hopkins University and is a member of the Compliance Neighborhood Committee.

continued on next page.
Obviously, the best way to stay on top of your post award accounting is to review and reconcile all accounts each month. Unfortunately, many of us with combined pre- and post-award responsibilities have not been able to get a handle on this system due to the large volume of PI’s and accounts, and the tremendous demands on time that come from the pre-award deadlines.

Here are some TIPS to approach MONTHLY ACCOUNT REVIEW to make sure you tackle the big problems first:

- **STOP THE BLEEDING** with a monthly review of deficit accounts. Work on a few each month until you have tackled them all. Review accounts with current charges. If salaries are being charged, this needs to be reviewed as the effort may be incorrect or perhaps the salary was never moved to the next grant year. Also, purchase orders may need to be changed or cancelled (i.e. for gases, animal housing charges, storage, etc). Some deficits may be simple cases of invoices that need to be sent, or, carry forwards that are not yet posted to the new year, etc. Correct the easy ones and get them off the books, and then spend time on the problem issues. Some folks might argue to get the oldest invoices off the books first. However, there may be some legitimate cost transfers to be done on the more recent ones, and if attended to promptly can still be carried out before accounts close.

- **MONTHLY REVIEWS** of accounts with budget periods that have already ended is important. Make sure no more salary is hitting, and if it is, be sure to transfer it immediately to the new source of funding.

- **SET UP A GRID** with all account numbers and the months of the year. Each time you work on an account for any reason, check it off on the grid. Each month, look at some accounts that have not been reviewed in the past 6 months.

- **KEEP EFFORT SPREAD SHEETS** on all personnel which total the effort by source each month. Project these out for one year. You will begin to see holes in funding coming up in future months and can proactively work with the PI’s to figure out how to cover the funding before you reach a crisis point.

- **MEET WITH YOUR PIs** at least once a quarter to review their grant portfolios including deficit accounts, current status of ongoing grants, etc. It is important to have one-on-one contact with them. Review reports with them and make sure they understand what is on the reports and that they are reviewing them for accuracy as well. Only the PI truly knows what belongs on their grants.

- **ALL OF THE ABOVE** may sound simple and straightforward, but often finding the time to do it can be difficult. Block some time on your calendar to work on these items. If you block out a couple of afternoons or mornings each week to work on these post award issues, keep in mind this should be time spent uninterrupted. (Note: This should be above and beyond the daily post award transactional time spent) Allow for three days each week to address these issues and you will make a lot of progress. Also keep pre-award deadlines in mind when blocking time, so that you are not always giving up the “blocked time” to do something else. If you must work on an application, reschedule your post-award time for another day.

Good luck!

Susan Cassidy is Director, Research Finance Radiology Research at Brigham and Women’s Hospital in Boston, Massachusetts and serves on the Departmental Administration Neighborhood Committee.

**PUI** (Predominantly Undergraduate Institution)

In April 2004, the PUI Neighborhood Committee established the Monthly Discussion Forum for the PUI listserv. The forum was launched to “stimulate communication and exchange of ideas between PUI members of NCURA.”

After a modest beginning, the listserv began to generate many thought-provoking queries and reflections that led to strong and positive dialogue on PUI-related issues and activities. One such discussion dealt with F&A issues at PUIs and the challenges they face in the recovery and distribution of F&A costs. Sharing this type of information and learning best practices at other institutions generated a positive experience for all participants.
PRE-AWARD Neighborhood

The Pre-Award Neighborhood (PAN) invites all NCURA members who have an interest in pre-award issues to join the PAN listserv. It is our goal to provide members with current information and a forum for discussions of pre-award issues. We hope that the listserv will become a tool that people utilize regularly. We need your input. Please let us know what topics you are interested in so that we can bring you the information.

To join the listserv, simply login to the Neighborhood site on the NCURA website, click on the Pre-Award Neighborhood, then click on Town Hall. The first link on the PAN Town Hall page will allow you to sign up for the listserv.

Recent topics on the listserv have included:
The recent Call for Ideas for the Grand Challenges in Global Health by the Foundation for National Institutes of Health (www.fnih.org) has raised questions for university research administrators who believed that NIH was deviating from their own regulations. The Foundation for NIH is a separate entity from NIH that was established by the United States Congress to support the mission of the National Institutes of Health (NIH): improving health through scientific discovery. The Foundation for NIH identifies and develops opportunities for innovative public-private partnerships involving industry, academia, and the philanthropic community. As a nonprofit, 501(c)(3) corporation, the Foundation raises private-sector funds for a broad portfolio of unique programs that complement and enhance NIH priorities and activities and, in fact, provides research funds to some Institutes/Centers at NIH. It is similar to local Veteran Administration Foundations that solicit and provide grants.

NIH has a new program entitled NIH Director’s Pioneer Award. The URL for more information is http://nihroadmap.nih.gov/highrisk/initiatives/pioneer/. Although 2004 nominations were closed on April 1st, it is still good to keep in mind for future funding possibilities.

NIH eRA Virtual School
Did you know that NIH has an eRA virtual school? For those of us in the grantee community, visit http://era.nih.gov/virtualsehool/ and click on the right door marked “Enter Grantees.”

The FSR module gives you a good understanding as to what will be provided in the Commons and IAR interactive tutorials that will be posted in the upcoming year.

Creating Accounts within NIH Commons
Did you know that experienced investigators might already have a profile with the NIH Commons? It is important to distinguish the difference between a profile and a commons account. A PI profile might exist due to the investigator’s involvement with IAR or prior submissions (i.e. awards). A commons account is simply the means necessary to gain access to the NIH Commons system. As you can imagine, it is important to link these two items together. NIH has a data quality group who does link the profiles with the commons accounts BUT you can do this yourself which speeds up the account creation process.

Directions for Linking Profiles with Commons Account
• Login to NIH Commons and Navigate: Go to Administration > Accounts > Maintain Accounts
• Conduct a Search by selecting: Role = PI; Status = Not Affiliated (click on search)
• Search Results: Results list search for Action=Create Account; Click on the Investigator’s link to Create Account
• Fill out modified version of “create account” to associate the PI profile with this new account.

Duplicate Entries within the NIH Commons
We’ve noticed that there have been a number of recent duplications for Investigators within the Commons. Sometimes it was that we created accounts for the Investigators versus linking the profile with the accounts as mentioned above. But, we have also noticed a couple of duplicate profiles (i.e., one is for IAR while the other is for the Investigator’s awards). The helpdesk requested a listing from us to modify our accounts. You may want to check with the helpdesk if you are experiencing similar problems.

Sponsored Project Manuals
Recently we’ve been having a dialogue concerning sponsored projects manuals. A PAN member wrote that her university was trying to develop a user-friendly, helpful on-line manual for faculty and staff and wondered if we had any examples. Since then many PAN members have responded with URL’s and comments about how helpful these sites have been.

In addition to the listserv, PAN has set forth a goal to review material in the Library and to increase the information available in PAN. Any and all suggestions are welcome!

Be sure to look for PAN representatives at the Volunteer Opportunities Booth at the National Meeting in November!

Michelle Clark serves as Training Program Manager at Georgia Institute of Technology and Holly Benze is Research Projects Administrator at The Johns Hopkins University. Michelle and Holly are members of the Pre-Award Neighborhood Committee.
THE KEY TO DEFUSING POWER STRUGGLES AMONG EMPLOYEES OR BETWEEN ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS IS

1) RECOGNIZING THAT THE POWER STRUGGLE IS OCCURRING, AND 2) ENSURING EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION.

POWER IN RELATIONSHIPS IS SELDOM EQUAL. When differing perceptions, actions, wants, or needs occur individuals will frequently use their power in an attempt to obtain their goals. When this involves more than one person and differing goals, conflict is inevitable. This conflict frequently produces a struggle for power over the issues instead of producing communication that resolves the issues. Effective communication very early in any professional process can usually prevent or resolve conflict. Once the conflict has developed to the point of a power struggle, one approach to defusing power struggles is to recognize that a power struggle is occurring and to use effective communication strategies in an attempt to defuse the struggle and, ultimately, to resolve the conflict.

In this article I will describe four common forms that power struggles take with examples to help recognize them. Then I will describe some communication strategies for defusing the struggle and making progress in resolving the underlying conflict. This is not a comprehensive characterization of power struggles and communication; but, is instead, aimed to cover as broad a range of useful understandings and strategies as possible in a short space.

FOUR FORMS OF POWER STRUGGLES. The examples of power struggles below describe cases in which both sides are engaged at the same time in the same type of power struggle. Alternatively, sometimes a power struggle is one-sided and sometimes each side might be engaging the struggle in different ways. Finally, more than one form of power struggle may be seen in the same conflict.

It is important to note that each of the kinds of actions described below are sometimes necessary; they are not necessarily wrong or bad. Even when they are the thing that must be done, they can produce conflict and power struggles. It is critical to acknowledge that fact, recognize what is happening, and then work to resolve the power struggle that has resulted.

1 Unilateral Decision-making/Action. This usually takes the form of one person or group making a decision and/or taking an action without consulting or communicating with other interested parties impacted by the decision and/or action. For example, a new grant & contract administrator comes on the job. Without warning and with neither exception nor flexibility, she/he requires a lot more detail for all reporting and is more a stickler for rules than the previous administrator. Some form of unilateral behavior is often the seed from which conflict and power struggles develop. Each of the following kinds of power struggles are likely to be seen after such a decision is made or action is taken.

Power Assertion. This usually takes the form of one or more individuals attempting to exercise authority over one or more others in an interaction. In the example above, physician investigators are unexpectedly faced with new requirements from the sponsored projects office. The physician investigator on the receiving end of this action is upset and says she/he and her/his staff do not have time to do this extra work and therefore will not do it. The administrator refuses to discuss or negotiate this issue and continues to insist they must comply. Each is asserting their power in this struggle between administrator and investigator.

Power Resistance. This usually takes the form of entrenchment by which the individual(s) typically refuse to acknowledge or adopt the guidelines, procedures, behaviors, methods, or other requirements that have been provided. For example, the investigator in the previous example might have responded slightly differently. The investigator could have refused to acknowledge the new requirements, completely ignoring the guidelines and procedures, and continuing to do things as they had been done previously.

One-upmanship. This usually takes the form of one person finding a way to make one or more other person look or feel less competent, important, meaningful, or less on some other professional or personal attribute. This is often a by-product of a well-intentioned action. For example, either the investigator or the administrator in the above example might arrange for the other person’s boss to tell them they are wrong and must change. Sometimes, for example, in meetings with common peers from whom the word will get out, one of them lists all the ways in which the other is wrong or incompetent. In either case, the result is likely to be the same – one party feels slighted and is likely to continue the power struggle.
One or more forms of power struggle may have been necessary and/or may be expressed purposefully. This can make the power struggle easier for the individuals involved to recognize. However, as soon as one or more of those involved start having strong feelings in response to the struggle, then one or more of the kinds of struggle may be expressed out of anger or fear and not necessarily on purpose. This can make it harder for the individuals involved to recognize a power struggle is occurring.

The forms listed above provide a powerful tool for an individual to use to recognize when a power struggle is happening. That is the cue to realizing that ineffective communication is occurring. Ineffective communication produces barriers that nurture conflict development and continue power struggles. The way to break down barriers and move forward productively is to ensure effective communication.

ENSURING EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION. Encouraging effective communication happens in two general ways. One way to encourage effective communication is to reduce or eliminate specific kinds of ineffective communication. The other way to encourage effective communication is to develop and/or use one or more effective communication strategies.

REDUCING INEFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION. There are many ineffective communication techniques. As an example, I have to learn to recognize it in myself. Then, I can replace ineffective communication techniques with effective strategies. Listed below are some of the major ineffective communication strategies that we can identify and change in ourselves. Please note that there is overlap among them. It is not as important to identify the “right kind” of ineffective communication within myself as it is important to identify “any kind” of ineffective communication within myself.

- Body language that negates or distances those involved in the power struggle.
- Verbal language that negates or distances those involved in the power struggle.
- Coercion by ordering, threatening, moralizing, excessive questioning, or advising.
- Manipulation by invoking professional, social, cultural, or other forms of difference or relationship history.
- Defensiveness by refusing, denying, not understanding, or not accepting another’s value or one’s own responsibility.
- Escalation of the situation by feeding the emotion instead timing out or stepping back.
- Patronizing to create distance by diverting the topic, only allowing logical argument, only reassuring the other instead of examining the issues, or other.
- Inconsistent or inaccurate messages by using perceptual biases, wrong assumptions, poor information sources, or other.
- Imposing a point of view through criticizing, name-calling, diagnosing, problem-solving, authoritarian assertion, or other.

DEVELOPING AND/OR USING EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES. Sometimes only one person in the struggle recognizes the conflict. There are some effective communication strategies that can help when that situation occurs. These are:

- Active listening by focusing completely on what the other says & feels. I should listen intently to what the other person says - no interruption, no correction, no making sure my point gets through, no agenda for me.... I should listen and hear every thing this other person says.
- Anger management by talking about “angry issues” without expressing feelings. Instead of losing my temper or, possibly, blowing up, I should talk about the issues over which I am angry.
- Apology by acknowledging my own mistake. If I can identify a mistake I have made, then no matter how difficult, it is imperative that I acknowledge and apologize for it as soon as possible in order to try to get communication back on track as soon as possible.
- Community building by seeking out effective communication with others.
- Constructive feedback by identifying the issues at hand and/or the communication difficulties occurring.
- Forgiveness by letting go of perceived wrongdoing. Yes, sometimes it is I who must bend by actively forgiving whatever I may have experienced, even if the person on the other end of the power struggle has not recognized or acknowledged anything for which to be forgiven.
- I-You Statements in which it is better to make “I” statements because they reflect my view; whereas “You” statements are sometimes perceived as an accusation.
It is important to keep these strategies in mind at all times in all forms of communication, even when others are aware of the struggle and are also working to resolve it.

Sometimes one or more people on each side of a conflict recognize what is happening. This provides the opportunity to use additional strategies. It is both acceptable and desirable to employ multiple strategies simultaneously to resolve a power struggle. Some effective communication strategies that can help when that situation occurs are:

- **Brainstorming** in which solution ideas are generated with the explicit agreement that there be no critiquing or evaluating the ideas during the brainstorming phase.
- **Caucusing** during which a mediator works privately and separately with the participants to the power struggle, going back and forth to find means of resolution.
- **Conflict assessment** to develop a rational analysis of the conflict underlying the power struggle.
- **Consensus decision-making** during which all parties are willing to give and take on goals, wants, actions until a conflict resolving agreement acceptable to everyone is developed.
- **Cooling-off periods** are useful in heated discussions where taking breaks can allow emotions in response to the power struggle to subside.
- **De-escalation** often refers to conscious and explicit efforts to reduce the intensity generated by the power struggle by acknowledging and discussing among all parties both the intensity and the need for reduction.
- **Dialogue** is active engagement in discussion to learn each others’ beliefs, assumptions, views, etc., which may be underlying the conflict.
- **Distributive bargaining** where everyone engaged in a struggle over a well-defined process, procedure, activity, object, functionality, etc. agrees to “divide up the pie” and negotiates the “size of the pieces.”
- **Integrative bargaining** where the parties in the struggle “make more of the pie” by identifying elements that everyone can give up.
- **Empowerment** by determining how to give equal power to everyone involved in the power struggle; this is often done by engaging all parties equally in the problem definition and/or problem solving process.
- **Face-saving** through which everyone involved actively develops together the opportunity for all to “look good” in the outcome of a power struggle.
- **Framing/Reframing** during which everyone involved, together defines or redefines important issues or the way the issue is seen.
- **Ground rules** which are developed and agreed upon by all parties in the power struggle.
- **Joint fact-finding** by which everyone involved in the power struggle works together to clarify disputed facts or issues.
- **Ombudsman** which is an independent third party empowered to clarify or resolve the power struggle.

So, we now have a basic understanding of four forms that power struggles can take. We know that each can occur singly or in any combination during a power struggle. We know that the key to defusing power struggles is to recognize it is occurring and to ensure effective communication to make progress toward resolution. We know that the goal of ensuring effective communication can be reached by reducing ineffective communication and/or using effective communication strategies. In support of that goal we have learned a number of specific strategies for reducing ineffective communication and a number of different strategies for using effective communication. Now all we need to do is to employ these in our professional relationships.

Daniel R. Sewell is Director, Research Development, Fielding Graduate Institute.
At times it is important for us to remember why we have chosen to work at a university – to step back, smell the roses, and get the big picture. We all know that it’s normally not the big salaries or all those stock options – so what is it?

I queried many of our colleagues and these were some of their reasons: The people, environment, students, working with diverse projects, supporting the faculty, location (urban/rural setting), health benefits, bureaucracy (just teasing), and other benefits.

Sometimes we look at stock options, big salaries, and long titles (although universities have lots of long titles too!) and are tempted to test the green grass on the other side of the fence. We, as directors, managers, and supervisors, are not the only ones who peek over the fence – our staff are tempted to do that as well. Therefore, in addition to the “green grass” items noted above, there are times when those items may not be enough. What else can be done? What I have found that works, so far, in the small, rural, agricultural area of the “Palouse” are the following ideas:

Staff Involvement. Yes our jobs can be extremely busy, however, involve staff on key decisions, policies, guidelines, etc. or at least provide the staff opportunity for input and feedback on important items. This type of staff involvement provides a sense of ownership and respect given to that staff member. The staff member feels respected and that their voice matters – which it does or they would not be involved.

Needs Accommodation. Sick kids, family events, taking a class, managing a big project, returning from maternity leave, etc. If these needs can be accommodated for in a way that does not unduly impact the needs of the office, then peace and security is provided to that individual and they in turn feel served.

Communication Link. All employees like to “know stuff” and like to be kept “in the loop”. If possible, it is important to be sensitive to those opportunities when information can be shared that helps fill in the gap of miscommunication or faulty communication so people hear and know the truth. Having correct information and the “whole story” can really help folks be motivated.

Recognition Factor. I recently received a note across my desk recognizing a Veterinary Technician for her “conscientious and thoughtful work she has done on behalf of effective animal care at this Institution”. The Animal Care and Use Committee Chair wrote that memo and copied the Vice-Provost of Research. This type of recognition will go a long way to providing encouragement to a staff employee who, by University policy or state law, is not able to receive a bonus for this outstanding work. Normally our hands are tied at Universities to provide incentive pay for a job well done, therefore, a reasonable option is recognition amongst peers.

Personnel Management. The diverse set of individuals’ strengths and weaknesses, personalities, and people’s experiences, help keep a proper balance in the work place. It is important that this stay balanced; therefore, understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the staff and being familiar with personality differences can help us properly fit together the team for true effectiveness. For example, if a staff member is savvy with electronic submission for sponsors – then allow them to be the expert and then, as noted above, recognize that effort to your colleagues.

Management Support. We all know that “mistakes happen” and when they do employees like to know that you are behind them 100% or at least they hope they are not yelled at by their supervisor. Most folks do like to do a good job and if the right environment is provided then most want to give 110% or more but sometimes there are goof ups and those need to be handled in a respectful manner for all involved.

Respect for People. People are more important than things. People are our most important asset, and, at times our most detrimental. However, we must be wise stewards of these assets and build toward mutual respect of those we work with so the work environment can be a place enjoyed by all who partake of it.

Dan Nordquist is Director, Office of Grant and Research Development, Washington State University.
The Department of Defense (DoD) has special authority under 10 U.S.C. 2371 to enter into agreements known as “other transactions.” “Other transaction” is an abbreviated expression used to refer to any instrument other than a procurement contract, grant, or cooperative agreement. Other transactions are generally not subject to the federal laws and regulations governing procurement contracts. As such, they are not required to comply with the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR), its supplements, or laws that are limited to procurement contracts. The government is free to negotiate each agreement on terms that are mutually beneficial to the government and the recipient.

Other transactions (OTs) include a number of instrument types. Two types of commonly used OTs are:

- Other transactions authorized by the basic 10 U.S.C. 2371 authority for basic, applied and advanced research projects. These types of other transactions are generally used to provide support or stimulation (i.e., “assistance”). This authority, for example, is used to award Technology Investment Agreements (TIAs).
- Other transactions authorized by 10 U.S.C. 2371, as supplemented by section 845 of Public Law 103-160, as amended by section 804 of Public Law 104-201 and section 241 of Public Law 105-261, for prototype projects directly relevant to weapons or weapon systems proposed to be acquired or developed by the DoD. This type of other transaction is an acquisition instrument, commonly referred to as an “other transaction for prototype project,” “prototype other transaction,” or a “section 845 other transaction.”

This article will discuss the “prototype OT” which has been the primary instrument through which DARPA and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) have used the other transaction authority with our university. Unlike the traditional federal procurement contracts, the government can participate as a team member on the prototype OT project.

What is a prototype project?
A prototype project must be directly relevant to weapons or weapon systems, including subsystems or components proposed to be acquired or developed by the DoD. Weapons systems can be broadly interpreted to include training, simulation, and support equipment. A weapon system can be offensive or defensive. Prototypes may be physical or virtual models used to evaluate the technical or manufacturing feasibility or military utility of a particular technology or process, concept, end item, or system.

When can the government use this authority?
As outlined in the “Other Transaction” (OT) Guide for Prototyping Projects, issued by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, this authority may be used only when one of the following criteria is met:

- There is at least one nontraditional defense contractor participating to a significant extent in the prototype project; or
- At least one-third of the total cost of the prototype project is to be paid out of funds provided by the parties to the transaction other than the federal government; or
- A senior procurement executive for the awarding agency determines that exceptional circumstances justify the use of a transaction that provides for innovative business arrangements or structures that would not be feasible under a procurement contract.

The Prototype OTs awarded to our university have been for teams led by the university, which have included among the team members a nontraditional defense contractor.

What is a nontraditional defense contractor?
A nontraditional defense contractor is a business unit that has not, for a period of one year, entered into or performed on (1) any procurement that is subject to full coverage under the Federal Cost Accounting Standards; or (2) any other procurement contract in excess of $500,000 to carry out prototype projects or perform basic, applied, or advanced research projects for a federal agency.

Who is a traditional defense contractor?
Traditional defense contractors include (1) any of the large government contractors (generally fully CAS covered), (2) universities and nonprofits who have FAR contracts over $500k for research, (3) subcontractors to a FAR research or prototype contract over $500,000 or (4) SBIR Phase II recipients.

Additionally, the following contractors are not considered traditional: (1) contractors who have never had a government research contract over $500,000, (2) small subcontractors who have received less than $500,000, (3) entities who have only received grants, cooperative agreements, or other transactions for research or prototypes, and (4) divisions of traditional contractors when the division has not accepted FAR contracts or subcontracts.

When does the government use the OT authority?
The government exercises this authority when it determines it is to the government’s benefit to tap into the research and development of nontraditional government contractors. These nontraditional defense contractors can be at the prime level, subcontractors, or lower tier vendors. The use of a nontraditional contractor must be clearly stated in the government justification to issue an OT. In one recent OT to our university, the justification took a form similar to the following:

Qualification to Receive a Section 845 Agreement Award: The University team qualifies to receive an 845 agreement award because the team fully complies with the following clause of Section 803 of the recently enacted National Defense Authorization Act:

(d) Appropriate Use of Authority. - (1) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that no official of any agency enters into a transaction (other than a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement) for a prototype project under the authority of this section unless—

(A) There is at least one non traditional defense contractor participating to a significant extent in the prototype project.
[Nontraditional Company], a University teammate, qualifies as a non traditional defense contractor and will participate to a significant extent under the proposed University effort.

[Nontraditional Company] fits Section 803's definition of nontraditional defense contractor:

[Nontraditional company] has not entered into or performed with respect to:

1. any contract that is subject to full coverage under the cost accounting standards prescribed pursuant to section 26 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 422) and the regulations implementing such section; or

2. any other contract in excess of $500,000 to carry out prototype projects or to perform basic, applied, or advanced research projects for a Federal agency, that is subject to the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

For at least one year prior to the Phase IA award of January 24, 2001, [Nontraditional Company] has not worked under contract either directly or as a subcontractor to the U.S. Federal government in ten years.

What are some of the benefits of using prototype OTs?
Prototype OTs are an excellent way to fund research efforts when the parties do not know in advance what the results will be. The essence of a prototype OT is the opportunity for teamwork - building a collaborative relationship among all participants. OT members have an equal standing within the team structure. Each team member's success depends on the success of every participant in the OT, and the smallest member of the team has the same voice and prerogatives as the largest. The government program office is also an active participant in the team - not as director or overseer, but as an advisor to find the best technical solutions. This team approach decreases the need for government oversight. Since prototype OTs allow for the preservation of intellectual property rights among members of a team, team members are highly motivated to be successful since they can see a direct long term benefit to their organization and the project. Team-building efforts allow the participants to concentrate technical performance instead of program administration.

How does the government approach the OT agreement?
The Defense Authorization Acts authorizing prototype OTs require that full and open competition be used to the maximum extent practicable. Proposals are evaluated against criteria stated in the solicitation, and agreements are negotiated that are legally binding, but the word contract is not used to stress the differences between FAR-types contracts and agreements for other transactions. A few points worth noting about the structure of these agreements:

- FAR clauses are not mandatory, but FAR-like clauses can be used.
- Traditional work statements are not used - rather a series of performance goals driven by an affordability goal.
- The OT authority provides flexibility to negotiate terms and conditions appropriate for the acquisition, without the more traditional confines of statute or regulations in government procurement.
- From the government’s point of view, it is essential that the Agreements Officer uses good business sense and appropriate safeguards to protect the government’s interest - these include assurance that the cost to the government is reasonable, the schedule and other requirements are measurable and the payment arrangements promote on-time performance.
- The nature of the agreement and applicable terms and conditions can be negotiated by the Agreements Officer based on the technical, cost and schedule risk of the prototype projects.
- No one pricing structure is mandated. When prototype projects are competitively awarded and the risks of the project permit adequate definition of the effort to accommodate establishing a definitive, fixed-price type of agreement, then there typically would be no need to invoke cost accounting standards or audit. If the prototype effort cannot be defined into a definitive, fixed price type of agreement or the agreement requires at least one-third of the total costs to be provided by non-federal parties pursuant to statute, then accounting systems become more important and audits may be necessary.

continued on next page
How are intellectual property rights addressed?
As certain intellectual property rights normally imposed by the Bayh Dole Act (35 U.S.C. 202-204) and 10 U.S.C. 2320-21 do not apply to OTs, Agreement Officers can negotiate terms and conditions different from those typically used in procurement contracts. For universities, the fact that Bayh Dole does not automatically apply can be a concern; however, our experience has been that Agreement Officers generally seek to obtain intellectual property rights consistent with the Bayh Dole Act. Thus, for prototype OTs coming directly to the university, obtaining rights consistent with Bayh Dole provisions has not been difficult. It is important, however, to include the full text of the desired FAR Patent, Copyrights and Data Rights clauses in the agreement. Universities should note that if they are a subcontractor under an OT between the federal government and an industry partner, negotiating intellectual property terms can be a challenge—especially if the industry prime has agreed to terms that would be unfavorable to the university. Since, for the most part, the intellectual property terms granted to companies under prototype OTs tend to be generous, it is up to the University Contracting Officer to then secure from the industry team member favorable intellectual property rights for the university. This is easier said than done, and often requires extensive negotiations with companies that sometimes have little understanding of university culture and regulatory constraints. The University Contracting Officer should note that the government will require a government purpose use license, march-in rights, and foreign access to technology provisions. To mitigate time delays, the University Contracting Officer is well advised to conduct in-depth intellectual property discussions with the industry team member as early in the process as possible. The challenge is to balance the needs of the industry member, the university, and the government.

How are issues about foreign access to technology addressed?
Concerns about foreign access to technology are one of the most common and difficult negotiation problems with prototype OT for universities. The government will consider restricting awardees from licensing technology developed under OTs to foreign firms under circumstances that would hinder potential domestic manufacture or use of the technology. It is important to resolve any foreign access to technology restrictions and identify any conflicts before entering into an OT. Universities also must be aware that export restrictions may prohibit awardees from disclosing or licensing certain technology to foreign firms. We suggest working closely with your legal office and/or export control office to address any concerns relating to fundamental research exemptions or exceptions before entering into a prototype OT.

What has been the university's experience with OTs?
Our first two prototypes OTs were awarded to our National Robotics Engineering Institute (NREC). When DARPA initially notified us that the awards would be “section 845 other transactions,” we really had to do our homework; however, with the assistance of a knowledgeable and understanding DARPA Agreement Officer, the negotiations for both agreements went smoothly. According to the NREC Director, the underlying point is that they trusted us, and wanted us, and were willing to walk us through the process to get the agreements in place—this was pivotal to making things work. Once the agreements were in place, negotiations for amendments have been quite efficient, often requiring only 1-2 pages of text to add additional work for significant dollars ($1-12 million). Our OT agreements are fixed price with payable milestones. Although, we would certainly have preferred a standard cost reimbursable contract, our researchers feel the milestones keep the team focused and driven, and the research on track. Moreover, they feel the milestones are more compatible with the use of best engineering judgment than are fixed deliverables. A word of caution: writing realistic, achievable milestones is critical. As our NREC Director points out, “Milestone payments can be a problem. If we don’t meet a milestone, we don’t get paid. We got off to a tough start with a non-successful first demonstration and really had to focus our effort to recover. We have gotten better at writing milestones and tying them to big events. We have a good relationship with the Program Manager, and he is happy if we meet the spirit of the milestone. We like the freedom to move quickly, change milestones mid-stream, and go where the technology leads us. We have tremendous technical flexibility.”

Susan Burkett is Associate Provost, Research and Academic Administration, Carnegie Mellon University.
NCURA national office, who are always ready to jump in and do whatever they can to help.

Next year’s Region VI/VII meeting is tentatively scheduled for April 17-20, 2005, in Chandler, Arizona. Denise Wallen, Chair of Region VII is hard at work negotiating the site. Gary Chaffins (UO), our own Chair-elect, will be in-charge of the Chandler program and, by the time you read this, a call for volunteers to help with the program should already have gone out. Gary can be reached at gary_chaffins@orsa.uoregon.edu.

As I mentioned in the last issue, there are several regional positions for which elections will occur this fall. Specifically: Chair-elect, Secretary/Treasurer-elect, Member of the Regional Advisory Committee, and Region VI Member of the Board of Directors. Each position has a 2-year term, with Chair and Secretary/Treasurer serving one year each as “elect” and then following with one year in their full capacity. For those of you who may not be familiar with the process, the Regional Nominating Committee is responsible for coming up with no more than two candidates for each position. Once these candidates are announced, there is a 30-day window during which anyone in the Region can nominate additional candidates for these positions (self-nominations are also welcome). Then, the official slate of candidates will be announced, and the polls will open for a 30-day period. All voting is done on-line, and is managed by the national office. The results will be announced within a few days after the polls close (no dangling chads in this organization!). Our Regional Nominating Committee is comprised of Cora Diaz (UCSB), Dan Nordquist (WSU), and is chaired by Dick Seligman (Caltech).

A list of all regional officers can be found on the Region VI website: www.ogrd.wsu.edu/r6ncura/.

Well, it’s mid-July as I’m finishing this, and I can hear Tara’s foot tapping from 3000 miles away (my deadline for getting this in was yesterday). The temperatures are up to their summer norms (high 90s), and I’ve recently learned that I have two staff members who are “expecting” - both are due on the same day. Now, while I’m very happy for them, what are the chances of that in a 7-person office? I should probably call Facilities Management to make sure that our water supply is separate from that of the labs...

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

REGION VII

Rocky Mountain

We had an extremely successful Spring Meeting in San Francisco, with record breaking attendance. The Program Committee led by Region VI is already working on the Spring 2005 meeting in Arizona. As details become available they will be posted to the regional website (http://www.unm.edu/~ncuravii).

It is now time to begin planning and preparation for NCURA’s 46th Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C., October 31 - November 3, 2004. The preliminary program is available on the NCURA website (http://www.ncura.edu) and promises to be another stellar event. Region VII members will be hosting a Regional Business Meeting. All members of the region are invited, and new members are especially encouraged to attend to meet their elected representatives and their regional colleagues. The Region VII Business Meeting will be a post-luncheon Dessert Meeting and is scheduled for Tuesday, November 2 from 1:30 - 2:30 p.m. Location will be announced in the published program.

You are encouraged to keep an eye out for NCURA’s call for volunteers, and respond enthusiastically. NCURA provides wonderful professional development opportunities, and by engaging and becoming involved you will have a great experience to expand your professional development and networking circle.

Please remember to also visit the Region VII Website for upcoming information about election schedules and the possibility for a travel award to the Annual Meeting.

Enjoy the rest of the wonderful summer! The Region VII officers look forward to seeing you in November at the Annual Meeting in Washington, DC.

Denise Wallen is Chair of Region VII and is the Special Assistant to the Vice Provost for Research at the University of New Mexico.

Mark your calendars NOW for your Region’s 2005 Meeting!

Region I:  Dates: May 15 - 18, 2005  Location: Mystic, Connecticut  Hotel: Mystic Hilton

Region II:  Dates: April 17 - 19, 2005  Location: Philadelphia, PA

Region III:  Dates: May 15 - 18, 2005  Location: New Orleans, LA

Region IV:  Dates: May 1 - 4, 2005  Location: Chicago, Illinois  Hotel: Chicago City Centre Holiday Inn

Region V:  Dates: April 10 - 13, 2005  Location: Tulsa, OK  Hotel: Crowne Plaza

Region VI/VII:  Dates: April 17 - 20, 2005  Location: Chandler, Arizona

Watch your Region’s website for additional information!
An Exclusive Interview with the “Leader of the Band”

For over fourteen years NCURA has danced the night away at the Annual Meeting to the music of Soul Source and the No-cost Extensions band. This band is made up of NCURA members who get together once a year to entertain the NCURA membership. Your newsletter editor Dave Richardson was able to get an exclusive interview with the “Leader of the Band,” Steve Smartt.

DAVE: How long has Soul Source & The No-cost Extensions been in existence?
STEVE: The 1990 Annual Meeting was the band’s first gig and we’ve been invited back every year since. The 2004 NCURA Party will be our 15th year.

DAVE: How was the band created?
STEVE: When the Tuesday Night Party was first added to the NCURA program, there was a DJ the first couple of years. It was a great party, but it occurred to me that among this talented bunch of people surely there were some experienced garage band members in our midst. After the 1989 Annual Meeting, I pitched the idea to the NCURA National Office and to Steve Erickson, who was VP/President-elect at the time. As you know, the NCURA VP traditionally has lead responsibility for planning the Annual Meeting. Steve liked the idea and took a chance on us (we still call him the godfather of Soul Source and the No-cost Extensions). So, NCURA allowed me to run an RFP—Request for Performers—in the newsletter. We got just a few volunteers initially, so the core ingredients for a band started to come together.

Garry Sanders and I are two of the founding members still in the group. Spanky McCallister came along a year or two later, as did Jerry Fife and Tara Bishop. We’ve been fortunate to enlist other regulars along the way (Milton Cole, Tim Conlon, Scot Gudger, Jennifer Morgan, and Stephen Williams), rounded out by a couple of local DC musicians as ringers.

DAVE: Each year everyone is always impressed by the band’s performance. How often do you practice prior to the annual party?
STEVE: We have the luxury of just one rehearsal each year, the night before the party. It’s an exercise in creative time management. This is a “what you hear is what you get” band.

DAVE: The band plays a significant set of musical numbers. How is the set chosen?
STEVE: We have quite a catalog built up over the years so now the hard part is deciding which songs NOT to play. Some in the band speculate we could play about 10 hours and not repeat any song. Even so, every year we test drive a handful of new tunes at the rehearsal and make a go/no-go decision by the time we’re through. I get to assume the duties of deciding which tunes will be played and the order of songs in the set lists. The lists are then distributed to the band members the day of the party.

DAVE: Each year it seems that the band’s performance improves as the annual party progresses through the night. Is this a result of the alcohol consumption by those that are partying or does it take the band a little while to warm up?
STEVE: Although there may be a correlation between alcohol and sound quality, like any good party, the later it gets, the more fun is had both on the stage and on the dance floor. Anyone who leaves before the party is over is missing some of our best music.

DAVE: The band is known for the NCURA cult classic hit “I Got Your F&A Right Here.” Where exactly is “Right Here?”
STEVE: Speaking of the CD, is it just a coincidence that NCURA’s membership base has grown significantly since its release or does this just once again demonstrate the unbridled power of the band?

STEVE: The band claims no credit for this coincidence. That said, we’ll take any and all the good vibes we can get.

DAVE: It has been rumored that the band may sign with a major record label, is this true?
STEVE: Anyone who leaves before the party is over is missing some of our best music.

DAVE: Are you kidding? We love our present NCURA private label deal. We’re getting to live out the rock and roll fantasy under NCURA’s sole proprietorship. I expect we will never perform anywhere else under the name Soul Source as long as NCURA keeps inviting us back to play our “annual farewell” gig.

DAVE: Anything that you want to say to your fans?
STEVE: Thanks for making the party memorable every year. If Soul Source played and you weren’t there to hear it, would it be an NCURA party? No way!
NCURA's focus on quality training and customer service has been reflected in another year of financial growth for the organization. At December 31, 2003, the revenues surpassed that of 2002 by over 10%. The conferences, workshops, and additional educational resources such as the video conferences continue to generate the majority of operating income, showing that NCURA is continuing to meet the needs of its membership. The increase in attendance of the conferences and workshops indicate that the topics being covered and information being shared is in line with the needs of the membership. This increase in revenue has allowed NCURA to add additional funds to its investment account. Of even greater significance, this increase allowed NCURA to maintain membership dues at the same level for the second year in a row.

NCURA’s strategic goal states that “NCURA will maintain its financial strength and integrity.” NCURA’s financial performance in 2003 is meeting this strategic goal with increased revenues from both dues revenue and programming. In addition, President Patrick Fitzgerald has taken the initiative to continue to develop relationships with current and potential sponsors, generating almost $45,000 in sponsorship income enabling NCURA to add enhancements to its conferences without increasing registration fees. NCURA looks to continue these relationships developed with the sponsors.

**Revenue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues</td>
<td>$634,600</td>
<td>$554,801</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
<td>$771,843</td>
<td>$678,381</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting Workshops</td>
<td>$81,946</td>
<td>$93,670</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Conferences</td>
<td>$763,476</td>
<td>$649,286</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Conferences</td>
<td>$258,542</td>
<td>$311,250</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentals Workshops</td>
<td>$380,284</td>
<td>$356,909</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships</td>
<td>$44,700</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>$99,866</td>
<td>$78,189</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Dividends</td>
<td>$25,199</td>
<td>$33,203</td>
<td>-32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized gain (loss) on investments</td>
<td>$86,943</td>
<td>($20,288)</td>
<td>123%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized losses on sale of investments</td>
<td>($26,735)</td>
<td>($25,781)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>$13,384</td>
<td>$16,914</td>
<td>-26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$3,134,048</td>
<td>$2,726,534</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership Services</td>
<td>$552,012</td>
<td>$506,277</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
<td>$677,571</td>
<td>$607,008</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting Workshops</td>
<td>$73,872</td>
<td>$59,224</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Conferences</td>
<td>$656,733</td>
<td>$497,791</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Conferences</td>
<td>$223,564</td>
<td>$365,225</td>
<td>-63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentals Workshops</td>
<td>$224,151</td>
<td>$213,517</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>$65,215</td>
<td>$47,526</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,473,118</td>
<td>$2,296,568</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NET DIFFERENCE** $660,930 $429,966 35%
WESTAT, located in Rockville, MD, is one of the foremost contract research corporations in the United States. We provide research and related services to agencies of the U.S. Government and to a broad range of institutional and business clients. Our diverse staff includes more than 1,700 professionals meeting the challenges of complex research projects. We currently have immediate openings for the following IRB positions:

**Central IRB Project Administrator**
Job Code NCUR/HS/4436

Assist in the day-to-day operations within the Central IRB (CIRB) office including supervising several research assistants (RA), overseeing the day-to-day flow of the RA assignments, and performing quality control monitoring of work. Experience in research administration, IRB activities/operations, and/or HRP (Human Research Protection) is desirable. Must have at least 3 years of relevant experience. A bachelor's degree is preferred. This position is based in Rockville, Maryland.

**IRB Coordinator**
Job Code NCUR/HS/4451

We are seeking an IRB coordinator to work with Principal Investigators (PIs) and project managers on the Tuberculosis Epidemiologic Studies Consortium (TBESC) contract. Primary responsibilities will be working with the PIs to determine timelines and approaches for obtaining IRB approvals; meeting periodically with the PIs to review progress; and collaborating with the Prevention Informatics Office to design the TBESC IRB tracking system which will be integrated with other IRB tracking systems. The ideal candidate will have at least 3 years of experience supporting IRB activities; a thorough working knowledge of all IRB-related and human subjects regulations; knowledge of Office of Human Research Protections (OHRP) policies and procedures; and a basic knowledge of the HIPAA. A minimum of a bachelor's degree is required; M.P.H. preferred. This position is based in Atlanta, Georgia.

Visit our website to view complete descriptions of the above positions and additional career opportunities. WESTAT offers a highly professional atmosphere and an outstanding benefits package. For immediate consideration, please send your cover letter, indicating the Westat Job Code, and resume, by one of the following methods to: (Job Code is REQUIRED to apply.)

Westat
Attn: Resume Systems
1650 Research Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850-3195
Fax: (888) 201-1452
Email: resume@westat.com

We are an Equal Opportunity Employer.
On the 15th and 30th of each month the Medical Research Funding Bulletin provides more than 10,000 investigators with a 75 to 100 page catalogue of over $70,000,000 in new medical and scientific grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements from government and private agencies. Also included are news and announcements from the science funding community. The Bulletin service is used by government voluntary agencies to announce new and ongoing funding programs.

GOVERNMENT GRANTS AND CONTRACTS
All newly announced funding opportunities are carried in the Bulletin service. You'll find the current grants and contracts from many government agencies, including the National Science Foundation, Department of Energy, Center for Disease Control, National Institutes of Health, Department of Defense, Army, Office of Naval Research, Health Resources Services Administration, Food and Drug Administration, and Department of Education.

PRIVATE FUNDING
The Bulletin's database of private sources has over 1000 award programs from foundations, corporations, and voluntary organizations, including the American Cancer Association, American Heart Association, March of Dimes, Damon-Runyon, American Lung Association, Burroughs Wellcome, Robert Wood Johnson, Pfizer, Bristol Myers, etc.

NEWS & ANNOUNCEMENTS
Topical information and updates about both government and private agencies, grants, and contracts listed in previous issues, as well as new funding concepts and regulations. The Bulletin service is available for $6.25 per month.

To obtain a sample copy of the Bulletin please Email: grants-one@nyc.rr.com or Visit our WEBSITE http://pws.prerv.net/sscfunding/

Science Support Center • P.O. Box 7507 FDR station • New York, New York 10150-7507
Phone: 212-371-3398 • Fax: 801-761-4200 • Email: grants-one@nyc.rr.com

Because of our commitment to family-centered care, combined with ongoing research and teaching efforts, St. Jude Children's Research Hospital, located in Memphis, offers the following opportunity.

**Administrative Director • Academic Programs**
(Job Number: 09225)

As the key administrative contact, provides direction for the administrative aspects of the office such as budgetary tracking and maintenance of the computer database and website. Ensures the quality and continuity of various teaching programs managed by this office. Additional duties include oversight of regional recruiting efforts for postdoctoral candidates and the accrual and management of competitive training grants.

Master's degree in a relevant field (i.e. basic science or education) required; PhD or EdD desirable. A minimum of five years relevant management experience essential.

St. Jude offers a positive working culture, professional advancement, & competitive compensation. Qualified applicants may apply via our online process at

[www.stjude.org/jobs](http://www.stjude.org/jobs)
The University of Colorado Health Sciences Center is seeking an experienced full-time exempt professional to manage the Office of Grants and Contracts. This office assists principal investigators and administrators in obtaining and administering extramural funds that include Government and non-Government grants and contract projects (sponsored projects) with annual expenditures of more than $195,000,000. This position reports to the Vice Chancellor for Research. Five managers will report to this position, with an overall staff of 26. The Director formulates and implements policies and procedures, provides advice to investigators, department heads and other administrative staff regarding grants and contract matters, administers the grant application and contract proposal function, manages the negotiation of contracts and grants and ascertains acceptability of awards to the Health Sciences Center. The position also administers gift accounts, directs the preparation of monthly and annual reports and manages the oversight of financial and statistical records, including the operation of Federal letters of credit, cash collection and deposit, account establishment, expenditure review, and account closeout. The Director provides leadership, direction and development of the human and fiscal resources of the office, promotes a work environment that enables staff to be productive, determines long term goals, collaborates with researchers to develop policies and practices which enhance program success and chairs and serves on various committees.

Established salary range: $100,000 to $140,000 annually. Actual salary offers will be commensurate with experience.

This position will remain open until filled and the review of applications will commence on August 15, 2004. For consideration, please e-mail a cover letter, the names and contact information for three professional references, and a resume or CV to: robyn.colman@uchsc.edu.

The University of Colorado is committed to diversity and equality in education and employment.

The University of Colorado Health Sciences Center is seeking an experienced full-time exempt professional to manage all compliance requirements related to research. This position will report to the Vice Chancellor for Research with extensive collaboration with the Chancellor's staff, Deans’ offices of the Schools, faculty and affiliates of the campus. The position is responsible for directing and implementing a strategic compliance plan for research, providing direction, guidance, and supervision for all staff and managing the budget. This includes development of policies and procedures, an auditing and enforcement process and procedures and a comprehensive communication and training program. The Director is responsible for providing expert advice to the Chancellor, Deans, faculty, administrative staff, and affiliates regarding regulatory compliance, obtaining and implementing regulatory compliance resources and coordinating and participating in various committees.

This position requires graduation from an accredited college or university with a bachelor’s degree in basic or environmental sciences, health or public administration, public health or a related field and five years of professional experience with federal regulatory compliance in an academic research campus, consultant role, government agency or corporate clinical trials/pharmaceutical environment. An advanced degree related to the assignment is highly desirable. The successful candidate will have extensive knowledge of research and federal regulatory requirements, strong communication skills, demonstrated leadership experience in change management and the ability to work with multiple constituents.

Established salary range: $110,000 to $140,000 annually. Actual salary offers will be commensurate with experience.

This position will remain open until filled and the review of applications will commence on August 15, 2004. For consideration, please e-mail a cover letter, the names and contact information for three professional references, and a resume or CV to: robyn.colman@uchsc.edu.

The University of Colorado is committed to diversity and equality in education and employment.
The National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA), founded in 1959, is an organization of individuals with professional interest in problems and policies relating to the administration of research, education and training activities at colleges and universities.
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Workshops and Senior Level Seminars at the 46th Annual Meeting

by Ann Holmes and Josie Jimenez

The 46th Annual Meeting will welcome NCURA members home again to the Hilton Washington, October 31st - November 3rd. This 46th Annual homecoming will play host to a fantastic array of networking and professional development offerings, including the workshops and senior seminars.

Workshop 2004 includes the must-have Fundamentals workshops in Pre- and Post-Award areas for those new to the field or those looking forward to expanding their knowledge base. Financial Compliance, the FAR, the Circulars, Subawards, Intellectual Property and Contract Negotiation are well represented again this year. New workshops include Proposal Development, Adding Value to Faculty Ideas, Research Administration for IT Professionals Supporting Grants.Gov, and Developing Training Programs on Your Campus.

We'll be spending a full day with NIH & NSF on Thursday, November 4th again this year. These sessions fill up quickly, so if you would like to attend, make sure to register online.

We have expanded the Senior Seminar Series this year from three sessions to five. For those Senior Level members of our profession, this is an invaluable professional development opportunity to share and learn from your colleagues and counterparts around the country.

So, come home for NCURA's 46th Annual Meeting. Whether you are new to the profession, mid-level in your career or the at the most senior levels of the profession, NCURA has an offering for you during the Workshop and Senior Seminar Series 2004! Program details can be found at http://www.ncura.edu/conferences/46/

Ann Holmes and Josie Jimenez are members of the 46th Annual Meeting Program Committee and are Workshop 2004 Coordinators. Ann Holmes is Director of Administration, Center for Advanced Study of Language, University of Maryland College Park and Josie Jimenez is Assistant Director, Office of Grants and Contracts, New Mexico State University.